

Guildford Borough Council

Item 5: 'Ways forward' &

Item 14 'Boosting housing supply and early years provision – relation to spatial strategy'

Measures to boost housing delivery in the early years in the context of an OAN figure of 630dpa + contribution to the wider HMA

Summary

1. Following the hearing session on 13th June 2018 in which *Item 5: Ways forward* was discussed, the Council has undertaken work with respect to exploring further opportunities for boosting housing supply in the early years. This note explores each of the potential spatial options for doing so in advance of the hearing session programmed for 3rd July. It does so in the context of the Inspector's recent note on OAN etc – ID/6 and, to a limited extent, the discussions on 26th June.¹
2. The note is in two parts.
3. First, it explores the opportunity of boosting housing supply in the early years by considering the potential for enlargement or increased density of allocated sites before exploring the potential for each spatial option to contribute to early delivery, in the order they appear in the spatial hierarchy.
4. As a result of this reappraisal process, the Council has identified the following potential sites as being the most appropriate candidates for realistically increasing the supply of homes in the early years of the plan (in preferred order):
 - Increased capacity at Garlick's Arch (150 homes)
 - Urban extension at Aarons Hill, Godalming (200 homes)
 - Village extensions at:
 - East of Glaziers Lane, Flexford (105 homes)
 - Hornhatch Farm, Chilworth (80 homes)
 - Alderton's Farm, Send Marsh (120 homes)
5. In total, this would provide for an increase of 655 homes, of which there is a realistic prospect that 555 homes would be delivered within the first five years of the plan post adoption.
6. The second part of this note considers the consequences of the Inspector's views on the appropriate housing requirement, in particular for the plan's housing

¹ For the avoidance of doubt, this note does not purport comprehensively to respond to the points on that day. Responding, including to the Inspector's proposed note, will be a separate process.

trajectory and the ability of GBC to maintain a five year supply. In doing so, it takes account of the additional sources of supply identified above.

7. First, it is clear that based on an OAN of 630dpa, and taking into account the additional sites, the Council is able to demonstrate a robust 5YHLS without a stepped trajectory.
8. Second, once the suggested amount of unmet need for Woking is factored in, a 5YRHLS without a stepped trajectory is still achievable. However, it is arguably less robust. In light of this, the Council suggests two alternative approaches for the Inspector's consideration, both of which lead to a more robust outcome: (i) a slightly reduced (20%) contribution to Woking's unmet need and (ii) a stepped approach to meeting the full extent of Woking's need. The Council's preference is for these alternative approaches, preferably the second, but maintains that on current assumptions all three can lead to a sound plan.

Opportunities for boosting early delivery

The enlargement or increased density of allocated sites (including urban sites), particularly those that can deliver early

9. In the Submission Local Plan the Council has taken a relatively conservative approach when identifying the capacity of each site allocation, based upon the best available information at that time. This is considered a robust approach for two reasons.
10. First, each allocation is for an *approximate* figure and therefore does not serve to restrict a higher number coming forwards, should a higher number be assessed to be appropriate through further detailed master-planning work undertaken as part of the planning application process.
11. Secondly, it helps to ensure a resilient plan that has sufficient flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances and one which can maintain a rolling five year housing land supply. It is preferable to be conservative when assessing the capacity of a site and over-deliver at the planning application stage, rather than over estimate it and under-deliver.
12. The draft NPPF includes significantly more guidance on increasing the density of development and ensuring the efficient use of land. The emerging Development Management DPD will need to reflect the proposed requirement that plans set minimum densities for development. Once published both the new NPPF and the Development Management DPD will help ensure that when these sites are assessed at planning application stage, there is sufficient policy direction to ensure that the site capacity of each is maximised. However, whilst it is considered there will likely be an improvement in capacity, it is not possible at this stage to quantify with any accuracy what increase in numbers might be achieved.

Garlick's Arch

13. The site promoters of Garlick's Arch consider that the allocation at A43 is too low and does not reflect the full potential of the site. This matter has been explored in more detail and, in the light of new evidence from the site promoters, the overall capacity of the site is now understood to be 550 homes. The promoters have provided evidence that 450 could be delivered within the first five years of the plan with the remaining 100 in year 6.

