

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of Guildford Borough Council held in the Council Chamber, Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 4BB on Wednesday 9 February 2022

The Mayor, Councillor Marsha Moseley (Mayor)

* The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Dennis Booth (Deputy Mayor) – in the chair

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 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 Richard Billington | Councillor Susan Parker |
| Councillor Chris Blow | * Councillor George Potter |
| * Councillor Ruth Brothwell | * Councillor Jo Randall |
| * Councillor Colin Cross | * Councillor John Redpath |
| * Councillor Guida Esteves | * Councillor Maddy Redpath |
| Councillor Graham Eyre | * Councillor John Rigg |
| * Councillor Andrew Gomm | * Councillor Tony Rooth |
| * Councillor Angela Goodwin | * Councillor Will Salmon |
| * Councillor David Goodwin | Councillor Deborah Seabrook |
| * Councillor Angela Gunning | * Councillor Pauline Searle |
| * Councillor Gillian Harwood | Councillor Paul Spooner |
| * Councillor Jan Harwood | * Councillor James Steel |
| * Councillor Liz Hogger | * Councillor Cait Taylor |
| Councillor Tom Hunt | * Councillor James Walsh |
| * Councillor Diana Jones | * Councillor Fiona White |
| Councillor Steven Lee | * Councillor Keith Witham |
| Councillor Nigel Manning | * Councillor Catherine Young |

*Present

Honorary Alderman David Wright was also in attendance.

CO88 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor, Councillor Marsha Moseley and from Councillors Paul Abbey, Chris Blow, Graham Eyre, Tom Hunt, Steven Lee, Nigel Manning, Susan Parker, Deborah Seabrook, and Paul Spooner; and also from Honorary Freeman Jen Powell, Honorary Aldermen Catherine Cobley, Jayne Marks, Terence Patrick, Lynda Strudwick, and Jenny Wicks, and from the Joint Chief Executive Tom Horwood.

CO89 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

Councillor Catherine Young declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Agenda Item 14 - Community Governance Review of West Horsley Parish Council (see Minute No. CO101 below). Councillor Young was a member of West Horsley Parish Council.

CO90 MINUTES

The Council confirmed, as a correct record, the minutes of the special meeting held on 2 December and the ordinary meeting held on 7 December 2021. The Deputy Mayor signed the minutes.

CO91 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

On behalf of the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor reported that, as part of Her Majesty the Queen's Green Canopy initiative, the Mayor had recently planted a tree for the Jubilee in Stoke Park. The Mayor had also thanked the Head Teacher from Holy Trinity Pewley Down School for allowing some of the young people from the school's Eco Team to help her with the planting. The Mayor had also thanked the Parks and Countryside Team for sourcing the tree, preparing the ground and making sure everything ran smoothly on the day.

The Mayor had also attended a Choral Evensong at Guildford Cathedral on the 70th anniversary of Her Majesty the Queen's accession on 6 February 2022, along with the Lord Lieutenant of Surrey, the High Sheriff and other distinguished guests.

The Deputy Mayor drew the Council's attention to forthcoming fundraising events in aid of her charities: the Shooting Star Children's Hospices and the Mayor's Support Fund, namely the Film and Fizz Night at the Guildhall on 11 March 2022, and the St George's Day Ball at the Harbour Hotel on 23 April 2022.

CO92 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 12 JANUARY 2022: HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN'S PLATINUM JUBILEE

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, and in the absence of the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Dennis Booth proposed, and Councillor Angela Gunning seconded the following motion:

"That an address be sent to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II offering Her Majesty the congratulations of Guildford Borough Council in the name of the people of Guildford, on the occasion of the seventieth anniversary of her accession to the throne and wishing her long to reign."

The Council unanimously

RESOLVED: That the motion be adopted.

CO93 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Leader of the Council drew attention to the grant schemes that were still open for residents and businesses struggling to manage the financial impact of the pandemic. The household support fund grants were available until the end of March and there was a new Omicron hospitality and leisure Grant scheme, details of which were available online.

The Leader also commented on Council tax rebate scheme, which would provide for a £150 rebate to households living in Band A to D property. The Council would contact eligible households once the details of the scheme had been announced by the Government.

The Leader noted that work on the construction of a new pedestrian crossing that would improve the route from Guildford station to the town centre had started recently and was due for completion by 11 March 2022.

For the ninth year in a row Guildford town centre had been recognised by the Purple Flag assessors for providing evenings and nights out that were safe, vibrant, and varied. Guildford remained the only town in the county and one of only 70 in the UK to hold the award.

The Leader was pleased to announce that Guildford Crematorium had won a prestigious Civic Trust award in a competition recognising buildings that made a positive impact on local communities.

CO94 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No members of the public had indicated a wish to ask a question or make a statement to the Council.

CO95 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

Councillor Catherine Young asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, the question set out below. (Councillor Bigmore's response to each element of the question was as set out in **red type** below.)

