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1.0 Introduction

The Purpose of this Consultation Statement

This statement has been prepared by Guildford Borough Council in accordance with Regulation 12 and Regulation 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012. All references to “Regulation(s)” in this document are to these Regulations, unless otherwise specified.

Regulation 12(a) requires that before a local planning authority adopts a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), it must prepare a statement setting out:

- the persons whom the authority consulted in connection with the preparation of the SPD;
- a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
- how those issues have been addressed in the SPD.

Background to the North Street Design and Development Brief SPD

The principal purpose of this brief is to provide a clear steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. The brief considers the potential impact of the development of the area on Guildford as a whole and lays down principles for its redevelopment that seek to serve the interest of the wider town. On adoption, it will supersede the existing Design and Development Brief for North Street, Commercial Road and Leapale Road (2003).
2.0 Initial stakeholder consultation

Who was consulted?

During the early stages of preparing the North Street Design and Development Brief SPD, discussions were held at meetings with relevant council officers and consultants acting on the Council’s behalf. These discussions were used to inform the Brief.

Three stakeholder workshops were organised in the Guildhall, High Street, Guildford, on 23 May 2012. A short presentation was made and then small working groups were given a series of topics/issues to consider and feedback their views on as well as being given some questions to answer.

Representatives from the following groups or organisations attended.

- Local businesses from in and around the site area
- Local residents from in and around the site area
- Councillors
- Council officers
- Surrey County Council – Highways
- Bus operators
- Local residents associations
- Local commercial agents
- Guildford Business Forum
- Guildford Town Centre Management Group
- Landowners
- YMCA
- Guildford Environmental Forum
- Management for the Friary Centre.

The following notes provide a summary of the findings and list in detail the comments provided.

**Summary of findings**

The stakeholders workshop made clear that there are some areas in which there was a broad sense of support/consensus with the ideas presented, as well as areas in which there was a great deal of concern/disagreement/conflicting views.

**Consensus/support**

(Urban) design

Strong/widespread agreement on the design approach presented in the PowerPoint in relation to:

- development with streets and (series of smaller) spaces – majority wants open streets, although there are some people who like a mixture of malls and open streets
- fine urban grain on North Street with buildings “stepping up” with topography
- need for human scale
• building heights to fit with context but in order of three-six storeys
• need to consider rooftops/roof of the roofs
• variety in architecture; but all needs to be of highest quality
• contemporary, but sympathetic to Guildford. Not pastiche, but not ultra modern (i.e. all glass and steel) either

Use/activity

The majority of the stakeholders agree the development should provide:

• A mixture of shops, i.e. small independent shops as well as large “brands”
• A café culture, i.e. cafes, restaurants with activity spilling out on the street (but no clubs/bars)
• Housing
• Possibly some community uses, for example, community hall

Concern/disagreement

The most controversial points related to the following:

Retail-led development/amount of retail to be provided

A considerable number of people questioned the need for such a large amount of retail in Guildford:

A. concerned about the impact on the High Street/Debenhams/Tunsgate
B. challenged the ambition, or need to compete with other town centre as a “Top X” retail destination. Feel it is more important to create quality streets and café culture to retain/enhance vitality and attraction of Guildford.
C. challenge the ambition to attract shoppers from ever further afield on sustainability grounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Agree*</th>
<th>Disagree/serious concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>need shops, but not at cost of everything else. Also need housing and space for buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - C</td>
<td>X (but also want space for bus facility)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A and B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - A</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A, impact on High Street, Debenhams)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - B</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A, current plans have too much retail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - D</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A – too much)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00 - A</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A, B and C, need not proven)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00 - B</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A and B, relocated Debenhams?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Agree with retail-led, but also including some housing/cafes/restaurants and so on

Concern that “the figures don’t add up”. Although not everyone raised this on their own accord, if asked, almost everyone would say that the development of the site should not undermine the success of the High Street (or Tunsgate/Debenhams).

North Street
Mixed views were expressed on bus access and pedestrianisation. Concern about impact of pedestrianisation wider network, so only in favour as this does not worsen congestion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Street</th>
<th>Buses in North St</th>
<th>NO buses in North Street</th>
<th>Pedestrianise all or section at key times</th>
<th>No pedestrianisation, but shared surface/env. improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - B</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (all)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - D</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (section only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - A</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (section only and only if capacity on wider network)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - B</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (if capacity on wider network)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00 - A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00 - B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking

Mixed views on the level of parking. Mostly people want to retain existing levels, but many also say it "needs to be realistic".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Car parking</th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Retain same numbers</th>
<th>Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(+30%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 - D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00 - A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:00 - B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bus station/facility on site

The majority of people who attended the workshops would like to see some sort of bus facility in/near the area, for example, has to be central and where else can it go (not Bedford Road)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus station/facility on site</th>
<th>Bus interchange on site</th>
<th>Bus drop-off facilities in streets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - C</td>
<td>X – but not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other

In about 4-5 of the 10 sessions, there was a concern that the development (brief) of this site is premature and more research needs to be done about the wider needs / vision for the town, in particular relating to traffic movement and congestion. For instance, this may help solve the bus station issue and give a better understanding of the right amount and location of car parking for the area.

Summary of answers to the questions (all groups)

Why do you / people come to Guildford town centre?

- Convenience / working / living / going to school / studying here / it's the nearest
- Historic environment / The High Steet / attractive town centre / quality of environment / heritage / quality of architecture / cobbled High Street / unlike other places
- Human scale / nice and compact
- Safe and civi
- Quality of shops / upmarket / premium shops
- Range of leisure / cultural facilities / restaurants
- Good bus access

Why do you / people go elsewhere?

- Too much traffic in Guildford / the gyratory problem at peak time
- Difficult to park / don't like pay and display
- The hills – difficult / tiring to walk in Guildford
- Wider range of shops and shops with wider range of lines
- Not enough smaller, independent shops in Guildford
- Supermarkets / big food shop
- To catch major acts / shows
- Internet shopping

Do you have a favourite town centre and why? What lessons can be learned from elsewhere?

- Guildford – scenic value
- Brighton – historic character, North Laines (independent shops), range of areas with different character. Nightlife / buzz. Good transport links. Guildford could be more like this.
- Kingston – easy parking, market, John Lewis, variety of independent shops.
- Central London – much wider range of shops and other activities. Different experience
- York – good Park and Ride, history
- Chichester – environment, shops
- Chester
- Winchester – environment, independent shops
- Cambridge – great Park and Ride, also university town which make much better use of it river
- Exeter – shops, mix old and new
- Salisbury
- Reading – parking / easy of access (flat)
- Freiburg – environment, transport, character.

Consider what town centres are for! Need to create cafe culture / leisure destination to compete with on-line shopping
- Bath – historic town centre, old and new, fits together
- Totness – independent shops, small
- Windsor – character but also good shops

Do not like:
- Bath Southgate – too bland
- Bristol Cabot Square – not appropriate to Guildford
- Aylesbury – bad shops
- Bracknell – looks tired and dated; what you can end up with if you don’t develop

Do you agree that the site should be redeveloped?
- Yes – we need vibrant town centre
- Yes – a John Lewis would be great
- Yes – as a larger block
- Yes – this is a great opportunity. But is should be done well.
- Yes, but not yet. It is key chance to sort out some of Guildford’s problems, BUT further studies are needed first to find out what these are and the role this area should play in that.

Do you agree that / understand why redevelopment of this land should be retail-led?
- Yes – shopping is leisure activity and will continue to be popular
- Yes – but not just big shops, also need small / independent shops.
- Yes – no other land uses viable
- Yes – plus other uses to make it vibrant
- Yes, but mixed with residential (this needs to managed well to contain the noise of shops – i.e. services and a/c units)
- NOT too much retail. Third department store would not be sustainable. Concern about future of the High Street / Debenhams / Tunsgate
- No – not in the traditional “shopping development with anchor store” type of way. Want truly mixed use development with shops, restaurants, high quality housing, administrative uses and bus interchange.
- No – not sure why there is the need “to compete” with other town as a retail destination – there are many other things that attract people to a town and make it vibrant. Also attracting people from afar is not sustainable.

What are your key concerns about the impact of the development on Guildford?

Top 3 Do Not’s

DON’T have short term view
DON'T do anything until traffic, transport, viability and relationship with other sites is sorted out.

DON'T build a shopping centre

DON'T over-develop at the expense of transport access, parking and bus access.

DON'T undermine rest of town centre / threaten the High Street

DON'T develop with single use / not just retail

NOT another large department store

DON'T have clubs and bars that cause problems at night

NO fast food outlets

DON'T require uses that would make it unviable (for example, community use or library)

NO huge monolithic box / another “mall”

DON'T try to mimic the High Street

DON'T build too high / interrupt views

DON'T threaten North Street market

DON'T create more traffic / cause more congestion

NO buses in North Street

DON'T lose the bus station

DON'T have just shops with poorly paid personnel who can't afford to live in Guildford or linger after work.

What are the key ingredients to make the development feel appropriate to Guildford?

Top 3 Do’s

DO make it achievable in defined timescale

DO grasp this as an opportunity to make North Street as vibrant as the High Street

DO consider all ages, connecting different part of the town

DO have development with a human scale that fits in with existing character

DO have multiple architects and variety (for example Exeter and Waitrose Guildford)

DO have mixed use with 24/7 vibrant environment

DO create opportunities for smaller / independent / high value shops – we need “affordable shopping” as well as affordable housing

DO create opportunities for cafe culture / restaurants

DO have pedestrianised streets
DO have streets that are accessible 24/7

DO have rear service for shops

DO sort out parking so future residents / visitors don’t park on surrounding residential streets

DO have more greenery

DO improve traffic flow

DO keep it simple

DO respond to sustainable social trends

DO have a masterplan for the whole town first

DO consider integration with Upper High Street

What are your views on the issues and opportunities raised in the presentation? This includes:

Other land uses, i.e. housing, community, leisure?

- Housing (on upper floors)
- Housing (as separate blocks)
- Café culture
- Independent shops and restaurants
- Mixed leisure (i.e. spa) to make it integrated and sustainable
- Community uses, library, nursery
- Not retail-led, other are critical part of mix

Car parking?

- No need to replace all car parking.
- Replace existing car parking
- Replace existing plus a bit more.
- Need 30 per cent increase to bring people in and make development successful.
- Need right amount in right place
- Need basement car parking and servicing
- Pay on foot (no pay and display)
- No surface car parks
- Park and Ride for shoppers needed (and on Sunday)

Bus access?

- Need smaller bus station / facility to north of the site, off Woodbridge Rd / to rear of the site
- Drop off points within the site but not on North Street
- No buses on North Street
- No need for bus station
- Need bus station for clean / green buses
- Town centre need good bus access from all directions
- Bus station outside town centre (near railway station?) with shuttle buses into town centre
- Allow for increase in services

North Street – (semi) pedestrianisation?
• Pedestrianise between 10am -4pm as minimum along the whole length of the street.
• Yes, but just short section between Leapale Road and M&S
• Subject to impact on traffic flows
• No through traffic
• Shared space with pedestrian priority
• Collecting points (M&S / House of Fraser) need to remain – no pedestrianisation, but shared surface with 20 mph and environmental improvements.
• No shared space (dangerous / confusing and limits opportunities for e.g. a big street market
• Buses to go in North Street
• No buses in North Street
• Some traffic allowed but no parking.
• Parking needs to remain to support shops
• Needs contra-flow cycling

Open streets vs. enclosed mall?

• Open (and pedestrianised) streets (majority)
• A mixture of both

Building heights?

• Should fit in surrounding context.
• Mostly 4 storeys, but could be a bit higher near Leapale Ln / Commercial Road corner.
• 5-6 storeys, but stepping in height with topography.
• 5 max
• Consider views and avoid light pollution (i.e. not a HoF)
• Don’t interrupt the long views from the downs to the Mount.
• Roofs should be used and look good / roofscape very important / green roofs / roof terraces.
• As 2003 brief

Building styles? Buildings to keep / demolish?

• No buildings worth keeping
• Keep some older buildings to add character
• Demolish BT building
• Don’t copy High Street
• Should complement the High Street / as high quality as the High Street
• Be aspirational – buildings to become the listings of the future
• Small scale units rising up North Street
• Need variety / different styles
• Modern / contemporary but tasteful and age well
• County town style with traditional materials
• Look at Brighton and Exeter as good examples
• Stone, glass, need variety – no concrete
• As 2003 brief

Amenity spaces?

• Need town square
• Need a square, but not too big
• Pocket parks / small (informal) performance areas, incidental space
• Need to be good quality
• Better links to railway station are needed
• As 2003 brief

Other (sustainability, landscaping)?

• Improve environment of market
• More street planting and trees
• High sustainability standards / BREEAM Excellent
• Adaptable buildings
• Green walls
• Grey water
• Roof gardens
• Solar panels on car park roofs
• York Road / Onslow Street roundabout needs improvement
• Planning gain should not just be for North Street, but also create better solutions to Onslow Street problem
• Lighting strategy needed
• As 2003 brief
3.0 Formal consultation on the draft SPD

The consultation draft SPD was made available for a formal six week consultation between Monday 2 July 2012 and 5pm Friday 10 August 2012, in accordance with Regulations 12 and 13.

Those who were consulted are all listed in appendix 1 of this consultation statement.

How they were consulted
Members of the public, interested organisations and statutory consultees were informed of the consultation via email (1,585 emails were sent) or by letter (560 letters were sent). The email and letter sent included key information about how to view the document and how to make comments, and are included at appendix 2 and 3 respectively.

All the consultation information was available on its website in accordance with Regulation 35 (see appendix 4).

In addition, copies of the documents and supporting documentation were made available in local libraries and at the Council’s Planning reception at Millmead.

Key issues raised during the consultation

29 responses were received from the public consultation. These are set out in appendix 5.

The main points raised by the public consultation were:

- general support for the redevelopment of the area
- support for the urban design analysis and that any scheme brought forward must consider and respond to the wider town centre
- concern raised on the amount of retail floor space being proposed
- concern around no provision of a bus facility within the site
- concern around car parking provision, vehicle accessibility through the site and traffic congestion
- the impact on the High Street and potential loss of trade
- how the public consultation has been undertaken in the lead up to the school holidays
- the need for housing as part of a mixed use scheme
- the site area being increased but also that the BT telephone exchange is not included.

All responses have been considered.
Appendices

Appendix 1 – Who was consulted on the draft SPD

1st Guildford Guides
1st Horsley Scout Group
1st Jacobs Well Scout Group
1st Merrow Scout Group
1st Rydes Hill Scout Group
5th Guildford Scout Group
A2 Dominion Housing Group Ltd
Abbot’s Hospital
Abbotwood Resident Association Central Crescent
Abbotwood Residents Association
Abbotwood Women in Touch
ABC Group
Academy of Contemporary Music
Access Group - Guildford
ACE Surrey
Action for Children
Action for Links for Living (ALL)
Active Surrey
Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd
Affinity Sutton
Affinity Sutton Homes Group
Age Concern Blackheath and Wonersh
Age Concern Riverside
Age Concern Surrey
AGM Design Build
Ahmadiyya Muslim Association UK
Airwave Solutions Ltd
Albury Parish Council
Albury Trust
Allen Fencing