Greater housing provision on town centre and brownfield sites

14. The Planning and Regeneration Directorate has a Major Projects team who are progressing the delivery of a number of town centre sites, which could potentially help contribute towards longer term supply. In that regard the Council has produced a note in relation to the delivery of development and regeneration in urban areas, which includes a proposed new policy on this topic – draft Policy S3 (GBC-LPSS-019). However, the sites these initiatives may unlock are not sufficiently progressed in order to contribute to early delivery.
15. The plan includes all suitable, available and *deliverable* (that is, with a realistic prospect of delivering housing within 5 years) town centre sites as part of its supply. Should additional sites become available or suitable through the course of the plan period, then these could be progressed through the planning application process as windfall sites. They may also be considered for inclusion in updates to the Council's Brownfield Register based on its annual review. However their likely contribution towards early delivery is considered to be limited as these sites, particularly if large scale, tend to be complex to bring forward with longer lead in times.
16. Evidence was submitted by GVG during the hearing session in relation to potential further sites which the Council had not included within its supply². The Council do not consider these sites meet either the deliverable or developable tests set out in footnote 11 or 12 of the NPPF. The reasons for this are set out in Appendix 1. The continued assertion echoed by a number of parties that there are a number of urban sites which might contribute in the first five years is refuted. There is no evidence for it. The Council reiterates that it does not consider that there are any sites in the town centre that have not been assessed that could realistically deliver additional housing in the first five years. In terms of future delivery beyond that period there are no sites which are sufficiently certain to be counted in the supply figure at this stage.

More flexibility towards land use changes (such as more flexible hotel, offices and employment land policies)

17. This response should be read alongside the Council's detailed response in relation to the appropriate balance of land uses and its justification for protecting

² REP-17406209-002 Summary GVG Plan vs GBC June 2018

employment, retail and hotel sites contained within the Council's response to Question 5, 6, and 28 of the Inspector's Initial Questions and Question 7 and 8 of the Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions.

18. The Council maintains that, notwithstanding the urgent need for increased housing, it is important to protect these valuable, lower value land uses as they help ensure a thriving local economy, boost the leisure and tourism industry and promote a vibrant town centre that performs a sub-regional role.
19. There is a demonstrable need for these land uses as identified in the Employment Land Needs Assessment, Retail and Leisure Study, and Hotel Futures report. Furthermore, as explained in greater depth in the Council's written responses, national policy requires local planning authorities to support economic growth and promote competitive town centre environments.
20. The Submission Local Plan, with proposed modifications in response to the Inspector's questions, is considered to strike the right balance in terms of protecting valuable sites whilst providing sufficient flexibility to enable those sites that are not viable or no longer needed to be changed to other uses, including housing. The Council do not consider it is sustainable to weaken these protection policies any further given the scarcity of these sites in the right locations. Furthermore given the lower land values that these uses command, once they are changed to high value residential uses this is likely to be permanent.

More housing on sites beyond the Green Belt

21. The Council has reconsidered this spatial option but maintain the position as set out at the hearing session.
22. The position is as follows; the housing trajectory already projects that 927 homes will be delivered within the first five years of the plan on land currently designated as Countryside Beyond the Green Belt (CBGB). These consist of extant planning permissions, a number of which are subject to a Grampian condition in relation to the availability of SANG. The housing trajectory projects that the remaining CBGB (site allocations A28 and the rest of A29) will be delivered within years 6 – 15.
23. Given the scale of development that is already projected to occur within the early years of the plan, the Council consider that neither the remaining land allocated in the plan nor additional new sites in this area would realistically be capable of boosting early delivery. This is in part due to the smaller nature of this urban area and the ability of the market to sustain this level of delivery combined with the social implications that this scale of increased development in such a short space of time would have on the character of this area.
24. In addition to this, there are concerns regarding whether the Ash Vale Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) has capacity to support an increase in delivery within Thames Water's current discharge permits. The Water Quality

Assessment³ states that further growth in the Ash Vale catchment will likely cause the current permit headroom to be exceeded requiring a new permit to be issued. The WwTW permit currently has headroom for approximately 750 homes.

25. Given the scale of permissions already due to come forward in the first five years, combined with potential development in neighbouring boroughs, it is considered likely that upgrades and significant investment will be required at the WwTW in order to accommodate the additional flows from growth, without compromising water quality targets in the River Blackwater.
26. For these reasons, the additional site of 600 homes that is identified in Volume V of the Green Belt and Countryside Study (land south of Poyle Road) is not able to contribute to boosting early delivery.

