

## **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

To receive any apologies for absence.

## **2 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

To receive and note any disclosable pecuniary interests from councillors. 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 also 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.

Councillors are further invited to disclose any non-pecuniary interest which may be relevant to any matter on this agenda, in the interests of transparency, and to confirm that it will not affect their objectivity in relation to that matter.

## **3 MINUTES** (Pages 1 - 18 of the Council agenda)

To approve the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 4 December 2018.

## **4 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

To receive any communications or announcements from the Mayor.

## **5 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS**

The Leader to make a statement in relation to the Local Plan.

Councillors shall have the opportunity of asking questions of the Leader in respect of his communications.

## **6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

### Statements:

Mr Ivor Thomas has given notice of his wish to address the Council meeting in respect of agenda item 9: Capital and Investment Strategy 2019-29 to 2023-24, and specifically the capital bid entitled: "Shalford Common - Regularising Car Parking and Reduction of Encroachments" (see pages 117 to 125).

The Lead Councillor for Enterprise and Economic Development may respond to the statement from Mr Thomas.

## **7 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

- (1) **Councillor Jenny Wicks** to ask the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the following question:

"In view of the likely rush of planning applications when the Local Plan is adopted, may I ask the Leader of the Council the following questions:

- (a) For some time there has been talk of a Borough-wide Design Guide which would strengthen the hand of planning officers in requiring good design in development

in the Borough and preventing mundane ‘anywhere’ architecture, could the Leader please confirm when this Design Guide is going to be available and implemented?

- (b) The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will bring financial benefits to accompany development and will particularly benefit neighbourhoods with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan, could the Leader please confirm when will the implementation of CIL take place?
- (c) When will our new Development Management policies be ready for implementation?”

**The Leader of the Council’s response is as follows:**

**“In response to part (a) of Councillor Wicks’ question**, it is important to note that a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) can only supplement policy – not create it. Emerging Policy D1, which was amended and strengthened as part of the examination process, requires high quality urban design. Any applications coming forward will be subject to the requirements of this policy together with the NPPF (2019), which contains a greater emphasis on achieving well-designed places compared to the previous NPPF (2012). Importantly, Policy D1 now requires the use of the Design Review Panel for strategic sites.

Assessment by the Design Review Panel is also expected for other large schemes. This provides the mechanism to ensure applicants give design considerations sufficient thought and priority early on in the process, thereby avoiding mundane ‘anywhere’ architecture. The Council is currently preparing a Strategic Development Framework (SDF) SPD which will set the general design principles and high level masterplanning framework for the strategic sites. Whilst this SPD relates to the strategic sites only, the general design principles will be applicable to all sites and will eventually be incorporated within the Borough-wide Design Guide. In the meantime, their inclusion within the SDF SPD will serve as useful context for what constitutes good design.

In addition to the SDF SPD, the Council has recently adopted a Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and is in the process of preparing, for consultation, a Guildford Town Centre Views SPD, which identifies important views into and out of the town centre. Work has begun on the Borough-wide Design Guide; however, the priority to date has been in preparing the other documents to which I have referred. However, as set out above, the absence of the Borough-wide Design Guide does not prejudice our ability to secure high quality development.

**In response to part (b) of the question**, the CIL process is intended to follow the adoption of the Local Plan. It will require its own consultation process as well as submission for independent examination, which is anticipated to occur in 2020, with approval of the CIL charging schedule to follow.

**In response to part (c) of the question**, work is underway preparing the Development Management (DM) Development Plan Document. Consultation on the draft plan is anticipated to occur towards the end of 2019. In the meantime, many of the existing DM policies in the Local Plan 2003 continue to perform well in decision-making. The Local Plan: Strategy and Sites also includes a number of DM policies (relating to retail, employment and Green Belt) where these were considered necessary in order to achieve the objectives of the strategic policies.”

Councillor Paul Spooner  
Leader of the Council

- (2) **Councillor Tony Rooth** to ask the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning the question set out below. The Lead Councillor's comments in response to each element of the question is set out in red type below:

"In relation to the recent grant of a lease of Burchatts Farm Barn, may I please ask the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management

(a) whether he is aware that:

- (i) Burchatts Farm Barn, a Grade 2 listed building was acquired by the Council in 1925 in perpetuity as a community facility;

I am aware that the property is Grade 2 listed but I can advise that there is no restriction on the land registry title requiring the land to be used in perpetuity as a community facility. However, as some of the land is open space, under the Public Health Act 1875, there is an obligation to advertise a proposed disposal and to consider any comments made. This obligation has been complied with.

- (ii) in March 2017, when the Council embarked on market testing the options for the venue's future use, the Council's press release stated: "Essential to the process will be ensuring the future of Burchatts Barn, and how it will continue to complement our largest and most popular green space, Stoke Park which attracts over 750,000 visitors a year. This is part of the Council's long-term planning for the borough."

Prior to the press release issued in March 2017, we recognised that the property was creating a growing financial burden at a time of increasing financial constraint. It had been used by the Council for a variety of uses including events but for a number of years was showing an annual deficit of between £30 and £70,000. This meant finding a use that achieved a rental income and removed the liability of maintaining the building whilst also finding a use that did not interfere with other users of Stoke Park, for example, considering the impact of additional parking at this end of the Park. Cllr Davis Lead Councillor for Asset Management at the time, made it clear in the same press release that there was a balance to be had in order to find a solution that offered best value for the Council. He said:

*"We endeavour to balance the needs of the community with our aim to provide more efficient services. As part of this, we must ensure our assets provide good value for money. This is why it is important that we review how we operate places such as Burchatts Barn to make sure they are run in the best possible way for the future. Burchatts Barn has been used for event hire for private functions and has supported some major events on the park such as National Armed Forces Day. More recently, however, these bookings have reduced, affecting the economic viability of the building for the Council. So we are exploring and assessing the options for the future of the venue, and the market-testing is the first step."*

- (iii) Councillor Richard Billington, the then Lead Councillor for Rural Economy, Countryside, Parks and Leisure, added: "The future of Burchatts Barn must continue to enhance Stoke Park, an important and highly valued recreational facility and part of Guildford's landscape, for the benefit of local residents and visitors to the borough.";

The proposed use of the Barn will not adversely impact on Stoke Park, which I recognise is an important and highly valued recreational facility that benefits local

residents and visitors to the borough. The use of the building will not involve any alterations that would detract from its setting adjacent to the open area of the park and the property will continue to enhance the local landscape.

- (iv) leasing the venue out to a chiropractor business is neither a community nor recreational facility, would require internal changes and require planning permission for change of use;

Guildford Chiropractic Clinic are an important local business serving our local community, whose use of the facility and low impact on Stoke Park was considered to be complementary. Their offer also included that most of the hall space would remain unchanged and used as a large reception area. Guildford Chiropractic Clinic has lodged a planning application which includes a change of use showing commitment to gaining certainty and clarity on this point. The internal changes are relatively minor and the fact the property is listed will determine what limited changes can be made.

- (v) the leasing out to the chiropractor business at £40,000 p.a. represents only £4,000 p.a. above the requested market price offered by the much respected Guildford Shakespeare Company;

The proposal submitted by the Guildford Chiropractic Clinic was the most robust and financially strong bid compared to all the other offers received, including Guildford Shakespeare Company. They also agreed to terms to take on full responsibility for the maintenance and repair of the building.

