

**Guildford Borough Council**

**Planning Contributions  
Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)  
Update 2016**

**Consultation Statement**

**September 2017**

Prepared in accordance with Regulation 12 of the  
Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012

**If you would like this document in a different format, different language, Braille, large print or audio, please contact the Planning Policy Team on 01483 444471**

## **CONTENTS**

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Preparing the SPD Update	2
3.	Responses to the formal consultation on the draft SPD	2

## Introduction

- 1.1 We have prepared this consultation statement in accordance with Regulation 12(a) of the **Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012** (SI No 767, 2012). All references to “regulation(s)” in this document are to these Regulations unless otherwise stated.
- 1.2 Regulation 12(a) requires that before we adopt a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), including a revision of a SPD we must prepare a statement setting out:
- the persons whom the authority consulted when **preparing** the SPD;
  - a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
  - how those issues have been addressed in the SPD.

## Preparing the SPD Update

- 2.1 In preparing the Planning Contributions Update SPD, we involved, and sought views on early drafts from the organisations and individuals listed in **Table 1**. The main issues they raised are included in the table below. The suggestions were incorporated into the draft SPD for consultation.

**Table 1 : Those consulted in preparing the draft SPD**

Who we consulted	Their response
<b>GBC Housing Services</b>	Reviewed draft section on affordable housing and suggested improvements
<b>GBC Waste collection services</b>	Provided an updated draft chapter
<b>GBC Head of Development Management</b>	Provided comments on draft of SPD, mainly relating to Section 2
<b>GBC Policy and Partnerships Officer</b>	Provided wording on Corporate Plan
<b>GBC Arts Officer</b>	Provided suggested wording and examples for public art
<b>GBC Conservation and Design Manager</b>	Reviewed draft chapter on public realm
<b>SCC Spatial Planning Team</b>	Reviewed original 2011 SPD and suggested some changes to the sections on County Infrastructure planning obligations

- 2.2 In preparing the draft Planning Contributions SPD Update, we carried out screening to

consider whether a full Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), Habitats Directive Assessment (HRA), and / or Equalities Statement would be needed under the relevant legislation. We consulted the three “environmental bodies”, Natural England, Heritage England and the Environment Agency in confirming the SEA and HRA screening opinions.

- 2.3 On adoption, the SPD will supersede the existing Planning Contributions SPD, March 2011, which we will withdraw in accordance with the relevant Regulations.

### **Formal consultation on the draft SPD**

- 3.1 We held a four-week consultation on the draft SPD between 19 September 2016 (midday) and 17 October (11.59pm), under Regulations 12 and 13. We advised those local residents, businesses, residents and amenity groups, and other members of the public and relevant organisations whose details we hold on our [Get Involved website](#) of the consultation. We sent over 16,000 emails and letters, depending on the contact information that had been provided. This includes the many organisations that the Regulations classify as “specific consultees”, including Natural England, the Environment Agency and Heritage England with particular regard to the draft Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Appraisal screening.
- 3.2 We also publicised the consultation on the Council’s website, and made the consultation and supporting documents available in the four libraries in the borough, and in the main Council office at Millmead for the duration of the consultation period. These arrangements were in accordance with our [Community Involvement in Planning](#), June 2013.
- 3.3 Section 23(1) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides that :

The local planning authority may adopt a local development document (other than a development plan document) either as originally prepared or as modified to take account of :

- (a) any representations made in relation to the document (see **Table 2** below);
  - (b) **any other matter they think is relevant** (see **Table 3** below);
- Regulations 11(2) and 14 of the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulation 2012 state that an adoption statement must be provided to clarify any modifications made.

- 3.4 **We considered the 28 comments that we received** from specific and general consultees, and made amendments to the draft SPD update arising from these. A summary of the main issues raised by the 28 responses received is presented in **Table 2** below. The Council’s Legal Services department also suggested some non-material comments and amendments during the consultation period, and the draft SPD has been updated with these amendments in the final version. In accordance with Regulation 11, we also amended the draft SPD to account for the other matters we thought relevant, as set out in **Table 3** below.

**Table 2 :Consultation responses from specific and general consultees with resultant changes made to the draft SPD**

Respondent	Main issues raised	How the issues raised have been addressed in the SPD
Ash Parish Council	Ash Parish Council Planning Committee has considered this consultation document and has no objections.	Noted, thank you for your consideration of the draft document.
Ashill Land Ltd	<p>This representation should be read in accordance with our response made to the draft Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance Strategy SPD and the draft Planning Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2016.</p> <p>We have concern regarding the approach and proposed implementation of <u>affordable housing contribution on brownfield sites</u> including the deduction of existing vacant buildings from the affordable housing requirement in Paragraph 2.28 of the draft SPD. Ashill Land Ltd supports the principle of utilising <u>Vacant Building Credit</u> for brownfield developments.</p> <p>The NPPG states that Vacant Building Credit can be claimed for empty buildings brought back into lawful use or demolished for redevelopment: the developer should be offered a financial credit equivalent to the existing gross floorspace of those vacant buildings when the local planning authority calculates any affordable housing contribution, which will be sought. This is an incentive for brownfield development on sites containing vacant buildings; however its operation needs to be clarified further by the LPA and further guidance is required within the SPD as to how it will apply in the Guildford area.</p> <p>Though we support the comment made at paragraph 5.51 that the Council will deduct the existing gross floorspace of existing vacant buildings from the affordable housing requirement we would seek greater clarification as to its implementation and operation alongside</p>	<p>Additional wording has been added to SPD to reflect the national guidance provided by the PPG.</p>

	<p>the draft Guildford Local Plan. This change will allow smaller brownfield sites to become viable.</p> <p>Ashill Land Ltd would also argue that other discountable measures can be applied such as affordable care home provision (Use Class C2) which meets an identified need. In such cases, and to ensure such development remains viable and deliverable to the developer this should be offset against affordable housing or CIL requirement as per paragraph 173 of NPPF.</p> <p>Ashill Land Ltd generally supports steps taken to provide greater clarification on the SANG provision in the Guildford area. It is however requested that further consideration be given to any development that can be discounted from the development thresholds and offset against the SANG requirement, such as sites delivered through the site allocation process.</p> <p>In respect to developer contributions considered necessary to make development acceptable in planning terms paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework, planning conditions and obligations, states that, 'Local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition'. Paragraph 204 reinforces the required tests under which planning obligations should be sought.</p> <p>The national planning practice guidance reinforces legislative restrictions set out earlier and provides:          'In all case including where tariff style charges are sought, the local planning authority must ensure that the obligation meets the relevant</p>	<p>As noted in paragraph 5.57 in the Section relating to Affordable Housing, there is no requirement under Policy H11 for C2 care homes or nursing homes to provide affordable housing.</p> <p>Each requirement set out in this SPD should be met. We will consider each planning application on its individual merits, and will consider development viability when determining applications and negotiating planning obligations.</p> <p>The SPD sets out that we will only secure planning obligations that meet the relevant tests.</p> <p>Agreed; this is reflected in the SPD. We stress that this must be read alongside the PPG advice that the land value of a site should reflect policy requirements,</p>
--	---	--

	<p>tests for planning obligations in that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. Planning obligations should not be sought – on for instance, <u>public art</u> – which are clearly not necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>The Government is clear that obligations must be fully justified and evidenced. Where affordable housing contributions are being sought, obligations should not prevent development from going forward’</p> <p>As planning obligation should only be legitimately secured by a local authority where it is necessary to make a development acceptable in planning terms, and the NPPG specifically highlights <u>public art</u>, Ashill Land Ltd object to this requirement on this basis subject to further review of the Council’s S106 requirements.</p>	<p>planning obligation requirements, and where applicable the CIL, as referred to in the SPD.</p> <p>As we have an adopted policy and suitably robust evidence to support such a requirement, the Council is assured that it may legitimately require provision of public art in some developments, on a case-by-case basis, and subject to the planning obligation pooling restrictions.</p>
<p>CPRE Surrey Branch and Guildford District</p>	<p>CPRE has been unable to respond to all aspects of this proposed new strategy in time to meet the deadline concerned. We have therefore only commented on a selection of points with which we have some familiarity.</p> <p>We have previously made submissions to GBC concerning a number of proposed SANG applications including at the Chancies, Russell Place Farm, Effingham Common, Burpham Court Farm, and Tyting Farm.</p> <p>CPRE is a long-standing member of the Open Spaces Society who are experts on registered common issues such as at Effingham involving public rights of access. We think that the proposal in the draft strategy not to use commons for SANGs outside the Thames Basin Heaths needs further explanation. We do, however, agree that</p>	<p>This comment is directed at the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy 2017 SPD, which was consulted upon at the same time as the Contributions SPD 2016.</p> <p>A response to this comment can be seen on page 155 of the consultation statement for the strategy, available here: <a href="https://www.guildford.gov.uk/tbhspa">https://www.guildford.gov.uk/tbhspa</a>.</p>



Effingham Common should not be used.

We do not understand why there is no evidence supplied on how far the previous strategy has been successful to date in achieving its objectives. We have noted that advertising boards have appeared for “commercial dog walkers” in the vicinity of a number of commons locations, which fall within the Thames Basin Heaths area in Worplesdon. This suggests that the strategy to date has not been effective. Surely, some better assessment should inform the new strategy with regard to long standing SANGs such as the success or otherwise of the Chuntries.

We question how the large amount of income from the existing SANGs will be spent on their maintenance. We ask ourselves how the substantial surpluses generated can legally be spent elsewhere under the present arrangements.

We are surprised that there seems to be no linkage between the draft local plan proposals for housing and the availability of SANG provision.

We support the retention of the 43 hectares of Tyting Farm for agricultural use, and are informed by the Tyting Society about the ongoing discussions with GBC about their possible suitability as a SANG, but wonder how this can be made compatible with dog-walking when these Green Belt fields within the Surrey Hills AONB are used for grazing cattle from the Surrey Wildlife Trust.

