

MINUTES of the WAVERLEY
BOROUGH COUNCIL held in
the ZOOM MEETING - Virtual
Meeting on 20 April 2021 at
6.00 pm

- * Cllr Penny Marriott (Mayor)
- * Cllr John Robini (Deputy Mayor)

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| * Cllr Brian Adams | * Cllr Daniel Hunt |
| * Cllr Christine Baker | * Cllr Jerry Hyman |
| * Cllr David Beaman | * Cllr Peter Isherwood |
| * Cllr Roger Blishen | * Cllr Jacquie Keen |
| * Cllr Peter Clark | * Cllr Robert Knowles |
| * Cllr Carole Cockburn | * Cllr Anna James |
| * Cllr Richard Cole | * Cllr Andy MacLeod |
| * Cllr Steve Cosser | * Cllr Peter Marriott |
| * Cllr Martin D'Arcy | * Cllr Michaela Martin |
| * Cllr Jerome Davidson | * Cllr Peter Martin |
| * Cllr Kevin Deanus | * Cllr Mark Merryweather |
| Cllr Simon Dear | * Cllr Kika Mirylees |
| * Cllr Sally Dickson | * Cllr Stephen Mulliner |
| * Cllr Brian Edmonds | * Cllr John Neale |
| * Cllr Patricia Ellis | * Cllr Peter Nicholson |
| * Cllr David Else | * Cllr Nick Palmer |
| * Cllr Jenny Else | * Cllr Julia Potts |
| Cllr Jan Floyd-Douglass | * Cllr Ruth Reed |
| * Cllr Paul Follows | * Cllr Paul Rivers |
| * Cllr Mary Forszyszewski | * Cllr Penny Rivers |
| * Cllr Maxine Gale | * Cllr Anne-Marie Rosoman |
| * Cllr Michael Goodridge | * Cllr Trevor Sadler |
| * Cllr John Gray | * Cllr Richard Seaborne |
| * Cllr Michaela Wicks | * Cllr Liz Townsend |
| Cllr Joan Heagin | * Cllr John Ward |
| * Cllr Val Henry | * Cllr Steve Williams |
| Cllr George Hesse | * Cllr George Wilson |
| * Cllr Chris Howard | |

Apologies

Cllr Simon Dear, Cllr Jan Floyd-Douglass, Cllr Joan Heagin and Cllr George Hesse

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, the Rev'd Michael Hopkins of the Methodist and United Reformed Churches in and around Farnham led Council in a one minute silence to mark the death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh.

CNL102/20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda item 1.)

102.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Simon Dear, Jan Floyd-Douglass, Joan Heagin, and George Hesse.

CNL103/20 MINUTES (Agenda item 2.)

103.1 The Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 23 February 2021, which was resumed on 25 February, and concluded on 22 March, were confirmed as a correct record.

CNL104/20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Agenda item 3.)

104.1 Cllr Paul Follows declared a personal interest in relation to Item 10, as he was Leader of Godalming Town Council (one of the main consultees on this PSPO). GTC specifically created a working group of single-hatted councillors to respond to the consultation, Cllr Follows would therefore take part in the discussion and vote on this item.

104.2 Cllr Steve Williams and Cllr Anne-Marie Rosoman each declared a personal interest in relation to Item 10, as he was a member of Godalming Town Council (one of the main consultees on this PSPO). GTC specifically created a working group of single-hatted councillors to respond to the consultation, and both Cllr Williams and Cllr Rosoman would therefore take part in the discussion and vote on this item.

CNL105/20 MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Agenda item 4.)

105.1 The Mayor spoke briefly to remind Members that due to the expiry on 7 May 2021 of the Regulations that allowed Council meetings to take place remotely, the Annual Meeting of Council had been brought forward to 27 April, and would be held via Zoom, as the Council Chamber was not big enough to accommodate all councillors with social distancing.

105.2 The Mayor was coming to the end of her Civic year, and due to Covid-19 restrictions she had not been able to go to many events, or organise events to support her charities. However, she was continuing with her personal challenge, to walk 100 miles, swim 100 lengths, and cycle 200km on the static bike, and was aiming to finish before Annual Council. On behalf of her charities - Homestart Waverley, 40 Degreez, and the Farnham Sea Cadets - the Mayor thanked those who had sponsored her already.

CNL106/20 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Agenda item 5.)

106.1 The Leader read the following statement:

“Dunsfold Airport Ltd has informed Waverley Borough Council that there will be changes to land ownership at Dunsfold Park and that Trinity College expects to undertake a process to pass its investment to a new land owner over the next 12 months. As the site is so significant for the local area and for the borough, the council has offered to assist in the smooth transition and has provided information to Trinity on the importance of development at the Park. We are interested in exploring with them all of the options for the future ownership of the Park and how an exemplary sustainable development will be delivered on the timescales of the existing planning permission. This is a very significant step and an opportunity to ensure that the Park achieves our high ambitions in the context of post-Covid recovery. We look forward to

engaging closely with Trinity College’s transition team in the coming weeks and months.”

- 106.2 The Leader then invited Executive Portfolio Holders to give brief updates on current issues not covered elsewhere on the meeting agenda:
- A feasibility study had been commissioned to explore possible locations for solar farms in Waverley.
 - Electric Vehicle chargers had been installed in 4 Waverley car parks, and at an on-street location in Cranleigh.
 - Waverley would be represented as a Rule 6 party at the UKOG planning application appeal in July.
 - Good progress was being made on addressing the backlog of Housing repairs, thanks to the Housing Team and the contractor. Tenant satisfaction had also improved.
 - Rent arrears were currently at £278k, spread over 1,100 accounts. Not surprisingly, this was higher than pre-Covid; however, it was less than 1% of the rent roll, and the Rents Team were to be congratulated on their work with tenants to minimise debts.
 - Housing development was continuing on Ockford Ridge, and planning permission had been granted for small affordable housing schemes in Chiddingfold and Binscombe, the latter having been funded by the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government specifically to address rough sleeping.
 - Crest Nicholson had advised that they would be making environmental improvements to the Brightwell Yard development, including changing the energy systems for the flats from gas boilers to electric and installing solar panels on the roofs.
 - Waverley’s leisure centres had re-opened and the first week had been very positive. Customer feedback was very positive, swimming was very popular, and classes would be resuming in May.
 - IT developers continued to progress development of web and mobile apps using Low Code, with new apps for housing rents, garden waste subscriptions, and pool car booking.

CNL107/20 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC (Agenda item 6.)

- 107.1 The following question had been received from Charles Collins, Savills, Guildford:
- “Noting that the Planning Service Plan timetable highlights the review of LPP1 needs to be completed by February 2023, can the Council confirm that the housing numbers informing the review will be based on the current Standard Method figures of 679 homes per annum, plus any unmet needs, and what overall housing figure/period the Plan review period will cover?”

Cllr Andy MacLeod, Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy responded as follow:

“The Council is required to review the Local Plan to assess whether it needs to be updated at least once every five years. In the case of Local Plan Part 1 this means undertaking the review by February 2023. In considering whether the Plan needs updating the Council will follow national policy. In relation to housing need, the NPPF states that strategic policies should be informed by

a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance, unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach. Given that it is almost two years before this 'review' needs to be completed, it is too early to confirm what method will be used to identify housing need. If it is decided that the Plan needs to be updated then current policy in the NPPF states that strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption."

CNL108/20 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL (Agenda item 7.)

108.1 The following questions had been received from Cllr Brian Edmonds:

1. "What is the current financial loss due to Covid Leisure Centre closures allocated to Waverley Borough Council tax payers and how much of this loss will be recovered from Waverley Borough Council's Business Interruption Insurance?"

Response from Cllr Mark Merryweather, Portfolio Holder for Finance, Property & Assets:

"The net cost to the Council's budget in 2020/21 arising from the periods of statutory closure and restricted reopening of Waverley's five leisure centres is not yet finalised but will be contained within the amount approved by Council in August 2020. The estimated cost was agreed in an exempt section of the report to Council due to its commercial sensitivity. External legal advice confirmed that the Council's contract with its leisure operator requires the Council to compensate for financial impact arising from a change of law and terms were agreed through negotiation. Because the Council is not the operator of the leisure centres, the Council does not have business interruption insurance but the leisure operator does. However, as many businesses have found, their insurance is very unlikely to apply to the pandemic impact but this is still subject to final clarification from their broker. Waverley has recovered part of the loss from Government Covid support funding."