- (vi) there is an obligation to maintain its use as a community/recreational asset in perpetuity?

I would refer you to my first answer that covers this point.

- (b) to make the terms of the lease with the chiropractor business public at this meeting?

I would refer you to my answers above which include some of the key terms of the lease.

- (c) to confirm whether he considers that the lease has been entered into in accordance with the provisions for community/recreational use of the Barn and hence whether the Council was in a position to enter into a lease for another use in the first place and whether the Council can withdraw from the lease, whether or not already entered into?"

I would refer you to my first answer

- (3) **Councillor Bob McShee** to ask the Lead Councillor for Community Health, Wellbeing and Project Aspire, Councillor Iseult Roche, the following question:

“As options for Guildford Spectrum are being considered, either to build a new facility or to refurbish the existing building, can the Lead Councillor please make a commitment that, whichever option is selected, a new football pitch and separate running track will be provided?

Could the Lead Councillor also confirm the estimated costs of each option?”

### **The Lead Councillor's response is as follows:**

"The inclusion of facilities at a revised Spectrum facility will be based on a number of factors including, but not limited to:

- (i) Impact on the implementation of Council policy and strategies e.g. health and well-being, sports development strategy, emerging Local Plan etc.
- (ii) Does the facility represent a key offer for desired audience?
- (iii) What is the level of competition / alternative facilities in the area?
- (iv) Does the facility meet a shortfall in community provision or have a significant potential financial impact?
- (v) What are the secondary spend opportunities arising from the facility's use?

Whilst it would be operationally desirable to separate the football pitch and athletics track provision, it may not be practical on site as a full size all weather pitch with suitable changing rooms and club room would cover approximately 8,000m<sup>2</sup> (based on Sport England standard facility measurements). The cost of such a venue (excluding VAT) would be £2,325,000 (based on Sport England's standard facility costs). A grass pitch would potentially be significantly cheaper (approximately £900k less) but less flexible in its use and more costly to maintain. The cost (excluding VAT) of an Athletics Track (with grandstand and changing rooms etc.) would be £2,890,000 (again based on Sport England's facility costs). The footprint would be significantly bigger again and much more than the existing Spectrum building (the visible footprint of which is 11,103m<sup>2</sup>). These estimated costs are likely to be a bit low because of the premium price we pay for construction in this part of the country.

We have been very open throughout about wishing to build on the success of the existing offer so where facilities already exist it is very unlikely they would be removed (but may be modernised in accordance with current customer behaviour/expectations). The football offer at Spectrum, whilst not ideal, meets current required standards. The Council has a good relationship with Guildford City Football Club and most recently met with them a few days ago and we will continue to work with them and all our other fantastic clubs in the future".

Councillor Iseult Roche  
Lead Councillor for Community Health, Wellbeing and Project Aspire

- (4) **Councillor Bob McShee** to ask the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the following question:

"Can the Leader of the Council please provide a progress report on the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project?"

### **The Leader of the Council's response is as follows:**

#### Local Plan

Slyfield Area Regeneration Project (SARP) is allocated (A24) and the Local Plan examination in June/July 2018 included a half day examination on SARP. The Inspector found the Plan 'sound and deliverable', subject to modifications. However, the Inspector required no modifications in respect of Slyfield Area Regeneration Project.

#### Thames Water

The project incorporates the relocation of the Thames Water sewage treatment works and the engineering of a new deep sewer. The Executive approved the transfer of funds on 30 October 2018 from the provisional capital programme to the approved capital programme to facilitate the funding of 50% of Thames Water's technical costs. Good

progress is being made in relation to the negotiation of the legal agreement with Thames governance expected in mid-March 2019 to facilitate signing of the agreement.

#### Surrey County Council (SCC)

SCC have completed their due diligence and feasibility costings in relation to the proposed relocation of the waste and community recycling facility. Heads of Terms are with SCC for consideration.

#### Programme

The team has developed a project plan and detailed programme with interdependencies. The Executive approved the transfer of funds on 30 October 2018 from the provisional capital programme to the approved capital programme to facilitate technical work and surveys in advance of the submission of planning applications.

#### Constraints & Viability

A full legal title report is ongoing and physical constraints relating to utilities and infrastructure have been analysed in order to provide viability information for the financial business case.

#### Funding

PwC have assisted the Council in the preparation of a Green Book business case to support the submission of the Housing Infrastructure Fund and the EM3 LEP applications. A report on the business case for SARP has been scheduled onto the Forward Plan for Council consideration in October 2019 and an 'all Councillor' briefing on the Project will be held in June/July".

Councillor Paul Spooner  
Leader of the Council

- (5) **Councillor Colin Cross** to ask the Lead Councillor for Skills, Arts, and Tourism, Councillor Nikki Nelson-Smith, the question set out below. The Lead Councillor's comments in response to each element of the question is set out in red type below:

"In relation to the Guildford Museum development project, may I please ask the Lead Councillor for Skills, Arts, and Tourism the following:

- (a) Can we be given details of the overall control, both in personnel and financial terms, that GBC retains over the Museum Working Group?

I chair the Museum Working Group (MWG), which advises me on the delivery of this project, which is one of the Council's Corporate Plan priorities. The MWG comprises the following councillors:

Cllr David Elms  
Cllr Angela Gunning  
Cllr Gordon Jackson  
Cllr Michael Parsons  
Cllr Tony Phillips  
Cllr David Reeve  
Cllr Caroline Reeves  
Cllr Paul Spooner

The Director of Environment, a representative from Heritage Services, the project manager and the lead consultant attend meetings of the MWG to provide updates on progress and discuss issues and opportunities.

The MWG has no decision-making powers, nor does it hold a budget.

- (b) Is the maximum projected budgeted cost for the full Museum Development Programme fixed at £18m, as was stated at last Monday's Place Making and Innovation EAB by Cllr Nelson-Smith? Could she please confirm that this includes the £7m already allocated?

The cost of £18m is an estimate and based on RIBA stage 1 feasibility designs. We are at an early phase of development. As such, a cautious estimate has been given by our specialist cost consultant. Further detailed work will be undertaken in the next phase of the project, which will include further value engineering and architectural refinement. It is industry practice to front load the cost of unknown risks significantly higher at RIBA stage 1 due to a higher contingency and associated fees. The cost of £18m includes the remaining Council-allocated budget of £6.2m.

- (c) What justification is there to assume there will be an annual Museum footfall in future of 65,000 when the 2016-17 figures are only 9,462? (Are the 2017-18 figures available?)

In the last few years, the number of visitors has reduced to around 10,000 per year compared to 30,000 a decade ago. Although there is a committed group of staff, opportunities to develop the museum have been constrained by ageing collections and exhibitions, limited space and access, the general building conditions and poor facilities such as the toilets and a lack of a café.

The projected numbers are based on the Museum providing an exciting new offer (as outlined at the recent EAB meeting). We have arrived at this projection using specialist consultants that have significant experience of delivering new museums. They have benchmarked our proposal against comparable facilities nearby with similar levels of resident demand. Many of these have much higher numbers of visitors and we have taken a cautious view to ensure we have a sustainable museum model for the future. It should also be noted that we have the added attraction of the Castle that attracts 250,000 visitors per year in its own right. The extensive audience development and engagement programme also confirmed that there is a latent demand among the population of Guildford who do want such a facility and will visit. As with the rest of Guildford, the museum will also attract day visitors from the rest of the UK and abroad.