Greater housing provision as extensions to Guildford urban area

27. The Council has reconsidered this spatial option but maintain the position as set out at the hearing session.
28. The position is as follows; there are two additional Guildford urban extensions identified by the Green Belt and Countryside Study that have not been allocated. These are Liddington Hall to the north west and Clandon Golf to the south east. These are located on highly sensitive Green Bet sites and, in contrast to the smaller village sites, comprise the entire land parcel. For this reason, development here would cause significant harm to the Green Belt.
29. As urban extensions, Liddington Hall and Clandon Golf are large strategic scale sites with a capacity of 600 homes and 1000 homes respectively. Allocating these sites would compound the issue that has been raised by a number of representors in relation to the Council's apparent over reliance upon a small number of larger sites. As noted by the HBF, their members state that to increase delivery the Council should ensure a mix of site sizes and site locations. The Council is already allocating three Guildford urban extensions and a total of four strategic scale residential-led sites. The Council consider that allocating a further strategic site would distort the balance in relation to the proportion of housing delivered on the strategic scale sites (currently 40% of total supply).
30. The Council also considers that the contribution that these sites could realistically make in the first five years is relatively limited given the lead in time necessary for these sites to begin delivering homes. This is particularly in the context of the other Guildford urban area extensions that are proposed to be allocated and will also be delivering some homes within this time period.
31. It is acknowledged that due to their locations, the two sites are less reliant upon Highways England's A3 Guildford RIS scheme than other schemes.

³ GBC-LPSS-SD-037b

Nevertheless, if built, there would be demands for travel on the A3 trunk road and the Strategic Road Network, including during peak periods.

32. Liddington Hall and Clandon Golf, when compared to the larger and well located allocated urban extensions at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill Farm, have fewer opportunities for achieving meaningful and sustainable rail, bus and cycle links, and for the internalisation of trips. As a result, these non-allocated sites would be more car dominated than the proposed urban extensions.
33. Accordingly, there is reduced opportunity for these non-allocated strategic scale sites to 'retain capacity' and create 'headroom' on the A3 by respectively providing for non-car trips from their sites and also shifting a proportion of existing traffic from the A3 to other modes.
34. In addition to the above, given that the issue that requires addressing is that of early delivery and in light of the high levels of flexibility in supply that are already provided for in the plan, the Council do not consider it sustainable or appropriate to allocate further sites whose delivery would primarily occur within years 6-10. This point applies to all potential sites.

The identification of sites adjacent to the urban areas of adjacent boroughs (e.g. Godalming)

35. This option relates to the cross boundary site at Aaron's Hill. The context has changed since the Council prepared the Regulation 19 Local Plan (2017) for consultation. The site has, following hearings sessions in Summer 2017, been allocated for development in Waverley's Local Plan Part 1. Prior to this, it was not considered appropriate to allocate it on the basis that the Guildford site would not form a logical part of Godalming unless the Waverley site came forward.
36. Given the allocation in the Waverley Local Plan and the need to ensure that the final Green Belt boundary follows an easily recognisable and permanent feature, the Council considers the Guildford element should also be allocated to enable the comprehensive development of the whole site. The Council has already been involved with pre-app discussions on this site with colleagues at Waverley. Whilst the Waverley part of the site is progressing through the planning application process, much of the initial work undertaken to assess the suitability of the scheme has been undertaken on a comprehensive basis considering both parts of the site.
37. The Council has discussed the deliverability of this site with the site promoters and the timescales within which the Guildford element could be expected to come forward. The promoters intend to engage different developers to each build out part of the site. In light of this 200 homes on the Guildford site are therefore considered deliverable in the first five years of the plan.

