

23 MAY 2016

**BOROUGH, ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE EXECUTIVE  
ADVISORY BOARD**

23 May 2016

Councillor Jenny Wicks (Chairman)  
\* Councillor Liz Hogger (Vice-Chairman)

* Councillor Philip Brooker	Councillor Julia McShane
* Councillor Nils Christiansen	* Councillor Bob McShee
* Councillor Andrew Gomm	* Councillor Mike Parsons
* Councillor Angela Goodwin	* Councillor Mike Piper
Councillor Nigel Kearse	* Councillor Matthew Sarti

\*Present

**BEI4 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Nigel Kearse, Julia McShane and Jenny Wicks.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 23(j), Councillor Caroline Reeve attended as a substitute for Councillor Julia McShane.

Councillors Geoff Davis, Matt Furniss and Susan Parker were also in attendance.

**BEI5 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT AND DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE  
PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

No disclosures of interest were submitted.

**BEI6 MINUTES**

The minutes of the Board meeting held on 4 April, Special Meeting held on 13 April and 10 May 2016 were confirmed.

**BEI7 IMPLICATIONS FOR GUILDFORD OF THE 'SURREY INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY'**

The Interim Director of Development gave a presentation on the 'Surrey Infrastructure Study'.

The Board was invited to provide views/comments on the document and raised a number of questions, including:

- *How would the biggest funding gaps be met in the provision of railways and highway infrastructure?*
- Funding for railways was provided by the train operating companies and Network Rail. A capital shortfall was expected owing to the Guildford Station enhancement being pushed back. Investment in the local road network was provided via a very small pot of available funds from Surrey County Council. The rest of the funding would need to be sought from the Department for Transport, Highways England, S106, S278 or via directly delivered schemes such as Wisley, Gosden Hill, Blackwell Farm via SARP.

23 MAY 2016

- The Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance confirmed that the data provided in the Surrey Infrastructure Plan was now out of date. The caveats in relation to Guildford were detailed in full on page 132 of the plan. For example, we now know that motorway investment was planned via the Road Investment Strategy 1 as part of the Guildford Transport Strategy between the M25 and South West Quadrant.
- *Queried how it was possible that 1,540 people had migrated into Guildford on an annual basis?*
- This was not a net migration figure and represented the number of overseas university students coming to Guildford.
- *Would be helpful to map the population profile onto the housing stock.*
- *Queried why there was a 32% increase in demand for secondary school spaces versus only a 10% increase in demand for primary school places. Did not understand the lower differential for primary school places?*
- The 10% increase in demand for primary school places was reflective of the overall drop in birth rates.
- *Noted a shortfall of 15% was anticipated in provision of GP's and health services. Would like to understand how well Guildford was provided for?*
- The figure was based upon the time taken to get a doctor's appointment.
- *SARP had not been mentioned in relation to infrastructure funding, was that an error?*
- The Interim Director of Development confirmed that the document was not intended to be accurate but rather a sales document to obtain funding from central government.
- *M3 LEP GVA was quoted as £45 million per annum. How did this translate into LEP funds to invest?*
- The LEPs GVA had very little bearing on how the GVA worked. Growth funds 1 and 2 were based on central government allocations into each LEP. There may have been some consideration in relation to the GVA funds. Growth fund 3 was not allocated to an individual LEP and therefore LEPs had to make bids to central government based on specific schemes. Funding would be allocated accordingly regardless of whether the GVA funds amounted to 10 billion or 35 billion.
- *What was an opportunity area?*
- Opportunity areas, if established in your borough, can provide incentives such as cheaper borrowing, specialist consultant budgets to get development moving in a particularly difficult to develop area. There was no opportunity areas established in Guildford.
- *How confident was Guildford Borough Council that the infrastructural needs of an aging population would be met through the provision of GP surgeries, dentists and leisure facilities.*

