

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Draft Minutes of a meeting of Guildford Borough Council held virtually via MS Teams. on Tuesday 6 October 2020

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

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| * Councillor Paul Abbey | * Councillor Ted Mayne |
| * Councillor Tim Anderson | * Councillor Julia McShane |
| * Councillor Jon Askew | * Councillor Ann McShee |
| * Councillor Christopher Barrass | * Councillor Bob McShee |
| * Councillor Joss Bigmore | * Councillor Masuk Miah |
| * Councillor David Bilbé | * Councillor Ramsey Nagaty |
| * Councillor Chris Blow | * Councillor Susan Parker |
| * Councillor Dennis Booth | * Councillor George Potter |
| * Councillor Ruth Brothwell | * Councillor Jo Randall |
| * Councillor Colin Cross | * Councillor John Redpath |
| * Councillor Graham Eyre | * Councillor Maddy Redpath |
| * Councillor Andrew Gomm | * Councillor Caroline Reeves |
| * Councillor Angela Goodwin | * Councillor John Rigg |
| * Councillor David Goodwin | * Councillor Tony Rooth |
| * Councillor Angela Gunning | * Councillor Will Salmon |
| * Councillor Gillian Harwood | * Councillor Deborah Seabrook |
| * Councillor Jan Harwood | * Councillor Pauline Searle |
| * Councillor Liz Hogger | * Councillor Paul Spooner |
| * Councillor Tom Hunt | * Councillor James Steel |
| Councillor Gordon Jackson | * Councillor James Walsh |
| Councillor Diana Jones | * Councillor Fiona White |
| * Councillor Steven Lee | * Councillor Catherine Young |
| * Councillor Nigel Manning | |

*Present

CO23 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN FOR THE MEETING

Upon the motion of Councillor Joss Bigmore, seconded by Councillor Caroline Reeves, the Council

RESOLVED: That Councillor Paul Spooner be elected chairman for this meeting.

CO24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor, Councillor Richard Billington and from Councillor Gordon Jackson.

CO25 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

CO26 MINUTES

The Council confirmed, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting held on 28 July 2020. The chairman signed the minutes.

CO27 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

On behalf of the Mayor, the chairman reported the following communications:

Mrs Marie Watts

Councillors were reminded of the sad news that Marie Watts, wife of former Chief Executive, and Honorary Freeman, David Watts had passed away recently. Mrs Watts had supported David throughout his career at the Council and had been a familiar, friendly face at many civic events. The Council's thoughts were with David and his family at this difficult time.

Covid-19

Covid continued to impact on the daily lives of our residents and continuing local support for those most in need was vital. On 19 September 2020, Guildford Gag House held a Comedy Night in aid of one of the Mayor's charitable causes, The Coronavirus Response Fund. The event helped to raise the profile of this vital fund and boosted donations on the Mayor's fundraising page, which now stood at £407. With match funding from the Council, this meant we were well on the way to raising £1,000 for the fund. Further donations would be most welcome. The Mayor had thanked Nick Wyschna and everyone at Guildford Fringe for making this happen.

The Mayor had also thanked the Guildford Fringe and the Community Wellbeing team for the fantastic Silver Sunday show held on 4 October 2020. The performances were still available for viewing and they had raised £300 so far for Ash Parish Dementia Action Alliance.

Remembrance Sunday and Armistice Day

Following the most recent announcement by the Government with regard to the Rule of Six, plans to commemorate Remembrance Sunday had been revised. Given the current restrictions, it was now planned to hold a private Service of Remembrance for no more than six civic and military representatives, to represent the people of Guildford and all three Services.

The ceremony would be live streamed on corporate social media channels to capture the spirit of the day and enable our communities to participate and Remember from their homes. However, this was an ever-changing situation, and the current plan might have to be revised, in compliance with any change to the regulations. More details would follow nearer the time for all involved.

It was also intended to hold a private ceremony to commemorate Armistice Day on Wednesday 11 November 2020.

CO28 ELECTION OF LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

Following the resignation of the Councillor Caroline Reeves as Leader of the Council on 22 September 2020, the Democratic Services and Elections Manager reported that Councillor John Rigg had proposed, and Councillor Maddy Redpath had seconded, the nomination of Councillor Joss Bigmore for election as the Leader of the Council.

Following comments from councillors in respect of the nomination, the Council

RESOLVED: That Councillor Joss Bigmore be elected Leader of the Council for a period ending on the day of the next post-election annual meeting of the Council.

Under the Remote Meetings Protocol, a roll call was taken to record the vote on the election of Leader, the results of which were 35 councillors voting in favour of Councillor Bigmore, 5 against, and 4 abstentions, as follows:

For Councillor Joss Bigmore (35 votes):

Councillor Paul Abbey
Councillor Tim Anderson
Councillor Jon Askew
Councillor Christopher Barrass

Councillor Ann McShee
Councillor Bob McShee
Councillor Masuk Miah
Councillor Ramsey Nagaty

Councillor Joss Bigmore
Councillor Chris Blow
Councillor Dennis Booth
Councillor Ruth Brothwell
Councillor Colin Cross
Councillor Angela Goodwin
Councillor David Goodwin
Councillor Gillian Harwood
Councillor Jan Harwood
Councillor Liz Hogger
Councillor Tom Hunt
Councillor Steven Lee
Councillor Ted Mayne
Councillor Julia McShane

Councillor Susan Parker
Councillor George Potter
Councillor John Redpath
Councillor Maddy Redpath
Councillor Caroline Reeves
Councillor John Rigg
Councillor Tony Rooth
Councillor Will Salmon
Councillor Deborah Seabrook
Councillor Pauline Searle
Councillor James Steel
Councillor Fiona White
Councillor Catherine Young

Against Councillor Joss Bigmore (5 votes):

Councillor David Bilbé
Councillor Graham Eyre
Councillor Angela Gunning
Councillor Paul Spooner
Councillor James Walsh

Abstentions (4 votes):

Councillor Andrew Gomm
Councillor Nigel Manning
Councillor Marsha Moseley
Councillor Jo Randall

CO29 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

The newly elected Leader of the Council announced the appointment of Councillor Caroline Reeves as Deputy Leader of the Council and confirmed that there would no other changes to the current Executive.

The Leader also summarised the main challenges faced by the Council moving forward and the key objectives of the administration.