Alliance Planning
Allianz Insurance PLC
AMEC Environment & Infrastructure UK Limited
Amphibian and Reptile Conservation
Ancient Monuments Society
Andy Trask Designs
Angus Farquhar
APA Planning Services Ltd
Architectural Heritage Fund
Archway Cottage
Argos
Arriva Southern Counties
Arriva Surrey and West Sussex
Arthritis Care
Arthur Waller Properties Ltd
Artington Parish Council
Artington Walk Residents Association
ASAP Architecture
Asda
Ash Action Group
Ash Citizens Advice Bureau
Ash Grange County Primary School
Ash Green Residents Association
Ash Library
Ash Manor School
Ash Parish Council
Ash Residents Action Group
Ashenden Residents Association
Ashill Developments
Ashurst & Lakeside Road Residents Association
Association of Train Operating Companies
Astenbell Ltd
Astolat
Astolat Bowling Club
Austen Road Surgery
Avicam Homes Ltd
B.P. Hydraulics Ltd
Badger Trust
Bagnall Property Consulting
Bahai Community of Guildford
Bahai Women Association
Barclay Roe
Barlow Robbins Solicitors
Barnett Spooner
Barnwood Housing Co-operative Ltd
Barton Willmore
Basingstoke Canal Authority
Beacon Centre
Beaufield Homes
Beckbridge Limited
Beechcroft Drive Residents Association
Bell Cornwell
Bellfields Residents Association
Bellfields Youth & Community Centre
Bellway Homes Limited
Belmont Preparatory School
Belvoir Letting Guildford
Bewley Homes PLC
Biodiversity Working Group
Bircham Dyson Bell
Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership
Blackwater Valley Enterprise Trust
Blackwater Valley Friends of the Earth
Bloor Homes
Blue Sky Planning Limited
BME/Asylum Seekers (Guildford Diocese)
Boughton Hall Avenue Residents Association
Bovis Homes Ltd
Boxgrove County Primary School
Boxgrove Park Neighbourhood Watch and Residents Assoc.
Boxgrove Park Residents Association
Boyer Planning
Bramley Parish Council
BREEAM
British Property Federation
British Trust for Conservation Volunteers
Broadway Malyan Planning
Brownies
Brownlee McCullock
Bryan Jezeph Consultancy
Bryan Smith Associates
BT Group plc
Buglear Bate and Co
Burghclere Estates LLP
Burneston House Dental Surgery Ltd
Burpham Community Association
Burpham Foundation Primary School
Bushy Hill Community Centre
Bushy Hill Junior School
Bushy Hill Tenants Association
Bushy Hill Youth Club
Business Link Surrey
BWEA
Byfleet Parish Council
Guildford Museum
Caldecotte Consultants
Camargue Ltd
Campaign for Planning Sanity
Campaign for Real Ale
Care for Guildford
Careers Support Group
Carers Support (Guildford)
Carlians Vehicle Contract
Carter Jonas
Carter Planning Ltd
Casa Developments
Castle Land and Development
CBRE Friary management
CEMEX UK Properties
Centaur Consulting Limited
Centre Point Church
CGMS Consulting
Charles Church Properties
Charlotteville Jubilee Trust
Chertsey Street Baptist Church
Chestnut Planning
Chilworth C of E Infant School
Chris Tennant Window Cleaning Service
Christ Church
Christ’s College
Church Housing Trust
Church Lane Residents Association
Church of England
Churches together Guildford
Churches Together In England
Circle Eight Film Group
Cirrus Properties
Citygrove
Civic Trust
Civil Aviation Authority
CLA, Country Land & Business Association
Clandon C of E Infant School
Clandon Regis Golf Club
Clandon Society
Clayton Drive Residents Association
Cobham Conservation and Heritage Trust
Coinford Design and Build
Colliers CRE
Commission for Racial Equality
Communique
Compton Parish Council
Compton Village Association
Connect2U Disability Forum
Council for British Archaeology
Council for Romany and other Travellers
Guildford Borough Council Councillors
Country Land and Business Association
CPRE
Cranley Road Area Residents Association
Cranmore School
Cross Group
Crossroads
Crown Estate Commissioners
Crown Hall
CTC
Custom Homes
Cycling Embassy of Great Britain
Cyclists Touring Club
D & M Planning
Daily Mail
Dairy Crest Ltd
Dalton Warner Davis LLP
David Lock Associates
David Ogilvie Design
Davis Langdon
Davis Planning
DC Planning Ltd
Deeprose Engineering Ltd
DEFRA
Dental Practice Guildford
Footsteps Registered Charity
Forestry Commission England
Francis Cave - Digital Publishing
Frank Taylor Planning
Freight Transport Association
Friary House Residents’ Association
Friary Ward Residents Association
Friends of the Earth
Friends, Families and Travellers
Furze Hill Residents Association
Fusion Online Limited
G4 Residents Association
GACC
Gardiner & Associates
Gatwick Airport
George Abbot School
Gerald Eve
Gerald Eve LLP
Gerry Lytle Associates
Ginger Townplanning
Girl Guiding Surrey West
GL Hearn
GL Hearn
Gleeson Homes Ltd
Gleeson Land
Glenesk School
Glitter House
Goadsby and Harding Commercial
Godalming Town Council
GoinGreen
Gosden House School
Gostone Highway Depot
Grass Roots
Green Acre Property
Green Issues Communications
Greencroft Residents Association
Greenoak Housing Association
Gregory Gray Associates
Grenke Leasing Ltd
Grove Heath North Residents Association
GRPlanning
Guide Dogs for the Blind
Guildbury
Guildford Access Group
Guildford Action
Guildford Action for Community Care (GACC)
Guildford Allotment Society
Guildford and District Jewish Community
Guildford and Godalming Wayfarers
Guildford Angling Society
Guildford Anti-Incinerator Network
Guildford Arts
Guildford Assoc. of Voluntary Service & Voluntary Action SW Surrey
Guildford Baptist Church
Guildford Boat House
Guildford Bowling Club
Guildford Business Forum
Guildford Cathedral Church of the Holy Spirit
Guildford Centre for the Blind
Guildford Chamber of Commerce
Guildford Children's Centre
Guildford Citizens Advice Bureau
Guildford City Football Club
Guildford Club for the Disabled
Guildford College
Guildford Community Church
Guildford Community Family Trust
Guildford Community Mediation Service
Guildford Connexions
Guildford County Court
Guildford County School
Guildford Crown Court
Guildford Cycle Group
Guildford Dental Practice
Guildford Divisional Police
Guildford East Scout District
Guildford East Scouts
Guildford Environmental Forum
Guildford Freiburg Association
Guildford Golf Club
Guildford Grove Primary School
Guildford High School for Girls
Guildford Institute
Guildford Interiors
Guildford Jewish Community
Guildford Labour Party
Guildford Library
Guildford Lions Club
Guildford Magistrates Courts
Guildford Mental Health Consortium
Guildford Methodist Church
Guildford Motor Club
Guildford Neighbourhood Police Team
Guildford Orthodontics
Guildford Park Community Church
Guildford Phone Mast Campaign
Guildford Poyle Charities
Guildford Quaker Meeting
Guildford Ramblers Association Group
Guildford Rambling Club
Guildford Rugby Club
Guildford Scout Council

Guildford Society
Guildford Sunset Homes
Guildford United Reformed Church
Guildford Vision Group
Guildford Walking Forum
Guildford YMCA
Guildford Youth Council
Guildford-Boxgrove Healthy Walks
Guildfordians Rugby Club
GVA Grimley Ltd
H.C. Webb Estates Ltd
Hallam Land Management Limited
Hampshire County Council
Handelsbanken
Headway Surrey
Heart Wood Wealth
Heathrow Airport
Henry Dolan & Associates Communications Consultant
Heritage Property Services
Hermes
Hetherington
Highways Agency
Hillier Almshouses
Hives Planning
HM Revenue & Customs
Hodgson Lunn & Co Architects
Hogs Back Residents Association
Holly Lodge County Primary School
Holmbury Developments Ltd
Holmwood Close Residents Association
Holy Trinity (Guildford) Housing Association Ltd
Holy Trinity Amenity Group
Holy Trinity Church
Holy Trinity Junior School
M J Gleeson  
Maddox and Associates  
Mansard Country Homes  
Marks and Spencer  
Markwell & Markwell  
Marshalls  
Martineau  
Mast Sanity  
Mayer Brown  
McCloskey & Bingham  
Med Hi Tec & Thoughtful Products Ltd.  
Member of Parliament for Guildford  
Member Parliament  
Mencap Woking  
Merriweather  
Merrow C of E Infant School  
Merrow Cricket Club  
Merrow Dramatic Society  
Merrow Methodist Church  
Merrow Residents Association  
Merrow Village Club & Hall  
MGA  
Michael Conoley Associates  
Michael Cox Associates  
Michael Shanly Homes  
Mill Lane Residents Association  
Millgate Homes  
Millmead Court  
Ministry of Defence  
Mitchell Evans Partnership  
MN Communications  
Moat  
Mobile Operators Association Ltd  
Mole Valley District Council  
Mono Consultants Ltd  
MONO Consultants Ltd  
Montagu Evans LLP  
Morgan Crucible - the Advanced Materials Group  
Motion  
Motion Transport Planning  
Mott MacDonald  
Mount Alvernia Hospital  
Mount Green Housing Association  
Multiple Sclerosis Society - Guildford and District Branch  
MVA Consultancy  
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners  
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups  
National Federation of Housing Associations  
National Gardens Scheme Charitable Trust  
National Trust  
Natural England  
Nepalese Society and other ASP groups  
Network Rail  
New Earth Solutions  
New Inn Surgery  
New Smith Capital Partners LLP  
Newark Lane Residents Association  
Newman Davis & Company  
NewSmith Asset Management LLP  
NFU South East Region  
NHS Surrey and Adult Social Care  
Nicholas James Group  
No. 5 Chambers  
No. 5 Project  
Normandy Parish Council  
Normandy United Reformed Church  
Norrells Drive Pte Ltd  
Norrels Drive Association
North Street Stallholders Association
North West Surrey Association of Disabled People
Northmead Junior School
Northumberland Estates
Nuffield Hospital
Oades Plant Hire
Oak Grange Road Association
Ockham & Hatchford Residents Association
Ockham Parish Council
Onslow County Infant School
Onslow Village Residents Association
Open Spaces Society
Outdoor Advertising Consultants
Outline
Pain Support
Paint Ball Games
Pakistan Muslim Welfare Association
Pannell Kerr Forster
Park Barn & Westborough Community Association
Park Barn Centre
Park Barn Residents Association
Park Barn/Westborough Community Forum
Parkinsons UK
Parsons Brinckerhoff Ltd
Partners of Loseley Park
Paul Dickinson & Associates
Paul Newman Property Consultant
Peacock and Smith
Peaslake Community Council
Peaslake School
Peaslake Surgery and Dispensary
Peck Properties
Pennymead Drive Residents Association
Perry Hill Ward Residents Association
Persimmon Homes South East
Peter Pendleton & Associates Ltd
Pewley Down Infant School
P-Fava.Consulting
Pharmacomm
Philippine Association of Surrey UK
Phillip Sears Designs
Phillips Planning Services Ltd.
Pine Walk Residents Association
Pinewood Group
Pirbright Laboratory Residents Association
Pirbright Parish Council
Pirbright Village Primary School
Planit Consulting
Planning Issues
Planning Magazine
Planning Perspectives
Planning Potential
Plant Heritage
Plantation Café
Play and youth Development Projects
Police
Police Station
Pond Meadow Special School
Postgraduate Medical
PPA Ltd
Printing House Square Residents Association
Priors Field School
Profesional Driving Services
Property and Transport Group (GBF)
Puttenham & Wanborough Residents Assoc.
Puttenham and Wanborough Housing Society Ltd
Puttenham Church of England Infant School
Puttenham Golf Club Ltd
Puttenham Parish Council
Qinetiq Ltd
Quakers (Religious Society of Friends)
Queen Eleanor's C of E Junior School
Queen Elizabeth Park Residents Association
Quod Planning
R.N.Buddery F.R.I.C.S.
Radian Housing Association
Ramblers Association
Rapleys LLP
Red Hot Yoga Ltd
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
Rentwood Resource Centre
Residents
Ridgemount Residents Association
Rileys
Ripley C of E Infant School
Ripley Carriage Ltd
Ripley Court Educational Trust
Ripley Parish Council
Riverside ECHG
Rookwood Residents Association
Roseacre Gardens Residents Assoc.
Rosebery Housing Association
Rosemary Crescent Resident Association
Rosemary Simmons Memorial Housing Association
Royal Automobile Club
Royal Borough of Kensington + Chelsea
Royal British Legion Industries
Royal Grammar School
Royal Horticultural Society
Royal Surrey County Hospital
RPS
RSCH
RSPB South East Office
RT Design
Rushmoor Borough Council
Rydes Hill Convent Prep School
Rydon Homes Ltd
Safeguard Coaches Ltd
Sakura
Sallie Hair and Beauty
Salvation Army
Sanctuary
Sandfield County Primary School
Sanofi Aventis
Sapphire Asset Management
Save the Children UK
Savills
Scott Brownrigg
Scott Planning Associates
Scott Wilson
Seale And Sands Parish Council
Seale, Sands & Runfold Amenity Society
Send C of E Infant School
Send Parish Church
Send Parish Council
Send Village Online
Seven Signs
Seymour Estate Agents
Seymours Guildford
Shackleford Parish Council
Shah Jahan Mosque
Shalford Conservation Society
Shalford Infant School
Shalford Parish Council
Shawfield County Primary School
Shawfield Day Centre
Shelter
Shere & Peaslake Scout Group
Shere C of E Infant School
Shere Parish Council
Shere Surgery & Dispensary
SHIFA
Shipleys LLP
Showmans Guild of Great Britain LHC Region
Showmans Guildford of Great Britain
Simmons & Sons
Simply Planning
SITA
SITEC
SMPAC
Snaky Lane Community Wildlife Group
Social and Recreational Project
Solum Regeneration
South East Coast Ambulance Service
South East Planning Aid
South East Water
South West Community Support Services Lockwood
South West Surrey Assoc. for Mental Health
South West Surrey Secondary Short Stay School
Southern Water
Spelthorne Borough Council
Sport England
Sport Guildford
Sports Council South East Region
Squires Garden Centres
St Bede’s C of E Junior School
St Catherine’s School
St Catherine’s Village Association
St Clare’s Church
St Francis Rectory
St John the Evangelists Church
St John’s Ambulance County HQ Brigade
St John’s Seminary
St Joseph’s Church
St Joseph’s RC Junior School
St Lawrence County Primary School
St Lukes Surgery
St Martha Parish Council
St Martha’s Court
St Mary’s C of E Infant School
St Nicolas C of E Infant School
St Nicolas Surgery
St Peter’s Catholic Comprehensive School
St Peter’s Shared Church
St Pius Catholic Church
St Saviours Church
St Teresa’s Prep School
St Thomas of Canterbury Catholic Primary School
St. Modwen
Stamford Associates Limited
Star Oyster
Steer Davies Gleave
Stevens & Bolton
Stockton Road Residents Association
Stocon Road Residents Association
Stoke Residents Area Neighbourhood Watch
Stonebridge Action Group
Stoughton Action Group
Stoughton Community Association
Stoughton Infant School
Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group (SASIG)
Strategic Planning Advice Ltd
Streetcar
Strutt & Parker
The House Group
The House of Commons
The Learning Corporation LLP
The Lifetrain Trust
The Matrix Trust
The Motor Neurone Disease Association
The National Trust
The Nomads
The Peace Party
The Planning Bureau Ltd
The Planning Inspectorate
The Raleigh School
The Ripley Society
The Rotary Club of Guildford District
The Shah Jahan Mosque
The Showmen's Guild of Great Britain
The Spinney, Guildford Grove Children Centre
The Student Health Centre
The Surrey and Hampshire Canal Society
The Thai Terrace
The Theatres Trust
The Trustee's of the Tyman Pension Scheme
The Twentieth Century Society
The University of The Third Age
The Victorian Society
The Wilky Group
The Willows
The Woodland Trust
The York Road Project
Three Valleys Water
Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design
Tillingbourne Junior School
Tilthams Green Residents Association
T-Mobile
Tongham Parish Council
Tormead School
Tourism South East
Town Centre Chaplaincy
Town Centre Management Group
Town Centre Signage Group
Trans Lease Services
Tribal MJP
Trustees of the Rundle Brendon Will Trust
Tunsgate Square Shop
Tyting Society
UK Association of Preservation Trusts
UNICHEM LTD
Unisport
University of Surrey
Vail Williams LLP
VC Godalming Haslemere - Surrey Hills
Vincent Homes - Bespoke New Housing
Vincent Knight
Vinci Construction
Visit Surrey
Voluntary Action South West Surrey
Waitrose
Waldon Telecom Ltd
Walk This Wey
Walnut Tree Close Residents
Wanborough Parish Council
WASHA
Waterden Dental Practice
Waverley Borough Council
Welcome to the Unofficial Onslow Village Website
West Clandon Parish Council
West End Parish Council
West Horsley Parish Council
West Retford Hotel Limited  
West Send Neighbour Group  
West Surrey Divisional Commander  
West Surrey Society  
West Waddy ADP  
Westborough & District Residents Organisation  
Westborough Allotments Self Help Association  
Westborough, Broadacres & District Residents Assoc.  
Westfield (Friary Centre)  
Westfield Shoppingtowns Limited  
Weston Lea Residents Association  
Wey & Arun Canal Trust  
Wey and Arun Canal  
Wey House School  
Wey Valley Indoor Bowling Club  
Weyfield Residents Association  
Weymouth Neighbourhood Group  
White and Sons  
White Lion Walk Centre Manager  
White Young Green Planning  
Whitmoor Common Association  
Wildbrook Properties Ltd  
Williams Brothers  
Williams Property Management  
Wodeland Avenue Action Group  
Woking Borough Council  
Wonersh Parish Council  
Wonersh Surgery  
Wood Street (St Alban's) Scout Group  
Wood Street County Infant School  
Wood Street Residents Association  
Woodhams - Family Trees  
Woodlands Park Residents Association  
Woolf Bond Planning  
Worplesdon County Primary School  
Worplesdon Parish Council  
Worplesdon Parish, with churches St Albans & St. Mary's  
Worplesdon Park & Ride Action Group  
Wotton Parish Council  
WS Planning  
Wyke Primary School  
YMCA  
Yvonne Arnaud youth Theatre  
Zinchome Limited
Appendix 2 – Email sent to consultees

Dear Sir,

Planning policy consultation - Monday 2 July to 5pm on 10 August 2012.

We invite your comments on two planning policy documents forming part of the new Local Plan that will assist the determination of planning applications.

- North Street Design and Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document
- Planning Contributions Supplementary Planning Document 2011 - revision in respect of replacing the requirement of social rented housing with affordable rented housing.

The consultation period runs from Monday 2 July to 5pm on 10 August 2012.

For more information and to view the documents, visit our website at http://www.guildford.gov.uk/policyconsultations.

You can submit comments online, by emailing planningpolicy@guildford.gov.uk or by writing to the address below. The documents are available to view in local libraries and at the council’s planning helpdesk, Millmead, Guildford. If you wish to be notified of the future adoption of these documents, please state this in your submitted comments.

You have received this notification because you have responded to a consultation in the past or have requested to be on our mailing list. If you no longer wish to receive information about the new Local Plan (formerly known as the Guildford Development Framework), please let us know.

More information about the new Local Plan is available from our website at www.guildford.gov.uk/ldf.