- All developments had to take into account the necessary provision of GP Surgeries and dentist surgeries. Developers also had to provide SANG land – alternative natural greenspace. Surrey County Council was responsible for the provision of NHS and primary care. A development strategy was currently being drafted to facilitate more joined up care provision in response to budget increases and an aging population. Guildford Borough Council was responsible for the hard infrastructure.
- *In relation to special needs education and secondary school capacity, no mention had been made of the 18-25 year age group. However, an Education and Health Statement could be applied for so that people with special needs could stay in education up until the age of 25. What plans were there to increase such educational facilities within Guildford?*
- Later life and special education needs was a key growth area, funding for which would be made available via central government and Surrey County Council.
- *Poor broadband signal was identified as a problem in Guildford. How would the funding gap be met?*
- Guildford Borough Council was currently working with Virgin BT so that businesses could apply to get a grant for faster broadband. As additional faster broadband networks were installed for businesses, domestic customers would automatically benefit.
- *Why was Guildford one of the last boroughs in Surrey to implement CIL?*
- The data in the report was incorrect. Guildford Borough Council could not implement CIL until the new Local Plan was adopted. So far, only Kingston and Woking Borough Council had CIL contributions in place.
- *Questioned the value of looking at a report that was out of date. Concerned to know when Guildford's Infrastructure Plan would be available? Referred the Board to p104 and the projection of 9,300 new homes, which was in line with the ONS projection. There was an expectation that Surrey's housing increase would be significantly constrained within this set of infrastructure guidelines relative to the ONS projections. Referred the Board to p40, table 3.15, 9,300 new homes was already a significant increase than any of the other Surrey boroughs. Surrey considered that the infrastructure was inadequate and capacity was fundamental. By contrast, 14,000 homes were currently proposed in Guildford's Local Plan.*
- The Acting Chairman confirmed that the report was based on data derived from July 2015. The Acting Chairman recognised that there were many caveats in the report. It nevertheless provided a useful framework to look at what gaps remained and to recognise how much Guildford Borough Council had already done.
- The Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance referred the Board to page 132 of the Surrey Infrastructure Plan where a number of caveats were detailed. The data had been produced based on the previous version of the Guildford draft Local Plan. The housing numbers were much higher in that data set and taken from the highest range level. It was also based upon an employment lands needs assessment that had now been revised and significantly reduced. It was essential to get it right as additional housing was dependent upon adequate infrastructure being in place. Policies and conditions had been drafted with this in mind. Appendix C of

23 MAY 2016

the current draft local plan detailed the infrastructure plans providing estimates of costs, delivery schedules and the partners that Guildford Borough Council were working with to achieve it.

- *Concerned in relation to the strategy for schools adopted by the County Council in terms of allocating sufficient school places and funding. Whilst it was not a Guildford Borough Council function, it was essential that the County Council provided greater clarity and certainty on school places and funding streams.*
- The number of schools to be provided was dependent upon the amount of development proposed and the associated infrastructure. Delivery of schools and their funding could therefore change according to these external factors.
- *200 million had already been allocated in the first two phases of LEP funding. The LEP was now in its third phase of dealing with funding applications. Would appreciate a better understanding of how LEPs work and how they fit in with Guildford's infrastructure plans. There appeared to be a lack of transparency and accountability of LEPs.*
- The Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance agreed that Guildford Borough Council should look at ways to support the LEP in their decision-making processes.
- *Noted that a number of bus priority lanes were proposed. Would it not be better to fit buses with transponders to give them automatic priority as opposed to a bus lane that only got used 20% of the time.*
- Acknowledged that technology was changing all of the time and could be looked at as part of the Sustainable Transport Strategy.

The Board acknowledged that the Surrey Infrastructure Study had provided a useful framework to look at the infrastructural challenges that faced Guildford whilst also acknowledging the number of caveats that existed. The Board also recognised the significant work that had already been undertaken to bridge funding gaps and looked forward to the development and implementation of Guildford's Infrastructure Plan overall.