CO30 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Katharine Paulson asked the Lead Councillor for Climate Change, Councillor Jan Harwood, the following question:

“In light of the recent Local Authority Green Belt: England 2019-20*, stats published on 20 September 2020, where Guildford Borough Council gets a special mention as accounting for 46 % of the changes to the greenbelt across the country and causing a 6 % loss of the country’s greenbelt, a figure that does not even take into account reallocations where timely planning enforcement action has not taken to protect unlawful sites from CLUEDs, could the Lead Councillor please confirm at what point will GBC and their planning department decide that green belt and agricultural land is a finite resource? The boroughs adjacent to London have a duty to keep this green space, to increase biodiversity, carbon sequestration, for production of food, and for the benefit of the future generations. Once this land is gone, it is gone forever, do the councillors really want to leave this legacy for future generations?”

*Source: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/pm-commits-to-protect-30-of-uk-land-in-boost-for-biodiversity>

The Lead Councillor's response was as follows:

"Guildford Borough is fortunate to be one of the greenest boroughs in the UK and as a council we are committed to protecting the biodiversity. The figures published are somewhat misleading in the absence of context. Firstly, 5.5% of the total greenbelt designation within our Borough (not the entire country, also the 6% figure is a rounding) was revoked. This has to be taken in the context that Guildford Borough was 89% greenbelt designated before the adoption of the Local Plan and is now 83.5%. To help understand the scale of this – it represents a loss of 0.09% of the country's greenbelt. Additionally, of the total, 4% was the insetting of villages previously washed over by the greenbelt policy which was spatially defined in Guildford in the 1987 Local Plan. The only other amendment that has been made to the greenbelt since it was defined in 1987 was the removal of Manor Park at the University of Surrey in the Local Plan 2003 – this removed 63.3ha (or 0.004% of the country's total greenbelt). This adjustment for insetting was made as those built up areas were not considered to contribute to the openness of the greenbelt and therefore no longer met the requirement for inclusion in the greenbelt as set out by national policy. This 4% was not earmarked for specific development and is subject to the same policies as other urban areas such as extensions and rebuilding. The remaining 1.5% of previous greenbelt land makes up a significant part of the housing supply in the now adopted Local Plan.

In other words, whilst the headline figures and accompanying pie charts may garner attention, the real takeaway from the published figures is a stark indication of just how few Boroughs are able to adopt local plans in a given year. The change (-6%) is still proportionally less than that experienced at a number of other authorities (e.g. Stevenage at -31%; Nuneaton and Bedworth at -10%). Fortunately for Guildford, having a sound Local Plan protects us from precisely the type of development that would endanger the biodiversity and openness we have the privilege of enjoying.

Additionally, I would argue that all Boroughs within the UK have the same duties regardless of proximity to London. We are not and will not be the breadbasket for the capital. Neither will we be the excuse or mitigation for poor development elsewhere.

Finally, I would like to remind everyone that the Greenbelt is absolutely not a finite environmental resource. It is simply a policy designation not an environmental designation. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Sites of Special Scientific Interest are protected for their environmental quality. Designation of greenbelt can both be made and taken away. The focus should be on the protection and enhancement of our environment precisely for the reason Mrs Paulson states: for the benefit of future generations".

Councillor Jan Harwood
Lead Councillor for Climate Change

CO31 CONSIDERATION OF PETITION: "CITIZENS' ASSEMBLY ON THE CLIMATE CRISIS"

The Council considered a report on the receipt of a joint petition and e-petition on 9 March 2020, containing a combined total of 503 signatories and e-signatories, requesting the Council to

"implement a binding citizens' assembly to formulate a plan for the council to tackle the climate emergency. This could be instructed as the first meaningful action of the Climate Change Innovation Board which has the mandate to build a borough-wide plan for tackling climate change."

As there were in excess of 500 signatures, the Council's Petition Scheme required the full Council to debate the matters raised by the petition/e-petition and to indicate to the petition organiser what action the Council proposed to take in response.

The report included the petition organiser's supporting statement accompanying the petition, which had stated:

"We applaud Guildford Borough Council in telling the truth and declaring a Climate Emergency in July 2019. We now need to act without delay and involve the residents of Guildford in a citizens' assembly. We do not need another slow moving local authority committee.

We need action.

Your initiative to have a Climate Change and Innovation Board (CCIB) has minimal public involvement and is to report to the GBC Executive within 12 months.

It is an emergency, not business as usual. 12 months is too late. The public need to be with you to formulate climate policies for the council, the area and for individuals – not be held at arm's length while a committee deliberates.

The residents of Guildford have to be involved to drive climate policy by holding binding citizens' assemblies on how to tackle our borough's emissions. This will remove any party-political bias and corporate interest from the process, and sidestep decisions being made based on the short-term focus of re-election.

Expert individuals and organisations will be employed to present Guildford constituents with the most appropriate ways to mitigate the threat of climate breakdown and devise a strategy for Guildford reaching net zero, as per the council's commitment on 23rd July 2019.

This will also empower the community in their efforts in tackling the climate emergency, whilst allowing for a truly democratic decision on how we, as a community, combat the climate emergency. The council must be a leader on the crisis, and take every possible opportunity to give the public the power in deciding how our tax-payer funds are used to tackle an existential crisis which affects all of us, as well as our children and generations to come.

At least a dozen other councils have already done this. A citizens' assembly could be convened within 4 months and report back to the council with binding recommendations within 6 months.

Camden Council is renowned as the leading London borough on climate action (Friends Of The Earth study, Sep '19). They initiated a binding Citizens Assembly from which a detailed and realistic 17-point action plan was drawn, and which allowed for immediate action. GBC also ranked well in the FoE study, and as such it is appropriate to follow Camden's lead and try to climb the league table.

Citizens Assemblies have already proved highly effective in finding democratic solutions to the hardest issues to resolve.

This is an opportunity for GBC to be completely transparent - as per 2019 manifesto pledges - and to work with its constituents in this crisis. There are multiple individuals and bodies locally who can be consulted on this.

We demand that Guildford Borough Council set up a citizens' assembly on the climate emergency without delay".

The petition organiser, Jessie West, made a statement to the Council in support of the petition.

The Lead Councillor for Climate Change, Councillor Jan Harwood proposed and the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves seconded the following motion for the purpose of the Council's formal response to the petition:

"This Council recognised the urgency for action on climate change through the declaration of an emergency. However, given the scope and scale of the challenges we face, Guildford Borough Council cannot tackle the climate change crisis alone.