Greater housing provision in and around inset villages

38. In developing its spatial strategy, the Council considered that this spatial option was most likely to boost early delivery. This was due to the sites being of a smaller scale, of lower dependency upon the delivery of infrastructure and generally having a dispersed nature. This option also enables a variety of site sizes and types, which increase the choice available and can support higher rates of delivery.
39. Volume III of the Green Belt and Countryside Study identified a range of smaller potential development areas (PDAs) around the villages, irrespective of the Green Belt sensitivity of the wider land parcel within which each site sat. Whilst PDAs were identified on the basis that they would not harm the main purposes of the Green Belt, the Council took the view that the relative harm would still be greater than development in land parcels which scored less against Green Belt purposes⁴. For this reason, as a starting point, the Council directed development towards PDAs within land parcels scored to be of low Green Belt sensitivity.
40. Whilst the Council considered as a starting position that development on medium and high sensitivity Green Belt was inappropriate, there was still a need to assess whether there were particular benefits which would outweigh the Green Belt harm and justify the exceptional circumstances for removing additional sites from the Green Belt. The Council considered that the balance was appropriately struck at 800 homes around the villages.
41. However this balance has been reconsidered in light of the Inspector's views in relation to objectively assessed need, and notably the necessity to increase early delivery. As a result of this reappraisal, the Council considers that a boost to early delivery would be most appropriately and realistically achieved through the allocation of additional village extension sites that are all capable of being completed within the first five years. They have also already been assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal process.
42. These sites were not considered suitable for inclusion in the Submission Local Plan at the time that the plan was proposing a phased approach to early delivery. However if greater emphasis is placed upon increased early delivery in order to facilitate a non-phased approach - as the Inspector has indicated may be necessary - a reappraisal is required of whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of additional sites.
43. The following sites are considered to be the next most sustainable for the reasons set out in the Housing Delivery Topic Paper and would offer the best opportunity for achieving this - if any or all are required:
 - East of Glaziers Lane, Flexford: 105 homes
 - Hornhatch Farm, Chilworth: 80 homes
 - Aldertons Farm, Send Marsh: 120 homes

⁴ GBC-LPSS-SD-TP-004, para 4.46

44. The Council considers, that, subject to appropriate site specific transport mitigation being secured, the delivery of these sites do not raise A3 RIS issues, identified in the last paragraph of ID/6.
45. The Council has also taken the opportunity to reassess the potential at Effingham in light of the successful appeal at the Howard of Effingham for 295 homes. This site was identified as a PDA in the Green Belt and Countryside Study and should, in light of the appeal⁵, now be included as part of the inset boundary and excluded from the Green Belt. However since the study was undertaken, part of the northern boundary of the site is no longer considered to be, in its current form, a defensible Green Belt boundary. The Council has therefore considered whether the boundary should be extended northwards to the edge of Thornet Wood.
46. The appeal scheme proposes that this part of the boundary, which also represents the extent of the applicant's landownership, forms part of the new link road through the development. Given the phasing of the development which is in part dependent upon the relocation of the secondary school, the build out of the approved scheme is projected to extend into Year 6 of the plan post adoption. Any extension to the site would be delivered as part of this scheme and will therefore not contribute towards early delivery. Also, and on reflection, the Council currently considers that the site should not be extended beyond that already permitted and that the link road will form an appropriate and defensible Green Belt boundary.
47. A potential site (c500-1,000 homes) at Normandy and Flexford was raised in the hearing on 26th June. It was stated that this site could deliver early without impacting on the section of the A3 that is proposed to be improved by Highways England from Road Period 2.
48. Reasons for not including it are set out in the Housing Delivery Topic Paper at 4.29-30. They can be expanded if required. Attention is drawn to the last sentence of 4.30 and that the claims in terms of sustainability are overstated.
49. Even if otherwise acceptable, as to early delivery, demands for access to the A3 from the site would primarily be from the Puttenham interchange with the A31. During the morning peak, when traffic will be predominantly leaving the site, significant numbers of vehicles would access the eastbound A31, joining the A3 at the A31/A3 Hog's Back junction. As identified in 2.14a of the Submission Local Plan, a noted issue is that queuing from the A3 trunk road extends back from the A3 trunk road onto the eastbound (nearside) lane of the A31 during peak hours. During the evening peak period, there would be similar issues focused on the westbound carriageway of the A3 and its junction with the A31. It is considered that this issue from a site of this scale (c500 – 1,000 homes) would be of particular concern to Highways England as no other strategic sites are

⁵ Planning Reference 14/P/02109

proposed in the Local Plan that will add material levels of traffic to this critical section.

