

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

At a meeting of Guildford Borough Council held at Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford on Tuesday 8 July 2014.

*The Mayor, Councillor David Elms
*The Deputy Mayor, Nikki Nelson-Smith

- | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| * Councillor Richard Billington | * Councillor Jennifer Jordan |
| * Councillor Melanie Bright | * Councillor Monika Juneja |
| Councillor David Carpenter | Councillor Diana Lockyer-Nibbs |
| * Councillor Adrian Chandler | * Councillor Julia McShane |
| Councillor Mark Chapman | * Councillor Bob McShee |
| * Councillor Sarah Creedy | * Councillor Nigel Manning |
| * Councillor Graham Ellwood | * Councillor Stephen Mansbridge |
| * Councillor Zöe Franklin | * Councillor Anne Meredith |
| Councillor Steve Freeman | * Councillor Mrs Marsha Moseley |
| * Councillor Andrew French | * Councillor James Palmer |
| * Councillor Matt Furniss | * Councillor Terence Patrick |
| Councillor John Garrett | * Councillor Tony Phillips |
| * Councillor Christian Gilliam | * Councillor Mrs Jennifer E Powell |
| * Councillor David Goodwin | * Councillor Caroline Reeves |
| * Councillor Lizzie Griffiths | * Councillor Iseult Roche |
| * Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr. | * Councillor Tony Rooth |
| * Councillor Angela Gunning | * Councillor Pauline Searle |
| * Councillor Gillian Harwood | * Councillor Paul Spooner |
| Councillor Jayne Hewlett | * Councillor Nick Sutcliffe |
| Councillor Liz Hogger | * Councillor Keith Taylor |
| Councillor Christian Holliday | * Councillor Neil Ward |
| * Councillor Philip Hooper | * Councillor Jenny Wicks |
| * Councillor Gordon Jackson | * Councillor David Wright |

*Present

Honorary Aldermen Gordon Bridger, Mary-Lloyd-Jones, Bernard Parke and M A H M Williamson were also in attendance.

CO27 - APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors David Carpenter, Mark Chapman, Steve Freeman, Jayne Hewlett, Liz Hogger, Christian Holliday and Diana Lockyer-Nibbs and from Honorary Aldermen Keith Childs, Catherine Cobley, Clare Griffin, Jayne Marks, and Lynda Strudwick.

CO28 - LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT: DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest

CO29 - MINUTES

The Council confirmed the minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the Council held on 19 June 2014 as a correct record. The Mayor signed the minutes.

CO30 - MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor was pleased to report that the people of Guildford gave the soldiers of the 3rd Battalion of The Princess of Wales's Royal Regiment a very warm welcome on Armed Forces Day, despite the terrible weather. The Mayor was also very pleased to report that cadets from the local ACF had managed to collect over £1,300 for the Mayor's charity, ABF Surrey – The Soldiers' Charity, during the day.

CO31 – PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In accordance with Public Speaking Procedure Rule 1 (c), the following persons addressed the Council in relation to Item 6 on the Council agenda: E-Petition – Excess Housing (see Minute CO32 below):

- (1) Susan Parker
- (2) Helen Jefferies
- (3) Paul Kassell
- (4) Roland McKinney
- (5) Neville Bryan
- (6) Ben Paton
- (7) Karen Stevens

The following persons addressed the Council in relation to Item 7 on the Council agenda: E-Petition/Petition – Save Send Garages (see Minute CO33 below):

- (8) Vic Truscott
- (9) Brian Weller
- (10) Justin Sanders

(The webcast showing the contributions from each of the speakers may be viewed [here](#), timed at 00:11:57)

CO32 – E-PETITION – EXCESS HOUSING

In accordance with Public Speaking Procedure Rule 1 (d) and the Council's petition scheme, the e-petition organiser Mr Nick Norton made a statement to the Council in support of his e-petition containing 733 e-signatures of people who lived, worked or studied in the borough.

The e-petition had asked the Council:

“to reject their current aggressive pro-development pro-building strategy. The current strategy would mean building more housing than we need (and also more commercial buildings than we need) because of an incorrect perception that economic growth can only come from building. This strategy is unsustainable and must be rejected.”