As an advisory member of the Surrey Hills AONB Board and former Chairman of the Tyting Society, I should like to know whether Planning Adviser Clive Smith has been asked to consult on this matter. We are also concerned about the acceptability of existing

	<p>parking in “the western sector” of Tyting Farm off Halfpenny Lane, which is used by St Martha’s church for services, weddings, and concerts. Has this issue been discussed with the Church Wardens concerned? Other road traffic issues need also to be considered.</p> <p>We are concerned as to the implications of charging for car parking at beauty spots in the Surrey Hills AONB as this could lead to the possible alternative use of free car parking for SANGs sites in adjacent areas.</p> <p>We have been surprised to learn from the Seale and Sands PC that proposals have been made at Runfold to use landfill sites, which are still under restoration, for SANGs. It is our understanding that this would be completely inappropriate and may involve “duty to cooperate” issues with neighbouring district councils. We believe that under current legislation landfill sites cannot be used as recreational open spaces. Here again Surrey Hills AONB implications may also need to be considered.</p> <p>We remain unconvinced that Russell Place Farm should have ever been considered appropriate as a SANG. Our objection still stands in this context.</p>	
Education Funding Agency	<p>The EFA welcomes the opportunity to contribute to the development of planning policy at the local level.</p> <p>The EFA was established in 2012 to help the government achieve its schools objectives by delivering effective capital programmes that improve the condition of existing buildings and support the creation of new places for pupils and learners. The EFA manages £54 billion of funding a year to support all state-provided education for 8 million children aged 3 to 16, and 1.6 million young people aged 16 to 19.</p>	<p>Thank you for your helpful response. We welcome ongoing work with the EFA to assist in delivering the new schools needed to support the housing development planned in the emerging Local Plan Strategy and Sites.</p>

	<p>The EFA aims to work closely with local authority education departments and planning authorities to meet the demand for new school places and new schools. As such, the EFA puts forward the following comments in response to the above consultation document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EFA strongly supports reference within the document (Section 17) to the use of planning obligations to secure developer contributions to education facilities where housing development generates the need for school places. The EFA acknowledges the pupil yield calculator Surrey County Council currently uses to seek s106 contributions and supports this approach in principle. The EFA suggests reference is made to the child yield calculator within Section 17 of the SPD.</li> <li>• It would be helpful if the key strategic policies to secure developer contributions are also explicitly referenced or signposted within the document. The NPPF (paragraph 72) notes that local planning authorities (LPAs) should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of communities, and that LPAs should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools to widen choice in education.</li> <li>• The EFA notes that significant growth in housing stock is expected in the borough, with 14,500 new homes anticipated between 2017-2033. The EFA welcomes the reference in Guildford’s Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (para 4.6.3) to schools as necessary infrastructure required to help deliver sustainable growth in the borough. The Guildford Draft Local Plan: Education Review (May 2016) also provides a useful background document setting out Guildford’s requirements for new schools over the plan period. This useful contextual data should be included or</li> </ul>	<p>We have added in an explanation of the child yield calculator within this section.</p> <p>Text has been added to reflect national planning policy.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>referenced within the Planning Contributions SPD update, to support the requirement for contributions to education provision. Ensuring adequate contributions and a supply of sites for schools is essential and will ensure that Guildford can swiftly and flexibly respond to existing and future need for school places to meet the needs of the borough over the plan period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In light of the above, the EFA would welcome continued engagement with Guildford BC during all stages of planning policy development to help guide the provision of new school infrastructure and to meet the predicted demand for primary and secondary school places. The EFA has previously responded to Guildford BC's Strategic Sites (June 2016) Local Plan consultation and supported the identification within that document of land for new schools and potential future expansions to those schools. In line with the Duty to Cooperate, please include the EFA as one of the relevant organisations with which you engage in preparation of the Local Plan and SPDs.</li> <li>• The EFA notes Guildford BC is currently preparing its CIL charging schedule and supports the inclusion on the draft Regulation 123 list of primary school provision on strategic sites allocated in the Local Plan. The EFA would be particularly interested in responding to any further review of infrastructure requirements, CIL draft charging schedule and (once adopted) any subsequent CIL review and/or amendments to the Regulation 123 list.</li> <li>• We hope that the above comments are helpful in shaping Guildford BC's Planning Contributions SPD update, with particular regard to the provision of new schools. The EFA looks forward to opportunities for continued involvement in the Local Plan process.</li> </ul>	<p>We welcome the involvement and assistance provided so far from the EFA in planning for school places to support the draft Local Plan Strategy and Sites.</p> <p>The draft 123 infrastructure list specifically excludes primary schools on strategic sites, as these will be delivered by a single developer to serve the needs arising from that strategic development.</p> <p>Expansions of existing primary schools to serve the cumulative needs of an area arising from multiple small developments are included on the draft 123 infrastructure list.</p> <p>We will continue to liaise with the EFA</p>
--	---	---

		regarding provision of new schools to support the delivery of the new local plan.
Environment Agency	<p><u>SEA/ HRA</u> We agree with the findings of the Guildford Borough Council Planning Contributions Supplementary Planning Document Update dated September 2016 and conclude that SEA and HRA are NOT REQUIRED for the Planning Contributions SPD.</p> <p><u>Draft SPD</u> We welcome and support the Planning Contributions SPD and the inclusion of Appendix 3: Guide for applicants: preparing flood risk sequential and exception tests. We also welcome Section 7 outlining flood risk and the relevant Local Plan policies.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 7.2</i> The draft SPD suggests that GBC will consult the Environment Agency on “all developments affecting floodplains of all main rivers”. This is incorrect; all planning application consultations to us should be in-line with the Development Management Procedure Order.</p> <p>We welcome that GBC acknowledges that there will be occasions when it is necessary to seek the views of the Borough Council engineers with respect to development proposals in the flood plain. We have been working closely with and supporting GBC engineers on a number of flood mitigation schemes and <u>would highlight the importance of partnership contributions from developers in order to implement those schemes.</u></p>	<p>Thank you for your confirmation.</p> <p>The draft SPD text has been updated to read, “The Council will consult the Environment Agency on developments affecting floodplains in accordance with the Development Management Procedure Order. On occasions it may be considered appropriate to seek the views of the Borough Council’s Engineers”.</p> <p>Added following text to paragraph 7.5 : “We will also seek contributions from relevant developments towards surface water flood alleviation schemes.”</p>

	<p><i>Paragraph 7.3</i>  We recommend that this section makes mention of and highlights the importance of climate change with respect to site-specific flood risk assessment. In February 2016 the Environment Agency updated its best practice guidance on climate change allowances and how these should be applied to site specific Flood Risk Assessments. This guidance is based on the UKCP09 data and findings as the best available, scientific, evidence to provide more representative climate change allowances for England and latest planning policy guidance. The ‘Flood Risk Assessments: Climate Change Allowances’ can be viewed at: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances</a></p> <p><u>Paragraph 7.9</u>  As of April 2015, the Environment Agency is no longer a statutory consultee on planning applications with respect to surface water. This</p>	<p>Updated the text to read :  “A site specific flood risk assessment supporting a development proposal must consider whether the development is likely to be affected by current or future flooding from any source – taking account of climate change, and whether the measures proposed to deal with these effects and risks are appropriate, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall.</p> <p>In February 2016 the Environment Agency updated its best practice guidance on climate change allowances and how these should be applied to site specific Flood Risk Assessments. This guidance is based on the UKCP09 data and findings as the best available, scientific, evidence to provide more representative climate change allowances for England and latest planning policy guidance. The ‘Flood Risk Assessments: Climate Change Allowances’ can be viewed at: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances</a>”</p> <p>Updated to, “The Council works with Surrey County Council (as the Lead Flood</p>
--	---	--

	<p>responsibility has been passed to Surrey County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority. This section should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p><u>Paragraphs 8.3, 8.4 and 8.5</u>  We welcome the recognition of the potential need to secure conditions to ensure that there is sufficient capacity within the sewerage network to connect developments to the network and that any necessary upgrades are in place ahead of development.</p> <p>Connection and extension of the public foul sewerage network is our preferred option as discharges from wastewater treatment plants owned and operated by sewerage undertakers are significantly less likely to cause pollution than discharges from private plants treating domestic sewage or trade effluent.</p> <p>This is because discharges from public sewerage systems are much more likely to meet the standards set in their environmental permit. The installation of private sewerage systems in circumstances where it is reasonable to connect to the public sewerage network is, therefore, not environmentally sustainable. However, where it is not reasonable to connect to the public foul sewer we may grant an environmental permit, as long as the proposed discharge is otherwise environmentally acceptable.</p> <p><u>Section 11 – Landscape and Biodiversity</u>  We welcome the mechanisms identified within the Planning Contributions SPD for ensuring compliance with the relevant Local Plan policies. However, there is little detail on how these are implemented for biodiversity and there is no mention of watercourses. We commented on GBCs draft Local Plan in July 2016 and</p>	<p>Authority) and developers to enable surface water run-off to be controlled as near to source as possible by the encouragement of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).”</p> <p>In further clarification from the EA, they say, “. To be more explicit we would like to see specific mention of the water environment in this section.”</p>
--	---	--

	<p>recommend that our comments are reflected in the review of this SPD.</p> <p><u>Appendix 3: Guide for applicants: preparing flood risk sequential and exception tests</u></p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of this Appendix to support applicants in preparing assessments of the flood risk sequential and exception tests, but also recommend that our comments on the draft Local Plan, July 2015, which include the need to take climate change into account, are considered in finalising this section of the SPD.</p>	<p>NOTE:</p> <p>In commenting on the Proposed Submission Local plan 2016 in relation to the draft Policy justification for Green and Blue Infrastructure, the EA stated “we welcome the production of a separate Development Management Policy (DMP) and a Green and Blue Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to set out how ecological networks will be managed and enhanced. We would like to be involved in this and suggest that separate policies and guidance are written for biodiversity and the water environment.</p> <p>This is noted for future Local Plan and SPD, it cannot be included in this SPD.</p> <p>At the end of “Given the anticipated impacts of climate change, it is likely that flood events will become more frequent and severe. Heavier rainfall in winter is expected to increase the hazards associated with flooding and the number of properties in the borough at risk of flooding. Higher peak river flows may also increase flood risk in some areas of the borough, whilst heavier rainfall could lead to more surface water flooding.” Added,</p>
--	--	--



