



[www.guildford.gov.uk](http://www.guildford.gov.uk)

Contact: Andrea Carr  
Committee Services  
01483 444058

29 August 2018

Dear Councillor

Your attendance is requested at a meeting of the **COMMUNITY EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD** to be held in Council Chamber, Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey GU2 4BB on **THURSDAY 6 SEPTEMBER 2018 at 7.00 pm.**

Yours faithfully

James Whiteman  
Managing Director

**MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD**

Chairman: Councillor Adrian Chandler  
Vice-Chairman: Councillor Pauline Searle

Councillor Angela Gunning  
Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr  
Councillor Christian Holliday  
Councillor Nigel Kears  
Councillor Sheila Kirkland

Councillor Bob McShee  
Councillor Tony Phillips  
Councillor David Reeve  
Councillor Matthew Sarti  
One vacancy

**Authorised Substitute Members:**

Councillor Colin Cross  
Councillor Andrew Gomm  
Councillor Angela Goodwin  
Councillor David Goodwin  
Councillor Gillian Harwood  
Councillor Liz Hogger  
Councillor Liz Hooper  
Councillor Mike Hurdle  
Councillor Jennifer Jordan

Councillor Julia McShane  
Councillor Susan Parker  
Councillor Dennis Paul  
Councillor Mike Piper  
Councillor David Quelch  
Councillor Caroline Reeves  
Councillor James Walsh  
Councillor Jenny Wicks

**WEBCASTING NOTICE**

This meeting will be recorded for live and/or subsequent broadcast on the Council's website in accordance with the Council's capacity in performing a task in the public interest and in line with the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014. The whole of the meeting will be recorded, except where there are confidential or exempt items, and the footage will be on the website for six months.

If you have any queries regarding webcasting of meetings, please contact Committee Services.

**QUORUM: 4**



## THE COUNCIL'S STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

### Vision – for the borough

For Guildford to be a town and rural borough that is the most desirable place to live, work and visit in South East England. A centre for education, healthcare, innovative cutting-edge businesses, high quality retail and wellbeing. A county town set in a vibrant rural environment, which balances the needs of urban and rural communities alike. Known for our outstanding urban planning and design, and with infrastructure that will properly cope with our needs.

### Three fundamental themes and nine strategic priorities that support our vision:

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| <b>Place-making</b> | Delivering the Guildford Borough Local Plan and providing the range of housing that people need, particularly affordable homes |
|                     | Making travel in Guildford and across the borough easier   |
|                     | Regenerating and improving Guildford town centre and other urban areas   |
| <b>Community</b>    | Supporting older, more vulnerable and less advantaged people in our community  |
|                     | Protecting our environment   |
|                     | Enhancing sporting, cultural, community, and recreational facilities   |
| <b>Innovation</b>   | Encouraging sustainable and proportionate economic growth to help provide the prosperity and employment that people need       |
|                     | Creating smart places infrastructure across Guildford  |
|                     | Using innovation, technology and new ways of working to improve value for money and efficiency in Council services             |

### Values for our residents

- We will strive to be the best Council.
- We will deliver quality and value for money services.
- We will help the vulnerable members of our community.
- We will be open and accountable.
- We will deliver improvements and enable change across the borough.

## AGENDA

### ITEM NO.

- 1 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**
- 2 **LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT AND DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

In accordance with the local Code of Conduct, a councillor is required to disclose at the meeting any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) that they may have in respect of any matter for consideration on this agenda. Any councillor with a DPI must not participate in any discussion or vote regarding that matter and they must withdraw from the meeting immediately before consideration of the matter.

If that DPI has not been registered, the councillor must notify the Monitoring Officer of the details of the DPI within 28 days of the date of the meeting.
- 3 **MINUTES** (Pages 1 - 8)

To confirm the minutes of the Executive Advisory Board meeting held on 5 July 2018.
- 4 **COUNCILLOR INVOLVEMENT IN THE PREPARATION OF THE BUDGET** (Pages 9 - 12)
- 5 **PROGRESS WITH ITEMS PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE EAB** (Pages 13 - 22)
- 6 **EAB WORK PROGRAMME** (Pages 23 - 26)

To consider and approve the EAB's draft work programme. Details of future Executive decisions are included.

**PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE WILL BE A PRIVATE PRESENTATION AND WORKSHOP IN RESPECT OF THE WIDER DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH INCLUDING MENTAL HEALTH FOR THE EAB FOLLOWING THIS MEETING.**

**Please contact us to request this document in an alternative format**

This page is intentionally left blank

5 JULY 2018

## **SOCIETY, ENVIRONMENT AND COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD**

5 July 2018

- \* Councillor Adrian Chandler (Chairman)
- \* Councillor Pauline Searle (Vice-Chairman)

- |                                 |                          |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| * Councillor Angela Gunning     | * Councillor Bob McShee  |
| Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr     | Councillor Tony Phillips |
| * Councillor Christian Holliday | * Councillor David Reeve |
| * Councillor Nigel Kearse       | * Councillor Tony Rooth  |
| * Councillor Sheila Kirkland    | Councillor Matthew Sarti |

\*Present

Councillor Matt Furniss was also in attendance.

### **S1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies for absence was received from Councillors Tony Phillips and Matthew Sarti. In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 23(i), Councillors Caroline Reeves and Jenny Wicks attended as substitutes for Councillors Tony Phillips and Matthew Sarti, respectively.

