

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Draft Minutes of a meeting of Guildford Borough Council held at Council Chamber, Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey GU2 4BB on Tuesday 3 December 2019

- * Councillor Richard Billington (Mayor)
- * Councillor Marsha Moseley (Deputy Mayor)

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| * Councillor Paul Abbey | * Councillor Ted Mayne |
| * Councillor Tim Anderson | * Councillor Julia McShane |
| * Councillor Jon Askew | Councillor Ann McShee |
| * Councillor Christopher Barrass | * Councillor Bob McShee |
| * Councillor Joss Bigmore | * Councillor Masuk Miah |
| * Councillor David Bilbé | * Councillor Ramsey Nagaty |
| * Councillor Chris Blow | * Councillor Susan Parker |
| * Councillor Dennis Booth | * Councillor George Potter |
| Councillor Ruth Brothwell | Councillor Jo Randall |
| * Councillor Colin Cross | * Councillor John Redpath |
| * Councillor Graham Eyre | * Councillor Maddy Redpath |
| * Councillor Andrew Gomm | * Councillor Caroline Reeves |
| * Councillor Angela Goodwin | * Councillor John Rigg |
| * Councillor David Goodwin | * Councillor Tony Rooth |
| * Councillor Angela Gunning | * Councillor Will Salmon |
| * Councillor Gillian Harwood | * Councillor Deborah Seabrook |
| * Councillor Jan Harwood | * Councillor Pauline Searle |
| * Councillor Liz Hogger | * Councillor Patrick Sheard |
| * Councillor Tom Hunt | * Councillor Paul Spooner |
| * Councillor Gordon Jackson | Councillor James Steel |
| * Councillor Diana Jones | * Councillor James Walsh |
| * Councillor Steven Lee | * Councillor Fiona White |
| * Councillor Nigel Manning | * Councillor Catherine Young |

*Present

Honorary Freeman Jen Powell and Honorary Aldermen Keith Childs, Terence Patrick, and Nick Sutcliffe were also in attendance.

CO78 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ruth Brothwell, Ann McShee, Jo Randall, and James Steel and from Honorary Aldermen Catherine Cobley, Sarah Creedy, Clare Griffin, Jayne Marks, and Lynda Strudwick.

CO79 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

CO80 MINUTES

The Council confirmed, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2019. The Mayor signed the minutes.

CO81 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor reported on the recent deaths of Mr David Cranham, former Mayor's Chauffeur who had been diagnosed with Alzheimer's, and Mr Jim Cunningham, from the Heritage Services team, who had been killed in a road accident.

The Council observed a moment's silence in memory of them.

CO82 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications from the Leader of the Council.

CO83 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr Keith Chesterton, on behalf of the Defend our Bus Station Group, asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, the following question:

"Can the Leader of the Council, on behalf of Guildford Borough Council, please make every effort to keep the bus station in its present location, but also to make sure it is improved?"

Bus passengers have made it plain on several occasions that overwhelmingly they want the bus station where it is but for it to be improved.

In 2017, the Council commissioned Systra to do consultations with stakeholders, including bus passengers, on the design and location of bus facilities in the centre of Guildford.

The summary report (GBC Ref 1056142) makes it clear that the vast majority of stakeholders, and certainly bus passengers wanted the bus station to remain where it is now but to improve it.

This confirmed what I with other members of the Defend our Bus station Group, found when in 2011/12 we spoke to hundreds of bus users at the bus station. We also collected 2,600 signatures to a petition "Don't Move the Bus Station – Improve It". Nothing has happened since to invalidate the results.

The primary reason for the Council wanting to move the bus station in the first place was so that John Lewis and a major shopping development with car park could be put in its place. Economic changes have now made that impossible.

Others wanted a full bus interchange at the railway station. This would always have been difficult but the Solum development has now made that impossible.

Thus the two reasons for moving it have disappeared.

The bus station is an essential part of the infrastructure of Guildford and should not be moved to suit the convenience of developers."

The Leader of the Council's response was as follows:

"The Policy allocation (A5) for North Street redevelopment includes a requirement (point 8) that the 'Bus interchange facilities presently provided at Guildford bus station on the site are to be provided in a suitable alternative arrangement to be located either partly or wholly on or off site.' Maintaining suitable bus interchange facilities in Guildford town centre is a key consideration in relation to any forthcoming planning application for the site.

The Council are aware of issues with the current facility. In line with the Local Plan policy, we will be working with the developer at North Street to secure provision of a suitable alternative to meet passenger needs.

There will be public consultation on redevelopment proposals for the North Street site, including in relation to the Bus Station, as part of the planning process."

Councillor Caroline Reeves
Leader of the Council

CO84 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

- (1) Councillor Steven Lee asked the Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration, and Housing Delivery, Councillor Jan Harwood, the following question:

“Guildford has a huge and persistent problem with regular traffic jams and congestion. We were recently named the most congested town in England and the issue ranked as number one with our residents in a recent poll.

With the planned development for Guildford and its environs over the next ten to fifteen years, there is a unique window of opportunity to work with County Highways and Highways England to overhaul our road infrastructure and thereby reduce congestion as part of the framework of development.

Given this, can the Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration and Housing Delivery tell us whether the planning department has considered creating a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to identify and safeguard potential future routes for new road infrastructure to alleviate traffic through Guildford - whether that be access points for a tunnel, a bypass route or any other practical option? If not, would they be willing to consider creating such an SPD?”

The Lead Councillor’s response was as follows:

“The Council works with both Surrey County Council and Highways England, respectively the statutory highway authorities for local and strategic roads.

The now adopted Local Plan: Strategy and Sites was prepared with the active involvement of both Surrey County Council and Highways England (and its predecessor the Highways Agency) in the period from 2012. The Council worked with these and other partners to align their strategies and investments for transport with our forward planning of development patterns. As the Local Plan inspector noted in his report on the plan, the Council worked ‘through an extensive number of working groups and stakeholder meetings’ on transport matters (para 17).