Consequences for housing trajectory and five year supply

50. In light of the above, the Council's Housing Trajectory has been updated to include all the potential additional supply (on the provisional basis that there is adequate justification for any or all of the three sites identified in paragraph 43), see Appendix 2.
51. Next, Appendix 3 indicates what the five year housing land supply position would be in such circumstances for an OAN of 630. This has been prepared to reflect the Inspector's assessment of the housing requirement set out in ID-6.
52. The Council consider that with an OAN of 630 and taking into account all the sites discussed above it can provide a reasonably robust 5 YHLS.
53. Consideration has then been given to the impact of the suggested contribution to the wider HMA. Given that the proposed contribution to Woking is a "policy on" factor, – and therefore should only ever apply post-adoption – the overall figure has been divided over the remaining years of the plan post-adoption, and does not apply to the backlog. This is not a stepped approach, and supplies the same overall amount of dwellings. Appendix 4 demonstrates this position.
54. This is potentially acceptable should phasing, supply and other assumptions be accepted, however it is materially less robust. Therefore, in light of these concerns, two alternative scenarios of meeting Woking's unmet need are proposed. Neither alters the underlying non-stepped Liverpool approach to meet Guildford's OAN.
55. By way of the first alternative, consideration is given to a 20% contribution to Woking's unmet need (630 homes), and Appendix 5 gives that position. That gives rise to a more robust 5 year supply.
56. Secondly, consideration is given to phasing the Woking contribution as illustrated in Appendix 6. In GBC-LSS-016 the Council made the point that the reality is that any contribution in the first 5 years should be considered to be meeting Guildford's needs, not Woking's. It reflects the position that Sedgefield cannot be achieved.
57. Hence, the Council still prefers the stepped approach to meeting Woking's need, as for example shown at Appendix 6. (However, there are different options for achieving that outcome whilst meeting the Woking figure in full, but the option shown also gives rise to a robust 5 year supply.)
58. A relevant factor to take into account in considering which final approach/figure is to be chosen is the extent of increase in actual building rates which will have to occur. That is a factor in seeking as robust a supply as possible.

59. In any event, the Council submits that given the uncertainties over Woking's needs and its ability to meet them, the Plan should contain an express provision for that element of the housing requirement to be reconsidered on any review. This is to ensure that Woking's actual requirement for assistance to meet its unmet need can be assessed on the latest figures and can be considered following Woking undertaking an unrestricted and comprehensive Green Belt review.

Appendix 1: Analysis of GVG alternative sites/allocations to those within the Submission Local Plan

Part 1: Inconsistency with Local Plan allocations and the GVG masterplan

Please note that this table **only** analyses those sites where GVG have proposed residential uses or additional residential units when compared to the allocations in the Local Plan. The table does not include sites that have planning permission or sites that include other inconsistencies, such as a lower level of housing to that contained in the site allocations.

Site	GVG (Sq M)	Proposal	Local allocation	Plan	Summary notes
A2 Guildford Cinema Bedford Rd	-	Parking – 3744 Retail – 802 Food & Beverage – 1,680 Dwelling Units - 144	Food & Beverage – 1,000 Cinema screens	- 3-5	The majority of this site is located within Flood Zone 3b, while the remainder is within Flood Zone 3a. Redevelopment that increases the footprint currently on site, or introduces more vulnerable uses, is not consistent with national policy.
A8 - Land and Buildings at Guildford Station (West Side)		Retail – 5750 Food & Beverage – 668 Station – 2930 Dwelling Units – 220 Parking Spaces - 600	Additional platforms and layout changes		The allocation is consistent with proposals in Network Rail’s Wessex Route Study. As of June 2018, Network Rail now consider that this scheme is required in Control Period 8 – which is 2029 to 2034 – in order to facilitate planned future uplifts in service frequencies. The Council is working closely with Network Rail in the preparation of this scheme and has commissioned Network Rail to undertake a study of platform and land usage at Guildford station in order to advance the development of the scheme. Policy A8 Opportunity (1) identifies the potential for housing and/or commercial uses and the retention of some station

car parking. Network Rail state this must not be at the expense of the ability to expand the station in the future. This is unlikely however to be realised in the early years of the plan.