#### **BE18 GUILDFORD DESIGN GUIDE**

The Design and Conservation Team Leader gave a presentation on the Guildford Design Guide.

The Board was invited to provide views/comments on the document and raised a number of questions, including:

- Recognised the value and importance in the emergence of such a document. The Guide was hoped to give weight in the consideration of planning applications by the Planning Committee in addition to the existing Residential Design Guide.
- Anticipated that more planning applications would be submitted in the future with modern designs and therefore the Guildford Design Guide would provide a necessary benchmark.
- Advocated councillors visiting sites and buildings around the country that were more modern in their design.

23 MAY 2016

- Recommended that more landscaping, greenness and biodiversity should be introduced into the building designs within Guildford Town Centre.
- The guide would provide a level of quality assurance to ensure that materials used in any building works was of a good standard.
- What was good design within the context of the borough?
- Was interested to know how levels of lighting within Guildford Town could be controlled given that Guildford was located next to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- Was mindful that planning policy needed to reflect and meet the distinct design needs of the different areas of Guildford.
- The Interim Director of Development stated that the Residential Design Guide (2004) did not provide planners with a framework that outlined the design requirements of the town. The Guildford Design Guide would therefore assist with this need.
- The Design and Conservation Team Leader also confirmed that sustainability would be part of any design criteria and implicit to it.
- Welcomed the creation of additional public spaces around Guildford Town with good quality landscaping and seating.
- Important to ensure that modern design was integrated well into the overall variety of designs within the borough. The Guildford Design Guide would therefore provide a set of principles by which this could be achieved.
- The Interim Director of Development confirmed that the Town Centre Regeneration Plan would look at how different materials could be used so to respect the heritage quarter.
- A dark sky policy had already been adopted by Effingham's Neighbourhood Plan and would endorse it being adopted borough wide.
- Would support further work to be undertaken to ensure that the design of off-street parking schemes was not so intrusive on the street-scene overall.
- Was it possible to provide guidelines on how to make smaller homes look like larger homes so that the desire to extend was negated?
- Advocated the need for more communal spaces and play areas.
- The Design and Conservation Team Leader confirmed that shared spaces and parking courts would become more of an issue going forward and therefore appropriate guidance would be drafted.
- Endorsed the creation of additional homes for the elderly in town centre locations close to essential amenities. It was anticipated that if more older people moved to the town centre, homes would be freed up for younger families.

The Board fully endorsed the following recommendation for the Executive to consider at their meeting on 19 July 2016.

- (1) That a working group was established to oversee the emergence of the Guildford Design Guide, ensuring that it was comprised of enforceable policies that carried planning weight, rather than a guidance document per se.

#### **BEI9 EAB WORK PROGRAMME**

The Acting Chairman noted that the Board had reviewed a number of topics so far, some issues were at the early stages of policy development and others were close to completion. It was important that a balance was struck in the items detailed in the work programme moving forward. It was also imperative that the Board worked more closely with Executive members. The original proposal was that Executive members would act as Chairperson(s) of the respective Advisory Boards, but was changed for very good reasons. The Acting Chairperson wished to work in partnership with Executive members and invited comments from Board members on the mechanisms by which the work programme was put together.

23 MAY 2016

The Board noted that where Executive members may have a view on an issue coming forward on the work programme it would be useful for such information to be circulated to the Board in advance of the meeting. This would ensure that a more meaningful discussion would be held by the Board in close consultation with the appropriate Executive member(s).

In anticipation of the next meeting on 11 July 2016, it was noted that Guildford's Parking Strategy was on the agenda, as requested by the Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance. The Interim Director of Development stated that the draft parking strategy would be ready for circulation mid-June.

The Board also noted that plans were in place to ensure that the appropriate Executive member(s) were invited to Agenda Setting Meetings of the Executive Advisory Boards and Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings.

The meeting finished at 8.45 pm

Signed .....

Date .....

Chairman