

# EXECUTIVE

6 January 2015

\*Councillor Stephen Mansbridge (Chairman)  
Councillor Nigel Manning (Vice-Chairman)

\*Councillor Richard Billington  
\*Councillor Sarah Creedy  
\*Councillor Matt Furniss  
\*Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr.

\*Councillor Gordon Jackson  
\*Councillor Terence Patrick  
\*Councillor Paul Spooner

\* Present

Councillors David Goodwin, Philip Hooper and Caroline Reeves were also in attendance.

## **EX73 – APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

## **EX74 – LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT – DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were no disclosable pecuniary interests declared at the meeting.

## **EX75 – MINUTES**

The Executive approved the minutes of the meeting held on 25 November 2014 as a correct record. The chairman signed the minutes.

The Executive also agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on 28 October 2014 approved and signed by the chairman at the meeting held on 25 November 2014, be amended to show that Councillor Sarah Creedy was absent from that meeting and that Councillor Paul Spooner was present.

## **EX76 – ANNUAL AUDIT LETTER 2013-14**

The Executive received and noted the Annual Audit Letter for 2013-14, which had been prepared by Grant Thornton, the Council's external auditors. The Annual Audit Letter summarised the key findings arising from:

- auditing the 2013-14 accounts and Whole of Government Accounts return
- assessing the Council's arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources
- certification of grants claims and returns.

The Executive was pleased to note that the Council had received an unqualified opinion on the accounts and its arrangements for securing economy, efficiency and effectiveness and an assurance statement on the Whole of Government Accounts. The auditors had certified one grant claim and were still working on the housing benefit claim.

The Annual Audit Letter did not include anything that had not been raised within the Audit Findings Report, considered by Corporate Governance and Standards Committee in September 2014, which contained some recommendations from the auditors because of their audit work, an action plan and management's response to the recommendations.

The Executive

RESOLVED: That the Annual Audit Letter for 2013-14 be noted.

Reason for Decision:

To ensure that the Executive is aware of the Annual Audit Letter and the overall opinion of the external auditors.

(The webcast showing the debate on this matter may be viewed [here](#), timed at 00:01:45)

## **EX77 – PROVISION OF RECYCLING COLLECTIONS AND TEEP**

The Executive considered a report on the implications for the Council's recycling service of new regulations, due to come into force in January 2015, which required separate recycling collections of paper, glass, plastics and metal from households if necessary to facilitate or improve recovery, and was technically, environmentally or economically practicable. The Council collected these materials commingled (placing the majority of recyclables in one bin) and in order to continue to collect in this way, the Council needed to review and justify maintaining the current approach in line with the regulations and relevant guidance.

The Council's current approach had proved to be extremely popular with residents. An extensive survey of 5,000 households in October 2014 had found that satisfaction levels had reached 97% and that over a third of residents claimed to be recycling more with the bin. The Council's analysis had shown greater material capture that supported this finding. The majority of residents liked and understood the Council's new service and, as a result, the service was well used and effective at capturing higher levels of materials than the previous system.

Having reviewed the recycling service in line with the Waste Regulations Route Map, officers had come to the view that it was unlikely that changing the collection system back to kerbside boxes was necessary to improve the quantity of recycling. Officers had found that a decrease in recycling material capture was likely if the system were redesigned back to a separate box system. They had concluded that separate collections were not necessary to achieve high quality recycling as the materials were generally reaching appropriate outlets that achieved high quality recycling.

Officers felt that box systems presented a number of significant technical challenges, particularly around issues of Health and Safety, and that a return to a box based system was likely to incur significant capital costs of around £5.4m and ongoing revenue costs of around £500,000 per year for Guildford and further disposal costs for Surrey in the region of £150,000 to £200,000 per year. As a result, a return to a separate box system was not considered to be economically practicable for Guildford at this time.

Having considered the report, the Executive

### **RESOLVED:**

- (1) That the views of the Recycling Team that the Council's current approach to recycling collection is compliant with the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011, be endorsed.
- (2) That the Council continues with commingled recycling until at least April 2019 and that this decision be reviewed at such time when the current domestic fleet is due for replacement.

