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1. INTRODUCTION

Guildford town centre and hinterland masterplan

1.1 Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners was commissioned in December 2014 to prepare the Guildford Town Centre and Hinterland masterplan on behalf of Guildford Borough Council. The team for the project also includes Bilfinger GVA, providing specialist commercial property market, viability and delivery advice, and Arup, specialists in flood risk management and movement.

1.2 The purpose of the masterplan is to develop a masterplan for Guildford Town Centre for the Local Plan period to 2023 and beyond. This builds upon the extensive consultation undertaken so far with the community and local stakeholders alongside the existing evidence base. It will be used in conjunction with other studies to support the preparation of the Guildford Borough Local Plan. The masterplan itself will not be used in determining planning applications, but applicants will be encouraged to consider it as a statement of intent.

1.3 The masterplan develops, refines and updates some of the proposals in the Vision report, but it is important to note that the new study includes a more detailed assessment of constraints and opportunities, particularly flood risk. It also responds to the extensive consultation on the draft Local Plan and Town Centre vision document in 2014. Further consultation has been undertaken with a range of key landowners and stakeholders.

Scope of consultation

1.4 The masterplan comprised the following sections:

• Overview of status and context;
• Summary of the commercial background to the project;
• Overview of Guildford’s unique landscape setting and historic townscape;
• Key placemaking concepts;
• Illustrative masterplanning guidance for key areas and potential development sites in the town centre including approximate capacity, artist impressions and drawings; and
• Summary of delivery issues and opportunities including potential timescales.

1.5 Three technical notes were prepared in support of the masterplan and appended for reference:

• Summary Note: Transport proposal for the Guildford town centre and hinterland masterplan (prepared by Arup, 2015). This summarises the assessment that has been taken of the various options and explains the rationale for the preferred scenarios in the main masterplan report
• Guildford Town Centre Highway Assessment report (the “GoTCHA” report as prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff). This report summarises the technical work undertaken as part of a separate study by the Council to consider wider town centre highways options.
• Viability and delivery notes: Bilfinger GVA has prepared a delivery commentary and supporting information in relation to viability and potential delivery steps for the key sites.
Consultation

1.6  The consultation ran from Friday 2 October at 10 until Monday 16 November at 4pm. Events were widely advertised by Guildford Borough Council and a staffed exhibition was available at the following times and locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fri 2 Oct</td>
<td>10am to 4pm</td>
<td>25 Swan Lane, Guildford High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 6 Oct</td>
<td>10.30am to 3.30pm</td>
<td>Farmers’ Market, Guildford High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 7 Oct</td>
<td>10am to 4pm</td>
<td>25 Swan Lane, Guildford High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 12 Oct</td>
<td>10am to 4pm</td>
<td>25 Swan Lane, Guildford High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 16 Oct</td>
<td>10am to 4pm</td>
<td>Ash Centre, Ash Hill Road, Ash GU12 5DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 17 Oct</td>
<td>10am to 4pm</td>
<td>25 Swan Lane, Guildford High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 23 Oct</td>
<td>10am to 4pm</td>
<td>25 Swan Lane, Guildford High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 28 Oct</td>
<td>10am to 4pm</td>
<td>Horsley &amp; Send Cricket Club, West Horsley KT24 6J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu 29 Oct</td>
<td>2pm to 7pm</td>
<td>25 Swan Lane, Guildford High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 3 Nov</td>
<td>10.30am to 3.30pm</td>
<td>Farmers’ Market, Guildford High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 6 Nov</td>
<td>10am to 4pm</td>
<td>25 Swan Lane, Guildford High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 11 Nov</td>
<td>10am to 4pm</td>
<td>25 Swan Lane, Guildford High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 13 Nov</td>
<td>10am to 4pm</td>
<td>25 Swan Lane, Guildford High Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7  Consultees were invited to attend the exhibition and encouraged to view the masterplan in more detail. The masterplan was available in electronic format both online at the GBC Town Centre masterplan page (http://www.guildford.gov.uk/tcmp) and via CD as supplied on request at the exhibition.

1.8  Consultees were encouraged to visit an online survey page to respond to 10 key questions about the masterplan. A separate survey was undertkane to explore the views of key landowners.

Report structure

1.9  The report is structured as follows:

- Chapter 2 summarises feedback from the online surveys.
- Chapter 3 provides a summary of the detailed written representations received from individuals, groups and statutory organisations.
- Chapter 4 defines an initial direction of travel, highlighting how the principal areas of discussion could inform proposed areas of amendment in the masterplan and other separate workstreams including the Local Plan process or more detailed transport studies.
2. SUMMARY OF ONLINE CONSULTATION SURVEY RESPONSES

Overview

2.1 216 responses were received via the online consultation form during the consultation period. The responses have been subject to two rounds of analysis. The first focused on the quantitative data resulting from the survey questions. The second method entailed a qualitative review of the key themes arising from the survey. Written responses to the quantitative questions frequently involved a degree of overlap between topics. Feedback has therefore been amalgamated by theme rather than by question to make the analysis more accessible. Where a consultee identified multiple responses on a single theme, these have been amalgamated to avoid double counting.

2.2 Eight key themes have emerged through the analysis as set out below:

- New Community Riverside Park (including question 1).
- New pedestrian and cycle routes (including questions 2 and 3).
- Improving the gyratory (including questions 4, 5 and 6).
- Shift to sustainable modes of transport (including question 7).
- Identifying sites for housing balanced with town centre uses (including question 8).
- A thriving town centre (including question 9).
- Protecting & enhancing Guildford’s townscape and character (including question 10).
- Overarching concerns.

New Community Riverside Park (including question 1)

2.3 The following graph illustrates strong support for the masterplan’s approach to delivering the creation of a new community park and better connections to the River Wey from the town centre. 69.5% of responses identified that they “agreed” (50.5%) or “strongly agreed” (19%) with the proposals in this regard. Less than 10% “disagreed” (5.1%) or “strongly disagreed” (4.2%).

Q1: Does the draft masterplan deliver the key objectives to create a new community riverside park and better connections to the River Wey from the town centre?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Participants made a number of further written observations which related to the broad theme of enhancing the riverside. Of the 44 additional responses on the riverside, 30% stated that the focus on the riverside was a positive aspect of the plan, and welcomed making a greater feature of the River Wey in the town. 14% of comments stated support for the linked objective of improving linkages to the town centre and water by reducing the impact of traffic on the town centre. It is important to highlight that 20% of the additional comments regarding the riverside disagreed with the status of the riverside as a key objective with some noting that the associated transport issues should not be a focus or a priority for residents.

2.5 There were also a number of specific comments made by much smaller numbers of respondents focusing on elements of detail. For example, some of these identified support for specific aspects of the River Wey proposals (e.g. Woodbridge Meadows / Walnut Tree Close). Others indicated that the river already benefits from good access, or suggested that the proposals could impact on the quiet nature of the waterfront.

New pedestrian and cycle routes (including questions 2 and 3)

2.6 59.3% of responses strongly agreed (13%) or agreed (46.3%) that the draft masterplan delivers on the key objective of providing a pedestrian and cycle route from the station to the town through Bedford Wharf. Only 11.6% of responses disagreed with the approach to delivering the pedestrian / cycle route.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2: Does the draft Masterplan deliver on the key objective to provide a pedestrian and cycle route from the station to the town through Bedford Wharf?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 Question 3 asked whether respondents would use the riverside park cycle routes and cycle parking. An identical number of responses were received – 39.4% stated “yes” and 39.4% selected “no”. Almost 15% selected “I don’t know / no opinion”.

5
Q3: Would you use the riverside park cycle routes and cycle parking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don't know/no opinion</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8 29 additional comments were submitted in relation to pedestrian and cycle connections in general. 14% of these noted the need for walking, cycling and public transport to be safe methods to the town centre. 10% requested a clearer explanation of pedestrian and cycle connections from Beford Wharf. A smaller number of comments focused on issues such as the need for additional detail in relation to public transport and vehicular interventions including the relationship with Onslow Street.

2.9 50 additional comments focused on opportunities for improved bus provision or alternative local public transport provision such as a tram service. 22% of these comments reiterated the need for enhanced bus services through better interchanges, more reliable information, greater frequency of service and extended service times until later in the day. 20% noted support for a new transport hub/interchange at the station. 12% expressed concern at the dispersal of bus stops and stated that this could result in an increase in the number of bus stands. Smaller numbers of comments highlighted queries, concerns or opportunities in relation to issues of detail such as bus station location, approach to bus lanes, funding and the impact of bus gates. Further details are identified under the “buses and trams” heading.

2.10 19 additional comments related to Park and Ride provision. Of these, 42% were sceptical about the ability of Park and Ride as a solution in terms of the length of time to access the centre for short journeys and effectiveness in addressing through-traffic. 16% suggested that Park and Ride sites should operate longer into the evening. Individual comments made further comments about specific existing sites or practical extensions of existing operations.

2.11 92 comments related to more detailed feedback on cycling in the town centre. 11% of these noted that town centre cycling needs to be linked to a broader cycle network including wider residential neighbourhoods. 9% placed emphasis on the need for the best possible provision for
cycle lanes, routes, bike parking and changing facilities at key town centre locations and the station. 8% supported more cycle routes and fewer cars. Others were less positive about the proposals. For example, 10% highlighted that some residents consider themselves to be “too old” to cycle, 8% that the town centre lacks safe cycling routes with too much traffic and 8% cited Guildford’s terrain as a critical constraint. Other issues included living too far from the town centre to cycle (7%) and a preference for driving and walking (7%).

2.12 25 comments considered opportunities in relation to pedestrianisation. These points covered a wide range of suggestions including a number of specific suggestions for particular routes, crossings or existing / new bridges.

2.13 Of the 24 comments about rail and trains, 33% noted the need to consider townscape issues such as height, massing and aesthetics of the proposed station scheme against operational improvements. 21% noted the potential for a new parkway station to reduce town centre congestion. 13% supported an increase in capacity through extra platforms / tracks to achieve a greater modal shift.

2.14 A smaller number of comments focused on opportunities to enhance boat access (2 comments), improved provision for people with disabilities (9 comments) and better linkages with the university / research park / hospital and cathedral areas (4 comments).