Because climate change is a global issue and requires the cooperation of everyone on the planet, in order to make a meaningful difference we must work as far as possible to develop partnerships and alliances across the county and region.

The Council recognises that we are not only facing great uncertainty over the borough's recovery from the impact of the coronavirus pandemic, but also imminent discussions on possible unitary local government structures in Surrey, arising from the Government's Devolution White Paper. Unitary local government in Surrey would bring about significant change to roles and responsibilities for areas and services contributing to carbon emissions. It also has the potential to create and improve strong partnerships and alliances that are better able to tackle climate change.

Therefore, we believe "*implementing a binding citizens' assembly to formulate a plan for the council to tackle the climate emergency*" is not appropriate or practicable at this time in these circumstances. The Council notes that the Lead Councillor for Climate Change has already held informal discussions, at lead councillor level, with a number of councils in Surrey to explore possible joint working arrangements to address the climate emergency. This work will continue. We believe that we should work proactively with our partners in this regard and ensure we are best placed to meet and adapt to any changes in local government structure in the future and be strongly placed to lead action on climate change locally and across the county. Accordingly, the Council

RESOLVES: That the Managing Director be instructed to open discussions with all Surrey councils:

- (1) to explore possible formal joint working arrangements on climate change;
- (2) to seek formal agreement that the implementation of robust and sustainable policies on climate change should be the leading priority for any new unitary council(s) in Surrey with a recommendation that they explore the benefits of using a citizens' assembly as a means of engaging with the community and harnessing the power of local activism in the formulation of such policies; and
- (3) to report the outcome of these discussions to the Executive."

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Harwood as the mover of the original motion, indicated that, with the consent of his seconder and of the meeting, he wished to alter his motion as follows:

- (1) In the first sentence of the fourth paragraph, after "...*climate emergency*", insert "*for Guildford borough alone*".

(2) At the end of the third sentence of the fourth paragraph, after “*This work will continue*”, insert “*and will include consideration of holding a citizens’ assembly jointly with neighbouring authorities*”.

(3) After that sentence, insert the following new paragraph:

“The Council also notes that Lead Councillor for Climate Change has commenced discussions on a programme of community engagement, education and action with all Guildford stakeholders, including (but not limited to) parish councils, residents’ associations, local businesses and environmental groups, to enable Guildford borough to reach net Carbon Zero.”

(4) In paragraph (c) of the resolution within the motion, substitute “*full Council*” in place of “*the Executive*”.

The motion, as altered, would read as follows:

“This Council recognised the urgency for action on climate change through the declaration of an emergency. However, given the scope and scale of the challenges we face, Guildford Borough Council cannot tackle the climate change crisis alone.

Because climate change is a global issue and requires the cooperation of everyone on the planet, in order to make a meaningful difference we must work as far as possible to develop partnerships and alliances across the county and region.

The Council recognises that we are not only facing great uncertainty over the borough’s recovery from the impact of the coronavirus pandemic, but also imminent discussions on possible unitary local government structures in Surrey, arising from the Government’s Devolution White Paper. Unitary local government in Surrey would bring about significant change to roles and responsibilities for areas and services contributing to carbon emissions. It also has the potential to create and improve strong partnerships and alliances that are better able to tackle climate change.

Therefore, we believe “*implementing a binding citizens’ assembly to formulate a plan for the council to tackle the climate emergency*” for Guildford borough alone is not appropriate or practicable at this time in these circumstances.

The Council notes that the Lead Councillor for Climate Change has already held informal discussions, at lead councillor level, with a number of councils in Surrey to explore possible joint working arrangements to address the climate emergency. This work will continue and will include consideration of holding a citizens’ assembly jointly with neighbouring authorities.

The Council also notes that Lead Councillor for Climate Change has commenced discussions on a programme of community engagement, education and action with all Guildford stakeholders, including (but not limited to) parish councils, residents’ associations, local businesses and environmental groups, to enable Guildford borough to reach net Carbon Zero.

We believe that we should work proactively with our partners in this regard and ensure we are best placed to meet and adapt to any changes in local government structure in the future and be strongly placed to lead action on climate change locally and across the county. Accordingly, the Council

RESOLVES: That the Managing Director be instructed to open discussions with all Surrey councils:

- (a) to explore possible formal joint working arrangements on climate change;
- (b) to seek formal agreement that the implementation of robust and sustainable policies on climate change should be the leading priority for any new unitary council(s) in Surrey with a recommendation that they explore the benefits of using a citizens' assembly as a means of engaging with the community and harnessing the power of local activism in the formulation of such policies; and
- (c) to report the outcome of these discussions to **full Council**."

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

Following the debate on the substantive motion, Councillor Susan Parker proposed, and Councillor Ramsey Nagaty seconded, the following amendment:

- (1) After the second paragraph add the following paragraph:

"We also recognise the need – as expressed by Sir David Attenborough in his recent broadcast – that our response to climate change must not just be global, national, or even regional, but that it is a personal and local responsibility including that of local government and that it must start now."

- (2) In the third paragraph of the substantive motion, after "coronavirus pandemic" delete the comma and "but", and insert a full stop followed by "There are also imminent discussions on possible unitary local government structures in Surrey, arising from the Government's Devolution White Paper."
- (3) At the end of the first sentence of the fourth paragraph, add after "...these circumstances", "particularly due to the impact of Covid".
- (4) At the end of the seventh paragraph, add "This is a good start."
- (5) After the seventh paragraph, add the following paragraphs:

"However, we feel that this is not enough and that we must also support the petition in agreeing to establish a Citizens' Assembly as soon as it will be practicable to hold this due to Covid. We feel that the council should seek to change hearts and minds in the community to encourage residents to make appropriate individual choices.

We also wish to implement policies which will have an immediate impact on reducing climate change now. We recognise that Guildford is a key partner in the drive to reduce carbon emissions, and that our capacity to reduce the local carbon footprint is magnified by the planning policies which we are able to introduce".

- (6) Add the following paragraph to the resolution within the motion:

"(2) That, in addition, the Council itself commits that it will take urgent action in the short term to minimise climate change, such action shall include the development of policies by the Climate Change Board, who will present a progress report to full Council within three months, such policies will include:

- (i) measures to reduce the carbon footprint of:
 - (a) the borough's own activities (moving to a zero-carbon position);
 - (b) the borough's assets;
 - (c) buildings within the borough, so that the carbon footprint impact is assessed on all planning applications and given substantial weight in determining those applications; and
- (ii) new building policies, using the Council's planning and policy role including detailed planning requirements to minimise embedded carbon and impose the highest possible standards on all new building within the borough".