The visitor figures for 2017-18 are not yet available.

- (d) The successful examples of new local museum launches (e.g. Liverpool) mentioned at the EAB are all new builds on new sites. Due to the many limitations of the existing site, its location and high redevelopment costs, should we not consider the many benefits that would accrue from developing a new museum on a new site, such as Bedford Wharf?"

The current site was chosen following an options analysis exercise and consideration by the Executive. Whilst the current site does have challenges, it also has a number of advantages such as it will help develop a 'heritage quarter' and bring benefit to other attractions and facilities. The listed buildings and Castle have an intrinsic value that cannot be replicated elsewhere. In addition, the proximity to the town centre will attract visitors and also ensure this part of the town's historic centre is conserved for future generations. There may always be possible 'better' sites and many have already been explored. There is a cost to continually seeking new sites, however, while the existing museum continues its decline. Other sites often have their own

constraints. Bedford Wharf, for example, being close to the river would present different challenges.

## **8 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2019-20** (Pages 19 – 34 of the Council agenda)

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner to propose, and the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“That the Pay Policy Statement for the 2019-20 financial year, attached at Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved.”

### Reasons:

To comply with the Localism Act 2011 (Section 39)”

### **Comments:**

Councillor Angela Gunning

## **9 CAPITAL AND INVESTMENT STRATEGY (2019-20 TO 2023-24)** (Pages 35 – 220 of the Council agenda)

*NB. If, during the debate on this item, councillors wish to discuss the detail of either of the two capital bids (listed as Bid Nos 13 or 14 in Appendix 2 to the report), which are set out in the “Not for Publication” Appendix 15, the Council will need to pass a resolution to exclude the public from the meeting for that purpose on the grounds of the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended). The public will be readmitted to the meeting immediately following any discussion on either of the bids.*

The Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning to move, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner to second, the adoption of the following motion:

(1) That the General Fund capital estimates, as shown in

- (a) Appendices 3 and 4 to the report submitted to the Council (current approved and provisional schemes), as amended to include the new bids approved by the Executive on 22 January 2019 set out in Appendix 2;
- (b) Appendix 5 (schemes funded from reserves); and
- (c) Appendix 6 (s106 schemes),

be approved.

(2) That the HRA capital bids be approved for inclusion in the HRA capital programme.

(3) That the Minimum Revenue Provision policy, referred to in section 5 of the report be approved.

(4) That the capital and investment strategy be approved, specifically the Investment Strategy and Prudential Indicators contained within the report and Appendix 1.

### Reasons:

- To enable the Council to approve the Capital and Investment strategy for 2019-20 to 2023-24.
- To enable the Council, at its budget meeting on 26 February 2019, to approve the funding required for the new capital investment proposals.



**Comments:**

Councillor James Walsh

**10 HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT ESTIMATES 2019-20** (Pages 221 – 294 of the Council agenda)

Councillors' speeches:

*Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (f), there shall be no time limit for the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management in moving the motion to approve the Housing Revenue Account budget, or for one spokesperson from each opposition group in commenting on that motion. Normal Procedure Rules will apply in respect of all other councillors speaking in the debate - i.e. they will have five minutes each, and the Lead Councillor will have up to 10 minutes (if necessary) to sum up at the end of the debate.*

The Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning to move and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- (1) That the HRA revenue budget 2019-20, as set out in Appendix 2 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved.
- (2) That the 1% rent reduction required by the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016 be implemented.
- (3) That the fees and charges for HRA services for 2019-20, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report, be approved.
- (4) That a 3.4% increase in garage rents be approved.
- (5) That the Housing Investment Programme as set out in Appendix 5 to the report (current approved and provisional schemes), as amended to include the bids approved by the Executive at its meeting on 22 January 2019, be approved.

Reasons:

To enable the Council to set the rent charges for HRA property and associated fees and charges, along with authorising the necessary revenue and capital expenditure to implement a budget, this is consistent with the objectives outlined in the HRA Business Plan.

**Comments:**

Councillor Tony Rooth (group spokesperson)

**11 FUTURE GUILDFORD TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME** (Pages 295 – 486 of the Council agenda)

*NB. If, during the debate on this item, councillors wish to discuss the contents of the "Not for Publication" Appendix 7 (the "Blueprint"), the Council will need to pass a resolution to exclude the public from the meeting for that purpose on the grounds of the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in paragraphs 3 and 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended). The public will be readmitted to the meeting immediately following any discussion on Appendix 7.*

At its meeting on 19 February 2019, the Executive also considered this report and endorsed the recommendations therein.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner to propose, and the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- (1) That Option 1 be adopted, as described in the body of this report – that is, that the Managing Director be authorised, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to take all necessary steps to develop the Future Guildford Programme, developing the opportunities and approach described in the Future Operating Model Blueprint (the “Blueprint”, attached as the “Not for Publication” **Appendix 7** to this report), in accordance with the accompanying timeframe, and undertaking appropriate consultation.
- (2) That the implementation budget described in Section 9 of this report be approved, and that the implementation costs be financed from the specific earmarked reserves referred to in paragraph 9.6 of this report.
- (3) That the Managing Director, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be authorised:
  - (a) following appropriate consultation, to make a recommendation relating to the staffing structure and responsibilities of senior posts (that is, at Director level), to the Employment Committee; and
  - (b) to determine an appropriate recruitment strategy in consultation with the Employment Committee;
- (4) That the Employment Committee be authorised to determine who is appointed to the available posts referred to in paragraph 3 (a) above on the advice of the Managing Director.
- (5) That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee be requested to monitor progress of each stage of the implementation of the Future Guildford programme.

Reasons:

To improve the Council’s services and customer care, modernise our services and systems, make us more efficient and deliver the savings required to address our financial challenges.

**Comments:**

Councillor Angela Gunning

**12 SERVICE AND FINANCIAL PLANNING – GENERAL FUND BUDGET 2018-19** (Pages 487 - 582 of the Council agenda)

Council Tax Precepts

*The Council is required to formally approve the aggregate Council Tax for residents of Guildford Borough, including the Council Tax requirements of the relevant major precepting authorities, which are Surrey County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey.*

*We have received confirmation that neither Surrey County Council nor the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey have set an excessive Council Tax for 2019-20 and details of their respective precepts are included in Appendix 6 to the report submitted to the Council.*

Councillors’ speeches:

*Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (f), there shall be no time limit for the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management in moving the motion to approve the General Fund Budget and proposed Council Tax, or for one spokesperson from each opposition group in commenting on that motion. Normal Procedure Rules will apply in respect of all other*

councillors speaking in the debate – i.e. they will have five minutes each, and the Lead Councillor would have up to 10 minutes (if necessary) to sum up at the end of the debate.

Requirement for Recorded Vote

Under The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 and Council Procedure Rule 19 (d), the Council is required to conduct a recorded vote on the proposed budget and Council tax resolution referred to below.

Restriction on Voting

Councillors' attention is drawn to the requirements of Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as set out in paragraphs 13.11 to 13.13 of the report (page 500 of the agenda).

Section 151 Officer's statutory report

The Mayor to ask the Chief Finance Officer, Claire Morris, to comment on the budget and her statutory report set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council.

