

---

# Guildford Development Management Policies Examination

Response to Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions  
submitted on behalf of Martin Grant Homes  
(ID: 8944737)

**Matter 7:  
Policy ID6**

October 2022

**Guildford Development Management Policies Examination**

**Response to Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions**

**Matter 7:  
Policy ID6**

**Barton Willmore, now Stantec on behalf of  
Martin Grant Homes (ID: 8944737)**

<b>Project Ref:</b>	21633/P25/A5
<b>Status:</b>	Final
<b>Issue/Rev:</b>	01
<b>Date:</b>	21 October 2022
<b>Prepared by:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Checked by:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Authorised by:</b>	[REDACTED]

Barton Willmore, now Stantec  
The Blade  
Abbey Square  
Reading  
Berkshire. RG1 3BE

Tel: 0118 943 0000  
Fax: 0118 943 0001  
Email: [planning@bartonwillmore.co.uk](mailto:planning@bartonwillmore.co.uk)

Ref: 21633/P25/A5/EF  
Date: 21 October 2022

**COPYRIGHT**

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Barton Willmore, now Stantec.

All our stationery is produced using recycled or FSC paper and vegetable oil based inks.

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Barton Willmore, now Stantec is instructed by Martin Grant Homes (MGH) to submit this hearing statement in response to the Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions. This statement expands upon the representations submitted on behalf of MGH at the earlier stages of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies' preparation.
- 1.2 As background, MGH owns (freehold) the Gosden Hill strategic site allocated for residential mixed-use development in Policy A25 of the adopted Guildford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (April 2019).
- 1.3 MGH and its consultant team continues to proactively engage with the Council and other consultees to develop MGH's emerging masterplan for the site.
- 1.4 This statement supplements the representation submitted at Regulation 19 consultation stage in February 2022 and responds to the outputs of ongoing discussions with the Council and the output of MGH's own technical work.

## **RESPONSE TO MATTER 7: POLICY ID6**

**Main Question: Whether the other policies in the DMP are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with both national policy and the LPSS.**

1.1 No. As we have commented within previous representations, the imposition of rigid accessibility standards can compromise the layout and design of developments and not always allow for consideration of the best areas within a site for different forms of open space.

1.2 In this respect, we consider that Policy ID6 as drafted is not sound.

1.3 The policy offers no flexibility to allow for even minor deviations from the standards identified. Not allowing sites to be designed to make best use of the land available would be unjustified and inconsistent with national policy.

1.4 In this context, Policy ID6 should be amended as follows:

**1) Development proposals that would result in a net increase in number of residential units are required to provide or fund open space based on the expected occupancy of the new development and the quantity standards set out in Table ID6a. New open space is expected to meet the access standards in Table ID6a unless an alternative approach can be justified.**

1.5 This amendment is intended to provide an appropriate level of flexibility necessary to ensure that when masterplanning sites, the most appropriate locations for different forms of open space can be utilised, even if this results in minor deviations to the figures set out in Table ID6a. The amendment will enable a positive approach to the design of new development, consistent with national policy.

[bartonwillmore.co.uk](http://bartonwillmore.co.uk)

TOWN PLANNING  
MASTERPLANNING & URBAN DESIGN  
ARCHITECTURE  
LANDSCAPE PLANNING & DESIGN  
SUSTAINABLE VALUE  
INFRASTRUCTURE &  
ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING  
HERITAGE  
GRAPHIC COMMUNICATION  
COMMUNICATIONS & ENGAGEMENT  
DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS