

Purpose of Note

This note provides a summary of the responses received during consultation on the Strategy and Sites Issues and Options document setting out the main emerging themes. The note provides a brief analysis of the type and subject of comments made and the officer responses

The Issues and Options consultation process had at its heart the key strategic priorities of the Council. The aims of a sustainable local environment, a safe and vibrant community and a dynamic economy underlie the approach used in formulating the draft Issues and Options and formed the basis for consulting the community at the earliest possible stage of the process of producing the Local Plan.

A great deal of work was undertaken prior to the Issues and Options consultation last year. The Issues and Options consultation did not stand alone but was supported by a raft of evidence base documents. These documents were published in advance of the start of the consultation process to enable the community time to read and engage with the consultation process.

Consultation materials were made available in a range of ways including online access, hard copies for inspection and free copies available on disc. An extensive public consultation exercise was undertaken and comprised the following activities:

- a dedicated consultation website
- social media presence
- Leader and Lead Councillor interviews on local radio
- Huffington Post diary article about the Lead Councillor
- summary leaflets and canvass card distribution
- attendance at the Park Barn Community Day
- attendance at the Stoke Community Event
- pop up consultation events at nine locations across the borough
- four workshops across the borough
- three separate leading articles in About Guildford
- an advertising campaign on Eagle Radio
- a youth engagement campaign
- presentations to Councillors and Parish Councillors
- leafleting across the borough and at the railway station by the Leader and Lead Councillor
- 25 Swan Lane open 7 days a week including late night shopping
- online consultation
- consultation materials available at the Council offices, Swan Lane, all libraries and electronic copies sent to Parish Councils.
- briefing of residents associations and other interested parties
- engagement strategy aimed at Hard to Reach Groups

- facilitation of community engagement by specialist consultants
- provision of specialist PR support by outside agency

Consultation

The consultation exercise attracted a large number of responses made in a variety of different ways summarised in the table below. A number of representations were made outside the consultation period and these have not been taken into account in the following analysis. Any representations made outside the formal consultation process will be taken forward and considered as part of the Draft Local Plan consultation.

The online consultation portal generally worked well apart from a short period when the system was unavailable. The consultation period exceeded the statutory requirement by two weeks therefore; it was considered that there had been no detrimental impact on the ability of people to respond. There was some confusion about the end date of the consultation and as a result the decision was taken by the Head of Planning Services in conjunction with the Lead Councillor to extend the consultation period up to midnight on the last day instead of 5 pm.

We structured the consultation around a questionnaire that contained 41 questions. (See Appendix 1 for Questionnaire) Questions were grouped around common themes and these are illustrated in Appendix 2 with further more detailed analysis following on:

Introduction section

In the Introduction section, questions were asked about the facts and figures and strengths and weaknesses of Guildford as well as the vision for the Local Plan and objectives to frame it around. The specific questions within this section were:

1. Do you agree with the summary in Appendix B (Facts and Figures, Strengths and Weaknesses)
2. Do you think the research listed in Appendix C (Evidence Base) appropriately covers what we need to write the new Local Plan?
3. What are your views on a new vision for the Local Plan and the possible objectives?

Looking at the representations received the main themes and officer responses can be summarised as:

- The information provided was too limited in scope and contradictory in places. **Our response is** that this is a summary of a number of various issues without an overarching strategy so there may be some apparent contradiction that goes away when more detailed examination of different issues takes place.
- The analysis of strengths and weaknesses did not feature strongly enough the link between the quality of life and landscapes and the economic success of the borough.

Our response is that it is important that we have a good understanding of the borough including its strengths and weaknesses. It is acknowledged that there is a link between the quality of life and landscapes and the economic success of the borough. It is the role of the Local Plan to balance the competing demands of protecting and enhancing our environment and the accommodation our objectively assessed housing need.

- A number of respondents were of the opinion that Guildford is relatively affordable because it is cheaper than London
Our response is that whilst Guildford may be cheaper than London in terms of house prices, affordability is still an issue for many residents of the borough and many of the workers especially those in lower paid jobs who cannot afford housing in the borough. This is why the issue of affordability must be considered within the Guildford context as we need to provide adequate housing for our residents and workers.
- The River Wey represents a significant strength for the town centre and this is currently under exploited.
Our response is that it is recognised that the River Wey represents a considerable opportunity to improve the environment of the Town Centre and that its leisure and cultural capital should be taken advantage of. Issues relating to the treatment of the River Wey will be dealt with via the Town Centre Vision and subsequent Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document.
- There was significant concern that the Evidence Base was not consulted on and that there were flaws with some of the documents most notably the Green Belt and Countryside Study.
Our response is the Evidence Base has been prepared in part by technical experts and by the Planning Policy Team in conformity with current guidance and best practice. Whilst the Evidence Base studies have not been available for consultation they have been made available for examination and the conclusions drawn from them can and have been questioned. The Joint Scrutiny Committee has taken a particular interest in the Evidence Base and considered a reappraisal including public involvement, particularly with regard to the Green Belt and Countryside Study. Work has been commissioned to look at issues raised by the consultation and subsequent engagement process.
- The information presented was biased and that there was a hidden pro-development agenda
Our response is that there is no bias in the information presented as it is factual. There is no hidden pro development agenda but the Local Plan is being produced in line with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework that states that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- There was a great deal of feeling about the Green Belt with substantial objection to the loss of Green Belt for housing or other uses.
Our response is that we appreciate the strength of feeling about the Green Belt but that until the housing number is determined it is not possible to be absolute that no

Green Belt will be required to accommodate our identified levels of development including the need for homes, jobs and infrastructure.

- There was a strongly expressed preference for the use of brownfield sites rather than greenfield/Green Belt sites with a number of representations expressing the opinion that there was no need for any Green Belt releases as sufficient capacity existed in the urban areas to accommodate the need from the borough.
Our response is that the preference for the use of brownfield sites is in the main the more sustainable choice for development but that until the housing number is determined it is not possible to say that brownfield land will be capable of accommodating all of the identified level of need for development
- There was a large degree of objection to the need to provide housing for in migrants to the borough with commentary suggesting that housing provision should only be made for existing residents.
Our response is that guidance is clear that we must allow for migration to the borough. A zero net migration model is not a true reflection of reality and adopting such an approach would lead to an unsound plan.
- It is difficult to comment on the Issues and Options in the absence of a housing number
Our response is that it is appreciated that the lack of an adopted housing number makes it difficult to come to some judgements about the issues and options outlined but that it was considered important to embark on public consultation at the earliest possible point in time
- Existing infrastructure capacity represents a significant weakness
Our response is we are aware of the significant issues relating to infrastructure capacity but the Local Plan needs to look at what infrastructure is required to support the level of development in the plan and not to make good deficiencies in existing provision. The Local Plan will be accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan that sets out what infrastructure is required, where it will be located, who will provide it and who will pay for it.
- There needs to be a clear and coherent vision for the future development of the borough.
Our response is the Local Plan will provide a clear and coherent vision for the future development of the borough when it is finalised. At the present time the plan is in its initial stages of production
- The vision needs to give the same level of protection to the Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) as other designations such as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Green Belt.
Our response is the NPPF says distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites so that protection is commensurate with their status. AGLV is a local designation and we will consider how we will take protection of this area forward. We will not be able to give AGLV the same status as national or international designations.