### **S2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT AND DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **S3 MINUTES**

Further to the minute concerning the Council's Air Quality Strategy, a Councillor advised that he had been assured by the Waste and Fleet Services Manager that the Council was seeking to improve air quality through its electric fleet vehicle procurement process and he withdrew his previous comment to the contrary.

The minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 19 October 2017 were approved as a correct record, and signed by the Chairman.

### **S4 GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL PROCUREMENT**

The Board considered an update report advising of the procurement methods available to the Council and the current route to market trends used by officers. The report also informed the Board of the proposals for improvements to the procurement function at the Council and the future opportunities arising from the changes.

The report followed a presentation to the Board in February 2017 by officers who summarised the recommendations in their report, developments in legislation, training issues and the long-term goals of the Corporate Procurement Advisory Panel (CPAP). The Board had requested an update on the cost savings to be made by procurement 6-9 months later. However, as the Procurement Officer and Procurement Assistant had left the Council's employment, the Principal Solicitor overseeing the procurement function had prepared this report as an interim measure whilst recruitment to a newly created Procurement Manager post was being carried out. This report explored the tender procedures available under relevant Regulations and looked at the Council's current approach to procurement and areas of opportunity. A further report would be brought to the Board to deal with cost savings from procurement in due course when the Procurement Manager was in post and had the opportunity to review costs.

5 JULY 2018

The Council was legally obliged to ensure that it achieved best value and continuous improvement when exercising its functions including when it was purchasing goods, services and works. It carried a fiduciary duty to local tax payers to spend money lawfully and efficiently and was obliged by law to adopt standing orders which regulated its approach to contracting. Further, the Council was obliged to access the market in legally compliant ways; to meet various transparency obligations in relation to expenditure; and to meet a range of obligations under Data Protection legislation in respect of data controlling and processing.

The Council's duties were threefold, namely, compliance with relevant Regulations when procuring contracts valued above a threshold set by the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU); producing Procurement Procedure Rules (PPRs) which complied with Regulations and other legal requirements; and ensuring that the PPRs were followed by procuring officers. The latest rules that the Council need to comply with, the Public Contract Regulations 2015, came into force in February 2015. They modified the previous Regulations and codified the case law in this area particularly in relation to contract variations and exemptions. The 2015 Regulations created a framework by which public bodies must procure their goods, works and service contracts.

The report outlined the procurement routes to market for new tenders for goods, works and services contracts valued above the OJEU threshold which were Open Procedure, Restricted Procedure, Competitive Procedure with Negotiation, Competitive Dialogue, Innovation Partnership, Negotiated Procedure without Prior Publication and Light Touch Regime. For contracts below the OJEU threshold, a less formal tender or quote procedure could be followed which could either be an Invitation to Tender or a Request for Quote process following the procedures detailed in the PPRs. Framework agreements, a contract between the party who had set up the framework and a supplier or group of suppliers, could also be used in certain circumstances.

As with all procurements, the process undertaken to award the contract must be fair, open and provide for equal treatment. In all cases a detailed specification of the goods, services or works being procured was required prior to the tender going out to the market.

There was currently a devolved model of procurement at the Council with procuring managers in individual services undertaking all of the procurement activity. The Procurement Officer's role, acting with the Procurement Assistant, had been one of advice and assistance which procuring officers utilised at will. The Procurement Manager being recruited would strengthen this function, lead on improvements to the service and provide commercial input and route to market advice. The Procurement Manager would be tasked early on to provide comprehensive training across the services on procurement issues and to work closely with procuring managers to improve procurement outcomes, ensure effective contract management and demonstrate how procurement could assist with service planning and delivering cost savings. The PPRs would be re-written to ensure they were fully up to date with the law and the current requirements of the Council. In future, procuring managers would seek guidance from the internal procurement team prior to seeking external advice, and instructions to external consultants in relation to procurement advice and instructions would be issued via the procurement team.

The CPAP provided strategic advice on procurement activity across the Council and its role would be enhanced to provide a gateway function, approving the route to market and contract award for contracts over a certain level. The CPAP could also approve exceptions/waivers as well as oversee contract management issues. It would be chaired by the Director of Finance and include senior representatives from Procurement, Legal and Finance. Procuring managers would seek approval by the Panel following which the next stage of authority would be sought.

5 JULY 2018

The Council undertook significant procurement activity for goods and services. The changes put in place would improve its performance in this area by strengthening the procurement function, ensuring procuring managers had the necessary knowledge and skills and ensuring appropriate strategic control via the CPAP.

The following points arose from subsequent discussion:

- The reference in the report to the first procurement officer joining the Council in 2015 was intended to show that it was a relatively new resource.
- There would be merit in waiting for the newly appointed Procurement Manager to commence employment with the Council before making significant changes to procurement procedures as he or she may bring other experiences and ideas to the fore.
- The majority of the Council's procurement exercises required open (a one stage process with the Council proceeding directly to Invitation to Tender through open advertisement) or restricted (a two stage process including selection stage where suppliers were shortlisted against specific relevant criteria followed by an Invitation to Tender being sent to a minimum of 5 shortlisted suppliers) procedures usually involving more than two stages. The field would be narrowed in the event of much market interest or to give the Council flexibility.