The e-petition on the Council's website provided further information as follows:

“The current strategy from Guildford Borough Council involves an intention to build more housing than the current population needs (or than they are likely to need in the foreseeable future) and also more commercial buildings than existing businesses in the borough need to meet current requirements. There is no recognition of the real constraints that must be applied in order to preserve the environment we inhabit and no recognition of the legal requirement to ensure sustainability. This strategic direction seeks economic growth by an aggressive building programme, irrespective of the impact on existing residents.

This is expressed in the 2013-16 Corporate Plan, in the Enterprise M3 LEP minutes and elsewhere, becoming an element of the Council's strategic thinking. The 2013-2016 Corporate Plan informs the decision making processes of the Council and has been incorporated in the evidence base for the Local Plan but it has been subject to no public consultation as to whether this is what the residents of Guildford actually want.”

Before commencement of the formal debate on this e-petition, the Council

RESOLVED: That Council Procedure Rules be suspended to allow the Lead Councillor for Planning, 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 minute no CO33 below. The Lead Councillor for Planning, Councillor Monika Juneja proposed and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Stephen Mansbridge seconded the following motion for the purpose of the Council's formal response to the petition:

"The Council RESOLVES:

That its formal response to this petition is as follows:

1. The Council recognises that a significant number of residents are concerned about the future development of the Borough. It does not accept that its strategy is aggressive. Paragraph 20 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires the Council to help achieve economic growth by planning proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century.
2. The NPPF requires the starting point for the determination of our draft local plan housing target to be set out in a Strategic Market Housing Assessment (SHMA). The analysis of data within the SHMA, such as population and employment statistics provides us with a better understanding of our housing needs in the borough. We use this information plus evidence from other documents to set the housing target. There are a number of constraints that are imposed on us when determining our housing target. For example, we are required to demonstrate that we can, not only deliver sites and therefore new homes through the plan period, but significantly in the 1 to 5 year period. We will also be required to demonstrate that our strategy is deliverable and that if a large site or sites do not become available we have a plan B or indeed a plan C. This has meant that we have suggested the allocation of sites that if all were developed would exceed the target – which after all is not a maximum.
3. The Government published The Plan for Growth, alongside the Budget 2011, and as part of Autumn Statement 2011, announced a programme of structural reforms to remove barriers to growth for businesses and equip the UK to compete in the global race. These reforms span a range of policies including improving UK infrastructure, cutting red tape, root and branch reform of the planning system and boosting trade and inward investment.
4. The NPPF followed in March 2012. The main thrust of which is to achieve sustainable development. The NPPF is clear - development means growth - not just housing but economic. It is entirely appropriate that the local plan positively addresses this matter and continues to create jobs and support the growth in businesses. In order to inform the draft local plan we produced an Employment Land Assessment, which sets out how many new jobs we will require through the plan period.
5. The Council is fully aware that there are constraints on development within the borough such as the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and other environmental designations. These will be taken into account when reaching the final figure for the Borough's housing requirement, in the light also of the responses received to the current consultation on the draft Local Plan.
6. The Council is not obliged to consult on documents that fall within the evidence base for its Local Plan. However, as it is about to embark on a 12 week public consultation on the draft Local Plan, it would welcome detailed input from the petitioners on how - and why - they consider the draft Local Plan would over-provide both housing and economic development.

7. These issues are matters of conflicting and competing views amongst the local and wider community. The Council has a duty to take all such considerations properly into account, and balance the differing needs and views of people and businesses who make representations in finalising a Local Plan ready for examination for soundness.
8. Inevitably, this may mean some people will believe their views and needs have been given a lower priority than they would wish. The petitioners are therefore urged to express their views fully during consultation, and provide the Council with hard evidence in support of their arguments, so that the issues raised in this petition can be carefully evaluated before the Council comes to a final position on housing levels and economic growth.
9. It is up to the petitioners to feed into the statutory process of consultation, and the Council cannot at this point make a sudden change in policy without justification, or due observance of the prescribed procedures.
10. The Council thanks the petitioners for making their concerns known”.