Improving the gyratory (including questions 4, 5 and 6)

2.15 Question 4 demonstrates that 40.7% of responses stated agreement (“agree” or “strongly agree”) that the masterplan delivers on the key objective of improving the gyratory system to create better connections and spaces, and more activity fronting onto streets and spaces to liven up the core town centre. More than a quarter (26.4%) disagreed / strongly disagreed with this statement.
2.16 Question 5 illustrates a more balanced distribution of responses. 41.2% of respondents identified agreement (“agree” or “strongly agree”) with the proposals to reduce traffic flows in the town centre. However, 37% indicated that they disagreed (“disagree” or “strongly disagree”) with the draft masterplan in this regard.

Q5: Do you agree or disagree with the proposals to reduce traffic flows in the town centre set out in the draft Masterplan?

2.17 Question 6 asked respondents to identify their preference for either of the two gyratory solutions, scenario 1 or 2. The most popular response was “Neither” which was selected in 43.1% of the responses. Of the 44.5% of responses who identified a preferred gyratory scenario, the majority 26.4% chose scenario 1, and 18.1% selected scenario 2.

Q6: With regards to traffic improvements, do you have a preference for proposed Gyratory Scenario 1 or 2?
Shift to sustainable modes of transport (including question 7)

2.18 There was a strong consensus for the creation of a new waterfront and attractive town centre through a sustainable modal shift and a new parking strategy encouraging people to drive to Guildford (including Park and Ride) rather than through the town. 68.5% agreed with the approach in the draft masterplan.

Q7: Creating a new waterfront and attractive town centre will require: (a) a shift towards walking, cycling and public transport, and (b) a new parking strategy to encourage people to drive to Guildford (including Park and Ride) and not through the town.

![Graph showing responses to Q7]

2.19 219 additional comments were received in relation to vehicular flows and traffic. 18% of these expressed concern that both gyratory scenarios would lead to unsuitable alternative routes on congested routes, thus undermining the proposed solutions. 11% of these responses indicated support for the GVG rail and river bridge proposals. 9% of additional comments on this theme stated that the masterplan does not make sufficient provision for people making journeys from east to west or north-south. 5% cited support for a potential tunnel as part of an infrastructure proposal.

2.20 48 specific additional comments were made in relation to gyratory scenario 1. Of these, 15% expressed opposition to scenario 1 noting issues with the use of Town Bridge for traffic including impact on views. 10% noted support for this scenario. A further 10% queried the impact of the Farnham Road closure during peak hours. The remaining comments under this theme represented a spectrum of perceived pro's and con's for the scenario.

2.21 Interestingly, gyratory scenario 2 attracted 25 comments, fewer than scenario 1. 40% of these comments highlighted that this scenario imposes a significant barrier between the High Street and the river and provides insufficient alleviation of the separation. 16% supported the closure of Bridge Street to cars to create a better space.

2.22 28 additional comments were submitted on car parks / parking. These covered a wide range of issues. 18% noted the need for a clear parking strategy to be in place in advance of sites coming forward for development.
2.23 16 comments related to the A3 with 38% of these arguing that improvements to the A3 could create a more efficient pattern of movement which would support reductions in through traffic.

**Identifying sites for housing balanced with town centre uses (including question 8)**

2.24 45.4% of respondents indicated their agreement that the draft masterplan delivers on the objective of identifying sites for housing in the town centre alongside office, retail, leisure and community development. 27.8% of respondents were neutral on this topic but only 15.2% indicated that they disagreed.

![Bar chart](chart.png)

Q8: Does the draft Masterplan deliver on the key objective to identify sites for housing in the town centre (balanced with office, retail, leisure and community development)?

2.25 23 comments related to general patterns of land use as proposed. These highlighted a wide range of detailed issues and suggestions including the balance of uses and location of growth without any significant consensus.

2.26 50 additional comments were submitted in relation to retail uses. 30% of these indicated that there was too much emphasis on retail in the draft masterplan. Responses were sceptical about the need for more detail in the context of perceived tastes and habits with some requesting further evidence. Smaller proportions identified opportunities to support independent retail. 6 comments were received on Bedford Wharf including queries about adjacent plots and awareness of the proposals from affected parties.

2.27 14 additional comments were linked to office provision. 57% of these stated that too much space has been allocated to office provision.

2.28 65 comments were made with respect to housing. 14% of these emphasised the need to provide affordable housing and accommodation suitable for first time buyers. A range of other topics were
raised including approach to parking, mix of unit sizes, density and design quality. Allied to housing delivery, 12 comments were submitted on social infrastructure with 92% identifying concern about the need for school, community infrastructure and medical facilities to support the context for growth.

2.29 A range of comments were received on leisure, entertainment and culture (11), cafes and restaurants (3) and the market (4). Responses indicate the need for a balanced cultural offer, with careful consideration regarding potential over supply.

A thriving town centre (including question 9)

2.30 61.6% of responses agreed that town centre living would increase the vibrancy of the town. Only 11.1% disagreed with that town centre vibrancy would increase as a result of increased town centre housing provision.

| Q9: Do you think that town centre living would increase the vibrancy of the town? |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Percentage %                     | Yes             | No             | I don't know/no opinion | No response |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| 70                               |                 |                |                       |
| 60                               |                 |                |                       |
| 50                               |                 |                |                       |
| 40                               |                 |                |                       |
| 30                               |                 |                |                       |
| 20                               |                 |                |                       |
| 10                               |                 |                |                       |
| 0                                | Yes             | No             | I don't know/no opinion | No response |

2.31 Of the proportion that responded “yes” to question 9, 41 responses expanded on their reasons for their positive view, 22% of additional responses stated that town centre living can assist in creating a viable lively evening culture, increased vibrancy and well-used areas. 12% suggested that a mix of young and old people is vital. Of the smaller proportion that responded negatively to question 9, 13 additional comments were made. 38% of these already consider the town centre to be vibrant.

Protecting and enhancing Guildford's townscape and character (including question 10)

2.32 55.6% of respondents agreed that the draft masterplan delivers on the key objective of encouraging public realm and shopfront improvements in the town centre, with a careful approach to building heights to ensure that the town’s landscape and townscape is protected and enhanced. Only 6.5% of respondents disagreed with this point.
Q10: Does the draft masterplan deliver on the key objective to encourage public realm and shop front improvements in the town centre, with a careful approach to building heights to ensure that the town’s landscape and townscape character is protected and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.33 31 additional comments were submitted about the preservation of **Heritage and Townscape**. 19% of these noted that the masterplan recognises the importance of preserving heritage and existing town centre landscape / character. 16% are concerned that new development might not be in character with the old town, particularly the North Street scheme. 10% cited the importance of retaining special historic assets and features.

2.34 A further 28 comments focused on **building heights / views and character** with 50% of these strongly supporting the protection of green vistas, limiting heights and preserving views to manage impacts on townscape. 14% advocated a more prescriptive approach to building heights on a site-by-site basis.

2.35 3 comments made specific responses to proposals to **improve shopfronts**.

2.36 2 comments were submitted in relation to **environmental problems** and 6 comments were received with regards to **sustainability**. Issues such as energy networks, air pollution and flooding were highlighted.

**Overarching issues**

2.37 97 additional comments were received which focused on more **general issues**. Of these, 12% required more detailed information to make an informed decision and 6% wanted a more coherent plan. A number of specific comments were sceptical about elements of the proposals.
3. SUMMARY OF ONLINE CONSULTATION SURVEY RESPONSES

Overview

3.1 A total of 65 written representations were received in response to the draft masterplan consultation. These were from the following organisations / individuals:

- Historic England.
- Guildford Residents Association.
- Safeguard Coaches.
- Guildford Vision Group.
- Holy Trinity Amenity Group.
- Ash Parish Council.
- Councillors and MPs.
- Sea Scouts.
- Compton Parish Council.
- Waverley Borough Council.
- Worplesdon Parish Council.
- Fairlands Action Group (FLAG).
- National Trust.
- Beechcroft Residents Association.
- Environment Agency.
- Surrey County Council.
- Thames Water.
- Merrow Resident's Association.
- Enterprise M3 LEP.
- Guildford Society.
- Surrey Wildlife Trust.
- Inland Waterways Association.
- Guildford Environmental Forum.
- Natural England.
- Countryside Properties.
- Campaign to Protect Rural England Surrey (CPRE).
- Heritage Conservation Team at Surrey County Council.
- Guilford Society Transport Group.
- Comments submitted via Facebook.

3.2 The written submissions have been reviewed and key comments pulled out to produce an overall summary of responses. Key comments grouped by theme are set out under a series of headings below. Comments from statutory consultees are set out in greatest detail. Wider comments are then set out under the “other comments” heading without attributing comments in detail. Where non-statutory comments replicate statutory feedback, these have not been repeated.

Riverside

3.3 52 of the detailed written representations made explicit reference to the riverside. 27% of these comments were broadly supportive of the proposals for the creation of a green corridor and access along the Wey to open up the riverside.

Statutory consultees
3.4 National Trust identified broad support for the proposals relating to the River Wey corridor. A number of detailed points were raised as part of their responses:

- NT recommended that the reference to “change” within the character led development strategy is replaced with “enhanced” in line with NPPF requirements.
- The diagram on page 65 should be altered to reference “enhance the historic river corridor, manage wider town centre area and protect historic core.”
- None of the diagrams within the masterplan include the River Wey and Godalming Navigations Conservation Area boundary.
- NT recommended the inclusion of a detailed and cohesive strategy for provision of better signage, interpretive facilities adjacent to towpath at focal points, and on related footpath network and crossings should be included within masterplan and implemented throughout the length of the Navigations (should highlight historical buildings and character and value of valley floor meadow landscapes).
- NT registered concern at inaccuracy of some of the conceptual sketches within masterplan in relation to the width of the towpath route alongside the Navigations. For example, the sketches on pages 82&103 show a far greater width between Billings warehouse buildings and the Navigations than actually exists. NT has indicated that the organisation might resist the introduction of trees, as well as any structures (ramps, steps or overhangs) which would land within the tow path or on towpath as NT seeks to retain towpath for its intended historic use. It was also noted that the sketches imply block paving on the towpath which conflicts with the current unbound, grass edges which reflects the historic character and significance of the navigation.
- NT supports W1 plot to potentially be a cultural building, in both scenarios, particularly if it provided the opportunity for greater engagement and understanding of the Navigations and wider historic development of Guildford.
- Any development on Site W, particularly W2, must preserve and enhance the character and setting of Tread Wheel Crane in line with NPPF requirements.
- It is important that the master plan recognises the need for a strengthened and easily accessible access point somewhere in the town centre for the loading/unloading of barges with materials, plant and equipment for maintenance purposes in place of Bedford Wharf if this facility becomes unusable.

