

# 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 26 February 2019

\* Councillor Mike Parsons (Mayor)  
Councillor Richard Billington (Deputy Mayor)

- |                                     |                                 |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| * Councillor David Bilbé            | Councillor Nigel Kears          |
| Councillor Philip Brooker           | * Councillor Sheila Kirkland    |
| * Councillor Adrian Chandler        | * Councillor Nigel Manning      |
| * Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield | * Councillor Julia McShane      |
| * Councillor Nils Christiansen      | * Councillor Bob McShee         |
| * Councillor Colin Cross            | * Councillor Marsha Moseley     |
| * Councillor Geoff Davis            | * Councillor Nikki Nelson-Smith |
| * Councillor Graham Ellwood         | * Councillor Susan Parker       |
| * Councillor David Elms             | * Councillor Dennis Paul        |
| * Councillor Matt Furniss           | * Councillor Tony Phillips      |
| * Councillor Andrew Gomm            | * Councillor Mike Piper         |
| * Councillor Angela Goodwin         | * Councillor David Quelch       |
| * Councillor David Goodwin          | * Councillor Jo Randall         |
| Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr         | * Councillor David Reeve        |
| * Councillor Angela Gunning         | * Councillor Caroline Reeves    |
| * Councillor Gillian Harwood        | * Councillor Iseult Roche       |
| Councillor Liz Hogger               | * Councillor Tony Rooth         |
| * Councillor Christian Holliday     | * Councillor Matthew Sarti      |
| * Councillor Liz Hooper             | * Councillor Pauline Searle     |
| Councillor Mike Hurdle              | * Councillor Paul Spooner       |
| * Councillor Michael Illman         | * Councillor James Walsh        |
| * Councillor Gordon Jackson         | * Councillor Jenny Wicks        |
| * Councillor Jennifer Jordan        | * Councillor David Wright       |

\*Present

Honorary Alderman Terence Patrick was also in attendance.

## **CO72 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Richard Billington, and Councillors Philip Brooker, Murray Grubb Jnr., Liz Hogger, Mike Hurdle, and Nigel Kears, from Honorary Freeman Jen Powell, and from Honorary Aldermen K Childs, Mrs C F Cobley, Mrs C F P Griffin, J Marks, B Parke, and L Strudwick.

## **CO73 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

Councillor Christian Holliday disclosed a non-pecuniary interest in relation to Item 15 on the agenda (see Minute CO80 below), as Councillor Holliday was chairman of the Burpham Neighbourhood Forum.

## **CO74 MINUTES**

The Council confirmed, as a correct record, the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 4 December 2018. The Mayor signed the minutes.

## **CO75 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS**

### Honorary Alderman Bernard Parke

The Mayor informed the Council that Honorary Alderman Bernard Parke was currently undergoing treatment for cancer, which had been diagnosed recently. Councillors joined the Mayor in sending their best wishes to him for a successful outcome and full recovery.

### Forthcoming event in aid of the Mayor's charities

The Mayor informed councillors that Guildford Fringe Theatre were presenting Live at the Arnaud on Mother's Day, Sunday 31 March 2019 in aid of his chosen charities and the Guildford Young Carers Fund.

## **CO76 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS**

The Leader commented that, following the Local Plan hearing recently, the Inspector had made it clear that he had found the Local Plan to be substantially sound, and did not require any further major modifications. The Inspector would be sending the report to the Council for fact checking and then issuing the final report as quickly as possible thereafter. Subject to this, it was still intended to present the Plan to the Council for consideration of formal adoption as quickly as possible, which could mean before 2 May 2019.

In response to a question from Councillor Parker regarding decision-making during the pre-election 'purdah' period, the Council Solicitor and Monitoring Officer explained that the purdah imposed special restrictions on the Council in terms of publicity but did not extend the convention that Central Government applied to itself in relation to decision-making. Local authority business continued during purdah, although special care was taken to ensure that decisions of any magnitude were brought forward with detailed advice around how they can be considered appropriately.

## **CO77 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr Ivor Thomas addressed the Council in respect of agenda item 9: Capital and Investment Strategy 2019-29 to 2023-24 (Minute No. CO80), and specifically the capital bid entitled: "Shalford Common - Regularising Car Parking and Reduction of Encroachments".