Kind regards

Tracey Haskins
Planning Policy Manager
Guildford Borough Council

Phone: 01483 444471

Email: planningpolicy@guildford.gov.uk
Appendix 3 – Letter sent to consultees for whom we had no email address

Dear [Name],

Planning policy consultation - Monday 2 July to 5pm on 10 August 2012.

We invite your comments on two planning policy documents forming part of the new Local Plan that will assist the determination of planning applications.

- North Street Design and Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document
- Planning Contributions Supplementary Planning Document 2011 – revision in respect of replacing the requirement of social rented housing with affordable rented housing.

The consultation period runs from Monday 2 July to 5pm on 10 August 2012.

For more information and to view the documents, visit our website at www.guildford.gov.uk/policyconsultations.

You can submit comments online, by emailing planningpolicy@guildford.gov.uk or by writing to the address below. The documents are available to view in local libraries and at the council’s planning helpdesk, Millmead, Guildford. If you wish to be notified of the future adoption of these documents, please state this in your submitted comments.

You have received this notification because you have responded to a consultation in the past or have requested to be on our mailing list. If you no longer wish to receive information about the new Local Plan (formerly known as the Guildford Development Framework), please let us know. We have sent this letter because we do not have an email address for you. If it is possible to contact you by email in the future, please provide us with your details.

More information about the new Local Plan is available from our website at www.guildford.gov.uk/lpfd.

If you have any questions, please contact us.

Yours Sincerely,

Tracey Haskins
Planning Policy Manager
Appendix 4 – The Council’s website pages advising of the consultation and on-line response form

Policy Consultations
Consultation draft North Street Design and Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document and revision of the Planning Contributions Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (in respect of affordable housing).

We are consulting between Monday 2 July and 5pm on 10 August 2012.

Respond to this consultation using our Planning Policy online response form 2012.

North Street Design and Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document
The brief is being prepared as a supplementary planning document and adoption by the Council will become a material consideration when determining proposals for the area. It updates and replaces the Design and Development Brief for North Street, Commercial Road and Leopold Road from 2003.

Three stakeholder workshops were organised in the Guildhall, High Street, Guildford on 23 May 2012. The event was attended by over 60 representatives from a wide range of interest groups. The comments received have been taken into consideration when developing the draft brief.

Planning Contributions Supplementary Planning Document 2011 - revision in respect of replacing the requirement for social rented housing with Affordable Rented Housing.

In June 2011 the government announced a change to affordable housing designed to maximise the number of affordable homes delivered by making the best possible use of constrained public subsidy. The principal element of the programme is an Affordable Rent product to be offered by housing associations and other providers.

To reflect this new product, the definition of affordable housing and the split of the affordable housing required as set out in the Planning Contributions SPD needs to be amended.

On adoption of this revised supplementary planning document, the 2011 Planning Contributions SPD will be replaced by this amended SPD.

Supporting documentation
To comply with European legislation and our Government’s regulations the SPDs have been...
Supporting documentation

To comply with European legislation and our Government's regulations the SPDs have been subject to the following screening assessments:

- Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) screening considers the impacts of the SPD on specific groups within the community. The EqIA screening documents can be downloaded from the links on the right.
- Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) screening enables us to assess whether there are likely to be any impacts on internationally important nature sites (Special Protection Areas) (SPA) and Special Areas of Nature Conservation (SAC) and, how significant the effects are likely to be. The HRA screening documents can be downloaded from the links on the right.
- Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) screening enables us to assess the potential environmental impacts of the SPDs on the environment. The SEA screening documents can be downloaded from the links on the right.

The documents are available to download on the right hand side or you can view them in local libraries (Guildford, Ash and East Horsley) and at the council's planning helpdesk, Millmead, Guildford.

Respond to the consultation

To respond to the consultation please use our Planning Policy online response form 2012. Alternatively email or send your comments to the address below.

Contact us
Planning Policy
Planning Services
Guildford Borough Council
Millmead House
Millmead
Guildford
GU2 7MS
United Kingdom
Telephone: 01483 444471
Email: planning@guildford.gov.uk
Website: gud.gov.uk

Create links

Planning Policy online response form 2012

GuilfoordsBC's latest Tweets

Active kids are healthy kids - Join in the Junior Summer Fitness challenge @SySpectrum http://bit.ly/YRdYqL
RT @ surreymatters: The Olympic Road Cycling Time Trial is coming to Surrey tomorrow! Check out @SoSurreyLive website - http://bit.ly/OCttrialF
about hours ago
Consulting you

Use our consultation calendar to find out about past, future and current consultations.

You said...
A fun day event was held in June inviting the community to walk through Westborough Woods and view images of possible play equipment for the site. Residents then voted using a leaflet or by attending open meetings to discuss designs.

We did...
The PlayBuilder Project has been completed with play equipment installed. This was achieved by partnership working with the community, Guildford Borough Council, Surrey County Council, Surrey Wildlife Trust and funding received from the Department of Children, Schools and Families.

You can use this calendar to discover more about past, present and future involvement across the Guildford Borough. Just click on the links in the box.
### Consultation Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 Jul 2012</td>
<td>Consultation draft North Street Design and Development Brief Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Jul 2012</td>
<td>Consultation on a planning application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Events shown in the time zone: London

---

### You may like

- Guildford gets involved in the Olympic Games: Guildford Borough Council
- Guildford Tourist Information Centre
- Sports - clubs directory
- Contact us: Guildford Borough Council
- Planning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
<th>Recommended change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>Thank you for sending me the Development brief and related documents, though I am intrigued by your time-travelling ability - the SEA is dated October 2012! My comments on these for the public consultation are as follows:-</td>
<td>The error has been noted and will be corrected.</td>
<td>Recommend change October 2012 to June 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Several of the documents repeatedly claim that there is no differential impact on the disabled or elderly. As someone who is registered disabled and nearly 60 I am in a good position to judge this. (a) If no buses are allowed up and down North Street then how can people like me reach shops and businesses at the top of the hill? I already suffer from the abolition of the buses which used to run from Soughton to the top of North Street (library). We need buses to run to the top of North Street because we can’t walk up the hill. (b) Any level of PEDESTRIANISE of streets restricts access for the elderly and disabled. We need taxis and cars carrying the sick disabled and elderly to be able to take us to the door of shops and businesses. Some years ago I had to change my place of residence because I could not get to shops and businesses. None of the planning and related documents include any assessment of these effects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>The Design and Development Brief does not look at the provision of the bus facility. An Equalities Impact Assessment will need to be carried out as part of the options testing around the future bus facility provision. Comments regarding pedestrianisation are noted and agree that any future development needs to take account of people with impaired mobility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) A big new JOHN LEWIS is just what Guildford needs, especially since Debenhams has closed so many of its departments and facilities in recent years. John Lewis’s continually top the “Which” tables for products and customer services so they would be a huge asset to the town’s retail facilities.</td>
<td>Comments noted, however the Design and Development Brief does not identify any specific retailers.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) The present BUS STATION is ugly and dirty but it is in the ideal location. For the sake of the elderly and disabled it needs to be kept at the heart of the shopping area and NOT moved further away (such as near the railway station).</td>
<td>The Design and Development Brief does not look at the provision of the bus facility. An Equalities Impact Assessment will need to be carried out as part of the options testing around the future bus facility provision.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If this comment relates to a different consultation and set of documents then please pass this on to the relevant people.</td>
<td>I confirm that the comments relate to the North Street Design and Development Brief.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>I’m all for the improvements to North Street and the Friary Centre areas. I sincerely hope that Da Gennaro’s Italian Restaurant at 94, Woodbridge Rd. does not have to close because of greedy office and shop developers. Please let me know if their premises is going to be pulled down. My family have been using this friendly Italian restaurant for many years and would hate to see it go out of business.</td>
<td>94 Woodbridge Road is a property within the area covered by the North Street Design and Development Brief.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments noted and general support for redevelopment welcomed.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>We have waited too long already for this disgraceful area to be tidied up.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The North Street Design and Development Brief aims to guide future redevelopment of the area.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The early stakeholder engagement that took place on 23 May 2012 was intended to gain people’s views to be one factor that informed the preparation of the draft Design and Development Brief. The document has been informed by other studies alongside this early consultation and has not been prepared solely in response to the consultation feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional wording to be added to 3.3 regarding the need for a transport assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The confused and contradictory responses indicate that there is not and cannot be a clear plan produced from such a consultation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our elected representatives should produce the plan without being influenced by noisy unelected small pressure groups such as residents associations that have no mandate other than their own selfish ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no solution to the through traffic problem and the development of the North Street area should not be held back using traffic as an excuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
<td>Recommended change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>You seem to be hell-bent on adding more high rise awful looking buildings to the mess you have already made of a beautiful old Surrey Market Town. Why can you not keep the buildings in scale to the existing old buildings in Guildford?</td>
<td>The Design and Development Brief takes into account the existing character of the surrounding area and notes that there is a general three to four storey development range and that this height for the redevelopment along with some higher buildings would be appropriate. The Brief does not suggest high rise buildings.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>It looks as if you are determined to knock down and move the bus station to the top of the town, which will make it very difficult for older and infirm people to carry shopping uphill instead of downhill. If you think it looks ugly why not rebuild it?</td>
<td>The Design and Development Brief does not look at the provision of the bus facility. An Equalities Impact Assessment will need to be carried out as part of the options testing around the future bus facility provision.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>I am sure you will ignore all of the above but at least I put my little four penny worth in. All comments are considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>The Design and Development Brief does not cover the area proposed for a supermarket. This site is covered by the adopted Bellerby Theatre and North Place Day Centre SPD January 2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>Pleased that the town will continue to develop but two comments:</td>
<td>Comments noted and each one will be taken in turn with an officer response.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>1) Not sure that a supermarket is the best option for a focus store. In my experience people going into supermarkets come out with several bags of shopping which they then want to load into their cars. They would not be carrying them around town. They did the rest of their shopping. Thus the supermarket will need its own car park which will then be filled with its customers: no extra parking for the town centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>2) the ‘artists impressions’ of the new space were disappointing too domineering &amp; enclosing when there are large blocks arising from the pedestrian area. Also looked very paved/concrete on the ground. I realise that these are just impressions but would have liked to have see more variety like Kingston old part. We don’t want to end up with a Woking style centre.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>I am sorry that I do not use Email as I don’t have a short hand typing facility operating computers, being of farming stock and more used to making holes for plants etc than using even medium size keyboards. I imagine I am not alone.</td>
<td>Hand written responses are also accepted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>One exceeded this result a monthly payment of less than £100. Again we were a Non Profit Making Organisation and if some Notable Principals returned any excess to them.</td>
<td>Thank you for the time taken to respond. However, these comments do not relate directly to the North Street Design and Development Brief.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>Immediately after the war the establishment was open to all comers and we used messengers who were disabled to escort and visitors to every part of the offices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>I think I must bow out of the reconstruction plan with any luck all present ideas may be reversed. Can anyone explain with ever increasing fuel costs vehicles get longer. Best wishes for a brighter future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>I think that the development ought to find a way of better linking the train station with the high street. With my blue skies hat on I would envisage a traffic free route that went from the train station car park to a bridge over both Walnut Tree Close and the river, just metres north of where the current footbridge is. Then staying at that height it could join to the top of the multi storey car park from which the current access via the friary should be improved.</td>
<td>Bed ford Road surface car park, the train station and the square in front of the cinema are outside the remit of the North Street Design and Development Brief and your comments are more focused on the remit of the Town Centre Interim Framework.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>I recognise that such a scheme is not strictly part of this brief but believe this development should have ambitions to tackle this or at least build in space and recognition for such a scheme in future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>I suggest no more cafés in Guildford. Far too many now.</td>
<td>The exact mix of uses will be determined through a detailed scheme and planning application for the area.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following the recent press release from Hermes, we write to confirm that as of March 2012 Hermes has full control of the Friary Centre and much of the adjoining land identified for new retail development, having bought Westfield’s interest in the property.

We would ask the Council not to finally adopt the Town Centre Interim Framework until the outcome of the North Street consultation is known, in order that the results can be fully reflected within both documents.

We are continuing our dialogue with the Council with respect to bringing forward this key town centre scheme and are committed to delivering a high quality retail-led offer that will enhance and strengthen the town centre.

Comment noted. No change required.

We support the text which aims to reduce water consumption on page 45, but the Development Brief SPD must also consider the need for water and sewerage infrastructure to service the development.

A key sustainability objective for the preparation of the Local Development Framework/Local Plan should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 156 of the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012, states:

“Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:……the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater…..”

Paragraph 162 of the NPPF relates to infrastructure and states:

“Local planning authorities should work with other authorities to: assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater and its
treatment…..take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their area.”

Part 9 the South East Plan related to Natural Resource Management and included a separate section on Sustainable Water Resources and Water Quality Management. Policy NRM1 relates to Sustainable Water Resources and lists a number of water supply and wastewater issues which local authorities should take into account in preparing Local Development Documents including ensuring that development is directed “to areas where adequate water supply can be provided from existing and potential water supply infrastructure, having regard to the type of development and demand that it may generate, and to the potential limitations of water resources and water supply infrastructure in the area”. Policy NRM2 relates to Water Quality and lists a number of water quality/sewerage infrastructure issues which local authorities should take into account in preparing Local Development Documents including ensuring that: “adequate wastewater and sewerage capacity is provided to meet planned demand…..”.

With the abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategies this increases the importance that the LDF/Local Plan must contain policies covering the key issue of the provision of water and sewerage infrastructure to service development.

It is unclear at this stage whether the new development will be as a result of the proposed development. The North Street Development Brief SPD therefore needs to consider the net increase in water and waste water demand to serve the development and also any impact the development may have on the existing network, if no/low water pressure and internal/external sewage flooding of property is to be avoided.

The list of issues covered in the SPD should therefore make reference to the provision of water and sewerage infrastructure to service development as follows:

- The areas demand for water network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met
- The developments demand for sewerage network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met
- The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the area and down stream and can it be met

Recommended changes:

To accord with PG NPPF text along the lines of the following section should be added to the SPD:

- Water Supply & Sewerage Infrastructure

It is essential that developers demonstrate that adequate water supply and sewerage infrastructure capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overflowing of existing water & sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water authority to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.
Further information for Developers on water/sewerage infrastructure can be found on Thames Water’s website at: http://www.thameswater.co.uk/cps/rde/xchg/corp/hs.xsl/558.htm
Or contact can be made with Thames Water Developer Services
By post at: Thames Water Developer Services, Reading Mailroom, Rose Kiln Court, Rose Kiln Lane, Reading RG2 0BY.
By telephone on: 0845 850 2777.
Or by email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk

We would also like to draw your attention to the following issues with regards to the draft Development Brief:

Tree Strategy and Planting –
Thames Water recognises the environmental benefits of trees and encourages the planting of them. However, the indiscriminate planting of trees and shrubs can cause serious damage to the public sewerage system and water supply infrastructure. In order for the public sewers and water supply network to operate satisfactorily, trees and shrubs should not be planted over the route of the sewers or water pipes.

Access –
Thames Water will require 24 hour vehicular access to any pedestrianised area to undertake emergency works. Access to the sewerage and water supply infrastructure must not be impeded by street furniture. This will enable Thames Water to operate the network with as little interruption to the service as is possible.

Catering Establishments –
Thames Water recommends the installation of a properly maintained fat trap on all catering establishments. We further recommend, in line with best practice for the disposal of Fats, Oils and Grease, the collection of waste oil by a contractor, particularly to recycle for the production of bio diesel. Failure to implement these recommendations may result in properties suffering blocked drains, sewage flooding and pollution to local watercourses.

Retired Curator, Honorary Remembrancer of Guildford
Planning policy consultation: North Street D&DB

My primary concern is that archaeological investigations should be carried out systematically on the sites before construction begins. It is known that King Henry VIII built a ‘House of Honour’ in the grounds of the Dominican friary. This may, in fact, have been no more than an elaborate summerhouse. He was building Nonsuch Palace near Ewell at the time, using mainly timber-framing on brick foundations, and his House of Honour in the friary gardens may have been similarly constructed.

Another feature to be looked for is the town’s 10th century defensive ditch, running parallel to North Street and several yards to the north of it. (The ancient name for the street ‘North Town Ditch’ reflects the street’s origins as the intramural road behind the defensive earth bank or rampart.)

As far as historical buildings are concerned, I think the integrity of 16-17 North Street must be respected in any development of the frontages.

Dear Sir / Madam
North Street, Guildford Design and Development Brief Consultation

We write on behalf of our client, House of Fraser, and provide the following representations in respect of the above consultation.

House of Fraser currently operates one store within Guildford Town Centre, opposite the allocated North Street development site. House of Fraser is an important national retailer, and their store plays an anchor role in North Street, which is an established retail location. House of Fraser is keen to ensure that the vitality and viability of this area is maintained and enhanced, and that its contribution in this respect, can best be harnessed.

In this regard, House of Fraser express their support for the principle of redevelopment of the North Street area to provide a mixed-use scheme, including A3, leisure, housing and community uses (as identified in Section 4.4) which will help increase the vitality of this area of Guildford Town Centre and encourage linked-trips.

We do however wish to raise a number of concerns regarding certain aspects of the draft Design and Development Brief, which we believe will result in the full potential of the site being underachieved, and may threaten the viability of existing retail uses in this area of the Town Centre. Specifically, these objections relate to:

Concerns noted and each one will be taken in turn with an officer response.

The proposed extension of the North Street development site to incorporate an increase in retail floorspace above that supported by the 2003 Design and Development Brief;

Since 2003 the Council has undertaken further studies, namely those listed in the draft Design and Development Brief, the conclusions of which support an increase in retail floorspace since the 2003 Design and Development Brief.