	<p>Whilst the NPPF emphasises that “new development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the impacts arising from climate change” this is a sub-section of the requirements to meet the flood risk sequential and exception tests and it is not clear why this sentence has been used to open the introduction to these tests. The following sentence is much clearer with respect to the purpose of the flood risk sequential and exception tests. We recommend that reference to the need to consider the impacts of climate change within the flood risk sequential and exception tests is made later in this section.</p> <p><u>Figure 5: Flood risk vulnerability classification :</u> We suggest the addition of a note to the effect that where the applicant is not clear under which flood risk vulnerability classification a development is considered then they should seek clarification from the LPA to assist in preparing their assessment of the flood risk</p>	<p>“In February 2016 the Environment Agency updated its best practice guidance on climate change allowances and how these should be applied to site specific Flood Risk Assessments. This guidance is based on the UKCP09 data and findings as the best available, scientific, evidence to provide more representative climate change allowances for England and latest planning policy guidance. The ‘Flood Risk Assessments: Climate Change Allowances’ can be viewed at: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessments-climate-change-allowances</a>”</p> <p>Deleted first paragraph of section 2.0. At the end of section two, before the summary, added “ The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasises that new development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the impacts arising from climate change. The impacts of climate change within the flood risk sequential and exception tests should be considered. See the EA’s best practise guide (February 2016). “</p> <p>Under the table and key for figure 5, added, “If unclear which flood risk vulnerability classification should apply, it is recommended that clarification is</p>
--	---	--

	<p>sequential and exception tests and any Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).</p> <p><u>3.0 The borough context :</u>  We support the inclusion of the definitions of each flood zone as defined by the National Planning Practice Guidance. We would also recommend that GBCs definition of Flood Zone 3b is included within this section, or reference to the definition in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is provided.</p> <p>We welcome the mention of the impacts of climate change, and suggest that recommendation is made to applicants that they seek out the most recent climate change allowances guidance from the Environment Agency in preparing documents for submission with their planning application.</p> <p><u>6.0 Exception Test :</u>  The first bullet point does not read very clearly, should the second “informed” be “completed”?</p> <p><u>River Wey Modelling</u>  Please note the Environment Agency has recently undertaken updated detailed hydrological modelling of the ‘Middle Wey’ incorporating flood risk from River Wey, Guildford. The model outputs have recently been finalised and we have sent this to the planning department at GBC with whom we are working closely to develop a flood alleviation scheme in Guildford.</p> <p>Our intention is to update the flood map for the whole of the River Wey</p>	<p>sought from the Council”.</p> <p>In section 3, in the table in the definition of Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain, after “This zone comprises land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood” add “see <u>SFRA</u> for definition of the Flood Zone 3b, which distinguishes between 3b developed and 3b undeveloped”.</p> <p>The draft SPD has been amended to include reference in several places to recent guidance.</p> <p>Agree, updated.</p> <p>We have received the draft flood</p>
--	---	---

	<p>once all the modelling of the whole of the Wey catchment including the River Wey tributaries are completed. However, this not likely to be before summer 2017. We wish to note that it is likely that the existing flood zones in Guildford will be amended in the light of this.</p>	<p>modelling for the River Wey, and are aware that this is expected to be published in 2017.</p>
<p>Guildford Greenbelt Group</p>	<p>Detailed comments and statistics relating to the SEA and HRA screening of the draft Local Plan 2016.</p> <p>Response to Strategic Environmental Assessment &amp; Habitats Regulations Assessment Determination GGG consider that Appropriate Assessment is required and that the document to be inadequate in the following areas:</p> <p><u>Section 2 Habitats Regulations Assessment</u> <u>Para 2.2</u></p> <p>By claiming “an Appropriate Assessment is not required” the Council fails to appropriately consider the cumulative impact of proposed Policies and Sites outlined in the draft Guildford Local Plan within the 400m – 5 km “zone of influence” and its influence on the development of any TBHSPA ‘avoidance strategy’.</p> <p>The HRA referred to and proposed as the evidence document within the Guildford Draft Local Plan is deficient as follows:</p> <p>The lack of detailed assessment of proposed increased human population, introduction of large numbers of predatory species, introduction of a large number of species likely to cause major disturbance on the SPA in advance of policy formation within the HRA, demonstrates a failure of due consideration of such pathways. This renders the claim in Section 2 Habitats Regulations Assessment, para 2.2 that “there is no pathway which gives rise to significant effect either alone or in combination” unsafe and likely to be subject to scrutiny when the draft Guildford Local Plan is submitted for</p>	<p>Natural England, the statutory body responsible for the protected habitats is agreed that a HRA is not required for this SPD.</p> <p>The three “consultation bodies” specified in the relevant Regulations are agreed that a SEA is not needed for this SPD.</p> <p>These comments refer to the HRA and SEA screening of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area SPD. Please see the Consultation SPD for that SPD.</p>

	Examination in Public.	
Highways England	<p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN).</p> <p>The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>In the case of Guildford Borough Council, our interest is in the M25 and A3.</p> <p>We have no comments on the document itself, however for clarification we recommend that para 16.2 is amended.</p> <p>We are now Highways England not Highways Agency, and the highway authority for the A31 is Surrey County Council not Highways England.</p>	Suggested amendments made.
Historic England	In light of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, our view is that a SEA is not required in this instance.	Agreement of the SEA screening
<i>(Terence O'Rourke on behalf of)</i> M & G Real Estate	<p>The North Street redevelopment site is a priority for the Council in its Corporate Plan. It will play a key role in helping to deliver the Council's Vision for the Town Centre.</p> <p>This representation should be read in conjunction with representation made in July 2016 in regard to the Proposed Submission Local Plan and associated documents.</p>	

	<p>The draft SPDs do not present any new impacts onto the development. While there are minor changes from the original SPDs, we do not believe that these changes will have a detrimental impact on the proposed redevelopment of the North Street / Friary Centre and therefore we would like to submit our support for these SPDs.</p>	<p>Your support for the updated SPD is welcome.</p>
<p>Mole Valley District Council</p>	<p>We have no comments to make in this instance. Please note that this is an officer level response, which does not prejudice any future comments the Mole Valley District Council may make.</p>	<p>We acknowledge your response to the consultation.</p>
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Given the nature of these documents Natural England do not consider that a SEA or HRA will be required for the above-mentioned SPDs.</p>	<p>We welcome your agreement that this SPD update does not require a SEA nor HRA</p>
<p>Pegasus Life</p>	<p><u>Section 5 - Affordable Housing</u>  Paragraph 5.57 and the subsequent accompanying table sets out the qualifying developments for affordable housing provision. It states that affordable housing provision of 35% on site will generally be required from residential developments within the C3 Use Class over the size threshold in Policy H11 (Guildford Borough Local Plan January 2003) of 15 or more (gross) homes and/or a site area of 0.5ha or more in the urban areas. It then specifically states:  This generally includes retirement homes, as well as self-contained studio flats for a single household, and other self-contained flats, whether specifically aimed at students or not. Assisted living/Extra Care and other sui-generis residential developments may be required to make provision; there will be considered on a case-by-case basis and in some cases, an off-site contribution may be considered more suitable.</p> <p>We object to this draft qualifying definition as currently drafted since it</p>	<p>The supporting evidence on viability is</p>

	<p>does not take into account the viability of the emerging models of accommodation and care for older people, such as assisted living.</p> <p>Assisted living accommodation for older people generates additional costs relative to residential development (Use Class C3) due to the need for specialist design and specification, the sacrifice of saleable area for the provision of services and facilities with no compensating income, and other differentiating factors.</p> <p>Land must be competed for on the open market with key competition including non-specialist housebuilders, student housing developers and commercial developers. Inevitably, in reaching a competitive land value an affordable housing provision equal to that assumed by non-standard housebuilders bidding on the site cannot therefore be sustained.</p> <p>This is a structural issue, which affects the delivery of assisted living accommodation for older people at a strategic level. Not looking to achieve parity of affordable housing provision between specialist and mainstream developments is essential to supporting efforts to boost the supply of housing in this sector in line with both national and local priorities.</p> <p>Owing to the further increased costs of redevelopment on previously developed sites, it is therefore considered that the definition of qualifying developments for affordable housing (Paragraph 5.57) should be amended to exclude assisted living developments.</p> <p><u>Section 10 - Special Protection Areas</u> Paragraph 10.8 and the subsequent accompanying table sets out the SPA financial contribution, which is calculated based on the number of bedrooms within each dwelling.</p>	<p>provided in the Guildford Local Plan and Viability Study 2016. This includes an assumption for assisted living being developed on urban brownfield development with 35% of floorspace being non-chargeable functions and communal space.</p> <p>Our Community Infrastructure Levy rate for assisted living is proposed to be zero, as recommended by the Local Plan and CIL Viability Assessment 2016.</p> <p>This may leave scope for some affordable housing contribution from these developments.</p> <p>Applications for assisted living are considered on a case-by-case basis, and viability will be a consideration.</p> <p>The Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy 2017 SPD states that assisted living premises</p>
--	---	--

	<p>We object to this approach as it assumes an average occupancy level based on the number of bedrooms. Evidence from assisted living developments indicates that the average occupancy level of all dwellings, regardless of the number of bedrooms, is 1.25 residents per dwelling. On this basis, the approach set out in this section of the draft SPD does not accurately reflect the mitigation required for assisted living developments.</p> <p>I request that the draft SPD is updated to reflect these comments. I would be happy to discuss with GBC officers in more detail if requested.</p>	<p>will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. It is advisable to discuss this before any planning application is made.</p>
<p><i>(Ptarmigan Land on behalf of)</i> Iceni Projects Ltd</p>	<p>Our client has an agreement in place with the owners to develop the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, which is located immediately to the northwest of the A3 trunk road and to the southeast of Portsmouth Road, on the southeast edge of Send Marsh.</p> <p>We recently submitted representations on behalf of Ptarmigan Land to the Guildford Local Plan Strategy and Sites Consultation in July 2016. This submission should be considered in tandem with the representations submitted in July 2016.</p> <p>Our client recognises that the provision of affordable housing is a high priority in the Borough and that the approach to affordable housing mirrors that of the Draft Local Plan. However, it is important for the document to recognise that requirements for affordable housing provision will be subject to such provision being viable, having regard to guidance on assessing viability.</p> <p>Our client welcomes the Council's acknowledgement of Starter Homes, and the need for the SPD to be worded sufficiently flexibly to</p>	<p>Development viability, including specifically affordable housing viability is addressed in the SPD, based on evidence from the Local Plan and CIL Viability Study 2016.</p> <p>The requirement for self-build and custom</p>