Following the debate on the petition and the proposed response to it, and before the vote was taken thereon, Mrs Susan Parker exercised on behalf of the e-petition organiser, his right of reply on the debate.

The Council

RESOLVED: That the motion setting out the Council’s formal response to this e-petition, as set out above, be adopted.

Reason for decision:

To provide the Council’s formal response to the e-petition in accordance with the adopted Petition Scheme.

(The webcast debate on this item may be viewed [here](#), timed at 00:43:28)

CO33 – PETITION/E-PETITION – SAVE SEND GARAGES

In accordance with Public Speaking Procedure Rule 1 (d) and the Council’s petition scheme, the petition organiser Mr David Burnett made a statement to the Council in support of his petition and e-petition which contained a total of 443 signatures/e-signatures of people who lived, worked or studied in the borough.

The petition/e-petition had asked the Council:

“to cancel plans for a permanent traveller pitch in place of Send residents’ existing garages.”

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

“The eight garages on Wharf Lane in Send are used daily by residents. They reduce the amount of on-street parking, keeping the road free from congestion.

Guildford Borough Council would like the existing site of the garages to be included in the new Local Plan as one permanent traveller pitch. We the undersigned believe this site to be wholly unsuitable as a traveller pitch because:

The garages are a valued amenity for residents and have been fully occupied for years. The loss of the garages will create serious parking problems, resulting in poor traffic flow

and reduced accessibility for emergency vehicles. The site is located in a mature residential area and is adjacent to council bungalows housing disabled and older people.

At 15.2m x 17m, the site is smaller than the government's own guidelines for traveller pitches to accommodate a mobile home up to 25m. We would like GBC to remove the proposed site from its plans ahead of the public consultation period (July-September 2014)."

The Lead Councillor for Planning, Councillor Monika Juneja proposed and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Stephen Mansbridge seconded the following motion for the purpose of the Council's formal response to the petition:

"The Council RESOLVES:

That its formal response to this petition is as follows:

1. The Council is consulting on its Draft Local Plan, so at this point there is no certainty about the proposed new pitch. This is a site amongst many others on which we are consulting. However, because of the well-defined statutory processes for consulting on such proposals, the Council cannot agree to exclude the site at this point as requested by the petitioners. The proposal will be reviewed at the end of the 12-week consultation, once all responses are analysed, and the Council is able to prepare the Submission Draft of the draft Plan.
2. Exclusion of this site at the request of the petitioners would be premature and could be seen as the Council fettering its discretion in the Local Plan process, or acting 'at the dictation' of the petitioners. In either case, such premature action could give grounds for a legal challenge to the Plan.
3. The Council needs to keep its options open until completion of the public consultation on the draft Local Plan. The petitioners are therefore urged to feed into that process the detailed evidence they have of the loss of amenity, parking and traffic problems put forward in objection. Only after the consultation will the Council be in a position to analyse and evaluate the proposal, and to decide whether to include or exclude the land for a Travellers' pitch.
4. The Council would welcome the petitioners' input in the forthcoming consultation, and will be considering its acceptability and any possible alternatives. Its eventual decision will be reflected in the next Draft of the Local Plan.
5. The Council thanks the petitioners for making their views known."

Following the debate on the petition and the proposed response to it, and before the vote was taken thereon, Mr Burnett exercised his right of reply on the debate.

The Council

RESOLVED: That the motion setting out the Council's formal response to this petition/e-petition, as set out above, be adopted.

Reason for decision:

To provide the Council's formal response to the petition/e-petition in accordance with the adopted Petition Scheme.

(The webcast debate on this item may be viewed [here](#), timed at 01:48:38)

CO34 - QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9, Councillor Matt Furniss asked the Mayor, Councillor David Elms, the following question:

“I have been informed by an Honorary Freeman of the Borough and former Councillor that Guildford has a Borough Flag. Could I ask the Mayor if its whereabouts is known and, if so, whether we can start flying it once again from Guildford's flagpoles?”