## **S5 RECYCLING IMPROVEMENTS - REVIEW OF REFUSE AND RECYCLING SERVICE**

Councillor Matt Furniss, Lead Councillor for Infrastructure, Transport and Governance, introduced a presentation in respect of a review of the Recycling and Waste Collection Service. The review was a Corporate Plan objective due for completion in December 2018, seeking Executive approval in June 2019 and implementation from July 2019 to April 2020. The presentation covered the guiding principles of the review, the key drivers for change, an outline of the current service, the Phase 1 proposal, the potential Phase 2 proposal and next steps. The advantages and disadvantages of the current service and both proposals were included.

The guiding principles were to maintain high levels of customer satisfaction, respond to market and legislative changes, maintain/improve environmental performance, avoid additional hard containers for waste and choice of vehicles. The key drivers for change were the market, legislation and local factors including financial challenges for this Council and Surrey County Council, the need to replace the vehicle fleet and the aim to reduce waste. The current service, which utilised split bodied vehicles, consisted of fortnightly collections of comingled recycling and refuse and weekly collections of food waste. The Phase 1 proposal sought to continue the current service changing to single bodied vehicles plus a split bodied vehicle for food waste and nappy collection. The potential Phase 2 proposal would use single bodied vehicles collecting food waste and nappies weekly and three weekly collections of paper and card, comingled recycling and refuse. Advantages of the current service was service stability and disadvantages were that it did not respond to market changes, planned legislation and increased costs. Continuing the same service, simpler fleet vehicles and ability to adjust services to respond to changes in the market and legislation were advantages of the Phase 1 proposal and possible minor disruption to some residents was the disadvantage. The potential Phase 2 proposal's advantages were responding to changes in the market and planned legislation, increased recycling, savings on disposal costs, increased revenue opportunities and increased flexibility whilst major service change was the disadvantage. The next steps were to undertake a detailed financial analysis, plan implementation of a vehicle change in the service, report to the Executive to

5 JULY 2018

approve the release of vehicle funding, order vehicles and return to the Executive in June 2019 to consider whether and when to implement Phase 2.

In addition to the need to procure a new fleet of refuse collection vehicles, major factors affecting the service were the introduction of the Government's Deposit Return Scheme (DRS) in 2010/21 and market factors. The most significant market factor was China, which had previously received up to 70% of the world's waste paper, limiting the paper it accepted for recycling to high quality only which reduced the amount which could be disposed of via that route leading to a flooded and uncertain market. These factors could decrease demand, increase costs and reduce the amount of material collected at the kerbside for recycling by up to 30% as it was being disposed of via other routes. There was a high level of customer satisfaction with the service and the Council was currently ranked twelfth in the country for recycling levels.

The following points arose from related discussion and questions:

- There was some reluctance to see a return to the use of refuse sacks if Phase 2 was implemented as this was seen as a retrograde step which some residents may criticise. Use of sacks for comingled recycling was not favoured as broken glass could split sacks causing danger and untidiness. However, as the sacks would not contain food waste they should not attract vermin. The advantages of sacks, which were currently provided for flats, were that they could be collected more rapidly, were recyclable and reduced the need for more costly plastic containers. Also, some residents had limited space at their properties to accommodate numerous collection containers. However, there was a view that sacks were appropriate for nappy collections. Sacks would be provided by the Council and labelled to make their intended content clear. Residents may need to sign up to the weekly nappy collection.
- Collection services were varied to accommodate the residential situation. There was flexibility over bin size and residents could select the size which best met their needs, subject to a maximum. Although the use of large communal bins was effective for blocks of flats, in areas where they were used more extensively such as Brighton recycling rates tended to be much lower. A direct service to property was preferred. A separate container for paper and card was suggested as comingling of recyclables reduced their quality and therefore their value. It was a challenge for the Council to achieve the best container balance.
- Three weekly collections may be seen as unreasonable and confusing for residents who may forget which materials were being collected next due to the time lapse between collections. Effective communication with residents could alleviate confusion caused. Lessons could be learnt from other councils that had introduced three weekly collections. The Board received a list of 12 such councils, the majority of which were in Scotland and Wales, and one of which was considering moving to four weekly collections. There was stricter legislation in Scotland and Wales mandating kerbside sort and collection. Recycling targets were very high in these countries and local councils were penalised if they did not meet them. The Waste and Fleet Services Manager was intending to visit some councils operating this level of service to ascertain advantages and disadvantages.
- Although the overall number of staff and vehicles would be broadly the same following service changes, they would be configured differently.
- The Council's environmental performance had improved over the years and it sought to increase recycling rates. Councillor Nigel Kears requested that further information concerning how the Council would maintain and improve its environmental performance be sent to him.
- The new refuse collection vehicles, which would be suitable for providing the existing and future services, would be purchased in September 2019 at the earliest when there



5 JULY 2018

would be a clearer picture of market trends and legislation so services could be adapted to reflect them. A communications campaign would accompany the purchase.