	<p>accommodate any future government announcements on the delivery of Starter Homes. In addition our client strongly supports the inclusion of reference to the ‘vacant building credit’. However, we believe that greater flexibility is required over the delivery of self-build and custom-build housing on all strategic sites. This will not necessarily be appropriate on all-sites and consistent with the tests of soundness set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), it is important that each site can be assessed on its own merits, with sufficient flexibility built into policy wording to ensure that development is not stifled.</p> <p>Provision of flood mitigation measures is accepted and broadly supported, but as in the case of affordable housing requirements for a water efficiency standard of 110 litres per occupant per day and reduction in carbon emissions need to be worded in a manner that has due regard to the viability of making such provision on all sites.</p> <p>Seeking to provide financial contributions towards open space across the borough, or in areas of deficiency would in our opinion fail the test of CIL Regulation 123 in respect of ‘pooling resources’.</p> <p>Provision of open space should be directly linked to the location of the development – as in the case of SANG, as opposed to a borough-wide tariff towards provision. Furthermore, financial contributions towards Open Space, should only be sought where the provision cannot be provided on-site because of the proposed development. Consistent with the NPPF tests of Soundness and CIL Regulation 123, the proposed tariffs per dwelling size set out in Figure 3 of the SPD should be fully justified with robust evidence. Paragraph 9.11 of the SPD states that the figures have been developed using the experience of the Council’s Leisure Service in the delivery and improvement of play and sport facilities in the Borough.</p>	<p>build housing provision on housing sites will be set out in the new Local Plan that will be subject to independent examination.</p> <p>Text added to the SPD.</p> <p>The SPD sets out that we will only seek contributions towards open space improvements or provision where there is a local deficit in provision and there is evidence of a costed project which a development will contribute to (in the case of “provision” or “funding for provision”, pooling no more than five planning obligations towards any one project).</p> <p>As set out in the SPD, we ensure that we do not pool together more than five planning obligations that provide for</p>
--	---	--



	<p>This is not considered a robust justification in the context of the CIL regulations, and we request that the Council provide further details as to how the numbers in Figure 3 have been calculated. We would also stress that provision of amenity and open space on site should also be discounted from any total contribution sought.</p> <p>In respect of the approach to the Special Protection Area, we direct you to our representations that have been submitted to the draft Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Strategy SPD 2016. In particular, the Planning Contributions SPD needs to add text recognising that impact mitigation can be provided in two ways, either</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) through the provision of bespoke SANG on a site to serve the development, or</li> <li>b) by way of financial contributions based on a tariff.</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, we stress the need for the tariff to be based on a robust justification and an assessment to ensure that the increase proposed to the tariff would not render development, particularly on sites appropriate for larger houses of three or more bedrooms unviable.</p> <p>Any financial contributions towards <u>public realm or public art</u> that are not directly related to the development would fail the tests of the CIL Regulations should the monies recovered not be spent in an area, or in a means that can be deemed to be necessary to make the development acceptable. The pooling of resources would be contrary to the CIL Regulations.</p>	<p>funding for any specific open space provision project.</p> <p>Agree. The SPD contribution for Policy R2 (and for larger housing developments under Policy R3 where they cannot provide the playing fields, etc. on site) is to be specifically linked to an open space improvement project in the area of the development.</p> <p>The viability of a range of residential development types and sizes across the borough have been tested with these contributions in the Guildford Local Plan and CIL Viability Study 2016.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>In respect of <u>Public Art</u>, greater explanation is required as to what conditions would necessitate a contribution towards public art. This is important to ensure that it is fully justified in the context of the NPPF and the CIL Regulations, but also to ensure that developers are aware on the basis against which contributions are being sought when undertaking development appraisals and assessing development viability.</p> <p>The CIL Regulations were introduced to prevent the pooling of resources in the absence of a CIL Charging Schedule and Infrastructure List. The approach towards <u>Open Space, Public Realm and Public Art</u> requires greater consideration in this respect.</p> <p>Greater flexibility is required in the approach towards both Open Space and the Special Protection Area to recognise the contribution of on-site provision. In respect of Open Space, further justification is required to justify the tariffs set out for open space in order to pass the NPPF and CIL tests of soundness.</p> <p>We would also encourage the Council to ensure that sufficient flexibility and caveats are inserted to the wording of the document to allow both the SPD and future development to adapt to future policy change and account for financial viability.</p>	<p>As we have an adopted policy and suitably robust evidence to support such a requirement, the Council is assured that it may legitimately require provision of public art in some developments, on a case-by-case basis, and subject to the planning obligation pooling restrictions.</p> <p>The SPD sets out that open space contributions are for improvements to existing open space, and so are not subject to the CIL pooling restrictions.</p>
--	--	--

<p>Ripley Parish Council</p>	<p>Concern over the timeline of the consultation, in particular that the consultation was run separately to the draft Local Plan consultation, as more responses may have been forthcoming by running them together.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the consultation documents written in such a way as to be almost unintelligible to the layman.</p> <p>Our main concern is a perceived opportunity to abuse to the system; in dealing with millions of pounds worth of infrastructure projects, it is essential that decisions must be conducted in an open and transparent manner.</p>	<p>This SPD provides guidance relating to policies in Local Plan 2003, and not to the emerging new Local Plan.</p> <p>Whilst we have used non-technical language wherever possible, the main audience of this SPD is people submitting planning applications, which are predominately the development industry.</p> <p>The Council considers that this SPD improves transparency of process in negotiating planning conditions, obligations, highway agreements, etc.</p> <p>All planning permissions and obligations are publically available.</p>
<p>RSPB South East Office</p>	<p>We welcome Guildford's commitment to the protection of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), as set out in its draft Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Strategy (TBHSPA). However, the RSPB continues to have concerns regarding the implications of the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for the delivery of the TBHSPA Strategy in the Borough as proposed in this draft SPD.</p> <p>We acknowledge that the Council is constrained by the terms of the CIL Regulations and we appreciate that other Thames Basin Heaths local authorities have adopted CIL for the purposes of collecting developer contributions to deliver Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs). However, it is essential that a solution is</p>	<p>We confirm that we will continue to work with the other Thames Basin Heaths authorities (and Natural England) to secure mitigation of potential harm to TBHSPA. The Thames Basin Heaths</p>

	<p>adopted that satisfies both the new CIL Regulations and existing obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (Habitats Regulations) as amended. It is also important that the Council continues to work with the other Thames Basin Heaths authorities (and Natural England) to ensure that the adoption of CIL does not undermine the delivery of the TBHSPA Strategy.</p> <p>The RSPB appreciates that the restrictions on pooling s106 agreements introduced by the CIL regulations may necessitate changes to the mechanism used for gathering mitigation funds. However, we are concerned that these changes will remove the critical link between new housing within the 5 km zone and the delivery of SANGs, as it will no longer be possible to ring-fence funds for SANG delivery, and protect them from allocation towards other infrastructure needs.</p> <p>To address this concern it will be essential that the Council is able to demonstrate that SANGs are delivered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. at the necessary level to mitigate recreational pressure from all net new housing within the 5 km zone of influence;</li> <li>2. within the required proximity of the otherwise damaging development, and;</li> <li>3. in time to ensure that the necessary SANGs are up and running ahead of occupancy of the new housing within the 5 km zone of influence.</li> </ol> <p>Without this evidence, we are unable to see how the Council, as competent authority under the Habitats Regulations, will be able to have the necessary certainty that the potential impacts of increased recreational pressure arising from new housing within the 5 km zone will be avoided, either at the development plan level or the individual</p>	<p>Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy 2017 SPD (the strategy) makes it clear that the Council understands its Habitats Regulations obligations and will meet them. The strategy states that funds collected for SPA avoidance and mitigation are ring-fenced for that purpose.</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan will be accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which sets where SANGs can be delivered to enable the delivery of the housing sites in the plan.</p> <p>The CIL regulation restriction is for pooling of more than five planning obligations that provide for provision, or funding (for provision) of infrastructure that could be delivered by CIL.</p> <p>We confirm that we will have considered these restrictions, and that our proposed approach will not breach it.</p> <p>We confirm that the money collected through the system of planning obligations or other legal agreements will be ring-fenced for TBHSPA mitigation.</p> <p>We confirm that prioritising mitigating harm to TBHSPA above other developer contributions is necessary for Natural</p>
--	--	---

	<p>application level.</p> <p>It is understood that other TBH authorities have treated SPA mitigation as the pre-eminent call on their CIL funds to ensure that the required level of SANGs is delivered and to provide the certainty necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Habitats Regulations. It is essential that Guildford adopts a similar approach to the allocation of CIL funds and we recommend that the SPD (and the Local Plan) are explicit about this requirement.</p> <p>Guildford have failed to identify the value of green infrastructure provision with respect to contribution towards its Corporate Plan themes (paragraph 3.10). We recommend that this failure is rectified to demonstrate the potential significant creation / enhancement of green infrastructure that will be delivered through CIL with its associated benefits to the residents of Guildford Borough.</p> <p>The TBHSPA mitigation strategy requires mitigation for all net new residential dwellings, however, we note reference to Rural Exception Housing (paragraph 5.60/61). New rural dwellings which fall within the 5 km zone of influence must be mitigated under the TBHSPA mitigation strategy, however, under a CIL regime the Council is not obliged to levy a specific amount per dwelling to meet the necessary level of mitigation required.</p> <p>The RSPB's overarching concern with the implementation of an effective CIL regime is that the Council secures sufficient funds to deliver the necessary TBHSPA mitigation for all dwellings delivered within its area, taking account of variations in funds levied for particular types of dwelling.</p>	<p>England's satisfaction, and the SPD has been updated to reflect this.</p> <p>The comment about the corporate plan has been passed to the relevant team.</p> <p>The Thames Basin Heaths SPA Avoidance Strategy 2017 SPD sets out potential mechanisms for collecting SANG contributions. It also states that Council is considering mechanisms for the funding of SANG other than CIL because there are a number of developments that are exempt from CIL, most notably affordable and self-build housing.</p>
<p><i>(Savills on behalf of)</i> Thames Water</p>	<p>Thames Water are the statutory sewerage undertaker for the whole of the Guildford Borough and the statutory water undertaker for the</p>	

