

17 FEBRUARY 2020

PLACE MAKING AND INNOVATION EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

17 February 2020

- * Councillor Angela Gunning (Chairman)
- * Councillor Gordon Jackson (Vice-Chairman)

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| * Councillor Jon Askew | * Councillor Diana Jones |
| * Councillor Christopher Barrass | * Councillor Masuk Miah |
| * Councillor Ruth Brothwell | * Councillor Maddy Redpath |
| Councillor Graham Eyre | Councillor Will Salmon |
| * Councillor Liz Hogger | * Councillor Patrick Sheard |

* Present

PMI25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Will Salmon. Councillor Gillian Harwood was present as a substitute for Councillor Will Salmon.

PMI26 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT AND DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Councillor Gordon Jackson declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item numbers 4 and 5 as the Chairman of the Surrey Hills Trust Fund.

PMI27 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 21 October 2019 were confirmed as a correct record, and signed by the Chairman. The minutes included requested changes to the minutes of the previous Board meeting, held on 23 September 2019, which were also signed.

PMI28 REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION ON LOCAL PLAN: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

The Planning Policy Manager introduced a report regarding the Regulation 18 consultation in respect of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies and gave an explanatory supporting presentation.

The report explained that the Development Management Policies (known as the draft Local Plan) formed the second part of Borough's Local Plan. Once adopted the draft Local Plan would, together with the recently adopted Local Plan: Strategy and Sites document (LPSS), fully supersede the existing Local Plan 2003 to form part of the Council's Development Plan. The draft Local Plan provided the more detailed policies to be used by Development Management in the determination of planning applications and supplemented the small number of development management policies included in the LPSS where these were necessary in implementing the strategic policies, for example in relation to the Green Belt, employment and retail.

The structure of the draft Local Plan was consistent with that of the LPSS. The chapters therefore consisted of: Housing, Protecting, Economy, Design, and Infrastructure and Delivery. A list of all the proposed policies and a brief summary as to their aims and how they sought to achieve those aims were contained in Appendix 1.

PLACE MAKING AND INNOVATION EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

17 FEBRUARY 2020

The Regulation 18 consultation included both issues and options and proceeded to suggest a preferred option for each policy. This approach was designed to generate meaningful comments and concerns that would enable the Council to move directly to a Regulation 19 proposed submission document. This in turn would increase the possibility of being able to progress the plan to Examination stage without the need for main modifications and a further round of consultation. The consultation period would run for seven weeks from 20 April until 8 June 2020.

At its meeting on 24 March 2020, the Executive would also consider this matter, taking into consideration any comments from this Board before being asked to recommend to Full Council on 7 April 2020 that the draft Local Plan, incorporating any recommended changes, be approved for Regulation 18 public consultation for a seven-week period beginning on 20 April 2020. The Executive would also be asked to resolve that the Director of Strategic Services be authorised, in consultation with the relevant Lead Councillor, to make such minor alterations to improve the clarity of the document.

The reasons for recommendations were to encourage the Council to enable the draft Local Plan to be published for public consultation and to allow officers to undertake public consultation.

Undertaking a public consultation in respect of the draft Local Plan was a statutory requirement placed on Local Planning Authorities under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and would enable the Council to move closer to adopting this second part of the Local Plan.

The presentation covered the hierarchy of policy / guidance, draft Local Plan Development Management Policies, stages of preparing a local plan, preparing the Borough's draft Local Plan, structure of the draft Local Plan, overall thoughts in respect of the draft Local Plan, next steps and EAB recommendations to the Executive.

The hierarchy of policy / guidance featured the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance which fed into the South East Plan Policy NRM6 which related to new residential development close to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, and then into the Development Plan which consisted of Local Plan 2003 (extant policies to be replaced by the draft Local Plan), Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2019, Surrey Minerals and Waste Plans, and adopted and emerging Neighbourhood Plans. Finally, the Development Plan fed into adopted and emerging Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs).

The presentation described a Local Plan as being a development plan document which formed part of the Development Plan, as creating policy and as guiding planning decisions which must be taken in line with it unless material considerations indicated otherwise. The associated consultation period was a minimum of 6 weeks and a draft Local Plan needed to undergo examination in public by an independent planning inspector appointed by the Secretary of State and be adopted by full Council. From past experience the production of a Local Plan in Guildford was likely to take a minimum of three years.