2. "When will the 10 year plan to deliver Waverley Borough Council's net zero carbon status by 2030 be available to the public in either Microsoft Project format or similar?"

Response from Cllr Steve Williams, Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability:

"The Carbon Neutrality action plan was approved by the Council in December and has been published on the Council's website and is available to the public. Progress with the Action Plan will be monitored regularly by officers and a progress update will be reported annually to Executive and Council with an updated Action Plan detailing progress with each of the projects."

CNL109/20 MOTIONS (Agenda item 8.)

109.1 The following motion was moved by Cllr John Ward, and seconded by Cllr Paul Follows:

“This Council is deeply disappointed by the recent Government refusal to allow us to continue with some form of remote meetings which will adversely affect our ability to conduct Council business with efficiency and safely. We urge the government to urgently revisit this decision and continue to allow all levels of local government to continue with the sensible precautions and ability to function safely and democratically during this period.”

109.2 The Motion was debated by Members. The following Members spoke in the debate: Cllrs Cosser, Knowles, Foryszewski, Follows, Wilson, Williams, Potts, Palmer, Peter Martin, Townsend, Dickson, Rosoman, Keen, Merryweather, Hunt, MacLeod, Clark and Ward.

109.3 In accordance with Procedure Rule 17.4, a recorded vote was called.

The Mayor put the Motion to the vote, which was carried:

Votes in favour - 45

Votes against - 3

Abstentions – 5

RESOLVED that Waverley Borough Council is deeply disappointed by the recent Government refusal to allow us to continue with some form of remote meetings which will adversely affect our ability to conduct Council business with efficiency and safely. We urge the government to urgently revisit this decision and continue to allow all levels of local government to continue with the sensible precautions and ability to function safely and democratically during this period.

For: 45

Cllrs Christine Baker, David Beaman, Roger Blishen, Peter Clark, Carole Cockburn, Richard Cole, Martin D’Arcy, Jerome Davidson, Kevin Deanus, Sally Dickson, Brian Edmonds, Patricia Ellis, Paul Follows, Maxine Gale, Michael Goodridge, Val Henry, Chris Howard, Dan Hunt, Peter Isherwood, Jacquie Keen, Robert Knowles, Anna James, Andy MacLeod, Penny Marriott, Peter Marriott, Michaela Martin, Peter Martin, Mark Merryweather, Kika Mirylees, Stephen Mulliner, John Neale, Peter Nicholson, Nick Palmer, Julia Potts, Ruth Reed, Paul Rivers, Penny Rivers, John Robini, Anne-Marie Rosoman, Richard Seaborne, Liz Townsend, John Ward, Michaela Wicks, Steve Williams, George Wilson

Against: 3

Cllrs Brian Adams, David Else, Mary Foryszewski

Abstentions: 5

Cllrs Steve Cosser, Jenny Else, John Gray, Jerry Hyman, Trevor Sadler

CNL110/20 EMERGENCY DELEGATION (Agenda item 9.)

110.1 Cllr John Ward introduced the recommendation that Council agree an emergency delegation to the Chief Executive to take urgent Council decisions, as a contingency measure to avoid delays in urgent decision making following the expiry on 7 May 2021 of the regulations allowing the

Council to hold meetings with remote attendance. The Council was being required to resume meetings in person in advance of the vaccination programme being completed, and the need for social distancing measures being relaxed. It was therefore understandable that some Members may not feel comfortable attending Council meetings in person. However, it was important that the business of the Council could continue even in such circumstances. The Chief Executive would only take a delegated decision in the event that a meeting of Full Council was convened but not quorate, and the decision in question had been identified clearly as being urgent.