	<p>southern part of the Borough.</p> <p>Thames Water wholly support section 8 as it is largely in accordance with their previous representations to an earlier version of the SPD.</p> <p>It is important to consider the net increase in water and wastewater demand to serve the development and also any impact that developments may have off site, further down the network. It is therefore important that developers demonstrate that adequate water supply and wastewater infrastructure capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate reports and appraisals to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water and sewerage infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges your helpful response.</p>
<p>Scottish and Southern Energy Power distribution</p>	<p>I refer to your email regarding your Core Strategy Document. I provide general guidance on the provision of electricity infrastructure and the treatment of any existing infrastructure in relation to future development.</p> <p>Connections for new development from existing infrastructure can be provided subject to cost and timescale.</p> <p>Where existing infrastructure is inadequate to support the increased demands from the new development, the costs of any necessary upstream reinforcement required would normally be apportioned between developer and DNO ( Distribution Network Operator) in accordance with the current Statement of Charging Methodology agreed with the industry regulator (OFGEM). Maximum timescales in these instances would not normally exceed around 2 years and should not therefore impede delivery of any proposed housing development.</p>	<p>We acknowledge and welcome your helpful comments. We will use these to inform the draft Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Schedule and Plan, and the Delivery Statements for Strategic sites.</p>

	<p>Where overhead lines cross development sites, these will, with the exception of 400kV tower lines, normally be owned and operated by Southern Electric Power Distribution.</p> <p>In order to minimise costs, wherever possible, existing overhead lines can remain in place with uses such as open space, parking, garages or public highways generally being permitted in proximity to the overhead lines.</p> <p>Where this is not practicable, or where developers choose to lay out their proposals otherwise, then agreement will be needed as to how these will be dealt with, including agreeing costs and identifying suitable alternative routing for the circuits. The existing customer base should not be burdened by any costs arising from new development proposals.</p> <p>To ensure certainty of delivery of a development site, any anticipated relocation of existing overhead lines should be formally agreed with Southern Electric Power Distribution prior to submission of a planning application.</p>	
Southern Water	I confirm that Guildford Borough is not within Southern Water's operational area, and therefore we have no comments to make on the consultation.	Noted; contact will not be sent further consultations
Sport England	<p>Sport England notes that Local Plans should be based on an adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence base. In addition, para 73 of the NPPF requires that:</p> <p><i>“Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessment should</i></p>	<p>Please see the <a href="#">Guildford Borough Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment (2017)</a>, as the evidence referred to in Section 9 “Open space: amenity space,</p>

	<p><i>identify specific needs and quantitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area.”</i></p> <p>Sport England is aware that the Council does not have an up-to-date Playing Pitch Strategy or indoor or outdoor sports facilities strategy, which has been developed in line with Sport England guidance. It is noted that the Council relies on an open space, sport and recreation assessment based on the out-of-date guidance, “PPG17 – planning for open space, sport and recreation”.</p> <p>Without this additional evidence base, Sport England considers that the Council does not have a sufficiently robust assessment on which to plan adequately for indoor and outdoor sports facilities in accordance with paragraph 73 of the NPPF and that the approach put forward in the Planning Contributions SPD to provide indoor and outdoor sports and recreation facilities is not sound.</p> <p>In particular, Sport England does not support the use of standards to identify the amount of land to be provided for sport and recreation.</p> <p>Furthermore, it should be noted that restrictions brought in by Government limit the pooling of developer contributions under Section 106. Sports and recreation provision will need to be carefully and strategically planned across the borough so that developer contributions ensure appropriate and good quality sports facilities are located in the right areas.</p> <p>Sport England would highly recommend that the Council undertake a playing pitch strategy (PPS) as well as assessing the needs and opportunities for sporting provision. Sport England provides comprehensive guidance on how to undertake both pieces of work.</p>	<p>play space, and sports fields” of the SPD. This assessment has been produced in line with the requirements of the NPPF and is up-to-date.</p> <p>We also have an adopted sports strategy; <a href="#">“Active Guildford: Sport Development Strategy 2016-2022”</a>.</p> <p>Our current standards for provision / contribution towards provision or improvement of open space are set out in Policies R2 and R3 of the adopted 2003 Local Plan, which was subject to independent examination.</p> <p>The SPD has been worded to take into account the pooling restrictions introduced by the CIL regulations which affect provision of funding for provision. We acknowledge that we can no longer pool more than five planning obligations to provide a particular playing field project, although the pooling restriction does not apply to improvements to these.</p>
--	--	--



<p>Surrey County Council EI Service</p>	<p>Officers have previously liaised with you informally, prior to consultation, on a pre consultation draft version of the Planning Contributions SPD document and we are pleased to see that our suggestions have been taken into account.</p> <p>We have some specific text related comments to make at this stage, on the transport (section 16) :</p> <p><u>Section 16 - County Council infrastructure : Sustainable transport</u></p> <p><u>Para 16.1</u> Second line: Delete "strategic"</p> <p><u>Para 16.2</u> There are several errors of fact in this first line. It should read: "Surrey County Council is the Highway Authority for the local road network in the Borough and Highways England is the Highway Authority for the strategic roads, the M25 and the A3 that cut across the Borough. Surrey Count Council....."</p> <p><u>Paras 16.3 - 16.12</u> These sections contain a lot of detail about something which is important, but parking is no more important than other specific infrastructure, which receives comparatively little coverage.</p> <p><u>Paras 16.11 - 16.12</u> Where there might be added pressure on a CPZ which serves existing established demand, and a new development without demand lead parking is constructed, it may be reasonable to impose a restriction on that development on its residents being able to apply for permit. In other words, if reduced or zero parking development is constructed in a central area, with CPZ restrictions, it would be reasonable not to add to the demand for these managed spaces, and recognise that some</p>	<p>Thank you for pointing these out; the draft SPD has been amended.</p> <p>This section dealing with sustainable is only slightly longer than the section dealing with Education.</p> <p>Detail on parking standards are included here because the level of parking provision in proposed developments affects the need for sustainable transport developer contributions such as travel plans, car club and public transport / cycle and walking infrastructure.</p>
---	---	--

	<p>units within the new development have to be car free. The restriction could be imposed through Planning Obligations. The provision of a year's membership for a car club would complement such a restriction, but should ideally be for a longer period.</p> <p>In terms of the last four bullet points in 16.12, there seems little rationale in singling these specific initiatives out, when there is a much wider "menu" of sustainable travel tools that can be drawn upon.</p> <p><u>Para 16.13</u> Delete "Green" in first line.</p> <p><u>Para 16.15</u> Second sentence should read: "However, a development may impose an additional impact on a service, or the demand for a new service, which might need development support or investment. On-going developer funding for perpetuity, or until/unless the service became financially viable, would be required in these circumstances."</p> <p><u>Para 17.3</u> The assessment is updated annually - we therefore suggest adding a final sentence to the paragraph : "The Childcare sufficiency assessment is updated annually because of the fluctuating nature of the childcare and early education market".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. East Horsley library should more correctly be referred to as Horsley Library.</li> <li>2. The Shere Golden Diamond Jubilee library is referred to as a Community Partnered Library when it is a Community Link which is a collection of books in villages supported by SCC but not a fully operational library.</li> </ol>	<p>Changes made as suggested.</p> <p>Changes made as suggested.</p> <p>Changes made as suggested.</p> <p>Changes made as suggested.</p>
--	--	---

<p>Surrey County Council Heritage Service</p>	<p>The draft SPD on planning contributions does not make significant reference to the heritage of the Borough. There is perhaps an opportunity to recognise that increased development and occupation in the Borough will potentially negatively impact the heritage and archaeology of the area in the same way that the natural environment might be impacted, through increased use, access and tourism for example, and to address this potentially attritional process through the planning obligations system outlined here.</p> <p>Of particular concern is the provision of archaeological storage in the Borough. Guildford has the largest number of undeposited archaeological project archives in Surrey - almost 20% of the overall total at last count - which are currently awaiting transfer to the Museum by various commercial archaeological excavation units.</p> <p>These archives are generated almost exclusively through the operation of the planning process and they are in urgent need of transfer and long-term storage and curation.</p> <p>I am aware of a small number of authorities that are investigating the possibility of using the CIL and planning obligations process to make provision for museum storage space for archaeological archives, and I am also aware that Guildford Museum is currently experiencing difficulties in accepting more material, and is undergoing a process of review.</p> <p>I would therefore recommend that the possibility of using the CIL/Planning Obligations process to provide support and resources for the storage of archaeological material generated through the planning process could usefully be explored.</p>	<p>Thank you for your helpful response. We will explore the possibility of including this in our 123 infrastructure list.</p>
<p>Surrey Hills AONB Board</p>	<p>I would be happy to discuss with officers how best the document</p>	

	<p>should provide for financial contributions to be made towards recreation, public access, maintenance and enhancement projects within the Surrey Hills AONB. I look forward to being contacted shortly.</p> <p>There is concern the consultation document does not currently recognise that the much valued Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) covering a large part of the Borough. The AONB forms an essential part of its green and recreational infrastructure needing public investment to conserve its landscape and scenic beauty and meet the increasing recreational pressures resulting from the planned population growth.</p> <p>The Borough is unusually fortunate in having such extensive nationally important protected landscape, but it needs public investment. The landscape protection given to an AONB is the same as a National Park. But the difference between the two is that National Parks attract Central Government finance to promote their recreational duty. Yet the Surrey Hills AONB is subjected to probably more recreational demands and pressures than most National Parks because of its proximity to large populations. Currently, there is negligible public finance directed towards managing those recreational pressures or enhancing the Surrey Hills landscape.</p> <p>25% of the whole of the Surrey Hills AONB has open public access. The figure for the AONB in the Borough is not known but it is unlikely to be less. With increasing pressures on the County and Borough Councils' finances there is little or no prospect of public investment in maintaining this important public asset.</p> <p>The Surrey Hills AONB is an important element of the Borough's green and recreational infrastructure. Therefore it seems to stand to reason that the CIL document should provide for contributions to be</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestion on ways to enhance opportunities for recreation and access in the Surrey Hills AONB (which is within the Green Belt).</p> <p>Section 11 of the draft SPD has been updated to include greater reference to the importance of safeguarding and enhancing landscapes of the locality, and in particular to the importance of the nationally important landscape of the Surrey Hills AONB.</p>
--	---	---

directed towards meeting the increasing pressures to which it will be subjected from the Borough's planned population growth.