There were three stages to the preparation a local plan. The first stage consisted of research, early consultation and the preparation of issues, options and preferred options for consultation under Regulation 18 which would take place in April 2020. The second stage considered comments from the issues, options and preferred options and prepared a Proposed Submission Local Plan: Development Management Policies for consultation under Regulation 19. The third and final stage featured consideration of comments from the Proposed Submission Local Plan consultation and preparation of the Submission Local Plan: Development Management Policies for submission with the Regulation 19 representations to

17 FEBRUARY 2020

the Secretary of State for independent examination. Following publication of the Inspector's report, his/her main modifications would be accepted and the Local Plan: Development Management Policies adopted in Autumn 2022.

Preparing the draft Local Plan featured review of the NPPF, the still extant parts of the 2003 Local Plan, the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites and Topic Papers and consultation feedback / engagement with councillors. Internal consultation with Development Management had taken place to identify any gaps. The Planning Policy, Design & Conservation Team, colleagues across the Council, external partners and the cross-party Local Plan Panel had been involved. Future involvement would include the Executive, full Council, residents, developers, statutory consultees etc.

The draft Local Plan was structured into chapters in respect of Housing, Employment, Protecting, Design and Infrastructure, details of which were provided in the presentation.

Overall thoughts were that the draft Local Plan consisted of 38 proposed policies, many of which were subject to a fast changing agenda with ambitious policy requirements that would be challenged and need to be justified with robust evidence. Whole plan viability testing would take place ahead of the Regulation 19 consultation version and careful consideration would be given to the consultation responses received to assess their justification.

The next steps were as follows:

- Full Council approval – 7 April 2020.
- Seven-week Regulation 18 consultation 20 April – 8 June.
- Process and analyse comments received.
- Timetable dependent upon scale and complexity of issues raised that need to be considered.
- Local Plan Policies created.
- Full committee process (to full Council to agree consultation).
- Minimum six-week Regulation 19 consultation.
- Submission to Secretary of State – independent inspector appointed.
- Examination in public (including hearing sessions) and further consultation in respect of the main modifications.
- Inspector's final report published and full Council adoption.

The following points and comments arose from related questions and discussion:

- A councillor expressed the view that the wording in the Issues and Preferred Options consultation document attached to the report at Appendix 2 was likely to cause confusion amongst residents and consultees who were keen to see the Green Belt protected and it may attract objections. Further consideration would be given to the engagement strategy to ensure the consultation was accessible.
- The draft Local Plan included necessary policies such as that to protect public houses under threat. Promoting the consultation document in a positive fashion to highlight its strengths such as measures to tackle climate change included in policies was welcomed.
- Policy E10: Rural development (including agricultural diversification) made no reference to climate change leading to an intensification of vineyards, which were also tourist attractions. However, vineyards were considered to be an acceptable agricultural use and did not require any specific permissions. Buildings supporting agricultural use in the Green Belt were generally acceptable.

17 FEBRUARY 2020

- The Government's Future Homes policy was currently subject to consultation. Any changes to the draft Local Plan required as a result of this policy could be accommodated before the Regulation 19 consultation stage.
- It was felt that the definition of high quality design should be expanded and examples given to clarify what was expected. The Board was advised that the relevant SPD would contain photographic material to depict high quality design and the principles of good design, which were contained in Policy D4, would be used and interpreted in the determination of planning applications. The spatial design of larger development sites would be a consideration.
- The relevant SPD addressed sustainability and transport issues with a view to achieving a carbon neutral position in the future.
- Biodiversity was measured through examining and valuing habitats both pre and post development using a DEFRA matrix with the aim of increasing levels by 20% after developments. Habitats included soil and ancient woodland and those for native species were favoured over those for foreign creatures.
- New houses should be constructed to enable future adaptations to secure increased carbon reduction. The Government was proposing that the use of gas in new homes would be banned from 2025.
- Planning policies would have full weight following adoption.
- The scope of the proposed policies and the strength of their links to issues related to climate change, biodiversity and protection were supported.