3.5 Compton Parish Council registered support for river activity and would welcome the use of a few boats as floating restaurants or for corporate events.

Other comments

3.6 A wide range of other comments were received. Some of these were either supportive, or suggested additional guiding principles to strengthen the approach:

- Flood resistance of buildings close to the river should be a priority.
- Friary Court should be removed to open up the riverside frontage.
- The new open space by riverside should include a contemporary ecological approach toward design and management of this new green space (like Lea Valley Olympic Park) – especially at Walnut Tree Close and Woodbridge Meadows.
- Consider an ‘ecological park’ feature focused perhaps alongside Dapdune Wharf
- NT must be convinced that any proposals submitted for River Wey Navigation demonstrate major environmental benefits for the town.
- It should be recognised that river towpaths are not public footpaths. Use is governed by NT for responsible pedestrians and cyclists.
- Future improvements to river Wey must involve NT expertise and they must be closely associated with decision process.
• Evaluation must extend upstream beyond Town Bridge and take in the Yvonne Arnaud Theatre, riverside car park, and the green space up to the Guildford Rowing Club - flooding will always be an important consideration for Guildford.
• The views of river users should be considered in terms of design of bankside access, facilities and equipment.
• There is concern for stretch of river between High Street Bridge and Bridge Street Bridge, where the towpath adjacent to the YMCA premises is cantilevered over the river, resulting in a boating hazard needing to be avoided in future.
• New 'visitor moorings' by Malthouse Green open space should be created to enable boaters to easily visit centre. This would also be a good point for emergency access to river and for transhipment of essential navigational maintenance equipment as road is near to river.

3.7 One comment challenged the proposals and suggested that the riverside park might be attractive but would not revive the town’s economic fortunes

Public transport

3.8 135 comments were received in relation to public transport. 10% of these including Worplesdon Parish Council and Compton Parish Council noted that it is ambitious to achieve modal shift in transport and further consideration is required in relation to additional public transport infrastructure particularly in the context of the area’s age profile, car ownership and existing habits.

Statutory consultees

3.9 Highways England indicated support for the principle of better public realm and improvements for pedestrians and other non car-users.

3.10 National Trust stated that there is an opportunity on the non-towpath side of the Navigations to provide improved access routes for cyclists. However, whilst the Trust will allow permissive access to the towpath, it must be retained as a towpath and therefore cannot be designated as a cycle route providing priority access to an alternative specific user or group. The NT representation confirmed that any Park and Glide service would be subject to river flows and changeable river conditions and it is therefore unlikely to be a year round option. A river based service would need to consider pick up and drop off points (in terms of infrastructure and accessibility) in relation to existing park and ride sites and whether there will be a requirement to travel through locks to arrive in town centre and the time it takes to do this.

3.11 NT stated that they do not support the introduction of new jetties and pontoons as these would alter the historic character of the Navigations and impede the operational navigation of the waters by boats and barges, causing issues in times of high river flows and floods.

3.12 Surrey County Council noted that more detail is required on public transport improvements to help reduce traffic. Highways England identified broad support for sustainable transport in principle.

3.13 Worplesdon Parish Council noted that any potential tram system should connect key points such as the Park & Ride sites, RSCH, University and Friary Centre. WPC also stated that bus journeys are too slow and infrequent, particularly to rural areas which is a constraint on public transport. WPC also noted that Park & Ride has no impact on school run or through traffic. The Parish Council suggested that residents should be allowed to catch P&R buses from existing bus stops along P&R routes to ease congestion. Havering Farm on the A320 was recommended as a new P&R site to provide an additional road/rail interchange. WPC also stated that cycling might be limited by the age profile of residents.
3.14 WPC stated that there should be additional halts in Merrow and Park Barn. They noted that there is insufficient capacity from Portsmouth to Waterloo which discourages people from using rail. The WPC submission noted the need to consider the impact of Park and Glide has on the river itself in relation to the potential erosion of the river bank and pollution. This likely is to be a seasonal operation.

3.15 Compton Parish Council recommended that P&R services are extended to reflect the shifting habits of modern lifestyles and recommended the implementation of a wider network of cycle routes.

3.16 Compton Parish Council and Worplesdon Parish Council highlighted the need for new stations on the periphery of the town with a view to reducing car traffic in town and freeing up car parking space at the main station.

3.17 Ash Parish Council considered that the masterplan should consider the Guildford Station redevelopment in more detail.

Other comments

3.18 Non-statutory representations focused on a number of areas relating to public transport. These are summarised according to key sub-themes below:

General public transport

• Provision for tourist coaches to pick up and drop off and park easily is vital to support Guildford’s economy.
• Ban cars from the town centre.
• A congestion charge across the whole region would encourage the use of public transport.
• Investment in public transport is imperative.

Buses and trams

• Reference to a new transportation hub is missing from the masterplan and needs to be provided which reference to buses, rail and taxis. A central, modern and accessible facility was perceived as an essential element by some. Poor facilities/services alongside greater congestion could impact on bus use. Some considered that the closure of the bus station might worsen gyratory congestion.
• Further information is required in relation to local bus services and the bus station to clarify its future format and position. Existing bus infrastructure needs improving through provision of facilities with seating in the warm and dry with a cafe area, toilet facilities and information displays in proximity of primary town centre destinations.
• Some viewed the suggestion of bus stands along Onslow Street as unworkable and inadequate. Others indicated that an Onslow Street “boulevard” should feature high quality bus passenger and bus operating infrastructure. Others noted potential for split provision between the station and Onslow Street.
• The bus lanes could be removed.
• Support for the introduction of a shuttle bus service.
• There were some queries about how bus gates might operate and one response noted that the bus gates proposed in S1 could lead to severe restriction on residents on the west side of Guildford travelling to the east by car.
• School buses could lessen traffic.

Park and ride

• Park and Ride is considered to provide a good option to lighten the town centre traffic, but does nothing to address traffic problems in surrounding areas.
• Access to any new P&R needs to be close to main roads.
• P&R car parks should be attached to existing and new local rail stations.
• One response noted that P&R facilities take a lot of space. Opportunities to consider multi-storey P&R facilities should be considered in a dry environment, with cafe, Wi-Fi, dry cleaners.
• P&R should be priced to encourage greater use by town centre commuters.
• Consider promoting use of park and rides by the retailers and businesses in town centre and use surveys of these companies to demonstrate reduction in CO2.
• A suggestion would be to use the Planning Permission for any retail or commercial development in the town centre to make it a requirement for all staff travelling by car to use the park and ride facilities.

Cycling
• The gyratory system is not safe for cyclists - need to consider safety and make cycling more attractive to people.
• Concern over topography of town - whether it is suitable for cyclists - only fit cyclists can really move around the town on bike.
• Many of the rural roads in surrounding villages are not able to accommodate cycle lanes and yet they suffer traffic congestion so this would not encourage people to cycle or walk.
• New cycle routes should take into account desired destinations and routes that cyclists will inevitably use.
• Others were less positive about cycling with responses including the following feedback. “Do not need any more cyclists” and the “addition of cycle lanes without appropriate restrictions and enforcement is an empty and dangerous gesture”. “Cycling not practical - go into town to shop so can't carry everything on a bike. Not ideal in poor weather either”. “Cyclists intimidate pedestrians - need education and policing to ensure that all users of town centre are safe and secure”.

Pedestrianisation
• A mix of views were articulated. One response noted that the perceived pedestrianised area proposed is too extensive for the gap town.
• The crossing by Debenhams is the worst road crossing in world for pedestrians - no clear crossing signals.
• In the very short term, create four way traffic light system at cross roads of Walnut Tree close, Bridge Street, Parks Street and Farnham Road.
• Guildford needs two west-east pedestrian crossing points, either below or over the road barrier, which divides east & west Guildford - Onslow Street. Could do two simple foot & cycle bridges. One would be at the end of Bridge Street. The other would be between Debenhams and the Halifax Building Society. These could both be removed as and when Onslow Street became pedestrianised.
• Extend pedestrian and cycle routes by a bridge over Walnut Tree Close and the river which would link to Woodbridge Road.
• One response queried whether pedestrianisation was better realised as well designed mixed-use streets with shared surfaces, encouraging people to come into and park in the town centre.
• Some comments were very positive about pedestrianisation and advocated widespread pedestrianised areas to achieve better access between railway station and town centre. Some responses highlighted the need for underpasses to ease traffic.
• Clearer indication is required to identify where and what form pedestrian route improvements will take.
• Retain existing excellent towpath as a primary pedestrian and cycling route.
• Detailed comments were received in relation to a number of specific locations. For example, Rosemary Alley should be retained as a "pedestrian route". Access routes to Farnham Road and car park should be retained. Improved pedestrian/cycling access from Odeon bridge is welcomed but a ramp connection is needed between towpath and bridge. Clarity of terminology is needed. For example, does "no vehicular access" apply to the bottom of the High Street and is Quarry Street closed to vehicular traffic?
**Rail and trains**

- The Station is an opportunity - any plans for re-development of the station must go hand in hand with increasing passenger capacity at Guildford, and in conjunction with plans by Network Rail for more platforms.
- No consideration has been given to how rail will play a part in the modal shift - Cranleigh rail link should be reopened with a park and ride link and Airtrack to Heathrow should be promoted.
- The current rail/bus interchange is bad and opportunities exist to enhance the bus stop on west side and the overall sense of arrival as a gateway to other locations.
- One written representation suggested moving the rail parking to where the Odeon is so to enable a new bus/rail interchange.

**Boats / park and glide**

- An opportunity exists to increase references to the tourism potential of the River Wey navigation.
- Park and Glide was noted as being a seasonal attraction, with greatest potential for tourism. Pragmatic issues such as capacity and journey times were highlighted as potential issues.

**Mobility for disabled / older people**

- There is a need to consider ageing populations and young families in relation to car use. Cycling and pedestrian journeys are not suitable.