The substantive motion, as amended, would read as follows:

"This Council recognised the urgency for action on climate change through the declaration of an emergency. However, given the scope and scale of the challenges we face, Guildford Borough Council cannot tackle the climate change crisis alone.

Because climate change is a global issue and requires the cooperation of everyone on the planet, in order to make a meaningful difference we must work as far as possible to develop partnerships and alliances across the county and region.

We also recognise the need – as expressed by Sir David Attenborough in his recent broadcast – that our response to climate change must not just be global, national, or even regional, but that it is a personal and local responsibility including that of local government and that it must start now.

The Council recognises that we are not only facing great uncertainty over the borough's recovery from the impact of the coronavirus pandemic. **There are** also imminent discussions on possible unitary local government structures in Surrey, arising from the Government's Devolution White Paper. Unitary local government in Surrey would bring about significant change to roles and responsibilities for areas and services contributing to carbon emissions. It also has the potential to create and improve strong partnerships and alliances that are better able to tackle climate change.

Therefore, we believe "*implementing a binding citizens' assembly to formulate a plan for the council to tackle the climate emergency*" for Guildford borough alone is not appropriate or practicable at this time in these circumstances, **particularly due to the impact of Covid.**

The Council notes that the Lead Councillor for Climate Change has already held informal discussions, at lead councillor level, with a number of councils in Surrey to explore possible joint working arrangements to address the climate emergency. This work will continue and will include consideration of holding a citizens' assembly conjointly with neighbouring authorities.

The Council also notes that Lead Councillor for Climate Change has commenced discussions on a programme of community engagement, education and action with all Guildford stakeholders, including (but not limited to) parish councils, residents' associations, local businesses and environmental groups, to enable Guildford borough to reach net Carbon Zero.

We believe that we should work proactively with our partners in this regard and ensure we are best placed to meet and adapt to any changes in local government structure in the future and be strongly placed to lead action on climate change locally and across the county. **This is a good start.**

However, we feel that this is not enough and that we must also support the petition in agreeing to establish a Citizens' Assembly as soon as it will be practicable to hold this due to Covid. We feel that the council should seek to change hearts and minds in the community to encourage residents to make appropriate individual choices.

We also wish to implement policies which will have an immediate impact on reducing climate change now. We recognise that Guildford is a key partner in the drive to reduce carbon emissions, and that our capacity to reduce the local carbon footprint is magnified by the planning policies which we are able to introduce.

Accordingly, the Council

RESOLVES:

- (1) That the Managing Director be instructed to open discussions with all Surrey councils:
 - (a) to explore possible formal joint working arrangements on climate change;
 - (b) to seek formal agreement that the implementation of robust and sustainable policies on climate change should be the leading priority for any new unitary council(s) in Surrey with a recommendation that they explore the benefits of using a citizens' assembly as a means of engaging with the community and harnessing the power of local activism in the formulation of such policies; and
 - (c) to report the outcome of these discussions to the full Council.
- (2) That, in addition, the Council itself commits that it will take urgent action in the short term to minimise climate change, such action shall include the development of policies by the Climate Change Board, who will present a progress report to full Council within three months, such policies will include:
 - (i) measures to reduce the carbon footprint of:
 - (a) the borough's own activities (moving to a zero-carbon position);
 - (b) the borough's assets;
 - (c) buildings within the borough, so that the carbon footprint impact is assessed on all planning applications and given substantial weight in determining those applications; and
 - (ii) new building policies, using the Council's planning and policy role including detailed planning requirements to minimise embedded carbon and impose the highest possible standards on all new building within the borough".

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Parker as the mover of the amendment indicated that, with the consent of her seconder and of the meeting, she wished to alter her amendment as follows:

Substitute the following in place of paragraph (2) (i) (a) of the resolution:

“(a) the borough's own activities (moving to a **net** zero-carbon position);”

The Council agreed to accept the alteration to the amendment, as indicated above.

Following the debate on the amendment, as altered, it was put to the vote and was carried. Under the Remote Meetings Protocol, a roll call was taken to record the vote on the amendment, the results of which were 19 councillors voting in favour, 17 against, and 6 abstentions, as follows:

For the amendment

Cllr Christopher Barrass
Cllr David Bilbé
Cllr Chris Blow
Cllr Ruth Brothwell
Cllr Colin Cross
Cllr Graham Eyre
Cllr Andrew Gomm
Cllr Angela Gunning
Cllr Tom Hunt
Cllr Ann McShee
Cllr Bob McShee
Cllr Ramsey Nagaty
Cllr Susan Parker
Cllr John Redpath
Cllr John Rigg
Cllr Deborah Seabrook
Cllr James Walsh
Cllr Fiona White
Cllr Catherine Young

Against the amendment

Cllr Tim Anderson
Cllr Joss Bigmore
Cllr Angela Goodwin
Cllr David Goodwin
Cllr Gillian Harwood
Cllr Jan Harwood
Cllr Liz Hogger
Cllr Steven Lee
Cllr Ted Mayne
Cllr Julia McShane
Cllr Masuk Miah
Cllr George Potter
Cllr Jo Randall
Cllr Caroline Reeves
Cllr Will Salmon
Cllr Pauline Searle
Cllr James Steel

Abstentions

Cllr Paul Abbey
Cllr Jon Askew
Cllr Dennis Booth
Cllr Maddy Redpath
Cllr Tony Rooth
Cllr Paul Spooner

Following the vote on the amendment, but before the vote was taken on the substantive motion, the petition organiser, Jessie West exercised her right of reply on the debate.

The Council

RESOLVED: That the Council's response to the petition is as follows:

"This Council recognised the urgency for action on climate change through the declaration of an emergency. However, given the scope and scale of the challenges we face, Guildford Borough Council cannot tackle the climate change crisis alone.

Because climate change is a global issue and requires the cooperation of everyone on the planet, in order to make a meaningful difference we must work as far as possible to develop partnerships and alliances across the county and region.

We also recognise the need – as expressed by Sir David Attenborough in his recent broadcast – that our response to climate change must not just be global, national, or even regional, but that it is a personal and local responsibility including that of local government and that it must start now.