The Lead Councillor for Enterprise and Economic Development, Councillor David Bilbé responded to Mr Thomas' statement.

## **CO78 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

(1) Councillor Jenny Wicks asked 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 was 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 asked 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 italicised text 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 asked 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 was 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 asked 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 was 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 asked 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 italicised text 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.*

## **CO79 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2019-20**

Under Section 39 of the Localism Act 2011, the Council was required to consider and approve a pay policy statement for the financial year ahead. The Council therefore considered the Pay Policy Statement covering 2019-20.

The Pay Policy Statement reflected the current Senior Management structure, which comprised of four Directors reporting to the Managing Director and Service Leaders reporting to either the Managing Director or Directors. The request for the approval of the 2019 pay award for the Managing Director and the Directors had been removed as the cost-of-living pay award date had been changed to 1 July 2019 and had not yet been determined. A further report would need to be brought to Council to consider the pay award before it could be approved.



Councillors noted that the Council would continue to pay at the Real Living Wage for outside London, which was currently £9 per hour, at the bottom of the pay scale. This would aid recruitment difficulties in attracting and retaining key staff.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, seconded by the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning, the Council

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

Reason:

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

## **CO80 CAPITAL AND INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2019-20 TO 2023-24**

The Council considered a report on the Council's capital and investment strategy, including the capital programme new bids plus the requirements of the Prudential Code and the investment strategy covering treasury management investments, commercial investments, the Treasury Management Code, and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) Statutory Guidance.

In relation to the Capital Strategy, the Council sought to demonstrate that capital expenditure and investment decisions were taken in line with service objectives and properly took account of stewardship, value for money, prudence, sustainability and affordability. The Council also needed to demonstrate that it sets out the long-term context in which capital expenditure and investment decisions were made and gave due consideration to both risk and reward and the impact on the achievement of priority outcomes.

The strategy was intended to give an overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing and treasury management activity contributed to the provision of services along with an overview of how associated risk was managed and the implications for future financial sustainability.

Councillors noted that in order to achieve the ambitious targets within the Corporate Plan, the Council needed to invest in its assets, via capital expenditure.

The Council had a current underlying need to borrow for the general fund capital programme of £324 million. Officers had put forward bids, with a net cost to the Council of £6.4 million, increasing the underlying need to borrow to £330 million should the proposals be approved for inclusion in the programme.

Some capital receipts or revenue streams could arise as a result of investment in particular schemes, but in most cases were currently uncertain and it was too early to make assumptions. Some information had been included in the capital vision highlighting the potential income. It was likely that there were cash-flow implications of the development schemes, where income would come in after the five-year time horizon and the expenditure would be incurred earlier in the programme.

All projects would be funded by general fund capital receipts, grants and contributions, reserves and, finally, borrowing. It was not currently known how each scheme would be funded and, in the case of development projects, what the delivery model would be. To ensure the Council demonstrated that its capital expenditure plans were affordable, sustainable and prudent, Prudential Indicators were set that had to be monitored each year.

The capital programme included a number of significant regeneration schemes which, it was assumed, would be financed from General Fund resources. However, subject to detailed design of the schemes, there might be scope to fund them from HRA resources rather than General Fund resources in due course. Detailed funding proposals for each scheme would be considered when the Outline Business Case for each scheme was presented to the Executive for approval.

The report included a summary of the new bids submitted, the position and profiling of the current capital programme (2018-19 to 2022-23) and the capital vision schemes.

Bids totalling £34.58 million had also been submitted for the HRA, a summary of which was appended to the report. Of that total, £17.5 million was scheduled to go straight onto the approved programme and £17.1 million onto the provisional programme. The HRA capital programme would be funded from capital receipts, reserves and borrowing.

The Capital Programme Monitoring Group, Corporate Management Team, the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, and the Joint Executive Advisory Board Budget Task Group (JEABBTG), the Joint EAB, and the Executive had all reviewed the bids presented in the report.

The report had also included the Council's Minimum Revenue Provision policy and the Prudential Indicators.

In relation to Treasury management, the Council noted that officers carried out the treasury management function within the parameters set by the Council each year and in accordance with the approved treasury management practices.