Planning for the homes we need

In this section we asked questions about the mix and density of housing; the approach to affordable housing; the proportion of affordable housing; rural exception housing; traveller accommodation and different accommodation needs within the borough. The specific questions were:

4. Which approach to the mix and density of housing do you think is appropriate?
5. Which approach to affordable housing do you think is most appropriate?
6. Would you support an increase in the proportion of affordable housing and the types of developments that are required to contribute towards affordable housing?
7. Which approach to rural exception housing do you think is most appropriate?
8. Which approach to meeting travellers' accommodation needs do you think is most appropriate?
9. Which approaches to meeting the different accommodation needs of our community, including older people, students, low paid workers and young working people do you think is most appropriate?

The main themes emerging from the representations can be summarised as:

- Density of new development should be decided on a case by case basis according to the character of the area
Our response is that whilst it is not appropriate to set a blanket density across the borough there should be some parameters to ensure that the best and most efficient use is made of land. Determination of planning applications will be according to the development control policies in part two of the Local Plan and these will take into account the impact on the character of the surrounding area.
- Density above 300 dwellings per annum would be unsustainable
Our response is 300 dwellings per annum would not meet our objectively assessed need for development and therefore adoption of such a low target would lead to an unsound Local Plan. The Evidence Base does not support a target of 300 dwellings per annum.
- Density should be increased in the urban areas to avoid the use of Green Belt.
Our response is increasing density in the urban area would help towards the efficient and effective use of land but consideration must be given to the impacts of increasing density in the urban area especially with regard to congestion and impact on the character and appearance of the area. Increasing density in the urban area does not automatically mean no Green Belt will be needed for development.
- There is a need for more 2 and 3 bedroom houses
Our response is that the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) will look at the mix of housing that is required to meet our identified level of need. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) will look at the mix of housing that is required to meet our identified level of need. Informed by our housing needs survey work this will suggest whether more 2 and 3 bedroom houses are needed. We will then use this as guidance for suggesting an appropriate policy approach to this issue.

- There is a need for more housing suitable for elderly people downsizing
Our response is the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) will look at the mix of housing that is required to meet our identified level of need. Informed by our housing needs survey work this will suggest whether more housing suitable for people downsizing is required. We will then use this as guidance for suggesting an appropriate policy approach to this issue.
- More affordable housing is needed
Our response is we have assessed our affordable housing need via the 2009 SHMA that is currently being updated. The 2009 SHMA indicated that our affordable housing need is in excess of 1,000 dwellings per annum but in order to provide for balanced and mixed communities and in the interests of the overall viability of schemes we have currently adopted a policy that looks to achieve at least 35 per cent provision.
- Less affordable housing is needed
Our response is we have assessed our affordable housing need via the 2009 SHMA, which is currently being updated. The 2009 SHMA indicated that our affordable housing need is in excess of 1,000 dwellings per annum but in order to provide for balanced and mixed communities and in the interests of the overall viability of schemes we have currently adopted a policy that looks to achieve at least 35 per cent provision.
- Housing cannot be affordable given prices in the borough
Our response is that we are aware of the issues relating to affordability and this is a reason why more affordable housing is needed in the borough. The provision of affordable homes will enable people on lower incomes to live in the borough. A variety of housing is required in order to provide for balanced and mixed communities.
- In the absence of an identified housing number it is premature to talk about new settlements
Our response is we need to explore all options available to meet our identified need including the provision of new settlements however, no decisions have yet been taken on the level or location of housing to be provided. New settlements remain in contention for consideration.
- Local need should be the priority not accommodating overspill from London
Our response is that we do not have powers to limit in migration to the borough from London or any other destination of origin. Anyone is entitled to buy a house in the borough. Affordable housing is, in the main, allocated in the borough to people with a local connection.
- Protection should be given to the maintenance of a stock of small houses
Our response is the SHMA will look at what is an appropriate mix of housing to meet our identified need. This will be used to guide what protection could be given to the maintenance of existing stock.

- What is meant by affordable housing and how can you quantify actual need as opposed to desire
Our response is we have adopted the definition of Affordable Housing from the National Planning Policy Framework that states that this is social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. We are required to assess need and this is what the Strategic Housing Market Assessment as well as the Housing Needs Surveys look at. Our studies are carried out in conformity with national policy and guidance.
- There is a need to ensure that affordable housing remains so in perpetuity
Our response is affordable housing in East Horsley and Send is exempt from the rights to buy and acquire but in all other parts of the borough the sale of affordable housing on the open market is permitted. Where we can protect affordable housing from entering the open market we will aim to do so.
- Students should be required to live on campus so freeing up affordable housing for the community
Our response is whilst we cannot insist that students live on campus we are doing all that we can to encourage the University of Surrey to increase the amount of student accommodation on campus. However, it does not necessarily follow that building more student accommodation will free up affordable housing for the open market.
- The threshold for providing affordable housing should be as low as possible/high was possible/there should be no threshold at all
Our response is that we recognise that the provision of affordable housing may impact on the viability of schemes but in order to secure some provision a threshold is an appropriate policy tool. We are looking at what the threshold should be and what level of provision should be required but these decisions will need to be based on robust and defensible evidence.
- More use should be made of empty homes
Our response is that we are currently working to bring long term empty homes back into use through our Empty Homes Strategy although there is limited action that the Local Plan can take.
- Rural exception housing has been abused
Our response is that rural housing is made available for people with local connections, and that sites are provided according to strict criteria. We are doing all we can to ensure that the rural exception housing policy is properly applied but in parts of the borough we are unable to prevent the onward sale of affordable housing to the open market.
- There should be no rural exception housing on Green Belt
Our response is that such housing is provided on sites not normally considered for housing and in this borough that is Green Belt given that the borough is 89 per cent

Green Belt. It is therefore generally not possible to provide rural exceptions sites anywhere except for on the Green Belt.

