

APPENDIX SIX

SCOPING REPORT CONSULTATION

Consultation

The opinions of the four Consultation Bodies as well as Surrey County Council were requested with respect to whether the scope for the Sustainability Appraisal was appropriate. Consultation commenced by emailing a formal request for comments on 27th January 2006. The following reproduces the text of the letter to the Environment Agency as an example:

Regulation 12(5) Consultation under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 Revised Scoping Report for Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document and Parking Supplementary Planning Document Guildford Development Framework

I refer to previous correspondence on 21st January 2005 with respect to the Guildford Development Framework Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.

The Scoping Report continues to be updated as more information becomes available (baseline) and new plans, programmes and legislation are issued. The Scoping Report can be found on the GBC website (www.guildford.gov.uk): Planning & Building Control, Planning Policy, policy team, Local Development Framework, Sustainability Appraisal (see bottom of the page).

Whilst the first Scoping Report expressly covers all Local Development Documents I attach, for your comment, a summary of the key documents which Guildford Borough Council considers to be appropriate to the scope of the latest two Supplementary Planning Documents on Infrastructure and Parking.

The SPDs will be the subject of a Sustainability Appraisal in the coming weeks and published for consultation in March 2006. I should be grateful, therefore, if you would consider the attached and advise me whether you consider the scope for each document to be appropriate and your opinion concerning any key issues.

I also attach the current SA Framework which includes targets identified to date. I should be grateful for your comments on whether the SA Objectives, indicators and targets are suitable and/or accurate with respect to the responsibilities of the Environment Agency. Please contact me should you wish to discuss any issues raised in this letter.

Should you have any comments, I request that you advise me by email, telephone or letter by Friday 3rd March 2006.

**Tom Jones, MRTPI
Independent Consultant
28.03.06**

Consultation responses

English Heritage confirmed receipt of the email on 31st January 2005 and has made no comment.

Countryside Agency, letter by email 1st March 2006

‘Thank you for consulting us on the above.

It is currently the Countryside Agency’s policy to only become involved in a number of selected development plans consultations and we are therefore unable to offer comments on this occasion.

We should explain that the absence of comment is simply an expression of our priorities. It should not be taken as implying a lack of interest; indeed we are always seeking to promote examples of good practice so if you think that your development plan policies demonstrate particularly well how the Agency’s approach to planning in rural areas and urban fringe can be applied, then we would be pleased to hear from you.

If you wish to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

JULIE DELCROIX
Countryside Adviser (Planning)’

English Nature, comments by email 3rd March 2006

English Nature considered that the Objectives, indicators and targets within Table 7 (Baseline information) are in line with English Nature's previous recommendations.

English Nature strongly recommended that Guildford's own Supplementary Planning Document 'Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area' is considered as a key document for both infrastructure and parking.

Surrey County Council, comments by email 3rd March 2006

Surrey County Council has suggested that other standards that will need reviewing include A1 food retail in relation to supermarket size and the

cycling/motor cycling standards in general. The Borough Council may also wish to review the 0-25% standard operating in the town centre.

The list of plans should also refer to the Structure Plan (Policy DN3 Parking Provision) and the emerging South East Plan which updates the approved RTS.

The County Council also identified improvements which could be made to the SA Framework:

Objective 7

The 100% target for developing on previously developed land should be for both housing and commercial development.

Objective 7/Objective 11

There should be an additional indicator/target relating to development in accessible locations to monitor both best use of land and accessibility: '100% of all housing and commercial development to be built in the most accessible locations not more than 30 minutes public transport travel time from a town or shopping centre, business park, health facilities or school.'

Objective 10

2nd indicator - The PPGs are guidance and being reviewed, therefore reference to the 1970 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act and the 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act should be added as these provide the legal frameworks for the system.

6th indicator - the target should be 0%, but this is difficult to measure and you may want to discuss with Tony Howe.

8th indicator - This should be reworded: 'Proportion of planning applications with identified potential archaeological impacts, where acceptable archaeological assessment and/or mitigation occurred.'

The corresponding target proportion should be 100%.

Objective 19

Rather than number, the first indicator should relate both to planning permissions and completions and to amount of commercial floorspace gained or lost.

The County Council added that the SA will need to incorporate the new legislation on Gypsies and Travellers and flood risk assessments.

Environment Agency by email 14th March 2006

The Environment Agency considered that large park and ride schemes may have a significant effect on water quality, flood risk and wildlife conservation, requesting coverage in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Parking Standards SPD.

The amount of parking provided will have an effect on the overall rate of surface water runoff and possibly on water quality. If land that was to be used for parking is now used for higher density development then runoff will be increased and it may be more difficult to incorporate sustainable drainage systems. If more spaces are to be provided then water quality could be reduced.

The relevant Plans and Programmes need to include:

Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control
Planning Policy Guidance Note 25: Development and Flood Risk
Draft Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk

Responses to comments

A chasing phone call was made to English Heritage prior to the closing date of the consultation.

English Nature strongly recommended that Guildford's own Supplementary Planning Document 'Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area' is considered as a key document for both infrastructure and parking.

Surrey County Council has suggested that other standards that will need reviewing include A1 food retail in relation to supermarket size and the cycling/motor cycling standards in general. These issues are discussed in the SA at page 24, Section 3.1.4.

A reference has been added in the FSAR at page 5 to Structure Plan Policy DN3 Parking Provision and the emerging South East Plan which updates the approved RTS.

The other comments made by Surrey County Council request small amendments to the SA Framework and that SA considers the needs of travelers and gypsies. These issues will be addressed in the SA of other GDF documents

The Environment Agency considered that large park and ride schemes may have a significant effect on water quality, flood risk and wildlife conservation, requesting coverage in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Parking Standards SPD. The Agency also considered that the amount of parking provided will have an effect on the overall rate of surface water runoff and possibly on water quality. These issues are regularly referenced in the FSAR and a recommendation made for monitoring.

References to the relevant Plans and Programmes have been added at page 6 of the FSAR.