

Organisation	Comments	Response
Parish Administrator Christ Church Guildford	I think the picture on page 11 is not Swan Lane, I think it is Angel Gate	Agreed, it is Angel Gate. Photo caption to be amended
Guildford resident	I think the picture on page 11 is not Swan Lane	Agreed, it is Angel Gate. Photo caption to be amended
Guildford resident	Has no one in planning ever considered why such a low volume of people arrive at the station by bus - because they don't actually go there! The whole central plan fails to acknowledge this one simple fact which would reduce cars in the station area by an outstanding amount - this should be in the policy and its truly amazing that no one has actually considered this fact! from page 107 "Public Transport" - A low percentage of railway station users (less than 10 per cent arrive at the station by bus).	Agree. A few buses do stop near to Guildford Railway station, although not many. This could be considered by Transport for Surrey and / or Transport for Guildford.
	Separating East for other bus routes will prevent an interchange facility and deny people access to 75% of Guildford buses - exacerbating cross Guildford travel by Car not reduce it - Page 114 One of the potential options for a bus facility is Bedford Road surface car park. A compact bus station could be provided here to accommodate bus services from the south, west and north (approximately 87 per cent). Routing options for buses to access and exit the Bedford Road surface car park site are being investigated, and junction modelling is being undertaken by the Council's consultants. Bus routes from the east could be served by on-street street bus stands located on Leapale Road, Leapale Lane and the southern end of Haydon Place.	The Council's consultants continue to work on the relocation of the bus facility, in consultation with bus user and operators groups. The Council will consult with the public in the next six months. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Guildford resident	Page 19 [Section 4] - I rather feel that "residents" and other relevant stakeholders should have been more visibly consulted as well as the commercial interests listed.	Residents were consulted at both stages of the preparation of this framework (previously the draft masterplan). All residential addresses in the borough (over 60,000) were notified of the consultation on the draft masterplan with an article in November 2011's About Guildford. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	Page 19 [TC9] - Transport issues come well down the listing, despite their being perceived as very much the top priority by most people. [see the next item – para 5.1.1].	The objectives are not in any specific priority order, unlike the community priorities identified at section 5.1 which are prioritised. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	Page 25 - 5.1.1 objective to reduce traffic congestion – the first priority [see item above]. Para 4 adds adequate parking or other access. I agree this priority is generally held, and the reason is self-obvious.	This is a list of reported community priorities for the improvement of the town centre, which are listed in priority order as conveyed to the Council. These are not objectives. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	Page 27 - "Strength" No 5 - Has not GSA moved out of the centre to the University site?	Yes, it is now located at the University, nearby to the town centre as stated on page 27 and page 35, third paragraph. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	While the Magistrates Court is dreary, the exterior of the Crown Courts is arguably pleasant enough, appropriate for its purpose and its site.	Opinion noted. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	Is the Main Railway Station of 'poor design'? It seems pretty innocuous to me, though no-doubt more could be made of the site.	It is not benefitting of a modern main railway station building for a county town. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	London Road Station building is something of an historic gem - part of an important series.	Agree with comment about the building. The interim framework does not include any proposals to remove or remodel the station building. The opportunity to improve London Road station (page 28) relates to its large area of surface car parking and potential to improve this (at page 74 of the interim framework). No change to the interim framework suggested. .
	Page 42 et seq [Section 6] - It is arguable that the present document, in its finished form, is seriously premature.	This is an interim framework and is presented as such. A timetable for the preparation of the final document is included as Appendix 4. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	The text makes it clear that the Transport studies [highlighted as the top issue] are ongoing and not expected until later in the year. Additionally, while this study is based on earlier economic studies, these have, from the dates they were carried out, largely been overtaken by the national economic problems and well publicised changes in the patterns of shopping. Note that the earlier developers of the Friary extension have pulled out and that the main sponsors of town centre management have pulled out. This would seem to be seriously indicative that this material needs revisiting.	Appendix 4 sets out the timeframe for completion of outstanding evidence studies. Appendix 1 lists the evidence used to prepare the document. Guildford Retail and Leisure Study 2011 was prepared in late 2010 / early 2011, well into the recession, and has taken account of these factors. Westfield who previously owned the majority of the North Street site recently sold its interest to Hermes. Town Centre management nationally is changing as large national companies centralise. Business Improvement Districts (BIDS) are becoming more commonplace, whilst the previous model of large town centre retailers funding its management is declining. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	Page 51 - Noted that a redevelopment of Tunsgate is proposed. This seems unlikely in present economic circumstances.	The long leasehold owners are currently considering the long term investment potential of the site, with refurbishment or redevelopment of the shopping centre, as outlined in their agent's response to the winter 2011/12 consultation (CBRE on behalf of Merseyside Pension Fund). No change to the interim framework suggested.
	Page 61 - It is difficult to reconcile the wish to reconnect town with river with the proposal to turn Millbrook into a multi-storey car park [page 63].	We need to ensure that we strike the right balance between having enough short stay car parking spaces available for visitors to the town centre with very limited sites available. Agree, as stated page 54 of the interim framework, that use of riverside sites for surface car parking detracts from the riverside. The decking of Millbrook with a green roof would add to the number of parking spaces on the site, and would improve the appearance when viewed from above. This is not yet confirmed but is an option for which funding has been agreed (see page 122) of the interim framework. No change to the interim framework suggested.