The lack of evidence to support the need for the proposed amount of retail floorspace within the North Street development site, including the failure to take into account the extant outline permission to extend the Friary Shopping Centre;

The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permission.

The loss of car parking within the Town Centre.

The North Street Design and Development Brief recognises the need to reprovide on and/or off-site an appropriate level of public car parking.
It is appropriate to ensure that any new local policy documents are consistent with national policy and that they do not impact upon existing established retail locations. It within this context that we make the following representations, which expand on each of the four points outlined above.

**Increase in retail floorspace**

Whilst we support the principle of development on this site, as a means of regenerating and enhancing an under-used area of the Town Centre, we object to the increase in retail floorspace within development site beyond that previously identified in the adopted 2003 Design and Development Brief.

We do not believe that the level of retail demand currently identified in the Council’s existing evidence base is sufficient to warrant the increase in proposed retail floorspace at the North Street development site. Should the increase in retail floorspace within the North Street development exceed the identified level of need for additional floorspace in the Town Centre, this could threaten the viability of existing businesses, due to insufficient expenditure being available. This has the potential to dilute the retail offer of the town centre, thus leading to further vacancies and a decrease in investor confidence.

Indeed, if there is insufficient take-up of the additional retail floorspace, which the brief states may be up to 60,000 m2, this is likely to increase the number of vacant units and jeopardise the ability of the scheme to successfully rejuvenate this area of Guildford Town Centre.

**Lack of evidence to support the need for increased retail floorspace**

Further to the above, we object to the amount of retail floorspace proposed in the draft brief on the basis that the need for this level of floorspace is not supported by a robust and reliable evidence base.

The Guildford Borough Retail and Leisure Study (2011) identifies a requirement for 36,200 m2 gross comparison floorspace plus 4,500 m2 gross A3-A5 floorspace to 2021. The draft brief however identifies that the scheme will provide in excess of 50,000 m2 gross commercial floorspace; a figure which does not appear to be supported by this evidence.

In addition, the figure of 36,200 m2 identified in the Retail and Leisure Study does not take into account the extant outline planning permission which was granted in 2004 for the extension of the Friary Centre, which includes an additional 29,135 m2 of commercial floorspace. This permission was successfully renewed in 2010 and therefore remains deliverable within the next three years, as the permission does not expire until October 2015. If the Friary Centre extension were taken into account, the floorspace requirement to 2026 would be just 15,565 m2 (including comparison retail and A3-A5 uses), which is far less than the 60,000 m2 which the North Street development site is purported to deliver.

As the Friary Centre extension is not included in the evidence base which was used to inform this development brief, this could have significant negative implications for the viability of existing Town Centre retailers should the proposed North Street development prove to be in excess of the additional floorspace which is required and can be supported by the town as a whole. This is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which states that local authorities should ‘recognise town centres as the heart of their communities and pursue policies to support their viability and vitality’. By incorporating an unsustainable level of additional retail floorspace, the proposed North Street development would also contradict the stated purpose of the brief itself, which is to ‘…seek to serve the interest of the wider town’.

In addition to the above, we are also concerned that the evidence referred to in the draft brief has been misrepresented and is not a true reflection of the recommendation provided in the various previous published studies.

For example, page 13 of the draft brief states that the Guildford Town Centre Development Study (Cushman and Wakefield, 2010) identifies the Friary Centre extension scheme as ‘unviable’ and the North Street site as ‘the only suitable site to deliver this level of floor space’. Upon reviewing this study in detail, it does not appear that any such statements exist and it is unclear where the Council derived such information.

The Town Centre Development Study does refer to Westfield’s difficulties in progressing the scheme due to the effect of the economic recession, however this report was published in March 2010 and therefore is not considered to be relevant to the current market. It was also published prior to the Friary Centre extension permission being renewed in October 2010. Therefore, the Friary Centre scheme should not be overlooked as having the potential to contribute significantly to the need for new Town Centre retail floorspace, in addition to any development of the North Street site.

In addition, page 14 of the draft brief states that the Retail and Leisure Study (Roger Tym and Partners, 2011) identifies the North Street site as ‘…the most obvious development opportunity to deliver a significant scale of retail floor space’. This is an incorrect quotation, as this is taken from paragraph 9.17 of the Retail and Leisure Study which is in fact referring to the Friary Centre extension permission. Again, this supports our argument that the Friary Centre scheme should be accounted for in the calculations of retail floorspace need.

**Loss of Town Centre car parking**

It is noted that the Friary Centre Site Development Commercial Advice (Cushman and Wakefield, 2012) highlights the likely demand for around 1,000 parking spaces at the development site. Whilst it is acknowledged that this figure would need to be balanced against the Council’s sustainable transport policies, it is still likely that parking would need to be provided in excess of the 498 spaces which currently exist in this area of the Town Centre.

As the redevelopment of the North Street site would result in the removal of all car parking currently provided at Leapale Road, it is not clear where the replacement and additional parking would be located. The draft brief suggests there would be ‘…opportunities to relocate on-site car parking to the north-west corner of the site, entered near the Onslow Street – Woodbridge Street access point’, however this would restrict access to the south of the site, including existing retail units on the southern side of North Street.

As the 2003 Design and Development Brief states; the North Street development should enable ‘access to Leapale Road multi-storey car park to be improved for shoppers using the site’. It is clear therefore that access to car parking for shoppers is a key issue, and one which the draft brief has not fully considered.

The 2003 Brief does not identify an amount of retail floorspace. The Brief sets out that the development could achieve in the order of 50,000 to 60,000 sqm (gross) of commercial floorspace. This includes retail floorspace and other non-residential uses. The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sqm is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension. The North Street site is in the NPPF’s preferred location for retail. Page 56 of the Cushman and Wakefield study states “it is considered that the project remains unable to support the substantial infrastructure consisting of the bus station, affordable housing requirement, extensive public realm, highways changes, park and ride, community building, utilities and underground car parking which are estimated to create a liability of circa £70 million”.

The North Street Design and Development Brief is consistent with national planning policy with reference to ‘ensuring the vitality of town centres’.

No change required.

**Planner DPP**

The North Street Design and Development Brief is consistent with national planning policy with reference to ‘ensuring the vitality of town centres’.

No change required.
**Organisation** | **Comments** | **Officer response** | **Recommended change**
--- | --- | --- | ---
We therefore object to the development proposals on the basis that the issue of replacement car parking has not been given full consideration, including the impact which relocating the car parking further north would have upon pedestrian flows and levels of footfall in retail units on the southern side of North Street. | Objection noted. The purpose of the Brief is to provide a steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. | No change required. |
We trust the above representations will be taken into consideration in the finalisation of the North Street Design and Development Brief. Should you have any queries regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact either myself or my colleague, Charlotte Handscomb. | All representations are taken into consideration. | No change required. |
**Private Individual** | It would be nice if in any redevelopment you could find a way of retaining North Street's historic stepped pavement— a "romanstyle" charm which, along with Tungate Arch, I feel gives the town centre a unique distinctiveness in comparison to other more homogenised hubs. | Comments noted. The stepped pavements lie outside of the site are covered by the Brief. The pavements are North Street are subject to enhancement works being undertaken by the Council. This is referenced in the Brief under 'Cross-cutting studies'. | No change required. |
**Gatwick Airport** | We therefore object to the development proposals on the basis that the issue of replacement car parking has not been given full consideration, including the impact which relocating the car parking further north would have upon pedestrian flows and levels of footfall in retail units on the southern side of North Street. | Objection noted. The purpose of the Brief is to provide a steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. | No change required. |
Thank you for your email addressed to Tom Denton dated 26 June 2012. Tom has passed your email to me to reply to with regard to Aerodrome Safeguarding. The North Street area is approximately 28.4km NW from the ARP (Aerodrome Reference Point). This is outside of our ‘physical’ 15km safeguarding area, however it does fall within our 30km wind turbine consultation area, therefore our only concern at this distance would be wind turbines. If any development proposals were to include wind turbines, early consultation with the airport would be required, as wind turbines can impact on the safe operation of aircraft through interference with aviation radar. Any proposals that incorporate a wind turbine(s) must be assessed in more detail to determine the potential impacts on aviation interests. This is explained further in Advice Note 7 'Wind Turbines & Aviation', see attached. | Comments noted. The North Street Design and Development Brief does not include a proposal for wind turbines. However, this issue will need to be addressed as part of a detailed design scheme and planning application. | No change required. |
**We do have comments on the Design and Development Brief for North Street relating to archaeology and transport matters.** | Comments noted and each one will be taken in turn with an officer response. | No change required. |
Firstly, with regard to archaeology, it might be considered useful to remind developers that archaeological issues will need to be addressed. In any event, developers will need to be advised during the pre-application consultation process that this requirement will need to be incorporated within any development programme. Developers should be directed to consult the National Planning Policy Framework and also the Guildford Borough Local Plan regarding archaeological work on sites over 0.4ha. | The Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 Chapter 11 Historic Environments addresses archaeological issues. | No change required. |
For transport, we would ask you to incorporate the comments set out below as follows: | Comments noted and each one will be taken in turn with an officer response. | No change required. |
1) **Page 20 3.3 Access and Movement** ([Page 23 on the PDF]): | The North Street Design and Development Brief recognises that the redevelopment of this site may need to deliver the preferred solution for a bus facility but any bus facility must have regard to the design criteria set out in the brief. There is recognition that no decision has yet been made about general car access into the site but the Brief purely sets out opportunities for public parking provision. It is acknowledged that a full Transport Assessment will be required to assess the impact on the local road network of any future detailed scheme and to support a planning application. | No change required. |
Issues and Opportunities: The existing text suggests that the comprehensive redevelopment would create opportunities to relocate on site car parking to the north west corner of the site, entered near the Onslow Street - Woodbridge Road access point. Irrespective of whether it's a “relocation” of existing numbers, or a provision of additional spaces, care needs to be taken. No decision has yet been made about whether general car access would be appropriate into the site itself. Discussions with Guildford Borough Council (Chris Mansfield) have focused on the potential for allowing buses access into this central area, without consideration yet for a major car park access from the north. Access for buses might well be hindered if an intensification in parking access is required from the north. If this is to be considered, then a full modelling and assessment of it's practicality needs to be tested in the town centre modelling planned for this summer. | The North Street area is approximately 28.4km NW from the ARP (Aerodrome Reference Point). This is outside of our ‘physical’ 15km safeguarding area, however it does fall within our 30km wind turbine consultation area, therefore our only concern at this distance would be wind turbines. If any development proposals were to include wind turbines, early consultation with the airport would be required, as wind turbines can impact on the safe operation of aircraft through interference with aviation radar. Any proposals that incorporate a wind turbine(s) must be assessed in more detail to determine the potential impacts on aviation interests. This is explained further in Advice Note 7 'Wind Turbines & Aviation', see attached. | No change required. |
2) **Page 36 Key Principles Diagram** ([Page 39 on the PDF]): | The location of a future bus facility is yet to be determined. The North Street Design and Development Brief has been drafted in such a way as to be flexible on this matter. It is not for the Brief to determine the location of the facility. The Brief sets out that redevelopment proposals will need to demonstrate how existing functions of the area that would be affected by site clearance, such as bus facilities, can be appropriately re-provided on or off site. | No change required. |
There is no reference in this KPD to space being provided for a bus station facility, as per drawings provided by MVA on behalf of Guildford (Chris Mansfield). Locations 10/11/12/14 should include mention of a bus station facility as at least a possibility. | The North Street area is approximately 28.4km NW from the ARP (Aerodrome Reference Point). This is outside of our ‘physical’ 15km safeguarding area, however it does fall within our 30km wind turbine consultation area, therefore our only concern at this distance would be wind turbines. If any development proposals were to include wind turbines, early consultation with the airport would be required, as wind turbines can impact on the safe operation of aircraft through interference with aviation radar. Any proposals that incorporate a wind turbine(s) must be assessed in more detail to determine the potential impacts on aviation interests. This is explained further in Advice Note 7 'Wind Turbines & Aviation', see attached. | No change required. |
3) **Page 40 Vehicle Access** ([Page 43 on the PDF]): | The purpose of the Design and Development Brief is to provide a clear steer to prospective developers on the form of development considered appropriate for the site. Any provision of buses within the site must be considered very carefully for impacts on townscapes. Great care must be taken to achieve a high quality and attractive pedestrian environment around bus facilities. This is for a prospective developer to take full account of. | No change required. |
This section needs to major on the need to provide access for buses into the area. As stated above, if there is a desire to provide for access to a meaningful increase in car parking in this central area, as well as buses to a relocated facility, this will need to be tested. An off street facility would avoid the need for bus stands dominating the street scene, and a scheme has already been drawn up for this by MVA in their work for Guildford Borough Council. | As stated above, there has been no agreement yet that additional parking would be acceptable on the site. The view in Figure 4.5 appears not to register that buses will have to access the area from this approach. | No change required. |
4) **Page 43** ([Page 46 on the PDF]): | A full Transport Assessment will need to be carried out to support any detailed scheme for redevelopment of the area and to support a planning application. No decision has yet been taken regarding a bus facility and therefore it cannot be assumed that buses will have access from the approach shown in Figure 4.5. Additional wording has been added to 3.3 regarding the need for a transport assessment. | No change required. |
--- | --- | --- | ---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
<th>Recommended change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Under the heading &quot;Mobility&quot; it is requested that an additional bullet point be added perhaps under the fourth one: Providing a fit for purpose town centre bus facility.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>Recommend inserting a bullet point under Mobility worded 'a fit for purpose bus facility'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Site and Context</td>
<td>It is unfortunate that the area covered by the Development Brief does not include the BT Exchange building on Leapale Lane given its significance in this area of the town centre.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Council has tried to engage with BT regarding the future of their site. The site is not included within the Brief as it is currently unavailable.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Street Structure and Links</td>
<td>English Heritage welcomes the recognition of the historic development of the street structure and the distinction in urban structure between the area to the south of North Street and the area to the north (see comments below on The Approach).</td>
<td>Comments and support on these matters welcomed.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Topography, Heights and Strategic Views</td>
<td>English Heritage welcomes the recognition in the Brief of the importance of the topography and rooftops of Guildford.</td>
<td>Comments and support on these matters welcomed.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Building Quality and Plot Widths</td>
<td>The Development Brief area is bounded by just the one Conservation Area the Guildford Town Centre Conservation Area, originally designated in 1969 and extended in 2007. English Heritage welcomes the importance the Brief attaches to retaining the existing fine grain response to topography in the town centre i.e. minor variations in building heights, plot widths reflecting the traditional historic pattern in Guildford and &quot;stepping down&quot; the hill.</td>
<td>Comments and support on these matters welcomed.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>English Heritage supports a &quot;placemaking&quot; approach that retains the existing fine grain of the historic town centre in building form but does not simply default to historic styles or pastiche. English Heritage has no particular concerns about the suggested reconfiguration of the current street pattern of the Brief area to mimic that of the High Street/North Street area, notwithstanding the distinct difference between the urban structure to the south of North Street and that beyond the original northern boundary of the town to the north arising from their respective historical development, as recognised in the Brief, given that the urban structure of the Brief area is not particularly historically distinctive.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>Recommend inserting wording as follows &quot;No. 17 is the one remaining listed building in North Street. It is well proportioned early 19th century brick building that demonstrates well the regular frontage module, described above, that makes up the traditional form of the street. Adjacent proposals should reflect this example and enhance that.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>English Heritage welcomes the proposed retention of the Grade II listed building at 17, North Street, but the Brief should say more about its setting and the opportunities to enhance that.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Built Form</td>
<td>English Heritage considers the Brief's proposed new development ranging from 34 storeys along street frontages, with the uppermost storeys set back, and 5 or 5+ storey development in the centre to be acceptable in principle, provided careful attention is paid to the location and design of any taller buildings. English Heritage welcomes the Brief's requirements for development proposals to use topographic changes across the site sensitively and creatively and pay careful attention to the rooftops.</td>
<td>Comments and support on these matters welcomed.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English Heritage considers that a well-designed landmark building on the west corner of North Street and Woodbridge Road could be acceptable, but it should not detract from the setting of the listed building at 17, North Street. For this reason, it is considered that a landmark building on the east corner, adjacent to the listed building, would not be likely to be acceptable as it would detract from the relatively simple qualities of this historic building.

The landmark building on the east corner is not located directly adjacent to the listed building. However, its close proximity is noted and the potential to detract from the qualities of the historic building.

**Comment from the Guildford Society**

We consider that the above Consultation Draft SPD has some serious shortcomings and have the following comments:

1. The Brief could pave the way for very substantial development. The "Bellerby Theatre and North Place Day Centre Planning Brief" (January 2011) attempts to clear the way for the present Waitrose planning application. The North Street Brief is an attempt to clear the way for a much larger development including a new retail anchor store (a large department store).

   The North Street site is key in delivering the identified retail needs for the town. The North Street Design and Development Brief covers a larger area than the 2003 Brief and does look at opportunities for an anchor store.

2. The Brief is attempting to replace the 2003 "Design and Development Brief North Street Commercial Road Leapale Road Guildford". This title should be retained because the Brief covers much more than North Street. The present title is misleading.

   The site fronts North Street which is the prominent street in the area. The map clearly shows the extent of the area and it is therefore not considered necessary to provide all the street names within the title of the Brief.