Corrections:

In the list of fees and charges in Appendix 3 to the report, councillors' attention is drawn to the following corrections:

- (i) The originally proposed stray dog fees and charges (see page 526) were calculated on the basis of the Council's current stray dog kennelling contract and current service arrangements continuing. However, since calculating the fees, the Council's current stray dog kennelling provider has given notice on their contract, terminating on 1 March 2019.

The Council has followed a procurement exercise and secured a new supplier who will provide both kennelling facilities, and a 24/7 service to collect strays. This will enable the Council's Dog Warden to increase their time on implementing the changes to Animal Licensing which came into force on 1 October 2018. The new contractor, however, comes at a different cost to the current arrangement and, as such, it has been necessary to revise the fees previously put forward in order for the Council to recover its costs of providing a Stray Dog collection and kennelling service.

The proposed revised fees are:

	<b>2018-19</b> (wef 1 April 2018 £	<b>2019-20</b> (wef 1 April 2019) £	<b>Increase</b>  %
1 <sup>st</sup> day or part of day	66.00	<del>68.50</del> 108.50	64.4
2 <sup>nd</sup> day or part of day	82.50	<del>86.00</del> 131.00	58.8
3 <sup>rd</sup> day or part of day	99.00	<del>103.00</del> 153.00	54.5
4 <sup>th</sup> day or part of day	115.50	<del>120.00</del> 180.00	55.8
5 <sup>th</sup> day or part of day	132.00	<del>137.00</del> 207.00	56.8
6 <sup>th</sup> day or part of day	148.50	<del>154.50</del> 234.50	57.6
7 <sup>th</sup> day or part of day	165.00	<del>171.50</del> 271.00	64.2

- (ii) the proposed weekly charge under Careline Services: Elderly Persons dwellings clients which should read "£2.75", representing a 22.2% increase (see page 531); and
- (iii) the changes to the Land Charges Search Fees (see page 545) referred to in the table below. The Land Charges search fee includes highways and rights of way information supplied by Surrey County Council (SCC). SCC recently reviewed their charging methodology with the aim of achieving full cost recovery. The review has resulted in the increased charges shown, which we propose to pass-through in the overall fee.

	<b>2018-19</b> (wef 1 April 2018 £	<b>2019-20</b> (wef 1 April 2019 Exec (22 Jan) £	<b>2019-20</b> (wef 1 April 2019 Council (26 Feb) £	<b>Increase</b>  %
Basic Fee - domestic	161*	172	187.60	16.5
Con 29R Only - domestic	126*	132	147.60	17.1
Basic Fee - commercial	223*	234	249.60	11.9
Con 29R Only - commercial	168*	174	189.60	12.9
Con29 Additional Questions- SCC	18*	19.20	26.40	46.7

The Motion (Budget and Council Tax Resolution):

The Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning to move, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner to second, the following motion:

- “(1) That the budget be approved, and specifically that the Council Tax requirement for 2019-20 be set at £9,758,577 excluding parish precepts and £11,499,274 to include parish precepts.
- (2) That the Band D Council Tax for 2019-20 (excluding parish precepts) be set at £171.82, an increase of £5.00 (3.00%).
- (3) That the Band D Council Tax for 2019-20 (including parish precepts) be set at £202.47.
- (4) That the Council approves the following, as considered by the Executive on 22 January 2019:
- (i) the General Fund revenue estimates for 2019-20 including proposed fees and charges relating to General Fund services, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report submitted to the Council, subject to the following corrections to the fees and charges:

- (a) the changes to the Stray Dog Fees referred to in the table below:

	<b>2019-20</b> (wef 1 April 2019) £	<b>Increase</b>  %
1 <sup>st</sup> day or part of day	108.50	64.4
2 <sup>nd</sup> day or part of day	131.00	58.8
3 <sup>rd</sup> day or part of day	153.00	54.5
4 <sup>th</sup> day or part of day	180.00	55.8
5 <sup>th</sup> day or part of day	207.00	56.8
6 <sup>th</sup> day or part of day	234.50	57.6
7 <sup>th</sup> day or part of day	271.00	64.2

- (b) the weekly charge under Careline Services: Elderly Persons dwellings clients being “£2.75”, representing a 22.2% increase; and
- (c) the changes to the Land Charges Search Fees referred to in the table below.

	<b>2019-20</b> (wef 1 April 2019) £	<b>Increase</b>  %
Basic Fee - domestic	187.60	16.5
Con 29R Only - domestic	147.60	17.1
Basic Fee - commercial	249.60	11.9
Con 29R Only - commercial	189.60	12.9
Con29 Additional Questions- SCC	26.40	46.7

- (ii) the Housing Revenue Account estimates for 2019-20, including housing rents and other fees and charges;
  - (iii) the Capital and Investment Strategy for 2019-20; and
  - (iv) the Housing Revenue Account capital programme for 2019-20.
- (5) That the determination on empty properties and long-term empty properties, as set out in **Appendix 5** to the report submitted to the Council, be approved with effect from 1 April 2019.
- (6) That the Council notes that the Chief Finance Officer, in accordance with the terms of her delegated authority, has calculated the following amounts for the year 2019-20 in accordance with regulations made under Sections 31B (3) and 34(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) ('the Act'):-
- (i) 56,795.35 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as its council tax base for 2019-20 for the whole Council area.

- (ii) For those parts of the borough to which a parish precept relates:

<b>Parish of</b>	
Albury	613.46
Artington	140.17
Ash	6,582.01
East Clandon	145.39
West Clandon	694.03
Compton	475.66
Effingham	1,391.81
East Horsley	2,503.57
West Horsley	1,513.45
Normandy	1,343.15
Ockham	258.46
Pirbright	1,238.34
Puttenham	310.47
Ripley	907.38
St.Martha	405.13
Seale & Sands	523.13
Send	2,024.67
Shackleford	374.40
Shalford	1,837.32
Shere	1,989.11
Tongham	871.73
Wanborough	167.84
Wisley (Meeting)	94.95
Worplesdon	3,453.71

being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 6 of the 1992 Regulations, as the amounts of its council tax base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

- (7) That the Council calculates the following amounts for the financial year 2019-20 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:-

- (i) £167,560,926 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by parish councils.
- (ii) £156,061,652 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act
- (iii) £11,499,274 being the amount by which the aggregate at sub-paragraph (i) above exceeds the aggregate at sub-paragraph (ii) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act, as its council tax requirements for the year.
- (iv) £202.47 being the amount at sub-paragraph (iii) above divided by the amount at sub-paragraph (i) of paragraph (6) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B (1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including parish precepts).
- (v) £1,740,697 being the aggregate amount of all special items (parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act as follows:

<b>Parish of</b>	<b>£</b>
Albury	£44,092
Artington	£3,859
Ash	£451,709
East Clandon	£8,072
West Clandon	£23,012
Compton	£24,706
Effingham	£115,698
East Horsley	£131,787
West Horsley	£89,472
Normandy	£139,999
Ockham	£12,600
Pirbright	£58,970
Puttenham	£12,350
Ripley	£65,159
St. Martha	£15,030
Seale & Sands	£18,500
Send	£52,104
Shackleford	£10,108
Shalford	£79,035
Shere	£120,233
Tongham	£33,087
Wanborough	£4,200
Wisley (Meeting)	£0
Worplesdon	£226,915
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1,740,697</b>

- (vi) £171.82 being the amount at sub-paragraph (iv) above less the result given by dividing the amount at sub-paragraph (v) above by the amount at sub-paragraph (i) of paragraph (6) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item (parish precept) relates.