The Chairman summarised the main views expressed by the Board which were as follows:

- The scope of the proposed policies and the strength of their links to issues related to climate change, biodiversity and protection were strongly supported.
- The Board felt that the document as a whole was not easy for a resident to read and understand and asked that every effort be made to provide explanations in plain English to help residents understand what the document was, how it related to the existing Local Plan and what it sought to achieve.
- The addition of an explanation regarding what the plan could and could not do, especially in relation to climate change, was sought.
- The rural development policy needed a reference to vineyards in the text in terms of the opportunities they created to contribute to the rural economy, including through tourism.
- Examples of high-quality design would greatly improve understanding of the document.

PMI29 DRAFT STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (SDF) SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) - BRIEFING NOTE

The Planning Policy Manager introduced a briefing note and presentation in respect of the Strategic Development Framework (SDF) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and explained that SPDs were supplementary detail and guidance to adopted Local Plan policy to improve its use by the Council and developers to promote understanding of the planning process. SPDs were a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The process to produce an SPD was more rapid than that of higher level documents as the related consultation was for a minimum of four weeks only, an independent examination process was unnecessary and adoption was via the Executive with no need for full Council approval.

The presentation, given by a Senior Policy Officer - Planning Policy, outlined the scope, structure and Part 2 design principles of the SDF SPD. The scope was applicable to a number of sites / locations, namely, Weyside Urban Village (former Slyfield Area Regeneration Project), Gosden Hill Farm, former Wisley Airfield, Blackwell Farm, and land to

17 FEBRUARY 2020

the south of Ash and Tongham. The SDF SPD was structured into four Parts. Part 1 set out the policy context and engagement undertaken in its preparation whilst Part 2 described the general design principles applicable to all the five strategic sites. Part 3 detailed site specific guidance on each site / location including an SDF for each site (a high level masterplan which would form the starting point for applications preparing more detailed masterplans) and Part 4 related to matters to be considered at planning application and implementation stage (pre-application, design codes, design review panel, infrastructure delivery etc). The Part 2 design principles were to be considered against other policies and the National Design Guide. Although the principles were not comprehensive, they picked up the considerations most relevant to strategic sites and the creation of new communities including building in sustainability, creating an identity, promoting modal shift, assessing site constraints/opportunities and urban design principles.

Details in respect of each site / location consisted of matters including site boundary, development area, uses, water courses, existing buildings, focal points, on-site primary routes, access to development areas, key off-site routes, primary site access, sustainable movement corridor (SMC), key pedestrian and cycle routes, schools, modal filters for buses, pedestrians and cyclists, and suggested locations for Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG).

The next steps consisted of a five-week consultation running from 13 January to 24 February 2020, updating and finalising the document for adoption by the Executive as soon as practicable and forming the starting point for applicants developing their masterplans that would accompany outline planning applications.

The Board considered each site / location and the following points and comments were made:

Weyside Urban Village

The Board noted the details of this site where 1,500 high density homes with parking, roof gardens and open space were proposed following the relocation of the sewage works. A spine road would run through the site and the river would be a significant feature.

Gosden Hill Farm

This was a strategic site for mixed use development comprising a total of 1,800 homes with employment and school provision. The SMC would run through the site and the second access from Merrow Lane would enable the opportunity for a section of Merrow Lane to be downgraded to a walking and cycling route. Along the A3 trunk road there would be a green buffer at the north eastern corner, a Park and Ride facility and significant landscaping to offer a green gateway into Guildford.

Councillors expressed the views that traffic management and A3 access improvements were crucial as local roads were thought to be currently at full operating capacity. A detailed transport assessment to ascertain how traffic generated by this development would impact on the road network would accompany the planning application. Councillors expressed the view that an all movements junction of the A3 was required. They were advised that the site allocation policy in the adopted Local Plan: Strategy and Sites allowed for a deliberative process of consideration to be undertaken as part of the development management process of the potential opportunity to provide an all movements junction. A potential all movements junction was found to be unnecessary in previous work. In response to concerns regarding issues relating to access to retail venues, the town centre and railway stations, the Board was advised that the local Park and Ride, SMC and proposed new station offered transport options and the site promoter, in making a planning application, would need to undertake a

17 FEBRUARY 2020

transport assessment and, in so doing, involve Surrey County Council as the Local Highway Authority and Highways England. Further explanation was sought as to how the transport requirements of the Local Plan in relation to this site were derived.

