

STATEMENT OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

Monday, 20th March, 2023

The decisions summarised below were taken by the Executive at the above-mentioned meeting and, subject to the call-in procedure referred to in Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 17 and to Note (a) at the end of this document, shall have effect 96 hours after the meeting. Details of any recommendations to Council are also included for completeness.

Members of the Executive

Chairman:

Councillor Julia McShane (Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Community and Housing)

Vice-Chairman:

Councillor Joss Bigmore (Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Finance and Planning Policy)

Councillor Tim Anderson, (Lead Councillor for Assets and Property)

Councillor Tom Hunt, (Lead Councillor for Planning Development, Legal and Democratic Services)

Councillor George Potter, (Lead Councillor for Climate Change and Organisational Development)

Councillor John Redpath, (Lead Councillor for Customer and Commercial Services)

Councillor John Rigg, (Lead Councillor for Regeneration)

Councillor James Steel, (Lead Councillor for Environment and Regulatory Services)

*Present

Councillor Ramsey Nagaty was in remote attendance.

Agenda Item No.		Officer(s) to action Item
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Julia McShane, Leader of the Council, Councillor Tim Anderson and Councillor Tom Hunt.</p>	
2.	<p>LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
3.	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held 23 February were agreed as correct. The Chairman signed the minutes.</p>	
4.	<p>LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</p> <p>Leader's announcements were deferred to be delivered at full Council on 22 March.</p>	
5.	<p>REPLACEMENT OF GUILDFORD SPECTRUM</p> <p>The report was withdrawn prior to the meeting as further work was required.</p>	Kelvin Mills
6.	<p>COMMUNITY ASSET TRANSFER POLICY</p> <p><u>Decision:</u></p> <p>The Executive approved the adoption of the Community Asset Transfer Policy, asset out in Appendix 1 to the report, incorporating the updated wording to page 7. subparagraph 6 as set out in the Supplementary Information Sheet.</p> <p><u>Reason(s):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council did not currently have a policy on the transfer of assets to community groups. • To deliver community objectives. <p><u>Other options considered and rejected by the Executive:</u></p> <p>Do nothing – Do not adopt the policy. This would not address having a consistent decision-making process and community groups and Council officers would not have a clear procedure to</p>	Damien Cannell

follow if a group wished to submit an expression of interest

Details of any conflict of interest declared by the Leader or lead councillors and any dispensation granted:

None.

7. GUILDFORD'S UK SHARED PROSPERITY FUND AND RURAL ENGLAND PROSPERITY FUND

Decision:

Abi Lewis

1. Approved the progression of Guildford's UKSPF and REPF plans, as outlined in the report.
2. Delegated to the Strategic Director of Place, in consultation with the Leader, authority to enter into such other contracts and legal agreements connected with the UKSPF and REPF as may be necessary in compliance with Procurement Procedure Rules and within the allocated grant funding budget.

Reason(s):

The £1.4 million total funding Guildford Borough Council had been allocated from the UKSPF and REPF was a significant sum of money that could have a positive impact on the borough's local communities and businesses.

Grounded on insights from local stakeholders, partners and GBC Councillors and Officers, the projects put forward in Guildford's Investment Plan and REPF Addendum aligned with the borough's local priorities and intent to leverage collaboration with the Council's partners to maximise value for money.

Other options considered and rejected by the Executive:

OPTION 1: The Executive could have decided not to approve the proposed interventions (including changes) for Guildford's UKSPF and REPF. This would make the Council unable to advance the proposed projects and make use of the £1.4 million allocated by DLUHC and DEFRA within the prescribed timescales to empower our local businesses and communities.

Details of any conflict of interest declared by the Leader or lead councillors and any dispensation granted:

None.

8. ADOPTION OF GUILDFORD BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

Decision:

Stuart
Harrison

1. That subject to the adoption of the Local Plan: Development

Management Policies, the Parking Standards for New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (at Appendix 6) be adopted.