(vii) Part of the Council's area

<b>Parish of</b>	<b>£ p</b>
Albury	243.69
Artington	199.35
Ash	240.45
East Clandon	227.34
West Clandon	204.98
Compton	223.76
Effingham	254.95
East Horsley	224.46
West Horsley	230.94
Normandy	276.05
Ockham	220.57
Pirbright	219.44
Puttenham	211.60
Ripley	243.63
St.Martha	208.92
Seale & Sands	207.18
Send	197.55
Shackleford	198.82
Shalford	214.84
Shere	232.27
Tongham	209.78
Wanborough	196.84
Wisley (Meeting)	171.82
Worplesdon	237.52

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at sub-paragraph (vi) above the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at sub-paragraph (ii) of paragraph (6) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

(viii) Part of the Council's area

<b>VALUATION BANDS</b>								
	<b>Band A</b>	<b>Band B</b>	<b>Band C</b>	<b>Band D</b>	<b>Band E</b>	<b>Band F</b>	<b>Band G</b>	<b>Band H</b>
<b>PARISH</b>	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p
Albury	162.46	189.54	216.61	243.69	297.84	352.00	406.15	487.38
Artington	132.90	155.05	177.20	199.35	243.65	287.95	332.25	398.70
Ash	160.30	187.02	213.73	240.45	293.88	347.32	400.75	480.90
East Clandon	151.56	176.82	202.08	227.34	277.86	328.38	378.90	454.68
West Clandon	136.65	159.43	182.20	204.98	250.53	296.08	341.63	409.96
Compton	149.17	174.04	198.90	223.76	273.48	323.21	372.93	447.52
Effingham	169.97	198.29	226.62	254.95	311.61	368.26	424.92	509.90

VALUATION BANDS								
	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
PARISH	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p
East Horsley	149.64	174.58	199.52	224.46	274.34	324.22	374.10	448.92
West Horsley	153.96	179.62	205.28	230.94	282.26	333.58	384.90	461.88
Normandy	184.03	214.71	245.38	276.05	337.39	398.74	460.08	552.10
Ockham	147.05	171.55	196.06	220.57	269.59	318.60	367.62	441.14
Pirbright	146.29	170.68	195.06	219.44	268.20	316.97	365.73	438.88
Puttenham	141.07	164.58	188.09	211.60	258.62	305.64	352.67	423.20
Ripley	162.42	189.49	216.56	243.63	297.77	351.91	406.05	487.26
St.Martha	139.28	162.49	185.71	208.92	255.35	301.77	348.20	417.84
Seale & Sands	138.12	161.14	184.16	207.18	253.22	299.26	345.30	414.36
Send	131.70	153.65	175.60	197.55	241.45	285.35	329.25	395.10
Shackleford	132.55	154.64	176.73	198.82	243.00	287.18	331.37	397.64
Shalford	143.23	167.10	190.97	214.84	262.58	310.32	358.07	429.68
Shere	154.85	180.65	206.46	232.27	283.89	335.50	387.12	464.54
Tongham	139.85	163.16	186.47	209.78	256.40	303.02	349.63	419.56
Wanborough	131.23	153.10	174.97	196.84	240.58	284.32	328.07	393.68
Wisley (Meeting)	114.55	133.64	152.73	171.82	210.00	248.18	286.37	343.64
Worplesdon	158.35	184.74	211.13	237.52	290.30	343.08	395.87	475.04
<b>TOWN AREA</b>								
Guildford	114.55	133.64	152.73	171.82	210.00	248.18	286.37	343.64

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at sub-paragraphs (vi) and (vii) above by the number which in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

- (8) That the Council notes that for the year 2019-20, (i) Surrey County Council (SCC) and (ii) the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey (PCCS) have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Act, for each of the categories of dwelling in the Council's area as shown below:



VALUATION BANDS								
	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p
(i) SCC	969.00	1,130.50	1,292.00	1,453.50	1,776.50	2,099.50	2,422.50	2,907.00
(ii) PCCS	173.71	202.67	231.62	260.57	318.47	376.38	434.28	521.14

- (9) That the Council agrees, having calculated the aggregate in each of the amounts at sub-paragraph (viii) of paragraph (7) and paragraph (8) above, to set the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2019-20 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Act.

Part of the Council's Area:

VALUATION BANDS								
	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
PARISH	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p
Albury	1,305.17	1,522.71	1,740.23	1,957.76	2,392.81	2,827.88	3,262.93	3,915.52
Artington	1,275.61	1,488.22	1,700.82	1,913.42	2,338.62	2,763.83	3,189.03	3,826.84
Ash	1,303.01	1,520.19	1,737.35	1,954.52	2,388.85	2,823.20	3,257.53	3,909.04
East Clandon	1,294.27	1,509.99	1,725.70	1,941.41	2,372.83	2,804.26	3,235.68	3,882.82
West Clandon	1,279.36	1,492.60	1,705.82	1,919.05	2,345.50	2,771.96	3,198.41	3,838.10
Compton	1,291.88	1,507.21	1,722.52	1,937.83	2,368.45	2,799.09	3,229.71	3,875.66
Effingham	1,312.68	1,531.46	1,750.24	1,969.02	2,406.58	2,844.14	3,281.70	3,938.04
East Horsley	1,292.35	1,507.75	1,723.14	1,938.53	2,369.31	2,800.10	3,230.88	3,877.06
West Horsley	1,296.67	1,512.79	1,728.90	1,945.01	2,377.23	2,809.46	3,241.68	3,890.02
Normandy	1,326.74	1,547.88	1,769.00	1,990.12	2,432.36	2,874.62	3,316.86	3,980.24
Ockham	1,289.76	1,504.72	1,719.68	1,934.64	2,364.56	2,794.48	3,224.40	3,869.28
Pirbright	1,289.00	1,503.85	1,718.68	1,933.51	2,363.17	2,792.85	3,222.51	3,867.02
Puttenham	1,283.78	1,497.75	1,711.71	1,925.67	2,353.59	2,781.52	3,209.45	3,851.34
Ripley	1,305.13	1,522.66	1,740.18	1,957.70	2,392.74	2,827.79	3,262.83	3,915.40
St.Martha	1,281.99	1,495.66	1,709.33	1,922.99	2,350.32	2,777.65	3,204.98	3,845.98
Seale & Sands	1,280.83	1,494.31	1,707.78	1,921.25	2,348.19	2,775.14	3,202.08	3,842.50
Send	1,274.41	1,486.82	1,699.22	1,911.62	2,336.42	2,761.23	3,186.03	3,823.24
Shackleford	1,275.26	1,487.81	1,700.35	1,912.89	2,337.97	2,763.06	3,188.15	3,825.78
Shalford	1,285.94	1,500.27	1,714.59	1,928.91	2,357.55	2,786.20	3,214.85	3,857.82
Shere	1,297.56	1,513.82	1,730.08	1,946.34	2,378.86	2,811.38	3,243.90	3,892.68

VALUATION BANDS								
	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
PARISH	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p
Tongham	1,282.56	1,496.33	1,710.09	1,923.85	2,351.37	2,778.90	3,206.41	3,847.70
Wanborough	1,273.94	1,486.27	1,698.59	1,910.91	2,335.55	2,760.20	3,184.85	3,821.82
Wisley (Meeting)*	1,257.26	1,466.81	1,676.35	1,885.89	2,304.97	2,724.06	3,143.15	3,771.78
Worplesdon	1,301.06	1,517.91	1,734.75	1,951.59	2,385.27	2,818.96	3,252.65	3,903.18
TOWN AREA								
Guildford	1,257.26	1,466.81	1,676.35	1,885.89	2,304.97	2,724.06	3,143.15	3,771.78

\*Note: Wisley Parish Meeting

In accordance with the Executive's decision at its meeting on 8 August 2002 (see Minute No. 270 – 2002-03), the Chief Finance Officer has anticipated the precept for 2019-20 for the Wisley Parish Meeting to be £nil and this is reflected in all the relevant Council Tax figures above.