Part 2: Sites identified in the GVG masterplan that are not included as Local Plan allocations

Site	GVG Proposal (Sq M)	Summary notes
GVG1 Woodbridge Meadows West	- Community Unit – 1,920 Dwellings – 817 Parking Spaces – 500	- Residential redevelopment of the Woodbridge Meadows sites is not considered deliverable within the plan period. The majority of the site is subject to long leases, meaning the land is not available. This site is proposed to be designated as an Industrial Strategic Employment Site. Relocation of the employment land is not considered appropriate as it would need to be re-provided elsewhere.
GVG2 Woodbridge Meadows East	- Retail – 1,024 Community Unit – 1,986 Dwellings – 472 Parking – 300	As above.
GVG3 Riverview, Walnut Tree Close	- School – 14,672	The site has not been promoted for alternative uses, availability is therefore unknown. This site also forms part of Woodbridge Meadows Strategic Employment Site (see above).
GVG4 – Land between Railway and Kernal Court	Student units – 225	Site is owned by Network Rail who has confirmed that it is not available for alternative uses during the timeframe of the Local Plan to 2034.
GVG5 Riverview Builder’s Yard	- Care Home – 2,184 Dwellings – 6 Retirement units – 26	Some initial pre-application work was undertaken on this site a number of years ago but this has not progressed to any further subsequent pre-application discussions or a planning application. The site is not considered available.
GVG6 Riverside Business Centre	- Dwellings – 16	The site is predominantly in Flood Zone 3b with some Flood Zone 3a. Pre-application discussions are ongoing in relation to a student accommodation-led scheme.
GVG7 Bedford Wharf, Mary Road	- Dwellings – 200	The proposal is reliant on the GVG bridge ⁶ coming forward. Land, including the Crown Court, would need to be subject to Compulsory Purchase as it is in multiple ownership. The site is not considered available. Part of the site forms part of the Town Centre employment core.

⁶ The GVG bridge was discussed at length during the Guildford Station Public Inquiry (Ref 14/P/02168). The following is an extract from the Appeal Decision (para 53): “*The real challenge for such local initiatives however, is to secure the buy-in of the local decision-making authorities and key infrastructure stakeholders, in this case Network Rail (NR), Surrey County Council (SCC) as highway authority, and crucially, GBC as the development management decision-maker and plan-maker. For all its merits however, the GVG plan does not, in the crucial respect of the strategic new bridge, have the active support of any of these key players.*”

GVG8 Bedford Wharf, Margaret Road	- Dwellings – 60	The proposal is reliant on the GVG bridge coming forward. Land would need to be subject to Compulsory Purchase as it is in multiple ownership. The site is not considered available. The site forms part of the Town Centre employment core.
GVG9 Bedford Wharf, Civic Zone, Police and Courts	- Dwellings – 34 Civic Offices – 41,554	The proposal is reliant on the GVG bridge coming forward. Land, including the Crown Court, would need to be subject to Compulsory Purchase as it is in multiple ownership. The site is not considered available. This development is also reliant on the Police, Courts and Council moving to a new 'Civic Centre', to which there is no intention by GBC to do so. The site forms part of the Town Centre employment core.
GVG10 Bedford Wharf Car park	- Dwellings – 49 Hotel – 5,765	The majority of the site, including the whole of the surface level car park is within Flood Zone 3b. The site forms part of the Town Centre employment core.
GVG11 Land adjacent to A8, Guildford Park Rd	- Dwellings - 21	The site consists of a mixture of residential, commercial and other uses (including a Surgery). There is a current planning application for 3 dwellings on land to the rear of the Surgery. The remaining land is not currently available.
GVG12 Corner of Guildford Park Rd and Farnham Rd	- Dwellings – 41 Office – 6,869	Site not currently available. The site forms part of the Town Centre employment core.
GVG13 Town Wharf West	- Arts centre – 4,626	Site not currently available. Majority of site is within Flood Zone 3b, with the remainder within Flood Zone 3a. The majority of the site is currently a surface-level car park.
GVG14 Town Wharf East	- Dwellings – 101 Retail – 4,490 Food/Beverage – 3,034	Site not currently available. Land is in multiple ownership.
GVG15 Millmead	- Retail – 2,428 Dwellings – 93 Parking - 118	This site covers GBC's offices. GBC has recently invested to upgrade its offices and part of Old Millmead is let to other organisations. The Council has no intention to move nor is there an alternative site that it could move to (albeit GVG identify GVG9 as a new civic centre).