The Council was in a good financial position, with a strong asset base and a good level of reserves.

The budget for investment income in 2019-20 was £1.503 million, based on an average investment portfolio of £52.8 million, at an average rate of 3%. The budget for debt interest paid was £5.755 million, of which £5.156 million related to the HRA.

In relation to non-financial investments and investment strategy, the Council noted that local authorities could invest to support public services by lending to or buying shares in other organisations (service investments) or to earn investment income (commercial investments where this was the main purpose). The Council had £147.412 million of investment property on its balance sheet, generating a return of £8.9 million and a current yield of 6.59%.

In 2014, the Executive had endorsed a new asset investment strategy and business case to invest in new suitable properties within the borough for two major reasons. First, to increase the income generated, and, second, to stimulate and encourage business growth and development by investing in key sites for regeneration purposes. The Council's target was to increase annual income by £2 million from March 2012 to March 2018. By April 2017, the Council had achieved and exceeded this target.

The criteria for purchasing investment property, when originally approved were to achieve a minimum qualitative score and yield an internal rate of return (IRR) of at least 8%. It was now recommended that the IRR be changed to 5.5% due to the change in the market forces and recognition of the move to investing for strategic purposes, for example economic growth and housing and regeneration. The Council was not proposing to purchase outright investment property, but making purchases for strategic reasons. In addition, the Council was not looking to purchase properties outside the borough.

The Council had invested £4.501 million in its housing company – North Downs Housing (NDH), via 40% equity to Guildford Holdings Limited (£1.803 million) (who in turn passed the equity to NDH) and 60% loan direct to NDH (£2.698 million) at a rate of base plus 5% (currently 5.75%). The loan was a repayment loan in line with the NDH business plan – with loan repayment anticipated to start in 2021-22.

The Council had the option of setting a policy where it could use new capital receipts to fund revenue expenditure that would generate ongoing savings and this could be used towards the Future Guildford project.

The Capital and Investment Strategy 2019-20 to 2023-24 had also been considered by the Joint Executive Advisory Board at its meeting on 10 January 2019, by the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee at its meeting on 17 January 2019, and by the Executive on 22 January 2019.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (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.

## **CO81 HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUDGET 2019-20**

The Council considered a detailed report on the draft Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget and Housing Capital Investment Programme for 2019-20.

The 2019-20 estimates had been predicated on the assumptions, ambitions and priorities contained in the updated HRA business plan, a copy of which was appended to the report. Since the 2018-19 HRA budget report, there had been three key Government announcements that improved the Council's ability to deliver on its ambitions to increase and improve social housing in the borough. These were to:

- Remove the HRA borrowing restriction - *The Limits on Indebtedness (Revocation) Determination 2018*
- Revert to an index-linked rent setting policy from 1 April 2020 - *The Direction on the Rent Standard 2018*
- Not implement the enforced sale of higher value council houses - *A new deal for social housing August 2018 (Green Paper)*

The prevailing social rent policy set out in the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016 required social housing providers in England to reduce social rents by 1% per annum for the four years from 1 April 2016. Rents for 2019-20 would therefore be reduced by 1%.

The report had proposed a 3.4% increase in garage rents from April 2019, based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) plus 1%.

The report had set out details of progress with the new build programme together with the proposed investment programme in tenants' homes.

The estimates continued to be informed by the business plan, which attached a lower priority to the repayment of debt principal inherited as part of the self-financing HRA settlement. The Council noted that 2019-20 would be a 53-week rent year. There was some doubt around how this should be charged but recent advice received from the Local Government Association was that the Council should follow usual procedures and charge for each week within the year. The revised budget set out in Appendix 2 to the report reflected the impact of the 53 week rent year.

At its meeting held on 22 January 2019, the Executive had, subject to Council approving the budget at this meeting, approved the projects forming the HRA major repair and improvement programme, as set out in Appendix 4 to the report and had authorised the Director of Community Services to reallocate funding between approved schemes to make best use of the available resources, and to set rents for new developments.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the Council

**RESOLVED:**

- (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.

**Reason:**

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.

**CO82 FUTURE GUILDFORD TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME**

The Council considered the Managing Director's report setting out the proposal, called Future Guildford, to reorganise the whole Council. Despite achieved savings, wise investments and effective financial management, the Council still faced significant funding challenges. To help meet these challenges, the Council needed to reorganise and transform the way it works and provides services to residents.

