



GUILDFORD
B O R O U G H

BUDGET COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 8 FEBRUARY 2023

ORDER PAPER

ORDER PAPER (Pages 1 - 20)

This page is intentionally left blank



GUILDFORD BOROUGH

COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 8 FEBRUARY 2023

ORDER PAPER

WEBCASTING NOTICE

This meeting will be recorded for live and/or 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 Budget 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 Dennis Booth
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 – 10 of the Council agenda)

To confirm the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the Council held on 16 January 2023.

4. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

To receive any communications or announcements from the Mayor.

5. LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Leader of the Council to comment on the following matters:

- Becoming a Councillor briefing – Thursday 9 February 2023
- Purple Flag
- Voter ID at Polling Stations – Public Awareness Campaign

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

6. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No members of the public have registered to speak or ask a question.

7. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

(a) **Councillor Ramsey Nagaty** to ask the Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Finance and Planning Policy, Councillor Joss Bigmore, the following question:

- *“Proposed changes to the Planning System were recently announced by the Rt Hon Michael Gove MP.*
- *There is a consultation on changes to the NPPF.*
- *GBC has declared a Climate Change emergency.*
- *The ONS have confirmed that the housing need in the GBC Local Plan is greatly exaggerated.*

In view of the above, can the Lead Councillor for Planning Policy confirm that all necessary evidence (not merely infrastructure, economy, incorporation of the TCMP) is being gathered, specifically including a review of the Green Belt and Countryside study and an updated Brownfield Register?”

The Lead Councillor’s response is as follows:

The Council will have regard to all relevant factors when undertaking the Local Plan review in the context of National guidance on the matter. To support this, we will continue with preparatory work including gathering a proportionate and relevant evidence base to understand any changed circumstances affecting the borough.

At this stage, we are not of the view that circumstances have changed in such a way that means that undertaking an earlier review of the Local Plan would be advantageous to the borough and officers continue to work toward concluding a formal review towards the end of the statutory five-year period (i.e. by early next year) in line with the Council resolution in April 2022 (CO113).

Work will continue to be undertaken to update the relevant parts of the evidence base and this new evidence will be used to help inform the review.

A significantly greater evidence base would be required to support any updated (or new) Local Plan that is necessary following formal review. It would be premature to commission much of this work now prior to the outcome of a review, before a formal plan-making process is underway, and considering the significant uncertainty in relation to the national planning reform process and the potentially changed legal and national policy context for plan-making. Thus, following the review, an outline will be presented in terms of the extent of evidence base necessary and resources required to support a new plan-making process, and this will include consideration regarding whether our Green Belt and Countryside study remains fit for purpose.

This approach will enable us to respond flexibly to changing circumstances and avoids the risk of undertaking abortive work. That said, we are exploring if any evidence that is unlikely to become outdated can be produced jointly with Waverley Borough Council who have now carried out a review and decided to embark upon updating their evidence base.

Nevertheless, excellent progress is being made in the meantime with work toward adoption of our Local Plan Development Management Policies – I remain hopeful that we will be in a position to table the Plan before Council to consider for adoption during March following the Inspector’s consultation on his proposed main modifications that ended last week.

I am also pleased to report that in line with Council's resolution in April of last year that 'priority be given to the Production of a Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document' a draft of the SPD was presented to our cross party Local Plan panel this week. I hope that we will be in a position to consult on the document shortly.

Furthermore, we believe that the appropriate development of brownfield sites is a key means to achieve sustainable development and regeneration in our borough. To enable this, in November of last year, we published an update to our Brownfield Land Register which provides consistent information on brownfield sites that we consider to be appropriate for residential development. We will continue to keep this register current and plan on reviewing and updating it again before the end of this year".

- (b) **Councillor Maddy Redpath** to ask the Leader of the Council, and Lead Councillor for Housing and Community the following question:

"The refusal at Planning Committee of the North Street scheme demonstrated a clear disconnect between the priorities of the Executive and the Planning Committee. This was especially apparent between members of the Liberal Democrat Group.

The Housing Service under the stewardship of Cllr McShane is driving a scheme on Guildford Park Road which has a 9-storey element on land that is significantly higher than the North Street site. I am concerned that this may raise objection similar to those regarding height and massing on the North Street scheme especially given the proximity to the Cathedral.