Page 62 - A considerable number of shoppers and visitors welcome short stay open car parks, as they find it difficult to negotiate multi storey parks and - in the evening- regard them as dangerous. The actual parking gain from making small parks multi-storey can be disappointing, as disproportionate space is take up by ramps. This proposal should be taken cautiously.	Good multi-storey car parks make efficient use of land, and are safe and conveniently located. Economic feasibility if one of the considerations. The Borough Parking Strategy is currently being reviewed underway and is considering these types of issues. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Page 68 - The Portsmouth Road car park is subject to significant flooding. The ground floor would seem wholly unsuitable for a library. It would be more sensible, given the flooding problem, to leave the ground as car park [and river promenade], and build up one storey above.	A library is classified as a "less vulnerable use" along with cafes and restaurants, and are suitable for this location in accordance with technical flooding guidance. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Page 70 - If Debenhams proposes to pull out, then it is difficult to see where the retail demand is going to come from to populate a substantial new development at Leapale Road - equally or more off-centre. There is no particular reason why the hoped-for John Lewis should be more attractive than Debenhams [most regional J-L shops are somewhat dull].	Opinion noted. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Page 71 - It is not clear why GBC is so keen on moving from Millmead House. The cost of such a move will be substantial, and difficult to fund in present circumstances, unless a cheap out-of-town site is used. That is unlikely to benefit the 'stakeholders'.	To explore the potential to develop a public service hub in a more modern building. If the Millmead site is developed for housing, it may be possible to find another central town centre office building so that it remains accessible to its customers. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Page 74 - Car parking at the railway station and nearby serves a vital function for the South East region as a whole [eg commuting to London, Gatwick, Reading] - though it might be of lesser interest to Guildford town centre as such.	Agreed that car parking for commuters and other train users is needed. Where needed, the car parking should be retained. For example, the draft proposals shown by Solum included replacement of the surface commuter parking with a multi-storey car park. No change to the interim framework suggested.
There have been promises for decades to improve the pedestrian route from the station to the town, but even the half-baked proposals [eg widening the pavement in Bridge Street] that have come forward have failed to be implemented. This is a very serious issue hanging over the future commercial success of the town, as the railway provides major access to town centre work and shopping. As many people commute in as out.	Agreed, this important route is one of the town centre priorities. Its improvement requires joint working between Guildford Borough Council, Surrey County Council and potentially Solum Regeneration. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Page 77 - Noted that any station redevelopment needs to respect long distance views. This issue has been missed in current Approvals for 1 and 2 Station View.	As described, the interim framework recognises the importance of key views, and could be referred to in support of a planning application. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Page 102 - Park and Ride is not going to help with through traffic. Most of town centre traffic is through - regional and trans-town.	The two sentences relating to Park and Ride and to through traffic respectively do not relate to each other. The paragraph will be divided into two to reflect this.
Page 105 - Any widening of the pavement to the north side of Bridge Street will have substantial implications for the vehicular traffic - for example the presently near impossible exit from the Railway Station.	This issue has been considered by Surrey County Council and was found not to be a limiting factor. Further work to consider future improvements of the gyratory is being undertaken by Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council. This will inform a final framework, to include a Movement Strategy. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Page 107 - The sharing of street surfaces is currently fashionable. However the removal of kerbs makes a significant difference to the visual street scene. Note, for example, the disastrous impact of wall-to-wall York Stone paving in historic Horsham. Note also the careful detailing here of Town Bridge, where the old kerb line is retained in the pattern of the paving.	Opinion noted. It has been recognised as a great success at Exhibition Road, Kensington. Shared surfaces may retain a kerb line at the same level as the road, but in different surfacing, to distinguish it. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Page 108 - The proposal to move a shrunk bus station to Bedford Road raises all sorts of problems - discussed elsewhere by others.	As noted in the interim framework, this site is one of the options currently being considered. No change to the interim framework suggested.
As for Guildford Railway Station, planners should safeguard space for an additional platform for an eventual Heathrow link.	Network Rail has confirmed that this is no longer needed for the former Airtrack proposal. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Page 114 - I personally greatly welcome indoor markets. But I do note that many have been closed in towns up and down the country, and suggest that further enquiry be made. Meanwhile such a market could provide a convenient demountable stop-gap for the decade or so before anyone is in a financial position to carry forward substantial building on the Leapale Road site.	There are many examples of successful indoor markets in the country. The landowner, Hermes may wish to consider this, as might owners of other vacant buildings. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Page 119 - It might have been thought that the transport modelling should have preceded or paralleled an 'Interim' as elegant as this production, instead of being delayed until late 2012.	Agreed that evidence could have been prepared in a different order. The Council is working with Surrey County Council and other partners on this evidence as outlined at pages 101-105. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Page 128 - While a realignment of the Debenhams Crossing to line up with High Street appears welcome, it does carry with it transport implications. The original Guildford Society study that showed that such a crossing was feasible without hanging the sub-regional traffic was based on assumptions about the present site. The traffic engineers have more recently altered the sequencing of the crossing lights and this has already had detrimental effects – at times blocking the gyratory.	Traffic management, including phasing of traffic lights is an important factor in ensuring free-flow of traffic. Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council are looking into their phasing. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Page 132 - The Guildford Economic Strategy needs a 'heavy touch' review in the light of national economic circumstances and the national shift in shopping patterns. Most industry observers seem to suggest that 'all bets are off'. Certainly, data based on 2006 and 2011 have been wholly overtaken by events. The trade and professional papers [eg 'Building' magazine] are full of discussions of the implications [for example – the radical re-thinking carried out by the John Lewis Board].	The Retail needs assessment prepared in 2010/11 was prepared by consultants who are experts in the field of retail planning, using data from 2010/11. We do not consider it to have "been wholly overtaken by events" in the last year. No change to the interim framework suggested.