"Can the Leader of the Council provide information on the following:

1. An update on the Local Plan review.
Work on the Review is underway, we expect the results of the new transport study this summer and we are considering which other evidence needs re-evaluating. We have made progress in commissioning an independent assessment to advise us on the process.
2. Who has been appointed as independent consultant and what is their background?
Mary Cook of Town Legal LLP has been appointed. She is a leading planning barrister. Town Legal have been voted 'Most highly Rated Planning Law Team' by Planning Magazine for the past three years.
3. What is this person's brief and what is the scope of work proposed?
The Council resolution [see Minute No. CO102] approved last year forms the basis for the brief. This includes advising the Council on the appropriate route to review the Local Plan. We plan to report back including reflecting detail regarding the scope of work as per below.
4. What are the timelines, planned deliverables and milestones for the work involved?
We plan to report back to Full Council in response to the motion requesting independent advice at its next meeting on 5 April 2022, we are arranging a briefing for all Councillors with Mary Cook ahead of that meeting to allow for questions around her advice which we will share.
5. Would the Leader of the Council consider re-instating the Local Plan Panel (cross party) to enable involvement and provide support through this process?
As indicated above we plan to involve all Councillors in consideration of the advice and appropriate route to review and update the Plan."

In response to a supplementary question, the Leader of the Council confirmed that the brief to Mary Cook, and her advice would be circulated to all councillors. The Leader also explained that the Local Plan Panel would be reconvened to consider responses to the Regulation 19 consultation on the Local Plan Development Management Policies. The Leader also advised that work was progressing on the Town Centre Master Plan alongside the work around the Local Plan Review.

In response to another supplementary question in respect of the transport study and when it was expected, the Leader confirmed that he would circulate details of the scope of the transport study to all councillors after the meeting. The study was expected by the summer of 2022.

CO96 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2022-23

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 and publish it on its website. The Council therefore considered the Pay Policy Statement covering 2022-23, which had set out the elements of pay and other benefits paid to staff and in particular the most senior employees.

The Pay Policy Statement reflected the current Senior Management structure following the creation of the shared Chief Executive post across both Waverley and Guildford Borough Councils (as referred to in Section 5.2 of the Statement). This structure comprised three Directors reporting to the Joint Chief Executive, and Service Leaders reporting to either Directors or Heads of Service. As the Joint Chief Executive was employed by Waverley Borough Council, the Pay Policy Statement did not include data for this post and reference to the deleted Managing Director post had been removed.

Councillors noted that the Council would continue to pay at the Real Living Wage for outside London, which was currently £9.90 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 Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane, seconded by the Lead Councillor for Resources, Councillor Tim Anderson, the Council

RESOLVED: That the Pay Policy Statement for the 2022-23 financial year, attached at Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved.

Reason:

To comply with the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 (Section 39) and associated guidance.

CO97 CAPITAL AND INVESTMENT STRATEGY (2022-23 TO 2026-27)

The Council considered a report on the capital and investment strategy, which gave a high-level overview of how capital expenditure, capital financing and treasury management activity contributed to the provision of local public services along with an overview of how associated risk was managed and the implications for future financial sustainability.

Decisions made now, and during the period of the strategy on capital and treasury management would have financial consequences for the Council for many years into the future. The report therefore included details of the capital programme, any new bids/mandates submitted for approval plus the requirements of the Prudential Code and the investment strategy covering treasury management investments, service investments, and commercial investments. The report had also covered the requirements of the Treasury Management Code and the prevailing Statutory Guidance.

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, which was split into the General Fund (GF) and Housing Revenue Account (HRA).

All projects, regardless of the fund, would be funded by capital receipts, grants and contributions, reserves, and finally borrowing. When preparing the budget reports, it was not known how each scheme would be funded and, in the case of regeneration projects, what the delivery model would be. The report had showed a high-level position. The business case for each individual project would set out the detailed funding arrangements for the project.

The Council noted that some capital receipts or revenue income streams might arise as a result of regeneration schemes, but in most cases the position was currently uncertain, and it was too early at this stage to make assumptions. It was likely that there would be cash-flow implications of the development schemes, where income would come in after the five-year time horizon of the report and the expenditure incurred earlier in the programme.

The Council had an underlying need to borrow for the GF capital programme of £298 million between 2021-22 and 2026-27. Officers had put forward bids, with a net cost over the same period of £16.5 million, increasing this underlying need to borrow to £315.5 million should these proposals be approved for inclusion in the programme.

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

The main areas of expenditure (shown gross), as set out in the report, were:

- £218 million: Weyside Urban Village (WUV)
- £63.5 million: strategic property purchases – it was proposed to widen the remit of this fund to allow redevelopment opportunities (for example estate redevelopments)
- £32 million: North Downs Housing (NDH)
- £28 million: Ash road bridge and footbridge

As part of the savings programme and in realigning the capital programme in line with the new corporate plan, officers had reviewed the capital programme, and had recommended the removal of some schemes from the programme, and if required in future would come forward with a new mandate under the PPM governance framework.

The HRA capital programme was split between expenditure on existing stock and either development of or purchase of new dwellings to add to the stock. Work had started on updating the condition surveys of the existing stock and bringing it into line with changes to legislation. This had resulted in a need to invest a far greater sum for 2022-23 than in previous years - £24.5 million. The capital programme would be funded from HRA capital receipts and reserves. There was also £142 million between 2022-23 and 2026-27 million included for development projects to build or acquire new housing (including WUV).