It should be noted that specific requirements for junctions on the local and strategic road networks to be provided or have their capacity increased are set out in site allocation policies including for the strategic sites in the adopted Local Plan: Strategy and Sites. Highways England and Surrey County Council were statutory consultees for the public consultations on the draft versions of the plan, and their comments with respect to proposed changes to the local and strategic road networks were taken into account by Guildford Borough Council in the preparation of the plan.

Beyond those proposed changes to the local and strategic road networks described in the adopted plan, neither Highways England nor Surrey County Council requested, or has since made a request, that Guildford Borough Council further allocates or safeguards land for potential future routes for new public road infrastructure.

It is worth noting that, in agreement with Network Rail, the site allocation as Policy A7 Land west of Guildford railway station, was “allocated for a ‘Guildford platform capacity’ scheme involving additional platforms and layout changes at Guildford railway station as proposed in the Wessex Route Study”. Policy A28 allocates a site for a new rail station at Guildford West (Park Barn) on the North Downs Line adjacent to the Royal Surrey County Hospital.

In the statutory spatial planning arena, sites can only be allocated for new highway or transport infrastructure or safeguarded for potential future new highway or transport infrastructure through the preparation of a Local Plan (which is a Development Plan Document). This cannot be done through a Supplementary Planning Document. In a future review of the Local Plan, or preparation of a new Local Plan, it would be possible to explore whether further allocations or safeguarding for highway infrastructure can be justified at that time. This would need to be evidence based and be promoted/supported by the relevant highway authority.

Statutory highway authorities, including Highways England and Surrey County Council, also have bespoke statutory powers such as the power to prescribe improvement lines for widening public highways (under the Highways Act 1980 as modified) and Development Consent Orders (under the Planning Act 2008)”.

Councillor Jan Harwood

Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration, and Housing Delivery

Arising from a supplementary question, which sought clarification as to whether the Lead Councillor agreed that increasing roads or tunnels would reduce urban congestion, the Lead Councillor confirmed that theoretically if there were more roads with the same number of cars there would be less congestion, but in respect of a viable approach to traffic issues, the answer was probably “no”.

- (2) Councillor Tony Rooth asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, the following question:

“In view of the challenges faced to keep our town centre vibrant, our retailers trading and our shops open could the Leader of the Council confirm what steps the Council is taking to bring residents and visitors alike into our town by making attractions such as the Guildhall more available and open to the public?”

The Leader of the Council's response was as follows:

“While we do have a number of empty retail sites in the town, the most recent visitor numbers show an improvement from 2017, with 4.9 million tourism trips to the Borough with an improved overall spend of over £238.2 million and I believe we have worked hard to deliver an enhanced Visit Guildford brand through a new dedicated website and social media reach. The Tourist Information Centre also works hard to support town centre events and sells tickets for a number of key arts/cultural organisations. The retail sector everywhere has suffered and the issue of over inflated rents in this area will have to be addressed by the site owners or landlords. Of course, if a national chain folds then the store in Guildford will close even if it was successful. It should be noted that our independent stores have succeeded in bucking the trend.

A number of initiatives to support increased footfall have been undertaken and include:

- *Five new specialist markets in the High Street this year (Vegan and antique markets) that have been really successful*
- *Events like Innovate Guildford and the Digital Games Festival have brought new visitors to Guildford*
- *We are currently discussing tailored walks with the town guides for local employers and we have sent over 100 welcome packs to local businesses that include tourism and events information covering the town centre.*
- *Specifically looking at the retail sector following our meeting with Experience Guildford we agreed to explore the opportunities for more training with retailers on e-commerce and digital marketing – a number of retailers have also benefited from GBC business grants. We are mapping the ownership of units to see if we*

can identify ways of influencing the institutional owners to be more proactive in promoting their shops and looking at whether we can put in temporary vinyls to improve the appearance of empty units and also look at opportunities for pop-up shops.

We could be proactive in promoting the Guildhall for Corporate use (businesses that attended business leaders' dinners in the past have often asked about it). There is also an idea that the Guildhall or the Brewhouse could be used for music recitals. However, given both buildings are listed there may be additional costs incurred in being maintained as regular venues with health and safety considerations for this kind of use.

A few years ago, we set up a study group to look at the use of town centre venues, perhaps this should be reviewed through an Executive Advisory Board?"

Councillor Caroline Reeves
Leader of the Council

In response to a supplementary question, which sought the Leader's view on opening the Guildhall for greater use by the public, the Leader suggested that the use of town centre venues, including the Guildhall, should be reviewed through an Executive Advisory Board. The Leader also suggested that, as retail was not the only reason people visit Guildford, the Council should also be looking at promoting all the historical attractions in the town in order to attract a much broader group of visitors.

- (3) Councillor John Redpath asked the Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration, and Housing Delivery, Councillor Jan Harwood, the following question:

"This Council agreed unanimously in July that it wants to master plan the town centre appointing a best in class multi-disciplinary team of external experts to identify the best possible options for the town. The question about progress asked at the last council meeting received a noncommittal reply. After years of town centre deterioration and obfuscation on this subject it was assumed by many councillors the council motion required action now.

The challenges of congestion, pollution, accidents, inadequate housing delivery, missed environmental opportunities around the river and poor public realm require action.

I would like to ask will the Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration and Housing Delivery confirm that he will instruct the Director of Planning and Regeneration to abide by this unanimous motion to appoint external best in class experts immediately in order to produce the best outcomes which can be identified and implemented by the most appropriate planning route?"

