

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Draft Minutes of a meeting of Guildford Borough Council held at Council Chamber, Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey GU2 4BB on Tuesday 8 October, 2019

- * Councillor Richard Billington (Mayor)
- * Councillor Marsha Moseley (Deputy Mayor)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councillor Paul Abbey * Councillor Tim Anderson * Councillor Jon Askew * Councillor Christopher Barrass * Councillor Joss Bigmore * Councillor David Bilbé * Councillor Chris Blow * Councillor Dennis Booth * Councillor Ruth Brothwell Councillor Colin Cross Councillor Graham Eyre * Councillor Andrew Gomm * Councillor Angela Goodwin * Councillor David Goodwin * Councillor Angela Gunning * Councillor Gillian Harwood * Councillor Jan Harwood * Councillor Liz Hogger * Councillor Tom Hunt * Councillor Gordon Jackson * Councillor Diana Jones * Councillor Steven Lee * Councillor Nigel Manning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Councillor Ted Mayne * Councillor Julia McShane Councillor Ann McShee * Councillor Bob McShee * Councillor Masuk Miah * Councillor Ramsey Nagaty * Councillor Susan Parker * Councillor George Potter * Councillor Jo Randall * Councillor John Redpath * Councillor Maddy Redpath * Councillor Caroline Reeves * Councillor John Rigg * Councillor Tony Rooth * Councillor Will Salmon * Councillor Deborah Seabrook Councillor Pauline Searle * Councillor Patrick Sheard * Councillor Paul Spooner * Councillor James Steel * Councillor James Walsh * Councillor Fiona White * Councillor Catherine Young |
|--|---|

*Present

CO59 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ann McShee and Pauline Searle and from Honorary Freeman Jen Powell and Honorary Aldermen Keith Childs, Catherine Cobley, Clare Griffin, Jayne Marks, Terence Patrick, and Lynda Strudwick.

CO60 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

CO61 MINUTES

The Council confirmed, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2019 and the adjourned meeting held on 31 July 2019. The Mayor signed the minutes.

CO62 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

Visit to Guildford of the Oberbergermeister of Freiburg

The Mayor reported that, in early September he and other council colleagues welcomed to Guildford the new Lord Mayor of Freiburg, Martin Horn and a delegation of councillors from our twin town. The visit, celebrating 40 years of twinning, provided an opportunity to showcase some of Guildford's most historic sites and prominent local businesses, share ideas regarding common challenges, and to strengthen our special partnership. Freiburg would be celebrating

its 900th Anniversary in 2020 and arrangements were being made for Guildford to be represented in a number of planned projects to commemorate this special anniversary.

Charitable work

The Mayor reported that he had already received fantastic support from local groups and organisations, for his charities, particularly those who had confirmed their attendance at his first organised event, the charity night at The Shahin Tandoori Restaurant on Monday 14 October. The Mayor asked that anyone wishing to donate a prize for the raffle, should let Kate Foxton know.

Remembrance

The Mayor asked councillors to inform Kate Foxton if they would be able to spare some time for poppy selling on Friday 8 or Saturday 9 November, as there were still some time slots available.

CO63 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

Wisley Garden Village application

The Leader commented that the Managing Director had circulated to all councillors his summary and conclusions in relation to the Wisley Garden Village application, which had been prepared in consultation with the Leader, Councillor Bigmore and Councillor Anderson. The Leader was pleased that the outcome of the review had indicated that there had been no wrongdoing in this case and that the Managing Director would fully implement any actions following on from the lessons learned. The Leader also reported that Garden Village status had not been granted in this case and so the matter was now closed.

The Leader was asked to expand a little more on the Wisley letter matter and to ask whether she was comfortable that Savill's had written the letter on behalf of the Council in respect of advice that the Council was providing. The Leader indicated that she did not have anything to add to the Managing Director's statement.

The Managing Director stated that although they had provided that template but in his conclusions he had accepted that the relationship with Savill's and the information they provided should have been made clearer. He reiterated the point that no wrongdoing had been found in respect of this matter, but there were some lessons to be learnt including being clearer about where we get information from.

Changes to the Executive

The Leader reported on recent changes to the Executive, both in terms of membership and portfolio responsibilities. The Leader also reported on how the Council intended to improve communication and awareness of Climate Change initiatives being developed by the Council and others in the Borough.

CO64 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The following persons addressed the Council meeting in respect of the matters indicated below:

- (1) Gavin Morgan, on behalf of Guildford Heritage Forum, in respect of Agenda Item 11 Guildford Museum Development Project – Update
- (2) David Burnett in respect of the Council's decision to sell the plot of land at Wharf Lane Garages

The relevant lead councillors responded to the statements.

CO65 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

- (1) Councillor Bob McShee asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, the following question:

“Now that Highways England (HE) have commenced the A3 improvements near the University interchange, I would ask the Leader of the Council if Guildford Borough Council can put pressure on HE to remove ‘Deadly Junction’ the Beechcroft Drive/A3 Junction

I recently went on a tour of the University of Surrey and asked a member of their staff about this junction and was told that the University had agreed some years ago to join Beechcroft Drive to an access road on the University’s land.

As the University is willing to co-operate to remove this unsafe junction, I enquire if the Council can liaise with HE and the University to resolve this long outstanding safety issue.”

The Leader of the Council’s response was as follows:

“The Council has been liaising with Highways England, its predecessor the Highways Agency, Surrey County Council, Anne Milton MP, the University of Surrey and the Beechcroft Drive Residents Association over a number of years with respect to the potential closure of the Beechcroft Drive junction with the A3 and the provision of an alternative access for vehicles.

In 2015, Guildford Borough Council commissioned consultants to prepare outline highway design options and cost estimates for providing an alternative access to Beechcroft Drive (a private road). The options involved the improvement and/or diversion of the farm track which links Beechcroft Drive to the private network of roads on the University of Surrey’s Manor Park campus. This would then allow onward motorised vehicle travel to Egerton Road (a road forming part of Surrey County Council’s Local Road Network) via Gill Avenue (also a private road, which is controlled by the Royal Surrey County Hospital). These options would, if realised, have allowed for the closure of the Beechcroft Drive junction to the A3 Guildford bypass.

These highway design options have been considered in a number of meetings and conversations over several years with representatives of Highways England, Surrey County Council, the MP, the University, and the Beechcroft Drive Residents Association.

As of March 2019, Highways England has advised that it will not be providing an alternative access. We understand that Highways England would, however, consider options for facilitating a joint project.