The Borough Council together with the other Surrey Hills constituent planning authorities were involved in preparing and have formally adopted the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan. There is a statutory duty of regard or commitment on the Council to implement the Plan. The inclusion of CIL contributions towards implementing that Plan would be consistent with the Plan. To the contrary, any omission for the provision of CIL contributions to help implement the Plan would seem to be inconsistent with the Plan.

Paragraph 11.2 of the document recognises that the Borough's beautiful and attractive natural environment has contributed to its economic development by attracting business and people to the area. Paragraph 11.3 then states that economic and population growth and development is putting increasing pressure on its natural heritage. Then again paragraph 11.4 refers to the Council's duty to consider the management and enhancement of the landscape.

Paragraph 11.5 refers to NPPF Chapter 11 as stating "The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ...protecting and enhancing valued landscapes..." All these references seem to be building up and justifying the inclusion of valued landscape improvements within the contributions from developments as part of the Borough's infrastructure. Whilst the document does for biodiversity it does not for landscape and its associated recreation projects.

Similarly, in the section on open space it refers at paragraph 9.33 to natural green space as covering "all publicly accessible spaces including meadows, woodland and copses, all of which share a trait of

In spending CIL income once in place, we will have regard to the Surrey Hills AONB Management Plan. This will be subject to further consideration including during future processes of consultation on our draft CIL rates, and other relevant CIL information.

	<p>having natural characteristics and biodiversity value and are accessible for informal recreation”. But the schedule on the same page 32 concentrates upon the provision of land for play spaces and amenity space. Whilst for smaller residential developments it refers to a financial contribution towards the improvement of existing open space in the area, it does not appear this includes the AONB. If it does, for clarity it should include reference to the AONB both in this category and the other listed categories of development.</p> <p>The following illustrates the value to which the public regard the Surrey Hills AONB. In the month of September 2016 the Surrey Hills Google page was visited by 4.1million. Over a longer period, Surrey Hills had 7 times more reviews (total 411 reviews) than the neighbouring South Downs National Park with a rating of 4.6 out of 5 against the South Downs rating of 3.8. Yet the South Downs National Park receives 55 times more Government finance than the Surrey Hills. The Government finance does however include fulfilling the National Park’s planning function.</p>	
<p><i>(Terence O’Rourke on behalf of)</i> University of Surrey</p>	<p>The University’s comments relate primarily to the TBHSPA Avoidance Strategy SPD, but as the SANG tariff is replicated in the Planning Obligations SPD then the comments also relate to that document.</p> <p>The University is concerned that the SANG contributions have grown significantly from the levels in the previous document. Whilst the justification for the changes is set out in the document, the increasing costs could cause difficulties for bringing forward development in the Borough, including affecting the ability to deliver affordable homes. This tariff is only one of many contributions that are sought from development that together affect development viability. SANG contributions may squeeze the ability to make other contributions where viability is affected.</p>	<p>Officers agree that increasing the cost of</p>

	<p>The University is also concerned that the SANG contributions are applied to student residences.</p> <p>Student residences are not typical housing that generates recreational trips to the SPA. The University of Surrey does not allow its resident students to bring cars to the campus, and pets are not allowed in the accommodation. Students, particularly those living on campus, focus their daily activity around the campus for studies, sports and social activities, including recreation.</p> <p>The propensity for students to visit and/or have impacts on the SPA is therefore very limited, which Natural England has accepted in a recent application for student residences at Manor Park that led to a 75% reduction in the SAMM contribution element to reflect this.</p> <p>The University was also able to provide SANG on its own land in this instance, but as more residences come forward the ability to provide more SANG in this way may be reduced. If the requirement to provide SANG/SAMM became an increasing financial constraint, it would affect the University's plans to develop further residences on its campus.</p> <p>For these reasons, the University believes that the negligible impact on the SPA of the student population resident at Stag Hill and Manor Park should be recognized in the SPD.</p> <p>The University considers that its future new student residences should not be required to contribute to SANG/SAMM requirements given this negligible impact.</p> <p>The University would be happy to discuss this further with you.</p>	<p>the SANG tariff may affect viability. The tariffs have been calculated based on the costs to the Council of providing SANGs. Revising the value of the tariff downwards could result in the Council picking up the shortfall in SANG funding through public funds. This is not considered fair.</p> <p>It should be noted that the new strategy proposes to lower the tariff for one-bed dwellings.</p> <p>Officers acknowledge that students may have different living patterns to other residents. However, the potential impact on the SPA is likely to vary depending on the situation and is very unlikely to be nil in all situations. Therefore, the approach detailed in the strategy whereby student accommodation is considered on a case-by-case basis is considered the most appropriate.</p>
Wisley Property	The Draft SPD has been written in conformity with the current	This SPD is to provide guidance to the

<p>Investments Ltd and (Savills on behalf of) Wisley Property Investments Ltd</p> <p><i>submitted the same response</i></p>	<p>development plan. WPI appreciates that the SPD must be in accordance with the adopted development plan. We reiterate the importance of an early review; WPI's clear preference is to delay the SPD adoption SPD until the emerging Local Plan is adopted. It may then be in conformity to it. Otherwise, the SPD should be sufficiently flexible to allow for the IDP.</p> <p>It is of vital importance that reference is made in the SPD to the emerging development plan and the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (June 2016).</p> <p>In order for the SPD to remain an effective development management tool in the period between adoption of the SPD and the adoption of the emerging Local Plan and a potential CIL Charging Schedule, greater clarity is required in regard to the delivery of strategic sites.</p> <p>What will be of use is greater clarity from the Council on how it sees the IDP being delivered, in part, by key strategic sites such as Wisley. This is needed now, notably given the absence of five-year housing land supply, and need to increase housing delivery three-fold to meet the acknowledged objectively assessed housing needs (OAN).</p> <p>WPI has sent a draft S106 to the Council for Wisley new settlement in connection with the ongoing planning appeal.</p> <p>At present, the relationship between planning contributions, prospective CIL payments and the emerging IDP is unclear. If the Borough Council adopts the SPD now, then it cannot be in conformity with the emerging IDP. Instead, should the Borough want to adopt the SPD now, then it must be sufficiently flexible to allow for the IDP.</p>	<p>current, 2003 Local Plan.</p> <p>As this SPD is prepared at a stage when the emerging Local Plan has not yet been adopted, we cannot provide guidance relating to the draft Local Plan, nor to its supporting evidence. The legal requirement is that the SPD must not conflict with the adopted development plan.</p> <p>The current Local Plan can be given only very limited weight in development management at its current stage of preparation.</p> <p>This is not the purpose of this SPD, which is to provide guidance on policies of the existing adopted Local Plan. Delivery Statements will in future assist with this purpose for each of the strategic sites included in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>This relationship is set out in the draft infrastructure / Regulation 123 list that formed part of the first CIL consultation,</p>
---	---	--



	<p>WPI does not wish to make detailed comments on the individual contributions at this time, apart from the need for all of these to be CIL Regulation compliant. Prior to the adoption of the SPD, the Council must be confident that each principle or measure requested via planning obligations, conforms to CIL Regulation 122/123. This means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific and justified planning obligations directly related to a development proposal</li> <li>• No tariff based obligations towards defined infrastructure items</li> <li>• A clear mechanism for how the IDP is to be delivered</li> </ul> <p>At present, the SPD is not clear with respect of these points. WPI suggests that each provision is tested with respect of the CIL ‘pooling’ restrictions.</p> <p>We appreciate the requirement for mechanisms to enable a sustainable development. These will be secured via planning condition or obligation, with respect of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations, and applicable policy and evidence base, for example the emerging Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). To this end, we support the broad aims of the SPD. However, WPI objects to the following provisions of the SPD on the basis of either the evidence available, conformity to the present or emerging Local Plan or lack of direct reference to the emerging IDP:</p>	<p>which identifies the infrastructure that we may deliver by CIL (and therefore not by S106).</p> <p>The SPD acknowledges these issues.</p>
	<p><u>Affordable housing</u> Page 16 : Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy H11 requires 30%, however, it is set out at paragraph 5.48 of the SPD that the starting point for negotiations will be 35%. Greater clarity is required. The SPD is not consistent with adopted policy.</li> <li>- 70-30% tenure split is prescriptive and likely to be become out of kilter with national planning policy. It does not reflect, for example, the</li> </ul>	<p>The wording has been revised to assure consultees that the Council was not proposing a new approach in respect of affordable housing provision but is to continue with the approach that has been taken for many years. These recommended amendments have</p>