- Traveller accommodation is not needed
Our response is that we have a duty to assess the current and future needs of travellers residing in or resorting to Guildford and make appropriate provision in line with our assessment. Our responsibilities in this are set out in the Housing Act 2004 and Planning Policy for Travellers 2012 published by CLG.
- Traveller accommodation should be spread evenly across the borough
Our response is that accommodation should be provided in the most sustainable manner and this may mean that there isn't an even spread across the borough. Available and deliverable sites for traveller accommodation are not evenly spread across the borough and need should be addressed where it arises.
- There should be some/no market housing allowed on affordable housing sites
Our response is that national guidance in the NPPF requires us to consider allowing a small number of market homes on rural exception sites. Inclusion of any market housing would be at our discretion and would need to be robustly justified.
- Existing Council estates should be demolished and rebuilt at much higher densities
Our response is that whilst the Council strives to make the most efficient use of land existing Council estates are in the main, fully occupied and not available for redevelopment.
- What definition of travellers is Guildford Borough Council using?
Our response is that we use the definition of Travellers enshrined in the national policy guidance that says Travellers are persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds of their own or their family's or dependant's education or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently. Travellers are a recognised ethnic minority protected under race relations legislation.

Planning for the economy and jobs

In this section we asked questions about tourism, arts and culture; employment needs; the future development of the town centre; and local district and town centres. The specific questions asked were:

- 10 Are there any other issues that you think we should cover in relation to tourism, arts and cultural development?
- 11 Which approaches to meeting the existing and new employment needs of our borough, including supporting the economy of rural areas do you think are most appropriate?
- 12 Is this the correct approach to guide the future development of the town centre

- 13 Would you support the proposed approaches to helping support our local centres, district centres and Guildford Town Centre?

The main themes identified include:

- There should be more support for cultural and arts facilities
Our response is that we provide financial support to a number of arts and cultural facilities throughout the borough including GLive and the Yvonne Arnaud Theatre. The Council is aiming to develop a tourism strategy that will look at future funding for new and existing facilities.
- The important contribution that the environment and landscape makes to tourism should be acknowledged
Our response is we do acknowledge the contribution that the environment and landscape makes to the success of tourism in the borough. It is the role of the Local Plan to balance the competing demands of protecting and enhancing the environment and accommodating our identified level of need.
- There is a need for a proper art gallery and digital exhibition space in the town centre
Our response is consideration will be given to the provision of additional arts facilities through the Tourism Strategy and via the Town Centre Vision and the Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- There is no need to support culture, arts or tourism as the market will sort this out
Our response is that tourism, arts and culture make a valuable contribution to the economy of the town and the Council will continue to offer support as appropriate.
- There is a need for a dedicated sports ground for Guildford City Football Club
Our response is the Council will consider the case for a dedicated sports ground if a suitable site becomes available.
- The River Wey could provide a focus for cultural development
Our response is the treatment of the River will be dealt with in the Town Centre Vision and subsequent SPD. It is acknowledged that more could be made of the River and proposals coming forward for development in the Town Centre will be expected to contribute to this.
- There is a need for dedicated coach parking close to or within the Town Centre
Our response is that consideration will be given to the provision of dedicated coach parking through the Town Centre Vision and the subsequent Supplementary Planning Document.

- There is a need for good business accommodation
Our response is that the contribution that business tourism makes to the overall success of the borough's economy is acknowledged. Additional business orientated hotels will be encouraged in appropriate locations close to business locations
- Dunsfold Aerodrome should be used for business accommodation
Our response is that Dunsfold Aerodrome is outside of the borough boundaries and we therefore have little ability to influence development on that site. We will continue to cooperate with neighbouring authorities including Waverley over sites such as this.
- Rural enterprise should be encouraged
Our response is that the Local Plan will aim to encourage appropriate scale rural enterprise in appropriate locations taking into account the impact of the character and appearance of the local area.
- Bus services need improvement in the rural areas to encourage employment
Our response is that whilst we agree that bus services may need improvement in the rural areas to encourage employment, and we would support it, this would currently be outside of the remit of the Local Plan.
- Farms should be retained in agricultural use and not used for housing
Our response is it is the role of the Local Plan to balance the competing demands of retaining land in agricultural use and accommodating our assessed level of need.
- There should be no economic development in the Green Belt
Our response is that it is the role of the Local Plan to balance the competing demands of the protecting and enhancing the environment and accommodating our level of need for development of all types including economic development.
- Investment should focus on the knowledge based economy
Our response is that we acknowledge the contribution that knowledge based industries makes towards the overall success of the Local Plan. The Local Plan will aim to support investment in this sector of the economy.
- Provision of high speed broadband would help support jobs
Our response is Surrey County Council is rolling out a programme of Superfast broadband and this endeavour is supported by GBC
- Analysis of skills required shows a mismatch between what is needed and what residents have
Our response is we are working closely with partners who provide education to ensure that the skills the business community requires are being delivered. This is also an aim of our Economic Strategy.
- There is a need for incubator facilities for small businesses in the borough and 'grow on' units for expanding companies
Our response is we need to ensure that the amount and type of accommodation available for businesses matches the needs of businesses across the whole of the

borough. We have identified a need for some smaller units and more research is being carried out.

- There is little need to provide industrial floorspace
Our response is The Employment Land Assessment which forms part of the Evidence Base supports the need for industrial floorspace across the borough.
- Additional office accommodation should only be provided for the existing population
Our response is that according to the NPPF paragraphs 18 – 20 we cannot restrict provision to that needed only for the existing population. The NPPF requires us to commit to ensuring that the Local Plan does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. We do not have powers to limit migration and commuting into the borough and therefore need to make provision for need arising in the borough regardless of its origin.
- There is a need to make appropriate accommodation available for growing sectors of science, oil and medicine based jobs
Our response is that we are keen to support local businesses that in turn support our thriving economy. We are looking at the accommodation needs of existing and new employers through the ELA
- There are too many empty offices in the town so no new ones should be built
Our response is that we need to balance carefully planning for future employment. Whilst it is acknowledged that current vacancy rates are high we are recovering from a recession. We are likely to go through an economic cycle over the lifetime of the plan and need to build in an element of flexibility to provide choice for the business community. We must also protect existing major employment sites and retain them in employment use rather than grant planning permission for alternative uses
- There is a need to support the rural economy
Our response is the rural economy makes an extremely valuable contribution to the overall success of the borough with rural parishes accounting for approximately 25 per cent of all employment in the borough, and 36 per cent of all firms in the borough. Rural wards accounted for almost half of all new jobs created in the borough between 2002 and 2008. We take seriously the need to continue to support the ongoing development of the rural economy.
- Employment provision should take account of home working
Our response is the ELA looks at factors that impact on new job creation and the need for additional floorspace, specifically the impact of off-shoring and home-based working
- There is no need for additional employment land unless there is housing to match it
Our response is that the new Local Plan will set out policies and proposals to guide the future development of Guildford up to 2031. Our new plan will determine the best locations for the development we need. The new Local Plan seeks to achieve sustainable development which includes balancing the provision of new homes and new employment floor space.