This direction of thrust is even more odd seen against the Framework admission that the approved Friary scheme lacks economic viability and will not go ahead.	The approved scheme was shown not to be economically unviable even in boom times, as it was granted permission long before the start of the current recession. No change to the interim framework suggested.

	What dramatic change would make a new North Street/Friary/Leapale scheme viable, even if we can believe the now outdated growth figures?	The infrastructure costs, including the reprovision of a bus station, affordable housing, and the mix of development approved all impacted on the scheme's viability. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	In the present circumstances, early exploration should be made of the possibility of moving the Waitrose proposals from the Bellerby site to a North Street Site frontage. That would improve the Waitrose visibility as well as providing an 'anchor' for new development. The present Bellerby site effectively wastes almost the only substantial present offering with finance.	The North Street site will take many years for a scheme to be worked up and for it to be delivered. If no town centre sites are available, we may not be able to prevent proposals for new supermarkets further away from the town centre from being approved. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	Here, it is noted that the 'community' is unsupportive of substantial expansion in the retail offering - - [page 166], but is going to get it anyway!	Some things are not initially popular but are necessary for some other purpose, for example here to strengthen the viability of the town centre against competition from out of centre and other competing locations which are themselves seeing increases in retail floorspace. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	Page 136 - The economic background to the North Street/ Leapale Road brief is now overtaken by events [see note on Page 132] above	We do not agree with this, and no evidence for this has been presented. See our response above. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	A public forum of the Guildford Vision Group on evening of 28 August, discussed the Interim Framework. the 'Interim' was there praised as being a very great improvement on the 'Master Plan' consulted on half a year or so ago. I rather think that you will be receiving considerable comment arising out of the forum, but to have such praise from an inherently critical audience must be encouraging for the team that worked on this.	Opinion noted and welcomed. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Planning Secretary, Holy Trinity Amenity Group	It is misleading to say that the "High Street benefits from being a pedestrian-only street for most of the shopping hours". On weekdays it is only actually closed from 11am to 4pm, and is rarely clear vehicles until 11.30am as there is no exit control. So a fair statement is that it is closed for half the shopping hours - a much shorter closure than that in any other towns that I know. Any chance of amending this? HTAG have raised the issue of inadequate length of pedestrian hours many times; comparison with other towns shows how meagre our pedestrianisation is.	Agreed - This section of the street is currently pedestrianised for just over half of weekday shop opening hours. Page 53, fifth paragraph – replace "most" with "just over half"
The Guildford Society	Preliminary comments from the Guildford Society on the Interim Town Centre Framework August 2012. The Society notes that the draft of the Interim Town Centre Framework has not been put out for public comment, and we are sending this individually to Councillors in consequence.	Noted, this is the draft to be presented for adoption. This has been prepared taking into account the many responses received at the consultation / engagement stages earlier in the process of its preparation. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	The Interim Town Centre Framework (ICTF) contains many good things and has taken note of many of the comments made during previous consultations. However it represents 'work in progress' and much remains to be done, especially to ensure that aspirations are followed by 'delivery'.	Opinion noted and welcomed. Agree that it is not the final framework for the town centre, and is therefore "work in progress". The final framework will be informed by transport and other evidence which is still being/to be worked on.
	It admirably advocates cafe culture but delivers no new places for cafes (except Tunsgate). How about a map with existing and possible new cafes and markets etc.?	Support for this noted and welcomed. Suitable locations for new cafes are set out in the Strategy section, either on the site forms, for example, page 67, 68, 69, and 70, or in the text, for example, page 64, 92. Also see map on page 110.
	Apart from the riverside, it delivers no new open public spaces across the 18 development sites. As it stands, it is a charter for over-development. Even surface car parks have some value as open spaces. How about showing some possible new open space on Fig 20?	Several of the development sites are suitable for inclusion of open space in any redevelopment. Publically-owned sites which may include open space in their redevelopment include Guildford Park Road car park site, located in an area particularly lacking in green open space. Where development sites are privately owned, such space, although open to the public, is likely to remain in private ownership. Such sites include Guildford Railway Station and the North Street regeneration site.
	It repeatedly promises a better pedestrian route from the station to the town and even a better bridge across the river to Bedford Square, but then does not deliver a route across Onslow Street and the Friary Centre, so all is in vain. This is a major failing which must be addressed. The Friary Centre needs to be involved.	Agree that this is route is very important, and a more pleasant alternative needs to be secured. This may involve the downgrading of Onslow Street and /or new footways. The Friary Centre is most unlikely to be the location for a suitable 24 hour access due to costs associated with the issue of security.
	It acknowledges the need for radical improvements in road infrastructure, but delivers no studies of what these might be (a very major present failing).	Agreed. The interim framework explicitly states that it will have interim status because of the lack of transport evidence and solutions. These will be presented in a draft final framework, which will be subject to consultation. see timetable at Appendix 4.
	In the same vein, it sets out the plan for the SCC traffic modelling, but delivers no proposals for what new infrastructure should be modelled.	Agreed. The interim framework explicitly states that it will have interim status because of the lack of transport evidence and solutions. These will be presented in a draft final framework, which will be subject to consultation. see timetable at Appendix 4.
	It does nothing to preserve options for new road infrastructure, and indeed destroys them by giving carte blanche to developers at key sites, especially the railway station. This needs to be addressed with urgency.	Without yet knowing what land needs to be reserved for future infrastructure projects, it is not possible for The Council or Surrey County Council to require landowners to reserve land if their site is to be redeveloped.