(10) That the Council determines that the Borough Council's basic amount of council tax for 2019-20 is not excessive in accordance with the principles approved under section 52ZB of the Act.

(11) That, as the billing authority, the Council notes that it has not been notified by a major precepting authority that its relevant basic amount of Council Tax for 2019-20 was excessive under the regulations and that the billing authority was not required to hold a referendum in accordance with Section 52ZK of the Act.

(12) That the Council agrees, in respect of council tax payments:

- (i) that the payment dates for the statutory ten monthly instalment scheme be set to run from 2 April to 2 January each year; and
- (ii) that the payment dates be set as the second day of each month for a customer who has requested to opt out of the statutory scheme under the provisions of The Council Tax (Administration and Enforcement) (Amendment) (No 2) (England) Regulations 2012.

(13) That the Council agrees, in respect of non-domestic rate payments:

- (i) that the payment dates for the statutory ten monthly instalment scheme be set to run from 2 April to 2 January each year; and
- (ii) that the payment dates be set as the second day of each month for a customer who has requested to opt out of the statutory scheme under the provisions of the Non Domestic Rating (Collection and Enforcement) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2014.

(14) That the Council approves the annual statement of accounts for Wisley Parish Meeting, which is currently dormant, for the year ended 31 March 2018, as set out below:

	Year ending	
	31 March 2017 £	31 March 2018 £
1. Balances brought forward	3,489	3,507
2. (+) Annual precept	Nil	Nil
3. (+) Total other receipts	18	18
4. (-) Staff costs	Nil	Nil
5. (-) Loan interest/capital repayments	Nil	Nil
6. (-) Total other payments	Nil	Nil
7. (=) Balances carried forward	3,507	3,525
8. Total cash and investments	3,507	3,525
9. Total fixed assets and long-term assets	Nil	Nil
10. Total borrowings	Nil	Nil

**Reason for Decision:**

To enable the Council to set the Council Tax requirement and council tax for the 2019-20 financial year.

**Comments:**

Councillor Caroline Reeves (group spokesperson)  
Councillor Tony Rooth (group spokesperson)  
Councillor James Walsh (group spokesperson)

**13 REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD REVIEW TASK AND FINISH GROUP**  
(Pages 583 – 588 of the Council agenda)

NB. At their respective meetings held on 14 and 18 February 2019, the two Executive Advisory Boards endorsed the task and finish group's recommendations, which are set out in the report submitted to the Council.

**The Motion**

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss to move, and Councillor Nils Christiansen to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- (1) That Option 2: "*To disband the existing EABs and establish topic based advisory boards to be commissioned directly by the Executive as and when required*" be not supported and discounted as a possible future EAB governance structure.
- (2) That the existing arrangement of the two EABs be retained for the time being whilst the Forward Plan process is strengthened pending review following the Borough Council Elections in May 2019 to ascertain whether changes to the Forward Plan process and/or EAB structure are required.
- (3) That the review referred to in paragraph (2) above be carried out within 12 months of the Borough Council Elections.
- (4) That the Forward Plan be included on future EAB agendas as part of the standing item on the Work Programme to facilitate better agenda planning.
- (5) That lead councillors do not play a part in determining the Overview and Scrutiny Committee work programme at work programme meetings.

Reason:

To introduce a more efficient and effective EAB configuration.

**14 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 6 FEBRUARY 2019 FROM COUNCILLOR ANGELA GOODWIN**

Councillor Angela Goodwin to propose, and Councillor Pauline Searle to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“Care leavers have had their childhoods punctuated by instability and trauma, they leave home earlier and have less support than other young people. As a result, care leavers have some of the worst life chances in the country.

A 2016 report by the Children's Society found that when care leavers move into independent accommodation, they find managing their own finances extremely challenging. With no family to support them and insufficient financial education, care leavers are falling into debt and financial difficulty. The Children's Society recommends that care leavers should be taken out of Council Tax until they turn 25.

The Children and Social Work Act 2017 places corporate parenting responsibilities on borough and district councils for the first time, requiring them to have regard to children in care and care leavers when carrying out their functions.

To ensure that transition from care to adult life is as smooth as possible and to mitigate the chances of care leavers falling into debt as they begin to manage their own finances, this Council

**RESOLVES:**

- (1) That care leavers under the age of 25 living in Guildford Borough be exempt from payment of any Council Tax with effect from April 2019.
- (2) That the Council also agrees to look at ways of supporting care leavers further to ensure they fulfil their potential.”

**Comments:**

None

**Amendment**

Councillor James Walsh to propose and Councillor Angela Gunning to second the following amendment:

- (2) In the second paragraph, delete *"The Children's Society recommends that care leavers should be taken out of Council Tax until they turn 25"*.
- (3) Delete paragraph (1) of the proposed resolution: *"That care leavers under the age of 25 living in Guildford Borough be exempt from payment of any Council Tax with effect from April 2019"*.
- (4) Insert new paragraph (1) of the proposed resolution as follows:  
  
*"(1) That the financial, social and emotional needs of care leavers under the age of 25 living in Guildford Borough, and the attendant services and help provided by this Council, be examined by the Overview and Scrutiny*

*Committee at its earliest convenience, and recommendations to the Executive made as appropriate."*

If the amendment is carried, the substantive motion, would read as follows:

"Care leavers have had their childhoods punctuated by instability and trauma, they leave home earlier and have less support than other young people. As a result, care leavers have some of the worst life chances in the country.

A 2016 report by the Children's Society found that when care leavers move into independent accommodation, they find managing their own finances extremely challenging. With no family to support them and insufficient financial education, care leavers are falling into debt and financial difficulty.

The Children and Social Work Act 2017 places corporate parenting responsibilities on borough and district councils for the first time, requiring them to have regard to children in care and care leavers when carrying out their functions.

To ensure that transition from care to adult life is as smooth as possible and to mitigate the chances of care leavers falling into debt as they begin to manage their own finances, this Council

RESOLVES:

- (1) That the financial, social and emotional needs of care leavers under the age of 25 living in Guildford Borough, and the attendant services and help provided by this Council, be examined by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its earliest convenience, and recommendations to the Executive made as appropriate.
- (2) That the Council also agrees to look at ways of supporting care leavers further to ensure they fulfil their potential."

## **15 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 14 FEBRUARY 2019 FROM COUNCILLOR CHRISTIAN HOLLIDAY**

Councillor Christian Holliday to propose, and Councillor Mike Piper to second, the adoption of the following motion:

"This Council welcomes the contribution made to local communities by Neighbourhood Forums, a flagship innovation of the Localism Act 2011, which gives local people the opportunity to shape their communities through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Guildford Borough currently has nine Forum areas and four adopted Neighbourhood Plans.