- 110.2 Cllr Paul Follows seconded the recommendation. Cllr Hyman expressed serious concerns about the proposal which he felt was undemocratic, and unnecessary; he could not support the proposal, and suggested that the number required for a quorum should be reduced, if that was the potential barrier to making a democratic decision. Cllr Follows agreed that it was unfortunate that it was necessary to consider an emergency delegation, but emphasised that the purpose was to make urgent decisions in extraordinary circumstances, not for 'business as usual'. The proposed delegation was time-limited, and would be removed sooner, if circumstances allowed.
- 110.3 Cllr Potts expressed concerns on behalf of the Conservative Group, and whilst the need for a contingency measure was recognised, they would be more comfortable with there being a requirement for the Chief Executive to consult with the Mayor, relevant Committee chairman and the leaders of all the political groups before exercising the emergency delegation. Cllr Potts proposed an amendment so that the delegation would be:
*In relation to any meeting of Full Council convened for the period 7 May 2021-30 September 2021, in the event that the meeting is not quorate, any decisions identified on the meeting agenda as being Urgent, will be delegated (as far as the law allows) to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Mayor, the relevant Committee Chairman (including the Leader of the Council as Chairman of the Executive), **and Leaders of the political groups and Independent Members.***
- Cllr Ward and Cllr Follows seconded the amendment.
- 110.4 Cllr Hyman remained concerned about the proposal, even with the amendment, which he did not feel addressed his fundamental points: that any decision taken under such a delegation would be undemocratic, and the delegation was not necessary. Cllrs Cosser, Adams, Wilson, Dickson, Gale and Blishen all spoke in support of the amended proposal. In summing up, Cllr Ward thanked Cllr Potts for the amendment, and emphasised the exceptional circumstances that necessitated having an emergency delegation in place.
- 110.5 The Mayor put the amended proposal to the vote, which was carried by general assent with the following exceptions:
 Against: Cllrs Hyman, Jenny Else
 Abstentions: Cllrs Dickson, Trevor Sadler

RESOLVED that in relation to any meeting of Full Council convened for the period 7 May 2021 - 30 September 2021, in the event that the meeting is not quorate, any decisions identified on the meeting agenda as being Urgent, will

be delegated (as far as the law allows) to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Mayor, the relevant Committee Chairman (including the Leader of the Council as Chairman of the Executive), and Leaders of the political groups and Independent Members.

CNL111/20 PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER NO. 3 (ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR) 2021
(Agenda item 10.)

111.1 At the invitation of the Mayor, Cllr Nick Palmer, Portfolio Holder for Operational and Enforcement Services, introduced the proposed Public Space Protection Order to address anti-social behaviour issues that were having a significant detrimental impact on the community in some parts of the borough. Cllr Palmer thanked those who had responded to the public consultation, including Town and Parish councils. Their contributions had been considered carefully in framing the scope of the Order, which was a reasonable and proportionate response to the issues.

111.2 Before inviting speakers, the Mayor read the following representation received from the Clerk of Godalming Town Council:

"I am writing on behalf of the Godalming Town Council PSPO Working Group to thank Waverley Borough Council Officers for engaging with the GTC Working Group in the recent consultation to produce the latest version of the PSPO. The Working Group also found working with Sgt Clair Sutherland of Surrey Police of great benefit and appreciated the time and effort she dedicated to the consultation process as one of the many interested parties.

Working together a practical and proportionate tool to tackle ASB in Godalming and the wider Waverley area was produced. The Working Group believe that the time and effort given by the many people involved was well worth it. The process benefitted from a variety of perspectives, which provided constructive input to this important document.

Additionally, the opportunity provided by WBC to consider the collective view and allow further positive additions to be made to the wording showed a strong desire to engage with stakeholders. At a time when there are so many unprecedented challenges - the social and economic recovery from COVID - 19 and climate change in particular, it is hoped that this approach can be adopted again to achieve the very best outcomes for the community."

111.3 Cllr Follows echoed Godalming Town Council's thanks to Waverley officers and Sgt Sutherland for their work. He also thanked the Godalming Town Council Working Group, all of whom had been 'single-hatted' Members avoid any conflicts of interest arising when the matter came before Waverley Borough Council. Cllr Follows also thanked Godalming residents for their patience as this PSPO had progressed through various stages, and he hoped that it would be supported by Waverley colleagues.