The Mayor's response to this question was as follows:

“May I thank Councillor Furniss for his question. I can confirm that we have made a thorough search of storage areas at both Millmead House and the Depot and have not been able to locate such a flag. However, I do think that the idea has a great deal of merit and would be pleased to make enquiries as to design and cost with a view to commissioning a new flag. I shall keep councillors informed as to progress with this.”

Councillor David Elms
Mayor of Guildford

(The webcast debate on this item may be viewed [here](#), timed at 02:21:31)

CO35 - TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2013-14

The Council considered the Treasury Management Annual Report for 2013-14. The treasury management function involved the control and management of all the Council's cash, regardless of its source, including investments and borrowing. The Council's cash balances had built up over a number of years, and reflected a strong balance sheet, with considerable revenue and capital reserves. Officers carried out this function within the parameters set by the Council each year in the treasury management strategy statement.

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) treasury management Code of Practice and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities required the Council to set Prudential and Treasury Indicators. CIPFA also requires an annual report on treasury management activity and compliance with Prudential Indicators.

The objectives of the Prudential Code, and the indicators calculated in accordance with it, were to provide a framework for local authority capital finance that would ensure

- capital expenditure plans were affordable
- all external borrowing was within prudent and sustainable levels
- treasury management decisions were taken in accordance with professional good practice and
- in taking the above decisions, the Council was accountable by providing a clear transparent framework.

The annual report confirmed that the Council complied with its Prudential Indicators, treasury management policy statement and treasury management practices for 2013-14.

The report summarised the Council's treasury management performance over the past year, compared to estimate and discussed the factors affecting this performance. It also contained detailed information on the return on investments and interest paid on external debt.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Stephen Mansbridge, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the treasury management annual report for 2013-14 be noted.
- (2) That the actual Prudential Indicators reported for 2013-14, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved.

Reason for Decision:

To comply with the Council's treasury management policy statement, the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Code of Practice on treasury management and the CIPFA Prudential code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities.

(The webcast debate on this item may be viewed [here](#), timed at 02:29:09)

CO36 - NATIONAL ARMED FORCES DAY 2015

The Council noted that Armed Forces Day was held annually in June to celebrate and commemorate the service of men and women in the British Armed Forces. It was marked by a series of activities across the UK, with one town or city being chosen as the location for a highly prestigious National Armed Forces Day event.

With its strong historic and present day military links, the Council considered a report which outlined the case for Guildford submitting a bid to host the national event on 27 June 2015. This would give local residents and others in the region an opportunity to show their appreciation for serving and former Armed Forces personnel and, particularly relevant during the time of the First World War centenary commemorations, to remember the sacrifices they made and continue to make.

It was expected that there would also be significant benefits to the local economy through the large number of visitors who would attend the event. The extensive regional and national media coverage that would be received would also do much to promote Guildford as an attractive destination across the UK.

The report asked the Council to endorse a bid from Guildford to host National Armed Forces Day 2015 and to approve the required budgetary provision in respect of the overall cost, which was estimated to be £325,000.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Environment, Councillor Matt Furniss, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Stephen Mansbridge, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That Guildford's bid to host National Armed Forces Day on 27 June 2015 be endorsed.
- (2) That a supplementary estimate of £50,000 be approved for 2014-15 and provision of £275,000 be made in the 2015-16 budget to meet the estimated costs of hosting the event, to be funded from:
 - (i) £25,000 grant from the Ministry of Defence;
 - (ii) £150,000 of the 2013-14 underspend transferred to an earmarked reserve established for this purpose; and
 - (iii) estimated income of £150,000 to be derived through sponsorship, advertising and concessions.

- (3) That the Executive Head of Environment, in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Environment, be authorised to take all necessary action to deliver the National Armed Forces Day event.

Reason for Decision:

To endorse the submission of a bid to the Ministry of Defence (MoD) and, subject to its outcome, to allow Guildford to make budgetary provision and take all necessary action to host National Armed Forces Day in 2015.