The Council had previously delivered transformation through Fundamental Service Reviews, Lean Reviews and service redesign. These reviews had mainly been concentrated on one

specific service area and had not looked at the synergies and opportunities across the whole organisation. Whilst these approaches had delivered significant savings, it was clear that financial challenges, customer expectations, the limitations of the Council's ICT systems and infrastructure and the need to be more efficient, were demanding a new approach.

Future Guildford had been informed through the work of Ignite (management consultants) and was based on investing in ICT infrastructure, increasing customer self-service, better focus on commissioning and commercial opportunities, addressing issues of duplication and redesigning services to improve service delivery and being more efficient.

To achieve this, there would be a need to invest in the replacement of ICT systems, potential redundancy costs (where, subject to consultation, redundancies take place), and implementation costs. The savings from this exercise, which would address the financial challenges faced by this Council, were set out in the report.

The Council noted that whilst Ignite had provided the model and expertise to inform the approach, the implementation of Future Guildford would be managed through the Project Board using local knowledge of the Council and borough, to ensure a measured, balanced and appropriate approach. Corporate Management Team would also monitor the project on a weekly basis and updates provided to the Executive. It was also proposed to ask the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to monitor progress of each stage of the implementation of the Blueprint (Future Guildford programme).

The report, including the Blueprint, had also been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its special meeting held on 6 February 2019, and by the Executive at its meeting held on 19 February 2019. Details of the matters raised at those meetings were set out in the report now before the Council and on the Order Paper circulated at the meeting.

Councillors acknowledged that the decision to proceed with implementation of Future Guildford was necessary and that the process would be very challenging. It was also noted that the manner in which staff had engaged in the work with Ignite had been encouraging. Continuing open and honest communication with staff, and also with residents, would be crucial.

Emphasis was placed on the need for a supportive and collaborative approach to the implementation of Future Guildford by both staff and councillors, including comprehensive training for staff and councillors.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, seconded by the Deputy Leader, Councillor Matt Furniss, the Council:

RESOLVED:

- (1) That Option 1 be adopted, as described in the body of the report submitted to the Council – 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 the report), in accordance with the accompanying timeframe, and undertaking appropriate consultation.
- (2) That the implementation budget described in Section 9 of the report be approved, and that the implementation costs be financed from the specific earmarked reserves referred to in paragraph 9.6 of the 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.

**CO83 BUSINESS PLANNING - GENERAL FUND BUDGET 2019-20**

The Council considered a detailed report on the draft General Fund Revenue budget for 2019-20, which included a Council Tax requirement of £9,758,577 (excluding parish precepts) and a Council Tax increase of £5 per year (3%), resulting in a Band D charge of £171.82.

The provisional Local Government Finance Settlement (LGFS) for 2019-20 had been received on 13 December 2018. The figures included in the outline budget presented to the Executive on 27 November 2018 had been based on the 4-year local government finance settlement issued by Government in February 2017.

The Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA) comprising the local share of business rates, and revenue support grant, was set out in the provisional LGFS. The settlement had been in line with expectations and the multi-year settlement, which enabled the Council to retain £2.88 million of business rates in 2019-20, an increase of 2.3% on 2018-19.

The outline budget presented to Executive in November included a working assumption that the Council would be subject to 'negative RSG' (additional business rates levy) for 2019-20 consistent with the multi-year settlement. However, the Government had indicated that it would "directly eliminate" negative RSG for 2019-20, meeting the cost through business rates which it had retained centrally.

In addition, the Government had returned £180 million of business rates growth nationally to local government, with this Council's share of that growth being £44,208.

In determining that the Council's Core Spending Power had increased by 2.9%, the Government had assumed that the Council would raise the Council Tax by the maximum amount (£5 or 3% whichever was the higher).

The provisional award of New Homes Bonus (NHB) for 2019-20 totalling £1,039,201, was lower than the £1,200,000 included in the outline budget reported to the Executive. Although 322 new homes had been added to the Council Tax base in 2018-19, which represented a 0.48% increase in tax base, the deadweight for qualifying new homes bonus had been set at 0.4%, which was the minimum expectation Government had for the development of new housing.