**University, Research Park, Cathedral**

3.19 A limited number of written representations were received in relation to the university, research park area and cathedral:

- The masterplan lacks references to the Cathedral – analysis of a clear pedestrian route from the station to Cathedral is required. There needs to be a primary walking and cycling off-road route along the western side of the railway from the station to the University and Cathedral.
- Access could be supported by a shuttle bus service between station and Cathedral.
- Additional references could be included to the University. Information on student housing, specialist skills, student numbers, traffic and pedestrians created could be incorporated.
- In contrast, some representations welcomed the approach to connections between the town centre and the economic assets / productive potential at the university, science park and hospital.

**Vehicular flows and traffic**

3.20 224 comments were received about vehicular flows and traffic in the town centre in response to the draft masterplan proposals. The following points summarise the responses by statutory and other consultees across a range of topics.

**Statutory consultees**

3.21 Surrey County Council identified concerns relating to the effect of traffic on the B3000/Compton/Onslow Village/Worpseldon/Waverley (A3100/A281) if changes are made to access from Farnham Road / Walnut Tree Close. This comment was shared by a number of consultees. The county council requested that comprehensive modelling should be undertaken to better understand the impact on the gyratory, approaches, and alternative routes. It was also noted that a transport strategy needs to incorporate a Sustainable Movement Corridor at the centre for reductions to be possible.

3.22 The National Trust clarified that they will only permit new bridges across the Navigations where it can be demonstrated that historically there used to be a bridge or crossing point at that location, or a significant and compelling benefit/enhancement to the historic integrity and character of the Navigations would be achieved. NT noted that demonstration that all alternative options have
been considered that use existing crossing points. For example, there is an existing footpath alongside the Navigations south of the A25 (to the rear of Wickes/Travis Perkins) which would only require a short extension under the railway viaduct in order to link into the existing footpath alongside northern boundary of cricket ground and the pedestrian bridge across the Navigations adjacent to railway bridge as an alternative to the bridge from Woodbridge Meadows to Woodbridge Road.

3.23 NT indicated that the potential replacement of Town Bridge needs to support the weight of traffic, and must be sensitively designed regarding the historic significance of this crossing point and the character of the Navigations. If traffic is removed from Friary Bridge, then the bridge should be removed completely, removing a non-historic modern crossing point from the Navigations and enabling the enhancement of the Conservation Area. This would open up views of Onslow and Town Bridges which are currently blocked from view by the gyratory system at Friary Bridge. A replacement bridge should be significantly smaller and appropriate to its function in terms of scale. NT noted that whilst the pedestrianisation of Bridge Street is considered positive, S2 has limited visual benefits or potential enhancements for the Navigations Conservation Area.

3.24 Worplesdon Parish Council (WPC) identified a need for a coherent and integrated plan for traffic across a wider area. Specific concerns were raised in relation to potential traffic routing which would require vehicles joining the A281 to travel by St Nicholas Church which is prone to flooding. WPC also highlighted that a number of major sites have a significant area of surface water. This could be a more efficient use of space through mixed-use development with more multi-storey car parks. Town centre parking continues to be seen as a priority.

3.25 Compton Parish Council suggested potential for the development of a new ring road with access points to reduce town centre traffic. The CPC representation also indicated that the masterplan could have adopted a bolder approach to cross river / cross railway connections and infrastructure. CPC noted that scenario 1 bottom of High Street into main road (Scenario 1) and building wide replacement bridge could lead to noise, air pollution and visual effects of busy traffic, demolition of character buildings, loss of present bridge and harm to St. Nicholas church setting.

3.26 Worplesdon Parish Council and Compton Parish Council registered a view that the gyratory scenarios should provide further information about through traffic, including commentary on routes for those living in south-west Guildford needing access to the A3. Both parishes identified support for improved town centre car parking.

3.27 Highways England noted that there is unlikely to be a direct impact to the safe and efficient operation of the A3 as a result of the proposals.

3.28 Historic England noted support for a potential second phase to gyratory scenario 1.

Other comments

Wider traffic strategy
- Air quality will deteriorate in residential areas.
- New east/west link roads have to be built away from the town otherwise gridlock will ensue.

Through traffic
- Increasing signs to deal with through-traffic is not enough to ease traffic going north-south. Masterplan does nothing to mitigate traffic travelling through Guildford in north/south direction. Is 10% through traffic a realistic statistic?
- What impact will the proposals have on the ability to pick up or drop off children or attend appointments in the town centre.
**General vehicular flows**

- A number of comments identified support for infrastructure based solutions including support for a bridge between York Road and Guildford Park Road or a tunnel to take traffic away from the river and the High Street.
- A fuller analysis of traffic forecast data is necessary to take into account future forecasts resulting from an increase in housing/population.
- Closure of Farnham Bridge Road during peak times will force traffic onto already congested roads and cause delays to Guildford residents outside of the town centre.
- Closing Walnut Tree Close would aggravate congestion.
- Some comments indicated that the masterplan is too optimistic regarding the reduction of traffic capacity - restricting traffic flow will lead to more gridlock and make the situation worse.
- Some comments suggested development over the station / railway area as this would help to accommodate more town centre housing, relieve Green Belt pressure and contribute to the cost of infrastructure. The proposal could help to reduce car traffic, achieve integration with a bridge crossing and better connect east and west Guildford. This approach could enable Guildford to fully exploit its potential as a midpoint between Heathrow and Gatwick and link to Crossrail 2.
- The plan does not improve links across railway and river exacerbating problem of Guildford being a divided town.
- Emergency access to the hospital from the east side of Guildford would only be possible by ambulance.
- Other comments welcomed the “ambitious” approach to dealing with long-standing problems such as the gyratory and supported the overall concept of reclaiming Guildford town centre from its domination by vehicular traffic.
- A number of comments requested further evidence and explanation as to how the scenarios will work.
- The proposed four way junction of the Portsmouth Road, Mount, Park Street and High Street is too constrained by buildings and levels in scenario 1.
- Make Mount Pleasant 'one way'.
- A bypass for Guildford is recommended.
- The GoTCHA evaluations favour Option 10 with minor changes to infrastructure - only Bridge Street would be free for pedestrianisation.
- Consider the removal of railway bridge bottleneck, freeing up the full capacity of Farnham Road together with that of Guildford Park Road and thereby reducing the congestion at the Farnham Road Bridge Street junction.
- The vital artery of Guildford Park Road leading to Cathedral interchange has been ignored whereas Walnut Tree Close has been relied on in the modelling even though it is totally unsuitable as a major route.
- Alternative proposal: whole section from Quarry Street to Bridge Street-Farnham Road junction could be bypassed by means of a tunnel accessed from a new roundabout at the Chantry View Road Junction.
- One comment stated that a large infrastructure project should not be disregarded just because of cost. It could be presented to the National Infrastructure Commission.
- There is concern at the increased congestion on Farnham Road bridge, Park Street, Walnut Tree Close and Bridge Street.
- A short-term solution could be to relieve traffic by making the N-S route between Onslow Street and Millbrook a two-way road, thereby hugely reducing the amount of traffic that crosses the river twice.
- Millbrook carries far more traffic than Portsmouth Rd and the resulting traffic volume at the bottom of The Mount and along Park Street could increase by perhaps 200%. Traffic lights for both vehicles and pedestrians at the junction which would introduce an increase in air and noise pollution alongside a residential area.
- Closing one of the two bridges across the Wey as in Scenario 1 and 2 will cause yet more congestion.
- Two way running along Friary Bridge and Bridge Street could be a backward step resulting in conflict points.
• Both scenarios score badly regarding traffic in the Highways GOTCHA study.
• Calming measures and a 20mph speed limit would help lessen traffic on residential roads.
• Necessary to assess the environmental visual and noise impacts of new traffic routes and systems.
• Castle Street as a shared surface might be acceptable and local access should be maintained.
• Further details are required about the time/cost of the traffic mitigation measures required to achieve modal shift.
• Many drivers will prefer to endure worse congestion rather than park away from the centre or their preferred car park.
• One comment queried the validity of the June 2011 survey which is part of the evidence for the traffic reduction figures. There is a concern that the findings are over-optimistic in terms of traffic reduction actually needed. The use of NPR technology over a wider area was recommended to give more reliable data.
• It is recognised that a large proportion of rush hour cross-town car traffic is caused by the school run. This need serious investigation to quantify the impact to assess the need for more school buses.
• Further analysis is being carried out by the GoTCHA team using 2031 forecasts from the SINTRAM model. This can also take into account the recent announcement by Highways England about the planned improvements to the A3 after 2020. It is surely important to allow the results of this work to inform a decision on the capacity provision in the town centre.
• Closing Walnut Tree Close would further constrain accessibility for residents and workers, including access to station, and reduce resilience of the network.
• One comment suggested that realignment under the railway by Walnut Tree Close is a good idea.