Can the Lead Councillor for Housing and Community please confirm that there are no 'in principle' objections to the parameters of this scheme from her group, and especially from the ward members of Onslow, and Friary and St Nicolas. The Council has already spent around £7mn on this scheme over the past decade and is yet to submit a Planning Application, this Council can't afford any more unnecessary surprises, and our residents can't suffer from more delays to Housing and Regeneration".

The Lead Councillor's response is as follows:

"The development of the Guildford Park Road site is a priority for this administration and the entire Liberal Democrat group, as we believe it represents a fantastic opportunity for high quality, sustainable, affordable housing in a central location which is adjacent to existing transport infrastructure. The Liberal Democrat group remain committed to our manifesto promise to provide much needed affordable housing, because our borough desperately needs it and without it, we will see our communities diminished as young people and those on low incomes are priced out of the area.

While there have been discussions within the Liberal Democrat group about the principles underlying the Guildford Park Road development, these discussions have been held strictly on the basis that nothing said would be binding on Planning Committee members or fetter the independence of their decision

making in any way. Planning Committee members must approach any application with an open mind and avoiding preconceived opinions in order to determine the application on its own merits.

The evolving scheme for the Guildford Park Road site is being developed with consideration of the impact of the scheme both on the local community and the wider environment. The initial proposals having full regard to Planning policy and good design practice have been reviewed and refined to reflect the contributions and feedback from a range of stakeholders. We anticipate that as we continue to move forward with the scheme that there may be future revisions to the design, but it must be noted that the current proposal maintains important views across the town to the Cathedral. This development unlike other developments will provide at least 40% of the homes as social housing and with the money already invested having provided site access and put in place much needed infrastructure.

As a member of the Planning Committee, Cllr Redpath will no doubt remember her Probity in Planning Training and particularly the part where councillors who are members of the committee must not make up their minds on how to vote before formally considering the application, listening to the officer presentation, any representations and the full debate.

As she attended the meeting when the North Street scheme was considered, she will also recall that in her introduction of the application, the Chairman of the Planning Committee read out a prepared statement making it clear that GBC have contracted for the sale of land it owns within the site but that the existence of the contract was not a material planning consideration in respect of determining the application. Therefore, it should be very clear to everyone that members of the Planning Committee are not bound by the priorities of the Executive, and they should not be taking the Executive's views into account when making a decision relating to land in which the Council has an interest.

For that reason, no pressure or influence was put by the leadership of the Liberal Democrat group on members of the Planning Committee to vote in a certain way. Cllr Redpath comments that the outcome of the Planning Committee demonstrated a clear disconnect between the priorities of the Executive and the Planning Committee. I thank her for pointing this out as there should, correctly, be a disconnect between Executive and Planning Committee”.

- (c) **Councillor Tony Rooth** to ask the Lead Councillor for Regeneration, Councillor John Rigg the question set out below. (Councillor Rigg's response to each element of the question is set out in **red type** below.)

“Everyone should recognise Councillor Rigg's experience of dealing with large scale projects and major developers, including many years as a senior director with Savills. He has put in tremendous time and effort towards promoting the proposed planning application for North Street development put forward by St Edward, a joint venture between the developers, Berkeley Homes and M&G, who are represented by Savills.

May I please ask the Lead Councillor for Regeneration the following questions in relation to the North Street planning application:

- (1) How many meetings /discussions have taken place between GBC Corporate team (headed by yourself and Director Dawn Hudd) with the developers and Savills in respect of the proposed development?

I do not believe there were any meetings with Dawn Hudd, the developers and Savills present. There have been no discussions as far as I'm aware between myself and Savills or Dawn Hudd and Savills on North Street. Details of other meetings held with the developer and advisors have already been provided to Cllr Rooth.

- (2) How many meetings / discussions have taken place between the GBC Corporate team and GBC Planning in respect of the developer's planning application and the officer's report to the Planning Committee?

I have had no meetings with GBC Planning on North Street. I did attend with others including GBC Planning a meeting with the Design Panel South East. The Council Officer Corporate Team has had 2 or 3 informal meetings to provide general information about the development site. This was mainly general background information to help put matters into context. Equally we have both had occasional calls seeking information as any council member or the public may do.