	It acknowledges the public's intense opposition to removal of the bus station but delivers no solution: it implies that it will go. It wrings its hands about the potential damage to the best alternative to the car.	It acknowledges that the existing bus facility is not maximising bus usage. We are not yet in a position to determine where the new bus facility / facilities will be, although options have now been narrowed to a few possibilities (see page 108 of the interim framework).
	It promises a new Park & Ride site at Manor Farm, but no new site to the North, an acknowledged need.	This will be considered in preparation of transport evidence and drawing up of a transport strategy. No change to the interim framework suggested.

	It proposes massive increase in retail but seems to predict the demise of the town's largest store (Debenhams). This is paradoxical.	It is not predicting the store's demise, rather acknowledging that it under occupies this site, which is physically separated from the main retail core by a busy road, and suggesting that should the store be able to move, the site could be put to a more suitable and attractive use for this key riverside location. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	It does deliver improvements for pedestrians and cyclists and supports the narrowing of Bridge Street. However it does this without solving the known implications for increased traffic congestion elsewhere. The thinking is not joined up and lacks the wider transport vision that is needed.	The widening of the Bridge Street footway as considered by Surrey County Council almost a decade ago. Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council is now considering these issues in a more holistic way. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	It proposes development over several surface car parks in the town centre, but overlooks the proposed new one for Waitrose: if it existed, would it not also be in the list of development sites?	The current surface car park at the Bellerby Theatre site is the subject of a current planning application which includes a supermarket and a car park for the supermarket. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	It proposes replacement car parking by decking Millbrook and Mary Road without thought for the need for improved pedestrian routes from them: Millbrook is quite far from the shops (except Debenhams). Decking Millbrook contrasts strangely with the desire to open up the river frontages.	Potentially both, but could be Mary Road only (see page 122). Agree, as stated page 54 of the interim framework, that use of riverside sites for surface car parking detracts from the riverside. The decking of Millbrook with a green roof would add to the number of parking spaces on the site, and would improve the appearance when viewed from above.
	It says underground parking may be viable but delivers no studies of where and how much there could be. It even ignores previous plans for replacement underground parking on the Bright Hill site, an easy one. Work should be put in hand.	Feasibility work has recently been undertaken for the Bright Hill site. The Council has yet to make a decision on this site, which is also currently being considered in the review of the Parking Strategy to determine number and location of short stay car parks needed. No change to the interim framework suggested.
	It is oddly negative about Tunsgate Square, and mentions re-development. It has some good features, including public art.	Tunsgate Square has many positive features as well as a somewhat dated facade to Tunsgate and a blank brick wall facing Castle Street and the Castle Grounds.
	It proposed over-development of the Portsmouth Road site by the river. If it accommodates a large library, offices for the CAB etc etc, there will be little room for riverside open space.	Riverside green open space is not negotiable, it is vital for improvement of the riverside and to accommodate flood waters. The Council has undertaken initial feasibility drawings for this site.
	We look forward to the final town centre framework, but consider that this interim document, being 'work in progress', is not yet in a satisfactory state to be used as a material consideration with regard to planning applications.	Opinion noted. The Local Plan is based on data over a decade old and for the town centre, will benefit from having a more up to date framework to consider in determining applications.
Chairman, The Guildford Society	I last wrote on the Guildford Society's behalf in February to enlist your enthusiasm to achieve a long-term Masterplan for Guildford, one that really gets to grips with its endemic problems. We suggested how "master planners" with wide experience might help, and highlighted the opportunities in the move to real community engagement with the community will bring under "localism"- "from consultation to collaboration". We are in no way questioning the abilities or expertise of your Officers in the demanding roles they have to fill - our constitution requires us "to collaborate with other groups" (our elected Council and its officers inter alia) "to protect and enhance (Guildford's) beauty and amenity, to stimulate public interest therein". And "to work for the general benefit of the Borough".	The views at the consultation stage in winter 2011/12 were noted, and as a result, specialist urban planning / architecture have been working with us to produce the interim framework. In summer 2005 and in summer 2011, we held events to which we invited the public and interested organisations, discussed town centre issues with them and listened to their views. These engagement opportunities were before the documents were drafted, and were separate to the subsequent consultation on the draft documents (draft Town Centre Area Action Plan and Masterplan respectively).
	You will be aware, the Society set up a now independent working party, the Guildford Vision Group, to try to arrange appropriate engagement and collaboration. I understand that GVG has found this difficult. Meanwhile the Society continues to apply the expertise of its specialists to studying and responding to Council proposals, we trust in doing so backing the professional expertise of your officers in resisting perhaps short-term or political pressures.	Engagement with the council in preparation of its planning documents is as set out in the Council's adopted guide to Community Involvement in Planning. Its community and stakeholder engagement methods are similar to those of many planning authorities. The Guildford Society has been putting forward its views on a plan for the town centre since the first early engagement stage on the TCAAP in 2005. The Council has listened to the concerns and issues raised, and it must be acknowledged that the Council may consider that some of the suggestions made would not necessarily be suitable and that it must balance these views against the many other comments and opinions it receives. The Council welcomes working constructively with the GVG and other interested parties to produce the best possible plan for the town centre. No change to the interim framework suggested.