Scenario 1 (S1)
• Traffic over Town Bridge would ruin the present view down the central part of the High Street.
• Bridge Street will become extremely unpleasant for pedestrians and traffic as they compete for space.
• Old Town Bridge would need to be rebuilt - costly when there is a perfectly functional existing bridge.
• Views of the peaceful river towards Millmead would be lost from Town Bridge if there is a new bridge for vehicle traffic.
• High Street west of Town Bridge is narrower than Millbrook - High St would need to be widened to carry volume of traffic on A281. One representation contended that the proposals would require the demolition of George Abbot Public House.
• S1 would continue blight of awful access route from rail station to the town
• If S1 is adopted, need a much wider piazza in front of St. Nicholas Church
• S1 preferable as frees up longer section of eastern riverside, from High Street to Bridge Street for pedestrianisation
• Friary Court should be removed in S1
• Concerns over how traffic would be routed between Millbrook and GPR under S1.
• Should experiment with S1 - traffic congestion may be a price worth paying for enormous planning gain by linking riverside to town.
• All schemes that include the re-opening of the Town Bridge to road vehicles only move the problem of through-traffic to the south by a hundred metres or so. The more-or-less continuous traffic to/from Millbrook would be funnelled through a very narrow street (High Street), past two popular pubs with outdoor seating (The White House and George Abbot), St Nicolas Church and the long-awaited public space now Farnham Road car park.
• Supports S1 - but ensure the eastern riverside development benefits in S2 are incorporated in S1
• Does not support S1 - traffic would have to negotiate 4 right angle bends between Millbrook and Onslow Street.
• A modern bridge replacing Town Bridge would destroy the setting of St Nicholas Church and White Inn
• S1 fails to bring pedestrianisation to Bridge Street
• S1 has lack of right turn into High Street, for traffic travelling north up Millbrook - without the gyratory there would be long diversion to make this turn. To facilitate the turn, traffic light controls would be needed at the High St/Millbrook junction, a dedicated right turn lane would be needed
and a second lane to give more queuing space for traffic travelling E over the bridge. This would cause delays and would spoil the recent environmental improvements at this part of the High St

- S1 would require a section of High Street from Millbrook to Portsmouth Road to be elevated to be above flood level and to allow the towpath to pass underneath - this would create a barrier to continuity of the riverside and make traffic flow even more conspicuous.
- S1 would allow for pedestrianisation between Friary Bridge and Town Bridge but this will not be genuine riverside so may not be that beneficial
- S1 is the only way to open up the riverside space, except for a tunnel (but this is too costly). S1 allows for the possibility of incorporating the land on the West side of the river into the masterplan in a significant way.
- The single lane sections will cause considerably more congestion than the two lane solution - they will also be problematic when breakdowns occur, for emergency vehicle access, and affect bus services (increase unreliability of timetables deterent to modal shift).
- If Town Bridge needs to be replaced there would be a significant delay in the delivery timescale.
- The re-aligned bridge would reduce the space available for the riverside improvements currently occupied by the George Abbot pub, other buildings and the car park. However, if the realigned bridge approach occupied some space in front of Debenhams it might be possible to screen view of traffic by tree-planting on both sides of river and beside river.

**Scenario 2**

- Do not support S2 which continues to have a major traffic route/barrier between town and riverside
- Closing Bridge Street to traffic (S2) to create a pedestrian route from railway station to town is unnecessary if new pedestrian route is created along Bedford Road.
- Traffic restrictions on Bridge Street would lead to loss of connectivity across river and congestion and traffic displacement.
- S2 will result in traffic and height of air pollution in Onslow Street.
- S2 retains the intrusive and ugly Friary Bridge.
- S2 can be achieved at minimal cost.
- S2 will result in pedestrianisation of Bridge Street and allow for the retention of the four lane Friary Bridge.
- S2 would lead to the demolition of Friary Street shops which is not commercially viable and not deliverable.
- One representation proposed modification of S2 - existing route of A281 from High Street to Onslow Street could be maintained so shops do not require demolition - the existing road can still connect with the Friary Bridge at a traffic light intersection.
- Friary Street would need to be widened on the south side to carry the main Shalford traffic.
- The small open space shown by the river to the right of the Town Bridge (maps 69&79) will be separated by High Street by the re-routed road with heavy traffic, and will be destroyed by traffic noise.
- S2 would see demolition of Wagamama building which connects heritage of High St to Town Bridge - it is a Listed Building and a very popular restaurant.
- The only benefit of S2 would be the redevelopment of the west side of the Friary but to be a viable change, buildings would have to be larger which would dominate the riverside much more."
- In S2, the riverside is cut off by the north/south main road from Onslow Street to Millbrook - this would destroy retail value of Friary Street by removing the retail interaction between the two sides of the street.
- Care will be necessary in design of traffic light system to minimise occasions when one junction causes tailbacks that interfere with the flow from another junction.
- It might be possible to find a creative way of screening traffic crossing end of High St and take pedestrians over or under. Friary Court building over the road gives an indication of how high a pedestrian bridge would need to be. It might be possible to utilise the slope of the ped Bridge Street to create a level pedestrian bridge (in centre of the street) into the Friary Centre and remove the road crossing. This would have advantage of separating pedestrians and traffic but would probably not improve traffic flow at busy times.
• S2 does not address the congestion issue - it needs further thought.

**Car parks / parking**

• Masterplan seeks to encourage parking at the first car park encountered which is problematic if the destination is across town. This could increase rat runs.
• Don't need to replace Town Bridge to create an open space at Portsmouth Road car park.
• Building 6 major new car parks would have a damaging effect on local communities.
• Marina surrounded by residential apartments should be provided in place of Millbrook Car Park.
• Add some 3 or 4hr parking bays in permit areas around centre (instead of 2).
• Needs to be adequate provision for parking underground for long distance visitors to Guildford e.g. Gunwharf Quays in Portsmouth or Woking.
• Good idea to build multi-storey car parks over existing car parks such as Millbrook and Guildford Park Road - both are in walking distance from town.
• Plan does not identify the car parks which it has in mind to bring up to the "same high standard" - what is that high standard? How might those standards be achieved?
• Plan does not explain or demonstrate what could or might be done to "encourage parking at key interceptor car parks.
• Need a shuttle bus service linking car parks with all parts of towns for this scheme of 4 car parks to work.
• If there is a way to reduce business on-site parking, space would be freed up and cross-centre commuter traffic reduced.
• The provision of a multi-storey car park for proposed offices in centre seems contradictory to aim to locate offices in centre to reduce need for car travel.
• Welcome the conversion of Millmead surface car park to a park area but impact of loss of parking must be considered.
• Support Malthouse Green on Portsmouth Road car park but proposed new building along the W side would enclose the area much more than at present - hope that the height of this building could be made less (to 3 storeys).
• Allocation of car parking between offices, residential and rail travellers needs specifying; it is presumed that most would be used by rail travellers.
• Object to proposal for site Z, Bright Hill car park (p 123) - Victorian Robin Hood pub would be removed - it is a locally Listed Building - this site should be a prime candidate for the creation of a small green park area. Help to rebalance provision of open space around the centre.
• Make car parks multi-storey so that there are more spaces.
• Hard to assess how much car parking space is actually required - based on a lot of assumptions. Concerned that it will be under-utilised and a waste of space.
• Guildford Park Road and York Road, and to some extent Millbrook car parks, should be made available, off-peak, for visitors wishing to spend more time than the 3 hours determined by the current Short Stay pricing structure. They should be accessed during peak times.

**A3**

• A lack of capacity on A3 likely to be major detriment as to whether transport aspects of masterplan can be made to work.
• The A3 must be improved (diverted)
• Need clarification from Highway England as to plans for A3 before traffic can be sorted out in the town centre.
• The overloaded A3 will be at a standstill should this go ahead.
Wider issues

3.29 63 comments identified wider issues for comment and debate which are summarised below.

Statutory consultees

3.30 Surrey County Council identified concerns relating to the effect of traffic on the B3000/Compton/Onslow Street but generally support the principles and aims of the masterplan.

3.31 National Trust stated that some live planning applications are being progressed on key sites which include principles contrary to those set out in the draft document which could undermine the vision. NT also reiterated that they should be consulted on the preparation of any town centre specific and site allocation policies.

3.32 Compton Parish Council considered that further analysis could be provided about similar towns which have faced similar challenges and how they have coped. A query was also raised about the “Hinterland” terminology given the focus on the town centre in the masterplan.

3.33 Historic England supported the preparation and adoption of a design framework/design codes to guide future development and incorporate an assessment of existing urban fabric.

Other consultees

3.34 A number of general points were raised as follows:

- Must consider needs of local people - too much focus on business/tourism rather than residents (how they move about town).
- View Guildford not as retail/cultural/commercial centre but as an accessible country town.
- There will need to be radical change with huge consequences.
- Support for placemaking approach.

3.35 The following feedback was received on the masterplan and delivery process:

- Plan needs more evidence to explain underlying causes of congestion.
- Status of plan and feasibility of delivery are too vague.
- CGI views give exaggerated impression of extent and openness of proposed developments. More accurate and less promotional views needed.
- Concerned that the masterplan does not look far enough ahead.
- Appears to be little information on the deliverability of the masterplan in terms of cost or phasing - so uncertain how real the scheme is - this should be covered in more detail.
- Concerned that young people have not been sufficiently engaged - ideas of next generation are important.
- Need full analysis of Guildford property market in study area.
- A summary document, setting out ALL the options/scenarios, plus a reasoned explanation as to why one is favoured over all the others, is needed.
- Lack of analysis of future population changes and their impact on central Guildford e.g. on traffic congestion.
- Lack of evidence of pedestrian numbers - past/present/future.
- It is good that the masterplan mixes short term improvements with longer term goals.
- Concerned that the masterplan has not reached everyone/that people do not know about it.
- Video shows nothing of alternative plans needed for traffic - only pretty pictures of people sitting or walking around.
- Who will take control and lead on this masterplan? Needs to be taken forward in constructive and meaningful manner.
• Much of the vision depends on a pictorial presentation which may lack reality.
• Like to congratulate the council for commissioning such a study and for the Allies and Morrison team for developing such a clear piece of work, which appears to be understandable to a range of stakeholders.
• Support the Council having a town centre masterplan.
• Would have been useful to have some suggestions for town centre policies that would need to feed into wider plan (How does this council intend for this masterplan to come forward?)
• Would have been a better report if we overseen/challenged A&M during the process - mistakes to correct and descriptions to improve.
• Keen to see some of the ideas implemented soon.
• Currently lacks realistic detail - needs to be progressed to real and actual plans.
• No clear true objective of what the plan is intending to achieve.
• Concerns over evidence for some of the masterplan proposals. Computer modelling (UDIM) could help illustrate benefits of the masterplan and alternatives.
• Future planning of Guildford needs to start with an estimate of future population change and age cohort, traffic growth, economic growth. Development imposed by government could see the population of Guildford double in 40 years. The masterplan has no scenarios for this level of growth.
• It provides no guidance or indication of how these interventions and initiatives are to be achieved.
• The “Constraints” and “Opportunities” listing is rather confusing. Would be helpful to have “Preserve/maintain/respect” and “Improvements needed” instead.
• Millmead title is confusing - section actually covers the river corridor from Onslow Bridge to the old boathouse.
• Unreliable “vision” - lacking critical data and based on unsubstantiated assumptions.
• The five “placemaking” concepts are a disordered mix of misplaced priorities - most important objective should be the sensitive expansion of the Town Centre to provide additional housing and an enhanced retail experience.
• The plan is highway driven rather than focused on creating new space to enhance the town’s facilities and misses an analysis of Guildford’s principal physical, social and economic characteristics/problems and fails to set out objectives, problems, policies and projects which the plan would seek to resolve.
• The report is very welcome and most of the proposals put forward are to be applauded.
• The framework (page 64) is excellent.
• Consider treating riverside area as part of Town Centre Zone, to encourage consultees to consider how this can be best used for the benefit of the town centre itself.
• The plan does not do enough to illustrate how the proposed new development areas link up with and benefit existing areas of town - of which several have relative deprivation issues.
• Opportunities exist to liaise with the LEP to ensure projects currently prioritised under Local Growth Fund and any future proposals for Guildford fully help to achieve the aims set out in the masterplan.