The Council recognises that we are not only facing great uncertainty over the borough's recovery from the impact of the coronavirus pandemic. *There are* also imminent discussions on possible unitary local government structures in Surrey, arising from the Government's Devolution White Paper. Unitary local government in Surrey would bring about significant change to roles and responsibilities for areas and services contributing to carbon emissions. It also has the potential to create and improve strong partnerships and alliances that are better able to tackle climate change.

Therefore, we believe "*implementing a binding citizens' assembly to formulate a plan for the council to tackle the climate emergency*" for Guildford borough alone is not appropriate or practicable at this time in these circumstances, particularly due to the impact of Covid.

The Council notes that the Lead Councillor for Climate Change has already held informal discussions, at lead councillor level, with a number of councils in Surrey to explore possible joint working arrangements to address the climate emergency. This work will continue and will include consideration of holding a citizens' assembly conjointly with neighbouring authorities.

The Council also notes that Lead Councillor for Climate Change has commenced discussions on a programme of community engagement, education and action with all Guildford stakeholders, including (but not limited to) parish councils, residents' associations, local businesses and environmental groups, to enable Guildford borough to reach net Carbon Zero.

We believe that we should work proactively with our partners in this regard and ensure we are best placed to meet and adapt to any changes in local government structure in the future and be strongly placed to lead action on climate change locally and across the county. This is a good start.

However, we feel that this is not enough and that we must also support the petition in agreeing to establish a Citizens' Assembly as soon as it will be practicable to hold this due to Covid. We feel that the council should seek to change hearts and minds in the community to encourage residents to make appropriate individual choices.

We also wish to implement policies which will have an immediate impact on reducing climate change now. We recognise that Guildford is a key partner in the drive to reduce carbon emissions, and that our capacity to reduce the local carbon footprint is magnified by the planning policies which we are able to introduce.

Accordingly, the Council

RESOLVES:

- (1) That the Managing Director be instructed to open discussions with all Surrey councils:
 - (a) to explore possible formal joint working arrangements on climate change;
 - (b) to seek formal agreement that the implementation of robust and sustainable policies on climate change should be the leading priority for any new unitary council(s) in Surrey with a recommendation that they explore the benefits of using a citizens' assembly as a means of engaging with the community and harnessing the power of local activism in the formulation of such policies; and
 - (c) to report the outcome of these discussions to the full Council.
- (2) That, in addition, the Council itself commits that it will take urgent action in the short term to minimise climate change, such action shall include the development of policies by the Climate Change Board, who will present a progress report to full Council within three months, such policies will include:
 - (i) measures to reduce the carbon footprint of:
 - (a) the borough's own activities (moving to a net zero-carbon position);
 - (b) the borough's assets;
 - (c) buildings within the borough, so that the carbon footprint impact is assessed on all planning applications and given substantial weight in determining those applications; and
 - (ii) new building policies, using the Council's planning and policy role including detailed planning requirements to minimise embedded carbon and impose the highest possible standards on all new building within the borough".

Under the Remote Meetings Protocol, a roll call was taken to record the vote on the substantive motion, the results of which were 40 councillors voting in favour, none against, and two abstentions, as follows:

For the motion

Cllr Tim Anderson
Cllr Jon Askew
Cllr Christopher Barrass
Cllr Joss Bigmore
Cllr David Bilbé
Cllr Chris Blow
Cllr Ruth Brothwell
Cllr Colin Cross
Cllr Graham Eyre
Cllr Andrew Gomm
Cllr Angela Goodwin
Cllr David Goodwin
Cllr Angela Gunning
Cllr Gillian Harwood
Cllr Jan Harwood
Cllr Liz Hogger
Cllr Tom Hunt
Cllr Steven Lee
Cllr Ted Mayne
Cllr Julia McShane
Cllr Ann McShee
Cllr Bob McShee
Cllr Masuk Miah
Cllr Ramsey Nagaty
Cllr Susan Parker
Cllr George Potter
Cllr Jo Randall
Cllr John Redpath
Cllr Maddy Redpath
Cllr Caroline Reeves
Cllr John Rigg
Cllr Tony Rooth
Cllr Will Salmon
Cllr Deborah Seabrook
Cllr Pauline Searle
Cllr Paul Spooner
Cllr James Steel
Cllr James Walsh
Cllr Fiona White
Cllr Catherine Young

Against the motion

Abstentions

Cllr Paul Abbey
Cllr Dennis Booth

CO32 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

There were no questions from councillors.

CO33 CAPITAL AND INVESTMENT OUTTURN REPORT 2019-20

The Council considered the Capital and Investment Outturn report for 2019-20, which had set out:

- a summary of the economic factors affecting the approved strategy and counterparty updated
- a summary of the approved strategy for 2019-20
- a summary of the treasury management activity for 2019-20
- compliance with the treasury and prudential indicators
- non-treasury investments
- capital programme

- risks and performance
- Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP)
- details of external service providers
- details of training

In total, expenditure on the General Fund capital programme had been £48.1 million, which was less than the revised budget by £38.7 million. Details of the revised estimate and actual expenditure in the year for each scheme were set out in Appendix 3 to the report. The budget for Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) had been £1.02 million and the outturn was £926,639. This was due to slippage in the capital programme in 2018-19.

The Council's investment property portfolio stood at £153 million at the end of the year. Rental income had been £8.4 million, and income return had been 6% against the benchmark of 4.7%.

The Council's cash balances had built up over a number of years, and reflected a strong balance sheet, with considerable revenue and capital reserves. Officers carried out the treasury function within the parameters set by the Council each year in the Capital and Investment Strategy.

The Council had borrowed short-term from other local authorities for cash flow purposes and ensured that there was no cost of carry on this. No additional long-term borrowing was taken out during the year. As at 31 March 2020, the Council held £107.6 million in investments, £44 million of short-term borrowing and £192 million of long-term borrowing resulting in net debt of £129 million.

The report had confirmed that the Council had complied with its prudential indicators, treasury management policy statement and treasury management practices (TMPs) for 2019-20. The policy statement was included and approved annually as part of the Capital and Investment Strategy, and the TMPs were approved under delegated authority.

Interest paid on debt had been lower than budget, due to less long-term borrowing taken out on the general fund because of slippage in the capital programme.

The yield returned on investments had been lower than estimated, but the interest received was higher due to more cash being available to invest in the year – a direct result of the capital programme slippage. Officers had been reporting higher interest receivable and payable and a lower charge for MRP during the year as part of the budget monitoring when reported to councillors during the year.