2. That the Lead Councillor with portfolio responsibility for Planning Policy be authorised, in consultation with the Joint Strategic Director of Place, to make such minor alterations to improve the clarity of the Parking Standards for New Development SPD as they may deem necessary.
3. To note that Executive comments will be passed to the full Council meeting on 22 March 2023 via the Order Paper.

The Executive further

RECOMMEND (to Council):

- (1) That the Local Plan: Development Management Policies (as set out in Appendix 4 to the report), which incorporates the Inspector's Main Modifications (at Appendix 2 to the report) and the Council's Minor Modifications (at Appendix 3 to the report), be adopted.
- (2) That the Secretary of State be requested to exercise his powers to revoke the 'residual' policies of the 2003 Local Plan.
- (3) That updates to the Guildford Borough Policies Map be adopted in line with the Local Plan: Development Management Policies including additions proposed at Appendix A of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies, as amended by the Inspector's main modification 6.
- (4) That the Lead Councillor with portfolio responsibility for Planning Policy be authorised, in consultation with the Joint Strategic Director of Place, to make such minor alterations to improve the clarity of the LPDMP as they may deem necessary.

Reason(s):

1. To enable the adoption of the Parking Standards for New Development SPD to provide further guidance regarding the implementation of LPDMP Policy ID11 [now Policy ID10]: Parking Standards for New Development.
2. To enable minor alterations to be made to the SPD should they be necessary prior to publication
3. To enable the adoption of the LPDMP in line with the Council's Local Development Scheme and for the plan to become part of the Council's development plan, carrying full weight in the determination of planning applications.
4. To enable the revocation of the 'residual' Local Plan 2003 policies that are not superseded by policies contained in the LPDMP.

5. To ensure that changes are brought about to the policies map in line with the adoption of the LPDMP.
6. To enable minor alterations to be made to the LPDMP should they be necessary prior to publication

Other options considered and rejected by the Executive:

None.

Details of any conflict of interest declared by the Leader or lead councillors and any dispensation granted:

None.

NOTES:

- (a) Any decision marked “#” means that the item was deemed by the Joint Chief Executive and agreed by the Executive and Chairman of the scrutiny committee to which the matter would be referred to be a matter of urgency for the reason indicated and, in accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 17 (h), such decision takes effect immediately and is therefore *not* subject to the call-in procedure.

The call-in procedure is as follows:

- (i) the Chairman of a scrutiny committee; or
- (ii) a minimum of five members of the Council

may require that a decision be referred to the next available meeting of a scrutiny committee for review.

- (c) Councillors wishing to exercise their right to call-in a decision taken by the Executive must give notice in writing to the Joint Chief Executive. The reason for a councillor calling-in a decision shall accompany any such request and must meet one of the following criteria:
- (a) that there was insufficient, misleading or inaccurate information available to the decision-maker;
 - (b) that all the relevant facts had not been taken into account and/or properly assessed;
 - (c) that the decision is contrary to the budget and policy framework and is not covered by urgency provisions; or

- (d) that the decision is not in accordance with the decision-making principles set out in the Constitution.

Such notice should be marked for the attention of John Armstrong who can be contacted by e-mail on john.armstrong@guildford.gov.uk

- (d) On receipt of a call-in request, the Joint Chief Executive, or his nominated deputy (John Armstrong) will decide, in consultation with the chairman of the scrutiny committee to which the matter would be referred, whether it is valid and will notify the councillors concerned accordingly.
- (e) In the case of a valid call-in, the Joint Chief Executive shall refer the decision to the next available meeting of a scrutiny committee.
- (f) A decision marked with an asterisk denotes that the matter is a “Key Decision” which is defined in the Council’s Constitution as an executive decision:
 - (i) which is likely to result in significant expenditure or savings (of at least £200,000) having regard to the budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or
 - (ii) which is likely to have a significant impact on two or more wards within the Borough.