3.36 A small number of comments were made concerning opportunities for sustainability:

• No real mention of sustainable use of resources in plan and no Energy Strategy to support development. A renewable strategy and heat strategy could have been developed with new development. Need for heat modelling (as well as cooling), district heating and cooling feasibility to be included in plan.
• A policy of encouraging green roofs on town centre buildings should be encouraged. The environmental improvements in the town centre to remain as proposed and not be compromised
Preserving Guildford

3.37 33 comments were received in relation to Guildford’s historic environment and character.

Statutory consultees

3.38 Historic England made a number of representations in this regard, summarised as follows:
   - Include more positive recognition of role and important of historic environment of town and address deficiencies that affect it
   - Generally, masterplan recognises historic environment and the assets that contribute to, and highlight it.
   - The masterplan recognises historic environment and the assets that contribute to, and highlight it.
   - "Attractiveness of historic streets, buildings, open spaces etc. are integral to its success as commercial hub - proposals should respond to and reinforce these assets"
   - Supports high quality buildings which reinforce predominant historical forms of town eg layout
   - May be imbalance in treatment of traditional assets of town - may lead to further decline of historical core

3.39 National Trust
   - Masterplan should also acknowledge views from the River Wey corridor looking outwards. Major focal points include those that already have a road cross, provision of amenities (e.g. public house) or activities. Millmead and Town Bridge are primary gateways to the Navigations within Guildford town centre. Friary Bridge and railway viaduct are considered minor focal points along the Navigations but represent important points of historic and visual interest to navigation users.
   - NT would wish to see some thought to the likely scale and height of buildings along the river frontage to ensure that there is a consistent and coherent approach.

3.40 Worplesdon Parish Council agreed that Guildford’s historic landscape and townscape should be enhanced and that new development should be sensitive to the historic assets of the town.

Other consultees

Historic environment
   - The proposals could provide a more coherent approach which fully integrates, conserves and enhance town’s historic environment.
   - An opportunity exists for the GBC conservation team and SCC heritage team to discuss opportunities to optimise potential for Guildford’s significantly rich heritage assets to positively contribute to this plan.
   - The masterplan lacks detailed assessment of existing historic base.
   - One response indicated that the masterplan does not address the problem of uncoherent, unsympathetic previous development in town - it could have set out a series of proposals to address this and promote need for town centre design guide.
   - Artists’ impressions could make more reference to the existing environment.
   - Make reference to the museum - the relocation and regeneration of town’s museum/heritage offer needs a robust evidence base which should be incorporated into any forthcoming revised versions of the document.
   - Previous works in the vicinity of the river corridor and in particular, Woodbridge Meadows, have revealed possibility for nationally-significant prehistoric remains to be present - proposed works needs to be informed by relevant planning policy.
   - The defined Historic Core identified for protection is considerably less than the Town Centre CA. Existing policies for protection should be honoured and CAA appraisals should be made part of the plan.
• The High Street must be a major focus of the town - there is a danger that it will become downgraded.
• Need to be extra diligent to protect Victorian heritage - Victorian schools, London Road railway station and villas and houses.

**Improving frontages**

• North Street should be upgrade, car free and tree lined with additional large and attractive shopping frontages on the development site to the north side of the street.

**Heights, views and preservation**

• Welcomes commitment to value views and historic character of Guildford
• 4 storeys should be maximum height for buildings in new developments so that riverside feels more open than it is now and so riverside will be recognisable in views from the hill view points (eg Bright Hill)
• Tall and bulky buildings in town centre should be avoided - must control heights of new buildings
• Plan should include residential densities and maximum building heights. Should be limited to five residential stories plus mansard in order to preserve the important views in this gap town.
• Long term vision should be to restore view of Mount and countryside seen from North St - at present it is partially obstructed and spoilt by an ugly building"
• The masterplan does not provide a basis for defining how high new development should be on specific development sites in the town centre. We suggest that additional text should be added to this section, recommending that, to support new development proposals in areas of sensitivity, an appraisal of the impact on Guildford’s character from key views should be undertaken.
• Woodbridge Meadows could be capable of taking more height and maybe use a greater site extent.
Environment

3.41 28 comments were received in relation to environmental issues in Guildford including flooding and surface water drainage.

Statutory consultees

3.42 Natural England identified the following points in their representations:

- The masterplan site is situated in close proximity to European designated sites so has potential to affect their interest features - need to screen plan in relation to "Habitats Regulations" and proposals outlined, specifically related to new residential development, will have to undertake a Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA).
- The masterplan site is within 5km of Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and this part of the SPA lies within Whitmoor Common Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Any net increase in new dwellings must conform to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA 2009 Delivery Framework, and GBC's Thames Basin Heaths Avoidance Strategy.
- The site is within 7km of another part of the SPA, namely Ash to Brookwood Heaths SSSI, also forming part of the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham Special Area of Conservation (SAC).
- It is also in close proximity to the Wey Valley Meadows (SSSI).
- The masterplan should consider the necessary Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) that would be required to mitigate the proposed areas of residential development.
- Surrey Hills is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) – Natural England advise a landscape and visual impact assessment is undertaken.
- Natural England would expect the Local Planning Authority to consider the impacts of the plan on local sites in terms of biodiversity and geodiversity including local landscape character and local or national biodiversity priority habitats and species.

3.43 Thames Water made a number of representations in this regard, summarised as follows:

- Need to consider net increase in water and wastewater/sewerage demand to serve proposed developments and any impact the development may have off site further down the network, if no/low water pressure and internal/external sewage flooding of property is to be avoided
- Developers must engage with Thames Water early to establish demand for water supply, network infrastructure, development's demand for sewage treatment both on and off site and surface water drainage requirements/flooding.
- With regards to surface water drainage, Thames Water has requested inclusion of the following in the document, "It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding."
- The following should also be added to the masterplan to accord with NPPF/NPPG in relation to water supply and sewerage, "It is essential that developers demonstrate that adequate water supply and sewerage/wastewater treatment 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 studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water company to agree what improvements are required and how they will be delivered and completed prior to any occupation of the development."

3.44 The Environment Agency identified a number of general points in their representation as follows:
• In principle, the Environment Agency support the concept of rediscovering River Wey and making it the focus for a new riverside community park. The EA seeks to secure habitat improvements or enhancements for biodiversity interests, especially where increased access to any watercourse may impact on water-based flora or fauna. This may be case where new riverside footpaths or parks are being promoted, or where new bridges are proposed. EA will make similar representations in relation to any policies or potential allocations being promoted through the new local plan.

• EA seek to work in partnership with Guildford to ensure Water Framework Directive aspirations are embedded into plans.

• EA is pleased that flood risk is a recognised key issue throughout the plan. EA welcome the council's commitment to undertaking a flood risk sequential test in order to assess any sites which it intends to promote through the new local plan.

• The Environment Agency support the council's overall aim to steer new development to flood zone 1 and avoid any development in flood zone 3B and residential development in zone 3A. However, the EA is concerned that the council might seek to identify non-appropriate uses (in NPPF/flood risk terms) as part of Local Plan process (p.61). Commercial delivery must not be at expense of significant environmental constraints, i.e. Flood risk. The EA reiterate that they expect the flood risk Sequential Test to be applied, robustly, to any sites which the council intends to allocate through the local plan process.

• In relation to the reference to landscaping at Laundry Park functioning as a new flood storage area which could facilitate development on other key sites in town centre subject to more detailed assessment and modelling. EA has requested further clarification of this statement and would be concerned if this flood storage area was being proposed in order to allow for residential development in flood zone 3 elsewhere, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that this site was no longer at risk of flooding.

3.45 The Environment Agency also provided representations on specific sites as follows:

• Bedford Wharf – EA noted that most of area is situated within flood zones 2, 3a and 3b. Most of the potential development sites P, Q, R, S, T and U are within these zones. Flood risk sequential test will need to be applied robustly before any residential allocation can be made within a flood zone. P, Q, T and U sites propose development on flood zones 3a and 3b. Hotels are not compatible with flood zone 3b (more vulnerable use) and less vulnerable uses (offices/restaurants etc.) are also not compatible with flood zone 3b and should not be permitted there. Exception test (for more vulnerable uses) must be applied after the flood risk sequential test. The flood risk exception test will require suitable measures to be demonstrated for each proposal, via a site specific flood risk assessment, to ensure that each development will be safe for its lifetime, that it will not increase flood risk elsewhere, and that where possible it will reduce flood risk overall. Less vulnerable uses do not need exception test but still need robust flood risk sequential test. Very concerned about Site U (hotel = more vulnerable, A3 food and drink/A5 hot food takeaway uses = less vulnerable) as within flood zone 3b, the functional flood plain. The uses are not considered to be compatible with flood zone 3b. Car park proposed at site R · a less vulnerable uses so appropriate in flood zone 3a, but flood risk sequential test should be applied to see whether there are any other reasonably available alternative sites at lower risk which could accommodate proposed use.

• Millmead – most of river corridor in Millmead area is within flood zones 2, 3a and 3b. Residential development · site V2 · a more vulnerable use so not appropriate in flood zone 3b · should not be permitted there. Flood risk sequential test will need to be applied to any proposal which seeks to allocate residential development on this site. If acceptable, then exception test should be applied. Hotel uses (as proposed in site V1) · classified as a more vulnerable use · not compatible with flood zone 3b. Housing proposed at sites X and Y · small parts of site in higher risk flood zones · need sequential test and then a sequential approach to site layout.