The key stumbling block at the present time is the significant funding that would be required to provide for the alternative access and a commuted sum for its future maintenance.”

Councillor Caroline Reeves
Leader of the Council

Arising from a supplementary question, the Leader indicated that she could not give the actual figure in respect of the significant funding referred to in her answer, but agreed that this junction was particularly dangerous. Considerable time had been spent trying to resolve the issue but

unfortunately funding from Highways England and Surrey County Highways had been withdrawn. The Leader indicated that the Council should try to ensure that any planning applications that might come forward could find a way of creating this much needed road for residents at Beechcroft Drive.

A further question asked the Leader to reconsider how best to move forward in respect of finding a solution to this issue given that the University had insisted on any new access road to Beechcroft Drive should be wide enough for buses and two lanes, rather than a simple track as required by the residents. The Leader stated that Highways England had insisted on the high specification for the road, but as there currently were no sources of funding for its construction, the project could not be taken forward.

- (2) Councillor Bob McShee asked the Lead Councillor for Major Projects, Councillor John Rigg, the following question:

“Could the Lead Councillor for Major Projects please provide an update on the funding strategy in respect of the Weyside Urban Village project?”

The Lead Councillor’s response was as follows:

“The funding strategy for the Weyside Urban Village project is as outlined at the two Financial Briefing sessions for all councillors, which were held on 7 August and 4 September 2019. A copy of the presentation was subsequently emailed to all councillors.

Grant applications have been made to the Housing Infrastructure Fund and the M3 LEP for £52.3m and £7.5m respectively. The Business Case sets out a base case whereby project costs are funded by plot sale land receipts”.

Councillor John Rigg
Lead Councillor for Major Projects

- (3) Councillor Ramsey Nagaty asked the Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration, and Housing Delivery, Councillor Jan Harwood, the following question:

“Can the Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration, and Housing Delivery please comment on the summary below, extracted from Guildford Borough Council data included in the approved Local Plan and public documents since that date.

In particular, please can he:

- a) *Provide updated information on the latest estimates (estimates are the highlighted figures, which are also flagged via footnotes), so that the net oversupply within the Local plan can be quantified? By our estimates, Guildford is building 70% more homes than it needs, all on green fields, which is an environmental disaster. None of this is needed, as set out in the summary below.*
- b) *Explain why the Brownfield review that was agreed on the last full Council meeting has not yet been started, given that relatively little brownfield land supply could prevent the need to build on any greenfield sites at all, including on the countryside beyond the Green Belt in Ash and Tongham?*

Summary showing systemic oversupply by Guildford, including unnecessary use of green field sites

Estimates are highlighted for comment.

<i>Commitments as at 1.4.2018 (18 months ago)¹</i>	<i>p25 LP</i>	3675**
<i>Local authority sites not allocated</i>	<i>p25 LP</i>	620
<i>Guildford including SARP (Slyfield)</i>	<i>p26 LP</i>	1399
<i>Guildford town centre</i>	<i>p26 LP</i>	863
<i>Within villages</i>	<i>p26 LP</i>	154
<i>Ash & Tongham urban area</i>	<i>p25 LP</i>	44
<i>Previously developed land in the Green Belt</i>	<i>p26 LP</i>	195
<i>GBC estimate for windfalls (NOTE – low!)</i>	<i>p25 LP</i>	750
<i>Site approved but omitted from local plan subtotals – Bell & Colvill site</i>		40
Subtotal per Local Plan of approved land in settlements		7740
Amendments to this subtotal:		
<i>Slyfield – understatement of housing number compared to application to HMG – all GBC numbers</i>		101
<i>Student homes – at date of local plan: 2,100 student units with existing planning permission divided by 3 to give home equivalents as at 1.4.18²</i>		700
<i>New student planning permissions approved as windfalls in planning committee since 1.4.18 (underestimate?)³</i>		290**
Existing planning permissions and urban sites as identified by GBC		8841
<i>Further planning permissions and completions since 1/4/18</i>		500^{4**}
<i>THIS IS AN ESTIMATE - number to be confirmed</i>		
		9341
<i>Incremental historic windfalls compared to planning allocations [underestimate?]</i>		200^{5**}
<i>Anticipated future incremental windfalls</i>		500 ⁶
Total scope for urban sites		10041

¹ This was the subject of a question at the last Full Council meeting, and also an FOI request, to give a number updating the number provided in the Local Plan as at 1/4/18. No update has yet been provided either by the Lead Councillor (despite undertakings to do so) nor by the planning department.

Given that the Inspector approved the plan in February 2019, and no update was provided, was this a breach of due process, since it is therefore demonstrable that the current capacity of brownfield land was not considered either by GBC or by the Inspector at the time that the plan was approved?

² Number per extant planning permissions at 1.4.18 –to be updated using GBC data

³ Estimate based on planning committee notes, but likely to be significantly higher given recent permissions. Current information will be required to confirm the estimate

⁴ This is the uplift to 3674 to reflect the question which has not yet been answered which was referred to in Footnote 1.

⁵ There was considerable uplift in some approved permissions compared to original allocations; it may be useful to express this as a windfall component so that this can be extrapolated for the rest of the plan period, but not that the total uplift of footnote 4 and footnote 5 is the uplift to footnote 1, i.e. new permissions and completions

⁶ Extrapolated windfalls for the remainder of the (future) plan period

Required capacity from urban brownfield	637
LOW ESTIMATE - see below for illustration of supply	
Total requirement met without use of Green Belt land	10678

It can be seen that the total approved target requirement for homes within the borough of Guildford could hypothetically be met by finding 637 homes on urban brownfield sites in addition to sites in the urban area and on previously developed land. There is no need for any greenfield sites at all, and certainly no sites on green belt land.

This need for 637 homes could, hypothetically, be met as follows:

Urban supply capacity NOT included in Local Plan could be (illustrative, pending brownfield review/Masterplan):

North Street - additional homes per GBC estimate	400
Debenhams - estimate of additional homes per anecdotal comment	200
Walnut Tree Close/Woodbridge Meadows - estimate	400**
IE urban area can meet shortfall re housing need	800

At the time of the Examination in Public, it was clear already that there had not been a brownfield appraisal in relation to sites which could and should be considered for the plan, nor was the plan updated for the acknowledged revision of sites at North Street.