- The Employment Land Assessment should have been consulted on
Our response is that the Evidence Base was published for information and not for consultation. Comments have been received on the ELA and other Evidence Base documents. The Joint Scrutiny Committee has reappraised the Evidence Base and the ELA will be updated to ensure that it is as up to date as possible.
- The Town Centre should have underground parking
Our response is whilst we acknowledge that underground parking enables more efficient use to be made of land which we would support, economic viability and land stability issues need to be considered.
- Demand for retail floorspace is lower than stated
Our response is the figures we state come from our 2011 Retail and Leisure Study and provide for additional retail floorspace across the whole of the borough over the plan period up to 2031. We will be updating our retail research in line with government recommendations.
- Provision for retail floorspace should take account of the impact of the internet
Our response is we acknowledge the impact of internet retailing but note that more affluent areas have lower levels of internet retailing. New patterns of commercial practice may lead to the need for different types of retail floorspace such as that needed to support Click and Collect type operations. Retail habits will continue to evolve and although it is anticipated that internet retail activities will increase town centres will continue to act as the hub of the community and will remain a focus for retail activity.
- North Street should be redeveloped as soon as possible
Our response is that the North Street Development site is the key regeneration site in the Town Centre and we are working with our development partners to ensure that this site is able to make a valuable contribution to the ongoing success of the Town Centre and the borough's economy.
- There should be a Town Centre Masterplan
Our response is we have appointed consultants to help produce a Vision for the Town Centre and this will feed into the production of a Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document. A Town Centre Masterplan cannot make site allocations or prescribe development proposals as this would mean it would become a Local Plan document in competition with the new Local Plan. A Town Centre SPD would serve to plan and co-ordinate overall improvements to the Town Centre and it would be rooted in and consistent with the Local Plan.
- Congestion is the biggest issue in the Town Centre
Our response is we recognise that congestion is an important issue to consider in relation to the ongoing success of the Town Centre and we will continue to work with our partner agencies such as the Highways Authority and the Highways Agency to produce solutions.

- Guildford does not need discount stores
Our response is that according to government guidance it may be appropriate to support different types of retail stores and it is important that we provide for a range of different choices for consumers.
- None of the village centres should expand to retain their character
Our response is that villages need to be able to grow to retain their vitality and viability as local centres. In some cases, this means that some facilities within the village centre may need to expand and provision may need to be made for additional facilities. Any additional development will be required to respect the character of the village and where appropriate respect the character, appearance and setting of any Conservation Areas.
- Why have any designated centres
Our response is that government tells us we must include a hierarchy of centres in our plan and that they must have designated boundaries. We have the opportunity in the Local Plan to confirm existing boundaries to alter and amend boundaries.
- Ripley should/should not be a designated centre
Our response is that Ripley is proposed to be upgraded to a district centre to reflect the function and role of the centre to the local community.
- The Town Centre boundary needs adjustment
Our response is that the Town Centre boundary needs to be adjusted to remove peripheral mainly residential areas, and to include land between the Policy Station and the Cricket Ground on Woodbridge Road, and to include much of Walnut Tree Close and the Riverside Business Centre within the boundary.
- Large supermarkets should not be allowed
Our response is that large supermarkets in locations which are not ideal and which we would not have planned for are a matter of concern. In the absence of an up to date plan we have to consider planning applications for large supermarkets on their individual merits using national guidance. We will still need additional supermarkets but these will be planned for in the Local Plan.

Planning for access and transport

In this section we asked questions about balancing development and traffic and congestion; access and transport issues and infrastructure issues. The specific questions asked were:

- 14 Are there any other options we can consider to try and help balance development with traffic and congestion
- 15 Which approaches to addressing access and transport issues do you think are most appropriate?

The main themes identified include:

- Development should be focused where the need for travel is minimised
Our response is this approach would be in line with the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. The Local Plan will have sustainable development as a central theme.
- There should be more and better public transport especially buses
Our response is that we will continue to work with our partners to encourage the provision of more public transport and improved choice
- There should be pedestrian and or cyclist priority
Our response is that we will look at the opportunities for increased priority for pedestrians and cyclist in the development control policies of the Local Plan as part of the emphasis on sustainable development.
- The bus station needs improvement and or relocation
Our response is that we are looking at the future of the bus station as part of the North Street redevelopment project.
- New railway stations should be provided
Our response is that we will continue to work with our partners to seek the provision of additional facilities that help promote sustainable patterns of development.
- There are massive problems with existing infrastructure
Our response is that the Local Plan acknowledges that there are problems with existing infrastructure but it will look to ensure that additional infrastructure that is required due to new development is provided for alongside that development. The Local Plan cannot make provision for improvements required as these will be dealt with outside of the Local Plan process.
- There should be more/ no more park and ride facilities provided
Our response is that we will continue to work to support the provision of additional facilities that promote sustainable patterns of development. Consideration will be given to the provision of additional facilities where appropriate sites can be provided.
- Development should provide mitigation for the impacts of the increase in traffic it provides
Our response is that an Infrastructure Delivery Plan that sets out the infrastructure that is required, where it should be located and how it will be paid for will accompany the Local Plan.
- Parking needs attention
Our response is that we acknowledge that parking is an issue of concern, and within the Town Centre this will be looked at in the Town Centre Vision and the subsequent Town Centre SPD.

- Provision of a new settlement at Wisley will require the provision of adequate public transport to make it a sustainable choice
Our response is that it is clear that considerable work will be required to ensure that if Wisley is chosen as a site for a new settlement considerable investment will be required by the developers to ensure that adequate public transport measures are built into the proposals at the earliest stage.

