

MINUTES of the WAVERLEY
BOROUGH COUNCIL held in
the Council Chamber, Council
Offices, The Burys, Godalming
on 13 December 2022 at 6.00
pm

- * Cllr John Ward (Mayor)
- * Cllr Penny Rivers (Deputy Mayor)

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| * Cllr Christine Baker | * Cllr Jacquie Keen |
| * Cllr David Beaman | Cllr Robert Knowles |
| * Cllr Dave Busby | * Cllr Andy MacLeod |
| Cllr Peter Clark | * Cllr Penny Marriott |
| * Cllr Carole Cockburn | Cllr Peter Marriott |
| * Cllr Steve Cosser | Cllr Michaela Martin |
| Cllr Martin D'Arcy | * Cllr Peter Martin |
| * Cllr Jerome Davidson | Cllr Mark Merryweather |
| * Cllr Kevin Deanus | * Cllr Kika Mirylees |
| * Cllr Simon Dear | * Cllr Stephen Mulliner |
| * Cllr Sally Dickson | * Cllr David Munro |
| 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 Forszewski | * Cllr John Robini |
| * Cllr Maxine Gale | Cllr Anne-Marie Rosoman |
| * Cllr Michael Goodridge | * Cllr Trevor Sadler |
| * Cllr Joan Heagin | * Cllr Richard Seaborne |
| Cllr Val Henry | * Cllr Julian Spence |
| * Cllr George Hesse | * Cllr Liz Townsend |
| Cllr Chris Howard | * Cllr Philip Townsend |
| Cllr Daniel Hunt | Cllr Michaela Wicks |
| * Cllr Jerry Hyman | * Cllr Steve Williams |
| * Cllr Anna James | Cllr George Wilson |

*Present

Apologies

Cllr Peter Clark, Cllr Martin D'Arcy, Cllr Brian Edmonds, Cllr Val Henry, Cllr Chris Howard, Cllr Daniel Hunt, Cllr Robert Knowles, Cllr Peter Marriott, Cllr Michaela Martin, Cllr Mark Merryweather, Cllr Julia Potts, Cllr Anne-Marie Rosoman and Cllr George Wilson

Prior to the commencement of the meeting, the Mayor led the Council in a moment's silence in memory of Councillor Roger Blishen who had sadly passed away since the last Council meeting. Prayers were led by Reverend Roy Woodhams, Rector of St Nicholas, Cranleigh.

CNL54/22 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (Agenda item)

54.1 The Mayor welcomed Councillor Busby to his first meeting of the Council and thanked the Democratic Services and Business Support Team Manager on her last meeting and wished her well for the future.

CNL55/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda item 1.)

55.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Peter Clark, Brian Edmonds, Martin D'Arcy, Val Henry, Chris Howard, Dan Hunt, Robert Knowles, Peter Marriott, Michaela Martin, Mark Merryweather, Julia Potts, Anne-Marie Rosoman and George Wilson.

CNL56/22 MINUTES (Agenda item 2.)

56.1 The Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 18 October 2022 were confirmed and signed.

CNL57/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Agenda item 3.)

57.1 There were no interests declared under this heading.

CNL58/22 MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Agenda item 4.)

58.1 The Mayor updated the Council on his activities since the last meeting of the Council. The Mayor had unfortunately missed the Christmas Cake and Carols service due to illness and thanked all those involved. The Mayor had raised the 999 flag in honour of those who work in the emergency services. The service had been delayed due to the sad death of Her Majesty, the Queen. The Mayor had also attended the Forces Day Poppy Launch at Pirbright and the Army Benevolent Fund Speaker's Dinner at Frensham Heights School.

58.2 The Mayor had attended a Safe Drive, Stay Alive event in Reigate for young people learning to drive. The Mayor represented the Borough at the Farnham Venison Dinner which had returned to the Bush Hotel, which was where it originally started. The Mayor also represented the Borough at the Remembrance Day parade in Farnham, which had included an outdoor service. The Mayor visited Moorhouse School; St Catherine's School in Bramley; numerous church services; and had his first Christmas lunch at the Farnham Day Centre.

CNL59/22 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Agenda item 5.)

59.1 The Leader welcomed Cllr Busby to the Council and the Liberal Democrat Group. Since the last Council meeting, there had been a further meeting of the Cost of Living Working Group which was carrying out important work. The Leader thanked the Housing team for a number of recent interventions regarding heating; thanked the Finance team for their work on the recent statements from the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and the Democratic Services and Business Support Team Manager for her support of the Council meetings.

The Leader then invited the Executive to make the following announcements:

- 59.2 Cllr MacLeod advised that parking revenue had increased in recent months which was good news for the economic health of the Borough. Two afternoons of free parking for residents would be provided in the Christmas period. There had been a spate of abandoned vehicles in one part of the Borough which had been dealt with. The commercial element of Brightwells should complete in the middle of 2023, however the opening of the scheme would be determined by Surrey County Council. Coppa Club, a high end restaurant chain, would be opening a restaurant in the development.
- 59.3 Cllr Penny Marriott updated the Council on the work of the Community Safety team and the Safer Waverley Partnership, which had reported to its participating organisations on its work over a three year period. Cllr Marriott had also attended the Hundred Year celebration of the Muslim women's group, which was part of the Ahmadiyya community.
- 59.4 Cllr Mirylees advised that tender returns had been received for the Leisure Management contract and the evaluation of these would conclude in a couple of weeks. Bidders that met the requirements would then be invited to submit a revised tender, with the contract due to be awarded in March 2023. The Cranleigh Leisure Centre tender specification was being finalised, with a view to appointing a design team and energy consultant in January 2023. Consultation would take place with stakeholders would take place prior to the planning process which was expected to take approximately one year, with construction due to begin in 2024.
- 59.5 Cllr Palmer advised that the Housing team were providing a critical role at the moment during the cold weather. He encouraged councillors to contact the team if they were aware of any residents in need during the winter period.
- 59.6 Cllr Paul Rivers updated on the work on the response to the letter from the Secretary of State asking for Registered Social Landlords to set out what systems and processes they have in place to deal with damp and mould in social housing. He thanked all officers for their diligence and expertise.
- 59.7 Cllr Liz Townsend thanked the Economic Development team for organising the first joint business question time with Guildford Borough Council held at Charterhouse and thanked the panel and keynote speakers. The team had also been working with retailers across the borough distributing top-up funding to support festive activities to attract Christmas visitors. Cllr Townsend welcomed the improvement plan for the planning service and thanked the team for their hard work. The Local Plan Part 2 main modifications were out to consultation, and this was due to conclude on 27 January 2023.
- 59.8 Cllr Williams advised that Waverley and Farnham Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIP) had been prepared by the consultants working with Surrey County Council and both documents would be going through further consultation before being adopted. Additional electric vehicle charging points would be rolled out in five car park locations in the borough.