3. The Brief is crucial to future development in Guildford town centre. We consider the Brief to be weak, and misleading in that the anchor store is given little mention. The preliminary workshop held on 23rd May and the present consultation by written submission are insufficient. For an SPD of this importance the full range of optional consultation techniques set out in Appendix 2 of the GBC Community Involvement in Planning, July 2011, should have been applied even though the Brief is not a DPD.

   The public consultation undertaken as part of this SPD is in line with the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012. No change required.

4. In particular there should have been leaflets, public displays, and several more meetings, including meetings after publication of the draft. There should have been far more press and media coverage.

   The public consultation undertaken as part of this SPD is in line with the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012. No change required.

5. The Brief has been prepared in the absence of an approved Town Centre Masterplan (or Interim Development Framework (IDF)). The presumption must be that the IDF will be written to accord with the Brief. It is not possible to do this in a satisfactory manner. The IDF could benefit from the existence of a draft Brief, but the Brief should not be adopted prior to the IDF for obvious reasons.

   The two documents are complimentary. It is anticipated that both will be considered for adoption by the Executive Committee 6 September 2012.

6. Any well prepared Town Centre IDF will show a way of achieving a satisfactory new pedestrian route from the railway station to the town centre and a statement on the future location of the bus station. Both these are of much concern to the citizens of Guildford and could have substantial effects on the Brief. The absence of an adopted IDF means that the Brief is in its current form is flawed.

   Comments noted. This matter has been considered as part of the Town Centre Interim Framework and does not form part of this Brief.

7. Thus the Brief is silent on the pedestrian route and completely vague on the location of the bus station. The Brief should not assume in advance of the IDF that the bus station will move.

   The Brief recognises that a bus facility may be provided within this site.

8. The Brief proposes the demolition of almost everything on the site, but with no modification of the existing Friary Centre. The Centre seems to be sacrosanct while everything else, including the bus station, can go.

   The Brief does not cover the existing Friary Centre as this will not be redeveloped.

9. Consequences are that the proposed new Shopping Street (item 11) ends in the blank wall of the Friary and the main arrival point (2) is meant to be from Onslow Street! The numbers refer to the Key Principles Diagram of the Brief. No satisfactory route for pedestrians from the railway station to the town centre is proposed and the existing Friary Centre is disregarded.

   The key principles diagram shows the opportunities available through redevelopment. Item 11 suggests a new shopping street but part of this would be to include a new access way into the Friary Centre opening this route up. Item 2 is suggesting an opportunity for a landmark as a focus for views from Onslow Street towards Woodbridge Road.

10. If necessary, the geographic extent of the brief should be extended to include the Friary Centre so that points 8 to 10 above can be encompassed. The common landownership makes this a reasonable step.

   The Brief does not cover the existing Friary Centre as this will not be redeveloped.

11. As shown by a recent signature list, the general public is for good reasons very much against any move of the bus station to a point more distant from the town centre (such as the other side of Onslow Street). The Brief should acknowledge this.

   The Brief recognises that a bus facility may be provided within this site.
12. The 2003 Brief included a list of Legal Agreements including a new bus station, affordable housing, funding of Park and Ride, community accommodation and other financial provisions. The list comprises 17 items in all. The new Brief should contain a similar list to ensure the Borough reaps wider benefits from development of the site. It would be a dereliction from duty to let them lapse. In the absence of an IDF it is not possible to check such a list against other proposals and provisions.

The Brief is broad in its suggested uses, and suitable planning obligations will be discussed at pre-application stage when more details of a potential scheme are available.

13. For the above reasons we believe that premature adoption of the Brief is open to challenge.

Comment noted.

14. Furthermore, if it were to precede the IDF it may fall in to the category of a DPD rather than an SPD because it does cover an area of significant change.

The Supplementary Planning Document is not considered a DPD as it is not allocating land or setting new planning policies. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 153 states that ‘SPD’s should be used where they can help applicants make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery.’ The purpose of the North Street Design and Development Brief is to provide a clear steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered appropriate for the site.

No change required.

15. The area of the site is given in the Brief as 2.5ha, i.e. 25,000 sq m. Let us assume the total footprint of the buildings is no more than 20,000 sq m, leaving 20% for roads, passages and other open spaces. The amount of new retail proposed is 60,000 sq m. A 1,000 place CP would require perhaps 20,000 sq m, and an assumed 100 new homes at 100 sq m each would need 10,000 sq m. Then add other uses, community, amenity, food, banking of at least 5,000 sq m. Total is therefore at least 95,000 sq m. Therefore the average building height has to be about 5 stories. Yet the Brief states, very correctly in our view, that "The development of three to four storeys with some higher buildings in the north-west of the development site would be appropriate to the site and wider town." There is a significant inconstancy here. The amount of development proposed should be completely reviewed and reduced.

No change required.

16. We find the economic assumptions underlying the Brief surprising in present circumstances. The commercial collapse of 'The High Street' is common talk across the UK. There are a multitude of serious studies (one being that by Mary Portas). While The Society would not suggest that our "cobble'd" High Street itself is at risk, we do suggest that the hinterland (e.g. North Street, and Tunsgate) is more comparable to the failing High Streets elsewhere. It appears that there are already more vacancies than usual, and the national economic future looks unlikely to reverse this.

The preparation of the Brief has been informed by detailed studies including commercial advice from the Council’s advisors, Cushman and Wakefield.

No change required.

17. In this context, we have seriously to question whether events have overtaken the GBC Retail and Leisure Study May 2011 prepared by Roger Tym & Partners which is quoted in section 2.3 of the Brief. The Study considered that 65,700 sq m of new space is required by 2021 (36,200+4,500+25,000). These figures are derived from detailed analysis, but the fundamental assumption is an annual growth rate of comparison goods of about 3.3% (Table 4.5 of the Study). Behind this is an assumption that non-retail took 11.7% in 2010 and that this will grow to only 13.6% in 2021 (Table 4.6). Though we are not experts, we have read the analyses in the technical press of the future of retailing, including the switch to purchase on the Web. In the light of these we believe the 3.3% is too high and the 13.6% is much too low. We recommend that the Council re-assess these assumptions. They are crucial to the aspirations of the Brief. A figure of 1% growth to 2021 for comparison goods may be more realistic. (The site area covered by the 2003 Brief would then surely be sufficient.)

These technical studies have been produced by independent specialist consultants and the conclusions of which are considered to be founded on robust analysis and provide credible evidence.

No change required.

18. The Cushman and Wakefield advice of 2012 is quoted in section 2.4 of the Brief. It does not consider growth rates etc., and simply says that a new anchor store needs 20,500 sq m and that to secure the anchor store a further 41,000 sq m of retail is needed, totalling 61,500 sq m. It is coincidental that this within 10% of the 65,700 estimated by Roger Tym & Partners.

The Cushman and Wakefield advice of 2012 is independent of the Roger Tym and Partners study.

No change required.

19. At the workshop on 23rd May it was explained that the need for 61,500 sq m leads to the need to extend the site beyond that of the 2003 Brief. This logic is not set out in the Brief and hence our comment number 3 above.

The Brief explains the new site area at Para 1.3 including the site being extended to increase the potential development area to meet identified demand.

No change required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
<th>Recommended change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Roger Tym estimates the existing town centre comparison shopping floor space in the town centre is 89,102 sq m (Table 6.1). The Brief’s intention is to permit about 60,000 sq m of new retail, an increase of 67% (two thirds) without any supporting up to date research. The Brief does not concern itself with the possible consequences for the rest of the town centre. Other towns have been damaged by over development. This will be evident very quickly if GBC gets it badly wrong.</td>
<td>The Brief sets out that the development could achieve in the order of 50,000 to 60,000 sq m (gross) of commercial floorspace. This includes retail floorspace and other non-residential uses. The 2011 Retail and Leisure Study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area for additional comparison goods of 36,200 sq m (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&amp;Q extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sq m is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. We note that Westfield carried out retail impact assessments of their proposed increase of 25,000 sq m. They showed a negative effect of about 10% on High Street trading.</td>
<td>The impact assessment considered that in the absence of any major improvement in its retail offer, Guildford would be unable to maintain its share of the growing market and that catchment area residents would increasingly direct their spending to larger and strengthening centres beyond the catchment area. The reduction in turnover of 8.7% in the remainder of the town centre is as a result of no improvement in Guildford retail offer, not a result of the Friary extension. The impact assessment recognises that the Friary extension would attract a net gain of 7% turnover to the remainder of the town.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. We believe that in the present circumstances there is a risk that implementation of the Brief would lead to significant deterioration of retail in other parts of the town centre.</td>
<td>The purpose of the Brief is to provide a steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that it is important that needs for retail and other main town centre uses are met in full and are not compromised by limited site availability. This site is the only land within the retail core capable of accommodating the required amount of retail floor space for which demand has been identified. The Retail and Leisure Study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace identified. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. This could include closure of Debenhams, failure of Tunsgate and a change in the nature of the High Street as we know it.</td>
<td>The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that it is important that needs for retail and other main town centre uses are met in full and are not compromised by limited site availability. This site is the only land within the retail core capable of accommodating the required amount of retail floor space for which demand has been identified. The Retail and Leisure Study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace identified. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. We conclude that the amount of retail development proposed should be reduced. If the reduction was significant, then some of the resultant space could be transferred to ‘residential’, where there continues to be a considerable shortfall in the Guildford plans.</td>
<td>The purpose of the Brief is to provide a steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. Any proposed scheme and/or planning application will have to consider sustainable transport and mobility.</td>
<td>Recommend inserting a bullet point under Mobility worded ‘a fit for purpose bus facility’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The Brief proposes closing Leapale Road which has severe implications for bus routes. Closing this link with Woodbridge Road and minimising traffic in North Street, would enforce MVA’s original recommendation for divided bus services between East and West, so vehemently opposed by Guildfordians. Any through services to the Station, University and Hospital will need to be routed along Chertsey Street (very narrow in places) and York Road, already very busy and worse if Waitrose goes ahead. There will thus be no direct bus link between the top of the hill (High St./Chertsey St. junction) and the bottom (possibly Woodbridge Rd./Onslow St.).</td>
<td>The Brief sets out issues and opportunities that need to be considered for any future redevelopment proposal of the site.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The Brief does nothing to encourage a modal shift from car to public transport. In fact bus stands are to be inconspicuous (P.40).</td>
<td>The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that it is important that needs for retail and other main town centre uses are met in full and are not compromised by limited site availability. This site is the only land within the retail core capable of accommodating the required amount of retail floor space for which demand has been identified. The Retail and Leisure Study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace identified. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. As an “emerging document”, the Brief effectively defines the infrastructure upon which the Transport Authority will be applying its transport modelling, thus precluding any other infrastructure possibilities.</td>
<td>The purpose of the Brief is to provide a steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. Any proposed scheme and/or planning application will have to consider sustainable transport and mobility.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. This carries the risk that the development proposed in the Brief will fail because of the lack of adequate transport provision for the increased number of visitors to the town.</td>
<td>The Brief sets out issues and opportunities that need to be considered for any future redevelopment proposal of the site.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. 498 car parking spaces will be lost in the area if the Leapale Rd. MSCP is removed, together with 49 spaces in North Street. No specific provision is made for replacing these nor for the additional 400 or more required by a new anchor store and all the other retail space; (1000 is mentioned in the text). Access for any car parking is to be from Onslow Street/Woodbridge Road where presumably any bus facilities are also likely to be located. The outcome is likely to be severe congestion.</td>
<td>The purpose of the Brief is to provide a steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. It does not propose a detailed scheme for the site and quantum of development. A full Transport Assessment will need to be carried out to support any detailed scheme for redevelopment of the area and to support a planning application.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. There is no current transportation or parking plan to support the Brief.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The Brief provides no guidance as to what traffic could use North Street other than to say (page 40 under Vehicle Access) “Any increase in the amount of traffic on North Street will not be acceptable”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The adjacent area at Leapale Lane is identified as an open space (Fig 4.4) and yet measures are to be adopted to minimise possible conflict between pedestrians and vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Organisation Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
<th>Recommended change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>No provision is made for HGV access to College Road (Waitrose). There are no proposals to use any parts of the site to provide roadway infrastructure or widening. This promises to be a very congested area and an impossible challenge for the Transport Authority to introduce mitigating measures.</td>
<td>HGV access to Waitrose is a consideration for Waitrose as part of their planning application.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>A development of 65,700 sq m could, based on Westfield’s previous estimate of 1,348 for 25,000 sq m, generate about 3,500 new jobs. As noted above, there will be some diminution in other parts of the town but nonetheless the increase will be large. No provision is suggested for infrastructure or housing of these people.</td>
<td>The purpose of the Brief is to provide a steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. It is the role of the emerging Local Plan Strategy to consider the wider issues such as housing provision.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>The Brief shows a regrettable lack of local knowledge. Norwich House has been incorrectly placed in Fig 1.2. It is on the western corner of North St./Leapale Rd. and therefore in the originally defined area. A site visit will confirm this! Another example of the lack of local knowledge is that without a word the Brief implies the demolition of the Council owned present CAB offices in Haydon Place. There are several other such solecisms.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Brief correctly covers the CAB offices and these could therefore form part of any redevelopment.</td>
<td>Recommend moving the annotation on Figure 1.2 “Norwich House”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>All in all we conclude that the Brief must be withdrawn and rewritten.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### North Street Design and Development Brief - Consultation Response

Our Organisation represents some 600 households on the SE side of the Town Centre. Our area is adjacent to the town centre and includes some of it. It provides all our shopping amenities as we have no local shops in our area at all. We are therefore frequent users of the centre, and it is of great importance to us. We hope that due weight will be given to our views and those of other groups representing residents living within walking distance of the centre, who must be regarded as the primary “stakeholders” in the town centre.

We do in general support the intent to upgrade North Street, and provide extra retail on its North side, but we are strongly against such a massive retail expansion. Our detail comments are:

1. The development should not be described as “Retail Lead”.

This is the crucial issue. For several years our Group has taken the view, expressed already in response to several consultations, that planned retail expansion should be limited to that set for the “Friary Extension”, which was about 25,000sqm. We are surprised that the intent now is to commit to up to 60,000sqm of additional retail floor space. This would represent a near doubling of the retail space. Our understanding is that this perceived “need” is based on the desire to compete in retail size with towns regarded as competitors for regional trade, and the apparent eagerness of chains to have shops in Guildford. This is not the situation for most residents, or we think for visiting shoppers. We do not need more of the same; what is needed is a better quality “shopping experience” and more diversity - to include small independents and proper convenience shopping. The aim should be to give more choice of goods, not of suppliers. The required rebalancing of the retail offer could be made within the existing retail floor plus the extra 25,000sqm that would have been used for the “Friary extension”.

We fear that commitment to such a massive retail expansion, contrary to the retail trends now predicted, might become a threat to existing businesses and eventually degrade the town rather than enhancing it. (It is noted that the studies on which the scheme is based are not up to date).

Our reading of the NPPF is that it requires a balanced approach to development, and that much less weight is placed on retail expansion than on provision of housing. A housing-lead development would better meet present circumstances and predictions.

2. Identified needs for Town Centre Development.

We believe that the urgent needs for the town centre, that should be addressed in any expansion, and which would reflect the intent of the NPPF are:

(a) Provision of housing, particularly affordable housing.

From sustainability considerations the town centre is a good location, provided there is adequate incentive to use travel means other than the car. Affordable housing, both social and low cost, could be particularly beneficial in providing for the many shop workers and other town centre workers, who currently commute into the town to work, and also for elderly folk.
**Organisation**

Holy Trinity Amenity Group

**Comments**

- (b) Additional open space.

  It is noted that buildings have to be crammed into the site to achieve the target floorspace. The building mass must be reduced. While the introduction of new "gates" (narrow passages) may be justified as a continuation of the character of the existing centre, these must be combined with spacious open paved areas, to avoid the town becoming even more cramped and claustrophobic than it already is. The Brief does not provide this. Even the proposed new E-W street is not particularly wide at 12-15m and the "meeting space" square appears minute.

- (c) Convenience shopping.

  Provision is needed for small independent shops, and an indoor market (most other towns have one). This would also be a better location for the proposed Waitrose store that that currently proposed.

- (d) Retain the bus station must on this site.

  The arguments for this have now been well made many times.

  Provision of these functions is supported by NPPF requirements, such as:

  - Recognise town centres as the heart of their communities
  - Where appropriate, reintroduce or create new ones (markets)
  - Safe and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas

  3. Need to keep the High Street as the focus of the town centre

  We are concerned that the title of "North Street" is a misrepresentation of a scheme that only borders on the Street, and does not include the S side in the development. A key issue is the effect the development would have on the position of the centre of the town, and the present title misleadingly suggests that this could be little. We ask that a more appropriate title be given.

  To prevent a major displacement of the town centre to the North, away from the High Street, it is suggested that:

  1. Place the 25,000sqm of retail space at the North Street side, with residential behind.
  2. Provide a main, spacious, town square adjacent to, and open to, North Street. This would connect better with the existing centre, and with one side open would allow wider vistas. The proposed square/or meeting point in the centre of the development area would make the development seem separated from the existing retail area.
  3. Improve the lanes that link High Street and North Street, making them more interesting and welcoming.
  4. Abandon the proposal to remove retail from Sydenham Road - it is essential to retain retail here to keep some balance between both sides of the High Street.
  5. Integrate pedestrianisation with that in the High Street and the High Street - North Street links, so that there is a single town centre pedestrianised area.
  6. Arrange as many of the new retail units as possible to have their main entrance onto North Street.
  7. Integrate pedestrianisation with that in the High Street and the High Street - North Street links, so that there is a single town centre pedestrianised area.