Local resident	I am very concerned that it has been recommended in the Town Centre Interim Framework that Holy Trinity Churchyard should be enhanced. No details are given as to why or how it should be enhanced. (Last paragraph p.55 under heading 'Protect and enhance the historic environment'.)	The reason for the suggestion was to improve the quality of open spaces for residents, visitors and workers (as set out in that paragraph). Recommend deletion of the references to the Holy Trinity and St Marys churchyards from this paragraph
	The following has been written about the churchyard: "This ancient churchyard is an oasis of peace and tranquillity in a conservation area immediately off Guildford High Street. The informal lay-out of memorials, grass and tall trees are an essential part of the timeless character of the churchyard which has mellowed over the centuries. It is a much-loved setting for Holy Trinity Church, for the medieval Weston Chapel and for the ten other listed buildings, some of which date back to the 15th century. Up to a thousand people walk through the churchyard along the west path on a busy day."	Interesting. Not sure of the source. See above
	When development of the churchyard was refused, the nature of the churchyard was understood and one of the reasons for refusal was as follows: "The treatment of the proposed public open space laid out with formal gardens and benches would result in a far more active and usable area of manicured open space when compared to the existing open space and the tranquil and peaceful nature of the graveyard. Such active use would result in a loss of amenity to residents located within Holy Trinity churchyard and as such the proposed treatment of this land is considered contrary to policies 13BE of the GBLP (93) and policy 99G1(3) of the GBLP (99)."	In drafting the interim framework, I was not aware of this refused permission for the above churchyard. See above
	It is its "peaceful and timeless character" which is enjoyed by those who walk through the churchyard. Guildford guides also show visitors this historic area when visiting Holy Trinity Church. Peaceful as well as active open spaces are needed in the town. I do hope that the character of this much-loved churchyard can be preserved.	Agree. See above

Guildford Vision Group	<p>Guildford Vision Group (GVG) urges the Council to withdraw the Interim Town Centre Framework (ITCF) pending key studies</p>	<p>Guildford town centre is a great place to live, work, shop, visit, and to run a business and is a major shopping, service and business centre, but it is not currently achieving its full potential. There are issues to be resolved.</p> <p>The town centre by its nature is dynamic and cannot stand still; companies continue to make investment decisions and we need to ensure that we are an attractive investment location. If we do nothing we will be disadvantaged relative to our competitors, many of whom already have area actions plans in place to manage the future of their town centres.</p> <p>It's therefore important to produce a framework for the town centre, drawing on available evidence and the views of interested organisations and individuals.</p> <p>The interim town centre framework will help to shape how our town centre will look, function, perform and prosper over the next 18 years, to 2030. The interim framework is recommended for adoption as a useful tool in ensuring a holistic and coordinated approach is taken in future to redevelopment of key sites and of other enhancements to public and private land. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework.</p>
	<p>Guildford needs a comprehensive traffic & transport Plan before the ITCF and any major developments are approved</p>	<p>Surrey County Council is responsible for developing a transport plan which is known as LTP3. We agree that there is a need for a movement strategy for the town and wider area which we are working with Surrey County Council and the Highways Agency to develop.</p> <p>However, we feel that it is important to have a plan. Guildford town centre is a great place to live, work, shop, visit, and to run a business and is a major shopping, service and business centre, but it is not currently achieving its full potential. There are issues to be resolved.</p> <p>The town centre by its nature is dynamic and cannot stand still; companies continue to make investment decisions and we need to ensure that we are an attractive investment location. If we do nothing we will be disadvantaged relative to our competitors, many of whom already have area actions plans in place to manage the future of their town centres.</p> <p>It's therefore important to produce a framework for the town centre, drawing on available evidence and the views of interested organisations and individuals.</p> <p>The interim town centre framework will help to shape how our town centre will look, function, perform and prosper over the next 18 years, to 2030. The interim framework is recommended for adoption as a useful tool in ensuring a holistic and coordinated approach is taken in future to redevelopment of key sites and of other enhancements to public and private land. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework. Comprehensive traffic assessment are carried out for planning applications.</p>
	<p>The ITCF must be more visionary if Guildford's economy is to flourish</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please be reminded that the interim town centre framework is relevant for the town centre only. The boundary is defined within the document itself. We believe that the document is visionary for the town centre.</p>
	<p>The Council must engage urban master planners to help create the vision</p>	<p>We do not believe a master planning exercise is needed beyond the extensive information and community and stakeholder views already gathered to inform the current published interim framework.</p> <p>The interim framework has been prepared by the Council's qualified and experienced planning officers, working in conjunction with specialist urban planning/architecture consultants (Studio Real), to provide a high quality document which has developed considerably from the earlier iteration.</p> <p>The Council has, and continues to, use the expertise of other specialist consultants to advise us where needed, for example to determine future retail and leisure needs. Whoever prepares the framework however faces the same issues. For the framework to respond to the issues raised through consultation, such as traffic/congestion, further studies first need to be completed.</p>

Comprehensive and meaningful public consultation must underpin the vision	Engagement with the council in preparation of its planning documents is as set out in the Council's adopted guide to Community Involvement in Planning. Its community and stakeholder engagement methods are similar to those of many planning authorities. The Guildford Society has been putting forward its views on a plan for the town centre since the first early engagement stage on the TCAAP in 2005. The Council has listened to the concerns and issues raised, and it must be acknowledged that the Council may consider that some of the suggestions made would not necessarily be suitable and that it must balance these views against the many other comments and opinions it receives. The Council welcomes working constructively with the GVG and other interested parties to produce the best possible plan for the town centre. There have been four key significant stages of engagement, the responses to which can be viewed here: http://www.guildford.gov.uk/article/3969/Consultation-responses □ town centre area action plan issues and options (2005) town centre area action plan preferred options (2006) early engagement before drafting the master plan (June-July 2011) consultation on the draft town centre master plan (December 2011-January 2012). All comments received through community engagement have been fully considered in the preparation of the interim town centre framework. Using a consultant to prepare the whole document as a master plan would result in a significant further cost to the Council as well as delays in getting a framework for the town centre in place. In the acknowledged absence of outstanding evidence studies, additional consultancy input to the framework at this stage is not warranted or cost effective. No change to the interim framework suggested.