A hearing date had been set for the Council's legal challenge of the Secretary of State's decision to allow UKOG to drill for hydrocarbons in Dunsfold. This would be heard on 2 March 2023.

CNL60/22 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC (Agenda item 6.)

60.1 The following questions were received from members of the public in accordance with Procedure Rule 10:

i) The first question had been received from Mrs Anne Gray of Godalming.

As Mrs Gray could not be present at the council meeting, Mr Daniel Hussein had been nominated to read the following question on her behalf:

"Would the Mayor please accept the Petition signed by 4,044 users of Crown Court car park, organised by the Save Crown Court Action Group (see file attached). The Save Crown Court Action Group Co-ordinators are: Mrs Anne Gray, 3, Netherwood Court Filmer Grove Godalming. GU7 3AF and Mr Daniel Hussein, 40, Elizabeth Court, Elizabeth Road, Godalming, GU7. The Petition reads as follows:

"Save Crown court Car park. We, the undersigned, oppose the building of houses on the main Godalming car park at Crown Court, and/or the construction of a multi-storey car park at the Waverley HQ site at The Burys. We call on the Waverley Borough Council to:

- 1) Oppose plans to close or partly close Crown Court car park
- 2) Stop plans to build houses on Crown Court car park
- 3) Reject proposals to build a multi-storey car park at the WBC site or at Crown Court

"Crown Court car park is Godalming's largest car park, is used by a large number of residents and visitors and is often full. It is easy to use and conveniently situated at the heart of the town, close to shops and retail businesses in the High Street and Church Street, the Parish Church, the Bandstand, children's play facilities, events at the Wilfred Noyce centre and Moss Lane School. A Multi Storey car park at the WBC site on the edge of the Conservation Area overlooking the Lammas lands is inappropriate for Godalming and much less easy and convenient to use"

Response from the Mayor:

"Thank you for your question. Your petition will be reviewed in accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme, as set out in Annexe 1 of Part 4.9 of the Council's Constitution and a member of the Democratic Services team will be in touch with you to advise you of the next steps."

In response to a request from Councillor Peter Martin and with the agreement of the Leader, the Mayor agreed to take Agenda Item 16.1 (Motion on the Central Godalming Regeneration Project) before item 8 (Housing Revenue Account Business Plan - Strategic Review), as

members of the public in the Public Gallery had attended to hear this debate.

Cllr Hyman raised a Point of Order, and asked the Mayor to clarify the arrangements under the Petition Scheme regarding the number of signatures a petition needed to be accepted by the Council, the Executive or the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

ii) The following question had been submitted by Mrs Clare Weightman from Godalming:

“Does the Mayor know whether the sensitive personal data gathered for this petition was in accordance with the Data Protection Act (2018); and, in accepting this petition, can it be guaranteed that the aforementioned sensitive personal data of residents will not be used in future for party political purposes?”

Does the Mayor accept that the petition's questions and statements as presented to the public were inaccurate and misleading? For example, the reference to 'plans', when in fact they are options and cannot be construed as plans at this stage of the public engagement process. Moreover, the third statement implies that a multi-storey car park is being planned for Crown Court, when this has not been proposed.”

Response from the Mayor:

“Thank you for this question. As you are aware I have just been handed this petition so I am not in a position to give any assurances over the method of collection of signatures. Whilst I believe that councillors will not use the data from the petition for party political purposes I obviously cannot give any guarantee about how the originators of the petition will behave. Having just received this petition, my officers have not had the time to study it so I am unable to comment on the accuracy of the statements made within it.”

iii) The following question has been received by Mr Stuart Mantle regarding Ocean's 11 Fish and Chips, 133 Upper Hale Road, Farnham:

“Residents & neighbours continue to be seriously affected by the change of use of this establishment from restaurant to fast food take away first making contact with planning & environmental services in May 2019.

There are numerous planning breaches at this establishment, many of which have seriously impacted the day to day lives of those near it since opening. Environmental are again presenting breach of odour abatement notice offences to the court.

In May 2022 - an enforcement notice (EN/2002/12) was witness served to both freeholder & lessee at the time, instructing cease & desist of the take away operation. Removal for the extract flue by Nov 21st 2022. This has not been complied with. A change of lessee has resulted in an

extension of the date of the enforcement of the cease and desist order. It should be noted the freeholder has not changed nor have staff operating the premises daily since the notice was served.

Specific questions:

- 1) Why does enforcement take so long with such clear issues and why has this failed to be enforced by planning?
- 2) Why does the impact on the lives of local residents matter so little with this issue in favour of the business?
- 3) What can be done going forward to bring this establishment into compliance more quickly?"

At the request of the Leader, Cllr Andy MacLeod, Portfolio Holder for Enforcement, Operations and Brightwells responded, as follows:

"Officers from Planning Enforcement and Environmental Protection have spent considerable time and resource investigating complaints and taking action because we are concerned about the impacts on neighbours. The process has been hampered due to the former leaseholder's refusal to engage with the Council in relation to the problems described. The actions to date have included the service of an odour nuisance abatement notice and subsequent successful prosecution for non-compliance with this, and the service of a Planning Enforcement Notice which required the takeaway use to cease and the flue and ventilation system to be removed by 21 November 2022.

In early November, the lease to the premises changed hands. Officers have established a meaningful dialogue with the new leaseholders who are eager to resolve all outstanding matters. It is acknowledged that considerable time has passed since the initial complaints were received but due process must be followed and if people are not cooperative, it can take considerable time to achieve desired outcomes. We do understand that it is frustrating for complainants and we share these frustrations. It would be inappropriate to comment on any future potential enforcement action in a public forum, but a resolution to this long running matter remains a priority for both Planning Enforcement and Environmental Protection."

CNL61/22 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL (Agenda item 7.)