The main areas of major repairs and improvement expenditure were:

- £11 million: refurbishment, replacement, and renewal programme of existing stock, including kitchen and bathroom upgrades, void property refurbishment and roof works
- £9 million: works to existing stock to comply with changes to standards and legislation, including replacement fire doors, electrical testing and fire protection works
- £2 million: mechanical and electrical works, including central heating systems
- £1.9 million: other works, including damp prevention

The main development projects were:

- £45.7 million: Guildford Park Car Park
- £17 million: Bright Hill
- £15 million: WUV
- £10 million: Foxburrows

The report contained a summary of the new bids submitted and the position and profiling of the current programme (2021-22 to 2025-26). An updated HRA resources statement (Appendix 12 to the report) was attached to the Order Paper circulated at the meeting.

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 noted that the budget for investment income for 2022-23 was £1.2 million, based on an average investment portfolio of £118 million, at a weighted average rate of 1.69%. The budget for debt interest paid was £5.74 million, of which £5.05 million related to the HRA.

The Council noted that councils 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 earning a return was the primary purpose).

Investment property had been valued at £152 million, as per the 2020-21 Statement of Accounts, with rent receipts of £7.8 million, and a yield of 5.8%. The Council had also invested £21.2 million in its housing company (NDH), via 40% equity to Guildford Borough Council Holdings Ltd (£8.5 million) who, in turn, passed the equity to NDH, and 60% repayment loan direct to NDH (£12.7 million) at a rate of BoE Base rate plus 5%.

The report had also included the Council's Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy and the Prudential Indicators and had set out the updated flexible use of capital receipts policy. This policy, if approved by Council, would permit the use of any capital receipts received in year to be used to fund any service transformation costs incurred in the same year.

The Capital and Investment Strategy 2022-23 to 2026-27 had also been considered by the Joint Executive Advisory Board at its meeting on 10 January 2022, by the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee at its meeting on 20 January 2022, and by the Executive on 25 January 2022.

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 General Fund and HRA capital estimates, as shown in Appendices 3 to 12 to the report submitted to the Council, as amended to include the updated HRA resources statement attached to the Order Paper, and the bids approved by the Executive at its meeting on 25 January 2022, be approved.
- (2) That the Minimum Revenue Provision policy, referred to in section 5 of the report submitted to the Council, be approved.
- (3) That the capital and investment strategy be approved, specifically the investment strategy and Prudential Indicators contained within the report and in Appendix 1.
- (4) That the updated flexible use of capital receipts policy at Appendix 17 to the report be approved.

Reasons:

- To enable the Council to approve the capital and investment strategy for 2022-23 to 2026-27
- To enable the Council to approve the funding required for the new capital schemes proposed

CO98 HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUDGET 2022-23

The Council considered a detailed report on the proposed Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget for 2022-23, which had been built on the estimates and assumptions in the updated 2022 HRA Business Plan appended to the report. The business plan had been reviewed to reflect changes in relevant legislation and guidance, along with consideration of the Council's declaration of a Climate Emergency and the ongoing challenges of the pandemic as it affected the Council's operating environment.

It was proposed that the rents for 2022-23 should increase by 4.10% being the annual September 2020 to September 2021 Consumer Price Index (CPI) of 3.10% plus 1%. This approach was in line with the Rent Standard set by the Regulator of Social Housing and the

Direction made by the Secretary of State on 25 February 2019. The Rent Standard had been introduced following a four-year period (between April 2016 and April 2020) where rents were reduced by 1% per annum under the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016.

A 3% increase in garage rents was proposed for 2022-23, which was in line with the wider Council policy on fees and charges.

The report included overall details of the proposed investment programme for the properties that were managed within the HRA, additional details of this work had also been set out within the item on the Capital and Investment Strategy (see Minute CO97 above).

The HRA annual budget and HRA business plan had assumed that any surpluses on the HRA were used to invest in redevelopment and upgrading of the existing stock, invest in new build affordable housing to be retained and rented by the Council within the HRA and then if there were sufficient monies available, the repayment of debt taken on under HRA self-financing. The 30-year business plan appended to the report had shown that there were sufficient resources within the HRA to carry out the Council's investment plans as well as repay the debt over the 30-year business plan period and still leave a healthy reserve balance of £340million at the end of the 30 years for further investment not yet identified.

This report has also been considered by the Joint Executive Advisory Board at its meeting on 10 January 2022, and their comments had been included therein. At its meeting on 25 January 2022, the Executive had also considered the report and had endorsed the recommendations to Council.

Upon the motion of the Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Community and Housing, Councillor Julia McShane, seconded by the Lead Councillor for Resources, Councillor Tim Anderson, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the proposed HRA revenue budget for 2022-23, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved.
- (2) That a rent increase of 4.10%, comprising the September 2021 CPI (3.10%) plus 1%, in line with the Direction on the Rent Standard 2019 and as set out within Guidance provided by the Regulator of Social Housing, be implemented.
- (3) That the fees and charges for HRA services for 2022-23, as set out in Appendix 2 to the report, be approved.
- (4) That a 3% increase be applied to garage rents which is in line with the wider Council policy on fees and charges.

Reasons:

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

CO99 GENERAL FUND BUDGET 2022-23 AND MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2023-24 TO 2025-26

The Council considered a report which outlined the proposed budget for 2022-23, which included a Council Tax requirement for Guildford Borough Council of £10,898,314 and a Council Tax increase of £5 per year (2.75%), resulting in a Band D charge of £186.82. As set out in the report, the Council was required to set a balanced budget for 2022-23.