	<p>pending imposition of Starter Homes included in the Housing and Planning Act 2016.</p> <p>- A bespoke approach for strategic sites of a larger scale is also likely to be the most appropriate.</p>	<p>been incorporated into the draft SPD. As there are no substantial changes in approach, the Council will not be re-consulting on the revised wording.</p>
	<p><u>Open space / sports field</u></p> <p>Object</p> <p>The SPD states:</p> <p><i>The 2016 Assessment considered various standards from across the country and set local standards for each typology in consultation with stakeholders. Provision of open space by type was then mapped, including its accessibility. Adequacy of current provision (by typology) was then assessed against these standards by mapping access to each type. This identified the adequacy or deficits in provision by type of open space. The Study finally includes recommendations for policy, including new open space standards related to accessibility as well as quantity. These new standards will be included the new Local Plan Development Management Policies that will include policies to replace Local Plan 2003 Policies R2 and R3.</i></p> <p>As such, the SPD is already out of kilter with the emerging evidence base.</p> <p>WPI suggests that it would be best to wait until adoption of the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p><u>Open space provision / deficiencies</u></p> <p>Object</p> <p>The open space information at Figure 10 of Appendix 4 is taken from the Guildford open space, sport and recreation assessment 2016. This document has come forward ahead of the Local Plan and it must be acknowledged that the adequacy of open space with the wards will change dramatically upon adoption of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>This point is not agreed. The SPD forms planning guidance for development management decisions. The starting point for development management decisions is the development plan, of which the 2003 Local Plan is a part. The NPPF forms guidance for planning decisions, but does not replace the development plan.</p> <p>The Council has produced the Open Space Sport and Recreation Assessment 2017 (the assessment) which develops new local standards and assesses current provision against those standards. The new local standards will be adopted through a future local plan policy.</p> <p>Paragraph 73 of the NPPF states “Information gained from assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required”. As a result, the evidence of deficits and adequacy in open space provision set out in the assessment must</p>

	<p>The document looks only at the existing availability and does not give any indication of how further provision for each ward will be calculated – i.e. on a percentage population increase to try and predict future demand or how strategic sites could potentially off set additional facilities for a wider area than those required per site by policy.</p> <p>Clearly in this regard, a bespoke site-specific approach will be required, particularly with regard to the delivery of the Borough’s strategic development sites.</p>	<p>be used to inform planning decisions.</p> <p>However, the Local Plan 2003 includes standards for provision of open space in new developments.</p> <p>As a result, the open space standards applied during planning decisions must be those in the Local Plan 2003, but planning decisions must take account of evidence of deficits and adequacy set out in the assessment. The SPD reflects this.</p> <p>The evidence of deficit or adequacy of open space will be updated at appropriate intervals.</p>
	<p><u>SPA</u> Object</p> <p>WPI supports entirely the provision of phased infrastructure required to mitigate the impacts of developments and enable the delivery of the Local Plan. The provision of new hard and soft and Green Infrastructure at the Wisley new settlement is central to the promotion and delivery of the proposed allocation. However, the SPD needs to make allowance for the phased delivery of any required monies so as not to fetter the delivery of large strategic sites.</p> <p>WPI suggest that this is overly narrow and rigid, and pays little attention to wider infrastructure delivery factors. A proportional approach should be included, which enables the phased delivery of infrastructure, commensurate to overall scheme delivery, the overall Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) supporting the Local Plan, and with</p>	<p>SANGs must be attractive natural or semi-natural spaces in order to act as an alternative to the SPA for SPA visitors. The Council agrees that SANGs can be multi-functional spaces and supports the delivery of multiple benefits where this is compatible with the SANG use. Biodiversity enhancements are frequently compatible with SANG uses as they contribute to the attractiveness of the semi-natural environment and therefore increase the effectiveness of the SANG.</p> <p>However, many forms of open space are incompatible as they are too formal to be</p>

	<p>due regard to scheme viability, and hence delivery. The present wording which requires pre commencement payment, pays no attention to development viability, and hence the situation whereby the necessary infrastructure has to be phased alongside development delivery.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.33 of the SPD states that SANGs do not count towards the provision of natural green space as a type of open space as, <i>'SANGs serve the very specific purpose of acting as an alternative space for recreational users of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA'</i>.</p> <p>WPI wish to object to this wording in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>The fact that SANG is, most importantly, designed to encourage recreational use for a specific purpose (i.e. protection of the SPA) does <b>not</b> mean that a SANG area cannot also provide other benefits (such as ecological enhancement for example). There are numerous examples of SANG areas that deliver exceptional ecological enhancements – it is simply a case of reconciling the need for recreational activity with the specific ecological interest being enhanced – for example, wildflower-rich grasslands do not care if people walk through them, and negative effects of recreation on Ancient Woodland can be overcome through positive management.</p> <p>Natural England are very clear about the fact that SANG <b>can</b> be counted towards other open space requirements, provided that the other open space uses proposed within SANG do not conflict with its purpose as SANG (which natural greenspace does not).</p> <p>The fourth paragraph of NE's SANG Creation Guidelines (2008) states:  <i>"These [SANG] guidelines relate specifically to the means to provide</i></p>	<p>considered semi-natural environments (for example, parks, sports pitches, play areas). Additionally, where SANGs become saturated with people, they can cease to be attractive to SPA users. This is reflected in the SANG guidelines which require SANGs to be discounted where there is existing recreational use.</p> <p>Therefore, where developments provide, or contribute towards the provision of, SANG the Council will still seek provision or contribution towards other forms of open space.</p> <p>It is not Natural England's role to decide whether SANG can count towards the provision of other types of open space. Natural England are solely concerned with whether the design and layout of SANGs are appropriate and meet the SANG guidelines.</p>
--	--	---

	<p><i>mitigation for housing within the Thames Basin Heaths Planning Zone. They do not address nor preclude the other functions of green space (e.g. provision of disabled access). Other functions may be provided within SANG, as long as this does not conflict with the specific function of mitigating visitor impacts on the SPA..” [WPI emphasis].</i></p> <p>Centrally, the NE Guidelines do not preclude SANG being designed to be ecologically rich with features that can tolerate the required levels of recreational pressure (or where any conflict can be reconciled through management). For example, EPR’s Langley Mead SANG in Shinfield for example is currently subject to an extremely significant botanical restoration project wherein wildflower rich hay meadows and woodland areas are being managed to enhance biodiversity. The results have already yielded the appearance of some red data book species of plant that were not present beforehand (despite the use as SANG).</p> <p>The fact that the SANG is managed with wildlife in mind actually improves its ability to function as a SANG, because it promotes the feeling of ‘wildness’ that attracts the type of visitors that otherwise seek to visit open and expansive ‘rugged’ heathlands.</p>	
	<p><u>Landscape and Biodiversity</u> Noted. WPI supports these principles. A site-specific approach will be needed, which best reflects the adoption and management regime proposed.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted.</p>
	<p><u>Waste collection</u> Object WPI agrees that new development must include appropriate provision of waste collection and recycling.</p>	<p>It is accepted across the country that services that are predominantly funded from general taxation, such as schools,</p>

	<p>However, WPI questions the justification for new development funding waste collection, as this is a statutory service funded by general taxation.</p>	<p>GPs surgeries and police facilities may also be subject to proportionate developer contributions. For example, see letter of September 2016 from CLG and EDF to all Chief Executives, which refers to use of developer contributions to help to fund schools where the need arises from new housing.</p>
	<p><u>Public realm</u> Object WPI questions why public realm 'infrastructure' is not (which is amendments to the public highway) is not affected by the CIL Regulation 123 pooling restriction.</p>	<p>As stated in the SPD, we will not pool more than five planning obligations for any single public realm project, which accords with CIL regulation 123.</p>
	<p><u>Public art</u> Object Until the publication of the Public Art Strategy this section of the SPD is premature. In addition, it is not clear on what is being required.</p>	<p>As we have an adopted policy and suitably robust evidence to support such a requirement, the Council is assured that it may legitimately require provision of public art in some developments, on a case-by-case basis, and subject to the planning obligation pooling restrictions.</p>
	<p><u>Parking Provision</u> Noted The SPD would benefit from a clear outline of parking requirements/ standards by development scale/ dwelling type. This may be better suited outside of a Planning Obligations SPD.</p>	<p>The government's policy introduced by the CLG's Written Ministerial Statement requires that local planning authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and non-residential developments where there is clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network.</p>

		<p>We are considering which areas of the borough would justify new setting parking standards in an updated SPD.</p> <p>In addition, Neighbourhood Plans can also set local parking standards for their area.</p>
	<p><u>County Council Education</u> Object WPI supports the site-specific approach, which appears to be taken on education provision. However, quoting average educational yield in a SPD may be overly restrictive, instead this information could be updated annually. The SPD could outline more detail related to the IDP on how additional primary and secondary education provision may be delivered and where.</p>	<p>Noted and current Early Years child yields removed The IDP relates to the delivery of the draft new Local Plan, which has yet to be examined, whilst this SPD must be consistent with the current development plan, which includes Guildford bough Local Plan 2003.</p>
	<p><u>Libraries</u> Object The SPD provides no evidence nor guidance of any existing deficiency of library provision, or planned improvements. General contributions are unlikely to be CIL Regulation compliant.</p>	<p>SCC will base any request on its evidence, and will provide this to GBC in making any request for contributions.</p>
	<p><u>Flood risk</u> Object WPI is concerned that the guidance is simply repetitive of the PPG. Hence the guidance is likely to be superfluous.</p>	<p>Noted. The EA is supportive of this additional local guidance.</p>
	<p><u>Appendix 5 : Play space standards</u> Object</p>	<p>Thank you for pointing this out, this</p>

	<p>WPI note that there is an error on Page 72 of the SPD. The minimum area for a NEAP including buffer zone should be 8400m2 not 84000m2</p>	<p>drafting error has been addressed</p>
	<p><u>Appendix 7 : Example Viability appraisal – affordable housing provision</u>  <u>Object</u>  The table/ example is overly simplistic and does not reflect the detail required to demonstrate the impact of the difference of on-site/ off-site affordable housing provision (or mix therein). A number of factors are in play, notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing mix, and type of affordable and market</li> <li>• Build cost differences</li> <li>• Cash-flow and return on capital / notably delivery rates</li> <li>• Profit from affordable housing</li> </ul> <p>These are well-established principles of viability testing, as indicated by the NPPF, Harman Report and RICS guidance. Appropriate references to this best practice would be a more appropriate Development Management tool.</p>	<p>This is an equivalence approach, and is not intended, and does not need to be a full development appraisal (for which the listed factors would be relevant).</p>
<p><i>(White Young Green on behalf of)</i>  the Earl of Onslow and the Trustees of the Onslow Estate</p>	<p>These comments are submitted further to the representations made in relation to the proposed Guildford Borough Local Plan.</p> <p><u>The Case for CIL</u>  We are in general terms supportive of the Council's proposed approach the introduction of CIL. We would offer the following comments in relation to the consultation.</p> <p>We support the commitment to the principles of national guidance that conditions and obligations should be relevant to the development proposed, necessary, related to planning and reasonable, in</p>	<p>Your comments on the use of planning obligations and on the CIL are noted.</p>