GVG supports the Council in its mission to secure the economic future of Guildford and to create a County Town of substance, vitality & diversity	Support for this noted and welcomed.
GVG believes that the ITCF: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is an improvement on the draft Town Centre Masterplan But • Underplays the over-riding & primary need for a preceding comprehensive traffic & transport review • Lacks a compelling Vision, including aspirational design template, and proper consultation with all interests and stakeholders • Does not successfully address Guildford's long term sustainability and pins too much on retail-led regeneration • Still focuses on individual development sites rather than people • Makes no real attempt to reconnect areas to the centre, eg the University & Research Park, the Hospital & the Cathedral • Seriously underexploits public space, especially the river; fails to deliver landmark opportunities – town square, civic buildings etc • In some unhelpful aspects is more 'Final' than 'Interim' 	The interim town centre framework makes it clear what evidence is missing. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework. We do not agree that the ITCF lacks a compelling vision or that there was not proper consultation with all stakeholders. The ITCF does address Guildford Town Centre's long-term sustainability and is not pinned on retail-led regeneration. A reminder that the ITCF is about Guildford town centre which does not include the Surrey Research Park, Hospital and Cathedral. These will be addressed in the Local Plan. We agree much more needs to be made of the river. This is recognised and reflected in a separate strategy section for the river in the interim framework; see section 6.6 River Wey (page 97). The interim framework sets out aspirations to plan such improvements. The Delivery section of the interim framework explains specific projects already known to deliver these. Further work will then need to be brought forward to deliver these, in consultation with the community and other interested parties.
GVG believes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The single most important issues facing Guildford is traffic congestion • The town will fail to flourish without a comprehensive, even radical, plan to tackle traffic & transport issues • It is completely illogical to permit North St & Station developments ahead of the strategic traffic studies • Major developments, if approved, stand to frustrate potential traffic treatments, especially at the Station site. Rail & river bridge options must be protected to allow radical solutions • The Council's own studies show congestion to be one of the two major disincentives to economic growth in the town • Perceived difficulties in achieving financing for long-term traffic & transport solutions should not deter ambition 	Traffic is one of the important issues facing Guildford, others include maintaining and improving the economic situation of the town. We agree that we need a movement strategy for the town. These documents do not permit developments, they are not planning applications. Agree that achieving financing should not deter ambition but we have never said it has.
GVG believes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council should be much bolder in its aspirations for Guildford • The ITCF should emphatically embrace the needs and aspirations of all its stakeholders and communities • The ITCF should include more on the identified additional and affordable housing need, the second of the disincentives identified by research • A visionary plan will more likely secure the long term economic future of the town • A visionary plan should focus more on the needs and economic contribution of identified growth areas eg the University & Research Park - the single largest contributor to Guildford's GDP • Guildford has all the ingredients to be a sustainable, accessible, attractive and inter-connected place in which to invest, live and work, and to visit and enjoy leisure time 	The ITCF does not rule out additional and affordable housing. We agree that a visionary plan is likely to secure the long term economic future of the town. Again the University and Research Park fall outside of the town centre. These areas will be addressed in the Local Plan. We agree that Guildford has all the ingredients to be a sustainable, accessible, attractive and inter-connected place in which to invest, live and work, and to visit and enjoy leisure time.

	<p>GVG believes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional urban master planners have the expertise and experience from which Guildford should benefit Master planners bring a suite of key skills to bear – incl. road engineering & streetscape design The ITCF represents the once in a lifetime opportunity to make Guildford fit for the 21st century Master planners would draw on the good work already undertaken by the Planning & Economic Development teams The future of Guildford demands no less than a professional, well researched plan that embraces all sections of the community There is no option to do nothing or to be half-hearted if Guildford's life and long-term prospects are to be sustained and enhanced 	<p>We do not believe a master planning exercise is needed beyond the extensive information and community and stakeholder views already gathered to inform the current published interim framework. The interim framework has been prepared by the Council's qualified and experienced planning officers, working in conjunction with specialist urban planning/architecture consultants (Studio Real), to provide a high quality document which has developed considerably from the earlier iteration.</p> <p>The Council has, and continues to, use the expertise of other specialist consultants to advise us where needed, for example to determine future retail and leisure needs. Whoever prepares the framework however faces the same issues. For the framework to respond to the issues raised through consultation, such as traffic/congestion, further studies first need to be completed.</p>
	<p>GVG believes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation on the ITCF was inadequate, The periods of consultation was too short and badly timed No town centre plan will succeed in the long term unless all stakeholders and shades of opinion have been properly canvassed and addressed Only a vision 'owned' by the whole community will succeed Planning procedures may have been short-circuited or ignored in a rush for short term financial gain vs enhanced long term, sustained economic prospects 	<p>Engagement with the council in preparation of its planning documents is as set out in the Council's adopted guide to Community Involvement in Planning. Its community and stakeholder engagement methods are similar to those of many planning authorities. The Guildford Society has been putting forward its views on a plan for the town centre since the first early engagement stage on the TCAAP in 2005. The Council has listened to the concerns and issues raised, and it must be acknowledged that the Council may consider that some of the suggestions made would not necessarily be suitable and that it must balance these views against the many other comments and opinions it receives. The Council welcomes working constructively with the GVG and other interested parties to produce the best possible plan for the town centre. There have been four key significant stages of engagement, the responses to which can be viewed here: http://www.guildford.gov.uk/article/3969/Consultation-responses <input type="checkbox"/> town centre area action plan issues and options (2005) town centre area action plan preferred options (2006) early engagement before drafting the master plan (June-July 2011) consultation on the draft town centre master plan (December 2011-January 2012). All comments received through community engagement have been fully considered in the preparation of the interim town centre framework. Using a consultant to prepare the whole document as a master plan would result in a significant further cost to the Council as well as delays in getting a framework for the town centre in place. In the acknowledged absence of outstanding evidence studies, additional consultancy input to the framework at this stage is not warranted or cost effective. There has certainly not been any short-circuiting of planning procedures. No change to the interim framework suggested.</p>