Housing delivery timescales were a concern and it was agreed that related checks would be made with Development Management regarding the introduction of specific development delivery timescales in planning permissions.

Increased noise blight from the A3 was raised as an issue and it was noted that an acoustic survey would be undertaken at the site and that any necessary measures such as landscaping, tree planting and acoustic fencing would be implemented.

Former Wisley Airfield

This site at the former Wisley Airfield was identified by the SDF as a strategic site for mixed use development with a capacity for 2,000 new homes over the plan period.

Although the SDF planned that the development of the site would take the form of a sustainable community, there were concerns that it would lead to car dependency and increased traffic congestion in the area as it lacked close access to a railway station. The SDF was thought to lack information regarding sustainable off-site movement and travel. The proposed new four-form entry secondary school was anticipated to draw traffic into the site. It was felt that the proposed density of 50-60 dwellings per hectare at the centre of the site, which was over the suburban average, would benefit from landscaping, planting and screening to soften the transition from a countryside area to an urban site.

The Board agreed that further explanation of, and strengthening of references to, the off-site cycle network and bus services were necessary.

Blackwell Farm

This strategic site was intended as an urban extension to the west of Guildford on land to the west of Surrey Research Park, Royal Surrey County Hospital and Surrey Sports Park, to the north of the A31 and south of the North Downs railway line. The Local Plan identified the site as a strategic site for mixed-use development, with capacity for a minimum of 1,500 dwellings during the Local Plan period, and a total of 1,800 dwellings overall. The SDF included guidance in relation to planting to soften the impact of this proposed development and measures to address the surface water issue. Public transport links would include the passage of the SMC through the site.

A view was expressed that the SDF needed to be strengthened in terms of achieving sustainable transport, identifying open space requirements, promoting a green environment and securing well designed carbon neutral homes. The SDF could include clarification to show how the development could improve cycle links from the site, including nearby Christmas Pie trail. There was a Local Plan requirement to deliver the SMC. It was noted that the Surrey Research Park was owned by the University and that Gill Avenue was in the ownership of the Royal Surrey County Hospital. It was suggested by councillors that the SMC should include a bus loop to access the proposed new Guildford West (Park Barn) station. Although Network Rail did not routinely promote new stations, the Government had encouraged proposals for new stations through offering funding and Network Rail was aware of the proposal for the Guildford West (Park Barn) station. It was considered important that the required infrastructure was put in place when it was first needed. The SDF could be expanded to include mitigation and design guidance relating to the new access road and any residual harm to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, possibly involving developer contributions.

17 FEBRUARY 2020

The introduction of 20 mile per hour speed limits in the new developments on the strategic sites was suggested. Although the Local Highway Authority had previously had a limited appetite for introducing 20mph speed limits or zones, Planning Policy could be requested to investigate the matter further with respect to this and other strategic sites.

Land to the South of Ash and Tongham

The SDF promoted a continual link between the sites in this area which were separately owned. Surface water attenuation was an issue at these sites and the proposed Ash Road Bridge would feature to the north of the area. Development of a number of sites within the area had been approved, however, the SDF process was informed by parallel workstreams and has had value in terms of refining the Council's position in ongoing negotiations. SANG mitigation for the entire site would be provided on privately owned land with agreements between the developers and SANG owners. SANG land must be maintained in perpetuity and would be transferred to an enduring body such as the Land Trust when mitigation occurred. Figure 53 provided an indication of areas of differing character and included elements of 'radiating landscape structure' centred on Ash Manor. Proposals were expected to demonstrate how they responded to the current site including elements of landscape structure. The illustration of the landscape structure, although indicative in extent, should be considered in the light of planning permissions granted. Further clarity could be provided in this regard.

PMI30 FORWARD PLAN

The Executive Forward Plan was noted.

PMI31 EAB WORK PROGRAMME

The EAB noted upcoming items on its Work Programme.

The meeting finished at 10.20 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman