



COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 28 JULY 2021

ORDER PAPER

WEBCASTING NOTICE

This meeting will be recorded for subsequent broadcast on the Council's website in accordance with the Council's capacity in performing a task in the public interest and in line with the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014.

The whole of the meeting will be recorded, except where there are confidential or exempt items, and the footage will be on the website for six months.

If you have any queries regarding webcasting of meetings, please contact Committee Services.

I would like to welcome everyone to this evening's meeting of the Council.

I should be grateful if you would ensure that your mobile phones and other hand-held devices are switched to silent during the meeting. If the fire alarm sounds during the course of the meeting - we are not expecting it to go off - please leave the Council Chamber immediately and proceed calmly to the assembly point in Millmead on the paved area adjacent to the river as you exit the site.

This Order Paper sets out details of those members of the public who have given advance notice of their wish to ask a question or address the Council in respect of any business on tonight's agenda. It also sets out details of any questions submitted by councillors together with any motions and amendments to be proposed by councillors in respect of the business on the agenda.

Unless a member of the public has given notice of their wish to ask a question or address the Council under Item 6 (Public Participation), they will not be permitted to speak. Those who have given notice may address the Council for a maximum of three minutes. Speakers may not engage in any further debate once they have finished their speech.

Councillor Marsha Moseley
The Mayor of Guildford

Time limits on speeches at full Council meetings:	
Public speaker:	3 minutes
Response to public speaker:	3 minutes
Questions from councillors:	3 minutes
Response to questions from councillors:	3 minutes
Proposer of a motion:	10 minutes
Seconder of a motion:	5 minutes
Other councillors speaking during the debate on a motion:	5 minutes
Proposer of a motion's right of reply at the end of the debate on the motion:	10 minutes
Proposer of an amendment:	5 minutes
Seconder of an amendment:	5 minutes
Other councillors speaking during the debate on an amendment:	5 minutes
Proposer of a motion's right of reply at the end of the debate on an amendment:	5 minutes
Proposer of an amendment's right of reply at the end of the debate on an amendment:	5 minutes

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

To receive and note any disclosable pecuniary interests from councillors. In accordance with the local Code of Conduct, a councillor is required to disclose at the meeting any disclosable pecuniary interest (DPI) that they may have in respect of any matter for consideration on this agenda. Any councillor with a DPI must not participate in any discussion or vote regarding that matter and they must also withdraw from the meeting immediately before consideration of the matter.

If that DPI has not been registered, the councillor must notify the Monitoring Officer of the details of the DPI within 28 days of the date of the meeting.

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

3 MINUTES (Pages 5 – 20 of the Council agenda)

To confirm the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Council held on 19 May 2021 and the extraordinary meeting held on 6 July 2021.

4. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

To receive any communications or announcements from the Mayor.

5. LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Leader to comment on the following matters:

- Covid update
- Keep Britain Tidy's Love Parks Week
- Farmers' Market
- New online Housing Register
- Executive portfolio responsibilities: To clarify that air quality matters are the responsibility of the Lead Councillor for Climate Change

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

6. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No questions or requests to speak have been received from the public.

7. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

- (a) **Councillor Ramsey Nagaty** to ask the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, the following question:

"Following the press release issued by the Council on 17 May 2021, which stated that 'We have started to review the Guildford Local Plan and the evidence behind it', may I please ask the Leader of the Council:

- (1) *To provide an update on progress with the review, and in particular progress with the appointment of a top level experienced independent Planning Expert or Barrister, who will take a fresh view and approach to this review, and to assist objectively and advise the best ways forward; and*
- (2) *To put in place a working group to progress the review urgently.”*

The Leader’s response is as follows:

- “(1) *Officers have undertaken initial work reflecting the steps to be followed in order to review the Local Plan. This is based on published Planning Advisory Service guidance. I have agreed with our Strategic Services Director that this work should be expanded to incorporate a ‘roadmap’ reflecting the appropriate route to not only review the Local Plan, but also update the Plan’s Evidence Base. In parallel, the process of reviewing the Local Plan transport evidence base, as part of the wider review process, is being progressed with Surrey County Council and Highways England. Independent expertise will be drawn on as and when necessary during the process.*
- (2) *Councillors Jan Harwood, John Rigg, and Tim Anderson have been providing input to this process. I will take under consideration whether to invite a formal working group to consider the ‘roadmap’ when it is delivered in the week commencing 6 September”.*

Councillor Joss Bigmore
Leader of the Council

- (b) **Councillor Ramsey Nagaty** to ask the Deputy Leader and Lead Councillor for Climate Change, Councillor Jan Harwood, the question set below. (Councillor Harwood’s response to each element of the question is set out in **red type** below.)