No need has been demonstrated for ANY release of Green Belt land either by inseting villages, development around villages or strategic sites. The **excess supply**, all of which attacks Green Belt land, can be expressed as follows:

Gosden Hill	1700
Blackwell Farm	1500
Keens Lane (planning permission now granted for 141 homes and 70 care home places)	150
Former Wisley Airfield	2000
Development around villages	945
Land inset in villages	252
Net oversupply	6547

Percentage oversupply using Green Belt land 61.31%

Add in countryside beyond the Green Belt (Ash & Tongham) 885

Building on green field sites **7432**

Percentage oversupply using green field sites **69.60%**

i.e. we are building **approximately 70% too many homes**, all of which are on green fields. This is in breach of our undertaking to reduce our carbon footprint.

Note: Keens Lane has now been granted planning permission, unfortunately, but it is indicative of the inappropriate and planned Green Belt utilisation which was not required or justified in preparing the original plan.

In fact, that component now represents a further determined supply of 141 homes and 70 care home places, so the shortfall relative to extant planning permissions and urban supply, and the justification for further Green Belt incursion, is still less.

Similarly, Tannery Lane has now obtained planning consent for 75 homes (compared to 60, an uplift of 25%), and unless overturned it too will represent a significant oversupply. Note in that decision that there was a 25% uplift compared to the original site allocation, so the 70% oversupply indicated above could be in fact even higher – 25% uplift on 70% would give an overall uplift of 87.5% compared to the objectively assessed housing target, which already meets all of Guildford’s objectively assessed housing need.

There is a requirement to demonstrate a 5-year land supply. However, this could have been easily demonstrated by the Planning department within existing urban sites and planning permissions since these substantially already exceed the annual requirement x 5 plus a buffer”.

The Lead Councillor’s response was as follows:

“In response to part a) of Councillor Nagaty’s question, planning officers have previously responded that the information will be shared with him as soon as it is available. It is considered to be important that finalised data, which informs the Council’s housing supply position is not released in a piecemeal manner and that it is rigorously checked by officers prior to publication. One of the key reasons for this rigour is to ensure that the data forming the basis for the Council claiming a 5-year housing land supply is robust and can be relied on as a basis to refuse inappropriate applications and defend planning appeals, including on green belt sites, where claims may be made to the contrary.

The Council does not update the 5-year housing land supply on a day to day or week to week basis. The Council’s 5-year supply is currently set at the figure the Inspector used in his report at 5.93 years of supply until 31 October 2019. After this date the plan is no longer considered to be ‘recently adopted’ and officers are working on the latest figure based on completions and permissions and other data informing the deliverability of sites post the information provided at the examination. Officers anticipate having information by mid-October and would then share with Lead councillors prior to publishing. Prior to this, we will ensure that we review the figures provided by Councillor Nagaty relevant to our housing supply position and check for any discrepancies.

In terms of the summary provided by Councillor Nagaty, including the statement that headroom (characterised as ‘oversupply’ in the summary) above the housing requirement is not needed, without comprehensively addressing the claim or figures provided, it is important to bear in mind the following:

- *The Local Plan has been subject to thorough examination, which considered whether exceptional circumstances were in place to justify the release of green belt land. This occurred in the context of headroom in the Plan’s housing supply. The reasons provided by the Planning Inspector to justify his conclusions in this regard are included in his report.*
- *The Local Plan process provided the opportunity to put forward deliverable brownfield sites. None were provided to the satisfaction of the Inspector.*
- *Greenfield / former green belt sites will contribute significantly to delivery in the first 5 years of the plan and the prospects of maintaining a robust rolling 5-year housing land supply. This includes more than 1,600 (affordable and market) homes that are characterised as “excess supply” in the summary. Concurrently, much of the supply*

- included on urban and brownfield sites as shown in the summary is not considered deliverable in years 1-5 of the Plan.*
- *The figures provided only look at overall supply across the plan period – it does not attempt to look at the supply of homes necessary to demonstrate a five-year supply of homes. The Council is required to demonstrate a rolling five-year housing land supply. The number of homes necessary to meet this must address the shortfall that has accrued since the start of the plan period and include a 20% buffer. Without a five-year supply of housing, relevant Local Plan policies will be considered out of date and the Council will be vulnerable to alternative speculative development, including in Green Belt locations. Much of the supply that the summary table includes is not going to be delivered within the first five years. It is therefore misleading to concentrate simply on overall supply when it is the delivery of homes within this rolling five-year period that is the most important factor to consider in determining whether the plan is robust and can remain up to date.*
 - *It is necessary to avoid counting housing supply beyond the plan period (as it appears has occurred in the summary with regard to the ‘understatement of housing’ relating to Slyfield) in determining supply.*
 - *It is necessary to ensure that sites included in the Council’s housing supply are deliverable and / or developable as defined within the NPPF (e.g. considering limitations on more vulnerable uses such as housing in areas of flood risk).*
 - *Including an altered windfall allowance as part of the Council’s housing supply from what was accepted at the time of the Local Plan would need to be justified and supported by evidence in order to stand up to scrutiny – officers are considering the position in this regard and will include any revisions in the revised Land Availability Assessment (LAA).*
 - *Reductions (as well as gains) in relation to anticipated housing yields need to be considered in supply calculations based on new evidence. Furthermore, flexibility in supply is important in the event of any future slippage in anticipated housing delivery.*

In response to part b) of Councillor Nagaty’s question, the current Brownfield Land Register was published in December 2018, following the first version in December 2017.

The Council is currently producing an updated LAA. The LAA necessarily reviews the development potential of all brownfield sites that have been submitted for assessment to the Council and it:

- *identifies land with potential for development for housing and employment, and other uses;*
- *assesses the land's potential capacity with regard to the physical and policy contexts for the site;*
- *assesses when a site is likely to be developed based on the definitions provided in the NPPF.*

The revised LAA will be available before the end of October. Where appropriate, brownfield sites included in the LAA are also included in the Council’s Brownfield Land Register. The Register comprises a list of Previously Developed (or Brownfield) sites that have the potential to accommodate residential development and are suitable, available and achievable. Submission of sites for consideration for the Brownfield Land Register and/or Land Availability Assessment (LAA) can occur at any time during the course of the year. Officers have also undertaken desk-based exercises to identify potential brownfield sites in addition to those submitted. The full methodology will be published as an appendix to the revised LAA. The updated Brownfield Land Register is anticipated to be published by December 2019 at the latest.”