61.1 The following questions from Councillors had been received in accordance with Procedure Rule 11.

i) Cllr George Hesse had asked the following question:

"Many local authorities have designated conservation areas which are protected from inappropriate development by use of Article 4 directives that remove permitted development rights, thus requiring planning applications to be submitted. This ensures that choice of suitable materials, size, bulk, mass, design, overlooking issues, Etc are carefully scrutinised and neighbours have the opportunity to object currently denied under permitted development. This does not currently apply in the Borough of Waverly and therefore our Conservation Areas are very

vulnerable to unsuitable development. Would Waverly Borough Council consider applying for Article 4 Provisions to apply in all its designated Conservation Areas to provide this additional protection that these areas require.”

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Economic Development, Cllr Liz Townsend, gave the following response:

“Waverley Borough Council has 43 conservations areas, ranging in size and character. Permitted Development (PD) rights are restricted within Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings are subject to additional controls.

Although Article 4 directions can be made to withdraw additional PD rights, the NPPF advises that such directions should be applied in a measured and targeted way. They should be limited to situations where necessary to protect local amenity or the well-being of that area, based on robust evidence including the potential harm that the article 4 direction is intended to address. They should apply to the smallest geographical area possible. Compensation may be payable to property owners, although this is limited to loss or damage directly attributable to the withdrawal of PD rights.

There is only one article 4 direction in place directly relating to a Conservation Area (affecting 13 properties in Chiddingfold). This reflects the extent of existing planning controls within Conservations Areas and the significant resource implications entailed in making article 4 directions (including surveys and consultation) and in dealing with the additional planning applications and enforcement matters arising from the removal of PD rights (albeit an application fee is now required).

In view of these factors, it is not considered that a blanket approach to applying article 4 directions to all Conservation Areas in Waverley would be justified or feasible. The gathering of the evidence base requires extensive investigation and is a lengthy process, including an assessment of all buildings in each conservation area to establish a prioritised list and to establish the impact that each specific permitted development right has had on the amenity and well-being of the area. A full and extensive public consultation would also be required, and representations considered before an article 4 direction if appropriate could be confirmed.

The Council could consider the measured and targeted use of an article 4 direction if presented with full and robust evidence for each conservation area of the potential harm to local amenity or well-being resulting from specific PD rights bearing in mind that this should be targeted to the smallest possible geographic areas and not seeking a blanket ban. Based on this evidence the resource implications of preparing and implementing a direction would then need to be assessed so that this workstream could be considered and prioritised in line with other service plan priorities and the council’s resources.”

ii) Cllr Keen asked the following question on behalf of Cllr Knowles, who had given his apologies for absence:

“Was this Council consulted or informed of the decision by Surrey Heartlands with the support of the RSCH to create an elective surgery hub for all Surrey at Ashford Middlesex, a location just outside the London Borough of Hounslow and no transport connections to most of Surrey and if not, does the executive have any confidence in the Surrey heartlands as this shows again a lack of consideration for residents in the south of the county.”

Response from Cllr Mirylees, Portfolio Holder for Health, Wellbeing, Parks and Leisure

“I would like to thank Cllr Knowles for his question, and Cllr Keen who has also raised this issue with me.

I have checked with all those officers involved with interactions with Surrey Heartlands and none had been made aware of the proposal to create an elective hub in Ashford Middlesex. I have been advised that for clinical matters such as these, this lack of consultation with the Council is unfortunately not unusual.

Although it is likely that patient transport would be available if a resident has issues attending an appointment due to travel requirements, this is clearly less than ideal for residents in the south of the County and the Executive shares those concerns. Therefore, the Leader of the Council will be writing to the Chief Executive of Surrey Heartlands to set out our concerns and seek assurances that residents of Waverley will not be disadvantaged by this move.

Having said that, contact was made subsequently by Terry Willows, Chief of Staff at NHS Sussex, and only after councillors and officers pressed for a response, and these are some of the assurances he gives: to the extent that there is any impact this technical change would only impact residents and patients who live in the Chichester District Council area. There is no impact for residents who live in the Waverley Borough Council area, neither their GPs nor their access to NHS services would change and all of the health services they receive would continue to be commissioned and funded by Surrey Heartlands ICB. The GP practices in Waverley in question would see no change to the funding they receive which is based on registered patient list size. The only change foreseen would be in relation to continuing health care and s117 mental health after-care where funding responsibility would pass from Surrey Heartlands to Sussex ICB. The change would also mean that both Surrey and West Sussex County Councils would be able to produce more accurate population Health Data without the need for manual adjustments to their data to reflect the current misaligned border. This will ultimately mean better population health data to support better commissioning of services to reflect population need.

We recognise that there are many concerns that have been left unanswered and therefore despite this we will be taking this issue up officially.”

iii) The following question had been received from Cllr David Beaman:

“Given that WBC has recognised the need to take action to achieve its Climate Change objectives why does this Council continue to offer free Christmas car parking resulting in lost revenue rather than funding free travel on bus services given that encouraging greater use of public transport is more sustainable rather than encouraging use of private cars through the provision of free car parking?”

Response from Cllr Andy MacLeod, Portfolio Holder for Enforcement, Operations and Brightwells

"Thank you, Cllr Beaman, for your question, which made some good points and a good suggestion which we will follow up on. Your point on climate change is certainly one we as the Executive are aligned with. The free Christmas Parking in Waverley offer, aligns with our corporate commitment to invigorate our high streets and to work closely with our Chambers of Commerce. The intention is to reduce travel by encouraging local buying in Waverley's shops. Any reduction in online purchasing will also reduce the associated journeys by delivery vehicles.