Parish Councils had requested precepts totalling £2,029,250 meaning the overall council tax requirement for the borough, including parish precepts would be £12,927,564.

The provisional Local Government Finance Settlement (LGFS) for 2022-23 was received on 16 December 2021 and the figures included in the budget presented reflected the information contained in the settlement. The Settlement Funding Assessment (SFA) comprised the local share of business rates, and revenue support grant and was set out in the provisional LGFS. The settlement enabled the Council to retain £2.929 million of business rates in 2022-23 - the same amount that was retained in 2021-22 and 2020-21. Core Spending Power had increased to £15million, within the core spending power calculation, the Government had assumed that the Council Tax would be raised by the maximum amount (£5 or 2% whichever was the higher).

Overall, the LGFS had been positive for the Council as it included additional funding of:

- £240,000 grant to compensate the Council for the Business Rates Multiplier not increasing in line with inflation
- £131,000 lower tier services grant (this grant had been £237,000 in 2021-22 but was meant to have been a one-off grant)
- £202,000 services grant which was a one-off grant for 2022-23 (to partly offset the National Insurance increase)
- £766,000 New Homes Bonus grant for 2022-23 only
- The ability to raise council tax by a maximum of £5 (2.75%) rather than 2.0%, this additional increase would generate a further £86,000 in council tax income

The Chief Finance Officer (CFO) presented her statutory report to the Council, a copy of which was appended to the main report. The CFO's 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. Councillors noted that the Council had a budget gap of £1.6million in 2023-24, which would rise to £3.8million by 2025-26. Appendix 4 showed the budget movement summary of growth and savings which had been included in the General Fund Summary. Appendix 5 detailed progress made against the Council's Savings Strategy. In considering the financial risk register in Appendix 6, the Council noted that the level of reserves was currently sufficient to meet the Council's risks.

The financial monitoring report for the first eight months of 2021-22 had been reported to the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee on 20 January 2022. The projected net expenditure on the General Fund for the current financial year had been estimated to be £0.2million less than the original estimate due mainly to actions undertaken as part of the voluntary non-essential expenditure freeze which had been implemented as part of a previously projected overspend due to the on-going impact of the COVID19 pandemic. Any ongoing variances between actual expenditure and budget identified in 2021-22 had been taken into account when preparing the budget for 2022-23.

Appendix 7 to the report provided a list of fees and charges for approval as part of the budget. The fees and charges for 2022-23 had been increased by 3% from 2021-22 where the market allowed; however, as identified in the budget movement summary and the parking business plan, some fees had been increased by more than 3%.

The Joint Executive Advisory Board had considered the outline budget at its meeting held on 11 November 2021. At its meeting held on 25 January 2022, the Executive had considered this report and endorsed the recommendation therein. The Executive had also approved:

- (a) the transfers to/from reserves as set out in Section 8 and Appendix 2,
- (b) the growth and savings items included in the General Fund Summary at Appendix 2 and set out in detail in Appendix 4,
- (c) the savings identified in the updated savings strategy at Appendix 5 to be delivered over the medium-term plan period, and

(d) the financial risk register set out in Appendix 6

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, neither of which were deemed to be excessive.

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 budget be approved, and specifically that the Council Tax requirement for 2022-23 be set at £10,898,314 excluding parish precepts and £12,927,564 to include parish precepts.
- (2) That the Band D Council Tax for 2022-23 (excluding parish precepts) be set at £186.82, an increase of £5.00 (2.75%).
- (3) That the Band D Council Tax for 2022-23 (including parish precepts) be set at £221.61.
- (4) That the Council approves the following, as considered by the Executive on 25 January 2022:
 - (i) the General Fund revenue estimates for 2022-23 including proposed fees and charges relating to General Fund services, as set out in Appendix 7 to the report submitted to the Council;
 - (ii) the Housing Revenue Account estimates for 2022-23, including housing rents and other fees and charges;
 - (iii) the Capital and Investment Strategy for 2022-23; and
 - (iv) the Housing Revenue Account capital programme for 2022-23.
- (5) 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 2022-23 in accordance with regulations made under Sections 31B (3) and 34(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) ('the Act'):
 - (i) 58,335.91 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 2022-23 for the whole Council area.
 - (ii) For those parts of the borough to which a parish precept relates:

| Parish of | |
|------------------|----------|
| Albury | 621.03 |
| Artington | 137.10 |
| Ash | 7,016.14 |
| East Clandon | 144.06 |

| Parish of | |
|------------------|----------|
| West Clandon | 717.36 |
| Compton | 484.71 |
| Effingham | 1,404.83 |
| East Horsley | 2,514.39 |
| West Horsley | 1,510.18 |
| Normandy | 1,356.03 |
| Ockham | 264.40 |
| Pirbright | 1,254.01 |
| Puttenham | 313.60 |
| Ripley | 913.56 |
| St. Martha | 403.47 |
| Seale & Sands | 516.85 |
| Send | 2,075.25 |
| Shackleford | 372.01 |
| Shalford | 1,883.46 |
| Shere | 1,991.56 |
| Tongham | 931.10 |
| Wanborough | 176.89 |
| Wisley (Meeting) | 103.19 |
| Worplesdon | 3,502.81 |

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.