Councillor Jan Harwood
Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration, and Housing Delivery

Further supplementary questions were asked enquiring as to:

- (a) the extent of the substantial over supply;
- (b) whether the Lead Councillor agreed or disagreed with the position in relation to the alleged over supply that this had been part of the process of the Local Plan at the examination in public and that the Inspector had insisted that it was necessary to make the local Plan adoptable;
- (c) how the lead councillor believed that the assertion that no deliverable brownfield sites were provided to the satisfaction of the inspector was actually discussed at the examination in public;
- (d) why there was no recollection at the examination in public that a Brownfield Land Register had been published in December 2018 and why it had not been made available to councillors or to the public or as part of any public consultation.

In response, the Lead Councillor stated that it was not a matter for him to decide the soundness of the Local Plan or to make a decision on whether the supply numbers put forward were robust as that was the Inspector's decision, and he had made his position clear. The Lead Councillor also confirmed that the relevant local plan documents were all available and the consultation processes were followed.

- (4) Councillor John Redpath asked the Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration, and Housing Delivery, Councillor Jan Harwood, the following question:

“At the last Council meeting it was unanimously agreed to do a Town Centre Masterplan and to appoint best in class external advisers. Can the Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration, and Housing Delivery please confirm exact progress made, when we can see the draft brief to external consultants and can a target date for their appointment be supplied on which the Council can rely?”

The Lead Councillor's response was as follows:

“I believe that the answers to Councillor Redpath's question were covered in a detailed response to a question raised by Councillor Angela Gunning at the Council meeting on 23 July 2019 (see Minute CO25: pages 4 – 6 of the Council agenda), save for an indication of progress since what was then reported under “What is the timetable?” (point 3 of Councillor Gunning's question).

In this regard, the following progress is noted:

- *Inception meeting with service provider for initial engagement conducted*
- *Stakeholder engagement (scoping survey) initiated – October 2019”*

Councillor Jan Harwood
Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration, and Housing Delivery

Further supplementary questions were asked enquiring as to whether:

- (a) whether the Lead Councillor would answer the specific points regarding progress being made and to provide an estimated date when councillors can see a draft brief, and a target date for the appointment of the consultants;
- (b) whether the comprehensive draft masterplan prepared by Allies and Morrison was still being used or taken forward in any form
- (c) when councillors can expect an update on this

In response, the Lead Councillor stated that progress had been noted in his written response in respect of the inception meeting and stakeholder engagement. He indicated that until the Council had consulted sufficiently and understood the parameters, it would not be appropriate to set a briefing and that he would be working with Councillor Rigg to progress the matter as expeditiously as possible.

The Lead Councillor indicated that there were many aspects of the Allies and Morrison master plan that were useful and could be utilised it. The focus was now on deliverability.

The Lead Councillor for Major Projects stated that he hoped that the Town Centre Master Plan would take the best of the plans previously prepared by Allies and Morrison, the Guildford Vision Group, and the Council. There were many things which had not been addressed in previous plans, for example transport infrastructure, congestion, pollution, and opening up the riverside. The Council would be seeking to appoint best in class masterplanners with a view to delivering a plan, which would identify sites which could be brought forward within months of adoption.

CO66 E-PETITION: NEW PARKING RESTRICTIONS AT KINGSTON MEADOWS CAR PARK, EAST HORSLEY

Councillors noted that, in January 2018, the Executive had approved a proposal to extend parking restrictions to Council-owned parks, including Kingston Meadows Car Park in East Horsley. These measures had been taken to improve access to parking for local clubs and societies, in particular the village hall, and users of the park's facilities.

On 8 July 2019, an e-petition was launched on the Council's website requesting the Council to immediately suspend the 'no return same day' restriction at Kingston Meadows Car Park. This e-petition received in excess of 500 signatures and under the Council's adopted Petition Scheme required the Council to debate the matter raised by the e-petition and to indicate to the e-petition organiser what action, if any, the Council proposed to take in response.

In accordance with the Council's petition scheme, the e-petition organiser Susan Murray, made a statement to the Council in support of the e-petition.

The petition had stated the following:

"We the undersigned petition Guildford Borough Council to immediately suspend the Kingston Meadows Car Park 'no return same day' restriction, which is unfairly restricting genuine users of the Medical Practice, East Horsley Village Hall and Kingston Meadows Park from using these facilities in the manner for which they were intended. These new restrictions are causing unnecessary hardship to individuals, young families, surgery patients, U3A, Wheel of Care and other local interest groups."

In her supporting statement accompanying the e-petition, the e-petition organiser had stated:

"We believe that further consultation is needed between GBC, EHPC, WHPC and local interest groups to determine a suitable and proportionate parking order that prevents commuters from using the car park, whilst simultaneously ensuring that the needs and interests of local residents are met."

The Lead Councillor for Waste, Licensing, and Parking, Councillor David Goodwin proposed and the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Customer Service, Councillor Joss Bigmore seconded the following motion for the purpose of the Council's formal response to the e-petition:

"That the Council's response to the e-petition is as follows:

That the Executive be requested to consider the following:

- (1) To ask officers to review the parking order through the statutory Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process as soon as practicable
- (2) To agree that the existing TRO remains in place until it is replaced
- (3) To implement a parking control that safeguards the use of the car park for park users
- (4) To agree that a revised control considers the following parameters:
 - (a) Removal of the no return element
 - (b) One free period of 4 hours each day per visitor within the hours of control (including allowing returns at no charge within the free period) and the ability to charge for additional hours for any time in excess of the free period or for any separate parking event outside of the free period in the same day
 - (c) Restrictions that apply Monday to Friday (not at weekends and bank holidays)
 - (d) Enforcement times of 9am to 6pm

with the final TRO to be issued for consultation being agreed by the Director of Environment, in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Countryside, Rural Life, and the Arts and the Lead Councillor for Waste, Licensing, and Parking”.

Before the vote was taken on the motion, Susan Murray exercised her right of reply on the debate. The Council

RESOLVED: That the Council’s formal response to this e-petition, as set out above, be approved.

CO67 E-PETITION: NEW PARKING RESTRICTIONS AT SUTHERLAND MEMORIAL PARK CAR PARK, BURPHAM

Councillors noted that, in January 2018, the Executive had approved a proposal to extend parking restrictions to Council-owned parks, including Sutherland Memorial Park car park in Burpham. These measures had been taken to improve access to parking for local clubs and societies and users of the park’s facilities.

On 22 July 2019, an e-petition was launched on the Council’s website requesting the Council to remove the new parking charges and restrictions at Sutherland Memorial Park car park. This petition received in excess of 500 signatures and under the Council’s adopted Petition Scheme required the Council to debate the matter raised by the e-petition and to indicate to the e-petition organiser what action, if any, the Council proposed to take in response.