111.4 Cllrs Cosser, Cockburn, Gale and Penny Rivers all spoke in support of approving the PSPO although there were some reservations about whether there were the resources to enforce it; resources to address lack of investment in youth services; and the absence from the PSPO of some

provisions sought by the Godalming Town Council Working Group. Cllr Follows advised that the Portfolio Holder, Head of Environment & Regulatory Services, and Sgt Sutherland had met with the Working Group members to discuss their submission, and it was understood that there were some requests that were not practicable to include. Overall, the PSPO was appropriate, and proportionate.

111.5 The Mayor put the vote to approve the PSPO No.3 (Anti-Social Behaviour) 2021, which was approved without any objection or abstentions.

RESOLVED that the Public Space Protection Order No.3 (Anti-Social Behaviour) 2021, as set out in Annexe 3 to the agenda report, be approved.

CNL112/20 THE WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL (OFF-STREET PARKING PLACES) ORDER 2020 (AMENDMENT NO. 1) ORDER 2021 (Agenda item 11.)

112.1 Cllr Nick Palmer, Portfolio Holder for Operational and Enforcement Service, introduced the proposed Off-Street Parking Places Order Amendment, which would have the effect of incorporating the new Brightwells Yard multi-storey car park in the Order. This would allow parking charges and enforcement to be implemented when the new car park opened in the summer.

112.2 In response to comments from Cllr Hyman, Cllr Palmer confirmed that any outstanding planning applications required before the car park opened would be submitted by Crest Nicholson at the appropriate time.

112.3 The Mayor put the approval of the Parking Order Amendment to the vote, which was agreed without objection or abstentions.

RESOLVED that the Waverley Borough Council (Off Street Parking Places) Order 2020 (Amendment No.1) Order 2021, as set out in Annexe A to the agenda report, be approved.

CNL113/20 EXE74/20 AFFORDABLE HOUSING SPD (Agenda item 12.)

113.1 At the invitation, Cllr MacLeod, Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy, gave an update on the Affordable Housing SPD, which had been deferred at the previous Council meeting on 22 March. Cllr MacLeod reminded Members that there had been general support for the Affordable Housing SPD, but Cllr Mulliner had proposed an amendment which he felt would further strengthen the Council's position in relation to developers.

113.2 Planning and Legal Officers were continuing to discuss the proposed amendment with Cllr Mulliner, and whilst there had not been time to bring back the matter for Council consideration at this meeting, it would come back to Council on 27 April.

CNL114/20 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE (Agenda item 13.)

114.1 The Mayor invited the Leader to present the Minutes of the Executive.

CNL115/20 EXECUTIVE MINUTES 2 MARCH 2021 (Agenda item 13.1)

115.1 It was moved by the Leader, duly seconded and RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Executive held on 2 March 2021 be received and noted.

There were no Part I matters for Council consideration and no requests to speak on Part II matters.

CNL116/20 EXECUTIVE MINUTES 30 MARCH 2021 (Agenda item 13.2)

116.1 It was moved by the Leader, duly seconded and RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Executive held on 30 March 2021 be received and noted.

There was one Part I matter for Council consideration.

116.2 In accordance with Procedure Rules, the following Members spoke on Part II matters:

Cllr Hyman, on EXE 87/20, and EXE 91/20

Cllr Cockburn, on EXE 93/20

CNL117/20 EXE 88/20 COUNCIL TAX EXEMPTION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE LEAVING CARE
(Agenda item)

117.1 Cllr Merryweather, Portfolio Holder for Finance, Assets and Commercial Services, introduced the proposal to agree a new Council Tax exemption that would ensure that Care Leavers within Waverley would not have to pay Council Tax up to the age of 25.

117.2 A number of Members spoke in support of the proposal.

117.3 The Mayor put the recommendation to the vote, which was agreed without objection or abstentions.

RESOLVED that a new Council Tax exemption for Care Leavers, to be applied until the age of 25, be approved.