	<p>GVG stands for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A conviction that our community can be transformed by visioning processes that tap into the best external professional and expert advisors. GVG seeks full transparency and engagement with all parts of the community and its diverse stakeholders Helping to meet Guildford's urgent need of a long term vision in which the sustainable vitality of the town and its enterprise is ensured for the next 30 years and beyond A great vision that drives planning to exploit and further develop the unique character of Guildford – its history, riverside location and its beautiful setting within the Green Belt Working with all relevant bodies, individuals, developers and property owners, with our MP, our elected councillors, town & county staff, government departments and agencies in an apolitical way that is open, practical, progressive and purposeful 	<p>What GVG stands for is noted.</p>
Member of the public	<p>The town plan must not be so dominated by SHOPS ! We were told there is an under provision of food retail in the town centre, but we have Tesco, Sainsbury's, M & S, several delis and the North Street market. Demand has apparently been identified for retail development, inexplicable when so many shops are closing. Personally I have no desire for the Friary to be extended - that's quite enough (with White Lion Walk and Tunsgate Square) of the "shopping mall" style of development. I should prefer more individual shops. There is the current preoccupation with Waitrose. We were told that an "anchor retail outlet" would need to have frontage to North Street.</p>	<p>Comments noted. 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 documents do not propose a shopping mall style of development. Guildford town centre has a relatively low vacancy rate of 10.3% (June 2012) compared to 14.6% which is the national vacancy rate.</p>
	<p>Why could in not go in the station development (which apparently has plans for a supermarket) which would cause far fewer traffic problems</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
	<p>Firms are reluctant to take the vacant offices in the town because of the lack of affordable housing and traffic congestion. One of the contributing factors is the closure of the Debenhams underpass (I believe at their request). The pedestrian crossing causes long tailbacks and it only needs one car to break down or one lorry to be parked on the gyratory system for the roads to be gridlocked for miles around.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>Of course the Cathedral, the University and the Research Park should be included in the Town Plan, as they such an important part of the economic structure of the town and of course there is general agreement on the desirability of affordable housing and riverside open spaces - two of the most suitable sites are currently in use as car parks.</p>	<p>A reminder that the ITCF is about Guildford town centre which does not include the Surrey Research Park, Hospital and Cathedral. These will be addressed in the Local Plan.</p>

	<p>Please let us not be saddled with an overall plan for the town until all the elements, in particular the station development, have received careful consideration</p>	<p>Guildford town centre is a great place to live, work, shop, visit, and to run a business and is a major shopping, service and business centre, but it is not currently achieving its full potential. There are issues to be resolved.</p> <p>The town centre by its nature is dynamic and cannot stand still; companies continue to make investment decisions and we need to ensure that we are an attractive investment location. If we do nothing we will be disadvantaged relative to our competitors, many of whom already have area actions plans in place to manage the future of their town centres.</p> <p>It's therefore important to produce a framework for the town centre, drawing on available evidence and the views of interested organisations and individuals.</p> <p>The interim town centre framework will help to shape how our town centre will look, function, perform and prosper over the next 18 years, to 2030. The interim framework is recommended for adoption as a useful tool in ensuring a holistic and coordinated approach is taken in future to redevelopment of key sites and of other enhancements to public and private land. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework.</p>
Member of the public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is vital that a full report on traffic in Guildford is done before any decisions on development are made. This will not be available until 2014. 	<p>We agree that there is a need for a movement strategy for the town and wider area which we are working with Surrey County Council and the Highways Agency to develop. However, we feel that it is important to have a plan. Guildford town centre is a great place to live, work, shop, visit, and to run a business and is a major shopping, service and business centre, but it is not currently achieving its full potential. There are issues to be resolved.</p> <p>The town centre by its nature is dynamic and cannot stand still; companies continue to make investment decisions and we need to ensure that we are an attractive investment location. If we do nothing we will be disadvantaged relative to our competitors, many of whom already have area actions plans in place to manage the future of their town centres.</p> <p>It's therefore important to produce a framework for the town centre, drawing on available evidence and the views of interested organisations and individuals.</p> <p>The interim town centre framework will help to shape how our town centre will look, function, perform and prosper over the next 18 years, to 2030. The interim framework is recommended for adoption as a useful tool in ensuring a holistic and coordinated approach is taken in future to redevelopment of key sites and of other enhancements to public and private land. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework. Comprehensive transport impact assessment are required to be carried out for sizeable planning applications.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For businesses coming to Guildford the biggest problems are housing for staff and traffic 	<p>Comments noted and agree that these are both issues facing Guildford.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does Guildford actually need a huge increase in retail space? 	<p>Comments noted. 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.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would houses be better on the site north of North Street? 	<p>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 primary shopping area capable of accommodating the required amount of retail floor space for which demand has been identified.