Appendix 2: Updated Housing Trajectory with potential additional sites

	Pre-adoption				First five years					6-10 YEARS					11 - 15 YEARS					Total	
	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022	2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	2025/2026	2026/2027	2027/2028	2028/2029	2029/2030	2030/2031	2031/2032	2032/2033	2033/2034		
Completions	387	294	319																	1000	
Outstanding capacity (Commenced)				219						4	4	5	5	5	14	13	13	13	13	13	308
Outstanding capacity (Approved)					181	181	181	182													725
~ Ash and Tongham (including those subject to Grampian)					185	185	185	186													927
~ Howard of Effingham					20	60	60	60	60	35											295
~ Guildford Station							138	151	149												438
Windfall					30	30	30	30	30	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	750
Rural exception					6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	90
Town Centre										117	117	118	118	118	55	55	55	55	55	55	863
Guildford urban area (excluding SARP)					37	37	37	37	37	23	22	22	22	22	21	21	21	20	20	20	399
Slyfield Area Regeneration Plan										100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	1000
Ash and Tongham (urban area)										5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	44
Ash and Tongham extension (currently countryside)										93	93	93	93	94	81	81	81	81	81	81	871
Within villages					16	16	16	15	15	3	2	2	2	2	13	13	13	13	13	13	154
Villages (land proposed to be inset from the Green Belt)					46	46	45	45	45	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	272
PDL in the Green Belt					13	13	13	14	14	56	56	56	55	55							345
Proposed new settlement (former Wisley airfield)									50	100	150	150	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	2000
Extensions to urban areas and villages																					
Proposed extension to urban area (Gosden Hill, Guildford)									50	100	100	100	100	100	210	210	210	210	210	210	1700
Proposed extension to urban area (Blackwell Farm, Guildford)									50	100	100	100	100	100	170	170	170	170	170	170	1500
Land north of Keens Lane, Guildford						38	38	37	37												150
Land to the north of West Horsley						30	30	30	30												120
Land to the west of West Horsley						34	34	34	33												135
Land near Horsley Railway Station, Ockham Road North						25	25	25	25												100
Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley						65	85	150	150	100											550
Land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send						20	20														40
Potential additional sites																					
Aaron's Hill, Godalming						50	50	50	50												200
East of Glaziers Lane, Flexford						35	35	35													105
Hornhatch Farm, Chilworth						20	20	20	20												80
Aldertons Farm, Send Marsh						30	30	30	30												120
Potential housing provision	387	294	319	219	534	921	1078	1287	1217	957	820	822	871	872	938	937	937	936	935	935	15281

Appendix 3: 630 Liverpool non-phased

	Pre-adoption				First five years					6-10 YEARS					11 - 15 YEARS					Total
	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022	2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	2025/2026	2026/2027	2027/2028	2028/2029	2029/2030	2030/2031	2031/2032	2032/2033	2033/2034	
LP requirement annualised over plan period (2015 - 34)	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	11970
Years remaining	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Supply	387	294	319	219	534	921	1078	1287	1217	957	820	822	871	872	938	937	937	936	935	15281
Residual requirement taking account of supply to date annualised over remaining plan period	630	644	664	686	717	730	715	685	630	571	529	492	445	374	274	109	-168	-720	-2376	
5 year requirement	3150	3218	3320	3428	3584	3649	3575	3424	3150	2857	2643	2461	2225	1870	1372	543	-838	-3600	-11880	
5 year requirement plus 20% buffer	3780	3861	3984	4114	4300	4379	4290	4109	3781	3428	3171	2953	2670	2244	1646	651	-1006	-4320	-14256	
5 year supply	1753	2287	3071	4039	5037	5460	5359	5103	4687	4342	4323	4440	4555	4620	4683					
5 year housing land supply	2.32	2.96	3.85	4.91	5.86	6.23	6.25	6.21	6.20	6.33	6.82	7.52	8.53	10.29	14.22					

Appendix 4: 630 (pre-adoption), 682 Liverpool non-phased (1-15)