The Council's NHB allocation had also been suppressed by an increase in long-term empty homes in the borough. In response to the increase in empty properties, officers had recommended that, the Council varies the determination regarding empty property discount and long term empty levy made in December 2012 as detailed in Appendix 5 to the report. This

change should bring more dwellings back into occupation, and in the short term would raise additional council tax revenue.

The Joint EAB Budget Task Group (JEABBTG) and Joint Executive Advisory Board (JEAB) had considered the outline budget at their meetings on 8 and 21 November 2018 respectively.

The Chief Finance Officer's statutory report, appended to the main report, provided information about the strategic context within which the budget had been prepared, the medium term financial plan, the robustness of the estimates, adequacy of reserves and budget risks.

The financial monitoring report for the first eight months of 2018-19 had been reported to the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee on 17 January 2019. The projected net expenditure on the General Fund for the current financial year had been estimated to be £792,095 less than the original estimate.

The Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management and the Leader of the Council would determine the appropriation of the final balance in June 2019. Any ongoing variances between actual expenditure and budget identified in 2018-19 had been taken into account when preparing the budget for 2019-20.

Appendix 3 to the report provided a list of fees and charges for approval as part of the budget, subject to a number of corrections, which were set out on the Order Paper circulated at the meeting. The Executive had agreed the target increase given to service managers on 17 July 2018, subject to market constraints.

At its meeting held on 22 January 2019, the Executive had considered this report and had endorsed the recommendations therein and approved the transfer to reserves of the sums included in the proposed budget at Appendix 2 to the report.

Under The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 and Council Procedure Rule 19 (d), the Council was reminded that a recorded vote would be conducted on the proposed budget and Council tax resolution as set out in the report and the Order Paper circulated at the meeting which contained details of the respective precepts set by Surrey County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey.

The Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning proposed and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, seconded the motion to approve the budget and council tax for 2019-20.

Following the debate, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (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>	
Albury	£44,092
Artington	£3,859

<b>Parish of</b>	
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

<b>Parish of</b>	<b>£ p</b>
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

VALUATION BANDS								
	<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
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

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
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
TOWN AREA								
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

	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 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
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
<b>TOWN AREA</b>								
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.

**Result of the Recorded Vote:**

The motion to adopt the Budget and Council Tax resolution above was approved, with thirty-one councillors voting in favour, seven voting against and two abstentions, as follows:

**FOR:**

Councillor David Bilbe  
Councillor Adrian Chandler  
Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield  
Councillor Nils Christiansen  
Councillor Geoff Davis

**AGAINST:**

Councillor Angela Goodwin  
Councillor David Goodwin  
Councillor Gillian Harwood  
Councillor Julia McShane  
Councillor Tony Phillips

**ABSTAIN:**

Councillor Susan Parker  
Councillor Mike Parsons

**FOR:**

Councillor Graham Ellwood  
Councillor David Elms  
Councillor Matt Furniss  
Councillor Andrew Gomm  
Councillor Angela Gunning  
Councillor Christian Holliday  
Councillor Liz Hooper  
Councillor Gordon Jackson  
Councillor Jennifer Jordan  
Councillor Sheila Kirkland  
Councillor Nigel Manning  
Councillor Bob McShee  
Councillor Marsha Moseley  
Councillor Nikki Nelson-Smith  
Councillor Dennis Paul  
Councillor Mike Piper  
Councillor David Quelch  
Councillor Jo Randall  
Councillor David Reeve  
Councillor Iseult Roche  
Councillor Tony Rooth  
Councillor Matt Sarti  
Councillor Paul Spooner  
Councillor James Walsh  
Councillor Jenny Wicks  
Councillor David Wright

**AGAINST:**

Councillor Caroline Reeves  
Councillor Pauline Searle

**ABSTAIN:****CO84 REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD REVIEW TASK AND FINISH GROUP**

Councillors were reminded that, at its meeting on 9 October 2018, the Council had considered a report concerning a review of the structure of the Executive Advisory Boards (EABs), which contained the following three options:

1. To disband the existing EABs and establish one overarching EAB making greater use of existing powers to establish task groups to look at specific issues and projects relating to the delivery of the nine strategic Corporate Plan priorities.
2. To disband the existing EABs and establish topic based advisory boards to be commissioned directly by the Executive as and when required.
3. To make no change to the current arrangements.