At 21:35, in accordance with Procedure Rule 9 (Adjournment of Meeting) and on the recommendation of the Mayor, Council RESOLVED to continue the meeting until Council had concluded its consideration of the agenda.

CNL118/20 EXECUTIVE MINUTES 6 APRIL 2021 (Agenda item 13.3)

118.1 It was moved by the Leader, duly seconded and RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Executive held on 6 April 2021 be received and noted.

There was one Part I matter for Council consideration.

CNL119/20 EXE 99/20 GOVERNANCE MATTERS (Agenda item)

119.1 The Leader introduced the Executive's proposed changes to the Council's governance arrangements, which he put in the context of the experience of

forming the new multi-party Executive and its objectives for a more open government. Some consideration was given to moving to a more inclusive, Committee-based system, and a cross-party Governance Review Working Group was established to look into the various ramifications of this. It was clear from their deliberations that a continuation of the Strong Leader and Executive system would be a more efficient and workable style for Waverley and the Executive accepted that. The proposals now before Council responded to the challenges of improving the decision-making efficiency, and the unusually high number of committees Waverley had compared to councils of a similar size and profile.

- 119.2 With regard to Planning Committees, the Leader noted that some Members would recall that in 2007 there had been a trial of parallel, non-localised, planning committees A and B, which were universally unpopular. He was, and remain, an enthusiastic proponent of more localised planning and had supported the move away from the previous system. However, years of working with the 5 Committee system that evolved, including 6 years as Chair and Vice-Chair of two Area Committees, had convinced him that what had seemed to be a good idea at the time, had in practice been found to be wanting.
- 119.3 To help Officers cope with the extra demands that the Covid pandemic and home-working imposed on them, the overarching Joint Planning Committee and the pairs of Area Committees (Southern and Western, and Eastern and Central) had been replaced on a temporary basis by two wider, but still locally-based Committees, Eastern and Western. This system had worked well over a significant period and the proposal in Recommendation 1 was to remove the temporary restrictions on this arrangement. It was notable that most other councils in Surrey operated with just one planning committee.
- 119.4 Recommendation 2 sought agreement in principle to reduce the number of Overview and Scrutiny Committees. When the Boundary Commission briefed Members on the Electoral Review, they stated that their remit was to regularise the size of Wards so that the Councillor-Elector balance was as uniform as possible. They pointed out that if Waverley intended to propose a system that was out-of-step with similar councils around us, we needed to be able to clearly answer the question "*Why is Waverley so different?*" Virtually every other Council in Surrey, regardless of political control, found one Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be sufficient for their needs. The Leader suggested the lack of adverse recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committees over the last 2 years would clearly support a reduction in their number.
- 119.5 Waverley had previously had just two Overview and Scrutiny Committees and they had worked well, holding the then Executive to account on numerous occasions. The change-over to 4 committees was another thing that had seemed a good idea at the time, as it was hoped that Overview and Scrutiny would be helpful in evolving policy, but that had not proved to be the case. There had also been confusion over which Committee should consider particular items, resulting in some matters being considered by more than one Committee with a consequent waste of Portfolio Holders' and Officers' time.

- 119.6 The Leader noted that, having chaired the Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee, he recognised that housing was a very important part of the Council's responsibilities and so it was proposed that a *Housing Landlord Services Board* be established to consider aspects of housing that were not specifically Executive functions. Additionally, we propose that two O&S Committees, Corporate and Community, consisting solely of Councillors should take on the more formal scrutiny arrangements. It was hoped that this would improve the focus and quality of scrutiny which seems to have fallen away under the four-committee system.
- 119.7 The Leader noted that the remaining recommendations – to widen the scope of the Standards Committee, to enable the Executive to set up small working groups, and to commission the Standards Committee to undertake a thorough review of the Council's Constitution - were more straightforward and set out in full in the agenda report. He commended all five recommendations to Council for approval.
- 119.8 Cllr Follows seconded the recommendations, and reiterated the point that Waverley had a disproportionately high number of committees compared to similar district councils across the country, not just in Surrey. It was also a matter of the quality of output from the committees: having two planning committees had worked well for the past year, and councillors did not have to be a member of a planning committee in order to participate. And, having observed many Overview and Scrutiny Committees over the last two years, Cllr Follows was not persuaded by the argument that more committees meant better scrutiny outcomes.
- 119.9 Cllrs Mulliner, Goodridge, and Jenny Else all spoke in opposition to the proposal to reduce the number of Overview and Scrutiny Committees, whilst Cllrs Cockburn, Adams and Seaborne opposed the reduced in the number of planning committees.
- 119.10 Cllr Seaborne suggested that the extraordinary circumstances of the last 12 months should not be the basis for making permanent changes to the planning committees, and proposed an amendment to Recommendation 1, to continue the temporary arrangements to 20 October 2021:

“The temporary WESTERN and EASTERN planning committee arrangements first incorporated into the Constitution on 22 July 2020 by Full Council and extended on 20 October 2020 by Full Council continue to operate on a temporary basis with the current Terms of Reference until such time as Full Council resolves to make any further changes to them;”

The amendment was seconded by Cllr Cockburn.

- 119.11 Councillors debated the amendment to Recommendation 1, with speakers for and against the amendment. In summing up on his proposed amendment, Cllr Seaborne noted that the number of planning applications determined by the planning committees pre-Covid, in 2016/17, had been 160, compared with on 72 applications determined by committee in the 10 months of 2020/21. If the number of councillor call-ins returned to pre-Covid levels, there would be serious consequences if only two planning committees

remained: either there would need to be more meetings, or longer meetings. Cllr Seaborne's observation was that the quality and quantity of debate on a planning application declined the longer a meeting went on, and questioned whether this was fair to applicants. He would be happy to support an extension to the temporary arrangement until after the Covid pandemic, but could not support an arbitrary decision to embed the current arrangement for the long-term.

119.12 Cllr Ward concluded the debate on the amendment by noting that all those speaking in support of the amendment were Conservatives; he also noted that much of the debate in planning committees was repetitive which made meetings lengthy. Much had been said about the 2 committee arrangement being 'undemocratic' without any explanation of how this was so, and he would not be supporting the amendment.

119.13 The Mayor put the amendment to the vote, which was lost with 19 votes in favour, 32 against, and 1 abstention.

For: 19

Cllrs Brian Adams, Carole Cockburn, Steve Cosser, Kevin Deanus, Patricia Ellis, David Else, Jenny Else, Mary Forszewski, Michael Goodridge, John Gray, Val Henry, Chris Howard, Peter Isherwood, Anna James, Robert Knowles, Peter Martin, Stephen Mulliner, Trevor Sadler, Richard Seaborne

Against: 32

Cllrs Christine Baker, David Beaman, Roger Blishen, Peter Clark, Richard Cole, Martin D'Arcy, Jerome Davidson, Sally Dickson, Brian Edmonds, Paul Follows, Maxine Gale, Daniel Hunt, Jacquie Keen, Andy MacLeod, Penny Marriott, Peter Marriott, Michaela Martin, Mark Merryweather, Kika Mirylees, John Neale, Peter Nicholson, Nick Palmer, Julia Potts, Ruth Reed, Paul Rivers, Penny Rivers, John Robini, Anne-Marie Rosoman, Liz Townsend, John Ward, Steve Williams, George Wilson

Abstention: 1

Cllr Jerry Hyman

119.14 Councillors resumed the debate on the substantive motion, and the Recommendations 1 to 5 as out in the agenda, with arguments in favour and against the proposals. In summing up for the opposition, Cllr Potts recognised the wish to look at committee structures, but change had to be for the right reason and not just to save time or money. Previous changes to the Overview and Scrutiny Committees had involved a great deal of time and consideration of good practice. She urged Council not to rush into changes without evidence or proper justification, which risked alienating backbenchers.

119.15 The Mayor invited Cllr Ward to conclude the debate: he reiterated his earlier argument that no one had explained why Waverley was so different to other councils that it need five planning committees and four overview and scrutiny committees, compared with just one of each. Similarly, he had not heard an explanation of why fewer committees would be undemocratic. Cllr Ward urged councillors to focus on quality, not quantity, and being more effective in their scrutiny work.