- (6) That the Council calculates the following amounts for the financial year 2022-23 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
- (i) £138,044,606 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) £125,117,042 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) of the Act
 - (iii) £12,927,564 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) £221.61 being the amount at sub-paragraph (iii) above divided by the amount at sub-paragraph (i) of paragraph (5) 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) £2,029,250 being the aggregate amount of all special items (parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act as follows:

| Parish of | £ |
|------------------|------------------|
| Albury | 45,546 |
| Artington | 4,468 |
| Ash | 517,856 |
| East Clandon | 8,619 |
| West Clandon | 24,898 |
| Compton | 26,873 |
| Effingham | 124,202 |
| East Horsley | 146,000 |
| West Horsley | 86,148 |
| Normandy | 148,295 |
| Ockham | 15,471 |
| Pirbright | 71,700 |
| Puttenham | 13,250 |
| Ripley | 82,001 |
| St. Martha | 15,070 |
| Seale & Sands | 19,500 |
| Send | 82,089 |
| Shackleford | 15,996 |
| Shalford | 103,305 |
| Shere | 162,028 |
| Tongham | 33,793 |
| Wanborough | 5,242 |
| Wisley (Meeting) | 0 |
| Worplesdon | 276,900 |
| Total | 2,029,250 |

(vi) £186.82 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 (5) 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

| Parish of | £ p |
|------------------|------------|
| Albury | 260.16 |
| Artington | 219.41 |
| Ash | 260.63 |
| East Clandon | 246.65 |
| West Clandon | 221.53 |
| Compton | 242.26 |

| Parish of | £ p |
|------------------|--------|
| Effingham | 275.23 |
| East Horsley | 244.88 |
| West Horsley | 243.86 |
| Normandy | 296.18 |
| Ockham | 245.33 |
| Pirbright | 244.00 |
| Puttenham | 229.07 |
| Ripley | 276.58 |
| St. Martha | 224.17 |
| Seale & Sands | 224.55 |
| Send | 226.38 |
| Shackleford | 229.82 |
| Shalford | 241.67 |
| Shere | 268.18 |
| Tongham | 223.11 |
| Wanborough | 216.45 |
| Wisley (Meeting) | 186.82 |
| Worplesdon | 265.87 |

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 (5) 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 | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 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 | 173.44 | 202.35 | 231.25 | 260.16 | 317.97 | 375.79 | 433.60 | 520.32 |
| Artington | 146.27 | 170.65 | 195.03 | 219.41 | 268.17 | 316.93 | 365.68 | 438.82 |
| Ash | 173.75 | 202.71 | 231.67 | 260.63 | 318.55 | 376.47 | 434.38 | 521.26 |
| East Clandon | 164.43 | 191.84 | 219.24 | 246.65 | 301.46 | 356.27 | 411.08 | 493.30 |
| West Clandon | 147.69 | 172.30 | 196.92 | 221.53 | 270.76 | 319.99 | 369.22 | 443.06 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Compton | 161.51 | 188.42 | 215.34 | 242.26 | 296.10 | 349.93 | 403.77 | 484.52 |
| Effingham | 183.49 | 214.07 | 244.65 | 275.23 | 336.39 | 397.55 | 458.72 | 550.46 |
| East Horsley | 163.25 | 190.46 | 217.67 | 244.88 | 299.30 | 353.72 | 408.13 | 489.76 |
| West Horsley | 162.57 | 189.67 | 216.76 | 243.86 | 298.05 | 352.24 | 406.43 | 487.72 |
| Normandy | 197.45 | 230.36 | 263.27 | 296.18 | 362.00 | 427.82 | 493.63 | 592.36 |
| Ockham | 163.55 | 190.81 | 218.07 | 245.33 | 299.85 | 354.37 | 408.88 | 490.66 |
| Pirbright | 162.67 | 189.78 | 216.89 | 244.00 | 298.22 | 352.44 | 406.67 | 488.00 |
| Puttenham | 152.71 | 178.17 | 203.62 | 229.07 | 279.97 | 330.88 | 381.78 | 458.14 |
| Ripley | 184.39 | 215.12 | 245.85 | 276.58 | 338.04 | 399.50 | 460.97 | 553.16 |
| St. Martha | 149.45 | 174.35 | 199.26 | 224.17 | 273.99 | 323.80 | 373.62 | 448.34 |
| Seale & Sands | 149.70 | 174.65 | 199.60 | 224.55 | 274.45 | 324.35 | 374.25 | 449.10 |
| Send | 150.92 | 176.07 | 201.23 | 226.38 | 276.69 | 326.99 | 377.30 | 452.76 |
| Shackleford | 153.21 | 178.75 | 204.28 | 229.82 | 280.89 | 331.96 | 383.03 | 459.64 |
| Shalford | 161.11 | 187.97 | 214.82 | 241.67 | 295.37 | 349.08 | 402.78 | 483.34 |
| Shere | 178.79 | 208.58 | 238.38 | 268.18 | 327.78 | 387.37 | 446.97 | 536.36 |
| Tongham | 148.74 | 173.53 | 198.32 | 223.11 | 272.69 | 322.27 | 371.85 | 446.22 |
| Wanborough | 144.30 | 168.35 | 192.40 | 216.45 | 264.55 | 312.65 | 360.75 | 432.90 |
| Wisley (Meeting) | 124.55 | 145.30 | 166.06 | 186.82 | 228.34 | 269.85 | 311.37 | 373.64 |
| Worplesdon | 177.25 | 206.79 | 236.33 | 265.87 | 324.95 | 384.03 | 443.12 | 531.74 |
| TOWN AREA | | | | | | | | |
| Guildford | 124.55 | 145.30 | 166.06 | 186.82 | 228.34 | 269.85 | 311.37 | 373.64 |

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.