- Garden waste collections would continue unchanged and as the associated vehicle fleet was younger there was no need for replacement in the near future. Although garden waste collections reduced the amount of waste being landfilled, they also reduced composting. Surrey County Council's composting campaign, which formed part of the wider Surrey Waste Partnership communications, had been successful with a high take up of composters.
- The review would not include a public consultation as there were no distinct choices for residents with the market and legislation dictating changes.
- Doubt was expressed over the impact of the DRS on reducing the amount of kerbside recycling by a predicted 30% as a similar scheme involving the return of glass bottles in the past had limited take up. However, the mandatory 5p charge per plastic bag had been very effective in encouraging reuse of shopping bags.
- Few refuse collection operatives received work related injuries.
- Education was key to encouraging the public to reduce waste and it was felt that every opportunity should be taken to promote this. The Surrey Waste Partnership had undertaken some work in this area which included schools. Reference was made to campaigns promoting reusable nappies. A Councillor offered to provide officers with details of a nappy library operated by volunteers in Guildford Library.
- Although Surrey County Council sent some waste to an energy from waste incinerator, all the recyclables collected in the Guildford Borough were recycled.
- The current profitable recycling streams were textiles at a value of £200 per tonne and paper at up to £40 per tonne. Unfortunately, few textiles were placed on the kerbside for collection. Approximately 8,000 tonnes of the Borough's mixed recycling was paper and card.
- The 2012 report in respect of the Recycling and Waste Collection Service was available on the Council's website.

In summary, the Chairman stated that, although the Board was in favour of Phase 1 of the review and endorsed it, there were some reservations around waste containers and three weekly collections associated with Phase 2. It was therefore agreed that the outcomes of the completed review would be reported to the Board in May 2019 for consideration prior to Executive approval being sought in June 2019. Members expressed a preference for the final decision regarding this high profile service to be made by full Council.

## **S6 PROCUREMENT OF NEW CEMETERIES**

The Board received a presentation regarding the procurement of new cemeteries. The presentation queried whether the Council should provide new cemetery space, provided background to current service provision and obligations, outlined current Borough capacity, addressed delivery of a new cemetery and raised discussion points.

Following a service review in 2013/14, the Executive agreed to endorse the acquisition and establishment of new burial ground within the Borough in close proximity to the town centre to ensure accessible provision for different faiths, cultures and practices, while continuing to examine other options and the suitability of land.

In terms of current service provision and obligations, the provision of burial grounds was not a statutory duty for local authorities, the increasingly diverse society had a variety of requirements, and local authorities were legally required to dispose of the deceased in cases where there were no family or estate and to do this in accordance with their religious beliefs. The Council operated two open burial grounds in central Guildford, namely, Stoke and The Mount, and was responsible for eight closed churchyards.

5 JULY 2018

Current Borough capacity was 5 to 10 years and there was very limited capacity for catholic lawn graves, non-conformist with no marked provision for members of the travelling community or followers of the Muslim faith and there were sections of the community that the Council was not able to cater for. Capacity was available in local parish churchyards, Brookwood Cemetery, Clandon Wood Natural Burial Reserve, Nightingale Cemetery and Eashing Cemetery.

A site had been allocated for cemetery use in the draft Local Plan and delivery would cost in the region of £5-7 million. A business case had been developed utilising the estimated capital cost and assumptions for ongoing costs and income. To break even the site would need to undertake around 80 full new burials per annum, including the associated memorial income. At this rate the pay back period would be 170 years.

Questions for discussion included in the presentation were whether the Council should provide a cemetery or leave provision to the private sector; whether a Borough provision should be subsidised, break even or net income generating; and where these decisions sat when judged against other priorities for the Service such as the delivery of the crematorium.

The following discussion points arose:

- Although there were estimates relating to the costs associated with a subsidised, break even or income generating service, there were many variables. The existing service was subsidised by the Council.
- The delivery cost of £5-7 million covered land acquisition, Environment Agency ground water measures and the development of the site
- The number of funerals arranged and financed by the Council under Section 46 of the Public Health (Control of Diseases) Act 1984 was increasing and work was being undertaken with Environmental Health to plan for this.
- There was minimal private sector interest in delivering cemeteries as crematoria were more economically viable than cemeteries.
- The only remaining places at The Mount Cemetery were reserved.
- Home burials were permitted with the permission of the land owner if they were not deemed to be a public nuisance.
- The parish churchyards were operated under ecclesiastical law and the majority were Church of England serving parishioners.
- The cost of burials at Brookwood Cemetery and Clandon Wood Natural Burial Reserve were significantly higher than Stoke Cemetery.
- The cemeteries were well looked after and people enjoyed visiting them.
- In response to the three discussion questions contained in the presentation, the Board indicated its support for the Council providing a new cemetery, as agreed following the service review in 2014, on a break even financial basis. In terms of spending priority, it was suggested that the new cemetery should be planned for over the next three years, and delivered after this date and that a site be identified in the meantime.

## **S7            PROGRESS WITH ITEMS PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE EAB**

The progress report required updating following changes to the Lead Councillors and their responsibilities. It was noted that the Smart Cities item would feed into various workstreams and now formed part of the Innovation Strategy. Progress updates were sought in respect of the Leisure Strategy and Arts Development Strategy. It was felt that Business Rates was an important issue for some small traders and the Discretionary Rates Review scheme should be reviewed at an early opportunity. It was currently scheduled for review in 2019.

## **S8            EAB WORK PROGRAMME**

5 JULY 2018

The Chairman advised of some changes that had been made to the Board's Work Programme, namely, the two health related items scheduled for the September meeting had been combined and the Social Care Green Paper item had been deferred as it had not yet been issued. The point of the future operation of public conveniences item listed for the October meeting was to consider whether the Council should continue to provide this service.