The Lead Councillor's response was as follows:

"The process described in the Council resolution [item CO29, 23 July 2019] has and is being progressed. In this regard, the Planning and Regeneration Department is driving this by:

- (1) conducting stakeholder engagement toward developing a set of shared objectives for revitalising Guildford town centre (People and Places are appointed to assist the Council) and the draft report will be ready this month;*
- (2) reviewing previous work commissioned in relation to the Town Centre including previous masterplanning, with a view to informing the next steps and further*

work (David Lock and Associates are appointed to assist the Council). Again this initial work will be with GBC shortly; and

- (3) *submitting a funding bid to Council, which anticipates further work required to progress in line with the Council resolution. It is intended that this bid will be considered in February 2020 and be included in the budget for the next financial year”.*

Councillor Jan Harwood
Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration, and Housing Delivery

In response to a supplementary question, which asked the Lead Councillor to confirm whether he would instruct, or had instructed, the Director of Planning and Regeneration to appoint external best in class experts, the Lead Councillor confirmed that, from his written answer, he had set out to make the appointment.

- (4) **Councillor Deborah Seabrook** asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, the following question:

“Residents are disappointed that the county council are not moving to Guildford, the county town. It feels like a missed opportunity.

I would like to ask the Leader of the Council:

- (a) *What efforts did the leadership make to persuade Surrey County Council to choose Guildford?*
- (b) *What was the strategy and how and by whom was it agreed?*
- (c) *Who led the bid team and what was its composition?*
- (d) *Why was there no communication or consultation with the whole council about negotiations?*
- (e) *Why was Woking chosen in preference to Guildford?*
- (f) *What is the assessment (including but not limited to financial aspects) of the impact and lost opportunity for Guildford of SCC’s move to Woking?*
- (g) *What has been learned and put into practice to ensure Guildford does not lose out on any future opportunities?”*

The Leader of the Council’s response was as follows:

“As part of the ‘Moving Closer to Residents’ project launched by Surrey County Council (SCC) in late 2018, SCC initially advised borough and district (B&D) councils of its intention to move out of County Hall in Kingston into Surrey by the end of 2020. The programme for doing so is based on increasingly agile ways of working for most staff and the creation of a ‘Civic Heart’, based in the county, accommodating Councillors, (including Cabinet and Scrutiny Committee meetings), the Corporate Leadership Team, democratic services and aspects of other support services such as legal and finance services. The ‘Civic Heart’ was described at that stage as needing to be owned freehold by SCC and potentially comprising around 250 staff but only requiring 100 to 150 desks as staff would be working in increasingly agile ways. In order to identify a new location for the Civic Heart, SCC embarked upon a search exercise, focused on Guildford and Woking as preferred locations, in the following three stages:

- (1) *SCC contacted all B&D councils in the county to ask if any of them had any buildings within their asset portfolios that may be suitable for the ‘Civic Heart’,*
- (2) *SCC employed two property agents to identify a building in Surrey to which a cohort of staff from County Hall, comprising those that work most closely in support of Members and the democratic procedures and processes of the Council (i.e. the Civic Heart) could be relocated to.*

- (3) SCC employed property agents to source a suitable building in Surrey large enough to provide the opportunity to move most staff from County Hall, and some other locations, into a single building.

A link to the SCC Cabinet papers for September and November detailing their 'Closer to Residents' project can be found on their website but for convenience the links are:

<https://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/documents/s63147/item%2015%20-%20MCTR%20Cabinet%20Report%20300819%20DRAFT%20v0.4.2.1.pdf>

<https://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/documents/g6331/Public%20reports%20pack%20Tuesday%2026-Nov-2019%2014.00%20Cabinet.pdf?T=10>

Other reports detailing the project can also be found on SCC's website.

In late 2018, Guildford along with a number of other councils responded to SCC's initial request with the details of a number of assets within our portfolio that we thought may be suitable, the list included Guildford Borough Council's Millmead Offices. The reason for including the Millmead offices was that through our Future Guildford Programme and our own move towards more agile working, the Council does have over 100 desk spaces available within our own building that were offered to SCC. SCC holds its Council and Committee meetings during the day whereas GBC holds its meetings in the evening. Officers also understand that Guildford's Council Chamber is the only Council chamber of the B&D councils in Surrey that is large enough to host a SCC full Council meeting. As such officers considered that there was significant opportunity for sharing office space between the two councils.

In response to specific questions.

(a) What efforts did the leadership make to persuade Surrey County Council to choose Guildford?

As SCC's business case has progressed over the last 12 months, a number of meetings between officers of the two councils were held including meetings between Chief Executive / Managing Director, Directors, Property, Facilities and ICT staff. In addition, officers understand that informal conversations between the former Leader and Deputy Leader and SCC's Leader and key members of the SCC Cabinet were also held. Guildford Officers also provided considerable information regarding the Millmead Offices to Surrey Officers and we understand a number of Surveys were undertaken at Millmead by SCC to help inform their business case. Since the May 2019 election, Officers have briefed the new Leader (GBC), Deputy Leader and Lead Councillor for Finance, Assets and Customer Service regarding the on-going discussions between the two councils about SCC sharing Guildford's Millmead offices for the purposes of its Civic Heart.

In October 2019, we heard that SCC had identified a suitable building in Woking as the new Headquarters (HQ) for SCC. This coincided with our own situation where one of our commercial properties was now vacant and this was having a large financial impact on this Council. One of the options discussed internally at this Council was to look and see if there was scope for this council to move to that site and allow SCC to lease the Millmead site for their HQ. The MD approached SCC's Chief Executive to gauge the level of interest there might be for SCC to lease the Millmead site, potentially fully furnished, and for us to move to our other building. SCC indicated they would wish to take freehold ownership of any building, so the proposal was revised to consider selling the freehold of the whole site to SCC, again potentially fully furnished. Please note that we had not worked up any acquisition costs or costs for us to move to another site at this time – these were simply early discussions. The SCC Council Leader and Chief Executive

visited GBC offices, Managing Director and Leader in early October to again view the site. Clearly, we had not been through appropriate consultation exercises with our staff, councillors or public so could not make any decisions. We had simply wanted to test the possibilities of a proposal of this nature with a view to trying to secure the SCC HQ here at Guildford and addressing our financial challenge in relation to the other building. In view of some of the challenges raised by the whole site (e.g. Annex, partial acquisition, access, etc.) and SCC's timeline for definitively settling matters which ran ahead of our own internal processes the proposal was not developed any further. SCC made an announcement regarding their move to Woking at the end of October 2019.