- (7) That the Council notes that for the year 2022-23, (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 | 1,084.26 | 1,264.97 | 1,445.68 | 1,626.39 | 1,987.81 | 2,349.23 | 2,710.65 | 3,252.78 |
| (ii) PCCS | 197.05 | 229.89 | 262.73 | 295.57 | 361.25 | 426.93 | 492.62 | 591.14 |

- (8) That the Council agrees, having calculated the aggregate in each of the amounts at sub-paragraph (viii) of paragraph (6) and paragraph (7) above, to set the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2022-23 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 | 1,454.75 | 1,697.21 | 1,939.66 | 2,182.12 | 2,667.03 | 3,151.95 | 3,636.87 | 4,364.24 |
| Artington | 1,427.58 | 1,665.51 | 1,903.44 | 2,141.37 | 2,617.23 | 3,093.09 | 3,568.95 | 4,282.74 |
| Ash | 1,455.06 | 1,697.57 | 1,940.08 | 2,182.59 | 2,667.61 | 3,152.63 | 3,637.65 | 4,365.18 |
| East Clandon | 1,445.74 | 1,686.70 | 1,927.65 | 2,168.61 | 2,650.52 | 3,132.43 | 3,614.35 | 4,337.22 |
| West Clandon | 1,429.00 | 1,667.16 | 1,905.33 | 2,143.49 | 2,619.82 | 3,096.15 | 3,572.49 | 4,286.98 |
| Compton | 1,442.82 | 1,683.28 | 1,923.75 | 2,164.22 | 2,645.16 | 3,126.09 | 3,607.04 | 4,328.44 |
| Effingham | 1,464.80 | 1,708.93 | 1,953.06 | 2,197.19 | 2,685.45 | 3,173.71 | 3,661.99 | 4,394.38 |
| East Horsley | 1,444.56 | 1,685.32 | 1,926.08 | 2,166.84 | 2,648.36 | 3,129.88 | 3,611.40 | 4,333.68 |
| West Horsley | 1,443.88 | 1,684.53 | 1,925.17 | 2,165.82 | 2,647.11 | 3,128.40 | 3,609.70 | 4,331.64 |
| Normandy | 1,478.76 | 1,725.22 | 1,971.68 | 2,218.14 | 2,711.06 | 3,203.98 | 3,696.90 | 4,436.28 |
| Ockham | 1,444.86 | 1,685.67 | 1,926.48 | 2,167.29 | 2,648.91 | 3,130.53 | 3,612.15 | 4,334.58 |
| Pirbright | 1,443.98 | 1,684.64 | 1,925.30 | 2,165.96 | 2,647.28 | 3,128.60 | 3,609.94 | 4,331.92 |

| | 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 |
| Puttenham | 1,434.02 | 1,673.03 | 1,912.03 | 2,151.03 | 2,629.03 | 3,107.04 | 3,585.05 | 4,302.06 |
| Ripley | 1,465.70 | 1,709.98 | 1,954.26 | 2,198.54 | 2,687.10 | 3,175.66 | 3,664.24 | 4,397.08 |
| St. Martha | 1,430.76 | 1,669.21 | 1,907.67 | 2,146.13 | 2,623.05 | 3,099.96 | 3,576.89 | 4,292.26 |
| Seale & Sands | 1,431.01 | 1,669.51 | 1,908.01 | 2,146.51 | 2,623.51 | 3,100.51 | 3,577.52 | 4,293.02 |
| Send | 1,432.23 | 1,670.93 | 1,909.64 | 2,148.34 | 2,625.75 | 3,103.15 | 3,580.57 | 4,296.68 |
| Shackleford | 1,434.52 | 1,673.61 | 1,912.69 | 2,151.78 | 2,629.95 | 3,108.12 | 3,586.30 | 4,303.56 |
| Shalford | 1,442.42 | 1,682.83 | 1,923.23 | 2,163.63 | 2,644.43 | 3,125.24 | 3,606.05 | 4,327.26 |
| Shere | 1,460.10 | 1,703.44 | 1,946.79 | 2,190.14 | 2,676.84 | 3,163.53 | 3,650.24 | 4,380.28 |
| Tongham | 1,430.05 | 1,668.39 | 1,906.73 | 2,145.07 | 2,621.75 | 3,098.43 | 3,575.12 | 4,290.14 |
| Wanborough | 1,425.61 | 1,663.21 | 1,900.81 | 2,138.41 | 2,613.61 | 3,088.81 | 3,564.02 | 4,276.82 |
| Wisley* | 1,405.86 | 1,640.16 | 1,874.47 | 2,108.78 | 2,577.40 | 3,046.01 | 3,514.64 | 4,217.56 |
| Worplesdon | 1,458.56 | 1,701.65 | 1,944.74 | 2,187.83 | 2,674.01 | 3,160.19 | 3,646.39 | 4,375.66 |
| TOWN AREA | | | | | | | | |
| Guildford | 1,405.86 | 1,640.16 | 1,874.47 | 2,108.78 | 2,577.40 | 3,046.01 | 3,514.64 | 4,217.56 |

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 2022-23 for the Wisley Parish Meeting to be £nil and this is reflected in all the relevant Council Tax figures above.