In accordance with the Council’s petition scheme, the e-petition organiser Richard Smee, made a statement to the Council in support of the e-petition.

The petition had stated the following:

“We the undersigned, petition Guildford Borough Council to remove the newly introduced parking charges and “no return same day” restrictions at Sutherland Memorial Park, Burpham.”

In his supporting statement accompanying the e-petition, the e-petition organiser had stated:

“The parking at Sutherland Memorial Park has been used for many years by parents of the local primary school as a parking area to enable them to drop off and collect their children without having to use the heavily congested Burpham Lane.

Following the introduction of the "no return same day" parking restrictions at the car park, it is no longer possible to use the car park for both drop-offs and pick-ups without paying the full £9 parking fee.

The restrictions are therefore expected to lead to an increase in the volume of cars driving down Burpham Lane directly to the school as people seek to avoid these charges. This increase in traffic is expected to pose a much higher risk of injury to those children that cycle or walk to the school, as well as cause a decrease in air quality in the immediate area.

Additionally, the parking has also historically been used by the staff at Burpham Primary School due to there being limited onsite parking, and the newly introduced restrictions will therefore lead to an increased financial burden on some of the staff that work there. The school currently enjoys an “Outstanding” overall Ofsted grade, and anything that impacts upon the school’s ability to attract or retain staff could potentially jeopardise this achievement.

It is feared that the impact of the newly introduced parking restrictions will therefore be detrimental to the Burpham community and will adversely affect the younger members of the community the most.

This petition has been created with the aim of requesting that the Council consider the wider impact of the current restrictions on the Burpham community and remove the newly introduced restrictions and charges.”

The Lead Councillor for Waste, Licensing, and Parking, Councillor David Goodwin proposed and the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Customer Service, Councillor Joss Bigmore seconded the following motion for the purpose of the Council’s formal response to the e-petition:

“That the Council’s response to the e-petition is as follows:

That the Executive be requested to consider the following:

- (1) To ask officers to review the parking order through the statutory Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process as soon as practicable
- (2) To agree that the existing TRO remains in place until it is replaced
- (3) To implement a parking control that safeguards the use of the car park for park users
- (4) To agree that a revised control considers the following parameters:
 - (a) Removal of the no return element
 - (b) One free period of 5 hours each day per visitor within the hours of control (including allowing returns at no charge within the free period) and the ability to charge for additional hours for any time in excess of the free period or for any separate parking event outside of the free period in the same day
 - (c) Restrictions that apply Monday to Friday (not at weekends and bank holidays)
 - (d) Enforcement times of 9am to 5pm

with the final TRO to be issued for consultation being agreed by the Director of Environment, in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Countryside, Rural Life, and the Arts and the Lead Councillor for Waste, Licensing, and Parking.”

After the debate on the motion, but before the vote was taken on it, Richard Smee exercised his right of reply on the debate.

The motion was put to the vote and was lost.

Councillor George Potter proposed, and Councillor Steven Lee seconded the following alternative motion:

“That the Council’s response to the e-petition is as follows:

That the Executive be requested to consider the following proposal:

To temporarily cease enforcement of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) at Sutherland Memorial Park Car Park and undertake a review as part of the annual parking business plan, such review to include consideration of options based on upon the following:

Maintaining the car park for park visitors:

- (a) Maintain the restrictions in the current TRO with the exception of removing the no return and replacing it with display of a valid ticket.

Making the car park available for community use:

- (b) Revoke the Order (and return to allowing all day free parking to all), except for the enforcement of anti-social parking, through a new TRO.
- (c) Change the time the order applies from 6am to 5pm weekdays to between 10 am and 5pm, maintaining five hours free (providing time for dropping off, dog walking and additional visits later in the day), as well as unlimited visits after 5pm. The no return would be removed and changed to display of a ticket. This would still restrict motorists from parking all day prior to when the ticket machine issues tickets (10am) and charges would apply to park beyond the five-hour free period.”

The Council

RESOLVED: That the Council’s formal response to this e-petition, as set out in the alternative motion above, be approved.

CO68 REVIEW OF ALLOCATION OF SEATS ON COMMITTEES: 2019-20

The Council received the report of the proper officer (Democratic Services Manager) on the review of the allocation of seats on committees consequent upon Councillor Gordon Jackson’s resignation from the Conservative Group on 16 September 2019. The political balance on the Council was now:

Guildford Liberal Democrats: 17
 Residents for Guildford and Villages: 16
 Conservatives: 8
 Guildford Greenbelt Group: 4
 Labour: 2
 Independent: 1

Under Council Procedure Rule 23, whenever there was a change in the political constitution of the Council, the Council must, as soon as reasonably practicable, review the allocation of seats on committees to political groups.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Fiona White, the Council

RESOLVED: That the Council approves the calculation of numerical allocation of seats on committees to each political group and to the independent member for the remainder of the 2019-20 municipal year, as set out in the table below:

Committee	Lib Dem	R4GV	Con	GGG	Lab	Ind
Total no. of seats on the Council	17	16	8	4	2	1
% of no. of seats on the Council	35.42%	33.33%	16.67%	8.33%	4.17%	2.08%
Corp Gov & Standards Cttee (7 seats)	2	2	1	1	1	0
Employment Cttee (3 seats)	1	1	1	0	0	0
Community EAB (12 seats)	4	5	2	1	0	0
Place Making & Innovation EAB (12 seats)	4	4	1	1	1	1
Guildford Joint Cttee (10 seats)	4	3	2	1	0	0
Licensing Cttee (15 seats)	6	5	2	1	0	1
Overview & Scrutiny Cttee (12 seats)	4	4	2	1	1	0
Planning Cttee (15 seats)	5	5	3	1	1	0
Total no. of seats on committees (Total: 86)	30	29	14	7	4	2

Reason:

To enable the Council to comply with Council Procedure Rule 23 in respect of the appointment of committees and with its obligations under the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 in respect of the political proportionality on its committees.

CO69 GUILDFORD MUSEUM DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

The Council noted that the development of a new museum was a transformational project of substantial cultural impact and influence aimed at making a significant positive contribution to Guildford's attraction as a place to live, work, play, and be creative.

Since March 2019 when this matter had previously been reported to the Executive, work had continued to refine the project scope, reduce risk and cost uncertainty, and develop a funding strategy to deliver the scheme.