(b) What was the strategy and how and by whom was it agreed?

There was no formal strategy. Initial discussions were focussed around building a business case for SCC to share Guildford's Millmead offices and civic suite. The reason this idea was pursued was to increase partnership/joint working, share costs of office accommodation and enable better utilisation of Council offices. Our indicative proposal in October 2019 was a reaction to hearing about the main HQ being at Woking and addressing our financial challenge with our commercial building.

(c) Who led the bid team and what was its composition?

There was no 'bid team' as SCC's approach was not to invite bids but to collaboratively discuss options with B&D councils. Later in the process, SCC engaged two property agents to search the local market for suitable offices that were not already in public sector ownership. The Managing Director, Director of Finance, Facilities Manager and Corporate Property Manager were the staff most involved in discussions with SCC Chief Executive, Director of Transformation and Property Officers.

(d) Why was there no communication or consultation with the whole council about negotiations?

The former Council had previously agreed, as part of the savings proposals for its 2017-18 budget, to lease out spare office space within the Millmead offices to generate rental income. Under the Council's Constitution, a decision to lease a part of the Council's Millmead offices (or any of our property) is a decision that would be taken under Officer delegated authority by the Corporate Property Manager, in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Finance, Assets and Customer Services. The Council already has a number of tenants within its Millmead offices and the decision to lease the vacant space to those tenants and on what terms is an operational decision.

That said, if it had become apparent that the option of sharing the Millmead offices with SCC was SCC's preferred option then the Full Council would have been informed.

Also, the option discussed in October 2019 to potentially sell the Millmead site to SCC could only have proceeded with full consultation having taken place with staff, councillors and the public. As stated previously, aspects of the site and disposal, along with SCC's timetable did not allow for this this option to be developed any further.

(e) Why was Woking chosen in preference to Guildford?

This is a matter for SCC and is set out in the SCC Cabinet report referenced (and link provided) above.

(f) What is the assessment (including but limited to financial aspects) of the impact and lost opportunity for Guildford of SCC's move to Woking?

We have not carried out an assessment and do not feel it would be a valuable use of time or money to undertake one. The office space at Millmead is in the process of being leased to SCC for their 'Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH)' so it is not anticipated that there will be a loss of rental income. Other office space at Millmead is also already leased to SCC for its Guildford Adult Social Care team and discussions are also on-going about SCC locating other teams at Millmead in the future subject to space availability.

(g) What has been learned and put into practice to ensure Guildford does not lose out on any future opportunities?

Joint working between the two councils continues as it has always done. Where opportunities to collaborate and share services or property arise Officers will continue to explore them. The fact that there is no available vacant office block large enough to accommodate SCC's needs at a price it can afford in Guildford is somewhat outside of this Council's control. However, the Council's adopted local plan does make provision for the development of further employment space within the town centre."

Councillor Caroline Reeves
Leader of the Council

In response to a supplementary question, the Leader confirmed that the key factor around the lack of consultation with councillors in respect of this matter was the lack of time allowed for the Council to go through a process of talking to Members and officers and working out how we would decant into a new building.

CO85 LOCAL COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME 2020-21

The Council received a report on its statutory duty to consider annually whether to revise its Local Council Tax Support Scheme (LCTSS), replace it with another or make no changes. The Council was obliged to consult with interested parties if it wished to revise or replace the scheme. In addition, the Council had to approve a scheme for the 2020-21 financial year by 31 January 2020.

In 2019-20, a number of minor changes were made to the scheme. For 2020-21, it was proposed to introduce the following changes, which could be met from within the existing revenue budget:

- Increase Premiums to ensure that the help given does not unduly reduce due to inflation.
- Increase Non-Dependant Deductions to reflect an expectation that their contribution to the household expenses should increase each year.
- Update Income and Capital Disregards to include "the Windrush Compensation Scheme". This mirrored the government's change to the Pension Age scheme, and ensured that recipients were not penalised for receiving compensation. It also ensured that claimants were treated consistently across all schemes.
- Amend the definition of pension age and working age in accordance with the government's changes to the Council Tax Reduction Schemes (Prescribed Requirements) (England) Regulations 2012 for 1 April 2020, once they were received.

A stakeholder consultation was held between 16 September and 13 October 2019, the results of which were set out in the report. It was noted that although the County Council and Police and Crime Commissioner had supported the changes, the overall response did not overwhelmingly support for or against any the proposed changes for 2020-21.

Councillors noted that the Council continued to operate in a tough financial climate and that its medium-term financial plan position remained challenging. However, it was recognised that passing on further savings via the LCTS scheme in 2020-21 would place additional financial pressure on vulnerable households. A discretionary hardship fund would help support any resident suffering adversely from the consequences of savings in welfare support over the past seven years, in addition to the proposed changes for 2020-21.

The Executive had considered the report at its meeting on 26 November 2019 and had endorsed the recommendation therein.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Housing, Access and Disability, Councillor Angela Goodwin, seconded by the Lead Councillor for Finance and Assets, Customer Service, Councillor Joss Bigmore, the Council:

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the current Local Council Tax Support Scheme be amended for 2020-21, as set out in detail in Appendix 2 to the report submitted to the Council, with effect from 1 April 2020.
- (2) That the Council maintains a discretionary hardship fund of £40,000 in 2020-21.

Reasons:

- (1) To ensure that the Council complies with legislation to implement a Local Council Tax Support Scheme from 1 April 2020.
- (2) To maintain a discretionary fund to help applicants suffering from severe financial hardship.