“There is considerable concern from residents of Shalford regarding progress with managing the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in Shalford. Could the Lead Councillor for Environment kindly confirm:

- (1) *what actions have been taken to address the air quality issues so far?*
“The Council understands the residents’ concerns about air quality within the AQMA in Shalford and wants to work with local residents, ward councillors, Surrey County Council and the Parish Council in achieving compliance with air quality limits. This is a really challenging issue to solve as the predominant source of emissions is domestic cars as they drive along the main road through the village.

The Council has an Air Quality Action Plan for Shalford which details the actions the Council is planning on taking to address the AQMA. A number of measures and initiatives, which will improve air quality, or raise awareness, are already being implemented in the Guildford area. These are not focussed specifically in Shalford but assist in reducing emissions more generally and increasing awareness of air quality, travel choice and choice of vehicle. These include easitGUILDFORD and an Electric Vehicle charging network pilot study.

Officers have started some early discussions on some of the Shalford specific measures such as improvements to cycle paths plus bus and train improvements and hope to make more progress this year. These are really challenging measures and will require support from partners to deliver improvements.”

- (2) what impact has this had on the air quality within the AQMA?

"The impact is unknown at this stage particularly as air quality at this time is not representative of normal traffic patterns".

- (3) what actions will be taken going forward in light of the current pollution levels recorded as may be adjusted for the reduced traffic during the Pandemic?

"The reduction in traffic during the height of the pandemic was reflected in our air quality monitoring across the Borough and therefore monitoring data during this period alone will not be used to make any key decisions about air quality. More recent results suggest traffic levels are starting to increase in parallel with the easing of restrictions".

- (4) when will the monitoring information to date, and any plans covering both Shalford and the wider Guildford area, be published for residents to see?"

"Our air quality monitoring results for the whole Borough are published on the Council's website. Please note that this is the raw data, and a valid bias factor must be applied for interpretation purposes.

<https://www.guildford.gov.uk/article/19807/Find-out-how-we-monitor-air-quality-and-pollution>

The 'Annual Status Report' submitted to DEFRA reviews the previous year's air quality monitoring and follow up actions. Once approved by DEFRA this year's report will be available on the Council's website".

- (c) **Councillor Paul Spooner** to ask the Lead Councillor for Resources, Councillor Tim Anderson, the question set below. (Councillor Anderson's response to each element of the question is set out in **red type** below.)

"The Council acquired Liongate in 2013 following the financial crisis and during a period when investment in property still enabled significant return on investment for rental properties, as demonstrated by the significant rental income obtained over the period the Council retained ownership of the property.

However, the Council disposed of this asset in 2020 at a significant loss on the apparent basis that the Executive were informed that a conversion to residential could not be obtained, and the property was sold through private treaty (not public auction as claimed by the Leader) on an unconditional basis, without overage or any other clause to enable best value to be obtained should a new owner be successful in obtaining planning permission from the Local Planning Authority (GBC). In a very short period after disposal the new owners were able to obtain not one but two planning permissions for residential conversion and this has left the Council with a substantial loss to the residents of Guildford and no opportunity to use the site for affordable rent or social rent for the many residents who could have benefitted from retention and investment in the site, and a significant increase in book value for the Council Tax-payers of the Borough.

I ask that the Executive launch an urgent and thorough independent investigation into how this occurred. The decisions made are difficult to understand on so many levels and we need to understand what went wrong that resulted in a £3m loss between purchase and sale value and the lost opportunity for much needed Council housing.

In particular, I would like to ask the Lead Councillor for Resources:

1. *Why was this property disposed of and not regenerated by the Council for much needed housing? Permitted Development rights would show that residential use would be readily obtained (as it was)?*

“In September 2018, pre-empting the tenant actioning their break, the Council commissioned Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH) to prepare an Options Appraisal for Liongate on the potential future uses of the site.

The report reviewed the relative merits of each option and provided a high-level range values for each and their view on demand/risk factors. To inform this a site survey, Flood Risk assessment and pre-planning advice were also commissioned.