The meeting finished at 9.23 pm

Signed .....

Date .....

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Community Executive Advisory Board Report

Ward(s) affected: All

Report of Director of Finance

Author: John Armstrong

Tel: 01483 444102

Email: john.armstrong@guildford.gov.uk

Lead Councillor(s) responsible: Nigel Manning

Tel: 01252 665999

Email: nigel.manning@guildford.gov.uk

Date: 6 September 2018

## **Councillor involvement in the preparation of the Budget**

### **Executive Summary**

Councillors will recall that, in September 2016, both EABs agreed to establish a Joint EAB Budget Task Group (JEABBTG), comprising four councillors appointed by each EAB. The terms of reference of the JEABBTG were approved as follows:

To consider and review for submission to the EABs, Executive and Council:

- (1) the draft General Fund and Housing Revenue Account revenue budgets, and
- (2) the draft General Fund and Housing Revenue Account capital programmes, including growth bids to inform the evaluation process.

The chairman was elected from the eight members on the working group, and the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management attended meetings in an ex officio capacity.

The JEABBTG met on 10 and 23 November 2017, where their comments against each of the bids were documented on a bid summary schedule and reported as part of the reports on the outline budget and capital programme to the Joint EAB meetings in November 2017 and January 2018 and then to the Executive later in January 2018.

For 2018-19, each EAB is asked, once again, to appoint four councillors who, together, will comprise the JEABBTG.

Councillors will recall that the JEABBTG was politically balanced as follows:

- 4 x Conservatives,
- 2 x Liberal Democrats,
- 1 x Guildford Greenbelt Group member, and
- 1 x Labour member

The councillors appointed to the JEABBTG last year were:

Councillor Nils Christiansen  
Councillor Colin Cross  
Councillor Angela Gunning  
Councillor Mike Piper  
Councillor David Quelch  
Councillor David Reeve  
Councillor Caroline Reeves  
Councillor Matt Sarti

If the EABs are happy to continue with this arrangement, it is suggested, based on the political composition of the two EABs, that the Community EAB, at its meeting on 6 September, appoints to the Task Group one member each from the Conservative, Liberal Democrat, GGG and Labour groups, and the Place-Making and Innovation EAB at its meeting on 10 September appoints three Conservative members and one Liberal Democrat member to the Task Group.

The Joint EAB Budget Task Group for 2018-19 will meet on Thursday 8 November 2018 at 2pm.

**Recommendation:**

That a Joint EAB Budget Task Group be re-convened, comprising eight councillors (four from each EAB) and that this EAB appoints four councillors (one member each from the Conservative, Liberal Democrat, GGG and Labour groups) to serve on the Task Group for the 2018-19 municipal year.

Reason for Recommendation:

To ensure backbench councillor involvement in the budget setting process.

**1. Purpose of Report**

1.1 To appoint councillors to the Joint EAB Budget Task Group for 2018-19.

**2. Strategic Priorities**

2.1 The budget is the financial expression of the Council's strategic priorities set out in the Corporate Plan. The preparation of the budget therefore underpins all of the strategic priorities.

**3. Background**

3.1 Following the review of governance arrangements in 2015, the Council established the two EABs and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The governance review findings specifically envisaged the EABs playing a vital role in budget preparation. In September 2016, both EABs agreed to the establishment of a Joint EAB Budget Task Group (JEABBTG) with the following terms of reference:

“To consider and review for submission to the EABs, Executive and Council:

- (i) the draft General Fund and Housing Revenue Account revenue budgets, and
- (ii) the draft General Fund and Housing Revenue Account capital programmes, including growth bids to inform the evaluation process”.

3.2 Each EAB was asked to appoint four councillors to serve on the JEABBTG, and to elect a chairman from among the eight task group members. The Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management was asked to attend meetings in an ex officio capacity.

3.3 The Financial Services Manager, in conjunction with the Lead Councillor, set the agenda for each meeting of the task group. Other officers from Financial Services and other services attended as required.

#### **4. Progress of the JEABBTG**

4.1 The JEABBTG met twice in November 2017 and councillors had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss the merits of each bid, and their comments were documented on a bid summary schedule which formed part of the reports on the outline budget and capital programme to the Joint EAB and then the Executive in January 2018. The agenda items covered at the JEABBTG meetings were:

- (1) Brief presentation on the Outline General Fund Revenue Budget
- (2) Evaluation of the revenue Growth Bids
- (3) Update on the Housing Revenue Account Budget
- (4) Review of capital programme bids

4.2 The Joint EAB Budget Task Group for 2018-19 will meet on Thursday 8 November 2018 at 2pm.

#### **5. Financial Implications**

5.1 There are no financial implications associated with the proposals in this report.

#### **6. Legal Implications**

6.1 There are no legal implications associated with the proposals in this report.

#### **7. Human Resource Implications**

7.1 There are no HR implications associated with the proposals in this report.

#### **8. Summary of Options**

8.1 In summary, the options are as follows:

- (1) To continue with the arrangements for a JEABBTG as recommended, in order to provide backbench councillor involvement in the preparation of the budget.
- (2) To discontinue such arrangements, which would mean that there would be no formal means by which backbench councillors could get involved in detail in budget preparation.