We like your suggestion for a free bus service at Christmas and have noted your link to a successful and popular scheme run by Swansea Council. Bus services are Surrey County Council's responsibility, and we will be contacting Surrey to encourage the introduction of such a scheme next Christmas. If this happens, we might well review our own free Christmas parking scheme. I hope that answers your question and we look forward with working with you to encourage the county council to support future initiatives to support our climate change objectives and our high streets."

iv) The following question has been received from Councillor Steve Cosser:

Can members please be informed of the density of Waverley owned housing per head of population in each of the following areas:-

1. The Town Council area of Farnham
2. The Town Council area of Godalming
3. The Town Council area of Haslemere
4. The Parish Council area of Cranleigh
5. The remainder of Waverley (i.e. the area not included in 1-4 above)

Response from Councillor Nick Palmer, Co-Portfolio Holder for Housing (Delivery):

“I would like to thank Cllr Cosser for his question:

The numbers of Waverley owned properties in the areas mentioned are as follows:

1. The Town Council area of Farnham **1256**
2. The Town Council area of Godalming **1072**
3. The Town Council area of Haslemere **698**
4. The Parish Council area of Cranleigh **398**
5. The remainder of Waverley (i.e., the area not included in 1-4 above) **1322**

It might be helpful also to highlight the total number of affordable homes in each area

1. The Town Council area of Farnham **2278**
2. The Town Council area of Godalming **1525**
3. The Town Council area of Haslemere **728**
4. The Parish Council area of Cranleigh **942**
5. The remainder of Waverley (i.e. the area not included in 1-4 above) **1831**

The Council's Housing Register indicates numbers of households who have expressed a preference for they wish to live:

1. The Town Council area of Farnham **280**
2. The Town Council area of Godalming **259**
3. The Town Council area of Haslemere **78**
4. The Parish Council area of Cranleigh **99**
5. The remainder of Waverley (i.e. the area not included in 1-4 above) **469**

A very comprehensive study on housing need in the Borough was a carried out to inform the Affordable Housing Delivery Strategy that was adopted by Council in April 2022. I would point Cllr Cosser to that study which can be found on the Council's website. I will ask officers to forward a link."

Cllr Cosser asked the Mayor to note that the response given had not addressed his question, which had asked for the **density** of Waverley owned housing per head of population in each area. The Mayor assured Cllr Cosser that a corrected response would be provided in writing.

CNL62/22 MOTION - CENTRAL GODALMING REGENERATION PROJECT (Agenda item 16.1)

- 62.1 At the invitation of the Mayor, Cllr Peter Martin introduced the Motion that had been submitted by himself, Cllr Steve Cosser and Cllr Michael Goodridge, the text of which had been circulated in the agenda for the meeting:

"In light of the negative feedback in the Central Godalming Regeneration Project Public Engagement Update as presented by the Finance Portfolio Holder to the Executive on 29th November and taking account of the

opposition expressed in a petition being presented to Full Council on 13th December,

This Council resolves to:

- Terminate plans to close or partly close Crown Court Car Park in Godalming
- Stop plans to build houses on Crown Court Car Park
- Reject proposals to build a multi-storey car park at the Waverley Borough Council HQ site”

- 62.2 Cllr Martin stated that this motion sought an outright rejection of any proposals to build houses on Crown Court Car Park or to construct a Multi-storey Car Park at The Burys to fund the rebuilding of Waverley Borough Council’s headquarters. Cllr Martin cited the Petition received by Council from The Save Crown Court Action Group to support the Motion. He argued that constructing a multi storey car park at the Waverley Headquarters would be unethical as the site was on the edge of the Godalming Conservation Area and overlooking the Lammas Lands. Cllr Martin stated that a more appropriate example of affordable housing in Godalming was the the current housing development at Ockford Park, which would provide around 262 homes, of which 78 are deemed affordable. He urged the council to rethink these plans and find alternatives. Cllr. Martin commended the Motion to the council.
- 62.3 Cllr S. Cosser spoke as a seconder on the Motion. Cllr Cosser referred to a statement issued by the Local Chamber of Commerce based on a survey of their members, stating that 85% of surveyed Chambers members opposed the propositions made by the Administration. Cllr Cosser quoted the statement issued by the Chambers of Commerce, which stated that “these proposals will not benefit retail and commerce in Godalming”. Cllr Cosser also referred to the Petition received by Council to support the Motion and argued that residents and businesses of Godalming would not accept any proposals that included building on the Crown Court Car Park and constructing a multi storey car park in central Godalming. He argued that any amendment that left the possibility for this open in the future should be rejected. Cllr Cosser concluded by urging councillors to support the Motion.
- 62.4 The Leader of the Council, Cllr Follows, proposed an amendment, which was seconded by Cllr Andy MacLeod. Cllr Follows circulated his amendment which was set out with tracked changes to the original amendment and as a clean version of the amended motion.
- 62.5 In response to a Point of Order from Cllr Simon Dear, the Mayor confirmed that an amendment did not have to be a minor change and was defined as adding words, removing words, or doing both, with the only restriction being that it should not simply negate the original motion. The Mayor was therefore happy to accept the amendment.
- 62.6 At the request of Cllr Hyman, Cllr Cosser, and other Members, the Mayor adjourned the meeting at 7:16pm for five minutes to allow Members time to read the amendment. The meeting resumed at 7.20pm. The Mayor invited Cllr Follows to introduce his amendment.

- 62.7 Cllr Follows thanked the Monitoring Officer for confirming the validity of his amendment in relation to the Constitution. He recalled how the previous administration had treated residents with regard to Brightwells and the current administration had sought to learn from that and engage early with the local community on concepts and options rather than pre-determined ideas. Cllr Follows had assumed that the opposition were well-meaning in their aims but just came at things from a different perspective, but he had seen a number of councillors consciously introduce misinformation on the subject of the proposals. As ward councillor for the area of Godalming affected by the proposals, these were not things he would necessarily want to do. But he had been open about why the proposal were necessary and his duty as a Waverley councillor took precedence over his personal views. Cllr Follows' view was that the original motion was irresponsible and the simple opposition to the proposals put the entire Waverley budget at risk without any alternative proposals.
- 62.8 Cllr Follows explained that the amendment recognised that there was a wide range of feedback to the engagement, aimed to provide the context for the regeneration project in terms of local government funding, proposed the release of proposals commissioned by the previous administration which would provide background to the latest proposals, and proposed a cross-party working group to review all options and financial details of the project. The working group would only sit if all parties on the Council agreed to participate.
- 62.9 Cllrs Michael Goodridge, Peter Martin, Stephen Mulliner, Simon Dear, Steve Coser, and Richard Seaborne all spoke emphatically in opposition to the amendment, highlighting local knowledge in understanding what was acceptable in Godalming; the risk to the well-being of the town, its shops and businesses in removing parking at Crown Court; public objection to a multi-storey car park in Godalming and especially the proposed location; lack of a robust business case to support the proposals; opposition to the principle of developing Crown Court and The Burys to fund the redevelopment of the Council Offices under any circumstances; and the unrealistic timeframe for the proposed working group to report.
- 62.10 Cllr David Munro noted that he would be voting for the amendment but saw it as a face-saving exercise by the administration which would provide a means of back-tracking on their original proposals.
- 62.11 Cllr Hyman expressed concern at the proposals and the potential impact on Godalming, but did not feel that the original motion was the right approach as it was too absolute in its opposition. However, he did not feel able to support the amendment and would abstain.
- 62.12 Cllrs Steve Williams, Liz Townsend, Joan Heagin, Nick Palmer, Sally Dickson, John Robini, the Deputy Mayor Penny Rivers, and Kika Mirylees all spoke in support of the amendment, noting that the public engagement had identified the extent of misinformation put out by opposition members; the desire for early engagement with residents and stakeholders on proposals for the town centre; the genuine need to address the deficiencies of the Council Offices and the need to look for local solutions in the absence of adequate