- Refurbishment by GBC for continued office use - **£4.0 - £5.0 million***
- Sale for residential with prior approval for PD - **£8.5 - £9.5 million***
- Sale for residential use - **£7.0 - £8.0 million***
- Sale for retirement living/care home – Extra Care: **£8.5- £9.5 million**, Retirement: **£7.5- £8.5 million***
- Sale/pre-let as a hotel - **£5.0 - £5.5 million***
- Sale for retail use - **£5.0 - £5.5 million***
- Sale for self-storage use - **£4.0 - £5.0 million***

The option to redevelop the site for housing internally was discussed with the Director of Community Services but dismissed due to the complexities of the site and the lack of in-house expertise.”

2. On what basis was the property considered for use by the Council (if at all)?

“See above. In addition, the Council did consider relocating its operations to the site and releasing Millmead, but it was agreed that the site was unsuitable”.

3. Why wasn't a Permitted Development Planning Certificate put in place before the property was offered in the market, with the clear added value if that had happened?

“In September 2018, pre-empting the tenant actioning their break, the Council commissioned LSH to prepare an Options Appraisal for Liongate on the potential future uses of the site.

The report reviewed the relative merits of each option and provided a high-level range values for each and their view on demand/risk factors. To inform this a site survey, Flood Risk assessment and pre-planning advice were commissioned. The flood risk assessor was in dialogue with the EA to produce their report. However, the EA was not very forthcoming with information.

The pre-planning advice stated:

“Sale for residential with prior approval for Permitted Development. The building is located within flood zone 3b. Residential uses fall within 'more vulnerable' as identified in the Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification of the NPPG. In Flood Zone 3b residential development should not be permitted. As such there is an in-principle objection. Any prior approval application would need to be accompanied by a site-specific flood risk assessment. We would consult the Environment Agency on any prior approval application. However, I must advise it is unlikely that prior approval would be granted, given the identified flood risk and 'more vulnerable' use.”

After commissioning a new and more involved flood risk assessment (using a different Assessor who had had success at Stoke Mill and a good dialogue with the EA) we received further advice from planning including the following statement from Planning dated 17 October 2019:

“As discussed, I’m not aware the LPA has considered any office to resi PD prior approvals in flood zone 3 so we don’t have a lot of precedents to draw on. What I can say is that we have strongly resisted resi and student schemes in flood zone 3 where these have been subject to applications for planning permission. I think it would be hard for a scheme to pass the sequential and exception tests for resi on this site if planning permission was sought, but this will be something that needs to be considered and demonstrated by the applicant.”

Given the issues around planning and to take advantage of any interest, it was decided not to try to obtain prior approval but perform a full marketing campaign on an ‘any offer’ basis and asked potential purchaser to rely on the advice given in the new FRA (attached as Appendix 1 to this Order Paper) which stated that:

“Based on the modelling the site is concluded to be outside the Functional Floodplain (i.e. the 1 in 20-year event). As such the policy within Guildford Borough Council’s Local Plan that states that development within Flood Zone 3b should not increase the existing vulnerability classification does not apply. A proposed change of use application in this location can therefore be considered acceptable provided suitable flood resilience and resistant approaches be included within the scheme.”

This enabled the Council to obtain the full value for the site without the risk and cost of applying for PD approval and it being rejected which would have significantly reduced the value of the site”.

4. *Who authorised the property being sold at a £3m loss? I am not aware of any similar property that was valued in 2013 and then again in 2020 that ‘achieved’ such a loss in property value?*

“The matter was approved by the Executive on 29 November 2019 - minute EX65.

*The property was recorded in accounts as being sold for £10,820,000 (£10,170,000 + £700,000- £50,000 deposit). £108,463 of costs (legal, marketing, security, dilaps surveys) was deducted. This made a total capital receipt in accounts of **£10,711,536.93**. £850k was written out to I&E on disposal – investment properties hit I&E each year - both upward and downward.*

For information, valuation history is:

2013-14 purchase £13m

2014-15 £13.865m

2015-16 £14m

2016-17 £14.35m

2017-18 £14.42m

2018-19 £13m

2019-20 £12.15m

The void also led to a loss of rental of £980,000pa. Whilst the property remained vacant there was empty premises business rates liability of £125,000, meaning that the budgeted income shortfall was £1.105m per annum. There were also escalating costs around utilities and security.

Please also see best consideration letter from agent (attached as Appendix 2 to this Order Paper).”

5. *Why was the Council apparently so concerned by EA speculation that flood risk would make Residential conversion impossible given residential permission was so readily given by the same Council as LPA?*

“Pre-application advice highlighted that the site is located within Flood Zone 3b which carries significant constraints in terms of planning policies and flood risk concern. Consent was sought through the Prior Approval route and therefore only specific matters could be considered. The first two Prior Approval applications (19/W/00109 and 19/W/00110) were both refused on these grounds carrying objections from the Environment Agency. Therefore, this would highlight that the initial concerns were valid.