119.16 With the agreement of councillor, the Mayor proposed that Recommendations 1 to 4 be taken together by roll call, with Recommendation 5 taken by verbal assent.

- Recommendations 1 to 4, were carried, with 31 votes in favour, 20 votes against and 1 abstention.
- Recommendation 5 was carried by verbal assent, with no objections or abstentions.

RESOLVED that:

- 1.1 the temporary WESTERN and EASTERN planning committee arrangements first incorporated into the Constitution on 22 July 2020 by Full Council and extended on 20 October 2020 by Full Council be made permanent (until such time as Full Council resolves to make any further changes to them) with the current Terms of Reference; and
- 1.2 the Head of Policy and Governance be authorised to make the corresponding revisions to the Constitution with the Chairman of the Standards Committee.
- 2.1 the principle is approved of moving to a governance structure whereby Waverley Borough Council no longer operates four overview and scrutiny committees but instead operates *two overview and scrutiny committees*, 'corporate' and 'community', and a new *Housing Landlord Services Board* whilst retaining the existing constitutional ability to establish informal OS working groups (as set out in section 4.2); and
- 2.2 the Standards Committee develop and recommend to Full Council for adoption the necessary proposed constitutional amendments to achieve this change, including terms of reference for the new committees.
- 3.1 the principle is approved of moving to a governance structure whereby Waverley Borough Council expands the remit of the existing Standards Committee to become a '*Standards and General Purposes Committee*' which, as well as dealing with the Standards and Constitutional issues it currently does, would also take responsibility for a range of other functions and pick up issues that arise over the course of time that do not obviously sit elsewhere (as set out in section 4.3); and
- 3.2 the Standards Committee develop and recommend to Full Council for adoption the necessary proposed constitutional amendments to achieve this change.
- 4.1 the principle is approved of reintroducing the capacity for *Executive Working Groups* to be constituted in order to shape and drive policy development across a range of portfolio areas (as set out in section 4.4); and

- 4.2 the Standards Committee develop and recommend to Full Council for adoption the necessary proposed constitutional amendments to achieve this change.
5. the Standards Committee carry out a general and comprehensive review of the Constitution to ensure it remains fit for purpose and to bring forward to Full Council any proposed constitutional amendments arising from its review (as set out in section 4.5).

For: 31

Cllrs Christine Baker, David Beaman, Roger Blishen, Peter Clark, Richard Cole, Martin D'Arcy, Jerome Davidson, Sally Dickson, Brian Edmonds, Paul Follows, Maxine Gale, Daniel Hunt, Jacquie Keen, Andy MacLeod, Penny Marriott, Peter Marriott, Michaela Martin, Mark Merryweather, Kika Mirylees, John Neale, Peter Nicholson, Nick Palmer, Ruth Reed, Paul Rivers, Penny Rivers, John Robini, Anne-Marie Rosoman, Liz Townsend, John Ward, Steve Williams, George Wilson

Against: 20

Cllrs Brian Adams, Carole Cockburn, Steve Cosser, Kevin Deanus, Patricia Ellis, David Else, Jenny Else, Mary Forszewska, Michael Goodridge, John Gray, Val Henry, Chris Howard, Peter Isherwood, Anna James, Robert Knowles, Peter Martin, Stephen Mulliner, Julia Potts, Trevor Sadler, Richard Seaborne

Abstention: 1

Cllr Jerry Hyman

CNL120/20 MINUTES OF THE LICENSING AND REGULATORY COMMITTEE (Agenda item 14.)

- 120.1 It was moved by Cllr Robert Knowles, the Chairman of the Committee, duly seconded and RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee held on 1 March 2021 be approved received and noted.

There were no matters for Council consideration in Part I, and no requests to speak on Part II matters.

CNL121/20 MINUTES OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE (Agenda item 15.)

- 121.1 It was moved by Cllr Peter Marriott, the Chairman of the Committee, duly seconded and RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Audit Committee held on 1 March 2021 be received and noted.

There were no matters for Council consideration in Part I, and no requests to speak on Part II matters.

The meeting concluded at 11.59 pm

This page is intentionally left blank