Forums in Parished Areas are led by elected Parish Councils, whilst Forums in non-Parished areas must seek designation as a body in their own right under separate procedures. This differentiation can lead to non-Parished Forums being at a disadvantage when Town Planning consultation events (such as consultation events connected to the Local Plan, SPDs etc.) are organised by the Borough Council for Parish members only, regardless of whether a Parish is undertaking a Neighbourhood Plan or not.

This Council therefore resolves that all current and future Neighbourhood Forums in non-Parished areas of the Borough be regarded as equivalent to Parish Councils for the purposes of consultation on all Local Plan and other planning matters, ensuring

equality of access and participation in such events for all Parishes and Neighbourhood Forums.”

**Comments:**

None

**16 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE** (Pages 589 - 602 of the Council agenda)

To receive and note the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 8 and 22 January 2019, which are attached to the Council agenda.

**Comments:**

None

**16A ITEM OF URGENT BUSINESS: REVIEW OF ALLOCATION OF SEATS ON COMMITTEES 2018-19**

Councillors’ attention is drawn to the attached report from the Democratic Services Manager (see Appendix A to this Order Paper).

The Motion

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss to move, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“That the Council approves the calculation of numerical allocation of seats on committees to each political group for the remainder of the 2018-19 municipal year, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report submitted to the Council, and summarised below:

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Con</b>	<b>Lib Dem</b>	<b>Ind Alliance</b>	<b>GGG</b>	<b>Labour</b>
Corp Gov & Standards	5	1	1	0	0
Employment	2	1	0	0	0
Community EAB	8	2	1	0	1
Place-Making EAB	8	2	1	1	0
Guildford Joint	7	2	1	1	0
Licensing	10	2	1	1	1
Overview & Scrutiny	7	2	1	1	1
Planning	9	3	1	1	1
<b>Total no. of seats on committees</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>

Reasons:

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

**Comments:**

None

**17 COMMON SEAL**

To order the Common Seal.

## **ITEM OF URGENT BUSINESS**

**Appendix A**

Council Report

Ward(s) affected: n/a

Report of Director of Finance

Author: John Armstrong (Democratic Services Manager)

Tel: 01483 444102

Email: john.armstrong@guildford.gov.uk

Lead Councillor responsible: Matt Furniss

Tel: 07891 022206

Email: matt.furniss@guildford.gov.uk

Date: 26 February 2019

### **Review of Allocation of Seats on Committees: 2018-19**

#### **Executive Summary**

On 22 February 2019, Councillor Nils Christiansen gave notice in writing to the proper officer (Democratic Services Manager) that, with immediate effect, he no longer wished to remain a member of the Conservative Group. On 25 February 2019, the proper officer received notice in writing from Councillor Christiansen of his wish to join the Independent Alliance.

The Council will recall that, at its last meeting on 4 December 2018, a similar report on the review of the allocation of seats on committees was presented following the resignation of Councillor Colin Cross from the Liberal Democrat group in October, and his decision to join the Independent Alliance. That review resulted in a number of changes to the allocation of seats on committees to political groups (see **Appendix 1**).

The political balance on the Council is now:

Conservative Group: 31  
Liberal Democrat Group: 8  
Independent Alliance: 4  
Guildford Greenbelt Group: 3  
Labour Group: 2

Under Council Procedure Rule 23, whenever there is 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.

This report sets out, in **Appendix 2**, a notional calculation of the numerical allocation of seats on committees to the five political groups using the normal rounding up/rounding down rules. The notional calculation identifies where adjustments are necessary to best meet, as far as reasonably practicable, the requirements for political balance.

**Appendix 3** sets out a proposed revised calculation of numerical allocation of seats on committees to political groups, for approval by the Council, based on the current political

balance.

### Recommendation to Council:

That the Council approves the calculation of numerical allocation of seats on committees to each political group for the remainder of the 2018-19 municipal year, as set out in Appendix 3 to this report, and summarised below:

Committee	Con	Lib Dem	Ind Alliance	GGG	Labour
Corp Gov & Standards	5	1	1	0	0
Employment	2	1	0	0	0
Community EAB	8	2	1	0	1
Place-Making EAB	8	2	1	1	0
Guildford Joint	7	2	1	1	0
Licensing	10	2	1	1	1
Overview & Scrutiny	7	2	1	1	1
Planning	9	3	1	1	1
<b>Total no. of seats on committees</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>

### Reasons for Recommendation:

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

## 1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 The Council is asked to review the numerical allocation of seats on committees to political groups following the resignation of Councillor Nils Christiansen from the Conservative Group on 22 February 2019, and his subsequent notification of his wish to join the Independent Alliance, which was received on 25 February 2019.

## 2. Background

- 2.1 Under Council Procedure Rule 23, the Council is required to review the allocation of seats on committees to political groups at its Selection meeting and as soon as reasonably practicable following any change in the political constitution of the Council or as otherwise required by statute. Wherever such a review is required, the Democratic Services Manager will submit a report to the Council showing what allocation of seats would best meet, as far as reasonably practicable, the requirements for political balance.

## 3. Main Considerations

### Requirement for political balance and numerical allocation of seats on committees

- 3.1 Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 sets out how committees must be constituted when the Council is divided into one or more political groups. The Council must give effect, *as far as reasonably practicable*, to the following four principles in constituting its committees:



- (a) where there is more than one political group, all the seats must not be allocated to the same political group;
- (b) the majority of seats must be allocated to the political group with the majority on the full Council;
- (c) the number of seats on each individual Committee of the Council allocated to each political group bears the same proportion on the full Council; and
- (d) the number of seats on the total of all the Committees allocated to each political group should bear the same proportion to the proportions on the full Council.
- 3.2 Regulations made under the 1989 Act<sup>1</sup>, make provision for securing the political balance on councils and their committees and for determining the voting rights of members of certain committees.
- 3.3 Details of the current numerical allocation of seats on the committees to the political groups, which were approved by the Council following the last review at its meeting on 4 December 2018 following Councillor Colin Cross' resignation from the Liberal Democrat Group and subsequent decision to join the Independent Alliance, are shown in **Appendix 1** to this report.
- 3.4 In light of the recent resignation of Councillor Nils Christiansen from the Conservative Group and his subsequent notice stating his wish to join the Independent Alliance, the political complexion of the Council is now as follows:
- Conservative Group: 31  
 Liberal Democrat Group: 8  
 Independent Alliance: 4  
 Guildford Greenbelt Group: 3  
 Labour Group: 2
- 3.5 The first stage of the review is to make a *notional* calculation of the numerical allocation of seats based on the percentage of seats to which each political group would be entitled when applying the normal rounding up/down rules. The notional calculation is set out in **Appendix 2**.
- 3.6 The **notional calculation** shows that the following adjustments are necessary:
- To reduce the allocation of seats on the Community EAB by one
  - To reduce the allocation of seats on the Place-Making and Innovation EAB by one
  - To reduce the allocation of seats on the Licensing Committee by one
  - To reduce the allocation of seats on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee by one
  - To reduce the allocation of seats on the Planning Committee by one
  - To reduce the allocation of seats to the Conservative Group by two as that group is only entitled to 56 seats overall
  - To reduce the allocation of seats to the Liberal Democrat Group by one as that group is only entitled to fifteen seats overall
  - To reduce the allocation of seats to the Guildford Greenbelt Group by one as that group is only entitled to five seats overall
  - To reduce the allocation of seats to the Labour Group by one as that group is only entitled to four seats overall
- 3.7 Taking all this into account, the second stage of the review is to agree a numerical allocation of seats to political groups on committees that meets, as far as reasonably practicable, the requirements for political balance for the remainder of the 2018-19 municipal year.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990 (as amended),

- 3.8 **Appendix 3** provides a draft calculation that allocates a seat on both the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Planning Committee to the Independent Alliance, and reduces the Conservative Group's allocation of seats on both those Committees by one. All other allocations would remain unchanged from the numerical allocation agreed by the Council on 4 December 2018.
- 3.9 Where it is necessary, following a vote to adopt a revised calculation of the numerical allocation of seats on committees, to appoint members (or substitute) members to committees, these appointments will be made by the Managing Director in accordance with the wishes of the relevant political group as prescribed in Council Procedure Rule 23 (e).