- (3) Could he please disclose details of presentation, minutes/notes, both formal and informal, in respect of such meetings / discussions?

Minutes available have already been provided to Cllr Rooth.

For myself as a regular bus user, may I also ask him the following questions in respect of the bus access and egress proposed bus interchange (which have been strongly objected to by Surrey County Council Transport and Highways, major bus operators and bus users' representative):

- (4) The same questions as in questions 1, 2 and 3 above to also include transport, highways and architectural advisers.

Details of meetings with the Developer and their advisers have already been provided to Cllr Rooth.

- (5) Could he please also disclose the advice requested and provided in relation to continuance of the present bus access alongside the Friary Centre as layout guidance including the Bus and Coach Station Design and Operation?

Copies of all reports and advice in respect of all aspects of the bus station are publicly available on the Guildford Borough Council planning Portal.

- (6) Could he please also disclose the advice that was requested and provided in relation to the possible relationship on North Street between buses and

pedestrians / cyclists and other pavement users which have been satisfactorily introduced in several towns and cities?

Copies of all reports and advice in respect of all aspects of the bus station are publicly available on the Guildford Borough Council planning Portal.

- (7) *Could the Lead Councillor confirm that discussing the bus station appearance, facilities etc. before the issue of access/egress to the bus station itself was resolved, was raised by myself and Paul Millin of SCC Highways and described as “being the cart before the horse” at meetings of the Bus Station Review group in November /December 2021 and in subsequent email exchanges, and could those emails be disclosed?*

I do not recollect that specific phrase. Perhaps Cllr Rooth can provide the emails he refers to. The redesign of the North in and North out arrangements from Leapale Road were, of course, considered in great detail over two years eventually by three firms of professional transportation consultants and found to be acceptable contrary to the Surrey County Council and bus companies’ objections which were not evidence based. Equally the capacity of the bus station following redesign was shown to be more than adequate with further expansion capacity available and that maintaining the southern entrance for buses via the gyratory and North Street was not in the interests of health and safety, including accidents and pollution and was actively against the interests of placemaking, the creation of a pocket park, pedestrianisation and community environmental and other wins.

- (8) *Finally, could the Lead Councillor please confirm the cost to date expended in relation to work on the proposed refurbishment of the bus station, excluding the access/egress issue, both in terms of time and money?*

Scott Brownrigg were appointed to advise the Council on the refurbishment of the bus Station. Their fee was £22,750.00 plus VAT. They were on a set fee, so time was not recorded. We have no access to the developer’s additional cost information coordinating the Scott Brownrigg designs into the bigger scheme and the supporting detailed technical transportation studies or supporting film evidence of underuse of the current bus station.

My questions relate to the access and egress to the proposed bus interchange (and the projected effects on size, capacity and layout of the proposed bus interchange and bus services generally, bus routes and bus times etc.) rather than the facilities and design of the bus station itself which clearly needs total refurbishment.”

8. PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2023-24 (Pages 11 – 22 of the Council agenda)

The Lead Councillor for Climate Change and Organisational Development, Councillor George Potter to propose, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“That the Pay Policy Statement for the 2023-24 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.”

Comments:

None

9. CAPITAL AND INVESTMENT STRATEGY (2023-24 TO 2027-28) (Pages 23 - 108 of the Council agenda)

Section 151 Officer’s statutory comments on the budget reports

Before the Council considers the budget reports, the Mayor to ask the Section 151 Officer, Peter Vickers, to comment on them.

The motion

The Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Finance and Planning Policy, Councillor Joss Bigmore, to propose, and the Leader of the Council, and Lead Councillor for Housing and Community, Councillor Julia McShane to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- “(1) That the General Fund and HRA capital estimates, as shown in Appendices 2 and 3 to the report submitted to the Council, as amended to include the bids approved by the Executive at its meeting on 26 January 2023, be approved.
- (2) That the Minimum Revenue Provision policy, referred to in section 5 of the report, 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 thereto.
- (4) That the updated flexible use of capital receipts policy at Appendix 8 to the report, be approved.