- (9) That the Council determines that the Borough Council's basic amount of council tax for 2022-23 is not excessive in accordance with the principles approved under section 52ZB of the Act.
- (10) 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 2022-23 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.
- (11) 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.
- (12) 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.

- (13) That the Council approves the annual statement of accounts for Wisley Parish Meeting, which is currently dormant, for the year ended 31 March 2021, as set out below:

| | Year ending | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | 31 March 2020 £ | 31 March 2021 £ |
| 1. Balances brought forward | 3,579 | 3,605 |
| 2. (+) Annual precept | Nil | Nil |
| 3. (+) Total other receipts | 26 | 0 |
| 4. (-) Staff costs | Nil | Nil |
| 5. (-) Loan interest/capital repayments | Nil | Nil |
| 6. (-) Total other payments | Nil | Nil |
| 7. (=) Balances carried forward | 3,605 | 3605 |
| 8. Total cash and investments | 3,605 | 3,605 |
| 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 2022-23 financial year.

Result of the Recorded Vote:

The motion to adopt the Budget and Council Tax resolution above was approved, with twenty-nine councillors voting in favour, none voting against, and nine abstentions, as follows:

FOR:

Councillor Tim Anderson
 Councillor Jon Askew
 Councillor Christopher Barrass
 Councillor Joss Bigmore
 Councillor Ruth Brothwell
 Councillor Colin Cross
 Councillor Guida Esteves
 Councillor Angela Goodwin
 Councillor David Goodwin
 Councillor Gillian Harwood
 Councillor Liz Hogger
 Councillor Diana Jones
 Councillor Ted Mayne
 Councillor Julia McShane
 Councillor Ann McShee
 Councillor Bob McShee
 Councillor Masuk Miah
 Councillor Ramsey Nagaty

AGAINST:

ABSTAIN:

Councillor Richard Billington
 Councillor David Bilbé
 The Deputy Mayor,
 Councillor Dennis Booth
 Councillor Andrew Gomm
 Councillor Angela Gunning
 Councillor Jan Harwood
 Councillor Jo Randall
 Councillor James Walsh
 Councillor Keith Witham

FOR:

Councillor George Potter
Councillor John Redpath
Councillor Maddy Redpath
Councillor John Rigg
Councillor Tony Rooth
Councillor Will Salmon
Councillor Pauline Searle
Councillor James Steel
Councillor Cait Taylor
Councillor Fiona White
Councillor Catherine Young

AGAINST:**ABSTAIN:****CO100 PERIODIC ELECTORAL REVIEW OF GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL:
PROPOSED RESPONSE TO DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Council considered a report on the proposed response to the Draft Recommendations of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) in respect of the review of the Council's electoral arrangements. The purpose of an electoral review was to consider the total number of councillors elected to the council, the names, number and boundaries of the wards, and the number of councillors to be elected to each ward.

The Council had approved its Council Size Submission in December 2020 in which it made a strong case for the retention of 48 councillors. The LGBCE announced in January 2021 that it was minded to make a recommendation that the Council's future size remained at 48 councillors.

The Council then approved its Warding Patterns Submission in July 2021, which set out the pattern of wards that the Council felt best met the statutory criteria in respect of delivering electoral equality, recognising the interests and identities of local communities, and providing for effective and convenient local government.

On 30 November 2021, the LGBCE published its Draft Recommendations for Guildford and announced a further period of public consultation on those Draft Recommendations, which ended on 7 February 2022. In essence, the Draft Recommendations had agreed with the Council's proposed pattern of wards in the parished areas of the borough and in respect of the Mellow, Stoke, and the proposed new Stoughton North and Stoughton South wards within the town. The Draft Recommendations in respect of the Burpham, Christchurch & Holy Trinity, Friary, Onslow, St. Nicolas, and Westborough wards differed, to varying degrees, from the Council's proposals.

On 14 December 2021, the cross-party Electoral Review Working Group reconvened to consider the Draft Recommendations, and in particular those Draft Recommendations which differed from the Council's own Warding Patterns Submission.

The report now before the Council had set out the product of the work of the Electoral Review Working Group in respect of the Council's proposed response to the LGBCE's Draft Recommendations. The Council's proposed response to the Draft Recommendations reflected the conclusions of the Working Group after taking account of the representations of other councillors.

Upon the motion of Councillor Tony Rooth, seconded by Councillor Liz Hogger, the Council:

RESOLVED: That the proposed response to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's Draft Recommendations in respect of the Periodic Electoral Review of Guildford Borough Council, as drawn up by the Electoral Review Working Group and set out in Appendix 2 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved and submitted to the Commission.