The following application, 20/W/00021, included a significant amount of additional information in respect of this matter and changes to the scheme as result the Environment Agency raised no objection to this application and as a result the Prior Approval application was approved.”

6. *Why didn't the Council write in an overage clause?*

“The purchaser was buying the site for residential conversion and was, in their view, paying a price based on the assumption they would obtain prior approval for that use. The next highest (i.e. lower) residential bid was in fact conditional on getting prior approval.

An overage clause is generally included in a commercial property/land sale contract and is used by the selling party for them to receive additional funds after the sale has been completed and an agreed 'trigger event' has taken place. The Council did request an overage payment but as the price already was a full price based on the assumption that they would obtain planning, an overage clause was unacceptable to the bidder”.

Given this Council's decision to hold independent enquiries on small matters such as Burchatts Farm Barn, this certainly justifies a formal and extensive investigation and report to the Council Tax payers in Guildford.”

“In this case, I believe an independent investigation is unnecessary. Previous investigations were seen to be necessary to uncover information to better understand the circumstances which led to a particular situation and the decision-making process. This time we are in possession of many committee meeting papers which were presented and minutes documenting conclusions. Additionally, we have reports from consultants on a wide range of options which were analysed and considered before decisions were made. The response to the six parts of the question above is comprehensive and has provided an opportunity to present an accurate picture which corrects assertions made in a political leaflet. Lastly, I do not question the original decision to acquire Liongate, but others may well do.”

8. LOCAL GOVERNMENT COLLABORATION (Pages 21 - 66 of the Council agenda)

Employment Committee – 22 July 2021

At its meeting on 22 July, the Employment Committee agreed to commend the proposed role profile (job description) in respect of the appointment of a Joint Chief Executive (Appendix 2 to the Council report) and also the proposed terms of reference and composition of the Joint Appointments Committee for approval by the Council (Appendix 4 to the Council report).

Exempt Appendix 1: Draft Heads of Terms for the Inter Authority Agreement

Since the publication of the agenda on 20 July, a revised version of the draft Heads of Terms for the proposed Inter Authority Agreement has been drafted, a copy of which was circulated to all councillors on 22 July.

Exempt Appendix 2: Draft Job Description for new joint chief executive

Following a councillor's enquiry as to whether the job description/person specification needs to include proficiency in working with IT systems and also concerns regarding equalities, Jennifer McNeil from South East Employers has responded by agreeing that *"the new Joint Chief Executive will need to be proficient in IT and systems that are used in local authorities in particular. Whilst this might be implied in some of the areas on the role description, I agree that it would be clearer if digital skills and IT proficiency were specifically referenced in the person specification. This is particularly relevant given the new ways of working that we are all facing and growing reliance on digital technology. I suggest adding another line in the person specification under the heading 'Experience':*

Strong level of digital literacy and proficiency, including traditional office software suites (e.g. M/S Office packages) and modern ways of working (e.g. video conferencing, remote working); a proven track record of embracing digital approaches and new ways of working to meet organisational needs. (listed as 'E' Essential)"

It is suggested that this is dealt with by way of an alteration of the motion (see below)

With regard to equalities issues, Jennifer McNeil advises that, *"at this stage we will be obliged to ensure fair practices are followed under employment legislation with potential for redundancies / redeployment etc. of existing staff. However, until the consultation process has been commenced and finalised, we do not yet know what expressions of interest we will receive for this new post, nor whether this will remain an internal appointment, or if it will be advertised more widely. Should it go more widely, then areas of diversity would need to be taken into account".*

Exempt Appendix 3: Human Resources Advice from South East Employers

The respective job descriptions for both Guildford and Waverley Heads of Paid Service and the Salary Benchmarking data for 2019-20 were omitted in error as attachments to the Human Resources report submitted by Jennifer McNeil. Copies of these documents were circulated to all councillors on 23 July.

Jennifer McNeil will also be present to answer any questions from councillors in respect of the proposed job description for the Joint Chief Executive, or the HR advice.

The motion:

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore to propose, and the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Jan Harwood to second the adoption of the following motion:

- “(1) To note the revised early draft of the Heads of Terms of the Inter Authority Agreement contained in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, and that significant further work is necessary to clarify the detail required to agree the Heads of Terms, and that a further report will be submitted to the Council to agree the final Heads of Terms.
- (2) To approve the draft job description, subject to consultation, in respect of the appointment of a Joint Chief Executive as set out in Appendix 2 to the report; and to agree the following as recommended by South East Employers in their paper outlining human resources issues, as set out in Appendix 3:

- (a) That the title of the new role be Joint Chief Executive (rather than Joint Managing Director).
 - (b) That the employing authority should be the existing employer if an internal candidate is appointed.
 - (c) That the salary for the new Joint Chief Executive post be a spot salary of £150,000 p.a. including all allowances, duties, and statutory responsibilities with the exception of election duties.
 - (d) That the new Joint Chief Executive post is ring-fenced for recruitment from the internal pool of affected employees in the first instance and that if no internal appointment is made then the role shall be advertised externally.
 - (e) That, subject to final approval by the Joint Appointments Committee the terms and conditions of employment for an internal appointment will be the existing terms and conditions of the employing authority.
- (3) To approve the establishment of a Joint Appointments Committee and its proposed composition and terms of reference, as set out in Appendix 4.
- (4) Subject to paragraph (3) above, to confirm the following appointments to the Joint Appointments Committee:
- The Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore
 - The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Jan Harwood
 - Councillor Paul Spooner
- (5) To agree that redundancy and any settlement costs incurred as a result of moving to a Joint Chief Executive shall be shared equally between the Councils and that any pension strain costs (if applicable) will remain the responsibility of the employing authority of the affected officer. It is noted that the cost sharing arrangement for the remainder of the collaboration project will form part of the Inter Authority Agreement.
- (6) To agree that the costs referred to in paragraph (5) above be funded from General Fund reserves.

Reason:

To approve the initial documents and governance required to progress the collaboration with Waverley Borough Council.”

Alteration of Motion:

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Joss Bigmore, as the mover of the original motion, has indicated that, with the consent of his seconder and of the meeting, he wishes to alter his motion in accordance with the proposed alteration below. The Mayor will put the proposed alteration to a vote without debate. If approved, Councillor Bigmore’s motion, as altered, will become the substantive motion for debate to which amendments may subsequently be moved.

Alteration:

Insert the following in the first line of paragraph (2) of the motion after “*subject to consultation*”:

“...and to the inclusion of the following additional line in the person specification under the heading ‘Experience’:

‘Strong level of digital literacy and proficiency, including traditional office software suites (e.g. M/S Office packages) and modern ways of working (e.g. video conferencing, remote working); a proven track record of embracing digital

approaches and new ways of working to meet organisational needs. (listed as 'E' Essential)''

The motion, as altered, would read as follows:

- “(1) To note the revised early draft of the Heads of Terms of the Inter Authority Agreement contained in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, and that significant further work is necessary to clarify the detail required to agree the Heads of Terms, and that a further report will be submitted to the Council to agree the final Heads of Terms.
- (2) To approve the draft job description, subject to consultation and to the inclusion of the following additional line in the person specification under the heading 'Experience':

‘Strong level of digital literacy and proficiency, including traditional office software suites (e.g. M/S Office packages) and modern ways of working (e.g. video conferencing, remote working); a proven track record of embracing digital approaches and new ways of working to meet organisational needs. (listed as 'E' Essential)’

in respect of the appointment of a Joint Chief Executive as set out in Appendix 2 to the report; and to agree the following as recommended by South East Employers in their paper outlining human resources issues, as set out in Appendix 3:

- (a) That the title of the new role be Joint Chief Executive (rather than Joint Managing Director).
 - (b) That the employing authority should be the existing employer if an internal candidate is appointed.
 - (c) That the salary for the new Joint Chief Executive post be a spot salary of £150,000 p.a. including all allowances, duties, and statutory responsibilities with the exception of election duties.
 - (d) That the new Joint Chief Executive post is ring-fenced for recruitment from the internal pool of affected employees in the first instance and that if no internal appointment is made then the role shall be advertised externally.
 - (e) That, subject to final approval by the Joint Appointments Committee the terms and conditions of employment for an internal appointment will be the existing terms and conditions of the employing authority.
- (3) To approve the establishment of a Joint Appointments Committee and its proposed composition and terms of reference, as set out in Appendix 4.
- (4) Subject to paragraph (3) above, to confirm the following appointments to the Joint Appointments Committee:
- The Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore
 - The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Jan Harwood
 - Councillor Paul Spooner
- (5) To agree that redundancy and any settlement costs incurred as a result of moving to a Joint Chief Executive shall be shared equally between the Councils and that any pension strain costs (if applicable) will remain the responsibility of the employing authority of the affected officer. It is noted that the cost sharing arrangement for the remainder of the collaboration project will form part of the Inter Authority Agreement.
- (6) To agree that the costs referred to in paragraph (5) above be funded from General Fund reserves.