Reasons:

- To enable the Council to approve the capital and investment strategy for 2023-24 to 2027-28
- To enable the Council to approve the funding required for the new capital schemes proposed

Comments:

None

10. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUDGET 2023-24 (Pages 109 – 130 of the Council agenda)

Correction:

On page 112 of the agenda, the comments of the Joint EAB (24 January 2023) are actually set out in Section 13 of the report.

Councillors' speeches:

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (f), there shall be no time limit for the Lead Councillor for Housing and Community in moving the motion to approve the Housing Revenue Account budget, or for one spokesperson from each opposition group in commenting on that motion. Normal Procedure Rules will apply in respect of all other councillors speaking in the debate - i.e., they will have five minutes each, and the Lead Councillor will have up to 10 minutes (if necessary) to sum up at the end of the debate.

The motion:

The Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Housing and Community, Councillor Julia McShane to propose, and the Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Finance and Planning Policy, Councillor Joss Bigmore to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- “(1) That the proposed HRA revenue budget for 2023-24, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved.
- (2) That a rent increase of 5%, be implemented.
- (3) That the fees and charges for HRA services for 2023-24, 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.”

Comments:

Councillor Nigel Manning (Conservative Group Spokesperson)
Councillor Angela Gunning (Labour Group Spokesperson)
Guildford Greenbelt Group Spokesperson *tbc*
Councillor Tony Rooth

11. GENERAL FUND BUDGET 2023-24 AND MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2024-25 TO 2026-27 (Pages 131 - 210 of the Council agenda)

Council Tax Precepts

The Council is required to formally approve the aggregate Council Tax for residents of Guildford Borough, including its own Council Tax requirement and the Council Tax requirements of the other relevant major precepting authorities, which are Surrey County Council (SCC) and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey (PCCS).

We have received confirmation that neither SCC nor the PCCS have set an excessive Council Tax for 2023-24 and details of their respective precepts are set out in the Council tax resolution below.

Councillors' speeches:

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (f), there shall be no time limit for the Lead Councillor for Finance and Planning Policy in moving the motion to approve the General Fund Budget and proposed Council Tax, or for one spokesperson from each opposition group in commenting on that motion. Normal Procedure Rules will apply in respect of all other councillors speaking in the debate – i.e., they will have five minutes each, and the Lead Councillor would have up to 10 minutes (if necessary) to sum up at the end of the debate.

Requirement for Recorded Vote

Under The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 and Council Procedure Rule 19 (d), the Council is required to conduct a recorded vote on the proposed budget and Council tax resolution referred to below.

Restriction on Voting

Councillors' attention is drawn to the requirements of Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as set out in paragraphs 7.10 of the report (pages 148 and 149 of the Council agenda).

The Motion (Budget and Council Tax Resolution):

The Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Finance and Planning Policy, Councillor Joss Bigmore, to propose, and the Leader of the Council, and Lead Councillor for Housing and Community, Councillor Julia McShane to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- (1) That the budget be approved, and specifically that the Council Tax requirement for 2023-24 be set at £11,392,760 excluding parish precepts and £13,566,876 to include parish precepts.
- (2) That the Band D Council Tax for 2023-24 (excluding parish precepts) be set at £192.41, an increase of £5.59 (2.99%).
- (3) That the Band D Council Tax for 2023-24 (including parish precepts) be set at £229.12.
- (4) That the Council approves the following, as considered by the Executive on 26 January 2023:
 - (i) the General Fund revenue estimates for 2023-24 including proposed fees and charges relating to General Fund services, as set out in Appendix 4 to the report submitted to the Council;
 - (ii) the Housing Revenue Account estimates for 2023-24, including housing rents and other fees and charges;
 - (iii) the Capital and Investment Strategy for 2023-24; and
 - (iv) the Housing Revenue Account capital programme for 2023-24.
- (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 2023-24 in accordance with regulations made under Sections 31B (3) and 34(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) ('the Act'):

(i) 59,212.12 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 2023-24 for the whole Council area.

