

20 FEBRUARY 2017

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

20 February 2017

- \* 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

**BEI55 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

Councillors Philip Brooker, Angela Goodwin and Julia McShane submitted apologies for absence.

In accordance with procedure rule 23(j), Councillor Jennifer Jordon attended as a substitute on behalf of Councillor Philip Brooker and Councillor Caroline Reeves attended as a substitute on behalf of Councillor Angela Goodwin.

Councillors Matt Furniss (Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance), Geoff Davis (Lead Councillor for Asset Management) and Michael Illman (Lead Councillor for Finance) were in attendance.

**BEI56 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT AND DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE  
PECUNIARY INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest.

**BEI57 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 January 2017 were confirmed as a true record and were signed by the Chairman.

**BEI58 GUILDFORD DESIGN GUIDE (2017) - PROGRESS AND PROPOSALS**

The item was presented by the Urban Design Officer. The Design and Conservation Team Leader was in attendance. Councillor Paul Spooner, the Leader of the Council and the Lead Councillor for Planning and Regeneration sent apologies for absence.

The Board heard that the existing Design Guide was published in 2004 and had a number of shortcomings such as being limited to residential buildings, being out of date in terms of policy and having poor readability. For this reason, the existing guide was rarely used by

20 FEBRUARY 2017

developers. Consequently, a new Guildford Borough Council Design Guide would be drafted and a proposed format was presented to the Board. Design guides from other councils were also presented and it was suggested ideas from elsewhere might provide useful new ways to set out good and bad design using graphics, images and checklists.

The Chairman pointed out that the new guide would be a key document and would have influence on future developments in the Borough. The Board was asked to consider and comment on the proposed new format and approach, and on the proposal to form a working group to support the ongoing work.

The Board made the following comments:

1. The new guide should be readable and accessible to all.
2. Although the new guide would not cover non-residential buildings in great detail, it was noted some aspects of the guide would apply to both residential and non-residential alike and that buildings regulations also covered context and character.
3. On the question of influence over internal aspects of design such as room size, the Board heard that nationally prescribed internal space standards was already under consideration. It was possible that this aspect would be included as a policy document in D4 Local Plan policies.
4. It was suggested the new guide might consider providing guidance on the appropriate height of buildings according to context, although it was acknowledged this might prove challenging to apply borough-wide.
5. It was proposed that the use of lighting and light pollution could be included in the new guide. Officers attending felt this was a possibility and look into further.
6. The new guide should have clear reference and relevance to development in rural areas as well as the town centre. Indeed, care should be taken to align guidance and Guildford Borough Council policy with Neighbourhood Plans. Villages should be treated as entities in their own right.
7. It was noted that requesting electric charging points for vehicles as standard would be a general policy matter and not for the guide.

The initiative was generally welcomed.

**RESOLVED:**

At first draft stage the Board would consider if a task group should be convened.

### **BEI59 SUSTAINABLE MOVEMENT CORRIDOR**

The item was presented by the Major Projects Portfolio Manager.

It was explained that the concept of a Sustainable Movement Corridor (SMC) was initially proposed by consultants ARUP within the Guildford Town and Approaches Movement Study (GTAMS) which was prepared for the Council in 2015. The objective of the SMC was to provide a clear pathway for different modes of transport to move between key points in the town centre and from one side of the town to the other. There was a priority for sustainable modes of transport which would encourage modal shift and reduce reliance on the private car, improve air quality, road safety, journey times and predictability. The idea of the SMC

20 FEBRUARY 2017

was accepted by the Council as an ambition to work towards. For assessment and delivery purposes the SMC had been broken into six segments geographically as east, west, north south and central sections. It was planned that the majority of the SMC would be funded by the developments proposed in the draft Local Plan and from New Homes Bonus and would be further designed in anticipation of that growth.

Indicative timescales to achieve the entire SMC ran up to 2025, however an economic case had successfully been put to EM3 Local Enterprise Partnership resulting in some funding being made available through the Local Growth Fund (LGF) round 3 towards the delivery of the western section. The LGF grant funding would need to be spent by 2021. It was noted that should the development at Blackwell Farm go ahead then further work to the western section would be required.

The sections of the SMC remained largely conceptual, but once properly planned, a programme of stakeholder and public consultation was proposed.

There was an officer resource working on the SMC who was shared with Surrey County Council.

The Board were asked to comment on the SMC. The Board made the following comments:

1. The Board unanimously welcomed the idea of the SMC.
2. There was a risk of the SMC not being achieved if the developments proposed in the draft Local Plan did not go ahead. As an important, strategic piece of work there should be other funding proposals in place.
3. It would be important to ensure that the SMC consultation was not lost amid a raft of other pieces of consultation being launched by the Council. It was felt to be too important.
4. Traffic modelling would be undertaken to anticipate the influence on traffic flow once the sections of the SMC began to impact, but it seemed likely there would be a period of time when congestion could get worse before it would get better.
5. The bus bay on Egerton Road should be looked at as a part of the western section work as there was a risk to other road users and pedestrians.
6. Are there some 'quick wins'? Could cycle routes be looked at sooner and linked up by using quieter, residential streets. Cycling to the Horsleys was described as currently dangerous.
7. The southern section should be the next section progressed as planning permission for the new development at Dunsfold had been granted. It was noted that there had been a developer contribution agreed from the recent Dunsfold aerodrome planning permission (Waverley BC) of £5 million to mitigate the impacts of increased traffic flow from the south side of the town centre.
8. The mix of cyclists and pedestrians using an underpass alongside motor vehicles met with some concern for reasons of safety and air quality. Specifically, the example discussed was the tunnel under the A3 near the University and Hospital.
9. It was asked if roundabouts could be remodelled to enable greater options of priority. Similarly, if bus lanes could offer a mix of priorities to ensure that there were not empty lanes when traffic was waiting.

20 FEBRUARY 2017

The Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance said that the SMC would link up public transport hubs, cycle paths, business districts and Park and Ride services. He added that bus companies were wanting to invest and that 30% of people in Guildford have said they would shift to sustainable transport if it were safe to do so and if journey times could be reliable.

Written comments were also received from the Guildford Society and the Guildford Cycle Campaign.

**BEI60 UPDATE/PROGRESS WITH MATTERS PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED BY THE BOROUGH, ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE - EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD**

The update paper was noted.

**BEI61 EAB WORK PROGRAMME**

The work programme was noted.

The meeting finished at 9.00 pm

Signed .....

Chairman

Date .....