

Q 1. Is this visit considered to be part of the consultation process for the Draft Local Plan?

It's not part of the formal consultation process.

Q 2. When will the Draft Local Plan be issued for consultation and how long a period of consultation will there be?

The next iteration of the Local Plan (Regulation 19) will be published for consultation in June. This 6-week consultation will be your opportunity to feed back your comments on the proposals and policies in that plan.

Q 3. What discussions are taking place with local Boroughs eg Rushmoor to use their brownfield sites for housing for Guildford?

Whilst we share relatively strong linkages with Rushmoor, our core housing market area (HMA) includes Waverley and Woking borough councils. At examination we will be expected to demonstrate that we have sought to maximise opportunities to meet our own needs. Under our legal duty to cooperate we will need to continue engaging with our neighbours on strategic matters however Rushmoor has its own housing need within their HMA with Surrey Heath and Hart that they will need to try and meet.

Q 4. Unless the identified funding gaps for future infrastructure projects are met by Central Government, as hoped for by SCC, then without the necessary funded infrastructure plan in place, GBC will be prevented from carrying out large scale housing development. Would the panel please confirm that this will be the case and that they will make a stand on the issue?

As part of preparing the Local Plan we will also prepare an Infrastructure Deliver Plan (IDP). This will outline the infrastructure needed to support the planned development and will outline how much it will cost, who will fund it and when it is likely to be needed. The funding gap identified in this will help inform the emerging Community Infrastructure Levy rates. Central government funding will continue to be a source of funding, but developers will be required to pay for or to contribute to infrastructure by CIL or by S106.

Q 5. In the last Local Plan it was Guildford Borough Council's proposal to consider Green Belt land between Flexford and Normandy to be developed (land parcel H12), to build 1,083 dwellings, a potential population growth of 2,589, more than doubling the population of the Village.

Can Councillor Spooner reassure the Villagers of Normandy that any future Local Plan will not impose such a major expansion on the Green Belt in Normandy, and that this area of land will not be built on, nor safeguarded for future development?

The Regulation 19 Local Plan will be made public as it starts going through the committee process in early April. Whichever spatial strategy and sites we choose will be subject to scrutiny by an independent planning inspector at examination. We will need to

demonstrate that our approach is sound. Planning applications can be submitted at any time regardless of the contents of the Local Plan.

- Q 6. Are any constraints to be applied by GBC to the 693 houses per year that the West Surrey SHMA indicated as the Objectively Assessed Need for Guildford Borough?

We have re-assessed all sites in light of constraints including Green Belt and flooding. This has informed the strategy in the next iteration of the plan.

- Q 7. Flooding is major problem and a genuine fear for residents in Normandy - what resources have GBC sort on this ongoing issue before making the situation even more of a risk by adding more concrete on flood plains

We are currently finalising the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which assesses river flooding. We have also considered surface water flooding in the Normandy /Flexford area, and have highlighted work needed. All new development needs to demonstrate that it would not worsen flooding on site or elsewhere, and should take all reasonable opportunities to reduce flood risk elsewhere where possible

- Q 8. Why are Landmark Chambers retained by GBC to advise planning officers in the Guildford Local Plan process and how much is it costing Borough Council tax payers in financial year 2015-16 and what is the budget for financial year 2016-17 for GBC to retain Charles Banner QC and others from Landmark Chambers and how much has the Council agreed to pay per hour should a Landmark Chambers barrister appear on behalf of the Council in front of a Planning Inspector during the Guildford Local Plan examination in public?

Landmark Chambers have not been retained by GBC to advise on the Local Plan. We have procured alternative Chambers to offer us support through the Local Plan process.

Our legal expenses budget for 2015-16 is £74,000. The legal expenses budget for 16-17 is £125,000.

- Q 9. Why is the next consultation on the draft Guildford Local Plan being carried out under Section 19 regulations and not Section 18 regulations when not all key evidence documents have been subject to public consultation?

All relevant evidence base will be published for the Regulation 19 consultation. Consultation is not normally undertaken on evidence base.

- Q 10. In the revised draft Guildford Local Plan to be put forward for Section 19 consultation in approximately June 2016 how many houses are proposed to be built on the land proposed for 'safeguarding' in Normandy in the first 5 years of the Plan period and if the answer is none, then why is it being proposed to be taken out of the Green Belt in the first place as it is assessed in GBC's Vol 5 as of 'High Sensitivity', fulfils 3 of the main purposes of the Green Belt, contributes to the views out of Surrey Hills AONB, supports

clear unhindered views into the Surrey Hills AONB and contributes to the 'openness' of the Green Belt within and between the settlements of Normandy and Flexford?

The Regulation 19 Local Plan will be made public as it starts going through the committee process in early April.

- Q 11. It was claimed in the Planning Officer's report for the North Wyke Farm planning application 15/P/01670 that GBC has only 2.4 years of land supply however it is known that GBC have stated in public forums that it has a database of landowners in the Borough and the pieces of land they are willing to bring forward for consideration for inclusion in the Local Plan and that in the Issues & Options document there was enough land available from these landowners for the first 5 years of the Plan, which poses the question have landowners withdrawn their land or is GBC crying wolf in an attempt to convince residents that Green Belt land in the villages must be released?

There is considerable land that has been put forward but is not suitable due to constraints. To be counted within the 5 year supply sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable (NPPF, para 47, footnote 11). Sites that are currently Green Belt therefore cannot be counted currently in our calculations. The Reg 19 version of the Local Plan will need to demonstrate a five year supply based on the allocations we are proposing in that document.

Five year supply figures vary each month as the amount of completions and homes with planning permission but not yet built change, however, Guildford borough has not been able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land for quite a while, and this is a material planning consideration when determining planning applications.

- Q 12. How much 'brownfield' land is in the ownership of GBC in terms of number of sites and area in hectares, and how much of it is being proposed for housing in the first 5 years of the Local Plan and how much of it is being proposed for commercial development in the first 5 years of the Local Plan?

The SHLAA 2014 includes information about landownership and phasing. There will be an updated LAA published in time for the consultation.

- Q 13. Of the 'brownfield' land owned by GBC, how many sites and what land area in hectares and as a proportion of the total, is located in Walnut Tree Close and Woodbridge Meadows?

There will be an updated LAA published in time for the consultation which will include updated sites and availability. It is worth noting that many town centre sites are constrained by flood risk (for which there is strong national policy requirements). Also the Local Plan must balance competition needs, and plan to meet the need for employment land as well as housing.

- Q 14. Do you know, at this time, what areas the new Local Plan has identified in Normandy for proposed development? Has this information been shared with any developers before the residents of Normandy?

The Regulation 19 Local Plan will be made public as it starts going through the committee process in early April. As part of preparing the LAA we need to understand whether land is available for development. Continued liaison is therefore necessary with site promoters and / or landowners.

- Q 15. Why, if the West Surrey SHMA is a vital document in the Local Plan evidence base that sets the Objectively Assessed Need of the annual housing number that is a starting point for the Local Plan, is there no public consultation on the West Surrey SHMA?

The SHMA has been subject to considerable scrutiny over the last few years. We are confident that it represents a robust study. We will need to defend this study at examination when a planning inspector will consider whether our plan is justified

- Q 16. When CIL rates can be used to control what development opportunities emerging from the Local Plan are most attractive for Borough Council tax payers and what are least attractive to developers, why are the proposed CIL rates set so the highest rates are for the town (CIL £500) and strategic sites (CIL £400), £300 in rural areas and villages and as low as £75 for purpose built student accommodation and zero for all other forms of liable floor space, presumably meaning commercial floor space?

National law and guidance prevents us from using CIL rates to encourage development in any particular area of the borough.

The CIL rates are set based on development viability and infrastructure funding gap – it should therefore create a more level playing field by requiring more from developments of more profitable uses, and those in more profitable areas of the borough.

- Q 17. What is the timetable for the Policies Map and if no timetable has been set why not?

The updated Policies Map will accompany the Regulation 19 Local Plan.

- Q 18. Why are only two DPDs being produced for the proposed Local Plan, what are they and what will they contain?

Strategy and Sites DPD – will set the overarching policies, how much development is being planned and where.

Development Management DPD – detailed development management policies to guide planning applications.

- Q 19. What is Policy NRM6 and what is being proposed to replace Policy NRM6 in the new Local Plan?

This is the saved policy from the former South East Plan regarding the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. The Reg 19 Local Plan will have a SPA policy.

- Q 20. What areas are GBC proposing to us to meet their SANG obligations?

We will need to demonstrate that there is sufficient SANG to support the development proposals in the Reg 19 Local Plan.

- Q 21. Should Villagers put forward places, through the Parish Council, they think would be suitable for small developments.
- Q 22. Residents are concerned that there are too many office based officers at GBC and not enough to do basic maintenance around the Borough, what is your comment?
- Q 23. How effective and how much influence will the Borough Councillor representing Normandy have in developing the Local Plan in regard to the development of Normandy?
- Q 24. Are planning applications for proposed sites such as Merrist Wood College and Rokers, that are occurring outwith the Local Plan process because the Central Government changed the NPPF and NPPG rules to permit previously developed land in the Green Belt to qualify as 'brownfield' and be developed for housing, be counted as contributing to the delivery of new housing stock within the Local Plan period and if not, why not?

Any planning permissions will count towards housing supply.

- Q 25. Normandy was pleased to receive a Gold standard for its Children's Play Area on Normandy Common but disappointed to receive only a Bronze award for Manor Fruit Farm. What does the Council need to do to obtain a Gold award for Manor Fruit Farm?
- Q 26. It is obvious from the fact, with Normandy Common, which is expected to achieve SNCI status and the other SNCI's in Normandy (including SSSI part of The Ash Ranges) that Normandy and Flexford are important areas for a diversity of wildlife species. Several known species are Red Listed and it is likely that there are others. Some of the rarer species such as some bats, hedgehogs, barn owls, redwing and fieldfares require large foraging areas to survive here and these would be lost if development proceeds on a scale and in the manner proposed by the borough council. The population of Normandy is currently quite small and most of the houses have fairly large gardens which themselves support wildlife. However modern housing developments tend to have very small gardens. Is the Council prepared to take this into consideration, and will they take steps before finalising their plan to find out what species exist and in what numbers as this would have a bearing on whether any large scale development is even possible? Any attempt to mitigate by the creation of SANGs is unlikely to be effective.

The cumulative areas of green space and the links between them are important for biodiversity, whether they are sub-divided into smaller gardens or not.

- Q 27. It is noted that additional caravans have been parked at Palm House Nurseries, Glaziers Lane, without Planning permission, and that five further plots have been requested, all within the Green Belt.

What are GBC's plans for this area in relation to the Local Plan particularly in regard to the location being within the Green Belt?

The Local Plan will need to demonstrate that it is seeking to meet all needs – this includes the accommodation needs of travellers and travelling showpeople. If sites are located in the Green Belt we will need to consider whether they would be appropriate to inset from the Green Belt to enable this need to be met.