CO86 REVIEW OF COUNCILLORS' ALLOWANCES - REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL

The Council considered the report and recommendations of the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) on its review of Councillors' Allowances, together with the separate recommendations of the Executive. The Council had appointed the IRP for the purpose of reviewing the existing scheme of allowances, including making recommendations on the types of allowance and amounts to be paid.

The Lead Councillor for Finance and Assets, Customer Service, Councillor Joss Bigmore proposed, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, seconded a motion to adopt the IRP's recommendations, as amended by the Executive.

Having considered the report including the Executive's recommendations and, having regard to the recommendations of the IRP, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Basic Allowance payable to all members of Guildford Borough Council be £7,405 per annum.
- (2) That the maximum number of recipients of Special Responsibility Allowances at any one time does not exceed 50% of Council Members (24 Members).
- (3) That the Leader of the Council continues to receive a Special Responsibility Allowance of 200% of the basic allowance, £14,810 per annum.
- (4) That the Deputy Leader receives a Special Responsibility Allowance of 50% of the Leader's Special Responsibility Allowance, £7,405 per annum.

- (5) That the Members of the Executive, the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Mayor receive a Special Responsibility Allowance of 40% of the Leader's Special Responsibility Allowance, £5,924 per annum.
- (6) That the Shadow Leader's Special Responsibility Allowance be withdrawn.
- (7) That the Chairman of the Licensing Committee, the Deputy Mayor, the Chairman of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee, the Chairs of the Executive Advisory Boards and the Guildford Joint Committee Chair each receive a Special Responsibility Allowance of 25% of the Leader's Special Responsibility Allowance, £3,703 per annum.
- (8) That the Vice Chair of the Guildford Joint Committee receive a Special Responsibility Allowance of 10% of the Leader's Special Responsibility Allowance, £1,481 per annum.
- (9) That the Chairs of the Licensing Sub-Committees continue to be eligible to receive a Special Responsibility Allowance on a per meeting basis, currently £280 per meeting.
- (10) That Political Group Leaders continue to receive a Special Responsibility Allowance of 1% of the Basic Allowance per group member (£74 per councillor per annum).
- (11) That the role of Deputy Lead Councillor should not be awarded a Special Responsibility Allowance.
- (12) That co-optees continue to receive an allowance of 2.5% of the Leader's Special Responsibility Allowance, £370 per annum.
- (13) That Travelling and Subsistence Allowance should continue to be payable to councillors and co-opted members in connection with any approved duties.
- (14) That the amounts payable in respect of Travelling and Subsistence Allowance should continue to be the amounts which are payable to officers of the Council for travelling and subsistence undertaken in the course of their duties.
- (15) That Councillors should also be permitted to claim for reimbursement of any reasonable parking charges incurred whilst on approved duties.
- (16) That the Dependants' Carers' Allowance should be based on two rates. Rate one for general care be at a rate of £10.58 per hour, with no monthly maximum claim. Rate two should be for specialist care based at cost upon production of receipts and requiring medical evidence that this type of care is required.
- (17) That no change should be made to the current eligibility conditions for receipt of the Dependants' Carers' Allowance, except that the duties for which this allowance is payable should be in accordance with the list of approved Councillor duties. The Council should also actively promote the allowance to prospective and new councillors both before and following an election.
- (18) That the level of the Mayor's and the Deputy Mayor's allowances payable under Sections 3 and 5 respectively of the Local Government Act 1972 to meet the expenses of their offices should remain unchanged at £8,000 and £2,000 per annum respectively.
- (19) That the recommended duties for which Dependants' Carers' Allowance and Travelling and Subsistence Allowance should be payable should be amended to include councillor ward and constituency activities including attendance at ward surgeries.
- (20) That the Council considers the introduction of a policy to support parental leave for councillors as outlined in the Panel's report.

- (21) That the basic allowance, each of the SRAs, the Co-Optees' Allowance and the Dependants' Carers' Allowance be increased annually in line with the percentage increase in staff salaries until 2023, at which time the Scheme shall be reviewed again by an independent remuneration panel.
- (22) That the new scheme of allowances to be agreed by the Council in December 2019 be implemented with effect from the beginning of the 2020-21 financial year, at which time the current scheme of allowances will be revoked.

Reason:

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

CO87 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW OF THE PARISHES OF EAST HORSLEY AND EFFINGHAM

Councillors were reminded that at its meeting on 23 July 2019, the Council had approved a request from East Horsley Parish Council to conduct a community governance review (CGR) in accordance with provisions of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 ("the 2007 Act") regarding the following proposals:

Proposal 1

Subject to Proposal 2 below, to alter the existing boundary between the parishes of East Horsley and Effingham in the area close to Effingham Common.

Proposal 2

To recommend to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England ("LGBCE") that it approves the change of the existing boundary between the Clandon and Horsley ward and the Effingham ward of the Borough Council so that it is coterminous with the change to the parish boundary referred to in Proposal 1 above.

Proposal 3

To increase the maximum number of councillors to be elected to East Horsley Parish Council from nine councillors to twelve councillors.

The Council considered a report setting out details of the representations received during the consultation period and the options open to the Council in making its formal response to the CGR.

Upon the motion of Councillor Liz Hogger, seconded by Councillor Catherine Young, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That, taking account of the statutory considerations, the Council agrees the outcome of the community governance review as follows:
 - (a) to alter, with effect from 1 April 2023, the existing boundary between the parish of East Horsley and the North Ward of the parish of Effingham in the area close to Effingham Common along the route shown in the terms of reference of the review, subject to the further alteration described in paragraph 9.2 (b) of the report submitted to the Council;

- (b) to recommend to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England that it approves, as a consequential change, an alteration of the existing boundary between the Clandon and Horsley ward and the Effingham ward of the Borough Council so that it is coterminous with the change to the parish boundary referred to in (a) above;
 - (c) to increase the number of parish councillors to be elected to East Horsley Parish Council from nine to twelve with effect from the next scheduled parish council elections in May 2023; and
 - (d) to make no other changes:
 - (i) to the parishes of East Horsley and Effingham or
 - (ii) to the electoral arrangements for East Horsley Parish Council and Effingham Parish Council.
- (2) That the Democratic Services Manager be authorised to make a community governance reorganisation order under Sections 86 and 88 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to give effect to the decision approved in paragraph (1) above, together with all necessary incidental, consequential, transitional or supplementary provisions as may be required to give full effect to the order.