The report had also been considered by the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee and Executive at their respective meetings held on 30 July and 22 September 2020, and both had endorsed the recommendation in the report.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Resources, Councillor Tim Anderson, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the treasury management annual report for 2019-20 be noted.
- (2) That the actual prudential indicators reported for 2019-20, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved.

Reason:

To comply with the Council's treasury management policy statement, the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Code of Practice on treasury management and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities.

CO34 REVIEW OF THE COUNCILLORS' CODE OF CONDUCT AND CONSIDERATION OF BEST PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS IN PUBLIC LIFE

Arising from a number of concerns raised by councillors since the 2019 elections in relation to ethical standards, communications, and transparency, the Council noted that the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee at its meeting in November 2019 had established a cross-party task group, including a co-opted parish representative and an independent member of the Committee, with a wide remit to consider, review and make recommendations in respect of these matters.

The Task Group had met on a number of occasions since it was established and had considered, reviewed, and made recommendations to the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee on 30 July 2020 on, inter alia, the following matters:

- (a) the Councillors' Code of Conduct, including the policy on acceptance of gifts and hospitality by councillors;
- (b) the 15 Best Practice Recommendations of the Committee on Standards in Public Life contained within its Report on *Local Government Ethical Standards*

The Committee supported the Task Group's recommendations, some of which were for full Council to make the final decision, and which were the subject of the report now before the Council.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, seconded by the Vice-Chairman of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee, Councillor Deborah Seabrook, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the draft revised Councillors' Code of Conduct, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report, submitted to the Council be adopted and implemented with immediate effect (this incorporates CSPL Best Practice Recommendations 1 and 2).
- (2) That parish councils in the borough be invited to consider adopting at the earliest opportunity the revised Code of Conduct set out in Appendix 3 to the report, with such modifications as they deem necessary.
- (3) That the Monitoring Officer be authorised to prepare, maintain and make available for inspection at the Council's offices and online a revised register of councillors' interests to comply with the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and of the Council's revised code of conduct.
- (4) That the Council agrees that the code of conduct should normally be reviewed every four years during the year following the Borough Council Elections, with any such review involving formal consultation with parish councils within the borough (CSPL Best Practice Recommendation 3 refers).
- (5) That the Council's Arrangements for Dealing with Allegations of Misconduct by Councillors ("the Arrangements") be amended as follows:
 - (a) paragraph 7.3 (g) iii) to read: "Whether the complaint appears to be *trivial*, malicious, vexatious, politically motivated or 'tit-for-tat'"
 - (b) paragraph 7.4 (6) to read: "The complaint appears to be *trivial*, malicious, vexatious, politically motivated or 'tit-for-tat'"

- (c) paragraph 7.10 to read: “The decision of the Monitoring Officer, or Assessment Sub-Committee (as the case may be) shall be recorded in writing, and a decision notice will be sent to the Complainant and the Subject Member within 10 working days of the decision. *The Independent Person shall be given the option to review and comment on allegations which the Monitoring Officer (or Assessment Sub-Committee) is minded to dismiss as being without merit, vexatious, or trivial.* The decision notice will summarise the allegation, give the decision of the Monitoring Officer or Assessment Sub-Committee, and the reasons for their decision. There is no right of appeal against the decision of the Monitoring Officer or Assessment Sub-Committee.”
- (d) Substitute the following in place of paragraph 31 of Appendix 3 to the Arrangements (Procedure and Powers of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee and Hearings Sub-Committee): “*The Monitoring Officer will also arrange for a decision notice to be published as soon as possible on the Council’s website, including a brief statement of facts, the provisions of the code engaged by the allegations, the view of the Independent Person, the reasoning of the decision-maker, and any sanction applied.*”

(CSPL Best Practice Recommendations 2, 8, and 9 refer).

- (6) That no change be made to the Arrangements in respect of CSPL Best Practice Recommendation 6: that councils should publish a clear and straightforward public interest test against which allegations are filtered.
- (7) That the Council notes that the role of the Monitoring Officer includes providing advice, support and management of investigations and adjudications on alleged breaches to parish councils within the remit of the principal authority, and agrees that the Monitoring Officer should be provided with adequate training, corporate support and resources to undertake this work (CSPL Best Practice Recommendation 12 refers).

Reasons:

- To address various corporate governance and ethical standards related concerns raised by councillors.
- To address the Best Practice Recommendations of the Committee on Standards in public Life in their report *Local Government Ethical Standards (January 2019)*

CO35 REVIEW OF THE PROTOCOL ON COUNCILLOR-OFFICER RELATIONS

Arising from a number of concerns raised by councillors since the 2019 elections in relation to ethical standards, communications, and transparency, the Council noted that the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee at its meeting in November 2019 had established a cross-party task group, including a co-opted parish representative and an independent member of the Committee, with a wide remit to consider, review and make recommendations in respect of these matters.

The Task Group had met on a number of occasions since it was established and had considered, reviewed, and made recommendations to the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee on 24 September 2020 in respect of the Protocol on Councillor/Officer Relations.

Councillors noted that although the Protocol was not a statutory document, its purpose was to provide guidance for councillors and officers on their respective roles and expected conduct in their relationship with one another. The Committee had commended the Task Group’s recommendations, which were the subject of the report now before the Council.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore proposed, and the Vice-Chairman of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee, Councillor Deborah Seabrook, seconded the adoption of the following motion:

- (1) That the draft revised Protocol on Councillor/Officer Relations, attached as Appendix 2 to the report submitted to the Council, be adopted.
- (2) That the Protocol be reviewed at least every four years at the same time as the Council reviews its codes of conduct for councillors and staff.

Reasons:

- To ensure that properly reviewed and up to date guidance is made available to councillors and officers.
- To ensure that the Protocol is kept under review at least every four years

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Bigmore as the mover of the original motion, indicated that, with the consent of his seconder and of the meeting, he wished to alter his motion as follows:

Change paragraph (1) of the motion so that it reads:

“(1) That the draft revised Protocol on Councillor/Officer Relations, attached as Appendix 2 to the report submitted to the Council, be adopted *subject to the following amendment to paragraph 10.1 of the Protocol:*

“10.1 *All confidential information held by the Council, in whatever form, remains confidential to the Council and subject to the requirements of the Data Protection regulations, unless and until such confidentiality is waived by the Monitoring Officer. Any dispute will be determined by the Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee*”

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

Following the debate on the substantive motion, Councillor Susan Parker proposed, and Councillor Ramsey Nagaty seconded, the following amendment:

In paragraph (2) of the substantive motion, substitute “two” in place of “four”.