(ii) For those parts of the borough to which a parish precept relates:

Parish of	
Albury	619.95
Artington	137.20
Ash	7,275.55
East Clandon	152.39
West Clandon	718.34
Compton	482.45
Effingham	1,322.41
East Horsley	2,606.21
West Horsley	1,547.13
Normandy	1,359.26
Ockham	269.21
Pirbright	1,258.51
Puttenham	312.03
Ripley	915.91
St. Martha	400.04
Seale & Sands	509.60
Send	2,154.53
Shackleford	379.55
Shalford	1,889.64
Shere	1,985.19
Tongham	1,005.09
Wanborough	181.20
Wisley (Meeting)	107.31
Worplesdon	3,637.27

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 2023-24 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:

- (i) £147,783,389 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) £134,216,513 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) of the Act
- (iii) £13,566,876 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) £229.12 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) £2,174,116 being the aggregate amount of all special items (parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act as follows:

Parish of	£
Albury	43,602
Artington	4,915
Ash	547,587
East Clandon	9,556
West Clandon	26,143
Compton	26,873
Effingham	129,781
East Horsley	151,342
West Horsley	97,055
Normandy	154,481
Ockham	15,935
Pirbright	77,361
Puttenham	14,600
Ripley	91,390
St. Martha	13,850
Seale & Sands	19,500
Send	85,233
Shackleford	16,700
Shalford	117,375

Shere	178,822
Tongham	42,190
Wanborough	5,500
Wisley (Meeting)	0
Worplesdon	304,325
Total	2,174,116

(vi) £192.41 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	262.74
Artington	228.23
Ash	267.67
East Clandon	255.12
West Clandon	228.80
Compton	248.11
Effingham	290.55
East Horsley	250.48
West Horsley	255.15
Normandy	306.06
Ockham	251.60
Pirbright	253.88
Puttenham	239.20
Ripley	292.19
St. Martha	227.03
Seale & Sands	230.68
Send	231.97
Shackleford	236.41
Shalford	254.53
Shere	282.49
Tongham	234.39

Wanborough	222.76
Wisley (Meeting)	192.41
Worplesdon	276.08

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	175.16	204.35	233.54	262.74	321.12	379.51	437.89	525.47
Artington	152.15	177.51	202.87	228.23	278.94	329.66	380.38	456.45
Ash	178.44	208.18	237.93	267.67	327.15	386.63	446.11	535.33
East Clandon	170.08	198.42	226.77	255.12	311.81	368.50	425.19	510.23
West Clandon	152.53	177.95	203.37	228.80	279.64	330.48	381.33	457.59
Compton	165.40	192.97	220.54	248.11	303.24	358.38	413.51	496.21
Effingham	193.70	225.98	258.26	290.55	355.11	419.68	484.24	581.09
East Horsley	166.98	194.81	222.65	250.48	306.14	361.80	417.46	500.95
West Horsley	170.10	198.45	226.80	255.15	311.84	368.54	425.24	510.29
Normandy	204.04	238.04	272.05	306.06	374.07	442.08	510.09	612.11
Ockham	167.73	195.69	223.64	251.60	307.51	363.42	419.33	503.19
Pirbright	169.25	197.46	225.67	253.88	310.29	366.71	423.13	507.75
Puttenham	159.46	186.04	212.62	239.20	292.35	345.51	398.66	478.39
Ripley	194.79	227.26	259.72	292.19	357.12	422.05	486.98	584.37
St. Martha	151.35	176.58	201.80	227.03	277.48	327.93	378.38	454.05
Seale & Sands	153.78	179.41	205.05	230.68	281.94	333.20	384.46	461.35
Send	154.64	180.42	206.19	231.97	283.51	335.06	386.61	463.93
Shackleford	157.60	183.87	210.14	236.41	288.94	341.48	394.01	472.81
Shalford	169.68	197.96	226.25	254.53	311.09	367.65	424.21	509.05
Shere	188.32	219.71	251.10	282.49	345.26	408.04	470.81	564.97

Tongham	156.26	182.30	208.34	234.39	286.47	338.56	390.64	468.77
Wanborough	148.50	173.25	198.01	222.76	272.26	321.76	371.26	445.51
Wisley (Meeting)	128.27	149.65	171.03	192.41	235.16	277.92	320.68	384.81
Worplesdon	184.05	214.73	245.40	276.08	337.43	398.78	460.13	552.15
TOWN AREA								
Guildford	128.27	149.65	171.03	192.41	235.16	277.92	320.68	384.81