Reason:

To ensure that community governance within the area under review is:

- reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area; and
- is effective and convenient

CO88 TAXI AND PRIVATE HIRE ENFORCEMENT - DELEGATIONS FOR SURREY JOINT WARRANTING

The Council considered a report which sought approval for the proposed arrangements between Surrey Licensing Authorities to introduce joint warranting for Licensing Officers to enable improved enforcement of the taxi and private hire trade across the County.

This proposal had been considered and supported by the Licensing Committee at its meeting on 25 September 2019. The delegation of non-Executive functions to another local authority and the acceptance of any delegation of functions from another local authority were decisions that only full Council may take.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Waste, Licensing, and Parking, Councillor David Goodwin, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Council's Taxi and Private Hire enforcement powers, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be delegated jointly to the following licensing authorities:
- Elmbridge Borough Council
 - Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
 - Mole Valley District Council
 - Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
 - Runnymede Borough Council
 - Spelthorne Borough Council
 - Surrey Heath Borough Council
 - Tandridge District Council
 - Waverley Borough Council
 - Woking Borough Council

without prejudice to the Council's ability to exercise those powers itself within the Borough.

(2) That similar delegated Taxi and Private Hire enforcement powers be accepted from the following licensing authorities:

- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
- Mole Valley District Council
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Runnymede Borough Council
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Tandridge District Council
- Waverley Borough Council
- Woking Borough Council

(3) That the Regulatory Services Manager be authorised to undertake the Taxi and Private Hire enforcement powers referred to in paragraph (2) above.

Reason:

To improve safety within the licensed hackney carriage and private hire vehicle service operating in Surrey.

CO89 SELECTION OF THE MAYOR AND THE DEPUTY MAYOR 2020-21

The Council considered a report on nominations received for election of Mayor and appointment of Deputy Mayor for the municipal year 2020-21. The constitutional changes adopted by the Council as part of the review of the Civic Function in April 2014 in respect of the Mayoralty, provided that the Council would normally elect the Deputy Mayor appointed at the annual meeting of the Council as Mayor at the next succeeding annual meeting.

Although political group leaders had been asked to submit nominations in respect of the Deputy Mayoralty for 2020-21, none had been received.

Accordingly, the Council was asked to consider the nomination of Councillor Marsha Moseley for Mayor in 2020-21. Councillor Moseley left the meeting during the Council's consideration of this matter.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Fiona White, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Marsha Moseley be nominated for the Mayoralty of the Borough for the 2020-21 municipal year.
- (2) That consideration of nominations for appointment of Deputy Mayor for the 2020-21 municipal year, be deferred to the meeting of the Council to be held on 5 February 2020.

Reason:

To make early preparations for the selection of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor for the 2020-21 municipal year.

CO90 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE

The Council received and noted the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 24 September 2019.

CO91 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 26 SEPTEMBER 2019: ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT

This motion was withdrawn in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 15 (p).

CO92 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 21 NOVEMBER 2019: MODERN SLAVERY

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor James Walsh proposed, and Councillor Angela Gunning seconded, the adoption of the following motion:

“Guildford Borough Council has embedded measures to address the evils of modern slavery in its safeguarding policy and procedures and we welcome this as an essential first step to tackling exploitation in Guildford.

However, with the number of people estimated to have been coerced into modern slavery nationally increasing tenfold between 2013 and 2016 – from 13,000 to 136,000 – we believe that a more proactive approach now needs to be taken by this council, in line with the 50 others – including Surrey County Council – that have signed up to the Charter against Modern Slavery.

Collectively, councils across the UK spend £40bn per year on procuring services from hundreds of contractors and sub-contractors and they oversee large supply chains in all areas of their business. As public bodies, accountable to the public, they have a duty to ensure that those supply chains do not hide the sins and iniquities of exploitation.

The Charter against Modern Slavery

By signing the Charter against Modern Slavery, Guildford Borough Council commits to:

1. Train its corporate procurement team to understand modern slavery through the Chartered Institute of Procurement and Supply's (CIPS) online course on Ethical Procurement and Supply.
2. Require its contractors to comply fully with the Modern Slavery Act 2015, wherever it applies, with contract termination as a potential sanction for non-compliance.
3. Challenge any abnormally low-cost tenders to ensure they do not rely upon the potential contractor practising modern slavery.
4. Highlight to its suppliers that contracted workers are free to join a trade union and are not to be treated unfairly for belonging to one.
5. Publicise its whistle-blowing system for staff to blow the whistle on any suspected examples of modern slavery.
6. Require its tendered contractors to adopt a whistle-blowing policy which enables their staff to blow the whistle on any suspected examples of modern slavery.
7. Review its contractual spending regularly to identify any potential issues with modern slavery.
8. Highlight for its suppliers any risks identified concerning modern slavery and refer them to the relevant agencies to be addressed.
9. Refer for investigation via the National Crime Agency's national referral mechanism any of its contractors identified as a cause for concern regarding modern slavery.
10. Report publicly on the implementation of this policy annually.

Councils who sign this charter can access cost-free support through the Transparency in Supply Chains report (<https://tiscreport.org/>), an NGO that will monitor companies supplying the council in relation to their compliance with section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015.

This Council resolves:

- (1) To sign the Charter Against Modern Slavery, which encompasses points 1 to 10 above, immediately to ensure that it does not inadvertently rely on exploitation and modern slavery in its use of suppliers.
- (2) To report back on progress to Full Council on an annual basis, one year from the date the Charter is signed and each year thereafter.”