The project was currently at RIBA stage 2 with considerably more technical input required and a detailed design to be developed in order to move to RIBA stage 4 which would provide

greater cost certainty. These factors were reflected in the current high cost estimate that included a £3million contingency allocation.

The Council had approved £1.2 million to progress the project to RIBA Stage 4 and there remained a further £5.4 million in the provisional budget as a contribution to the total estimated cost of £18 million.

An 'Expression of Interest' for funding of up to £4 million had been made to the National Lottery Heritage Fund (NLHF) in August 2019. If the NLHF's criteria were met, the Council would be invited to submit a full funding application and be notified of the result in March 2020. It was then intended to seek additional external funding during 2020-21 and to begin implementing the organisational structures to optimise the fundraising efforts. This would include setting up a charitable entity to apply for and manage other funds and the establishment of a Fundraising campaign team.

To facilitate the project, the museum would need to retain its accredited status by applying to Arts Council England. The Museum Accreditation Scheme was the UK industry standard for museums and galleries. The standard demonstrated that the museum complied with best practice to protect the collection for the future.

As part of the process, the Council needed to submit adopted up-to-date policies and plans. To date Officers had updated the Museum's Forward Plan, Collections Development Policy, Documentation Policy and Access Policy to ensure that they met the accreditation requirements and were aligned with the aspirations of the new museum.

Building new partnerships and collaborations was a key part of this project and, to date, had included the University of Surrey, Surrey Archaeological Society, Surrey Infantry Museum Regiment, Friends of Guildford Museum, Guildford Heritage Forum, other local heritage attractions, the Carrollian Wonderland Trust and local satellite/gaming companies.

At its meeting held on 24 September 2019, the Executive had considered this matter and had:

- (1) Approved the revised scope of the project
- (2) Approved the Funding Strategy and appointment of fundraisers to implement the strategy
- (3) Delegated authority to adopt policies required for the Museum Accreditation to the Director of Environment in consultation with the Lead Councillor.
- (4) Confirmed its support for the applications to National Lottery Heritage Fund (NLHF) and other funding bodies as they arise.
- (5) Authorised the Director of Environment to prepare an asset disposal strategy for Castle Cottage and 39 Castle Street (Victorian School Room) and to ring-fence the capital receipts from the disposal to pay for the museum redevelopment.
- (6) Approved the establishment of a registered charity to facilitate fundraising and receive donations from Trusts and other funders.

The Council considered a report which sought further approvals to support future work on the Guildford Museum development project.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Tourism, Leisure, and Sport, Councillor James Steel, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That a capital supplementary estimate of £11.8million to be funded by external grants and contributions from National Lottery Heritage Fund (NLHF) and other private trusts and donors as per the funding strategy, be approved.
- (2) That the Council agrees to underwrite the non-NLHF fundraising target of £7.8million and notes the risks associated with doing this as set out in paragraph 8.16 of this report, in particular to agree that if there is a shortfall in external funding then the Council will need to fund it from general fund borrowing and find additional service savings in order to fund the borrowing costs.

Reason:

To enable the Guildford Museum development to proceed.

CO70 REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICTS AND POLLING PLACES

The Council considered a report on a number of recommendations arising from the recent review of polling districts and polling places undertaken by the Electoral Services Manager. This statutory review, which was based on polling districts and polling places for parliamentary elections, had to be carried out during the 16-month period commencing 1 October 2013 and every fifth year thereafter.

The consultation period commenced on 14 January and ended on 5 April 2019. A screening Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) had been carried out but a full EIA was not considered to be appropriate.

Although no changes had been recommended to any of the polling districts, a number of changes had been proposed in respect of designated polling places, as described in the report.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Fiona White, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That no changes be made to polling districts, and that, subject to the changes set out in paragraphs (2) to (9) below, no changes be made to existing designated polling places.
- (2) That the designated polling place in polling district B1 Christchurch (North) within the Christchurch Ward be changed from Burchatts Farm Barn to the Urban Saints building, Stoke Park, London Road, Guildford.
- (3) That the designated polling place in polling districts C3 Friary (West) & C4 Friary (East) within the Friary & St Nicolas Ward be changed from Sandfield Primary School to the Salvation Army Hall, Woodbridge Road, Guildford.
- (4) That the designated polling place in polling district D3 Holy Trinity (North) within the Holy Trinity Ward, be changed from The Spike to St Joseph's Church Hall, Eastgate Gardens, Guildford.
- (5) That the designated polling place in polling district H2 (Artington) within the Shalford Ward be changed from St Francis' Church to Compton Village Hall, The Street, Compton in polling district H1.
- (6) That the designated polling place in polling district I1 Stoke (South-West) within the Stoke Ward, be changed from The Waterside Centre to The New Hope Church, Larch Avenue, Guildford.

- (7) That the designated polling place in polling district M4 East Horsley (Central) within the Clandon & Horsley Ward be changed from Horsley Library to East Horsley Village Hall, Kingston Avenue, East Horsley.
- (8) That the designated polling place in polling district Q1 St Martha within the Tillingbourne Ward be changed from Chilworth Infant School to Chilworth Village Hall, New Road, Chilworth.
- (9) That, in relation to the following polling places within the Ash Wharf Ward:
- (a) the designated polling place in polling district T1 Ash (Shawfields) be changed from Shawfield County Primary School to Primrose Hall, Church View, Ash; and
 - (b) the designated polling place in polling district T2 Ash (Ranges) be changed from The Ash Centre to Victoria Hall, Ash Hill Road, Ash.

Reason:

As a result of this statutory review, the new designated polling places will improve elector polling experience and further reduce the necessity for schools to close on polling days.

CO71 TIMETABLE OF COUNCIL AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS 2020-21

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Fiona White, the Council

RESOLVED: That the proposed timetable of Council and Committee meetings for the 2020-21 municipal year, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved.

Reason:

To assist with the preparation of individual committee work programmes.

CO72 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE

The Council received and noted the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 16 July and 27 August 2019.

CO73 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 26 SEPTEMBER 2019: ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor Susan Parker proposed, and Councillor Ruth Brothwell seconded, the adoption of the following motion:

“This Council has recognised that there is a climate change crisis and has agreed that actions should be taken in order to move to a zero-carbon footprint as soon as possible.

Other councils have similarly recognised an environmental responsibility. In the cases of other councils this recognition has included a moratorium on building on green fields, such as Arun Council.

This does not mean a moratorium on all parts of the local plan, just site allocations on greenfield sites.