Paragraph (2), as amended, would read as follows:

“(2) That the Protocol be reviewed at least every *two* years at the same time as the Council reviews its codes of conduct for councillors and staff.”

Following the debate on the amendment, it was put to the vote and was lost. Under the Remote Meetings Protocol, a roll call was taken to record the vote on the amendment, the results of which were 1 councillor voting in favour, 33 against, and 7 abstentions, as follows:

For the amendment
Cllr Susan Parker

Against the amendment
Cllr Paul Abbey
Cllr Tim Anderson
Cllr Jon Askew
Cllr Joss Bigmore
Cllr Chris Blow
Cllr Dennis Booth
Cllr Colin Cross

Abstentions
Cllr Christopher Barrass
Cllr Ruth Brothwell
Cllr Ramsey Nagaty
Cllr John Redpath
Cllr Maddy Redpath
Cllr John Rigg
Cllr Catherine Young

For the amendment

Against the amendment

Abstentions

Cllr Graham Eyre
Cllr Andrew Gomm
Cllr Angela Goodwin
Cllr David Goodwin
Cllr Angela Gunning
Cllr Gillian Harwood
Cllr Jan Harwood
Cllr Liz Hogger
Cllr Tom Hunt
Cllr Steven Lee
Cllr Ted Mayne
Cllr Julia McShane
Cllr Ann McShee
Cllr Bob McShee
Cllr Masuk Miah
Cllr George Potter
Cllr Jo Randall
Cllr Caroline Reeves
Cllr Tony Rooth
Cllr Will Salmon
Cllr Deborah Seabrook
Cllr Pauline Searle
Cllr Paul Spooner
Cllr James Steel
Cllr James Walsh
Cllr Fiona White

Following the vote on the amendment, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the draft revised Protocol on Councillor/Officer Relations, attached as Appendix 2 to the report submitted to the Council, be adopted subject to the following amendment to paragraph 10.1 of the Protocol:

*“10.1 All confidential information held by the Council, in whatever form, remains confidential to the Council and subject to the requirements of the Data Protection regulations, unless and until such confidentiality is waived by the Monitoring Officer. Any dispute will be determined by the Monitoring Officer **in consultation with the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee**”.*

- (2) That the Protocol be reviewed at least every four years at the same time as the Council reviews its codes of conduct for councillors and staff.

Reasons:

- To ensure that properly reviewed and up to date guidance is made available to councillors and officers.
- To ensure that the Protocol is kept under review at least every four years

Under the Remote Meetings Protocol, a roll call was taken to record the vote on the substantive motion, the results of which were 37 councillors voting in favour, none against, and 4 abstentions, as follows:

For the motion

Cllr Tim Anderson
Cllr Jon Askew

Against the motion

Abstentions

Cllr Paul Abbey
Cllr Ramsey Nagaty

For the motion

Cllr Christopher Barrass
Cllr Joss Bigmore
Cllr Chris Blow
Cllr Dennis Booth
Cllr Ruth Brothwell
Cllr Colin Cross
Cllr Graham Eyre
Cllr Andrew Gomm
Cllr Angela Goodwin
Cllr David Goodwin
Cllr Angela Gunning
Cllr Gillian Harwood
Cllr Jan Harwood
Cllr Liz Hogger
Cllr Tom Hunt
Cllr Steven Lee
Cllr Ted Mayne
Cllr Julia McShane
Cllr Ann McShee
Cllr Bob McShee
Cllr Masuk Miah
Cllr George Potter
Cllr Jo Randall
Cllr John Redpath
Cllr Maddy Redpath
Cllr Caroline Reeves
Cllr John Rigg
Cllr Tony Rooth
Cllr Will Salmon
Cllr Deborah Seabrook
Cllr Pauline Searle
Cllr Paul Spooner
Cllr James Steel
Cllr James Walsh
Cllr Fiona White

Against the motion

Abstentions

Cllr Susan Parker
Cllr Catherine Young

CO36 EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARDS (EABS) - REVIEW OF STRUCTURE AND REMIT

Further to an officer review of the effectiveness of Executive Advisory Boards (EABs) which took place in the latter part of 2018-19, recommendations had been made in respect of reconfiguring the EABs and introducing measures to strengthen the Forward Plan process. In response to these recommendations, the Council had resolved to establish a councillor task and finish group to consider the recommendations and report its findings to the EABs and Council before any related decisions were made.

Having considered the group's subsequent findings, the Council made some resolutions concerning work programming, the Forward Plan and the configuration of EABs. The most notable resolutions were that the existing arrangement of the two EABs be retained for the time being, whilst the Forward Plan process was strengthened pending further review 12 months following the Borough Council Elections in May 2019 to ascertain whether changes to the Forward Plan process and/or EAB structure were required.

Following the second phase of the review, the EABs combined to meet as the Joint EAB on 9 July 2020 to consider the future structure and remit of EABs. The Joint EAB's recommendations had also been considered by the Executive on 22 September and then by the Corporate

Governance and Standards Committee on 24 September. Both had commended the recommendations for adoption by the Council at this meeting.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, proposed, and the Chairman of the Community EAB, Councillor Angela Goodwin seconded the following motion:

- “(1) That the concept of retaining two EABs, each meeting on alternate months with the flexibility to have a balanced inter-changeable remit as appropriate to the agenda items, without the risk of losing topic continuity and expertise, and possibly ahead of Executive meetings to offer a pre-decision opportunity to make recommendations, be agreed.
- (2) That the remit of EABs be realigned to reflect the Executive portfolios and Directorates of the Council and that, accordingly, the Place-Making and Innovation EAB be renamed as the Strategy and Resources EAB and the Community EAB be renamed the Service Delivery EAB.
- (3) That the existing Joint EAB arrangement be continued and implemented when significant and wide-ranging agenda items, such as budgetary matters, are under consideration.
- (4) That closer two-way working between the Executive and EABs, including an expectation that relevant Lead Councillors (or other Executive members in the absence of the relevant Lead Councillor) proactively attend EAB meetings and EAB Chairmen and / or Vice-Chairmen attend Executive meetings to elaborate on advice given and to receive feedback, be established and adopted.
- (5) That a clear formalised procedure of reporting EAB advice and views to the Executive and EABs receiving Executive feedback be adopted.
- (6) That, in addition to exploring relevant Forward Plan items and Corporate Plan priorities, the EABs have free range to select their own review topics on which to advise the Executive, including the establishment of task groups where considered necessary (and subject to available resources).
- (7) That the EABs receive items sufficiently in advance of determination by the Executive in order to have the opportunity to advise on, and influence, its decisions from a broader knowledge base.
- (8) That the Democratic Services and Elections Manager be authorised to make appropriate amendments to the Constitution to give effect to the above recommendations.