(The webcast debate on this item may be viewed [here](#), timed at 02:31:44)

CO37 - REVIEW OF THE MAYOR'S AND DEPUTY MAYOR'S ALLOWANCES AND POSSIBLE SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY ALLOWANCE FOR THE MAYOR: RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL

The Council gave formal consideration to the report and recommendations arising from the review by the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor's Allowances and the possible introduction of a Special Responsibility Allowance for the Mayor in respect of chairing Council meetings.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Licensing and Governance, Councillor Paul Spooner, seconded by the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the issue of mayoral allowances be revisited in the full review of the councillors' scheme of allowances expected shortly after the borough council elections in 2015, at which point a greater evidence base will be available.
- (2) That, in the interim period, the level of the Mayor's allowance should remain unchanged at £8,000*.
- (3) That the Deputy Mayor's Allowance be increased to £2,000* backdated to 7 May 2014.
(*net of any provision for tax and NI contributions)
- (4) That a Special Responsibility Allowance be attached to the role of Mayor in respect of chairing Council meetings at the rate of £1,592 per annum, backdated to 7 May 2014.

Reason for Decision:

In order to comply with the requirements of The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 (as amended).

(The webcast debate on this item may be viewed [here](#), timed at 02:37:20)

CO38 - APPOINTMENT OF COUNCILLORS TO THE INFORMAL GUILDFORD LOCAL COMMITTEE CLUSTER MEETINGS

The Council was reminded that the Executive, at its meeting on 29 May 2014, had considered a report on enhanced joint working with Surrey County Council's Local Committee and, in particular supported the proposal to establish a series of informal local meetings in public to be convened as 'cluster meetings'. These meetings would divide the Borough into four areas to allow more local engagement with residents.

The objective of these meetings was to allow the Local Committee to provide a greater focus on public engagement and transparency through a councillor led dialogue with communities on local issues of importance to them.

The informal cluster meetings would take place annually in the Autumn, providing a forum for councillors from both councils to engage with residents within a locality. Parish councils and residents' associations would be invited to participate, publicise and assist in the organisation of the meetings.

Each cluster would comprise the county councillors for the area and an equivalent number of borough councillors nominated by this Council. The four cluster areas were as follows:

- (a) **Guildford Neighbourhoods Cluster** comprising:
 - the three county councillors representing the Guildford East, North and West divisions
 - three borough councillors to be drawn from the Burpham, Merrow, Stoke, Stoughton and Westborough wards
- (b) **Town Centre Cluster** comprising:
 - the two county councillors representing the Guildford South East and South West divisions
 - two borough councillors to be drawn from the Christchurch, Friary & St Nicolas, Holy Trinity and Onslow wards
- (c) **Eastern Parishes Cluster** comprising:
 - the two county councillors representing the Shere and Horsleys divisions
 - two borough councillors to be drawn from the Clandon & Horsley, Effingham, Lovelace, Send and Tillingbourne wards
- (d) **Western Parishes Cluster** comprising:
 - the three county councillors representing the Ash, Shalford and Worplesdon divisions
 - three borough councillors to be drawn from the Ash South & Tongham, Ash Vale, Ash Wharf, Normandy, Pirbright, Pilgrims, Shalford and Worplesdon wards

Having considered the various nominations received, the Council:

RESOLVED: That the following councillors be appointed to the cluster meetings indicated below:

Guildford Neighbourhoods Cluster

Councillor Christian Gilliam
Councillor Monika Juneja
Councillor Julia McShane

Town Centre Cluster

Councillor Adrian Chandler
Councillor Tony Phillips

Eastern Parishes Cluster

Councillor Terence Patrick
Councillor David Wright

Western Parishes Cluster

Councillor Nigel Manning
Councillor James Palmer
Councillor Tony Rooth

(The webcast debate on this item may be viewed [here](#), timed at 02:41:01)

CO39 - MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE

The Council

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 29 May, 4 June and 26 June 2014 be received and noted.

(The webcast debate on this item may be viewed [here](#), timed at 02:42:25)

CO40 - COMMON SEAL

The Council

RESOLVED: That the Common Seal of the Council be affixed to, or the Executive Head of Governance or in his absence the Managing Director, to sign on behalf of the Council any documents to give effect to any decisions taken by the Council at this meeting on 8 July 2014.

Mayor
7 October 2014