#### **4. Legal implications**

- 4.1 As the Council's membership is divided into political groups, it is required by sections 15 and 16 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and related regulations, to ensure that appointments to fill seats on committees are allocated in the same proportion as that in which the Council as a whole is divided, and to give effect, *as far as reasonably practicable*, to the four principles referred to in paragraph 3.1 above.
- 4.2 There is also a duty to review annually the allocation of seats on committees to political groups or following any change in the political constitution of the Council.

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

- 5.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

#### **6. Human resource Implications**

- 6.1 There are no human resource implications arising from this report.

#### **7. Background Papers**

None

#### **8. Appendices**

- Appendix 1: Current numerical allocation of seats on committees for 2018-19 as agreed by Council on 4 December 2018
- Appendix 2: Notional Calculation of the Numerical Allocation of Seats on Committees for the remainder of 2018-19
- Appendix 3: Draft Calculation of the Numerical Allocation of Seats on Committees for the remainder of 2018-19

**Note:** By reason of the special circumstances described below, the Mayor considers that this item should be dealt with at this meeting as a matter of urgency pursuant to Section 100B 4 (b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

**Special Circumstances:** As the change in political balance on the Council occurred on 22 February, the Council must as soon as reasonably practicable review the allocation of seats on committees to political groups in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 23.

## CURRENT Numerical Allocation of Seats on Committees: 2018-19 as agreed by Council on 4 December 2018

Committee	Conservatives	Liberal Democrats	Independent Alliance	Guildford Greenbelt Group	Labour
Total no. of seats on the Council	32	8	3	3	2
% of no. of seats on the Council	66.67%	16.67%	6.25%	6.25%	4.17%
Corporate Governance & Standards Committee (7 seats)	5	1	1	0	0
Employment Committee (3 seats)	2	1	0	0	0
Community EAB (12 seats)	8	2	1	0	1
Place Making & Innovation EAB (12 seats)	8	2	1	1	0
Guildford Joint Committee (11 seats)	7	2	1	1	0
Licensing Committee (15 seats)	10	2	1	1	1
Overview & Scrutiny Committee (12 seats)	8	2	0	1	1
Planning Committee (15 seats)	10	3	0	1	1
Total no. of seats on committees (87 seats)	58	15	5	5	4

## NOTIONAL Calculation of the Numerical Allocation of Seats on Committees for the remainder of the 2018-19 Municipal Year

Committee	Conservatives	Liberal Democrats	Independent Alliance	Guildford Greenbelt Group	Labour	Adjustment
Total no. of seats on the Council	<b>31</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	
% of no. of seats on the Council	<b>64.58%</b>	<b>16.67%</b>	<b>8.33%</b>	<b>6.25%</b>	<b>4.17%</b>	
Notional total number of seats on committees (Total: 87)	<b>56.18</b> rounded down to <b>56</b>	<b>14.5</b> rounded up to <b>15</b>	<b>7.25</b> rounded down to <b>7</b>	<b>5.44</b> rounded down to <b>5</b>	<b>3.63</b> rounded up to <b>4</b>	
Corporate Governance & Standards Committee (7 seats)	4.52 seats rounded up to <b>5</b>	1.17 seats rounded down to <b>1</b>	0.58 seats rounded up to <b>1</b>	0.44 seats rounded down to <b>0</b>	0.29 seats rounded down to <b>0</b>	
Employment Committee (3 seats)	1.94 seats rounded up to <b>2</b>	0.5 seats rounded up to <b>1</b>	0.25 seats rounded down to <b>0</b>	0.19 seats rounded down to <b>0</b>	0.12 seats rounded down to <b>0</b>	
Community EAB (12 seats)	7.75 seats rounded up to <b>8</b>	2 seats <b>2</b>	1 seat <b>1</b>	0.75 seats rounded up to <b>1</b>	0.5 seats rounded up to <b>1</b>	<b>-1</b>
Place Making & Innovation EAB (12 seats)	7.75 seats rounded up to <b>8</b>	2 seats <b>2</b>	1 seat <b>1</b>	0.75 seats rounded up to <b>1</b>	0.5 seats rounded up to <b>1</b>	<b>-1</b>
Guildford Joint Committee (11 seats)	7.1 seats rounded down to <b>7</b>	1.83 seats rounded up to <b>2</b>	0.92 seats rounded up to <b>1</b>	0.69 seats rounded up to <b>1</b>	0.46 seats rounded down to <b>0</b>	
Licensing Committee (15 seats)	9.69 seats rounded up to <b>10</b>	2.5 seats rounded up to <b>3</b>	1.25 seats rounded down to <b>1</b>	0.94 seats rounded up to <b>1</b>	0.63 seats rounded up to <b>1</b>	<b>-1</b>
Overview & Scrutiny Committee (12 seats)	7.75 seats rounded up to <b>8</b>	2 seats <b>2</b>	1 seat <b>1</b>	0.75 seats rounded up to <b>1</b>	0.5 seats rounded up to <b>1</b>	<b>-1</b>
Planning Committee (15 seats)	9.69 seats rounded up to <b>10</b>	2.5 seats rounded up to <b>3</b>	1.25 seats rounded down to <b>1</b>	0.94 seats rounded up to <b>1</b>	0.63 seats rounded up to <b>1</b>	<b>-1</b>
Rounded notional total no. of seats on committees	<b>58</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Total: 92</b> <b>-5</b>
Variance from rounded notional entitlement	<b>-2</b>	<b>-1</b>		<b>-1</b>	<b>-1</b>	

## Draft Calculation of the Numerical Allocation of Seats on Committees for the remainder of the 2018-19 Municipal Year

Committee	Conservatives	Liberal Democrats	Independent Alliance	Guildford Greenbelt Group	Labour
Total no. of seats on the Council	<b>31</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
% of no. of seats on the Council	<b>64.58%</b>	<b>16.67%</b>	<b>8.33%</b>	<b>6.25%</b>	<b>4.17%</b>
Notional total number of seats on committees (Total: 87)	<b>56</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
Corporate Governance & Standards Committee (7 seats)	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Employment Committee (3 seats)	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Community EAB (12 seats)	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Place Making & Innovation EAB (12 seats)	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
Guildford Joint Committee (11 seats)	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
Licensing Committee (15 seats)	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Overview & Scrutiny Committee (12 seats)	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Planning Committee (15 seats)	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Total no. of seats on committees (Total: 87)	<b>56</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>