Planning for infrastructure and services

In this section we asked questions about the infrastructure that would be necessary to address the needs arising from the level of planned development. The question that was asked was:

16. Are there any other options available to the Council for addressing infrastructure issues?

The main themes can be summarised as:

- Existing infrastructure cannot cope with current levels of development and therefore cannot cope with any more development.
Our response is that the Local Plan must be positively prepared and forward looking. We will continue to work with our partners and where appropriate, developers of strategic sites to plan and coordinate the funding and delivery of infrastructure to support planned new development in the Local Plan. The Local Plan cannot deal with issues relating to existing infrastructure which are the responsibility of infrastructure providers such as Surrey County Council acting as the Highways Authority.
- Infrastructure needs to be provided in advance of development
Our response is that infrastructure cannot be provided in advance of development as development funds the provision of infrastructure. However the Council will give consideration to providing pump priming to ensure that development is not held back by issues relating to infrastructure provision.
- Development should not occur in areas prone to flooding
Our response is that we are in the process of producing a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and this will be used to help guide decisions about the level and location of development.
- There should be no need to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) as providing SANG encourages more development.
Our response is that we are required to provide SANG to accompany housing development occurring within a 400metre to 5km boundary of the Special Protection Area designated under European legislation. It is not that the provision of SANG encourages housing development but that housing development requires the provision of SANG.

Planning for the environment

In this section we asked questions about the Green Belt, countryside and open space; the built environment; and climate change and sustainability. The specific questions asked were:

17. Which approaches to the Green Belt, countryside and green open spaces do you think are most appropriate?
18. Which approaches to the built environment do you think are most appropriate?
19. Which approaches to dealing with climate change and sustainability do you think are most appropriate and have we missed anything out?

The main themes can be summarised as:

- There should be no building anywhere on the Green Belt
Our response is that we are required to make adequate provision for our objectively assessed level of development need and this may involve the requirement for the Green Belt boundary to be rolled back to allow for this. No decisions have yet been made.
- Green Belt should be protected and enhanced
Our response is that the Local Plan will aim to protect the Green Belt but that there must be a balance drawn between protection of the Green Belt and the need to accommodate development.
- The Green Belt and Countryside Study (GBCS) is fatally flawed and should be abandoned
Our response is that the GBCS has been the subject of a scrutiny reappraisal and some additional areas of work have been identified to ensure that the study is as robust as possible. It is part of the Evidence Base and has been published so it would be inappropriate to withdraw it.
- The area around Ash Green should be designated as Green Belt
Our response is that land can only be considered for designation as Green Belt if it fulfils the purposes of the Green Belt and we will look at the potential for additional Green Belt as part of the overall development strategy for the borough.
- The Borough's landscape is worthy of protection
Our response is that we acknowledge that the borough's landscape is worthy of protection and will aim to balance that against the need to make appropriate provision for our identified level of need.

- The Green Belt and Countryside Study identifies inappropriate potential areas for development
Our response is that the Green Belt and Countryside Study is one piece of evidence that will not be used in isolation to determine where development should be located. Identification as a Potential Development Area does not mean that those sites will be allocated for development as the GBCS only looked at Green Belt issues and did not take into account other considerations such as flooding and land designations.
- Villages should not be inset into the Green Belt
Our response is that the proposals to inset villages into the Green Belt is in line with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework. No decisions have yet been made about which villages will remain in the Green Belt and which will be inset.
- Green Belt boundaries should not be altered
Our response is that any alteration to Green Belt boundaries would be taken in light of the need to make adequate provision for our identified housing need
- Flooding should be dealt with at a strategic level
Our response is that we will continue to work with our partner organisations who share responsibility for dealing with flooding issues to ensure that flooding is dealt with at an appropriate level
- Groundwater protection and water quality should be strategic issues
Our response is that we will continue to work in partnership with those bodies and organisations who are responsible for dealing with issues of groundwater protection and water quality. The Local Plan will contain appropriate policies to deal with these issues.

Planning for our towns and villages

In this section we asked questions about use of the settlement hierarchy; the use of the Green Belt and Countryside Study and the long term future of Ash Green. The specific questions asked were:

20. Do you support using the Settlement Hierarchy to help us decide where new development should go or is there other research that we should rely on?
21. Do you support using the Green Belt and Countryside Study to identify new settlement boundaries for our villages
22. Which option do you think would be the best for the long-term future of Ash Green and its residents?

The main themes identified were:

- The scoring and information is wrong and leads to incorrect conclusions and ranking of settlements is incorrect

Our response is that the information in the main came from the Parish Councils but we are checking this information and will amend it where necessary. We will no longer use the functional score to help determine where development should occur.

- There is a need to use other factors to help determine distribution, not just the Settlement Hierarchy
Our response is that the Settlement Hierarchy is one piece of evidence and we will use other evidence to help direct and support decisions on where development should be located.
- Growth should be proportionate
Our response is that the NPPF seeks to achieve sustainable development. It also states that in the rural areas development should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. We are therefore seeking to direct development towards those areas that are sustainable or can be made so. We also need to consider the availability of sites and how to best maximise improvements to supporting infrastructure. Given this it is not necessarily appropriate to evenly distribute development across the borough.
- Disagreement with the scoring for certain settlements
Our response is that we acknowledge that local circumstances will change over time and that some of the scoring has been applied incorrectly so we will no longer be using the functional score element of the Hierarchy. We are reviewing the information submitted and have invited the Parish Councils to resubmit information which we will then look at and assess to see if any of the ranking in the Hierarchy should be amended. It is unlikely, however that any changes would materially affect the position of different settlements in the Hierarchy.
- Villages should not be inset and should remain covered by Green Belt.
Our response is that the NPPF states if it is necessary to prevent development in a village primarily because of important contribution that the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included within the Green Belt. If however the character of the village needs protection for other reasons, alternative means should be used, such as conservation area status or normal development management policies, and the village **should** be excluded from the Green Belt. (Our emphasis) For the Local Plan to be found sound we need to be in conformity with the NPPF and the Green Belt and Countryside Study (GBCS) has assessed all of our villages and concludes that some villages do not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt and therefore should be inset. However, no decisions have yet been made about which villages will be inset and the GBCS is only one piece of evidence that does not direct policy.
- The Green Belt and Countryside Study is biased in favour of development and did not consider other factors, its methodology is so flawed it should be abandoned.
Our response is that the Green Belt and Countryside Study only forms part of the Evidence Base in helping us to direct development towards the most sustainable locations. However we will need to use a range of other evidence base documents to help us decide where development should go.