### **Reason for Decision:**

To ensure that the Council's collections of recyclables continue to comply with relevant legislation.

(The webcast showing the debate on this matter may be viewed [here](#), timed at 00:04:35)

## **EX78 – CONTINUATION OF THE CURRENT THAMES BASIN HEATHS SPECIAL PROTECTION AREA AVOIDANCE STRATEGY**

The Executive considered a report setting out details of the proposed continuation of the current Thames Basin Heaths (TBH) Special Protection Area (SPA) Avoidance Strategy 2009-2014. A full review of the strategy would be needed to demonstrate that adequate Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) was available to mitigate development in the next Local Plan period and would therefore need to be closely aligned with the development of the new Local Plan.

Continuing the use of the existing Strategy and delaying the full review would result in savings by avoiding the duplication of processes. Councillors noted that Strategy was largely up to date as the SANG position was updated annually through the Monitoring Report and the tariffs were updated through the annual review of the Planning Obligations SPD. As there was very little benefit in undertaking a full review at this stage, the Executive

RESOLVED: That the continued use of the current Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy be approved beyond the end of 2014, until the expected level of development in the next Local Plan period becomes clearer and a full review can be undertaken or until the adoption of the Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule.

### Reasons for Decision:

- A full review at this stage would result in only minor changes to the existing strategy. The current SANG position is in line with national and regional planning policy and is updated annually.
- A full review at the present time would need to be repeated in the future to support the new Local Plan, duplicating processes and adding costs.

(The webcast showing the debate on this matter may be viewed [here](#), timed at 00:13:42)

## **EX79 – GUILDFORD COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY**

The Executive considered a detailed report on the Guildford Community Infrastructure Levy preliminary draft charging schedule on which, it was proposed, that the Council should consult during January and February 2015.

Councillors were reminded that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was the government's preferred mechanism for securing pooled contributions from developers to fund infrastructure to support development in the area. Although the Council was not obliged to introduce the CIL locally, in September 2011, the Executive had agreed to introduce it for Guildford borough. The forthcoming restriction on the pooling of planning obligations had increased the need to introduce CIL in the borough.

Once introduced, as the charging authority for this area, the Council would decide on the infrastructure on which it would like the CIL receipts to be spent. The Council may pass CIL receipts to Surrey County Council, or other infrastructure providers. In some circumstances the Council may decide that the developer should provide infrastructure or land as the CIL contribution.

The Executive noted that the Council would also pass to each parish council a proportion of CIL receipts raised in that parish every year to spend on its priorities. In areas with no parish council, the Council would work with existing groups in local communities to identify their priorities for the area and organise delivery of those projects.

Officers had prepared the preliminary draft charging schedule (PDCS) which sets out the Council's initial proposals for the CIL. This took into account the location, type and amount

of development proposed in the draft Local Plan 2014, the infrastructure needed to support it and likely available funding sources, as well as development viability evidence.

The PDCS was the first consultation towards introducing the CIL, a copy of which was appended to the report, along with other supporting documents. All responses would be taken into account when the draft charging schedule (CS) was prepared for consultation prior to submission for independent examination.

The Executive was informed that a ministerial statement made on 28 November 2014 and related additional guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance had introduced a national minimum site size threshold of 11 homes and having a total maximum gross floorspace of at least 1,000 sqm. This had sought to restrict affordable housing and pooled planning obligation contributions from developments under that size (or 6 homes in designated rural areas and the Area of Outstanding National Beauty if the Council chose to have a differential threshold). This would reduce the cost of planning obligations to small developments.

A further amendment relating to planning obligations required the Council to deduct existing floorspace from the required affordable housing contribution, which would help to incentivise brownfield development and re-use of existing buildings.

The Executive therefore

RESOLVED: That the preliminary draft charging schedule, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Executive, together with the supporting documents referred to in Appendices 2 to 5, be approved for public consultation for a period of six weeks in January and February 2015.

Reason for Decision:

To progress introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy to ensure that future development contributes to the infrastructure needed to support its delivery.

(The webcast showing the debate on this matter may be viewed [here](#), timed at 00:15:36)

Meeting closed at: 7.17pm

**Chairman**  
**20 January 2015**