Guildford’s Local Plan has a target that will increase the number of homes in the borough by approximately 25%. That plan has inherent oversupply built into the model (a minimum of 14,600 to meet a target need of 10,000; with no information yet provided on the planning permissions and completions already meeting that target need). The plan proposes to site approximately 70% of new homes on green fields and it should be noted

that this too is a minimum; planning applications decided since the plan's adoption have been subject to officer advice that all sites included in the plan cannot be disputed and can be uplifted by 25% or more.

Guildford Borough Council has not yet prepared an updated brownfield review, as agreed by this Council in July, which would have allowed us to meet our housing target in the urban area more sustainably. The Climate Change working group under the last council agreed that we should improve or enhance our environmental standards compared to Government minimum standards, but no Supplementary Planning Documents have yet been discussed to implement this agreed position. Our new housing will make the carbon crisis much worse.

Our high housing numbers are likely to exacerbate severe water stress as part of the Thames catchment area. Our borough is also subject to air quality constraints. Air quality across Guildford borough is poor, and it is likely that more Air Quality Management Areas will be designated across the borough in the shorter term. All car-based unsustainable housing will increase the impact on our poor air quality and will encourage the use of fossil fuels to an unsustainable extent.

Housing on green fields will increase car use. There is no transport option which does not involve the increased use of cars for all the green field sites in the borough. We do not have a well-developed public transport network which is carbon neutral, and so heavy car use, usually in slow moving congested traffic, is likely to arise associated with all new greenfield development in and around our borough. As a result, housing on green fields will worsen air quality, make it exponentially harder to achieve a zero-carbon footprint, and increase water stress. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. Housing on green fields will worsen our carbon footprint and make it almost impossible to reduce it.

The assessment of housing need and the allocation of housing sites has not been conducted with the intention of reducing our carbon footprint and therefore these need to be fundamentally reviewed in the light of a legal responsibility to reduce our carbon footprint. This was not considered by the Inspector as part of the Examination in Public, and therefore is a new and urgent obligation.

Independence is critical. Nominations for the consultants to be appointed should be made by Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England. It is not appropriate for the planning committee or department to appoint such consultants – we cannot have the Planning team marking its own homework yet again.

This is a matter of overriding concern for the borough as a whole, and this Council has already expressed its concern about climate change in motions both in this administration and in the last administration. It is now time to take appropriate and urgent action.

This Council therefore resolves:

- (1) That an environmental audit of the impact of excessive building on green fields be conducted by independent environmental experts.
- (2) That the objectives of that environmental audit should be to consider our carbon footprint in the context of new housing, and to determine the impact of reviewing site allocations to reallocate to the urban area.
- (3) That nominations for the consultants to be appointed should be made by Surrey Wildlife Trust and Natural England following an all-party committee to draft the remit.

- (4) That the precise terms of that environmental audit be subject to approval by full Council.
- (5) That pending that environmental audit, all planning permissions for developments on green fields or undeveloped land be subject to a temporary moratorium and the Secretary of State will be asked to ratify the results of any environmental audit.”

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Parker as the mover of the original motion, indicated that, with the consent of her seconder and of the meeting, she wished to alter her motion by incorporating amendments shown in red text indicated below:

“This Council has recognised that there is a climate change crisis and has agreed that actions should be taken in order to move to a zero-carbon footprint as soon as possible.

Other councils have similarly recognised an environmental responsibility. In the cases of other councils this recognition has included a request for a moratorium on building on green fields, such as Arun Council.

This does not mean a moratorium on all parts of the local plan, just site allocations on greenfield sites.

Guildford’s Local Plan has a target that will increase the number of homes in the borough by approximately 25%. That plan has inherent oversupply built into the model (a minimum of 14,600 to meet a target need of 10,000; with no information yet provided on the planning permissions and completions already meeting that target need). The plan proposes to site approximately 70% of new homes on green fields and it should be noted that this too is a minimum; planning applications decided since the plan’s adoption have been subject to officer advice that all sites included in the plan cannot be disputed and can be uplifted by 25% or more.

Guildford Borough Council has not yet prepared an updated brownfield review, as agreed by this Council in July, which would have allowed us to meet our housing target in the urban area more sustainably. The Climate Change working group under the last council agreed that we should improve or enhance our environmental standards compared to Government minimum standards, but no Supplementary Planning Documents have yet been discussed to implement this agreed position. Our new housing will make the carbon crisis much worse.

Our high housing numbers are likely to exacerbate severe water stress as part of the Thames catchment area. Our borough is also subject to air quality constraints. Air quality across Guildford borough is poor, and it is likely that more Air Quality Management Areas will be designated across the borough in the shorter term. All car-based unsustainable housing will increase the impact on our poor air quality and will encourage the use of fossil fuels to an unsustainable extent.

Housing on green fields will increase car use. There is no transport option which does not involve the increased use of cars for all the green field sites in the borough. We do not have a well-developed public transport network which is carbon neutral, and so heavy car use, usually in slow moving congested traffic, is likely to arise associated with all new greenfield development in and around our borough. As a result, housing on green fields will worsen air quality, make it exponentially harder to achieve a zero-carbon footprint, and increase water stress. We need to reduce our carbon footprint. Housing on green fields will worsen our carbon footprint and make it almost impossible to reduce it.

The assessment of housing need and the allocation of housing sites has not been conducted with the intention of reducing our carbon footprint and therefore these need to be fundamentally reviewed in the light of a legal responsibility to reduce our carbon footprint. This was not considered by the Inspector as part of the Examination in Public, and therefore is a new and urgent obligation.

Independence is critical. Nominations for the consultants to be appointed should be made by CPRE and Surrey Wildlife Trust ~~and Natural England~~. It is not appropriate for the planning committee or department to appoint such consultants – we cannot have the Planning team marking its own homework yet again.

This is a matter of overriding concern for the borough as a whole, and this Council has already expressed its concern about climate change in motions both in this administration and in the last administration. It is now time to take appropriate and urgent action.

This Council therefore resolves:

- (1) That an environmental audit of the impact of ~~excessive~~ building on green fields be conducted by independent environmental experts.
- (2) That the objectives of that environmental audit should be to consider our carbon footprint in the context of new housing, and to determine the impact of reviewing site allocations to reallocate to the urban area.
- (3) That nominations for the consultants to be appointed should be made by CPRE and Surrey Wildlife Trust ~~and Natural England~~ following an all-party ~~committee working group~~ to draft the remit.
- (4) That the precise terms of that environmental audit be subject to approval by full Council.
- (5) That, pending that environmental audit, ~~the Council will approach the Secretary of State to request all planning permissions for developments on green fields or undeveloped land be subject to~~ a temporary moratorium on approving planning applications for developments on green fields, or undeveloped land within Guildford borough.”