- Green Belt boundaries should not be amended, Green Belt is sacrosanct
Our response is that Green Belt designation is not a blanket ban to all development and that we have been urged by the Department for Communities and Local Government to 'leave no stone unturned' in our search for land to accommodate our assessed level of need. The Borough is 89 per cent Green Belt and it is unlikely that we will be able to accommodate all of our assessed need within the urban areas.
- Insufficient attention has been paid to the potential for development on brownfield sites
Our response is that whilst we would wish to locate most of the development on brownfield sites, our current research suggests that we do not have sufficient amounts of this land to accommodate our development needs. We have assessed capacity within the urban areas and on previously developed land and will continue to update this assessment through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
- There should not be a presumption in favour of development
Our response is that we are required to produce a plan in conformity with the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development is the central theme of the NPPF. The Local Plan will therefore reflect that theme in its overall strategy and in the detailed policies.

Cross boundary issues

The question we asked in this section related to how we go about discharging our duty to cooperate. The question asked was:

Do you agree with this analysis? Are you aware of any other strategic cross boundary issues you think that we should be considering?

The main themes can be summarised as:

- Parish Councils should be treated the same as prescribed bodies for the purposes of discharging the duty
Our response is that the prescribed bodies for the purposes of discharging the duty to cooperate are set out in guidance/legislation and Parish Councils are not within that list. We will however continue to work closely with Parish Councils in developing the policies to form the new Local Plan.
- The University should be treated as a prescribed body for the purposes of discharging the duty.
Our response is that the University is not one of the bodies set out in the guidance as a prescribed body for the purposes of discharging the duty to cooperate. We do acknowledge the valuable contribution that the University makes and will continue to work in partnership.

- You need to work with neighbouring authorities including the County Council
Our response is that we will continue to cooperate and work in partnership with neighbouring authorities including the County Council to help discharge our responsibilities under the Duty to Cooperate.

- Housing assessment should not take into account need arising from other council areas
Our response is that we have to make provision for all need in the borough where it arises. We have no power to stop people moving into the borough from other areas and we have to reflect the reality of the situation including making an allowance for in migration.

- Bus providers should be treated as prescribed bodies
Our response is that the Bus providers are not one of the bodies set out in the guidance as a prescribed body for the purposes of discharging the duty to cooperate. We do acknowledge the valuable contribution that Bus providers make and will continue to work in partnership with them to ensure that adequate and appropriate services continue to be provided.

- Cooperation is required over the issue of accommodation for travellers
Our response is that we are in active cooperation with our neighbours over the issue of Traveller accommodation. We have agreed a common methodology to help us accurately assess the demand for traveller accommodation.

Planning for Sites and spatial options

In this section we asked questions about the choices of differing spatial options; sites in and around the urban areas, within villages and on previously developed sites in the countryside; sites surrounding Ash and Tongham; alteration of the Green Belt boundaries; sites next to the Guildford Urban Area; sites surrounding villages; potential development areas around settlements in neighbouring boroughs; significant expansion of existing villages; the provision of a new settlement; the provision of park and ride in Worplesdon; the provision of SANG; land for burials and cremations; land for allotments and land for open space. The specific questions asked were:

24. Which of these choices do you think are most appropriate and are there any others we should be considering?
25. Are you aware of any other land in the existing urban areas of Guildford, Ash and Tongham, within the existing boundaries of our villages or previously developed land in the countryside that could help meet our future needs?
26. Do you support using land surrounding Ash and Tongham to help meet our future needs and is there any other land we should be considering?
27. Should we alter the Green Belt boundaries to make the changes detailed?
28. Do you think we should develop this land to help meet our future needs or are there other more suitable sites?
29. Do you think that we should develop this land to help meet our future needs or are there other more suitable sites?

30. Do you we should do more work to assess potential development areas around other villages and settlements
31. Do you think we should do more work to assess potential development areas such as those outlined in the Issues and Options document and is there any other land we should be considering?
32. Do you think we should do more work to assess a potential development area, large enough to be a new settlement at the former Wisley airfield and or elsewhere?
33. Do you support a new Park and Ride in the Worplesdon area or is there other land we should be considering?
34. Do you know of any potential SANG in the borough and can you suggest a location for a small car park for Effingham Common SANG
35. Do you support the use of this land to help meet our future burial and cremation needs or is there other land we should be considering?
36. Do you support the use of this land to help meet our future allotment needs or is there other land we should be considering?
37. Do you know of any more land that we should consider for open space to help meet future needs?

The main themes emerging can be summarised as follows:

- Support for the redevelopment of buildings and spaces in the towns and villages
Our response is that we welcome support for the redevelopment of buildings and spaces in towns and villages, as this is often the most sustainable choice for development.
- None of the choices make an appropriate level of provision for housing as they are all too high
- **Our response is** that we need to make provision for our identified level of need. We have identified the need we need to accommodate according to best practice and in line with current guidance. We will then need to assess how much of that need the borough can accommodate in a sustainable manner.
- Objection to any development that impacts on the AONB., Green Belt and AGLV
Our response is that given the borough is 89 per cent Green Belt and 46 per cent AONB it is unlikely that any level of development however low will impact on the designated areas. It is the role of the Local Plan to balance the competing demands of protecting and enhancing our environment and accommodating our identified level of need.
- It is not possible to object or support any of the choices in the absence of a housing number
Our response is that it would be premature at this initial stage in the Local Plan process to prescribe what the housing number should be. We will look at all the evidence we receive and at our research to determine what the appropriate level of new homes should be.

- An allowance should be made for windfall development
Our response is that the regulations have recently changed regarding windfall development so we will be reassessing how we incorporate this element into our calculations.
- The SHLAA needs updating to show all available land for development
Our response is that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will be updated on an annual basis to reflect the most up to date assessment of land that is available for development to help meet our identified need.
- Concern about the cumulative impact of new housing and other development
Our response is that it is the role of the Local Plan to balance the competing demands of protecting the environment and accommodating our identified need and this includes carefully assessing the impact of new housing and other development on the local area and beyond.
- Countryside beyond the Green Belt should continue to be protected from development
Our response is that Countryside Beyond the Green Belt (CBGB) is a local designation that is given a relatively high level of protection in the Local Plan (2003) but which is no longer consistent with national policy. Given the important status that the Green Belt designation has in the National Planning Policy Framework it is important that we assess the extent to which this land could accommodate future growth thereby reducing where possible the reliance on Green belt land.
- Support for the provision of new Green Belt land
Our response is that we support in principle the idea of new Green Belt but any land designated as such should fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in guidance and legislation.
- Objection to the use of blanket densities
Our response is that wherever possible we have used densities calculated on an individual site basis, but we acknowledge that the GBCS uses a blanket density figure of 40 dwellings per acre. As our spatial strategy develops we will be able to consider appropriate densities for development sites.
- Support for the development of higher densities in urban areas
Our response is that we acknowledge that higher densities can be achieved in the urban areas but this cannot be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. Higher densities are not always appropriate bearing in mind the impact on townscape and landscape matters.
- Objection to the development of certain sites including Wisley, Ash and Tongham, Gosden Hill, Blackwell Farm, Gunners Farm, Bullens Hill Farm, land north and south of Salt Box Road, West Clandon. Pewley Down, Aldi in Burpham and Waitrose in Guildford Town Centre, Wood Street Village, Shalford, Chilworth. Park and ride at Worplesdon,