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 2023-24, (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	1,116.72	1,302.84	1,488.96	1,675.08	2,047.32	2,419.56	2,791.80	3,350.16
(ii) PCCS	207.05	241.55	276.06	310.57	379.59	448.60	517.62	621.14

- (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	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
PARISH	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p	£ p
Albury	1,498.93	1,748.74	1,998.56	2,248.39	2,748.03	3,247.67	3,747.31	4,496.77
Artington	1,475.92	1,721.90	1,967.89	2,213.88	2,705.85	3,197.82	3,689.80	4,427.75
Ash	1,502.21	1,752.57	2,002.95	2,253.32	2,754.06	3,254.79	3,755.53	4,506.63
East Clandon	1,493.85	1,742.81	1,991.79	2,240.77	2,738.72	3,236.66	3,734.61	4,481.53
West Clandon	1,476.30	1,722.34	1,968.39	2,214.45	2,706.55	3,198.64	3,690.75	4,428.89
Compton	1,489.17	1,737.36	1,985.56	2,233.76	2,730.15	3,226.54	3,722.93	4,467.51
Effingham	1,517.47	1,770.37	2,023.28	2,276.20	2,782.02	3,287.84	3,793.66	4,552.39
East Horsley	1,490.75	1,739.20	1,987.67	2,236.13	2,733.05	3,229.96	3,726.88	4,472.25
West Horsley	1,493.87	1,742.84	1,991.82	2,240.80	2,738.75	3,236.70	3,734.66	4,481.59
Normandy	1,527.81	1,782.43	2,037.07	2,291.71	2,800.98	3,310.24	3,819.51	4,583.41
Ockham	1,491.50	1,740.08	1,988.66	2,237.25	2,734.42	3,231.58	3,728.75	4,474.49
Pirbright	1,493.02	1,741.85	1,990.69	2,239.53	2,737.20	3,234.87	3,732.55	4,479.05
Puttenham	1,483.23	1,730.43	1,977.64	2,224.85	2,719.26	3,213.67	3,708.08	4,449.69
Ripley	1,518.56	1,771.65	2,024.74	2,277.84	2,784.03	3,290.21	3,796.40	4,555.67
St. Martha	1,475.12	1,720.97	1,966.82	2,212.68	2,704.39	3,196.09	3,687.80	4,425.35
Seale & Sands	1,477.55	1,723.80	1,970.07	2,216.33	2,708.85	3,201.36	3,693.88	4,432.65
Send	1,478.41	1,724.81	1,971.21	2,217.62	2,710.42	3,203.22	3,696.03	4,435.23
Shackleford	1,481.37	1,728.26	1,975.16	2,222.06	2,715.85	3,209.64	3,703.43	4,444.11
Shalford	1,493.45	1,742.35	1,991.27	2,240.18	2,738.00	3,235.81	3,733.63	4,480.35
Shere	1,512.09	1,764.10	2,016.12	2,268.14	2,772.17	3,276.20	3,780.23	4,536.27
Tongham	1,480.03	1,726.69	1,973.36	2,220.04	2,713.38	3,206.72	3,700.06	4,440.07
Wanborough	1,472.27	1,717.64	1,963.03	2,208.41	2,699.17	3,189.92	3,680.68	4,416.81
Wisley (Meeting)	1,452.04	1,694.04	1,936.05	2,178.06	2,662.07	3,146.08	3,630.10	4,356.11
Worplesdon	1,507.82	1,759.12	2,010.42	2,261.73	2,764.34	3,266.94	3,769.55	4,523.45
TOWN AREA								
Guildford	1,452.04	1,694.04	1,936.05	2,178.06	2,662.07	3,146.08	3,630.10	4,356.11

*Note: Wisley Parish Meeting

In accordance with the Executive's decision at its meeting on 8 August 2002 (see Minute No. 270 – 2002-03), the Chief Finance Officer has anticipated the precept for 2023-24 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 2023-24 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 2023-24 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 2023, as set out below:

	Year ending	
	31 March 2022 £	31 March 2023 £
1. Balances brought forward	3,605	3,605
2. (+) Annual precept	Nil	Nil
3. (+) Total other receipts	0	3
4. (-) Staff costs	Nil	Nil
5. (-) Loan interest/capital repayments	Nil	Nil
6. (-) Total other payments	Nil	Nil
7. (=) Balances carried forward	3,605	3608
8. Total cash and investments	3,605	3,608
9. Total fixed assets and long-term assets	Nil	Nil
10. Total borrowings	Nil	Nil

Reason:

To enable the Council to set the Council Tax requirement and council tax for the 2023-24 financial year.