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area considered in the ITCF should include the university, science park and cathedral. A third of Guildford's wealth is generated in this area. 	<p>Comment noted. Please be reminded that the interim town centre framework is a plan for the town centre only. The boundary is defined within the document itself. These areas will be addressed in the Local Plan, which will cover the whole borough.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be a better overall vision for Guildford. 	<p>Comment noted. Please be reminded that the interim town centre framework is relevant for the town centre only. The boundary is defined within the document itself. We believe that the document is visionary for the town centre.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Huge shopping centres have a negative effect on a small town centre like Guildford's. 	<p>Comment noted. The ITCF is not suggesting huge shopping centres.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We should concentrate on our own character, and make Guildford special. 	<p>Comment noted and agree that the character of Guildford is to be protected but should not restrict future growth and development. This is included as objectives TC1 and TC2.</p>
	<p>This does not reflect on the hard work of our planners: it is simply that such a huge undertaking needs people who can see the bigger picture and who can concentrate on the problem full time.</p> <p>This is too big a decision to be taken by the executive. The full council should be involved. We have to get this decision right. We already have empty shops in the town. Building houses would help the economy as a whole, and meanwhile we can see whether shops are really what we want.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Chairman, Guildford Environmental Forum	Guildford Environmental Forum is taking an ongoing interest in the development of the Town Centre Framework, but there is an aspect of the <u>Interim</u> Town Centre Framework that is particular concern to us. We are aware of a number of criticisms raised about this document by the Guildford Vision Group, we are also aware that there is considerable work still to be done on it including housing and employment land assessments, and especially on the public transport and traffic aspects. Once the document has been adopted even in an interim form, we presume that it may be considered as material in planning applications. There is a danger that planning permissions will be granted on the basis of this flawed document, that does not have the conclusions of the remaining research and consultation embodied within it. In order to prevent this happening we ask that the Executive decision includes a clear stipulation that the Framework is not used as a material consideration in any planning applications where these unfinished studies would be relevant.	Thank you for your interest in the Interim town centre framework. We recognise further work is needed on transport matters. Further studies and modelling are required for the movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework. As you mention other research is in progress regarding housing and employment land assessment, which will inform the new Local Plan for Guildford borough, including a forthcoming consultation draft Local Plan Strategy. It is not necessary or appropriate to stipulate that the interim document is not used as a material consideration. The status of the interim town centre framework is clearly explained in Chapter 1 Introduction, page 4, What effect will it have? The interim framework will be given appropriate weight in pre-application advice and in determining planning applications, reflecting this fact.
Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the University of Surrey	The University wrote to Guildford Borough Council to express its broad support for the Guildford Town Centre Masterplan 2012-2030, consultation draft December 2011 (now called the Interim Town Centre Framework).	Noted. These were considered in drafting the interim framework.
	The University generally welcomed the masterplan, but acknowledged that if Guildford is to continue to prosper and to attract inward investment, there must be: • An adequate supply of employment sites in sustainable locations; • Opportunities for people to access the housing market at an affordable price; • A transportation system that is able to facilitate movement to, from and across the town without undue congestion and delay and promote sustainable patterns of travel where possible.	Broad support noted and welcomed.
	The University has reviewed the current version of the Interim Town Centre Framework and wishes to maintain its broad support for the document. While activities occurring within the town centre will not directly affect University land and buildings, there is a steady flow of University staff and students between the town centre and the University's two campuses, and the reputation of the town as a place to live, work and visit is an influential factor for prospective students and staff. It is therefore in the University's best interest that the principles underpinning the Interim Town Centre Framework help to deliver a town centre which is able to function well and is integrated with surrounding areas, particularly in terms of transportation and movement and the built environment.	Noted. Functional linkages with the University of Surrey are summarised on page 31 of the interim framework.
	The University has long held concerns regarding traffic and parking issues in the town centre and notes that Guildford Borough Council is currently undertaking a review of its parking strategy and is seeking to address traffic congestion problems through the production of a movement strategy which will test the impacts of town centre developments. It is understood that further information on these matters will be available towards the end of the year and the University looks forward to the opportunity to comment on the Town Centre Framework again when these documents have been made available.	The review of the parking study and the forthcoming transport modelling will inform a Movement Strategy and refining of this interim framework. The dates for both evidence studies and other outstanding studies is included as Appendix 4 in the interim framework.
	The University welcomes the progress that has been made with the Interim Town Centre Framework and considers that it sends out the positive message that Guildford is open for business. The University welcomes the adoption of the Interim Town Centre Framework subject to the opportunity to review and comment on an updated version of the framework following the conclusions of the transport and parking studies.	Support welcomed. This is an important purpose of the interim framework. Absolutely. As outlined in Appendix 4, the public and interested organisations will be involved in finalising the framework following completion of the evidence.
Guildford Community church	As a church, we currently meet in the college, but would be interested in looking into getting our own building, or renting a suitable premises. We would very much like this to link to our community, and provide some sort of community venue. I note that part of the aim of the council is to get some buildings back into use, and to provide some community space, so I wonder whether there are any buildings that you think we might be able to take on, with the possibility of working in partnership in some way, to also provide community space. At the moment, I do not have a fixed idea of the sort of space we could provide, but would be happy to discuss this further if you think it worthwhile.	Request for community space noted, and passed to Property Services.