  4. Other Issues

  4.1 All pedestrianised streets and alleys must be always open to the public, in perpetuity; to ensure this they all need to be adopted by the Highways authority, at least as the Townpath category of maintainable streets.

  4.2 The area needs to be split between several developers, to allow phased development, and to avoid control of a large part of the town centre being in the hands of a single operator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
<th>Recommended change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holy Trinity Amenity Group</td>
<td>(b) Additional open space.</td>
<td>The Brief recognises that detailed capacity and feasibility studies should be undertaken to determine the size of the development. The mix of uses and amount of retail floorspace will be determined through a developer's detailed scheme and the submission of a planning application. The Brief does not determine the amount of development but recognises that the site is capable of achieving 50 to 60,000sqm (gross) of commercial floorspace.</td>
<td>Recommend adding &quot;The size of the development should be subject to detailed capacity and feasibility studies, but it is expected that it will be in the order of 50 to 60,000 sq m (gross). The proportion of commercial space within this total depends on the amount of non-commercial use that might be proposed. It should also be noted that floor space can be provided in basement areas, taking advantage of the sloping site, and that there is capacity for some taller elements within the development: see the sections in figures 4.1 and 4.2, opposite.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Convenience shopping.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Retain the bus station must on this site.</td>
<td>The Brief recognises that a bus facility may be provided within this site.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Brief recognises that a bus facility may be provided within this site.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The site fronts North Street which is the prominent street in the area. The map clearly shows the extent of the area and it is therefore not considered necessary to provide all the street names within the title of the Brief.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
<th>Recommended change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terence O'Rourke on behalf of University of Surrey</td>
<td>The university broadly welcomes the design and development brief for the following reasons:</td>
<td>Comments noted and general support welcomed.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvements to the town centre retail offer will enhance the reputation of Guildford as a place to visit and shop. This will be an influential factor for prospective students and staff when choosing where to study and work, and is therefore welcomed by the university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It aims to create &quot;more attractive gateways into the town centre&quot;. Well-defined gateways are an important feature of successful town centres and help to create a sense of arrival. They also improve the legibility which is critical to navigating through town centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The redevelopment of this area may help to improve linkages with land to the west of the town centre. Pedestrian or vehicular link improvements would aid the free movement of staff and students between the Manor Park and Stag Hill campuses and are welcomed by the university. The requirement for developments in the North Street area to contribute towards improving street crossings on Onslow Street will also aid connectivity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is proposed that future development in this area will &quot;form a vital and lively extension to the town centre during the day and into the evening&quot; (paragraph 4.4). The quality of the town centre offer, during the day and at night, can contribute significantly to the student experience and proposals to enhance it are welcomed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There could be an opportunity for further housing to be delivered in this area. The university welcomes planning policy or guidance where it would make Guildford a more sustainable place to live and would increase the number of homes, including affordable homes. If more affordable housing is provided in the borough, there is a greater likelihood that university students and staff, and employees of tenants of the Surrey Research Park will be able to live close to where they work or study. This relationship is important if the university is to continue to attract new students and staff and also for other employers based in Guildford. If housing opportunities do not exist for the young and old, people and businesses could be lost to other towns or cities where accommodation is more available and affordable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The town centre experiences vehicle congestion at peak times and proposals to reduce congestion, which could include increased park and ride provision at edge of town locations, are welcomed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In conclusion, for Guildford to continue to prosper and attract inward investment, the town centre must be an attractive place to live, work and engage in a range of leisure activities. The North Street Design and Development Brief will help to facilitate this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downsende Residents' Association</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>Comments noted and each one will be taken in turn with an officer response.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. These are the comments of the committee of our residents' association on the contents of the proposed Design and Development Brief for North Street which was issued for comment in June, 2012. We have also noted the summary on the GBC website of the comments made by members of the public during the discussion and workshops held at the Guildhall on 23 May, 2012.</td>
<td>Comments noted and each one will be taken in turn with an officer response.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. We are disappointed with both the scope and the content of the Design and Development Brief as it continues to call for a dramatic increase in refurbished and new retail space in the centre of Guildford. Many of those present at the 23 May workshops also doubted whether such a large increase in new retail space would be necessary and their view was recorded in the summary on the GBC website. However such views have evidently not been accommodated in the brief as subsequently issued. We agree that old and outdated retail facilities need to be renewed but we do not agree that that such an increase in total retail space as indicated in the brief is either required or is sustainable for Guildford in the future. Despite the predictions of the highly paid retail consultants engaged by GBC, we consider that a common sense and widely held approach is that the current levels of internet buying will continue strongly. It is indeed likely that the proportion of Internet sales will increase across all retail sectors. We believe that this will mean that current levels of retail space, suitably renewed and updated, will most likely suffice and be sustainable.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Our association has expressed this view before, particularly during the consultation on the Town Centre Masterplan. We are concerned that our comments, and indeed those of many of our colleague associations which are similar to ours, have not been taken seriously by GBC. We believe that as residents close to the centre of Guildford, although outside the centre itself, we have the right to expect that our opinions on how the centre is to be developed should be listened to and acted upon when there is broad support.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. We find the response form wholly inadequate for constructive comment on the brief and have therefore again felt it necessary to comment in the way that we have in this note. We hope that this approach is acceptable.</td>
<td>This approach is acceptable.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peripheral consequences of the Brief</td>
<td>The purpose of the Brief is to provide a steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. It does not propose a detailed scheme for the site and quantum of development. A full Transport Assessment will need to be carried out to support any detailed scheme for redevelopment of the area and to support a planning application.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Only the specific area of North Street is described in the brief and as a consequence there is little or no guidance as to how the development will be required to fit into the areas surrounding North Street. There has been much public comment, both on GBC consultation documents and in the press, on traffic congestion in the town centre and we had expected that a comprehensive investigation into possible remedies would have been examined before the North Street brief is finalised.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Parking is an important issue and despite the success of the existing Park and Ride facilities, there will be great pressure on the need for additional parking in the centre to service the dramatic proposed increase in retail space. The removal of existing parking spaces as part of the brief will only exacerbate this situation. It is clearly not in the interests of Guildford’s residents who live on the periphery of the town centre to be confronted with yet more parked vehicles in the local roads which will be the inevitable consequence.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
<td>Recommended change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. We agree that the existing bus station has passed its sell by date and updated facilities are required. However the removal of the existing bus station to either the smaller Bedford Road site or its replacement by a number of street side stands at various locations in the town centre does not provide an adequate service for the many residents of Guildford who live outside the centre and depend on the buses.</td>
<td>The Brief recognises that a bus facility may be provided within this site.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. We accept that pedestrian movement, as would be expected, is catered for within the North Street brief area. However there is no guidance as to how the increased number of pedestrians will be able to progress to and from the railway station which will be an important entry point for the expected extra shoppers.</td>
<td>These wider issues are being considered as part of the Town Centre Interim Framework and is not within the remit of this Brief.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concluding comment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. We remain concerned that the sequence of proposed plans for the town centre is not logical. There is, we believe, a danger that short term decisions, apparently considered necessary by GBC, will prevent the realisation of imaginative future longer term plans. We all want a successful and vibrant town centre but feel that the current haphazard and piecemeal approach is not good enough. A well thought through longer term vision is required.</td>
<td>The Town Centre Interim Framework sets out the longer term vision.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We write on behalf of our Client, Hermes, who welcome and support the revised design and development brief for the North Street regeneration area.</td>
<td>Comment noted and general support welcomed.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having recently acquired Westfield’s share in the Friary Centre and adjoining land, Hermes is now the sole interest, alongside the Borough Council, in the shopping centre and associated land. Hermes is keen, in partnership with the Council, to pursue and deliver the extension to the shopping centre, for which there is an extant planning consent. To move this forward Hermes has now appointed a project team.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermes is committed to delivering a new high quality urban quarter, which extends the core primary shopping area and enhances the retail offer of the town. Its vision for the area is a retail-led mixed-use scheme that embodies best practice urban design principles, ensuring that the new quarter complements and integrates with Guildford’s very special and historic town centre. This is an exciting prospect for Guildford, and Hermes is pleased to be able to play a part in the regeneration of this significant part of Guildford town centre.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are confident that the Council and Hermes both want to significantly improve the retail offer for the Borough and the town, and within that context this site is key. We have reviewed the draft design and development brief to ensure that it facilitates the delivery of a truly high-quality town centre extension. We trust that the following comments are helpful in fine-tuning the document, and also request the opportunity to discuss these further with you.</td>
<td>Comments noted and each one will be taken in turn with an officer response.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Design and Development Brief Boundary In order to achieve the full integration sought by the document we believe it essential that the existing Friary Centre itself is included within the development brief area and that it is a major consideration in the future redevelopment of the area.</td>
<td>The Brief does not cover the existing Friary Centre as this will not be redeveloped.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gateways: Any development within the area should also be cognisant of 1 Onslow Street, which potentially forms a key landmark feature and gateway into the town centre.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Existing planning consent: In order to fully contextualise the updated brief reference should be made to the existing planning consent for the Friary Centre extension.</td>
<td>The existing planning consent is referenced under ‘Planning Context’.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Location of an anchor store: Ideally, the ‘anchor’ store should be located in a position that will attract a range of high quality retailers to its immediate vicinity, ensuring the vitality and viability of the wider regeneration project, as well as encouraging a more robust retail circuit through the town centre. We believe the location for the anchor store should be addressed at a later date in order to avoid prescribing the solution at this stage.</td>
<td>The spatial distribution of anchor stores has formed part of the analysis contained within the Brief. This is not prescriptive as to a future anchor stores location which could be sited anywhere within the boundary of the site.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Integration with existing town centre: we would like to see greater emphasis on the integration of the new urban quarter with existing adjacent buildings and uses through the public realm strategy. For example, the position of footpaths and public squares should aim to fully knit the new development into the existing urban fabric whilst still acknowledging the location of the Friary Centre. Strategic vistas should also be considered, which again may result in the Friary Centre having more prominence than is currently afforded in the development brief.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Brief sets out an analysis of the street structure at section 3.4 and highlights the issues and opportunities to improve linkages and integrate the area with its surroundings.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Access: we would welcome a fuller explanation of the access strategy for the area, including public transport, cycling, walking, servicing, park and ride, and car parking so that our Client’s own approach can dovetail with that of the Council.</td>
<td>Local traffic issues including congestion, parking and transport facilities such as the bus station have been highlighted as areas of concern. In order to respond to these, we need to carry out further studies to inform a final Town Centre framework and strategy.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermes is eager to meet with you to discuss and progress these matters at the earliest opportunity, so that the document can be fine-tuned and help to bring forward the much-needed redevelopment of this central area of Guildford.</td>
<td>Comment noted and the approach to partnership working welcomed.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your invitation to comment on the North Street Design and Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document.

I was not sure from the documents whether you are really looking for comments on your strategy or on the details of your consultants proposed solution.

I felt it might help to understand your strategy if you could take more time to develop your objectives, assess your competitors, develop forecasts of the impact of the project and perhaps consider alternative solutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
<th>Recommended change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>From the brief I understand the objectives are 25,135m² of commercial space with an anchor store taking about 80%, 170 residential units and a new bus station. You want to encourage the lanes and gates and for Guildford to compete with neighbouring centres and be a top non-metropolitan borough in UK. However, the brief does not seem to explain why these objectives were fixed rather than others. Moreover, it appears to consider one solution only and then go into considerable detail about some of the specifics. There are probably other important objectives which are not discussed such as planning gain and local tax revenue, local wealth, parking and traffic congestion, employment and amenities.</td>
<td>The purpose of the Brief is to provide a steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. It does not propose a detailed scheme for the site and quantum of development. A Full Transport Assessment will need to be carried out to support any detailed scheme for redevelopment of the area and to support a planning application.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitors are mentioned but I did not see an analysis of, for example, Kingston or Woking to assess their strengths and weaknesses and show how these could impact your project. Are these the only competitors?</td>
<td>The preparation of the Brief has been informed by other studies including the Guildford Town Centre Development Study and the Retail and Leisure Study which sets out the analysis of competitors.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have not shown alternative strategies; for example you could develop a comparison of ‘do nothing’ vs. ‘partial project’ vs. ‘full project’ or you could perhaps consider whether anything other than retail can achieve what you want. Could extra emphasis on heritage, academia or arts and leisure perhaps provide alternative solutions.</td>
<td>The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that it is important that needs for retail and other main town centre uses are met in full and are not compromised by limited site availability. This site is the only land within the retail core area capable of accommodating the required amount of retail floor space for which demand has been identified.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You seem to have assumed North Street can be redeveloped without the rest of the town being affected. Is that realistic?</td>
<td>The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace identified. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You do not seem to have provided financial forecasts of the impact of the project. I imagine the idea is that part of the commercial gain can be secured for the town to help fund the bus station, affordable housing and other new amenities but this is not explained.</td>
<td>The Brief is broad in its suggested uses, and suitable planning obligations will be discussed at pre-application stage when more details of a potential scheme are available.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not clear whether you have considered changes in technology over the life of the project which could affect the results. For example, the impact of internet shopping.</td>
<td>The preparation of the Brief has been informed by other studies including the Guildford Town Centre Development Study and the Retail and Leisure Study which considers such impacts.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have approached this in the way a large capital investment proposal might be assessed. I hope this is helpful.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Background

The town centre area immediately to the east of the Friary Shopping Centre bordered by the Friary, Leapale Road and North Street (‘the Core Property’) and largely owned by Hermes and your Council constitutes a ‘Major Approved Development Site’ in paragraph 9.62 of your Council’s Local Plan for which the Council adopted a Design and Development Brief in September 2003. Subsequently your Council granted outline planning permission for a comprehensive mixed use development of the Core Property comprising 25,135 sq metres of commercial floor space including community spaces, 170 residential units and a new bus station. This planning permission was renewed under reference 09/P/02043 and if all matters reserved by that permission are approved, remains capable of being implemented until at least October 2015.

2. Draft Brief

So the proposals in the Draft North Street Design and Development Brief 2012 published last month represent a step change by enlarging the Core Property to include Dominion House, Leapale multi-storey car park and 12-14 North Street to create a 2.5 hectare area of significant change. No commitment is made to a new bus station, yet alone community spaces and housing, but a compelling need emerges for the first time to create 41,000 square metres of retail floor space on the Core Property so as to render a 20,900 square metre department store viable on land above Leapale Road of which the predominant owner is your Council.

Increasing the retail floor space in the town centre by more than 65% is likely to have a substantial and prolonged impact on existing retail traders, on the character of this historic county town and on the demands placed on its already inadequate infrastructure. In consequence we believe the draft Brief is a development plan document which requires to be submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination.

The Supplementary Planning Document is not considered a DPD as it is not allocating land or setting new planning policies. The National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 153 states that ‘SPD’s should be used where they can help applicants make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery’... ‘The purpose of the North Street Design and Development Brief is to provide a clear steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered appropriate for the site. | The Brief sets out that the development could achieve in the order of 50,000 to 60,000 sqm (gross) of commercial floorspace. This includes retail floorspace and other non-residential uses. The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the £B&G extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sqm is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension. The purpose of the Brief is to provide a steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. It does not propose a detailed scheme for the site and quantum of development. | No change required. | No change required. |