Comments:

Councillor Nigel Manning (Conservative Group Spokesperson)
Councillor James Walsh (Labour Group Spokesperson)
Guildford Greenbelt Group Spokesperson) *tbc*

12. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE 2021-22 (Pages 211 - 226 of the Council agenda)

The Chairman of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee, Councillor Deborah Seabrook to propose and the Lead Councillor for Climate Change and Organisational Development, Councillor George Potter to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“That the annual report of the Corporate Governance & Standards Committee for 2021-22, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be adopted.

Reason:

To ensure that the Committee is accountable for its work to the full Council.

Comments:

None

13. APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY MAYOR 2023-24 (Pages 227 - 230 of the Council agenda)

Update:

Since the publication of the agenda for this meeting, no nominations for Deputy Mayor for 2023-24 have been received. In the circumstances, unless a nomination is made at the meeting, it is suggested that the appointment of Deputy Mayor for 2023-24 be held over until after the Borough Council Elections and dealt with at the Annual Meeting on 10 May 2023.

14. APPOINTMENT OF JOINT INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL (Pages 231 - 244) of the Council Agenda)

The Lead Councillor for Planning Development, Legal and Democratic Services, Councillor Tom Hunt to propose and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“That Rodney Bates and Paul Marcus be appointed to the Joint Independent Remuneration Panel for a period of up to four years commencing with the 2023-24 municipal year.

Reason:

To comply with the requirements of The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003, and both councils' wish to establish a JIRP comprising of five members.

Comments:

None

15. MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE (Pages 245 - 258 of the Council agenda)

To receive and note the minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 24 November, 12 December 2022, and 5 January 2023 which are attached to the Council agenda.

Comments:

None

16. NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 27 JANUARY 2023: LOCAL PLAN (page 4 of the Council Agenda)

Alteration of Motion:

Since the publication of the agenda, the proposer of the original motion (Councillor Ramsey Nagaty) has indicated that he wishes to alter the motion in accordance with the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), which he can do with the consent of his seconder (which he has) and of the meeting.

The Mayor will put the proposed alteration, which is set out below, to a vote without debate. If approved, Councillor Nagaty's motion, as altered, will become the substantive motion for debate to which amendments may subsequently be moved.

Alteration:

Substitute the text of the original motion with the following:

“Guildford Borough Council is legally obliged to review the Local Plan 2019 by April 2024. Having taken Counsel's advice, the Council previously debated and decided not to accelerate this review because of the risk of higher housing targets being imposed. This could have brought more pressure and threat to the Green Belt, not less, and therefore would have been counter-productive. Nevertheless, the Council also decided to put in hand some preparatory work to enable that 2024 review of the Local Plan.

Since that decision was taken, there have been speeches by the government that suggest they are more protective of the Green Belt. There is considerable uncertainty in the planning system: changes to the NPPF are being consulted on; there are proposed changes to the Standard Method (used to calculate the number of homes required); and there may be changes to the legislation as part of the Planning Reform Bill. All this is new compared to when Council last debated whether to conduct an early review or update of our Local Plan.

The Council therefore

RESOLVES:

(1) That as part of a Local Plan update 2024, Council will investigate:

- (a) whether there are exceptional circumstances that would enable the return of allocated, but as yet undeveloped, countryside sites to Green Belt status and how to effect this; and
 - (b) the possibility of reducing the local housing need figure according to the Standard Method, as well as the housing allocation number for each allocated site not yet brought forward, in light of Guildford's specific issues relating to high student numbers and significant environmental constraints.
- (2) That consideration should then be given to whether this potentially reduced local housing need figure can be delivered sustainably in light of the increased priority of environmental factors”.

Subject to the Council's approval, Councillor Nagaty to propose the motion, as altered, and Councillor Tim Anderson to second.

17. COMMON SEAL

To order the Common Seal.