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Walsh, as the mover of the original motion, indicated that, with the consent of his seconder and of the meeting, he wished to alter his motion as follows:

After “*This Council resolves*”, the addition of “*to ask the Leader of the Council:*”

The Council agreed to accept the alteration to the original motion, as indicated above. The motion, as altered, therefore became the substantive motion for debate.

Having debated the substantive motion, this Council

RESOLVES to ask the Leader of the Council:

- (1) To sign the Charter Against Modern Slavery, which encompasses points 1 to 10 above, immediately to ensure that it does not inadvertently rely on exploitation and modern slavery in its use of suppliers.
- (2) To report back on progress to Full Council on an annual basis, one year from the date the Charter is signed and each year thereafter.

CO93 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 22 NOVEMBER 2019: NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor Chris Barrass proposed, and Councillor Jan Harwood seconded, the adoption of the following motion:

“The Council recognises that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has recently undergone a review.

However, with the now declared Climate Emergency (subsequent to that review), and the widespread support of the principle of building on brownfield before greenfield sites wherever possible, the Council requests the Secretary of State to hold an immediate further review of the NPPF to:

1. Better define “sustainable development” in the light of the declared Climate Emergency.
2. Better assist with brownfield delivery by granting councils simple effective powers to bring forward currently, as well as previously, used sites.
3. Amend Paragraph 145 of the NPPF which is having the unintended consequences in Greenbelt areas of enabling unrestricted building of four bedroomed houses through ‘infilling’, yet at the same time preventing residents from having a simple extension or garage for their own home.”

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Barrass as the mover of the original motion, indicated that, with the consent of his seconder and of the meeting, he wished to alter his motion as follows:

- (a) Substitute the following in place of the second sentence of the motion:

“However, with the now declared Climate Emergency (subsequent to that review), and the widespread support of the principle of building on brownfield before greenfield sites wherever possible, the Council asks *the Executive to request* the Secretary of State to hold an immediate further review of the NPPF *and its guidance* to:”

- (b) Substitute the following in place of item (1) of the list of matters regarding the NPPF suggested for review:

“(1) Recognise the declared Climate Emergency and provide more detailed guidance on creating “sustainable development” which takes into account the required actions on transport and development to meet Carbon Zero, for both brownfield and green field sites.”*

**NPPF – Paragraph 7 states: ‘the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’*

- (c) Substitute the following in place of item (3) of the list of matters regarding the NPPF suggested for review:

“(3) Amend Paragraph 145 of the NPPF – to correct the unintended consequences in Greenbelt areas of enabling unrestricted building of inappropriate houses through ‘infilling’, yet at the same time preventing residents from having a simple extension or garage for their own home.”

The motion, as altered, therefore read as follows:

“The Council recognises that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has recently undergone a review. However, with the now declared Climate Emergency (subsequent to that review), and the widespread support of the principle of building on brownfield before greenfield sites wherever possible, the Council asks the Executive to request the Secretary of State to hold an immediate further review of the NPPF and its guidance to:

- (1) Recognise the declared Climate Emergency and provide more detailed guidance on creating “sustainable development”*, which takes into account the required actions on transport and development to meet Carbon Zero, for both brownfield and green field sites.
- (2) Better assist with brownfield delivery by granting councils simple effective powers to bring forward currently, as well as previously, used sites.
- (3) Amend Paragraph 145 of the NPPF – to correct the unintended consequences in Greenbelt areas of enabling unrestricted building of inappropriate houses through ‘infilling’, yet at the same time preventing residents from having a simple extension or garage for their own home.

**NPPF – Paragraph 7 states: ‘the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’*”

The Council agreed to accept the alteration to the original motion, as indicated above. The motion, as altered, therefore became the substantive motion for debate.

Having debated the substantive motion, the Council

RESOLVED: That the substantive motion be adopted.

CO94 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

Upon the motion of the Mayor, Councillor Richard Billington seconded by the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Marsha Moseley, the Council

RESOLVED: That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the public be excluded from the meeting for consideration of the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

CO95 LEASE OF PROPERTY IN TOWN CENTRE

At its meeting on 26 November 2019, the Executive had considered this matter and had approved the principal terms of the proposed lease and the associated valuation fees, lettings fees and legal fees which were to be vired from the budget pressures reserve.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Finance and Assets, Customer Service, Councillor Joss Bigmore, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, the Council

RESOLVED: That the sum of £2.5 million be vired from the capital contingency fund in respect of the contribution towards the refurbishment and fees in respect of the town centre property referred to in the report submitted to the Council.

Reasons:

To complete the lease to secure a longer-term income stream and assist with the regeneration of this part of the town.

CO96 COMMON SEAL

The Council

RESOLVED: That the Common Seal of the Council be affixed to any documents to give effect to any decisions taken by the Council at this meeting.

The meeting finished at 9.22 pm

Signed
Mayor

Date

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Draft Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of Guildford Borough Council held at Council Chamber - Millmead House on Thursday 16 January 2020

- * Councillor Richard Billington (Mayor)
- * Councillor Marsha Moseley (Deputy Mayor)

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| * Councillor Paul Abbey | * Councillor Ted Mayne |
| Councillor Tim Anderson | * Councillor Julia McShane |
| * Councillor Jon Askew | * Councillor Ann McShee |
| Councillor Christopher Barrass | * Councillor Bob McShee |
| * Councillor Joss Bigmore | * Councillor Masuk Miah |
| Councillor David Bilbé | * Councillor Ramsey Nagaty |
| * Councillor Chris Blow | * Councillor Susan Parker |
| * Councillor Dennis Booth | * Councillor George Potter |
| * Councillor Ruth Brothwell | * Councillor Jo Randall |
| Councillor Colin Cross | * Councillor John Redpath |
| * Councillor Graham Eyre | * Councillor Maddy Redpath |
| Councillor Andrew Gomm | * Councillor Caroline Reeves |
| * Councillor Angela Goodwin | Councillor John Rigg |
| Councillor David Goodwin | * Councillor Tony Rooth |
| * Councillor Angela Gunning | Councillor Will Salmon |
| * Councillor Gillian Harwood | * Councillor Deborah Seabrook |
| * Councillor Jan Harwood | * Councillor Pauline Searle |
| * Councillor Liz Hogger | * Councillor Patrick Sheard |
| * Councillor Tom Hunt | * Councillor Paul Spooner |
| Councillor Gordon Jackson | * Councillor James Steel |
| * Councillor Diana Jones | * Councillor James Walsh |
| Councillor Steven Lee | * Councillor Fiona White |
| * Councillor Nigel Manning | * Councillor Catherine Young |

*Present

The Council stood in silent tribute to the memory of Honorary Alderman Clare Griffin, who had passed away recently.