Comments:

Councillor Nigel Manning

**9. PERIODIC ELECTORAL REVIEW OF GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL –
WARDING PATTERNS SUBMISSION** (Pages 67 - 104 of the Council agenda)

The Chairman of the Electoral Review Working Group, Councillor Tony Rooth to propose, and Councillor Liz Hogger to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“That the Warding Patterns Submission, attached at Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved, and presented to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, together with the accompanying maps at Appendix 2.

Reason:

To respond to the LGBCE’s invitation to make a Warding Patterns submission as part of the periodic electoral review of Guildford Borough Council”.

Alteration of Motion:

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Tony Rooth, as the mover of the original motion, has indicated that, with the consent of his seconder and of the meeting, he wishes to alter his motion in accordance with the proposed alteration below. The Mayor will put the proposed alteration to a vote without debate. If approved, Councillor Rooth’s motion, as altered, will become the substantive motion for debate to which amendments may subsequently be moved.

Alteration:

Insert the following as paragraph (2) of the motion:

“(2) That a Working Group be formed to consider and make long term recommendations (beyond 2026) regarding the suitable redrawing of borough and parish ward boundaries including the possible creation of new parish councils, taking account of implementation of new housing development on Local Plan Strategic Sites, and that such recommendations be used as follows:

- (a) to consider in respect of borough ward boundaries, seat allocations, and associated arrangements whether to request a further electoral review by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, and*
- (b) to consider whether the Council should conduct a community governance review of relevant parished areas with a view to identifying appropriate revisions to existing parish boundaries and possible creation of new parish councils.”*

The motion, as altered, would read as follows:

- “(1) That the Warding Patterns Submission, attached at Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved, and presented to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, together with the accompanying maps at Appendix 2.*
- (2) That a Working Group be formed to consider and make long term recommendations (beyond 2026) regarding the suitable redrawing of borough and parish ward boundaries including the possible creation of new parish councils, taking account of implementation of new housing development on Local Plan Strategic Sites, and that such recommendations be used as follows:*

- (a) to consider in respect of borough ward boundaries, seat allocations, and associated arrangements whether to request a further electoral review by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, and
- (b) to consider whether the Council should conduct a community governance review of relevant parished areas with a view to identifying appropriate revisions to existing parish boundaries and possible creation of new parish councils.

Reasons:

- (1) To respond to the LGBCE's invitation to make a Warding Patterns submission as part of the periodic electoral review of Guildford Borough Council.
- (2) To ensure the Council is able to respond appropriately to changing circumstances beyond 2026"

Comments:

None

10. OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2020-21

(Pages 105 – 118 of the Council agenda)

The Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Paul Spooner to propose, and Councillor Deborah Seabrook to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- "(1) That the report be commended as the annual report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- (2) That the current rules relating to call in or urgency provisions remain unchanged.

Reasons:

- Article 8.2(d) of the Council's Constitution requires the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee to report annually to Full Council on the work undertaken during the year, its future work programme, and amended working methods if appropriate.
- Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16(i), requires the operation of the provisions relating to call-in and urgency to be monitored annually and a report submitted to Full Council with proposals for review if necessary."

Comments:

None

11. APPOINTMENT OF HONORARY ALDERMEN (Pages 119 - 122 of the Council agenda)

The Mayor, Councillor Marsha Moseley to propose, and Councillor Julia McShane to second, the adoption of the following motion:

"That a special meeting of the Council be convened on Thursday 2 December 2021 at 7pm at the Guildhall, High Street, Guildford for the purpose of conferring title of Honorary Alderman on:

Vas Kapsalis
 Tony Phillips
 Keith Taylor
 Jenny Wicks
 David Wright

Reason:

To recognise formally the eminent service to the Council of former councillors”.

Comments:

None

12. MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE/EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

(Pages 123 - 136 of the Council agenda)

To receive and note the minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 20 April 2021, together with the respective statements of executive decisions taken by the Leader on 25 May, by the Deputy Leader in the absence of the Leader on 22 June, and by the Leader on 6 July 2021, which are attached to the Council agenda.

Comments:

None

13. COMMON SEAL

To order the Common Seal.