On behalf of all councillors, I would like to welcome you to this evening’s meeting.

I should be grateful if you would ensure that you switch off your mobile phones during the meeting.

If the fire alarm sounds during the course of the meeting - we are not expecting it to go off - everyone in the Council Chamber, Committee Room 1 and the main reception should leave immediately through the fire exits 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 address the Council in respect of any matter on the agenda. It also sets out details of any motions and amendments to be proposed in respect of the business on the agenda.

Unless a member of the public has given notice of their wish to address the Council, they will not be permitted to speak. Those who have given notice may address the Council for a maximum of 3 minutes duration. Speakers may not engage in any further debate once they have finished their speech. Other than the involvement of the petition organisers in the respective debates, no other member of the public will be permitted to speak or engage further in those debates.

In order to ensure that all councillors are able to participate in the debates without interruption, I shall ensure that we adhere strictly to the procedure rules in the Council’s Constitution in relation to the conduct of meetings.

Councillor Diana Lockyer-Nibbs,
The Mayor of Guildford
**AGENDA ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

To receive any apologies for absence.

**AGENDA ITEM 2: DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

Councillors are reminded that they need only disclose Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) as defined in the Code of Conduct. Councillors must withdraw from the meeting following any such disclosure.

**AGENDA ITEM 3: MAYOR’S COMMUNICATIONS**

To receive any communications from the Mayor.

**AGENDA ITEM 4: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Council is asked to agree to suspend Public Speaking Procedure Rules to enable all 14 speakers listed below to address the meeting this evening.

The following members of the public have given notice of their wish to address the Council in respect of agenda item 5:

1. Arnold Pindar
2. David King
3. Lois Driscoll
4. Tim Harrold
5. Susan Morris
6. Vivien White
7. Roland McKinney

The following members of the public have given notice of their wish to address the Council in respect of agenda item 6:

8. Robert Burch
9. Dr Peter Shaw
10. Ben Paton
11. Helen Jefferies
12. Fiona Curtis
13. Roland McKinney
14. Nick Norton

The Leader of the Council or the relevant lead councillor may make a statement in response to the public speakers.

**AGENDA ITEM 5: PETITION FROM EFFINGHAM RESIDENTS REGARDING THE MOLE VALLEY GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Petition organiser’s statement

The petition organiser, Jane Buckingham will make a statement to the Council in support of her e-petition and petition, which asks the Council:

“To recognise the wishes of Effingham residents of maintaining the Green Belt between Effingham and Bookham when Guildford Borough Council is consulted on the Mole Valley Green Belt review.”
The e-petition on the Council’s website provides further information as follows:

“Mole Valley is undertaking a Metropolitan Green Belt review, which could move the boundaries and protection of the existing Green Belt to allow new housing development to take place. The Bookham review has been delegated to a local forum, Bookham Vanguard, and it impacts Effingham residents as it could close the strategic gap between our villages and result in the loss of existing green space and wildlife habitat.

As Effingham residents, we believe it is important to protect this area of Green Belt and maintain a strategic gap between Bookham and Effingham.

We are strongly against any proposals that would result in closing or diminishing the existing gap and call on Guildford Borough Council to recognise the wishes of Effingham residents when the council is consulted on the Mole Valley Green Belt review”.

The petition organiser will have five minutes in which to make her statement, after which councillors will have the opportunity of asking her any questions. The Council will then debate the petition.

**The debate**

**Suspension of Council Procedure Rules**

The Mayor to ask the Council to agree to suspend Council Procedure Rules to allow the Lead Councillor for Planning and Governance (Councillor Monika Juneja) to speak for up to ten minutes in moving the respective motions in response both to this petition and the petition referred to in agenda item 6.

Proposed motion in response to this petition:

Councillor Monika Juneja to move, and Councillor Stephen Mansbridge to second, the following motion in response to the petition:

“The Council RESOLVES:

That its formal response to this petition is as follows:

1. The Council thanks the signatories to the petition from Effingham residents, and the organisers who have brought this matter to their attention. We recognise the deeply held concerns and strength of feeling about protection of the Green Belt between Effingham and Bookham.

2. The Council is well aware that one of the purposes of the Green Belt is to ‘prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another’.

3. The Council wishes to reassure the petitioners and residents that it has made no decisions itself about the future of the Green Belt within our borough. We are, however, in discussion with Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) about this and other issues, as part of an ongoing process of co-operation between neighbouring authorities through the development of our local plan.

4. The Council is well aware that the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 83) requires that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in “exceptional circumstances” through the preparation or review of the Local Plan, and this applies to both Guildford and MVDC. In its response to the MVDC Green Belt Boundary Review Consultation, the Council will remind them of this.
5. The Council will also urge MVDC to ensure that even if any amendment is made, there should continue to be a defined and defensible boundary between the two settlements. We shall also encourage MVDC to review all the sites within their review and not wait, producing more uncertainty, until the Guildford Draft Local Plan is published, as is suggested by the consultation.

6. The Council will forward the petition to MVDC and urge them to respond to it appropriately, but recommends that the Petitioners also present their concerns and wishes directly to MVDC before the Consultation period closes."

Comments:
Councillor Liz Hogger

Petition organiser’s right of reply
At the end of the debate and before the Council takes a vote on its response to the petition, Jane Buckingham shall have a right of reply for which she will be given a further period of five minutes.