	Pre-adoption				First five years					6-10 YEARS					11 - 15 YEARS					Total
	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022	2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	2025/2026	2026/2027	2027/2028	2028/2029	2029/2030	2030/2031	2031/2032	2032/2033	2033/2034	
Annual housing target	630	630	630	630	682	682	682	682	682	682	682	682	682	682	682	682	682	682	682	12750
Years remaining	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Supply	387	294	319	219	534	921	1078	1287	1217	957	820	822	871	872	938	937	937	936	935	15281
Backlog/Surplus		-243	-579	-890	-1301	-1449	-1210	-814	-209	326	601	739	879	1068	1258	1514	1769	2024	2278	
Backlog/Surplus annualised over remaining plan period		-14	-34	-56	-87	-104	-93	-68	-19	33	67	92	126	178	252	379	590	1012	2278	
5 year requirement + (5x annualised backlog/surplus)	3202	3322	3476	3636	3844	3928	3875	3749	3505	3247	3076	2948	2782	2520	2152					
5 year requirement plus 20% buffer	3842	3986	4172	4363	4612	4713	4650	4499	4206	3896	3691	3538	3339	3024	2582					
5 year supply	1753	2287	3071	4039	5037	5460	5359	5103	4687	4342	4323	4440	4555	4620	4683					
5 year housing land supply	2.28	2.87	3.68	4.63	5.46	5.79	5.76	5.67	5.57	5.57	5.86	6.28	6.82	7.64	9.07					

Appendix 5: 630 (pre-adoption), 672 Liverpool non-phased (1-15)

	Pre-adoption				First five years					6-10 YEARS					11 - 15 YEARS					Total	
	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022	2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	2025/2026	2026/2027	2027/2028	2028/2029	2029/2030	2030/2031	2031/2032	2032/2033	2033/2034		
Annual housing target	630	630	630	630	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	672	12600
Years remaining	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		
Supply	387	294	319	219	534	921	1078	1287	1217	957	820	822	871	872	938	937	937	936	935		15281
Backlog/Surplus		-243	-579	-890	-1301	-1439	-1190	-784	-169	376	661	809	959	1158	1358	1624	1889	2154	2418		
Backlog/Surplus annualised over remaining plan period		-14	-34	-56	-87	-103	-92	-65	-15	38	73	101	137	193	272	406	630	1077	2418		
5 year requirement + (5x annualised backlog/surplus)	3192	3302	3446	3596	3794	3874	3818	3687	3437	3172	2993	2854	2675	2395	2002						
5 year requirement plus 20% buffer	3830	3962	4136	4315	4552	4649	4581	4424	4124	3806	3591	3425	3210	2874	2402						
5 year supply	1753	2287	3071	4039	5037	5460	5359	5103	4687	4342	4323	4440	4555	4620	4683						
5 year housing land supply	2.29	2.89	3.71	4.68	5.53	5.87	5.85	5.77	5.68	5.70	6.02	6.48	7.10	8.04	9.75						

Appendix 6: 630 (pre-adoption), 630 (1-5), 682 (6-10), 734 (11-15)

	Pre-adoption				First five years					6-10 YEARS					11 - 15 YEARS					Total
	2015/2016	2016/2017	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022	2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	2025/2026	2026/2027	2027/2028	2028/2029	2029/2030	2030/2031	2031/2032	2032/2033	2033/2034	
Annual housing target	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	630	682	682	682	682	682	734	734	734	734	734	12750
Years remaining	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Supply	387	294	319	219	534	921	1078	1287	1217	957	820	822	871	872	938	937	937	936	935	15281
Backlog/Surplus		-243	-579	-890	-1301	-1397	-1106	-658	-1	586	861	999	1139	1328	1518	1722	1925	2128	2330	
Backlog/Surplus annualised over remaining plan period		-14	-34	-56	-87	-100	-85	-55	0	59	96	125	163	221	304	431	642	1064	2330	
5 year requirement + (5x annualised backlog/surplus)	3150	3218	3320	3428	3584	3701	3679	3580	3358	3117	2984	2890	2752	2511	2152					
5 year requirement plus 20% buffer	3780	3861	3984	4114	4300	4441	4415	4296	4030	3740	3580	3468	3303	3014	2582					
5 year supply	1753	2287	3071	4039	5037	5460	5359	5103	4687	4342	4323	4440	4555	4620	4683					
5 year housing land supply	2.32	2.96	3.85	4.91	5.86	6.15	6.07	5.94	5.81	5.80	6.04	6.40	6.90	7.67	9.07					