• Station area – a very small fringe of eastern part of site M appears to be within flood zone 2. Would expect a flood risk sequential test to accompany any proposed site allocation if this area were to be promoted for vulnerable uses through the borough local plan process. If the site is
found to be suitable for housing, a sequential approach to site layout should be undertaken. Most vulnerable land uses should be located at those parts of the site at the lowest risk of flooding.

- **Walnut Tree Close**: significant parts are within flood zones 2, 3a and 3b. More vulnerable uses, (i.e. residential) should not be permitted in flood zone 3b. Residential development is proposed on sites F, G and AG. Hotels (proposed as site F) are classified as a more "more vulnerable" use and not compatible with flood zone 3b - should not be permitted. In flood zone 3a, more vulnerable uses should be subject to flood risk sequential test first. If, the decision maker is satisfied that there are no reasonably available alternatives at a lower risk of flooding, only then should the exception test be applied. More vulnerable development is considered to be appropriate in flood zone 2, subject to satisfactory demonstration of the flood risk sequential test. We note that "non-residential development" is indicated at site J - wholly in flood zone 3a and partly in flood zone 3b - acceptability depends on vulnerability of the proposed uses. EA would have some concern about promoting Walnut Tree Close as a predominantly residential neighbourhood (p. 108) because of the significant flood zone constraints in the area - please that flood zones identified as key urban design principle for area. We welcome the council's acknowledgement (p. 114) that whilst residential use at the riverside setting may generate maximum receipts, it is not possible to locate residential within flood zone 3.

- **Woodbridge Meadows**: large part in flood zones 2, 3a and 3b. Part of site B is in flood zone 2 and some of this will be residential development which is a "more vulnerable" use. Appropriate in flood zone 2 subject to satisfactory demonstration of the flood risk sequential test. Formal consent for new bridge over river will be required from EA. In any case where development is proposed close to river, then buffer zone of suitable width should be established which should remain free of development, including lighting, domestic gardens and formal landscaping. This could form part of green provision. Land alongside watercourses valuable for wildlife - essential that this is protected.

3.46 Worplesdon Parish Council indicated that great care should be taken in avoiding impact on the flood plain, which plays a vital role in protecting town and outlying villages from serious flooding

Other consultees

3.47 A small number of non-statutory representations made reference to environmental issues as follows:

- The sensitive approach to managing flood risk is also welcome
- No mention about maximising benefits of scheme for biodiversity in area. The river corridor provides an excellent opportunity to enhance biodiversity in area - improvement of river as wildlife corridor should be fundamental aim of the masterplan. We would expect the redevelopment of the town centre to have substantial biodiversity gain such as green bridges for wildlife crossing busy roads.
- One comment stated that the plan lacks any flood improvement strategy or mitigation ambition or solutions.
- One comment noted that it would be helpful to have the flood areas more clearly defined, with the flood levels stated.
Land use

3.48 Historic England stated their overall support for the development of major sites to achieve the regeneration of important quarters of the town centre.

3.49 National Trust provided a series of general representations about development adjacent to the River Wey. In respect of All Sites along the Navigations the National Trust will seek to ensure there is:

- A consistency and cohesive design of riverside landscaping, including materials, signage, street furniture and fencing;
- Detailed consideration of appropriate materials and surface treatment of the public realm, particularly the towpath, reflecting the historic character of that part of the Navigations to avoid over urbanisation;
- Well maintained and visually attractive boundary structures;
- The removal/avoidance of any visual intrusion into the Navigations from car parking and loading areas;
- No building of structures, whether temporary or permanent, which could destabilise the banks of the Navigations;
- Appropriate lighting which does not overspill into the waterway environment urbanising the character of the area; and
- Opportunities for protection and enhancement of nature conservation along the riverside.

3.50 National Trust submitted site specific responses as follows:

- **Bedford Wharf**: NT questioned how ‘primary’ the pedestrian route across Walnut Tree Bridge be under S2 would be if Bridge St is to be pedestrianised? In addition, if no new connection across the railway line can be secured, popularity and use of this route may not increase significantly. NT wish to be consulted and involved in respect of location and design of any new bridge to ensure that the approach taken is appropriate to historic integrity and visual setting of the Navigations. It would also need new oversailing licence to be granted by the NT. NT seek to ensure that the existing ‘Auctioneer’s building is retained and visually well integrated into proposals and seek to ensure that new buildings are well set-back from the Navigations (unless historical precedent dictates otherwise). NT seek to ensure height of buildings facing the Navigations and opposite the multi-storey warehouse buildings is limited to two or three storeys in order to a) reflect historical character and b) allow multi-storey warehouses to act as visual backdrop to views into the Conservation Area from Bedford Road. Design of any new buildings facing river reflects historic industrial character (particularly the architectural style of Billings group of buildings). Proposals should improve the visual quality of public realm and seek to ensure the height and design of other buildings on site relates sympathetically to height and design of any new riverside buildings on site, to the existing buildings in adjacent Bridge Street Conservation Area. NT seek to ensure parking and loading areas are not located adjacent to navigations. NT seek to ensure opportunities to visually unify design, materials and colour of new waterway/river-side furniture, fencing and structures are incorporated, and to ensure that new lighting does not overspill into the waterway environment urbanising the character of the area.

- **Millmead**: Any development on site Y must respect relationship and historic connections between the two Grade II listed buildings (Millmead House and Weir House). The masterplan does not extend south of Millmead which we consider a missed opportunity. NT supports removal of parking from Site V but there are three important views into the site which should be taken into account in determining the most appropriate form of development for site. These are the view from the pedestrian footpath on approaching the site from the north, the view of the site from the Navigation itself and the view of the site from the public open space around the Tread Wheel Crane and Town Wharf. Any development should also respect St Nicholas Church. The NT seek
to ensure that: the spaciousness of the current views is maintained; new buildings on the site do not visually dominate the Navigations; the unobstructed view along the frontage of the site south towards the White House pub is retained; the broad pavement footpath access running through the site is retained and integrated within the development proposals; the opportunity is taken to enhance both the public realm and access to the Navigations (including scope for potential visitor moorings providing benefits to those who use the Navigations); development proposals reflect the historic scale and character of the location and relate well to the existing buildings on the south western corner of the site; proposals are included to visually improve the area around the Tread Wheel Crane so as to integrate the Tread Wheel Crane into a unified sense of place; building materials are predominantly timber, brick and slate or tile reflecting the historic character of the Conservation Area; and lighting does not overspill into the waterway environment urbanising the character of the area.

- **Walnut Tree Close:** The current application for new office development and the existing Walnut Tree Business Park consent undermines the vision for the new residential area which provides linkage and consistency along the length of the River Wey. NT support sensitive refurbishment of Dapdune Farm Cottage - it can assist in increasing awareness of the significant historic association and importance of the Navigations to the development of Guildford which would benefit from proper access.

- **Woodbridge Meadows:** NT are supportive that Meadows will be broader and road relocated increasing the amount of open space along the Navigations.

3.51 Worplesdon Parish Council noted the following points:

- There should be less retail uses in town centre and more residential. North Street could be used for housing. Housing could also be delivered in place of existing uses at the Police Station, Crown and Magistrates Courts, Old Orleans or the bus station. The focus on retail expansion which will threaten vibrant character of High Street. There are already many empty shops, online shopping is on the increase, and will result in an increase traffic in the area. Price Waterhouse Survey published in Guardian March 2015 showed that net high street closures almost trebled last year to 987.
- Lack of appropriate housing is a failure with the document
- North Street, Walnut Tree Close and Woodbridge Meadows could be better utilised to provide attractive communities
- offering nearby public transport links and a strong sense of community, provided there are adequate flood defences

3.52 Compton Parish Council made the following representations:

- More housing in Walnut Tree Close welcomed.
- Plan should build more on flood plains - other areas have successfully built on flood plains.
- Do not agree with adding large volumes of green spaces to an urban area if by doing so, development then becomes necessary in the countryside.

3.53 Waverley Borough Council identified a need to address potential impact of increased retail space on other areas (e.g. Waverley). More retail floorspace should not be to the detriment of the vitality and viability of other nearby town centres.

3.54 Ash Parish Council noted that an iconic building should be provided for Guildford.

Other comments

3.56 Various additional comments were raised in relation to a series of topics as set out below:

Retail
- Too much retail - internet shopping on the rise.
- Need to look into retail trends - more evidence and future retail needs must be considered.
- Must deal with traffic as it is the main drawback to future commercial expansion.
- Too much retail - will increase congestion.
- Must support smaller, independent traders and businesses.
- AJ North Site development - report gives little reference to this site. Study fails to estimate the increased footfall and how additional customers would access an already overcrowded centre. Fails to comment on car parking requirements or those of public transport. The site should be a mixed housing, quality retail and public space development with efficient bus access - needs a far greater priority for housing (perhaps for elderly?).
- Need more shops.
- Additional retail on the NW side of centre should be restricted to some convenience shopping for new housing there.
- New retail must be kept close to the High Street so the town centre does not move away from the High Street and to ensure it does not lose its vibrancy.
- A new anchor store i.e. John Lewis must be in keeping with character of town and be in close proximity to centre.
- North Street site not significantly considered in the document yet this is key to the whole Town Centre future
- Proposals which entail subsidising retailers to establish themselves in the centre need to be subject to a careful social costs benefit analysis.

Office, business, commercial
- Proposed land use exchanges warehouses for offices - where will existing users go? What is the impact on employment?
- More discussion needed with residents about the needs of local businesses
- Would be an ideal opportunity to set up starter units for freelance and micro businesses
- Less emphasis on “tech” companies as main growth industry of this Borough. Need a wide diversity of employment for people.

Housing
- Support more housing in the centre. Will add life and soul to town and support its economy - crucial to development.
- More housing will lead to more traffic
- Strongly support development on Woodbridge Meadows - should be higher density and more housing.
- Strongly object to the suggested housing numbers in town centre - need a lot more. Only 2,500 new homes out of 14,000 proposed by GBC Local Plan will be built in the town centre when this has been identified as the best place for new housing - the balance is totally unrealistic.
- Walnut Tree Road area should be primarily residential.
- Housing development welcomed on brown-field sites.
- The masterplan advocates an unrealistically high intensification of small-scale town centre residential developments which is not credible or realistic in terms of actual market demand.
- Housing developments can only occur in town centre after relocation of commercial uses - slow and uncertain process.
- No evidence to justify increase in housing provision from 1,932 in draft local plan to 2,551 in masterplan.
- Unrealistic to assume that 502 dwellings will be delivered within next 5 years when housing delivery rate has been poor.
Flood risk, ownership, access and viability (including CIL) will also impede on early delivery.