	<p>accordance with national guidance and case law. We note the Government's wish to restrict Grampian style conditions precedent and concur with this, but we also believe that in certain cases there is a clear justification for these where there are measures directly related to development that need to be secured to make the development acceptable.</p> <p>There are also cases where planning obligations can be appropriate to prescribe the nature of a development, such as affordable housing in order to comply with policy or to provide off site mitigation of the impact of proposed development to make it acceptable in planning terms and it is right that this also meets the relevant tests set out. We agree that there are circumstances where the wider or cumulative impact of development requires an approach that is beyond these measures and requires an approach based on CIL.</p> <p>The restrictions imposed on pooling of planning obligation and tariff style contributions also make it necessary to consider CIL as part of the overall approach to securing the funding and infrastructure necessary to support development. Hence, the commitment in Guildford Borough that development will not take place without the necessary infrastructure being made available is something that is a worthy objective and supports the introduction of CIL, provided that this is set at a level that is reasonable and appropriately justified.</p> <p>We do have concerns that for development in some areas, this may not be sufficient to overcome the lack of infrastructure or existing shortcomings and that priority should be given to sustainable locations and areas where development is possible within the relevant existing or proposed supporting infrastructure without compromising the rate of delivery.</p>	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal work of the emerging Local Plan considered this issue in relation to distance potential sites to certain key transport infrastructure and services.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>It is therefore, essential in bringing forward CIL and the approach to planning obligations and conditions, that the infrastructure requirements of the Local Plan are appropriately identified and quantified and prioritised to sustainable locations where the benefits of investment will be greatest. It is equally necessary for the need for new or improved infrastructure and its associated costs to be minimised by an appropriate and sustainable spatial and development strategy and that where new infrastructure is required, it is identified and provided or funded by the most appropriate mechanism. This is essential if the necessary development and infrastructure is to be both deliverable and viable and for the Borough as a whole to achieve its objectives.</p> <p><u>Infrastructure Requirements</u></p> <p>The aim of the SPD to help to ensure development contributes to the Corporate Plan themes, and in particular delivering infrastructure. This includes by 2020 having facilitated more homes across a range of tenures, with a particular focus on more affordable homes to rent and buy, started delivering a sustainable movement corridor from the west of the town and developed a programme of town centre pedestrianisation and transport changes and improved the bus, cycling and walking networks.</p> <p>We would also support the pre-application and design review processes as a means of delivering high quality development that benefits the town and the community for generations to come.</p> <p>It isn't clear at this stage what distinction will be made between measures included in planning obligations and those included within CIL and we would hope that this can be further clarified during the policy process. While the provision of certainty through the pre-application and application process is supported, the balance between</p>	<p>The supporting infrastructure for the emerging plan is set out in its Infrastructure Schedule.</p> <p>We note your support for both of these processes.</p> <p>This would be subject to further consultation following what was set out in the Council's draft Infrastructure / Regulation 123 list , which was subject to</p>
--	--	---

	<p>planning obligations, the provision of benefits in kind within the development proposed (such as schools, sport or other infrastructure) and CIL contributions is something that should be established through the CIL charging regime and SPD as far as possible.</p> <p>While it is important to provide the infrastructure needed over the plan period, we welcome also the commitment to ensuring development is both deliverable and viable. In this respect, the Local Plan strategy should seek to minimise the infrastructure required to support development through the adoption of a clear and considered spatial strategy that reduces reliance on the private car and supports sustainable patterns of growth and development. By doing so, essential infrastructure may be prioritised and benefit the most people, while minimising the impact of any funding gap or inflated infrastructure requirements.</p> <p><u>Affordable Housing</u></p> <p>It is important to meet the needs of the Borough for both market and affordable homes, both for sale and for rent in order for the community to be provided with a choice of housing at a more reasonable cost and to tackle the lack of supply over recent years. This helps sustain a vibrant, balanced and thriving community within the town.</p> <p>We would concur with the need to increase the level of affordable housing achieved within the Borough and to balance this with the provision of starter homes and other forms of tenure, such as private rented housing. The overall level of affordable housing sought is supported. It is however, important to provide a range of housing tenures and sizes to achieve a balance mix. In this regard the promotion of rented accommodation, both private and affordable, forms a further component of supply that can enable a long-term approach to increasing the supply and quality of housing provided.</p>	<p>consultation as part of the Council's Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule 2015. This list will be revised and will be subject to further public consultation alongside the updated draft CIL rates.</p> <p>Noted. However, private rented housing does not fall within the current national planning policy definition of affordable housing.</p> <p>The government consulted in early 2016 on widening the definition to include low cost market housing.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>The Council’s commitment to affordable rented housing at 80% of market values is supported but we would note that there is a balance between this and the maximum local housing allowance that would influence the overall supply of housing achieved. It may for example be possible to provide additional rented housing at 80% of market value than would be achieved by adopting the housing allowance and hence this would benefit more people who would otherwise struggle with traditional home ownership.</p> <p><u>Open Space and Other Infrastructure</u> The approach to open space and recreation facilities is generally supported and is important for this to be in line with recognised national standards in order to appropriately meet the needs of the community. This can often be achieved by an appropriate masterplanning approach based on garden village principles, which can ensure that every new home has a high quality environment and direct access to appropriate open space.</p> <p><u>Thames Basin Heaths SPA</u> It is important to draw together the results of the Thames Basin Heaths consultation and contributions, whether in kind or financial, as part of the overall approach to green infrastructure and this is generally supported together with the associated landscape and biodiversity commitments.</p> <p><u>Transport</u> The transport implications of development within the Local Plan are significant and complex. It should be a key requirement of the Plan for the most appropriate spatial strategy to be adopted that minimises reliance on the private car and promotes the most sustainable pattern of development that promotes walking, cycling and public transport and which optimises access to a full range of goods and services.</p>	<p>Noted, the currently adopted standards follow national standards.</p> <p>Developer contributions towards TBH SPD Avoidance mitigation is a separate consideration to more general open space provision.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal work of the emerging Local Plan considered this issue in relation to distance potential sites to certain key transport infrastructure and</p>
--	---	--

	<p>The approach adopted of identifying both site specific transport infrastructure (such as park and ride, car club and charging) and shared contributions to off site or wider transport infrastructure needed to support development within the area is supported.</p> <p>In Guildford Centre there is a high level of public transport accessibility and contributions from development within and adjoining Guildford may make an appropriate contribution to provide improvements to public transport (such as upgraded bus shelters), or walking and cycling infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Education and Social Services</u> A similar approach can be made to education and social services provision, with sites within and adjoining Guildford able to make direct 'in kind' contributions to benefit a greater proportion of the residents of the town where others may be reliant on financial contributions.</p>	<p>services. This is one of the key issues in drawing up a new spatial strategy.</p> <p>Agreed. These infrastructure initiatives are referred to in the Infrastructure Schedule of the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Agreed. The CIL provides a future potential mechanism to assist in the ability to collect contributions from many developments.</p>
Individual respondent	<p>I consider that additional costs at outline planning are detrimental to the process and discourage smaller developments. Also please bear in mind that like it or not we have voted democratically to leave the EU. A major factor in many minds was to remove over-legislation.</p>	<p>The SPD sets out how we will take viability into account in the contributions that we seek from developments.</p>
GBC Parking Manager	<p>This SPD update and the proposals in the Draft Parking Strategy 2016 need to align. This will be secured by changes to local planning guidance and traffic orders.</p>	<p>No section on permit-free housing has been included. The proposal for permit-free housing will be subject to consultation in the Council's Parking Strategy, which will be subject to consultation later this year.</p>
GBC Solicitor	<p>A variety of typos and minor alterations suggested.</p>	<p>These amendments have been made.</p>

**Table 3 : Any other relevant matter**

<p>The <u>open space threshold</u> in respect of developments under 25 homes as set out in in Section 9 : Open Space, in Appendix 1 : Summary of requirements, and in the related text has been amended from the draft SPD back to that of the 2011 Planning Contributions SPD. This amendment was made to ensure that the SPD does not conflict with the adopted development plan (in this case Policy R3 of the 2003 Local Plan). A caveat has also been included regarding the national threshold for “tariff” style contributions (where relevant) introduced through the CLG’s Written Ministerial Statement.</p>
<p>Draft SPD did not include the threshold for early years education contributions in the table Summary of Requirements at Appendix 1 includes the threshold of 11 homes (net), as for primary and secondary school expansions. The text has been updated (draft SPD, 17.7) to reflect this.</p>
<p>Various factual updates were made due to changes in the legislative and policy context and referenced evidence based documents. This includes references to: the approved of the Neighbourhood Planning Act (2.12); West Surrey Strategic Housing Market: Guildford Addendum Report, 2017 (5.12); Council’s Proposed Submission Local Plan, 2017 (5.25); Guildford Borough Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment, 2017 (9.17, Appendix 4); Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy 2017 SPD (10.3 and Appendix 1); Guidance on waste and recycling storage and collection, 2017 (12.1 and Appendix 8); draft Public Art Strategy, 2017 (15.6), and Surrey School Organisation Plan 2016/17 – 2025/26 (17.8).</p>
<p>The draft SPD guidance on contributions sought for Public Art remains applicable on a case-by-case basis, but has been further clarified as being subject to this case-by-case consideration only in the case of major schemes (of over 100 or more net residential dwellings and 2500sqm (net additional commercial floor space). (15.8, 15.9).</p>
<p>Appendix 1 Public Art requirement of “on-site provision” has been updated to read “on-site provision or contribution” to ensure internal consistency in the document, which made provision for these (off-site) contributions in the consulted draft. (see 15.8).</p>