**9. Conclusion**

- 9.1 The EAB is asked to confirm its agreement to the proposals outlined in this report so that backbench councillors can continue to assist the Lead Councillor and officers in their work on the preparation of the draft budget each year.
- 9.2 It would be very helpful if the Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups could submit nominations in respect of this EAB's four nominees to the Task Group in advance of this meeting.

**10. Background Papers**

None

**11. Appendices**

None



**UPDATE / PROGRESS WITH MATTERS PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE COMMUNITY EAB**

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Lead Officer</b>	<b>Lead Councillor</b>	<b>Action Agreed</b>	<b>Progress to Date</b>
07-Jan-16	General Fund Capital Programme (2016-17 to 2010-21)	Victoria Worsfold Financial Services Manager	Cllr Nigel Manning	The Board advised the Executive that: (i) external funding for Chilworth Gunpowder Mills and all appropriate projects be explored by officers; and (ii) annual forecast balances of the respective costs and benefits be included in capital expenditure proposals whenever possible.	03/10/17 e-mail update sought.
25-Feb-16	Procurement	Rob Parkin Council Solicitor and Monitoring Officer	Cllr Matt Furniss	The Board agreed to invite officers back to a meeting in six to nine months, to report on what had been achieved and to provide new information regarding a targeted approach to cost savings.	Report scheduled for 23 February 2017, but meeting was cancelled. 31/03/17 email from Sandra Herbert to say that Nathaniel Burrows could demonstrate the new procurement toolkit.
26-May-16	Business Rates Discretionary Rates Review	Claire Morris Director of Resources	Cllr Nigel Manning	The Board indicated that the application process should encourage the dual-use of properties, as well as offering incentives for pursuits that may complement local authority activity. The Board suggested that the Executive should receive an explanation of what each organisation in receipt of rate relief offered to the community.	On 19 July 2016, the Executive agreed: (1) to make no changes to the discretionary rate relief scheme, but noted that there will be an increase in cost over the next three years; (2) to review the scheme again in 2019 when there will be more information available about both future funding and the health of the High Street.

14-Jul-16	Arts Development Strategy	Jonathan Sewell Leisure Services Manager	Cllr Nikki Nelson-Smith	The Board suggested that a review should be carried out to identify any missed opportunities due to a lack of resources and to determine how additional funding could be used to enhance the arts development provision in the Borough. The Board resolved that the officers and the lead councillor review the budget for the Arts Development Service.	This topic is included on the Board's Work Programme for a future update.
08-Sep-16	Website Development Project	Jenifer Davis Web Programme Manager	Cllr Paul Spooner	The Board suggested that as both Councillors and residents used Modern.Gov and the search system for planning applications regularly, it was important that they functioned properly and should be included in the project.	<p>The new website went live as planned in December 2016. The actions arising from the meeting referred to two specific areas where the website is integrated to internal systems – the planning system (Idox) and Modern.Gov, which the Committee Services team use for managing and publishing committee information.</p> <p>As part of the website development project we are working with Modern.Gov to ensure a consistent look and feel across the two areas, we are also looking at the way that the information is presented to simplify the user journey. Additionally, by introducing a 'Council and Democracy' area on the site, we hope to make this type of information more easily accessible to all.</p> <p>The action to look at the planning application searches is more complex, as the system for the</p>

					<p>storage and retrieval of planning applications is provided by Idox and the roadmap to deliver upgrades and improvements needs to be agreed with them directly. We are working with them to determine whether we can change the look and feel of the area, and can make requests for functional changes, but, as part of a large group of customers using the same system, we are not able to determine the timescale or priority for any functional development or implementation. The planning team work directly with Idox and will continue to ensure the system meets our customer needs. We will report back to EAB once progress is made with Idox.</p> <p>09/10/17 update from Jenifer Davis. Planning services have been working with Idox to deliver improvements to the customer facing webpages on the planning system, and have made significant improvement to the customer experience, ease of use and accessibility of the system. In December 2016 the graphical user interface was given a refresh to bring it in line with the launch of the new website, and ensure users had a smoother experience moving from the main website to the planning pages. In addition to this, shortcut links were added to</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>the main website, giving users the opportunity to enter the planning system at more entry points: the Planning and Building Control pages, My Guildford and Self Service. The planning login page was also given more prominence. The Idox system was also upgraded in February this year, from version 2, to version 2.1. This brought a raft of upgrades to the customer interface, including better browser support and responsiveness – customers can now access the planning system on Internet Explorer 9, 10 and 11 and the current versions of Google Chrome, Firefox and Safari. In addition there is a better experience for those viewing on mobile phones, with a more responsive user interface. Other new features introduced in February include better signposting for those wishing to view or comment on a specific planning application and improved mapping integration as well as better information architecture – all designed to give a better customer experience. We will continue to work with Idox and other councils to ensure that our customer needs remain at the forefront of the development roadmap and future planned changes meet those customer needs.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