Reason:

To respond to the LGBCE's invitation to respond to its consultation on its Draft Recommendations in respect of the periodic electoral review of Guildford Borough Council.

CO101 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW: WEST HORSLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Councillors noted that the Council had powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct a Community Governance Review (CGR), which was a review of the whole or part of the Borough to consider one or more of the following:

- Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes;
- The naming of parishes and the style (i.e. whether to call it a town council or village council etc.) of new parishes;
- The electoral arrangements for parishes (including the number of councillors to be elected to the council, and parish warding), and
- Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes

The Council considered a detailed report on a formal request from West Horsley Parish Council to conduct a CGR, with a view to securing an increase in the maximum number of councillors to be elected to West Horsley Parish Council from nine councillors to eleven councillors.

The reasons cited by the parish council for making the request to increase the number of parish councillors, were as follows:

- To reduce the workload on individual councillors that had grown considerably over the past 24 months and was expected to continue.
- To address the substantial increase in population as a result of windfall and major housing developments underway in the Village as a consequence of implementing GBC's Local Plan.
- To seek to improve diversity on the parish council.

The Council was asked to approve the proposed terms of reference in respect of the proposed CGR, as set out in Appendix 2 to the report submitted to the Council, together with the proposed timetable for the review.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, seconded by the Councillor Christopher Barrass, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Council agrees to exercise its power under Section 82 of Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (as amended), by conducting a Community Governance Review of the parish of West Horsley, in accordance with the requirements of 2007 Act, and associated government guidance as described in the report submitted to the Council.
- (2) That the terms of reference in respect of the community governance review including the proposed timetable, as set out in Appendix 2 to the report, be approved and published.
- (3) That the Democratic Services and Elections Manager be authorised to conduct the community governance review on the Council's behalf and to take all necessary action to comply with the Council's statutory obligations in that regard.

Reason:

To address the community governance request received in respect of this matter with a view to ensuring that community governance within the area under review is:

- reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area; and
- is effective and convenient.

CO102 TIMETABLE OF COUNCIL AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS 2022-23

The Council considered a report on the proposed timetable of Council and Committee meetings for the 2022-23 municipal year.

Having consulted with the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council, political group leaders, and with Waverley Borough Council, it was proposed to move the regular day for the meeting of the Executive from Tuesday to Thursday in 2022-23 so as to avoid diary conflicts for the Joint Chief Executive given that the Waverley Executive also met on a Tuesday.

The draft timetable also took into account the arrangements for meetings, which would be set out in a report by the Monitoring Officer on 'Pre-Election Publicity Guidance' to be presented to a future meeting. Under those arrangements, the Monitoring Officer was recommending that only the Planning Committee, Licensing Sub-Committee, and Licensing Regulatory Sub-Committee should meet during the pre-election period.

The Executive had also considered the report at its meeting on 25 January 2022 and had recommended approval of the timetable as appended to the report.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane, the Council

RESOLVED: That the proposed timetable of Council and Committee meetings for the 2022-23 municipal year, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved.

Reason:

To assist with the preparation of individual committee work programmes.

CO103 DESIGNATION OF MONITORING OFFICER

The Council considered a report on the designation of the Monitoring Officer in light of the pending departure of Diane Owens on 28 February 2022.

Councillors noted that Section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 required the Council to designate one of its officers as monitoring officer.

Under the Council's current staffing structure, the post of Lead Legal Specialist was the post which officers had deemed most appropriate to be designated as the Council's Monitoring Officer as the role was the Council's most senior legal officer and solicitor. Whilst there was no specific requirement for the most senior solicitor or legal officer of any Council to be the Monitoring Officer it was common practice for the monitoring officer to be a fully qualified solicitor given that part of the role of the monitoring officer was to ensure the Council's compliance with laws and regulations.

Following Diane Owens' resignation, an external recruitment process had been undertaken with the help and support of an employment agency. Councillors were reminded that, in July 2021, the Council had decided to share a senior management team, including statutory officers with Waverley Borough Council. Following the appointment of the Joint Chief Executive, a restructure to create a Joint Senior Management had begun; however, the work was at too early a stage to provide an immediate solution for the recruitment of a new Monitoring Officer for Guildford. As such, it was not deemed an appropriate time to recruit a permanent Lead Specialist – Legal and Monitoring Officer. An external recruitment process for an interim officer for a period of 6 to 8 months had therefore been undertaken, details of which were set out in the report. Following

completion of the process, Mr Stephen Rix had been appointed as the Interim Lead Specialist – Legal. Mr Rix was a qualified solicitor with many years’ experience in local government at different councils as well as previous experience as a monitoring officer.

In accordance with Officer Employment Procedure Rule 4 (a), the formal designation of the Monitoring Officer was undertaken by full Council on the recommendation of the Employment Committee. At its meeting held on 8 February 2022, the Employment Committee had considered this matter and had endorsed the recommendation in respect of the designation of the Monitoring Officer.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane, the Council:

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with Section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, Stephen Rix (Interim Lead Specialist – Legal) be designated as the Monitoring Officer for the Council with effect from 1 March 2022.

Reason:

To comply with the requirements of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 (as amended).

CO104 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE

The Council received and noted the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 23 November 2021 and 4 January 2022.

CO105 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 9.00 pm

Signed
Mayor

Date