CO97 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Tim Anderson, Christopher Barrass, Andrew Gomm, David Goodwin, Gordon Jackson, Steven Lee, John Rigg, and Will Salmon and from Honorary Aldermen Catherine Cobley, Jayne Marks, and Lynda Strudwick.

CO98 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

CO99 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor reminded the Council of his forthcoming Charity Valentine's Ball on Friday 14 February 2020 and noted that there were still some places available. The Mayor asked for councillors' support for the fundraising activities on the night, perhaps by donating an auction or raffle prize.

CO100 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications from the Leader of the Council.

CO101 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Amanda Mullarkey, on behalf of Guildford Residents Association, addressed the Council in respect of the Weyside Urban Village Development and raised the following questions/points:

- (1) What optimism bias is being applied and is it high enough? Is the Council being over-optimistic in hoping that this relatively modest housing plot can unlock decontamination, new sewage treatment works, Surrey Waste Depot and a Waste facility?
- (2) Are the Council's decontamination and remediation costs sufficiently robust? Is £40.5 million enough to put right all the historical industrial and waste uses at this site, including the safe removal of pollutants and contaminants?
- (3) Has the Council fully factored in flooding and land instability?
- (4) Does 1,500 homes mean a Stalinist wall of flats along the Wey on the approach to Guildford? Is 1,500 homes wishful thinking trying to make the sums work or what would make for a good community scheme? Previously, councillors thought that 1,500 homes would mean too many tall towers. Has the Council dropped the masterplan scheme? The 3D visuals to market the site showed a massive blot with no thought for the riverside setting.
- (5) Has the Council resolved the road access issues, particularly across the flood plain? Is this a cost and risk deferred? Has the Council factored in the cost of compacting roads to stop them sinking?
- (6) Will the Council reinstate the Slyfield community forum?

The Leader of the Council responded to the statement by indicating that a full response to the questions would be given after the meeting. The Leader expressed confidence that the team working on this project would be addressing these and other issues as the project progressed.

CO102 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

There were no questions from councillors in respect of the business for which this extraordinary meeting had been called.

CO103 WEYSIDE URBAN VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT

The Council noted that Weyside Urban Village (formerly the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project (SARP)) was a major 41-hectare brownfield regeneration scheme that the Council had anticipated could deliver 1,500 homes across a range of tenures as well as 2,000 square metres of community space and 6,500 square metres of employment space. As such, the Government had designated it as one of its national Housing Zones.

The Council had been working for over 15 years to de-risk the infrastructure delivery and site assembly process. Over 44 per cent of the site was currently in Council ownership, and 100 per cent would be achieved on completion of land transfers with Thames Water. The conditional contract with Thames Water had been signed on 25 April 2019.

Housing was of great significance to the Borough and formed a major theme to the Adopted Local Plan. There was an ongoing shortage of affordable housing, particularly for first time buyers which in turn contributed to a skill shortage in the Borough.

The Council considered a report which sought approval of a capital budget of £359.504 million to enable the infrastructure phase of the Weyside Urban Village Project development to be carried out. The Council had been awarded a £52.3 million grant from the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF).

An EM3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) grant of £7.5 million had also been awarded.

At its meeting on 7 January 2020, the Executive had considered this report and had authorised the Managing Director, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to sign and complete the Grant Agreement with Homes England to implement the infrastructure works and draw down the grant expenditure.

The Executive had also endorsed the recommendation to Council as set out in the report.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, seconded by the Lead Councillor for Finance and Assets, Customer Service, Councillor Joss Bigmore, the Council unanimously:

RESOLVED:

- (1) That an additional capital supplementary estimate of £274.057 million be approved to allow a total capital budget of £359.504 million to enable the Council to deliver the infrastructure phase of this scheme.
- (2) That £5.781 million of the additional capital budget be placed on the approved capital programme to progress the allotment relocation and funding of the Thames Water agreement costs during 2019-20.
- (3) That the Council acts as Infrastructure Developer until completion of the Thames Water Infrastructure in 2026.

Reasons:

The reasons for recommendation cover financial, economic and social benefits.

The budget will enable the Council to deliver the infrastructure for the development ensuring deliverability and control.

The land value will be increased by the infrastructure phase being delivered upfront and ahead of Land Parcel Sales.

The project will also deliver:

- 1500 new homes including 600 Affordable Homes
- 2000 square metres of community space
- 6500 square metres of employment space
- A new relocated fit for purpose Thames Water Sewage Treatment Works
- Extensive infrastructure improvements
- This scheme contributes to the delivery of the adopted Local Plan
- This scheme contributes £233 million in economic impacts for Guildford

The project has significant infrastructure to be put in place to enable the above critical success factors to be delivered. Allocating a capital budget of £317.355 million will enable all of the infrastructure phase to be delivered and will de-risk the site in readiness for the next stage to facilitate the delivery of homes.

CO104 COMMON SEAL

The Council

RESOLVED: That the Common Seal of the Council be affixed to any documents to give effect to any decisions taken by the Council at this meeting.

The meeting finished at 7.55 pm

Signed
Mayor

Date