20-Oct-16	Smart Cities: an Energy Climate Change and Sustainability Perspective	Chris Burchell Local Economy Manager	Cllr Gordon Jackson	The Board asked the Lead Councillor to consider the matters discussed at the meeting with the other members of the Executive at the relevant time.	Various innovation projects being progressed by the Innovation Strategy Board relate to Smart Cities.
21-Nov-16	Proposed Leisure Strategy	Jonathan Sewell Leisure Services Manager	Cllr Iseult Roche	The Board agreed that the development of a facilities-led Leisure Strategy should be dependent on the outcome of the public consultation on the feasibility of a new sports and entertainment venue and the non-user survey being commissioned by Freedom Leisure.	This topic is included on the Board's Work Programme for a future update.
23-Feb-17	Health & Wellbeing Strategy Update	Helen Barnsley Public Health Co-ordinator	Cllr Iseult Roche	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public Health Co-ordinator to send the EAB details of successes referred to in her presentation.</li> <li>Lead Councillor to report back to the Board on the issue of preventing carer strain.</li> </ul>	The wider determinants of health, including mental health, will be considered by the Board on 6 September 2018.
25-May-17	Shared and Traded Services	Claire Morris Director of Resources	Cllr Nigel Manning	<p>The Board agreed that the projects provided some exciting and ambitious opportunities.</p> <p>The Board suggested options for shared and traded services including domotics, electric vehicles and woodland management.</p> <p>The Office Services Manager agreed to arrange a workshop for Councillors, following on from one arranged for officers in June.</p> <p>The Board's role in considering business cases for shared and</p>	02/10/17 Email sent to Kevin Handley for further update.

				traded services and making recommendations would continue.	
13-Jul-17	Recycling Improvements: Review of Recycling and Waste Collection Service	Chris Wheeler Waste and Fleet Services Manager	Cllr Matt Furniss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Recycling and Waste Officer agreed to circulate details of the end destinations of recycled objects.</li> <li>The Board asked for the Waste and Fleet Services Manager to provide a further update on the review of the refuse and recycling service in July 2018.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Details of the end destinations of recycled objects were emailed to EAB members 14/07/17.</li> <li>The Board received a presentation in respect of the review of the Recycling and Waste Collection Service at its meeting on 5 July 2018. A further update is scheduled for May 2019 for Phase 2 of the review.</li> </ul>
13-Jul-17	12 Month Review of Council's Revised Governance Arrangements	John Armstrong Democratic Services Manager	Cllr Matt Furniss	<p>The Board agreed that the following recommendations be submitted for consideration by full Council on 25 July 2017:</p> <p>(1) That the Council continues the public webcasting of meetings of the EABs.</p> <p>(2) That a six-monthly meeting between all members of the Executive and the EAB and OSC chairmen and vice-chairmen, together with one representative from the Corporate Management Team, be established to discuss topic areas for future work programmes and to discuss how the EABs and OSC could make a more effective contribution to the decision-making process.</p> <p>(3) That, in order to improve the arrangements for topic selection and agenda planning, the Executive/CMT</p>	<p>Report scheduled for Council meeting on 25 July 2017. All recommendations were accepted to ensure that the Council's decision-making processes remain accessible, robust and accountable to local people.</p> <p>On 24 July 2018 the Council agreed to amend the names and remits of the two EABs to reflect the priorities in the new Corporate Plan 2018-23. The Borough, Infrastructure and Economy EAB was renamed the Place-making and Innovation EAB and the Society, Environment and Council Development EAB was renamed the Community EAB.</p> <p>A further review has subsequently taken place and on 9 October 2018 the Council will consider a</p>

			<p>be requested to provide suggestions for topic areas for EABs drawn from the (revised) Corporate Plan Action Plan for consideration at future work programme meetings and to have a CMT (as well as Executive) representative attend those meetings.</p> <p>(4) That the approach to the development of the O&amp;S Committee work programme be broadened, by amending O&amp;S Procedure Rules to introduce a more flexible approach to topic selection through replacing the topic selection flow chart in OSC Procedure Rules with the PAPER tool.</p> <p>(5) That, in addition to raising questions at meetings, OSC members should have an opportunity for putting written questions to lead councillors attending OSC meetings in advance so that written answers may be prepared.</p> <p>(6) That lead councillors should normally present matters, with officer support, for discussion at EAB meetings and engage actively in a dialogue with the EABs regarding those matters, and that the terms of reference of the EABs be amended accordingly.</p> <p>(7) That EABs be encouraged to set up task groups to research and</p>	<p>report recommending the disbanding of the existing EABs and establishing one overarching EAB making greater use of existing powers to establish task groups to look at specific issues and projects relating to the delivery of the nine strategic Corporate Plan priorities.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>review areas for policy development, subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(a) consideration of implications for staff resources, and</li><li>(b) to the relevant lead councillors attending meetings of such task groups in an ex officio capacity as appropriate.</li></ul> <p>(8) That more proactive measures for public engagement in respect of the work of the OSC and the EABs be established by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(a) inviting suggestions for the OSC work programme from the public and partners as well as officers and councillors, and</li><li>(b) alerting the public about OSC and EAB agenda topics on days leading up to the meeting, on the day of the meeting and action agreed at the meeting through press releases/social media.</li></ul> <p>(9) That progress on matters previously considered by EABs be reported back to them when appropriate.</p> <p>(10) That a briefing note be provided to those officers invited to attend OSC meetings to ensure there is full comprehension of the process, including the role of scrutiny and the Scrutiny Officer.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--