Our response is that we acknowledge that there are sites that people would wish see not be developed but the Local Plan has to seek to direct development towards the most sustainable locations. Determination of the spatial strategy will take into consideration all relevant factors.

- Outstanding planning permissions should be implemented before any new permission is granted
Our response is that we currently have no powers to insist on the implementation of extant planning permissions before granting any new consents. We will however continue to encourage developers to build out any existing permissions where development remains viable and sustainable.
- Provision should be made for more natural and green cemeteries
Our response is that we need to continue to seek additional capacity in the borough for natural and green burial space as well as traditional burial space and crematoria. Consideration will be given as to whether developers of any strategic sites will be required to provide or contribute towards the provision of burial space.
- There is a need for an assessment of open space across the borough
Our response is that we acknowledge that we need to assess the provision of open space including Blue and Green infrastructure so that we can plan properly for the provision of any additional open space required due to the impact of new development. This will include assessing where deficiencies in provision occur and how this can be met.

Making it happen

In this section we asked questions about what other issues the Local Plan should look at; what issues should be covered in the Development Control part of the Local Plan; and information about delivery of the Community Infrastructure Levy. The specific questions asked were:

38. Do you think there are other issues we should be looking at as part of the Local Plan Strategy and Sites document?
39. Do you think there are other issues we should be looking at as part of the Local Plan Development Control Policies Document?
40. Do you have comments on the delivery information , including the future work to develop our CIL?

The main themes included:

- There is a need for a Town Masterplan
Our response is that whilst we acknowledge that the Town Centre requires a bespoke approach a Masterplan cannot make any site allocations or prescribe any policy approach as this is the role of the Local Plan. Consultants have been appointed to produce a Town Centre vision which will lead to a Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document.

- The Surrey Hills AONB needs greater emphasis
Our response is that **we** acknowledge that the AONB is amongst the most strongly protected land in the country from major development due to its nationally important landscape value. We are not suggesting that major development occurs within the AONB.
- The Green Belt needs greater protection
Our response is that whilst our plan will recognise the enormous value that the Surrey Hills AONB landscape and the Green Belt makes to the character of the borough, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 also requires us to plan positively, i.e. not simply be protectionist and say no to development. It requires us to make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of the area. This is one of the tests to which our draft plan will be subjected to, at independent examination in order for us to be able to adopt a new local plan
- Current infrastructure is inadequate especially transport
Our response is that we acknowledge that there are issues with the current level and capacity of infrastructure but the plan must be positively prepared and forward looking. We will continue to work with partners such as the Highways Agency and Surrey County Council as the Highways Authority to ensure that issues relating to infrastructure especially transport related infrastructure is adequately addressed.
- Local designations should be protected and enhanced.
Our response is the NPPF says distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites so that protection is commensurate with their status. AGLV is a local designation and we will consider how we will take protection of this area forward. We will not be able to give AGLV the same status as other national or international designations.
- Development should be sustainable
Our response is that we are required to produce a plan in conformity with the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development is the central theme of the NPPF. The Local Plan will therefore reflect that theme in its overall strategy and in the detailed policies and will direct development towards the most sustainable locations
- Guildford should retain its character
Our response is that the Local Plan will aim to protect and enhance the character of Guildford whilst at the same time seeking to balance the need to accommodate our objectively assessed level of development.
- The current Local Plan should be rolled forward
Our response is that we cannot simply roll the extant 2003 Local Plan forward. There have been considerable changes in both legislation such as the Localism Act since the adoption of the 2003 Local Plan and in guidance such as the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance, which

means that the policy approaches adopted in 2003 are not necessarily in conformity with current guidance and legislation

- CIL must be affordable and must not affect the cost of new homes
Our response is that CIL will be subject to a viability assessment that will look at the affordability of the charging levy and its impact on house prices and supply of new homes.
- Delay in implementing CIL must not be allowed to adversely affect the provision of infrastructure
Our response is that we are progressing the adoption of a CIL charging schedule alongside the production of the Local Plan. CIL has a long legal process that must be followed to ensure that the proposed level of charging is viable and achievable and that we have identified appropriate projects to be funded by CIL.
- Development should be conditional upon the provision of appropriate infrastructure
Our response is that we will require the provision of adequate and appropriate infrastructure to accompany major development proposals and will provide for all development to contribute towards the funding required through Section 106 Legal Agreements or CIL as appropriate.

Any other views

This section sought to determine if there were any other matters that did not fit into any of the other questions posed. There were several campaigns submitted and these have been dealt with under this question. The specific question asked:

41. Do you have any other comments or suggestions you wish to make on matters not covered by other questions in this consultation?

The main themes emerging include:

- Diagrams in Appendix D are misleading as they are at different scales
Our response is that the diagrams in Appendix D are of differing scales as the sites vary in size considerably. The commentary alongside each site form illustrates the scale of the site and the scale of development that has been used as an illustration of what site capacity might be.
- Consultation on the Issues and Options has been inadequate
Our response is that consultation on the Issues and Options has exceeded the statutory requirement by a large margin. The Issues and Options featured in three separate articles in About Guildford, was the subject of a major publicity campaign and had a very wide consultation exercise associated with it. Workshops and pop up events were held around the Borough and a leaflet campaign was also carried out. In addition a separate youth engagement strategy was devised and followed and particular efforts were undertaken to reach hard to reach groups.