The Council agreed to accept the alteration to the original motion, as indicated above. The motion, as altered, therefore became the substantive motion for debate.

During the debate, a procedural motion was proposed by Councillor Tony Rooth, seconded by Councillor Joss Bigmore, to postpone consideration of the motion until the next Council meeting, as it was felt that the Council needed to take into account the revised Brownfield Land Register, which was due to be published by December this year at the latest, and the updated Land Availability Assessment 2019.

The Council

RESOLVED: That consideration of the motion be postponed to the next Council meeting.

CO74 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 27 SEPTEMBER 2019: RESTRICTED COMMITTEE REPORTS

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor Christopher Barrass proposed, and Councillor Jan Harwood seconded, the adoption of the following motion:

“This Council believes that we are yet to make good on promises made to the Electorate to be more open and transparent in all of our actions.

By not doing so we may miss great ideas by not keeping all Councillors aware of the latest developments with their input coming too late in the creation of policy.

We must reaffirm a position where all committee reports are made public unless there are unequivocal legal or commercial reasons to the contrary.

The Council therefore resolves:

- (1) That all restricted committee reports must clearly and precisely state all of the following:
 - (a) Why the content is to be treated as exempt from the Access to Information publication rules.
 - (b) To whom within the Council the content is restricted
 - (c) When, following a period of exemption, the exempt information can be expected to be made public.
 - (d) The basis for the exemption should be made public at the point the agenda is published, together with details of how the decision to maintain the exemption may be challenged.
- (2) That all working group reports should be made available to all Councillors. For example, information about Major Projects, the Supplementary Planning Documents needed to complete the Local Plan, and also the concrete actions to further our climate change agenda are often kept to relatively small working groups.”

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Barrass as the mover of the original motion, indicated that, with the consent of his seconder and of the meeting, he wished to alter his motion by incorporating amendments shown in red text indicated below:

“This Council believes that we are yet to make good on promises made to the Electorate to be more open and transparent in all of our actions.

By not doing so we may miss great ideas by not keeping all Councillors aware of the latest developments with their input coming too late in the creation of policy. **For example, information about Major Projects, the Supplementary Planning Documents needed to complete the Local Plan, and also the concrete actions to further our climate change agenda are often kept to relatively small working groups.**

-

~~We must reaffirm a position where all committee reports are made public unless there are unequivocal legal or commercial reasons to the contrary.~~

The Council therefore resolves:

- (1) **To reaffirm, and adopt as best practice, the position that all committee reports are made public unless there are unequivocal legal or commercial reasons to the contrary and that where practicable, information within a report which is legally exempt from publication should be isolated from the body of the report as a restricted appendix, with the remainder of the report made available to the public.**
- (2) **To require** that all restricted committee reports clearly and precisely state **at the point the agenda is published** all of the following:

- (a) Why the content is to be treated as exempt from the Access to Information publication rules.
 - (b) To whom within the Council the content is restricted
 - (c) When, following a period of exemption, the exempt information can be expected to be made public.
 - (d) ~~The basis for the exemption should be made public at the point the agenda is published, together with~~ Details of how the decision to maintain the exemption may be challenged.
- (3) That all working group reports should be made available to all councillors, ~~subject where necessary to redaction of exempt information (on the advice of officers, and in consultation with the relevant lead councillor). For example, information about Major Projects, the Supplementary Planning Documents needed to complete the Local Plan, and also the concrete actions to further our climate change agenda are often kept to relatively small working groups.~~
- (4) To request the Managing Director to establish, in consultation with the chairman of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee, a working group comprising representatives of all political groups and officers, to:
- (a) examine the effectiveness of internal communications, between officers and councillors, in respect of, for example, progress with the formulation of development plan documents, major projects, and climate change initiatives,
 - (b) make proposals to promote transparency, and promote effective communications and reporting, and
 - (c) report back its findings to full Council.”

The Council agreed to accept the alteration to the original motion, as indicated above. The motion, as altered, therefore became the substantive motion for debate.

Having debated the substantive motion, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) To reaffirm, and adopt as best practice, the position that all committee reports are made public unless there are unequivocal legal or commercial reasons to the contrary and that where practicable, information within a report which is legally exempt from publication should be isolated from the body of the report as a restricted appendix, with the remainder of the report made available to the public.
- (2) To require that all restricted committee reports clearly and precisely state at the point the agenda is published all of the following:
 - (a) Why the content is to be treated as exempt from the Access to Information publication rules.
 - (b) To whom within the Council the content is restricted
 - (c) When, following a period of exemption, the exempt information can be expected to be made public.
 - (d) Details of how the decision to maintain the exemption may be challenged.
- (3) That all working group reports should be made available to all councillors, subject where necessary to redaction of exempt information (on the advice of officers, and in consultation with the relevant lead councillor).

- (4) To request the Managing Director to establish, in consultation with the chairman of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee, a working group comprising representatives of all political groups and officers, to:
- (a) examine the effectiveness of internal communications, between officers and councillors, in respect of, for example, progress with the formulation of development plan documents, major projects, and climate change initiatives,
 - (b) make proposals to promote transparency, and promote effective communications and reporting, and
 - (c) report back its findings to full Council.

CO75 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

Upon the motion of the Mayor, Councillor Richard Billington, seconded by the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Marsha Moseley, the Council

RESOLVED: That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the public be excluded from the meeting for consideration of the business contained in agenda item 18 on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in paragraphs 1 and 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the 1972 Act.

CO76 TERMINATIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, seconded by the Lead Councillor for Finance and Assets, Customer Service, Councillor Joss Bigmore, the Council

RESOLVED: That the proposed terms of the termination packages associated with the Voluntary Compulsory Redundancy of the postholders named in the report submitted to the Council, including the respective redundancy payments and employer pension costs, as set out in the table in paragraph 3.1 of the report, be approved.

Reason:

To enable applications for Voluntary Compulsory Redundancy to be approved as part of the Future Guildford transformation programme.

CO77 COMMON SEAL

The Council

RESOLVED: That the Common Seal of the Council be affixed to any documents to give effect to any decisions taken by the Council at this meeting.

The meeting finished at 10.21 pm

Signed

Mayor

Date