No change required. | No change required. | No change required. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
<th>Recommended change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guildford Vision Group</td>
<td>3. Community Involvement</td>
<td>The purpose of the Brief is to provide a steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. It does not propose a detailed scheme for the site or quantum of development.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We would have expected these proposals, which will affect everyone who lives or works in the town, to warrant far more publicity and to result in a great deal more consultation and engagement than has been undertaken. No more than lip service seems to have been paid to the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement adopted in July 2011. There should have been leaflets, public displays, focus groups and a great deal more all of which should have continued during the consultation period. Limited community involvement preceded publication of the draft Brief that we do not see reflected in its contents. Adequate consultation following publication has been eroded by the Brief being put out for consultation in the run up to the school summer holidays. Disappointingly the lessons arising from consultation on the draft Town Centre Masterplan over the Christmas and New Year have not been learned.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Evidence Base</td>
<td>The purpose of the North Street Design and Development Brief is to provide a clear steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered appropriate for the site. It does not propose a detailed scheme or suggest the quantum of development.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As a pressure group who are campaigning for an holistic approach to master planning the town based on best advice you will well understand our concerns at the evidence base which has informed the draft Brief.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is apparent from page 12 of the draft that the Council cannot deliver a comprehensive masterplan without further traffic and transport studies. Whilst these have now been commissioned the results are not yet available. They, and any subsequent externally commissioned reports that may need to supplement them, are key to establishing the mix and quantum of uses not only on this site but at the Bellerby Theatre site, the proposed foodstore gateway referred to in the draft Brief, also owned by your Council. The traffic assumptions at the Bellerby have already been shown by two leading firms of traffic engineers to be fundamentally flawed.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In his report to the Executive in October 2011 explaining why the 2003 Brief should be revisited the Council’s Head of Economic Development said that the preparation of a new Brief afforded the Council the opportunity to establish whether ‘current and emerging economic factors will support the longer term regeneration of the site’. We see nothing in the Brief to indicate that the impact of the continuing recession, which has led to several shops in and around the High Street closing, or the dramatic rise in internet sales and home delivery have caused the underlying growth assumptions to be revisited or a current retail floor space audit to be undertaken.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indeed you have confirmed to us in writing that the ‘guiding’ and ‘highly relevant North Street site development commercial advice 2012 referred to on page 14 of the draft Brief which calls for an aggregate 61,500 square metres of retail floor space does not exist as an document and is no more than verbal advice given by Cushman &amp; Wakefield to Studio Real. We suspect the delivery of 61,500 square metres of retail floor space on this constrained 2.5 hectare site adjacent to the Town Centre Conservation Area can only be achieved if building heights intrude on the unrivalled long views to the countryside enjoyed from the town.</td>
<td>The Brief recognises that detailed capacity and feasibility studies should be undertaken to determine the size of the development. The mix of uses and amount of retail floorspace will be determined through a developer’s detailed scheme and the submission of a planning application. The Brief does not determine the amount of development but recognises that the site is capable of achieving 50 to 60,000 sqm (gross) of commercial floorspace.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Transparency</td>
<td>The Brief has been written with full regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and is in conformity. The Brief is broad in its suggested uses, and suitable planning obligations will be discussed at pre-application stage when more details of a potential scheme are available.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The draft Brief announces that its principal purpose is “to provide a clear steer to prospective developers on the form of development considered most appropriate for the site”. It is difficult to see how a clear steer can be derived from the draft Brief when key planning policies have yet to be published and no guidance is given on important aspects of the development or the planning gain to be delivered to the community.</td>
<td>The Brief has been written with full regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and is in conformity. The Brief is broad in its suggested uses, and suitable planning obligations will be discussed at pre-application stage when more details of a potential scheme are available.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The draft Brief informs us that the draft Local Plan Strategy will not be put out for consultation until the autumn of this year, and we are aware the Interim Town Centre Framework being finalised by Studio Real will not be published for adoption before the end of the month. The Council’s Strategic Parking Strategy is also stated not to be due for completion until September 2012.</td>
<td>The Local Plan Strategy consultation has been delayed and is likely to commence early in 2013.</td>
<td>Recommend updating wording and replacing the date with the word &quot;soon&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is nothing in the draft Brief that addresses the external remodelling and integration of the adjoining Friary with the new retail floor space or puts definition into the size and location of any replacement bus station facility. We propose you to restate the existing bus station adjoining the Friary to the presentation of a 2000 image attached to this year with the Council’s then preferred alternative location in Bedfor Road being universally condemned. Planning gain, unlike the 2003 Brief, warrants no mention.</td>
<td>The Brief recognises that a bus facility may be provided within this site.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finally we are aware that confusion has been generated by the Site Boundary plan on page 7 of the draft Brief showing the incorrect location of Norwich House. There is also an absence of any reference in the text of the Brief to the site being enlarged to include the mis-described 12-14 North Street where HSBC, Mothercare, Argos and other retailers are now trading.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Brief explains the new site area at Para 1.3.</td>
<td>Recommend moving the mention in Figure 1.2 &quot;Norwich House&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Conflicts of Interest</td>
<td>The Brief is in the unusual position of being both the freeholder owner of the Friary Centre, owner of key elements of the 2.5 hectare site and the local planning authority for the combined areas.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The Council is freehold owner and local planning authority for many sites and premises within the borough, this is not unusual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
<td>Recommended change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|\[There will inevitably be conflicts between what the Council’s external property advisers recommend and what the local planning authority consider can be supported based on an impartial application of existing planning policy. There is a widespread perception that the publication of supplementary planning documents is being used to deliver disguised outcomes favoured by the Council as landowner to the disadvantage of other landowners and the wider community.

The North Street Design and Development Brief has been prepared in conformity with the Guildford Local Plan 2003 and the National Planning Policy Framework. Any future detailed scheme requires planning consent. | No change required. |

Directing the food store requirement to an edge of centre site owned by the Council and allocated for housing in the Local Plan has reinforced that view. The announcement that the Council’s Chief Executive is to speak at the British Council of Shopping Centres Annual Conference next month with Alistair Parker of Cushman & Wakefield and Jeremy Collins the Property Director of John Lewis has done nothing to dispel that impression even though Mr. Collins is no longer participating.| No change required. |

7. Conclusions

The inadequate evidence base and incomplete nature of the proposals do not form a basis for an intelligent response to be made to the Brief, particularly when a number of new and relevant planning policies will only be published after the consultation period closes.

The purpose of the North Street Design and Development Brief is to provide a steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered appropriate for the site. It does not propose a detailed scheme or suggest the quantum of development. The Brief has been prepared in conformity with the Guildford Local Plan 2003 and the National Planning Policy Framework. There will be no new planning policies published until the adoption of the Local Plan Strategy and Local Plan Delivery documents anticipated 2014 and 2015 respectively. | No change required. |

General Comments

The Brief has many excellent points, such as preserving small spaces, the east west street pattern, narrow connecting streets, the view of St Saviour’s Church steeple (the only steeple in Guildford), shared spaces, narrow shop widths, as well as the importance of roofscape and views, building in keeping with the topography of the land, and the development being open during all hours.

The purpose of the Brief is to provide a steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that it is important that needs for retail and other main town centre uses are met in full and are not compromised by limited site availability. This site is the only land within the retail core area capable of accommodating the required amount of retail floor space for which demand has been identified.

A doubling of the retail area: The risk of downsides from doubling the retail area in Guildford is of great concern. It is not clear why such an enormous expansion of a retail area behind North St is needed to regenerate parts of North St (No.19 Fig.3.2b).

The purpose of the Brief is to provide a steer to prospective developers on the form of the development considered most appropriate for the site. If all the new retail is to be controlled by one developer, appropriate safeguards, wherever possible, need to be put in place to prevent adverse impacts. | No change required. |

Also no reason is given why a John Lewis store should itself need such a large expansion of retail. There are already major shops, such Debenhams, House of Fraser, Marks and Spencer, Heals, Boots, W H Smiths, Laura Ashley and many supporting popular shops of a smaller size in Guildford. Over thirty years ago Debenhams came to Guildford without a large supporting area of retail to accompany it. There was much excitement at the time and it has done very well for Guildford.

The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace identified. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.

The future of retail in Guildford: The huge enlargement of retail to the north of the town would be in direct competition with the High St and the impact it will have on the High St will be beyond the control of the local authority. If the new retail development were to impact on the High St, the High St could turn into a street of boutiques, or it could fill up with charity shops giving a closed up atmosphere.

The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace identified. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping. | No change required. |

Such a large expansion of retail, particularly when the future of retail is so uncertain, could have an enormous adverse impact on our High St and present traders. Towns that have poor High Streets lacking in vibrancy and which are particularly suffering in the recession have often over expanded with additional retail areas nearby.

The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace identified. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping. | No change required. |

The Focus of Retail in Guildford

The titles of the Brief implies that it is wholly about North St. However, many of the diagrams and content of the document applies to the area behind North St and it would be helpful if the title of the Brief reflected this.

The site fronts North Street which is the prominent street in the area. The map clearly shows the extent of the area and it is therefore not considered necessary to provide all the street names within the title of the Brief.

The future of retail in Guildford: The huge enlargement of retail to the north of the town would be in direct competition with the High St and the impact it will have on the High St will be beyond the control of the local authority. If the new retail development were to impact on the High St, the High St could turn into a street of boutiques, or could fill up with charity shops giving a closed up atmosphere.

The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace identified. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping. | No change required. |

It is also noted that the developer is taking over the bus station site for retail and expanding further up North St. If all the new retail is to be controlled by one developer, appropriate safeguards, wherever possible, need to be put in place to prevent adverse impacts.

The North Street site is owned by Hermes, Guildford Borough Council and third parties. The existing bus station is owned by Guildford Borough Council. | No change required. |
The impact on the High St, traffic and residents is not part of the Brief.

Architecture – A high standard for North St and the new development

A high standard of architecture in any development and along North St is extremely important as it is architecture which ‘makes or breaks’ a development. It will be seen every day over many years by those who live in or visit Guildford to work or shop – and it will either make the town more attractive, enhancing its reputation, or it could damage the town’s present attractiveness. Once a development is built it is very difficult to rectify bad or characterless architecture. Architecture comes first, enhancement by trees, etc. second. The latter should not be relied upon to try and camouflage characterless architecture.

There is a bland characterless type of retail architecture used across the country, which are in character with their surroundings missing old with new, can provide much interest to a street.

Type of architecture:  It seems from the pre consultation meeting on the North St brief that pastiche is not wanted, but nor are glass and metal structures.  Contemporary glass buildings can be exciting or fit in well with other architecture when well designed, but many built to a budget are not.

Pastiche has become an unfashionable and negative ‘buzz’ word, but it should be remembered that much of Guildford High St is pastiche. Great painters, musicians and architects over the ages have built or created on past experience and past designs. Many of Britain’s iconic buildings are pastiche. Abbot’s Hospital was built on an old fashioned design for its time and Guildford’s much treasured ‘Arts and Crafts’ buildings, including the ‘Three Pigeons’ pub in the High St are all pastiche.

A building of future worth:  It is to be hoped that in an effort to avoid pastiche or contemporary buildings built of glass, Guildford does not end up with bland buildings of no future worth. It would lift the development and be a welcome addition to the town if at least one building on Norh St could be designed which is of great and lasting worth.

Access to Guildford’s retail area

The High St is the most important part of Guildford and should be part of any town centre plan and as such should be reflected in the Brief.  However, the whole emphasis is on access to North St and the retail extension behind it with little attention given to future access to the High St.

It is important that there is good access to any new development area, but this needs to be balanced with continued good access to our very popular High St, if indeed the High St is to remain a focus of retail in Guildford as it is at present.

It is proposed (No.20) that the Leapale Lane car park should move further north of the development. Leapale Lane car park in its present location serves both North St and the High St.  If it were moved further north, it would disadvantage access to the High St, particularly when the popular car park at Bright Hill, close to the High St, is closed for housing, whilst at the same time a large car park is opened for Waitrose which will also serve the new development area.

Comments noted.  No change required.

This together with the bus station moving from the lower end of North St, where buses at present serve both the High St and North St, to the north of the development, where buses would predominantly serve the new retail extension area, would further disadvantage access to the High St. Continued good access to the High St should be a priority in any town centre plan proposals.

Comments noted.  No change required.

Access by residents:  Access by residents living to the north of the new development is mentioned in the Brief.  However, if the main retail area were to move further to the north of the town, those residents living on the hills south and south east of the High St would be disadvantaged by a longer walk to reach the main shops. Many do walk having chosen to live within walking distance of the High Street. A bus service would be needed to bring residents from this area back from the shops, particularly at the end of shopping hours. Alternatively residents, who at present walk into town, will be tempted to use cars to reach the extended retail area north of North St, which will mean more cars driving to car parks in the town centre.

A Mix of Shops

A vibrant retail area with a mixture of shops, for both young and old, can make a more attractive scene, and can be preferable to retail areas which are divided with each area offering only shops to suit one type of shopper.

Comments noted. No change required.

Housing

The area north of North St could be generated with housing to provide much needed housing, which at the same time would support shops in the town centre. The emphasis is on retail but housing supports shops, restaurants and cafes, at the same time making town centres safer places.

Housing in town centres also render towns more lively and vibrant, particularly in the evenings, when retail areas in town centres can become lifeless and forbidding. This is shown in towns in Europe, where people actually live in town centres, some above shops and offices, others in attics with interesting roofs and small roof top gardens, bringing about a café culture and supporting town centre activities.

Comments noted. The North Street site is key in meeting the identified retail needs for the town. The Brief recognises that this could be part of a mixed use scheme and other uses that could be accommodated include housing. No change required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
<th>Recommended change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More detailed comments</td>
<td>7. The BT building should be part of any scheme and dealt with in an urgent manner. It is an unwelcome eyesore in Guildford.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Council has tried to engage with BT regarding the future of their site. The site is not included within the Brief as it is currently unavailable.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North St</td>
<td>12 Bullet point No.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The regeneration of North St is much written about. There are some very ugly buildings built in North St which obviously need replacing, and the whole area (as does the High St) needs maintenance and greenery added.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North St as a shopping street complements and is intertwined with the High St, sharing some of the same shops and is linked by connecting passages. Both streets are enhanced by markets. A further link between the two streets, linking the café at the back of Guildford House in the High St with the library in North St would be beneficial.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Guildford Town Centre Development Study, Cushman and Wakefield 2010</td>
<td>It is written that Guildford will be at a disadvantage to Woking and Kingston, if it does not expand its retail area by a considerable amount. However, if it is competing with other towns with the future in mind, it is essential that the new development is worthy of Guildford and does not damage Guildford’s competitive edge, derived from its topography, scenery and historic High St, appealing to shoppers who appreciate a quality of life shopping experience. Towns, such as Woking, provide a different shopping experience. Kingston has a large population and a very large densely populated catchment area to serve its retail area. If a reason is needed to expand Guildford’s retail area, it is difficult to see Kingston as a reason.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a fear that if Guildford does not move forward it will stagnate, but Guildford has the advantages of being near two airports, with good rail and road links, outstanding scenery, a wealthy catchment area and has not been over-expanded. There is no reason why it should stagnate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 3.2 &amp; Fig 3.2a Town Centre Dynamics</td>
<td>“The Guildford retail circuit is currently focused along the High St, Phoenix Court, White Lion Walk and the Friary Centre.” It is not clear what the words ‘currently focused’ mean. No mention is made of Debenhams or Tungate, where there is a Heal’s department store, clothes shops and a variety of other shops, plus a glass covered square with a café (but perhaps these shops and areas along with Sainsbury are included in the High St shopping circuit mentioned above). It would also be expected that a larger number of the shops in North St would be on the main shopping circuit.</td>
<td>Comments noted. To provide clarification ‘currently focussed’ means where the highest footfall is within the town centre now, shown in Figure 3.2a</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library:</td>
<td>The library is conveniently placed in the very centre of the town, close to the Post Office, banks, shops, cafes and buses, and is within walking distance for many residents. It needs to retain its central position, where it serves as an important community centre.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 3.3 Access and Movement</td>
<td>The bus station: The bus station’s unattractiveness on its present site can be remedied and the station redesigned to fill a smaller space. This is no reason for moving it from its present location and should not be given as a reason for doing so in the Brief. There is no mention of the possible adverse impact on the High St in moving the bus station away from North St, where it serves not only North St, but importantly the High St and the Friary Centre, and would also serve the extended retail development. The bus station is, most of all, convenient for shoppers bringing them right into the heart of all the retail area of Guildford and a large number of people opposed its move. It could be updated into an attractive streamlined bus station with greenery and perhaps a tree added.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined. The Brief recognises that a bus facility may be provided within this site.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 3.4 Street Structure and Links</td>
<td>The similarities between North St and the High St should be mentioned as well as the differences, such as the similar topography and views (now partially blocked in North St). Both streets are parallel to each other, both interconnected by passageways, both are shopping streets, both are within walking distance of residential areas and are served by a bus station. Some parts of North St still have historic buildings. The two streets are the centre of Guildford’s retail.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Brief contains an analysis of under the section ‘Street Structure and Links’.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 3.8 Public Realm and ‘Street Life’</td>
<td>As well as the twice weekly market in North St, the very successful farmer and craft markets in the High St should be mentioned. These add vibrancy to the High St and are particularly enjoyable set amongst historic buildings, in particular the Guildhall with its clock. Live music in the High St has given much entertainment over the years and small bands have played in front of Tungate. The importance of such entertainment and of markets in the High St, which have taken place over centuries, should not be downgraded to boost the new retail development.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The location of the markets falls outside of the site boundary for this Brief.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 4.2 The Approach</td>
<td>Good contemporary design is referred to. Design which is contemporary is usually considered to be of glass construction. Designs which are neither truly contemporary nor pastiche can fall into a no man’s land of overlarge bland characterless buildings. There needs to be reassurance that this will not happen. (A bad development for Guildford would be more damaging than no development – and this is an opportunity to make North St a unique street with buildings of worth.)</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
<td>Recommended change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private individual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail demand study seems not to be well based. Analysis of VOA listings of shops in the town centre shows a considerably greater existing stock of retail than around 30,000 sqm. I believe, in the absence of convincing evidence, that the suggested amount of retail could only be accommodated if:</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Brief sets out that the development could achieve in the order of 50,000 to 60,000 sqm (gross) of commercial floorspace. This includes retail floorspace and other non-residential uses. The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison area. Additional wording has been added to 3.3 regarding the need for a transport assessment.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Debenhams moved from the bottom of the High Street existing site should be redeveloped to open up the river to the town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Waitrose fronts North Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) John Lewis and Debenhams anchor the Friary extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a comprehensive traffic study as this is barely dealt with.</td>
<td>A full Transport Assessment will need to be carried out to support any detailed scheme for redevelopment of the area and to support a planning application.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EGRA East Guildford Residents Association</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whilst I fully support the need to improve this part of the town, I have significant concerns about this proposed North Street Design and Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document for the following reasons:</td>
<td>Comments noted and each one will be taken in turn with an officer response.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I do not think that the extent of the proposed expansion of retail floorspace and its impact on the rest of the town has been sufficiently thought through. I am not convinced that sufficient account has been taken of both</td>
<td>Impact assessments will need to be carried out to support a planning application. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the comparison area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace identified. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The deterioration in the economic situation since the studies into the needed retail capacity were undertaken,</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Brief sets out that the development could achieve in the order of 50,000 to 60,000 sqm (gross) of commercial floorspace. This includes retail floorspace and other non-residential uses. The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison area. Additional wording has been added to 3.3 regarding the need for a transport assessment.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The impact of the internet on shopping habits.</td>
<td>The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the comparison area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace identified. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am also concerned that the plan and consultation precede the publishing of the traffic studies being carried out to inform the 2013 Local Plan. Guildford already has a major traffic problem caused by the volume of traffic using the A3, poor access to the A3 and the need for cross town traffic to use the gyratory. It seems unsuie to plan for a huge increase in retail capacity without addressing these issues.</td>
<td>A full Transport Assessment will need to be carried out to support any detailed scheme for redevelopment of the area and to support a planning application.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am also concerned that by planning to develop this area of the town in isolation to other areas, we may lose opportunities to achieve other objects such as improving access to the river, maintaining public transport links from the north of the town to the south of the town and solutions to the gyratory.</td>
<td>Comment noted. This is not the remit of the Brief. These opportunities are being considered through the Town Centre Interim Framework and the Local Plan Strategy.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If GBC can get this plan right it may be possible to attract John Lewis to Guildford and to plan for a vibrant town centre of the future, safeguard the viability of the current High Street, make North Street worthy of future conservation area status, protect and enhance character that underpins Guildford’s economic success and embark on phase one of a transport vision including a bus interchange.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRARA is very anxious to ensure that this document avoids being a short sighted rewriting of planning guidelines to get John Lewis in and to remove planning conditions from the Friary 2 consent thereby placing outdated reliance on retail growth, adding unacceptable pressure on York Road, putting existing businesses at risk and short changing the community by denying opportunities to address key issues including provision of a bus interchange and tackling other transport issues.