Reason:

To introduce a more efficient and effective EAB configuration and contribution.

Following the debate on the motion, Councillor Ramsey Nagaty proposed, and Councillor Catherine Young seconded, the following amendment:

Omit “*possibly*” from paragraph (1) of the motion.

Paragraph (1), as amended, would read as follows:

- “(1) That the concept of retaining two EABs, each meeting on alternate months with the flexibility to have a balanced inter-changeable remit as appropriate to the agenda items, without the risk of losing topic continuity and expertise, and ahead of Executive meetings to offer a pre-decision opportunity to make recommendations, be agreed.”

Following the debate on the amendment, it was put to the vote and was lost. Under the Remote Meetings Protocol, a roll call was taken to record the vote on the amendment, the results of which were 8 councillors voting in favour, 28 against, and 5 abstentions, as follows:

For the amendment

Cllr Christopher Barrass
Cllr Dennis Booth
Cllr Ruth Brothwell
Cllr Graham Eyre
Cllr Ramsey Nagaty
Cllr Susan Parker
Cllr John Redpath
Cllr Catherine Young

Against the amendment

Cllr Paul Abbey
Cllr Tim Anderson
Cllr Jon Askew
Cllr Joss Bigmore
Cllr Colin Cross
Cllr Andrew Gomm
Cllr Angela Goodwin
Cllr David Goodwin
Cllr Gillian Harwood
Cllr Jan Harwood
Cllr Liz Hogger
Cllr Tom Hunt
Cllr Ted Mayne
Cllr Julia McShane
Cllr Ann McShee
Cllr Bob McShee
Cllr Masuk Miah
Cllr George Potter
Cllr Jo Randall
Cllr John Rigg
Cllr Caroline Reeves
Cllr Tony Rooth
Cllr Will Salmon
Cllr Pauline Searle
Cllr Paul Spooner
Cllr James Steel
Cllr James Walsh
Cllr Fiona White

Abstentions

Cllr Chris Blow
Cllr Angela Gunning
Cllr Steven Lee
Cllr Maddy Redpath
Cllr Deborah Seabrook

Following the vote on the amendment, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the concept of retaining two EABs, each meeting on alternate months with the flexibility to have a balanced inter-changeable remit as appropriate to the agenda items, without the risk of losing topic continuity and expertise, and possibly ahead of Executive meetings to offer a pre-decision opportunity to make recommendations, be agreed.
- (2) That the remit of EABs be realigned to reflect the Executive portfolios and Directorates of the Council and that, accordingly, the Place-Making and Innovation EAB be renamed as the Strategy and Resources EAB and the Community EAB be renamed the Service Delivery EAB.
- (3) That the existing Joint EAB arrangement be continued and implemented when significant and wide-ranging agenda items, such as budgetary matters, are under consideration.
- (4) That closer two-way working between the Executive and EABs, including an expectation that relevant Lead Councillors (or other Executive members in the absence of the relevant Lead Councillor) proactively attend EAB meetings and EAB Chairmen and / or Vice-Chairmen attend Executive meetings to elaborate on advice given and to receive feedback, be established and adopted.

- (5) That a clear formalised procedure of reporting EAB advice and views to the Executive and EABs receiving Executive feedback be adopted.
- (6) That, in addition to exploring relevant Forward Plan items and Corporate Plan priorities, the EABs have free range to select their own review topics on which to advise the Executive, including the establishment of task groups where considered necessary (and subject to available resources).
- (7) That the EABs receive items sufficiently in advance of determination by the Executive in order to have the opportunity to advise on, and influence, its decisions from a broader knowledge base.
- (8) That the Democratic Services and Elections Manager be authorised to make appropriate amendments to the Constitution to give effect to the above recommendations.

Reason:

To introduce a more efficient and effective EAB configuration and contribution.

Under the Remote Meetings Protocol, a roll call was taken to record the vote on the motion, the results of which were 40 councillors voting in favour, none against, and 1 abstention, as follows:

For the motion

Cllr Paul Abbey
 Cllr Tim Anderson
 Cllr Jon Askew
 Cllr Christopher Barrass
 Cllr Joss Bigmore
 Cllr Chris Blow
 Cllr Dennis Booth
 Cllr Ruth Brothwell
 Cllr Colin Cross
 Cllr Graham Eyre
 Cllr Andrew Gomm
 Cllr Angela Goodwin
 Cllr David Goodwin
 Cllr Angela Gunning
 Cllr Gillian Harwood
 Cllr Jan Harwood
 Cllr Liz Hogger
 Cllr Tom Hunt
 Cllr Steven Lee
 Cllr Ted Mayne
 Cllr Julia McShane
 Cllr Ann McShee
 Cllr Bob McShee
 Cllr Masuk Miah
 Cllr Ramsey Nagaty
 Cllr George Potter
 Cllr Jo Randall
 Cllr John Redpath
 Cllr Maddy Redpath
 Cllr Caroline Reeves
 Cllr John Rigg
 Cllr Tony Rooth
 Cllr Will Salmon
 Cllr Deborah Seabrook

Against the motion

Abstentions

Cllr Susan Parker

For the motion

Cllr Pauline Searle
Cllr Paul Spooner
Cllr James Steel
Cllr James Walsh
Cllr Fiona White
Cllr Catherine Young

Against the motion

Abstentions

CO37 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 18 SEPTEMBER 2020: OPPOSITION TO SINGLE UNITARY AUTHORITY FOR SURREY

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 15 (p), the proposer and seconder of the motion had requested the withdrawal of this motion. The Council

RESOLVED: That the motion be withdrawn.

CO38 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 22 SEPTEMBER 2020: PROPOSAL TO SUPPORT THE LOCAL ELECTRICITY BILL

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 15 (p), the proposer of the motion had requested the withdrawal of this motion. The Council

RESOLVED: That the motion be withdrawn.

CO39 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE

The Council received and noted the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 21 July and 25 August 2020.

CO40 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 10.28 pm

Signed
Mayor

Date