The vote
After Ms Buckingham’s right of reply, the Council will take a vote on its response to the petition, which may be carried out in one of three ways:

1. By general affirmation of the meeting, where there is no dissent
2. By a show of hands
3. By a recorded vote. Any councillor may request a recorded vote before a vote is taken, provided that four other councillors signify their support for a recorded vote by standing. Each councillor present will then be asked, in turn, to vote on the motion. The minutes of the meeting will record how each councillor present voted.

After the vote is taken on this matter, the Mayor will ask the Council to agree to take a short (five-minute) break to allow time for anyone wishing to leave the Council Chamber to do so.

AGENDA ITEM 6: E-PETITION – STRATEGIC HOUSING MARKET ASSESSMENT (SHMA)

This e-petition closed on 19 February 2014 with 1,200 e-signatures.

Correction to report

Paragraph 6.3 of the report (Legal Implications) should read as follows:

“6.3 Thus the SHMA Report forms a crucial part of the evidence base upon which the Local Plan policies will be founded. As yet, it has not been finalised. No evidence of its alleged inadequacy has been presented to the Council. Evidence of the alleged inadequacy of the SHMA was not presented to the Council with the e-petition itself. However, by the time this e-petition is considered by the Council, we will have concluded a four-week SHMA engagement exercise. As part of this process, we note that evidence and commentary on the SHMA has been submitted by interested parties. This information is being analysed by officers and our consultants. An unwelcome draft conclusion does not mean there is any flaw or inadequacy in the body of the Report.”
E-Petition organiser’s statement

The e-petition organiser, Susan Parker will make a statement to the Council in support of her e-petition, which asks the Council:

“to prepare a new SHMA and reject the consultant's draft report as inadequate”.

The e-petition on the Council’s website provides further information as follows:

“The consultant’s report is unsound as the foundation for a draft SHMA. It contains errors, subjective assessment and manipulated data, and so needs to be redone. It is subject to challenge.

Guildford needs an objectively prepared SHMA which is proportionate and realistic, meets proper requirements and will not be overturned, and will be useable in the context of the Local Plan. We therefore petition the councillors to prepare a new SHMA as soon as possible in consultation with community groups and parish councils.”

The e-petition organiser will have five minutes in which to make her statement, after which councillors will have the opportunity of asking her any questions. The Council will then debate the e-petition.

The debate

Proposed motion in response to this e-petition:

Councillor Monika Juneja to move, and Councillor Stephen Mansbridge to second, the following motion in response to the e-petition:

“The Council RESOLVES:

That its formal response to this e-petition is as follows:

1. The Council thanks the signatories to the e-petition about the draft SHMA Report, and the organiser who has submitted it, and recognises that it justifies a full debate under the Council’s petition scheme.

2. In order to adopt a sound Local Plan the Council must follow lengthy prescribed statutory procedures, as well as following the guidance provided by the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. Paragraph 47 requires the Council to demonstrate a 5-year deliverable housing supply, which is linked to the likely need in the borough.

3. The Council’s consultants are a well-known professional firm, engaged in work of this nature regularly throughout England, and established as a business for over 90 years. The draft SHMA Report has analysed data about the likely need from reputable and reliable sources.

4. The Council has held stakeholder engagement exercises for elected members (16 January), all the Surrey Councils, developers, planning agents, housing associations and the Home Builders Federation (27 January), and Residents’ Associations (3 February). A Senior Planning Inspector for the UK, Keith
Holland, was amongst those took part on 16 January, and has had an opportunity of feeding back any concerns to G L Hearn.

5. The Council does not disagree with the major part of the e-petition, in that it recognises that the Borough needs an objectively prepared SHMA, which will be an important piece of evidence upon which the Council’s Local Plan policy will rely - once it has been formulated.

6. The e-petition asserts that the SHMA contains errors, is subjective and manipulates the data; however, no evidence was submitted with the e-petition in support of this assertion, but we recognise that formal submissions received in response to the SHMA consultation have questioned the accuracy and objectivity of the SHMA. All submissions will be properly considered by officers and our consultants to ensure that the final SHMA contains no factual inaccuracies and is sufficiently robust. We cannot agree with the e-petitioners’ view that the SHMA ‘will be subject to challenge’ and that we should immediately discard it, not least because such action would also be premature as the Report has yet to be finalised.

7. The sentiments expressed will be fed back to the consultants in finalising their Report, so that the e-petitioners’ views are properly taken into account. The Council appreciates the concerns held by the petitioners, whilst being unable to agree with them or take the action requested.”

Comments:
Councillor Bob McShee
Councillor Jenny Wicks

Petition organiser’s right of reply
At the end of the debate and before the Council takes a vote on its response to the petition, Susan Parker shall have a right of reply for which she will be given a further period of five minutes.

The vote
After Mrs Parker’s right of reply, the Council will take a vote on its response to the petition, which may be carried out in one of three ways:

1. By general affirmation of the meeting, where there is no dissent
2. By a show of hands
3. By a recorded vote. Any councillor may request a recorded vote before a vote is taken, provided that four other councillors signify their support for a recorded vote by standing. Each councillor present will then be asked, in turn, to vote on the motion. The minutes of the meeting will record how each councillor present voted.