13-Jul-17	Progress on councillor involvement in the preparation of the budget	John Armstrong Democratic Services Manager	Cllrs Matt Furniss and Nigel Manning	<p>The Democratic Services Manager explained that both EABs had agreed to establish a politically balanced Joint EAB Budget Working Group in September 2016, comprising four councillors appointed by each EAB. The Board agreed to continue with this arrangement, and was asked to appoint one Conservative member, one Liberal Democrat member, one Labour member and one Guildford Greenbelt Group member to a new Joint EAB Budget Task Group.</p>	<p>Councillors Angela Gunning, David Quelch, David Reeve and Caroline Reeves were appointed to the Joint EAB Budget Task Group for 2017-18 to ensure backbench councillor involvement in the budget setting process.</p> <p>Nominations for the Budget Task Group for 2018/19 will be sought on 6 September 2018.</p>
07-Sep-17	Sustainability and Green Energy	Philip O'Dwyer Director of Community Services	Cllr Nikki Nelson-Smith	<p>"Environment Matters" newsletters, produced by the Energy and Sustainability Team, to be circulated to all councillors.</p> <p>The Facilities and Office Services Manager agreed to find out whether data was available on the amount of thermal units the project with Action Surrey had saved.</p> <p>The Facilities and Office Services Manager agreed to source information on the calorific value of dry woodchip.</p> <p>No figures were available for voltage optimisation, and the Facilities and Office Services Manager agreed to find out whether power factor correction would be used.</p> <p>Cllr Pauline Searle agreed to ask whether Freedom Leisure would be</p>	<p>An update on the possible creation of Guildford Energy Company, Climate Change and the Council's Green Agenda is currently an unscheduled item on the Work Programme.</p>

			<p>able to contribute towards the costs of potential project at Spectrum.</p> <p>The Board to invite a representative from University of Surrey to speak about 5G.</p> <p>The Board recommended that water source heat pumps and hydro-generation should feature in any long-term plans regarding Energy and Sustainability</p> <p>The Board agreed that the Facilities and Office Services Manager be invited to report on progress early in 2019.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

## EAB WORK PROGRAMME

Corporate Plan items are intended to give the EABs an early opportunity to consider major policies or projects.

### COMMUNITY EAB

<b>06 SEPTEMBER 2018</b>					
<b>Item</b>	<b>Additional information</b>	<b>Corporate Plan Priority</b>	<b>Relevant Councillor(s)</b>	<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Target completion</b>
Wider Determinants of Health including Mental Health		Yes	Cllr Iseult Roche	Helen Barnsley Public Health Co-ordinator and possibly Local Mental Health Trust representative	
Budget Task Force	Establish a Task Force involving both EABs to consider the budget for 2019/20.	Yes	Cllr Paul Spooner	Claire Morris Director of Finance	2018
<b>18 OCTOBER 2018</b>					
<b>Item</b>	<b>Additional information</b>	<b>Corporate Plan Priority</b>	<b>Relevant Councillor(s)</b>	<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Target completion</b>
Future operation of Public Conveniences			Cllr Matt Furniss	Chris Wheeler Waste and Fleet Services Manager	
<b>14 FEBRUARY 2019</b>					
<b>Item</b>	<b>Additional information</b>	<b>Corporate Plan Priority</b>	<b>Relevant Councillor(s)</b>	<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Target completion</b>
<b>04 APRIL 2019</b>					
<b>Item</b>	<b>Additional information</b>	<b>Corporate Plan Priority</b>	<b>Relevant Councillor(s)</b>	<b>Lead officer</b>	<b>Target completion</b>

## EAB WORK PROGRAMME

MAY 2019					
Item	Additional information	Corporate Plan Priority	Relevant Councillor(s)	Lead officer	Target completion
Recycling Improvement – Review of Refuse and Recycling Service	Phase 2 of review (requested in July 2018 when the Board considered Phase 1)		Cllr Matt Furniss	Chris Wheeler Waste and Fleet Services Manager Liz Mockeridge Recycling and Waste Officer	

### Unscheduled items

#### Community EAB

Item	Additional information	Corporate Plan Priority?	Relevant Lead Councillor(s)	Lead officer	Target completion
Social Care Green Paper	Invite Cllr Nikki Nelson-Smith		Cllr Iseult Roche	Philip O'Dwyer Director of Community Services	
Strategy for the Elderly/Later Life			Cllr Nikki Nelson-Smith	Philip O'Dwyer Director of Community Services	
Creation of Guildford Energy Company, Climate Change, and the Council's Green Agenda	To include solar, wind and other forms of renewable energy. Deal with Energy Company in private as it is commercially sensitive.		Cllr Nikki Nelson-Smith	Philip O'Dwyer Director of Community Services	
Student Accommodation	Suggested by Claire Morris (deleted from 21 May 2018 meeting).		Cllr Phillip Brooker	Claire Morris Director of Finance	
Procurement Update	Further report to be brought to the Board on cost savings from procurement when the new Procurement Manager is in post and has reviewed costs.		Cllr Matt Furniss	Diane Owens Principal Solicitor / Procurement Manager	

## EAB WORK PROGRAMME

Item	Additional information	Corporate Plan Priority?	Relevant Lead Councillor(s)	Lead officer	Target completion
Arts Development Strategy	An overdue update was requested at the meeting of the former Society, Environment and Council Development EAB on 5 July 2018.		Cllr Nikki Nelson-Smith	Jonathan Sewell Leisure Services Manager	
Proposed Leisure Strategy	An overdue update was requested at the meeting of the former Society, Environment and Council Development EAB on 5 July 2018.		Cllr Iseult Roche	Jonathan Sewell Leisure Services Manager	

This page is intentionally left blank