With this in mind, CRARA suggests the assumptions in the introduction need much more rigorous scrutiny and the brief needs to be made more robust to ensure outcomes are delivered.

Yes, we would welcome a John Lewis but we would like to see this pursued in a way that also furthers other objectives.

We need a far more frank assessment of how such a radical increase in retail space would affect trade in other core retail areas in Guildford.

We would also strongly oppose any closing of public pedestrian rights of accesses without the creation of at least equivalent lengths and areas of new public right of way. Retailers should not own the public space in any new development.

We would also strongly oppose new patterns of streets and pedestrian ways, mimicking the grain of streets and "lanes", but they should be public spaces and connectivity should be retained and enhanced. We want neither a massive retail block, that has to be circumvented by vehicles, nor a "shared space" which in reality is an excuse for narrow roads and development on land that should be allocated properly to vehicles and to pavements. If Leapale Road is developed to create a more square development plot, an equivalent road should be created consistent with the new grid pattern. Only a small section of North Street, if any, should be pedestrianised. North Street and a new Leapale Road should continue to offer vehicular connectivity across Guildford rather than transferring an unacceptable and ill thought out traffic burden onto York Road – a residential road with a school.

CRARA is struck by the extent to which many of the documents referred to have not come up through established consultative planning channels. Several are documents residents' associations have had little or no meaningful opportunity to be involved in or comment upon. Many have been adopted by the Local Strategic Partnership on which residents have no voice or representation whereas various interested parties do.

Residents want their part of Guildford to connect with a full, modern central bus interchange. Achieving a fully integrated central bus facility should be an integral part of the development brief. The text states "alternative solutions have been tested, including a bus station in Bedford Road car park, an on-street facility and a much smaller bus facility within the development site boundaries". The text refers to Cushman and Wakefield commercial advice that reducing the land take by the bus facility from the development and the reduction of other infrastructure costs are key to unlocking the site. CRARA attaches importance to the fact that providing bus and park and ride facilities was in return for granting use of public streets for development and believes GBC should ensure delivery of these conditions.

The preparation of the Brief has been informed by detailed studies including up to date commercial advice from the Council's advisors, Cushman and Wakefield.

The North Street Design and Development Brief recognises that the redevelopment of this site may need to deliver the preferred solution for a bus facility but any bus facility must have regard to the design criteria set out in the brief.

This Brief should include an up to date and leading edge analysis of how much retail space is viable in the current economic climate and given the growth of on-line shopping. Even the 2011 Retail and Leisure study by Roger Tym and Partners, based on data collected in 2010, relies on policies in the SE Plan that are out of date and is insufficiently forward looking. Careful assessment needs to be made of the likely impact of such a dramatic increase in retail space on the viability of existing retail areas including the setted and upper High Street, Tungsgate, Debenhams and the existing, as yet undeveloped, consent for a Friary extension. Figure 3.2b is of concern. It suggests "the development site represents an opportunity to extend Guildford's shopping core northwards, improve the interface with surrounding areas and revitalise North Street". CRARA is concerned by the absence of analysis of the impact on the areas of lower footfall, shown in paler orange, in the upper High Street and indeed in upper North Street.

Impact assessments will need to be carried out to support a planning application. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace identified. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.

We attach very great importance to a central bus interchange and would not be prepared to see the crucial planning condition of providing a new facility that connects all parts of Guildford, including the CRARA area, sacrificed in a dash to increase the retail floorspace. Comments noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined. The Brief recognises that a bus facility may be provided within this site.

The preparation of the Brief has been informed by detailed studies including up to date commercial advice from the Council's advisors, Cushman and Wakefield.

The North Street Design and Development Brief recognises that the redevelopment of this site may need to deliver the preferred solution for a bus facility but any bus facility must have regard to the design criteria set out in the brief.

These are technical studies have been produced by independent specialist consultants and the conclusions of which are considered to be founded on robust analysis and provide credible evidence. They are factual documents.

The Planning Context refers to a wide range of studies with particular relevance to the redevelopment of the North Street. The absence of an adequate traffic, transport and parking strategy is notable. CRARA is struck by the extent to which many of the documents referred to have not come up through established consultative planning channels. Several are documents residents' associations have had little or no meaningful opportunity to be involved in or comment upon. Many have been adopted by the Local Strategic Partnership on which residents have no voice or representation whereas various interested parties do.

No change required.

No change required.

No change required.

No change required.

Additional wording has been added to 3.3 regarding the need for a transport assessment.

No change required.

No change required.

No change required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Officer response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRARA Cranley Road Area Residents Association</td>
<td>If the retail space required by the High Street of the future contracts, perhaps more of the land in the development brief would be better used for much needed housing and by high tech and creative media businesses of the future with strong links to the research park and Slyfield. Even in a time of retail growth, it had been anticipated the more modest Friary 2 would draw trade from the High Street. Perhaps an anchor store, such as John Lewis, would be better accommodated within a reconfiguration of the existing retail allocation. We would welcome John Lewis and Waitrose being located within the heart of Guildford but we are not confident that the sites proposed and traffic plans are a wise solution in the best interests of Guildford or the developer. Impacts on character, traffic and existing businesses need to be rigorously assessed.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Brief sets out that the development could achieve in the order of 50,000 to 60,000 sqm (gross) of commercial floorspace. This includes retail floorspace and other non-residential uses. The Brief does not prescribe the mix of uses and quantum of development. This will form part of a detailed scheme for the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The 2009 Economic Development Study prepared for GBC and the University of Surrey by the Centre of Economics at the University of Portsmouth noted the high levels of congestion arising from the concentration of employment in the town centre as a weakness. It also noted that employment in retailing reduced between 2002 and 2007. Caution needs to be exercised in reliance on retailing, over expansion avoided and diversification encouraged.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The 2010 Town Centre Development Study by Cushman and Wakefield notes physical and viability constraints on retail development within the town centre which have not been addressed adequately in this development brief. The Study identified that developer activity across all sectors has slowed in the previous 18 months. It states “this is largely due to the current economic climate which has seen many large scale developments become unviable which creates funding problems”. It also notes “the Friary extension had stalled prior to the credit crunch”. CRARA is concerned that this development brief will be exploited by developers to seek to develop without necessary investment in infrastructure, including a full bus interchange.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indeed, we are told the 2012 North Street site development commercial advice by Cushman &amp; Wakefield includes reducing the land take by the bus facility and the reduction of other infrastructure costs as being key to unlocking the site, offering an anchor store North Street frontage and demand for 1,000 parking spaces. It is notable that the case for major retail development is rather weak and that short term needs for retail floorspace are described as “somewhat modest”.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents ask for transparency as to which retail clients GBC’s commercial advisors for the North Street site development - Cushman &amp; Wakefield – serve. Such openness is vital for the confidence of the community.</td>
<td>Planning Services do not have these details.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The case for a town centre supermarket does not seem particularly strong or up to date given recent consents, acquisitions and prospects. We have the prospect of two supermarkets at Slyfield, an Aldi in Burpham, a new supermarket by the station, a Waitrose on the Bellerby Theatre site and a new Friary supermarket. This would be in addition to already having had a new Tesco, M&amp;S and Londis and a Sainsbury expansion since the ambiguous Cushman and Wakefield supermarket assessment.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Traffic</td>
<td>The North Street brief describes development as creating opportunities to rationalise vehicular movement across the site. CRARA has strong concerns regarding these elements of the draft brief.</td>
<td>Concern noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At its AGM and in its response to the Town Centre consultation, CRARA residents expressed great concern at proposals to relinquish Friary 2 of a planning obligation to provide a new bus station. Residents want to be able to get buses from the main railway station to the Epsom Road. They want a bus interchange that connects the CRARA side of Guildford to the town centre. This planning document prejudices this outcome and blocks off roads. It assumes a relocated bus station serving only part of Guildford. This approach does not have community support.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined. No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The draft brief states “development needs to be delivered hand-in-hand with an alternative bus facility and that the redevelopment will need to deliver the preferred solution and demonstrate it meets the design criteria set out in this Brief”. There is no clarity as to what this means. This brief, produced in advance of a decision on the bus station report, opens the way for developers to submit that providing a facility would not be viable.</td>
<td>The Brief recognises that a bus facility may be provided within this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The brief states “redevelopment proposals will also need to demonstrate how existing functions of the area that would be affected by site clearance, such car parking or bus facilities, can be appropriately re-provided on or off site”. This again is far too vague. This brief should require provision of a bus facility and car parking on site. Page 40 needs to refer to provision of a bus interchange as well as to the design of bus facilities. This is vital. The report claims to be neutral on provision of a new bus station but the design principles and layout are not compatible with a full bus interchange, effectively prejudicing this option.</td>
<td>The location of a future bus facility is yet to be determined. No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact assessments will need to be carried out to support a planning application. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace identified. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do not support the extent of pedestrianisation of North Street proposed. We strongly oppose the proposal on page 30 that there would no longer be a vehicular connection through the site. Given the pedestrianised High Street and pressure on surrounding roads, we submit it is vital to retain a vehicular route parallel with York Road and the High Street. Otherwise the traffic burden on York Road will be unacceptable.</td>
<td>The Brief recognises that detailed capacity and feasibility studies should be undertaken to determine the size of the development. The mix of uses and amount of retail floorspace will be determined through a developer’s detailed scheme and the submission of a planning application.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Layout</td>
<td>CRARA welcomes the recognition that existing taller buildings have not always been accommodated successfully. We welcome the proposal that development of three to four storeys would be appropriate and ask that only very few buildings are higher so that contours are respected and Guildford’s distinctive topography can be followed. We ask for a review of the proposed retail space to ensure it is consistent with the proposed buildings heights. Any inconsistencies need to be addressed at the strategic stage to avoid the problems that arose in the Defra site where the number of units granted at outline stage could not be satisfactorily accommodated on the site once detailed designs were prepared.</td>
<td>The Brief recognises that detailed capacity and feasibility studies should be undertaken to determine the size of the development. The mix of uses and amount of retail floorspace will be determined through a developer’s detailed scheme and the submission of a planning application. The Brief does not determine the amount of development but recognises that the site is capable of achieving 50 to 60,000sqm (gross) of commercial floorspace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages 26 and 27 should acknowledge how ugly the buildings at the top of North Street (Ryman to Miners) are and aspires to radically enhance these if redevelopment opportunities arise - including setting back the building line at first floor level and creating an attractive open pavement. A reason for low footfall in this area is that it is such a depressing place to walk. We are concerned this brief does not appear to be focused on North Street but is more concerned with extending the scope of the Friary extension.</td>
<td>Comments noted. These buildings lie outside the remit of this Brief.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We welcome the recognition that a key feature of the existing urban form is the relatively narrow width of individual building frontages. We strongly agree “it is important that the fine-grained response to topography is retained”. We ask that more guidance is provided on this to avoid repetition of the very poor design along the side of Boot where an unsuccessful attempt had to be made to retrofit a broken up frontage mimicking smaller units. We must learn from mistakes.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRARA agrees the design of the new east-west street should reflect its significance as the spine of the redevelopment. We ask that North Street should, for the most part, be 18m wide affording views as achieved in the High street and provide ample space for generous pavements. CRARA strongly opposes the suggestion 12m would be adequate for a major character street and pavements.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We agree the gates could be narrower but suggest great care needs to be taken to ensure they are wide enough to allow light to penetrate and to allow space for seating outside cafes. The current lanes are constrained in this respect and dark places to sit outside even on sunny days - even though building heights are much lower.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Brief states the development will be expected to contribute financially to North Street enhancement schemes. We warmly welcome the fact it states contributions will also be sought to improve street crossings on Onslow Street to help achieve improved pedestrian linkages to town-centre areas immediately west of the site and to the railway station. However this does not go far enough. Developers should be required to make contributions to the bus station, a new crossing over the railway and an A3 strategy as well as towards connectivity to the railway station.</td>
<td>The Brief is broad in its suggested uses, and suitable planning obligations will be discussed at pre-application stage when more details of a potential scheme are available.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We ask GBC to reconsider:</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· the denial of any prospect of a central bus interchange with access from our side of Guildford.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· the extent of road closures (including closing Leapale Road or a replacement).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· the poor access to the railway station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· the loss of public rights of pedestrian access to yet more streets in Guildford.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· pulling traffic onto York Road (yet again)!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· lack of a car park strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· inadequate steer on developer contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· lost opportunity regarding character of North Street (we want it to be worthy of future listing).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· proposed name change of North Street which needs to be as wide as the High Street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We hope you will be able to accommodate our concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Officer response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individual</td>
<td>Current traffic problems in and around Guildford should be sorted first as that may affect what is best suited for can be pedestrianised or not.</td>
<td>A full Transport Assessment will need to be carried out to support any detailed scheme for redevelopment of the area and to support a planning application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep the central town's OLD character. Keep fascia while some stores should be more modern internally. But not all. Quaint and historical is good and what at least some locals and visitors want.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good mix of stores. What does well in it's national sales?</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not much night and drinks. Need some but MUST be controllable so we do not have a reputation for drunks, drugs and antisocial behaviour.</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sorry it's late. August has evaporated</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Police</td>
<td>Page 14 of the brief also identifies the need to greatly increase the retail floor space by up to 36,200 sqm and 4500 sqm for A3-A5 food and drink uses. The need for an anchor tenant taking 20,500 sqm possibly over four floors is also identified.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Page 14 of the Brief refers to studies that have been undertaken with regard to the future of Guildford Town Centre. The study identifies a need for this amount of floorspace but out of these uses the Brief only refers to retail and A3 uses under section 3.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is clear that if North Street is redeveloped in line with the aspirations in the design brief it will radically alter this area of Guildford and significantly add to its attractiveness for visitors using the day time economy, shops and restaurants and the night time economy, restaurants pubs and clubs etc. Whilst this is clearly welcome and beneficial also has the potential to increase the risks to the town centre from crime and disorder and of particular concern to me the risk of terrorism.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The brief proposes the land uses set out under section 3.8. This does not include pubs and clubs or uses for the night time economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From the perspective of crime and disorder, Guildford town centre has strong and resilient daytime and night time economies. Both attract large numbers of people and the increase in amenity space, leisure, shopping, pedestrian and traffic routes will put extra pressure on the resources of local police and other services. This is happening at a time when funding and resources are likely to be reduced in the forthcoming years.</td>
<td>Comment noted and concern acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle and pedestrian routes should be designed and managed following the principles of secured by design to create busy, well lit spaces, with good natural and formal surveillance. Guildford town centre already has comprehensive coverage by CCTV cameras which play a significant role in deterring and detecting crimes in Guildford Town Centre. It would be highly desirable for developers of the North Street site, by means of a Section 106 agreement, to be required to provide funding to extend and improve CCTV into the new development. In addition the Section 106 agreement will ask for funding for the pools two new Police and Community Support Officers dedicated to patrol duties in Guildford Town Centre for ten years.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The general design principles set out in the Brief support this approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is also desirable that a review of night time public convenience facilities takes place and temporary (e.g. night time urinals in North Street) or permanent provision made for the increased numbers of people on the streets in the early hours.</td>
<td>Suitable planning obligations will be discussed at pre-application stage when more details of a potential scheme are available. The Council will ensure that Surrey Police are consulted during the preparation of a scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is not known at this time whether licensed premises for entertainment and the sale of alcohol will be included in the proposed North Street Development. If they are, then the licensing officer for Guildford Borough, must be consulted to ensure that hours of opening and the nature of entertainment licenses are proportionate and supportive of the aim to reduce alcohol related crime and injuries.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The brief proposes the land uses set out under section 3.8. This does not include pubs and clubs or uses for the night time economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would encourage Guildford Borough Council to include in the North Street Design and Development Brief a requirement for any potential developer/s to be required to consult with Surrey Police at the earliest stage of their design process and certainly before any planning application is made for this site.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The Council will ensure that Surrey Police are consulted at the earliest opportunity in the preparation of a scheme, pre-application discussion and at the planning application stage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>