- West Horsley should be kept in the Green Belt
Our response is that the NPPF gives us a very clear direction about how villages in the Green Belt should be treated. The suggestion that West Horsley is inset into the Green Belt is in line with the NPPF.
- Chilworth should be protected from inappropriate development
Our response is We acknowledge that there is a conservation area, and we need to relook at whether it should remain as a potential development option. This will be done as part of further work on the Green Belt and Countryside Study (volume V). We will take account of the findings of this as we update the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, and move towards preparing a draft Local Plan.
- Save the Hogs Back and remove it from the consultation
Our response is that the consultation exercise on the Issues and Options has concluded and that it was carried out containing a suggestion that development might occur on Blackwell Farm. It is not possible to re run the consultation and remove this site as this would be considered premature in advance of any decisions being made about what the level and location of development should be.
- E22 and E23 must not be built on
Our response is that is that E22 and E23 have been identified as Potential Development Areas (PDAs) by the Green Belt and Countryside Study. This study is one part of the evidence base and no single part of the Evidence Base will dictate policy or direct development towards particular locations. There are a number of considerations that will need to be taken into account to determine what the level and location of development might be. At this stage in the process no decisions have been made about where and how much to build and it is therefore premature to rule in or out any particular sites.
- The questionnaire is too long and complicated
Our response is that we appreciate that the questionnaire has 41 questions in it and that it might be felt to be overly long and complicated. The Issues and Options by its very nature is seeking to ascertain what issues the Local Plan should deal with and what options might be available to deal with those issues. The questionnaire was not the only means of engaging in the consultation process. We will take on board all comments received about the consultation process in designing the consultation to accompany the publication of the draft Local Plan.

Appendix 1 Questionnaire

- 1 Understanding the borough of Guildford

Do you agree with the summary in Appendix B? If not can you please explain why?

2. Our research

Do you think the research listed in Appendix C appropriately covers what we need to know to write the new Local Plan? If not can you please explain why?

3. How do you want the borough to develop?

What are your views on a new vision for the Local plan and the possible objectives?

4. The right mix and density of homes

Which approach to the mix and density of housing do you think is appropriate?

5. Affordable homes

Which approach to affordable housing do you think is most appropriate?

6. Affordable homes

Would you support an increase in the proportion of affordable housing and the types of developments that are required to contribute towards affordable housing?

7. Affordable homes

Which approach to rural exception housing do you think is the most appropriate?

8. Homes for Travellers

Which approach to meeting Travellers' accommodation needs do you think is the most appropriate?

9. Homes for our aging population, vulnerable members of our community, students, low paid workers and young working people

Which approach to meeting the different accommodation needs of our community, including older people, students, low paid workers and young working people do you think is most appropriate?

10. Supporting our tourism, arts and cultural facilities

Are there any other issues that you think we should cover in relation to tourism, arts and cultural development – if so what are they?

11. Offices, industrial spaces and our rural community

Which approaches to meeting existing and new employment needs of our borough, including supporting the economy of the rural areas, do you think are most appropriate

12. Supporting our local centres, our district centres and Guildford Town Centre

Is this the correct approach to guide the future development of the town centre?

13. Supporting our local centres, our district centres and Guildford Town Centre

Would you support the proposed approaches to helping support our local centres, district centres and Guildford Town Centre?

14. Balancing development with traffic and congestion

Are there any other options we can consider to try and help balance development with traffic and congestion?

15. Minimising the impact of traffic congestion, promoting alternative ways of moving around and working with our partners

What approaches to addressing access and transport issues do you think are most appropriate?

16. Infrastructure and services provision

Are there any other options available to the Council for addressing infrastructure issues?

17. Green Belt, countryside, green open space and habitats

Which approaches to the Green Belt, countryside and green open spaces do you think are most appropriate?

18. Built environment

Which approaches to the built environment do you think are most appropriate?

19. Climate change and sustainability

Which approaches to dealing with climate change and sustainability do you think are most appropriate and have we missed anything out?

20. Settlement Hierarchy

Do you support using the Settlement Hierarchy to help us decide where new development should go or is there other research that we should rely on?

21. Villages in the Green Belt

Do you support using the GBCS to help us decide whether we should identify new settlement boundaries for our villages?

22. Ash Green

Which option do you think would be best for the long term future of Ash Green and its residents?

23. Duty to Cooperate

Do you agree with this analysis? Are you aware of any other strategic cross boundary issues you think we should be considering?

24. Spatial options

Which of these choices do you think are most appropriate and are there any others we should be considering?

25. Guildford, Ash, Tongham, the villages and previously developed land in the countryside

Are you aware of any other land in the existing urban areas of Guildford, Ash and Tongham, within the existing boundaries of our villages or previously developed land in the countryside what could help meet our future needs?

26. Land around Ash and Tongham (including countryside)

Do you support using more land surrounding Ash and Tongham to help meet our future needs and is there any other land we should be considering?

27. New Green Belt land

Should we alter the Green Belt boundaries to make the changes detailed?

28. Land surrounding Guildford urban area

Do you think that we should develop this land to help meet our future needs or are there other more suitable sites?

29. Land surrounding villages

Do you think we should develop this land to help meet our future needs or are there other more suitable sites?

30. Land surrounding villages

Do you think we should do more work to assess potential development areas around other villages and settlements?

31. Significant expansion of existing villages

Do you think we should do more work to assess potential development areas such as those outlined in the Issues and Options document and is there any other land we should be considering?

32. A new settlement

Do you think we should do more work to assess a potential development areas, large enough to be a new settlement, at the former Wisley Airfield and/or elsewhere?

33. Land for Park and Ride sites

Do you support a new Park and Ride in the Worplesdon area or is there other land we should be considering?

34. Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG)

Do you know of any potential SANG in the borough and can you suggest a location for a small car park for Effingham Common SANG?

35. Land for burials and cremations

Do you support the use of this land to help meet our future burial and cremation needs or is there other land we should be considering?

36. Allotments

Do you support the use of this land to help meet our future allotment needs or is there any other land we should be considering?

37. Open Space

Do you know of any more land that we should consider for open space to help meet future needs?

38. Making it happen

Do you think there are other issues we should be looking at as part of the Local Plan Strategy and Sites document?

39. Detailed policies

Do you think there are other issues we should be looking at as part of the Local Plan Development Control Policies document?

40. Implementation and monitoring

Do you have comments on the delivery information, including the future work to develop our CIL?

41. Any other views?

Do you have any other comments or suggestions you wish to make on matters not covered by other questions in this consultation?

Themes in representations

- Introduction
- Planning for economy and jobs
- Planning for infrastructure and services
- Planning for our town and villages
- Planning for sites and spatial options
- Any other views
- Planning for the homes we need
- Planning for access and transport
- Planning for the environment
- Cross Boundary issues
- Making it happen