government funding for local government; the offer to work collaboratively with the Opposition Group to identify alternative and fiscally equivalent options; the opportunity to provide much needed affordable homes in the centre of Godalming; and that the previous administration had begun the work to identify solutions to the problem of the Council Offices by redeveloping council owned land in Godalming town centre.

- 62.13 Cllr Mary Foryszewski expressed her disappointment at the tone of the debate and lack of respect shown by councillors to one another, and urged the administration to listen to the objections of local residents to the proposals.
- 62.14 Cllr Andy MacLeod, as seconder of the amendment, highlighted the negative slant of the original motion compared with the willingness embedded in the amendment to take a collaborative approach to looking at alternative solutions to the problems. He noted the tight timeframe, but felt that the aim was to sense-check the direction of travel and to identify other options.
- 62.15 The Mayor invited Cllr Follows to sum-up the debate on the amendment. Cllr Follows reminded Members that the previous administration had identified that the status quo was not an option. His intention was not to rule anything out with this amendment, but to engage with the budget issues and go forward in good faith in engaging with stakeholders on concepts, learning from the experience of Brightwells.
- 62.16 Cllr Peter Martin requested a recorded vote on the amendment, in accordance with Procedure Rule 17.4, which was supported by five Members and it was

RESOLVED

Following the consideration of all feedback to the Central Godalming Regeneration Project Public Engagement, including, but not limited to the presentation by the Finance Portfolio Holder to the Executive on 29th November and taking account of the views expressed in a petition being presented to Full Council on 13th December and taking into account the Council's duty to have regard for:

- A) the opportunities identified since at least 2018 to save revenue expenditure on operating and maintaining the Burys (Council Office) building, and the best use of the Council's assets for all the residents of Waverley.**
- B) the national macro-economic climate and the volatile condition of and uncertain prospects for local government funding settlements from central government, and**
- C) believing that this Council must act responsibly and with financial prudence on behalf of all our residents across the Borough and that sometimes this necessitates making difficult choices.**

This Council resolves to:

- **Terminate the consideration of any options to relocate some of the spaces in Crown Court Car Park in Godalming**
- **Stop the consideration of any options to build houses on Crown Court Car Park**
- **Reject any options to build a decked car park at the Waverley Borough Council HQ site**

IF

- **Alternative and fiscally equivalent options can be identified and implemented to meet the serious financial constraints impacting Waverley Borough Council within the relevant and appropriate planning and financial frameworks and regulations also keeping in mind the Council objective to maximise the delivery of genuinely affordable and social housing.**

To this end, the Council further resolves to:

- **Appoint a dedicated, all-party, Executive Working Group (in accordance with Part 4.4 Annexe 1 of the Waverley Borough Council Constitution) with the following terms of reference, scope, and composition:**
 - a) This Executive Working Group will be chaired by the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Assets.**
 - b) The scope of the group will be to find and further consider any alternatives to the Godalming Regeneration Project that address the financial objectives of the project and within the relevant and appropriate planning and financial frameworks and regulations.**
 - c) The composition of the group will be 2 Liberal Democrats; 2 Farnham Residents; 2 Conservatives; 1 Green and 1 Labour member.**
 - d) Sessions of this Executive Working Group will not be considered quorate without at least ONE representative from each of the legally constituted political groups on the council.**
 - e) The group will meet in January and report by 15th February 2022.**
- **To write to and engage with Homes England regarding any housing and infrastructure assistance, funding, and guidance that they could offer.**
- **To release and publish to the WBC website, in the interests of transparency, the Lambert Smith Hampton report (2018) commissioned by the previous administration of WBC.**
- **To write to the MP for South West Surrey, the Rt Hon. Jeremy Hunt in his capacity as a cabinet minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom, to request a plan for sustainable local government funding sufficient to allow this Council to deliver services without the need to consider projects such as the Central Godalming Regeneration Project.**

For (25)

Cllrs Baker, Beaman, Busby, Davidson, Dickson, Follows, Gale, Heagin, Hesse, Keen, MacLeod, Penny Marriott, Mirylees, Munro, Nicholson, Palmer, Reed, Paul Rivers, Penny Rivers, Robini, Spence, Liz Townsend, Phillip Townsend, Ward, Williams

Against (12)

Cllrs Cockburn, Cosser, Dear, Deanus, David Else, Jenny Else, Goodridge, James, Peter Martin, Mulliner, Sadler, Seaborne

Abstentions (4)

Cllrs Ellis, Forszewski, Hyman, Neale

62.17 The Mayor confirmed that with the amendment having been carried, this now became the substantive motion to be debated. Cllr Follows moved that as there had already been a significant debate and Members had made clear their positions, the matter should be put to the vote. The Mayor confirmed that there were no Members wishing to speak other than Cllr Peter Martin who wished to exercise his right of reply, as proposer of the original motion, and in that case Cllr Follows withdrew his closure motion.

62.18 Cllr Martin noted that in response to the administration's consultation on its proposals to close Crown Court Car Park to build houses, and to build a multi-storey car park, the public had voted 6 to 1 against the proposition, a petition of over 4,000 signatures had been presented to Council, and the Chamber of Commerce was deeply opposed. The administration had then ignored all that feedback with the amendment that would stop all the proposals if alternative and fiscally equivalent options could be identified and implemented to meet the financial constraints on the council and satisfy planning and other regulations. In his view, the people of Godalming had spoken and no financial justification was sufficient to do what was being proposed. Cllr Martin would be voting against the amended motion and he urged Members to do the same.

62.19 Cllr Follows requested a recorded vote on the Motion, in accordance with Procedure Rule 17.4, which was supported by five Members and it was

RESOLVED

Following the consideration of all feedback to the Central Godalming Regeneration Project Public Engagement, including, but not limited to the presentation by the Finance Portfolio Holder to the Executive on 29th November and taking account of the views expressed in a petition being presented to Full Council on 13th December and taking into account the Council's duty to have regard for:

- A) the opportunities identified since at least 2018 to save revenue expenditure on operating and maintaining the Burys (Council Office) building, and the best use of the Council's assets for all the residents of Waverley.**

- B) the national macro-economic climate and the volatile condition of and uncertain prospects for local government funding settlements from central government, and**
- C) believing that this Council must act responsibly and with financial prudence on behalf of all our residents across the Borough and that sometimes this necessitates making difficult choices.**

This Council resolves to:

- Terminate the consideration of any options to relocate some of the spaces in Crown Court Car Park in Godalming**
- Stop the consideration of any options to build houses on Crown Court Car Park**
- Reject any options to build a decked car park at the Waverley Borough Council HQ site**

IF

- Alternative and fiscally equivalent options can be identified and implemented to meet the serious financial constraints impacting Waverley Borough Council within the relevant and appropriate planning and financial frameworks and regulations also keeping in mind the Council objective to maximise the delivery of genuinely affordable and social housing.**

To this end, the Council further resolves to:

- Appoint a dedicated, all-party, Executive Working Group (in accordance with Part 4.4 Annexe 1 of the Waverley Borough Council Constitution) with the following terms of reference, scope, and composition:**
 - a) This Executive Working Group will be chaired by the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Assets.**
 - b) The scope of the group will be to find and further consider any alternatives to the Godalming Regeneration Project that address the financial objectives of the project and within the relevant and appropriate planning and financial frameworks and regulations.**
 - c) The composition of the group will be 2 Liberal Democrats; 2 Farnham Residents; 2 Conservatives; 1 Green and 1 Labour member.**
 - d) Sessions of this Executive Working Group will not be considered quorate without at least ONE representative from each of the legally constituted political groups on the council.**
 - e) The group will meet in January and report by 15th February 2022.**
- To write to and engage with Homes England regarding any housing and infrastructure assistance, funding, and guidance that they could offer.**
- To release and publish to the WBC website, in the interests of transparency, the Lambert Smith Hampton report (2018) commissioned by the previous administration of WBC.**

- **To write to the MP for South West Surrey, the Rt Hon. Jeremy Hunt in his capacity as a cabinet minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom, to request a plan for sustainable local government funding sufficient to allow this Council to deliver services without the need to consider projects such as the Central Godalming Regeneration Project.**

For (25)

Cllrs Baker, Beaman, Busby, Davidson, Dickson, Follows, Gale, Heagin, Hesse, Keen, MacLeod, Penny Marriott, Mirylees, Munro, Nicholson, Palmer, Reed, Paul Rivers, Penny Rivers, Robini, Spence, Liz Townsend, Phillip Townsend, Ward, Williams

Against (14)

Cllrs Cockburn, Cosser, Dear, Deanus, David Else, Jenny Else, Foryszewski, Goodridge, Hyman, James, Peter Martin, Mulliner, Sadler, Seaborne

Abstentions (2)

Cllrs Ellis, Neale

At 8.42pm, the Mayor adjourned the meeting for 10 minutes. The meeting resumed at 8.52pm.

CNL63/22 HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUSINESS PLAN - STRATEGIC REVIEW (Agenda item 8.)

- 63.1 The Leader of the Council moved the recommendations which were duly seconded by Cllr Paul Rivers, Co-Portfolio Holder for Housing (Operations).
- 63.2 A review of the 30-year HRA Business Plan had been commissioned in February 2022, with the aim of addressing the challenges in the Plan and ensuring it was on a sustainable financial footing. The HRA Business Plan was a rolling 30-year self-financing plan to deliver key long-term strategies and commitments within the Corporate Plan including managing, maintaining, and building new social and affordable housing for Waverley tenants. Since its origins in 2012 there had been a number of unforeseen challenges to the basic assumptions of the Business Plan: the government had imposed four years of rent decreases, followed by four years of capped rent increases which had impacted on income assumptions; asset management priorities like fire safety improvements and decent home standard requirements, and the Council's commitment to decarbonization had added to planned maintenance costs; and more recent increases in inflation had impacted on cost budgets across all areas. The strategic review addressed how the Council would meet debt repayments, fund housing maintenance and development of new affordable homes, and maintain adequate levels of reserves.
- 63.3 Cllr Seaborne agreed in principle with the need to revise the HRA Business Plan s. raises issue with section 4.13 of the report that explained the proposed approach to fund new homes building through a combination of Right to Buy (RtB) receipts and borrowing. The level of RtB receipts was

uncertain, but Cllr Seaborne wanted to understand better the assumptions that had been made in the revised Business Plan about these receipts and the corresponding amount of borrowing expected in order to make an informed decision, given the risks around potentially high levels of borrowing. Cllr Seaborne also noted that some of the figures in the annexes had changed between being considered by different committees and these changes needed to be clarified. Cllr Cosser echoed the concerns regarding variations in the details of the annexes.

63.4 At the invitation of The Mayor, the Section 151 Officer advised that the reason for variation in the details set out in the annexes was due to the borrowing rate changing in the period that these reports had been flowing through the committee process. There had been no other changes to the annexes. With this assurance, the Leader commended the recommendations to Council.

63.5 The Mayor moved to a vote and it was

RESOLVED that

- 1.the revised HRA Business Plan strategy as set out in the report be approved; and**
- 2.the proposed movements, restrictions and purposes of the reserves as set out in Annexe 2 of the report be approved.**

CNL64/22 HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUSINESS PLAN REVIEW - NEW BUILD HOUSING DELIVERY (Agenda item 9.)

64.1 The Mayor noted that there had been a considerable amount of commercially sensitive information provided to Members to support their decision-making. He did not propose to move into exempt session unless absolutely necessary, and asked Members to take care over what they referred to in their speeches.

64.2 The Leader of the Council moved the recommendations, which were duly seconded by Cllr Nick Palmer, Co-Portfolio Holder for Housing (Delivery). The report provided an overview of the Council's proposed new build affordable housing schemes which were in a position to be delivered through entering into a build contract with a contractor. The business case for each of the eight proposed schemes, delivering a total of 74 new homes, was set out in Exempt Annexe 1, and the budgets were detailed in Annexe 2. An independent value for money review had been carried for each business case and confirmed that the Council was using robust development assumptions.

64.3 Cllr David Munro spoke to commend the proposals and the ambition of the Council in its affordable housing development programme. Cllr Richard Seaborne spoke and noted that in terms of the number of new units delivered, the number of bedrooms and the number of new occupants that would be housed, the Turners Mead, Riverside Court and Aarons Hill projects added relatively little compared to the other projects but would take the same amount of staff time and resources to progress. Given the limited resources available he wondered whether these schemes presented value

for money. Cllr Seaborne also noted that the delivery cost per unit of Turners Mead and Aarons Hill were much higher than for other schemes and, when combined with the lack of materiality, he struggled to support these two particular schemes. Cllr Anna James echoed these comments in relation to Turners Mead, which was in her ward.

- 64.4 Cllr Stephen Mulliner welcomed the report and noted that the actual number of new homes being delivered was 56 as 18 homes had been demolished to enable the Site C development at Ockford Ridge. He echoed concerns about the materiality and value for money of some of the smaller schemes.
- 64.5 Cllr Palmer responded to Members' comments and concerns, noting that there was a need to spread new homes across the borough, where there was demand, but smaller schemes would always be more expensive due to the lack of economies of scale. The independent review provided reassurance that the budgets provided value for money in the context. The Leader also noted that the next phase of the development programme was being prepared and would come forward in due course.
- 64.6 The Mayor moved to a vote, taking all of the sites detailed in Annexe 1 as a block, and it was

RESOLVED

1. **that the recommendations set out in the business cases in Annexe 1 to the report be approved, as follows:**
 - **Annexe 1a - Site C Ockford Ridge, Godalming – delivery of 30 new homes and total scheme cost (retrospective approval)**
 - **Annexe 1b - Aarons Hill, Godalming – delivery of 4 new homes and scheme costs**
 - **Annexe 1c - Harts Grove, Chiddingfold – delivery of 5 new homes and scheme costs**
 - **Annexe 1d - Pathfield, Chiddingfold – delivery of 11 new homes and scheme costs**
 - **Annexe 1e - Queens Mead, Chiddingfold – delivery of 8 new homes and scheme costs**
 - **Annexe 1f - Turners Mead, Chiddingfold – delivery of 2 new homes and scheme costs**
 - **Annexe 1g - Riverside Court, Farnham – delivery of 2 new homes and the scheme cost**
 - **Annexe 1h – Woodside Park, Cattershall Lane – delivery of 12 new homes and scheme costs**
2. **that the budgets for each scheme, totalling £21,252,208m as set out in Annexe 2, be approved.**

CNL65/22 POLLING DISTRICT AND POLLING PLACE REVIEW 2022 (Agenda item 10.)

- 65.1 Cllr John Robini introduced the Polling District and Polling Place Review and commended the recommendations to Council, which were duly seconded by Cllr Michael Goodridge.
- 65.2 As a consequence of the recent Boundary Review of the Wards of Waverly Borough Council and the Community Governance Review of the Towns and Parishes within the Borough it was necessary for the Council to review the polling districts and location of places to make sure they were within the new boundaries. The purpose of the report was to agree the outcome of the new Polling District and Polling Place Review as these would be used for elections from May 2023.
- 65.3 Council noted that there had been discussion at the Standards Committee about the suitability of the Chichester Hall in Witley as a polling place in preference to the local school. In response to a request for clarification from Cllr Follows, the Chief Executive confirmed that the Returning Officer did have the authority to vary the polling place for a particular local poll if there were particular circumstances that made a polling place not viable.
- 65.4 The Mayor then put the recommendation to the vote and it was

RESOLVED that the proposed Polling District and Polling Places be approved.

CNL66/22 CHANGES TO THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION - TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS (Agenda item 11.)

- 66.1 Cllr John Robini introduced the report proposing changes to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers in relation to Tree Preservation Orders and commended the recommendations to Council, which were duly seconded by Cllr Michael Goodridge. The proposals had been considered by the Standards & General Purposes Committee, which had also noted minor changes to the Scheme of Delegation that had been made by the Monitoring Officer under delegated authority, to re-allocate specific delegations to the correct Executive Head of Service.
- 66.2 Cllr Jerry Hyman spoke to point out that changes to the Scheme of Delegation were in effect changes to the Constitution and should be approved by Council. Cllr Hyman also noted his concern that the revised Constitution agreed by Council in October 2022 had changed the way in which the Minutes of the Executive and other Committees were presented to Council, and suggested that Members might want to revisit this. Cllr Mulliner asked that any changes to the Scheme of Delegation or the Constitution made under delegated authority be reported in writing to Council. He also agreed that arrangements for reporting to Council might be considered as part of an exercise to better align the Constitutions of Waverley and Guildford, and the Leader confirmed that this workstream was being discussed and would come forward in due course.
- 66.3 There being no other speakers, the Mayor put the recommendation to the vote and it was

RESOLVED that

1. The changes to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers made by the Monitoring Officer under his delegated authority as set out in section 4.2 of the report be noted; and,
2. the proposed revision to the Scheme of Delegation as set out in section 4.3 of the report be approved, and Version 7.3 of the Scheme of Delegation be adopted.

CNL67/22 APPOINTMENT OF A JOINT MONITORING OFFICER (Agenda item 12.)

- 67.1 The Mayor advised that this item had been withdrawn and would be considered at a future meeting.

CNL68/22 APPOINTMENT OF RETURNING OFFICER AND ELECTORAL REGISTRATION OFFICER (Agenda item 13.)

- 68.1 The Mayor put the recommendation and it was

RESOLVED that the appointment of Robin Taylor as the Returning Officer for local elections, the Electoral Registration Officer for Waverley Borough Council, and the Acting Returning Officer for UK Parliamentary Elections be approved.

Cllr Hyman abstained from the vote and asked for this to be recorded in the minutes.

CNL69/22 REVIEW OF PROPORTIONALITY OF THE COUNCIL, ALLOCATION OF COMMITTEE SEATS, AND APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES FOR 2022/23 (Agenda item 14.)

- 69.1 The Mayor put the recommendation to Council and it was

RESOLVED that

1. The revised political balance of the Council, following the recent by-election for the Chiddingfold & Dunsfold Ward, the vacancy arising in the Farnham Bourne Ward, and the resignation of Cllr Floyd-Douglass from the Conservative Group, be noted; and
2. The allocation of seats and the appointment of Members to those seats in accordance with Groups' nominations, as set out in Annexes 1 and 2 to the report, be approved.

CNL70/22 USE OF URGENCY PROCEDURE FOR A KEY DECISION (Agenda item 15.)

- 70.1 The Leader of the Council introduced the report that set out the decisions that were undertaken in the reporting period as urgent decisions. There were no speakers. The Mayor put the recommendation and it was

RESOLVED that the use of the urgency procedure for taking a key decision on 1, 29, and 30 November 2022 be noted.

CNL70/221 MOTION - ELECTIONS ACT 2022 AND VOTER ID PROPOSALS (Agenda item 16.2)

- 70.1 At the invitation of the Mayor, the Leader introduced the Motion that had been submitted by himself and Cllr Peter Clark, and seconded by Cllrs Steve Williams, Nick Palmer and Maxine Gale. In the absence of Cllr Clark, Cllr Penny Marriott seconded the resolution set out in the Motion, which had been circulated in the agenda for the meeting.
- 70.2 The Leader explained that the Motion was a response to new provisions set out in the Elections Act 2022 which introduced new requirements for voter ID. Members of the administration had concerns about the need for voter ID, the justification for its introduction, the funding and implementation of the requirements, and the communication to residents about the need for ID and the acceptable forms of ID. These concerns were widely shared by councils and council leaders across the UK, and by the Local Government Association. The Leader had provided data on instances of local and national in-person electoral fraud, which showed a low number of allegations and even fewer prosecutions. The Elections Act 2022 did nothing to address the greater potential for fraud in relation to postal votes. 3.5m in the UK did not possess a form of phot ID and there were severe backlogs in the issue of passports and photo driving licences. There were no formal guidelines from the government on how the policy should be implemented and these could come too late to be effective. The list of acceptable voter ID was inconsistent and appeared to deliberately structurally disenfranchise young people or those who could not afford ID. The Motion called on the Council to take a number of steps to raise concerns about the Voter ID implementation plans with ministers and local MPs, and to communicate and engage locally to raise awareness of the need for voters to obtain suitable ID in good time for the May 2023 elections. The Leader hoped that these measures would find broad support from the Council.
- 70.3 Cllr Hyman spoke and highlighted the potential reputational damage to Waverley, as the local electoral administration authority, for any chaos developing at polling stations, and also the personal risk to elections staff working on polling stations. He was totally supportive of the motion.
- 70.4 Cllrs Mulliner and Cosser spoke and whilst they supported the principle of voter ID being introduced, they recognised that the timing of the implementation in relation to the May 2023 elections was poor, and communication about valid voter ID requirements had been inadequate. Both felt that there was probably more electoral fraud than was detected or reported, but recognised the practical issues about implementation for May 2023.
- 70.5 Cllrs Joan Heagin, Sally Dickson, Liz Townsend, Peter Martin, Jerome Davidson, Jacquie Keen, Penny Rivers, Steve Williams and Maxine Gale all spoke and were broadly in favour of the Motion although they expressed a range of views on the justification for introducing voter ID. In summing up, the Leader thanked councillors for their support.
- 70.6 The Mayor put the Motion to the Council and it was

RESOLVED that

Waverley Borough Council ('the Council') recognises the importance of ensuring that elections are fair and accessible for all voters, and notes:

- **that the council, as the relevant electoral authority, has a duty to comment on this area of national policy.**
- **that the proposed voter ID elements of the Elections Act (2022) will result in major changes to national elections, including the introduction of compulsory photographic ID in order to vote.**
- **that these changes are estimated to cost the taxpayer £180 million and will create unnecessary bureaucracy for local authorities.**
- **with concern that currently 3.5 million people in the UK do not have any form of photographic ID, and that photographic ID is expensive.**
- **that electoral fraud is (locally and nationally) extremely low and does not warrant such a disproportionate policy response.**
- **that the Elections Act (2022) takes no account of postal vote fraud.**
- **that the forms of acceptable ID are disproportionately weighted to over 60's and there are fewer and more expensive forms of ID valid for young people.**
- **in some cases, the young person's version of an ID document has been disallowed, while the older person's version of the same ID document is considered valid.**

Waverley Borough Council believes that the proposed changes will act as a barrier to some residents from voting. This will disenfranchise residents and increase inequality of access to the electoral process. This is despite almost zero incidences of electoral fraud. The Council further believes that at a time when voter turnout is declining, we should be doing all we can to make it easier, not harder for people to vote.

Waverley Borough Council does not want to see residents being turned away at the ballot box because of these changes, and resolves to:

- 1. Write to Rt Hon Michael Gove MP, Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, expressing our concerns and highlighting the statistics on the low incidence of electoral fraud, calling specifically for a review of the permitted ID types, and seeking urgent clarification as to how any changes will be funded in the short, medium and long term and how these changes will be communicated to the electorate before May 2023.**
- 2. Write to the MPs covering the Waverley Borough Council area (Rt. Hon. Jeremy Hunt MP and Angela Richardson MP) requesting that these concerns are raised in parliament and that they indicate their views regarding the content of the bill.**
- 3. Communicate the views and evidence expressed in this motion and the supporting statistics on the low incidence of electoral fraud using council media and communication channels.**
- 4. Engage with local schools, colleges, and places of further education to raise awareness of the proposed changes and encourage the electorate to apply for suitable ID in a timely fashion.**

CNL71/22 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE (Agenda item 17.)

- 71.1 The Leader introduced the Minutes of the Executive meeting held on 1 November 2022, for noting by Council. The Mayor invited Cllr Hyman, who had registered to speak, to make his statement.
- 71.2 In respect of EXE46/22, Cllr Hyman commented on the Portfolio Holder's response to the from a member of the public. In respect of EXE50/22, Cllr Hyman noted there were some typographical errors in the policy document, and also that it should have been submitted to Full Council for approval so that all Members were aware of it. At the invitation of the Mayor, the Leader responded that the Policy had been scrutinised by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, so there had been transparency and opportunity for Members to input to the Policy.
- 71.3 There being no other speakers, the Mayor put the recommendations and it was

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Executive meeting held on 1 November 2022 be received and noted.

The meeting concluded at 10.03 pm

Mayor