Creation of housing at Woodbridge Meadows is an opportunity for a new community that could benefit from Home Zone development and all the key eco values of sustainability. Need to set the bar for this. Not rushed development of buildings.

The need for cars can only be removed if people are living close to all amenities and facilities especially the fast main line trains to London. Therefore the town's population density needs to be higher to make this possible.

More affordable housing within Town Centre will entice our younger residents who wish to live/work within the town without the need to own a car".

The masterplan delivers the means of high quality growth, along with much-needed housing in town centre to support growth and relive the Green Belt.

Insufficient and expensive housing is the most serious constraint on further economic development as we need younger generation to maintain and expand our high value services.

Demand for housing should be for three needs: young professionals, social housing for disadvantaged, housing for the elderly. Priority should be given to the first as without economic development, the other two cannot be funded.

Release some small areas of lower quality Greenbelt land to finance sufficient affordable housing.

Key principles for Woodbridge Meadows are excellent.

Housing on greenbelt land will have a massive impact on our rapidly declining wildlife population and must protect agricultural land - needed to ensure food security in the UK.

The plan delivers fewer town centre homes than the proposed town centre uses would require to support them in the evening economy\n
Social infrastructure

We will need more schools/doctor's surgeries and utility services to support the housing schemes. Currently there is not a clear idea of the infrastructure that will be needed to make all of this work effectively.

Park / open spaces / green spaces

Do not spoil open spaces with unnecessary enhancement - over designed spaces can lack natural charm - grass and large trees are popular (willow trees in particular are good). Natural riverside scenery and river banks with informal planting, as well as more functional spaces, are attractive in town areas.

A nice new park at Bedford Rd would be great!

There should be absolute right of public use of all "public realm space" preferably through Council ownership.

Green spaces that exist should be shown on the maps eg HT Churchyard, Quakers Acre and that more are sought. A clear policy to plant more trees in this area is needed.

Laundry Park is welcome but green border to river should be provided, that this is not unduly elevated and with a soft surfaced (Sustrans type) surface for the walkway.

The boulevards proposed at Woodbridge Meadows would be alien to character of Guildford. We hope that all tree-planting can be informal and of indigenous species good for wildlife.

Proposal for a public square at the bottom of High Street - High St and North St could extend across river and link up through a new "Town Square" with shops on either side and office or residential accommodation. This would create direct connections through river corridor and if possible, a wide, direct and attractive underpass linking the square to the station forecourt. River would be covered over, as a whole or in part, between the Town and Friary bridges (Town bridge would have to replaced by a larger one but could incorporate the attractive features of existing one). The new square would be visually off-line with High St but it is proposed that the street should turn slowly to the right towards the square at the bottom of the High St.

General land use

A 'civic hub' is a good idea but must be easily accessible to all by all modes of transport and provision should be made for other information and advice centres to be placed nearby.
• I would query keeping the buildings along the Bridge Street, Site U, as the facade has little architectural value
• Telephone exchange should be investigated - will be a blot on landscape of town centre.
• Welcome provision of commercial and residential to meet future changing needs
• Would support higher rise buildings
• Plan does not protect the future of the town for business.
• Design of retail or commercial premises should be flexible to allow for expansion or reduction in size of units to reflect the need at any moment in time.
• A huge number of buildings, many quite modern, are proposed for demolition - consequences of this have not been set out and there should be consideration of the loss of floorspace, the net floorspace increase provided by the proposals, the economics of replacement in particular the increase in floorspace needed to make the replacement viable, sustainability considerations including waste of materials and embedded energy.
• Consider potential for improving existing buildings as an alternative to demolition
• Site AA (N St. - Chertsey St corner p. 79) - support redevelopment of this site
• Concerns about proposed development on site AB - this would be very cramped development with no significant open space nearby.
• Suggest Bathstore site on Sydenham Rd is suitable for redevelopment for dwellings. Suggest change of use of Oriel building, Sydenham Road (Barlow Robbins) from Office to apartments.
• Suggest redeveloping the Mt Alvernia Site on Harvey Rd/Pewley Way, for housing and a small green park.
• CIL payment structure should be modified to ensure that brownfield site development is more attractive to investment than green field sites in order to preserve countryside that does not have green belt protection.

Cafes / restaurants
• Need more restaurants
• Don't believe there is an adequate demand for an increase in cafes and that some of this space should be given over to housing.
• Does not support huge increase in alfresco dining - spoils riverside atmosphere and is not commercially sustainable – should be reduced. Support provision of pavement cafes however, as long as structures are not permanently installed.

Market
• Markets should remain in the High St and North St to bring shoppers to those streets
• Would like to see an indoor market which could provide opportunity for small independent retailers and increasing the diversity of shopping for residents

Leisure / entertainment / culture
• Independent cinema needed.
• Apprehensive at further development of a vibrant night time economy as it is now necessary for the developments on Bridge Street and lower part of town to be heavily policed for safety.
• Huge amount of A3/A5 use indicated is surely not viable, neither will it enhance the riverside - people visit the riverside.

Bedford Wharf
• A leisure lead redevelopment is best use of this area - riverside would become insignificant.
• The site is too valuable to be given over to green space - instead, new warehouse buildings could follow the waters edge similar to opposite bank and provide multi storey parking or office space, and green space could be provided further up the river.
• Key principles for Bedford Wharf are good - is there vehicular access to Beford Rd and how do buses fit in?
**Dapdune Wharf**

- Key concerns: Flood Zone 3B - suffered flooding past. Works undertaken in the last 40 years have improved situation. We object to being included within this highest risk flood zone. No mention is made of taking the opportunity within this masterplan to plan for improved flood prevention within the Guildford area. No mention is made of how the parkland will alleviate flood risk. Existing properties should be protected. A much clearer explanation is needed within the masterplan showing how GBC intends to achieve enhancing quality of buildings and also conforming to the requirements of the NPPF. Tow path would pass through our site and would have severe implications on our security. We use wharf extensively for canoe/kayaking and other boating activities, launching and recovering boats from water's edge. Footpath would be incompatible with this. We also would need to find alternative storage for boats and vehicle. There is existing footpath used by NT alongside our East boundary which connects with the existing public footpath from Woodbridge Rd over the Wey Navigation to Walnut Tree Close. This could be used and the opportunity taken to substantially improve existing footpath. Should be improved lighting and security. Strongly object to proposals to close upper part of Walnut Tree Close and the car park currently adjoining Woodbridge Meadows. Our only parking for our staff and parents and only access point for parents dropping off and picking up cadets. Need alternative provision if this is to go ahead.

**Station development**

- Solum (the developer) made a number of representations identifying the approach to their site. be amended to reflect these constraints.
- NT remains concerned regarding scale and massing of proposed buildings in relation to the existing three-storey buildings.
Town centre living

3.57 Two comments were received specifically in relation to town centre living. It was noted that the town centre living would appeal to younger population but there should be provision across all age ranges to create well-designed town centre communities which are a huge benefit to the town centre. One comment indicated that more housing will increase the vibrancy of the town rather than retail, making Guildford busier at night.
4. DIRECTION OF TRAVEL FOR DISCUSSION

Overview

4.1 A significant number of representations have been reviewed following the six week period of consultation. This section provides a concise overview of the suggested direction of travel for the masterplan for discussion with the client team.

4.2 It is understood that the masterplan will be updated as a technical evidence base document, and, subject to legal review, the final document could be subject to non-statutory endorsement from the Council. In parallel, GBC proposes to prepare a Corporate Plan for the town centre which will incorporate elements of the masterplan and articulate which elements are suitable for inclusion in the Local Plan. Some proposals are likely to come forward beyond the plan period, or will require further more detailed studies or strategies to progress the emerging position identified in the masterplan.

4.3 Principal areas of feedback and recommendations are identified below for reference:

• **Approach to riverside and land uses**: The broad approach to the riverside has received significant support including positive remarks from the statutory consultees and will be retained in the final masterplan. Generally the approach to flooding has been endorsed by statutory consultees. Some consultees argued for additional development of more vulnerable uses in the flood zone. Although this might be possible subject to planning application or via appropriate technical studies and justification, the objective of the masterplan is to define a NPPF compliant approach. Consideration of river crossing point locations will be considered in more detail as the proposals move forward.

• **Vehicle network, public transport and parking**: This topic received significant feedback through the consultation process. On balance, it is considered that the key principles and objectives should be maintained in the final masterplan. The consultant team continue to recommend the principle of a phased approach to the improvement of the gyratory and scenarios 1 or 2 form a helpful basis for more detailed technical feasibility and modelling work. However, a number of important queries have been raised and it is recommended that the masterplan acknowledges these challenges and defines a clear way forward in terms of the overarching movement implementation framework. The draft masterplan identified the need for a comprehensive study and strategy to consider traffic modelling, public transport and parking strategy in more detail. The final masterplan should define the timing, scope and critical milestones associated with this work, and highlight key sites such as North Street which will form a critical path for a wider strategy. Retention of the George Abbot public house is a key aspiration.

• **Town centre uses**: Some feedback queried evidence in the masterplan in relation to non-residential floorspace. It is important that the masterplan, and more significantly, the Local Plan highlights the specific evidence based studies which have informed the quantum of uses in the drawings. It is also important to note that the consultant team undertook a thorough evidence base review which is the subject of a separate technical report. Wider evidence base material such as socio-economic impact / infrastructure provision should be considered in the round and is likely to progress as part of the Local Plan process.

• **Building heights and design guidance**: Historic England and other consultees made the case for greater prescription in relation to building heights. It is recommended that simple general guidance and criteria are provided for context. At this stage, it would be inappropriate to be overly prescriptive on individual sites and more detailed guidance might be best situated in Development Briefs for key sites. It is considered that the drawings and visualisations provide an appropriate means of communicating principles and guidance in the masterplan.
• **Implementation**: The masterplan identified strategic terms of reference for the delivery strategy. It is recommended that the final masterplan clarifies an overarching package of technical/implementation workstreams and a clear governance/management structure to take these forward.