The Council resolved that, before any decision was taken in respect of the future of the EABs, a cross party task and finish group be established to consider the matter and report its findings to the Council.

Accordingly, the EAB Review Task and Finish Group was established and met on 20 November 2018 when it considered the future structure of the EABs.

The Task and Finish Group's principal finding was that the Forward Plan process was currently insufficiently robust to facilitate and inform EAB or Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) input as many proposed decisions were entered late which hampered work programming and early involvement. However, officers had sought to strengthen this process and issues with forward planning and updating the Forward Plan were being tackled through educating senior leaders and others to plan ahead and programme their work in a more timely fashion.

It was suggested that resolving issues with the Forward Plan could possibly resolve the issues associated with the perceived lack of effectiveness of the EABs.

The Council considered a report setting out the Task and Finish Group's findings and recommendations to the Council, which had also been considered by both EABs at their February meetings and both had commended their adoption by the Council.

Upon the motion of the Deputy Leader, Councillor Matt Furniss, seconded by Councillor Nils Christiansen, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (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.

#### **CO85 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 6 FEBRUARY 2019**

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor Angela Goodwin proposed, and Councillor Pauline Searle seconded, 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.”

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Angela Goodwin, as the mover of the original motion, had indicated that, with the consent of her seconder and of the meeting, she wished to alter her motion in accordance with the Amendment below.

**Amendment:**

Proposed by Councillor James Walsh and seconded by Councillor Angela Gunning:

- (1) In the second paragraph, delete *"The Children's Society recommends that care leavers should be taken out of Council Tax until they turn 25"*.
- (2) 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"*.
- (3) 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."*

The Council agreed to accept the alteration to the original motion, as proposed in the Amendment above. The substantive motion for debate, to which further amendments could be put, was therefore 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.”

Following the debate on the substantive motion, it was put to the vote and was carried.

## **CO86 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 14 FEBRUARY 2019**

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor Christian Holliday proposed, and Councillor Mike Piper seconded, 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.”

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Christian Holliday, as the mover of the original motion, had indicated that, with the consent of his seconder and of the meeting, he wished to alter his motion in accordance with the Amendment below.

### **Amendment:**

Proposed by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss and seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner:

(1) In the second paragraph of the motion, delete:

*“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.*

and replace with:

*“Once designated as a Neighbourhood Forum they are entitled to the same statutory consultation in both plan-making activity, and in relation to specific planning applications as Parishes, and Parish Forums.”*

(2) Substitute the following in place of the final paragraph of the motion:

*“This Council resolves that it shall continue to engage Parish Councils, Neighbourhood Forums and residents in the local plan process, and planning applications, to help shape the borough of Guildford, ensuring equality of access and participation for all.”*

The Council agreed to accept the alteration to the original motion, as proposed in the Amendment above. The substantive motion for debate, to which further amendments could be put, was therefore as follows:

“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. Once designated as a Neighbourhood Forum they are entitled to the same statutory consultation in both plan-making activity, and in relation to specific planning applications as Parishes, and Parish Forums.

This Council

RESOLVES: That it shall continue to engage Parish Councils, Neighbourhood Forums and residents in the local plan process, and planning applications, to help shape the borough of Guildford, ensuring equality of access and participation for all.”

Following the debate on the substantive motion, it was put to the vote and was carried.

#### **CO87 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE**

The Council received and noted the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 8 and 22 January 2019.

#### **CO88 REVIEW OF ALLOCATION OF SEATS ON COMMITTEES**

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 Nils Christiansen’s resignation from the Conservative Group on 22 February 2019. On 25 February 2019, the proper officer received notice in writing from Councillor Christiansen of his wish to join the Independent Alliance.

The political balance on the Council was now:

Conservatives: 31

Liberal Democrats: 8

Independent Alliance: 4

Guildford Greenbelt Group: 3

Labour: 2

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 Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the Council

RESOLVED: 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 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.

**Note:** By reason of the special circumstances described below, the Mayor considered 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.

**CO89 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 10.13 pm

Signed .....

Mayor

Date .....