

Respondent	Comments	Response
Introduction		
Member of the public	102 pages! Is the general public meant to be able to understand it?! Its full of baffling terminology	Thank you for taking the time to read the document and its appendices. We have tried to avoid use of technical planning terms, although in some places this is necessary to ensure the meaning is not lost. The Background Context Appendix is provided as additional information, but is not vital in understanding the interim framework strategy.
Member of the public	We should not stay stuck in the history and existing fabric of the town we need to be seen as an innovative centre and complement listed and notable building with imaginative new designs. the town does not seem to offer any defining image of itself other than a pretty high street and a big shopping mall, oh yes we have a science park and university and cathedral close by but they are remote how do we integrate them more into the town we need something more than retail on which to service.	The vision and strategy aim to widen the common perception of the town centre as just the High Street to make the most of its other assets. Included in vision and strategy
Member of the public	We feel the majority of bus users come in to use the town centre and to have the bus station by the railway station would benefit fewer people. The shuttle service to and from the railway station was sufficient for the needs of train users. There is not room for a bus station at the railway station. For shoppers carrying loads of purchases the return trip wants to depart close to the shops. The present position does more to keep cars out of the town centre.	Agreed. The railway station is not being considered for a future bus facility. Bus station location has not yet been decided. Reference to it being relocated to Bedford Road surface car park has been changed to just one of several options being considered.
Member of the public	With respect to the effort that has gone into compiling this proposal for Guildford's future, I suggest it lacks a focal point for the town.	Not clear whether this refers to a geographic focal point or a strategy. No change required
Member of the public	Essentially, the Masterplan usefully promotes transparency, particularly as the Plan itself will be "a material consideration in determining planning applications." (NB To be read in conjunction with AF55523E/07.01.12)	Noted. No change required
Guildford town resident	I appreciate all the work that has gone into producing this plan. Thank you all	Noted. No change required
National Trust	The introduction states that the Plan will not form part of the statutory LDF but following adoption of the Core Strategy 'is likely to form part of the statutory framework'. We request some clarification on this matter and believe that the Town Centre Master Plan as a key document within the Borough should carry Significant weight in development control decisions and appeals and should be a statutory Local Development Document.	Agree that this would be desirable, and this was the intention when the town centre plan started out as an Area Action Plan. It was also considered for a town centre SPD. However, such a statutory document would need to relate to an up to date strategic plan (local plan/core strategy) or to the South East plan (the Regional Spatial Strategy for the area). As the South East Plan was to have been revoked some time ago (although its revocation keeps being delayed), and as the borough currently has no up to date local plan, there is no higher level policy from which to produce a statutory document that complies with the legal requirements. Rather a detailed point to include in the document as to why statutory status is not currently possible, therefore explained here. No change required. .
Guildford town resident	I do not believe that the plan as currently conceived and constructed provides an adequate basis on which any significant planning decisions in the town centre should be made.	Point accepted. The draft plan for the town centre has been radically overhauled. Changes made throughout the document compared to the draft masterplan December 2011.
Guide Dogs	Ok vague re equality and access for all	Point noted and discussed in more detail at Guildford Access Group meeting. Text added about shared surfaces and car parking for visually impaired people and others with disabilities. .
Guilford town resident	We do not have sufficient fresh food suppliers; the market is dominated by expensive M&S and Sainsbury's. We need a proper, permanent, covered food market with sufficient close by parking. The time span is far too long! We ,as residents, want change in a reasonable time span, not in 20 years time! It seems that a group of amateurs are putting the masterplan together. I would like more evidence of professionals involved.	The desire for and benefits of markets are included in the strategy. Include need for and benefits of markets in Strategy
Downsedge Residents Association	The introduction explains the work that has already been done and gives some indication of what needs to be done to produce a Masterplan for the town centre. It appears to be an accurate statement of what is covered in the body of the existing report. However it is not practical to comment on the content of the introduction given that DRA has considerable comment on the report itself.	Noted - see their comments in each section. No change required
Guildford town resident	What effect will it have. Can you not be a bit more proactive here all seems a bit reactive and bureaucratic? Too much planning speak. I know that being a material consideration etc is important but it doesn't give confidence that anything will happen.	We have used non-technical wording wherever possible to explain. Add text to explain more fully how it will be useful.
Guildford town resident	I have not had an opportunity to have an in depth look at the plans only recently becoming aware that they are online. Having skimmed them I believe that the plans do not cover the level of detail that I would expect and, most importantly, do not sufficiently cover the big issues which the town faces at a high level traffic congestion, what brings people to Guildford and what will continue to attract people, the route from station to town and the bus station replacement. I will therefore not be commenting on each section individually at present but will express my opinion that a more detailed review is required. From opinions expressed in the Surrey Ad it is clear that there are a great many people with strong views about how the town should be developed which have not been fully represented in this review and now seems like a golden opportunity to get the plan right for the next decade or two. I would therefore suggest that the consultation period be extended to allow all views to be collected and the consultation to look at the broad issues facing the town in greater detail. This should include parking reviews, up to date census info,	Agree that greater detail on strategy is needed than was included in the draft masterplan. Interim framework identifies what brings people to Guildford town centre and will in the future, the future of the pedestrian route between the station and shops, and on the proposal to replace the bus station. It also details why it is an interim framework and does not yet include a movement strategy, nor the revised parking strategy. As explained in Appendix 3, the most up to date census data available has been used. This plan concerns the town centre not the whole of the town. All included in the interim framework except for transport / movement data and strategy. Text included in "An interim framework" in the Introduction to reflect lack of transport and movement information and strategy.

Holy Trinity Amenity Group	None	Noted. No change required
Guildford resident	The GBC consultation draft presents difficulties. The draft, rich in tactics, lacks a strategy. The 'Vision' is hardly a vision – it has become a stack of proposals. Rather than assembling a package of detailed criticisms [half the town seems to be doing that], I thought it would be more constructive to draft something that looked a little more like a strategy. That is what follows - I have not given in the text full bibliographic and statistical references – ask, please. This Masterplan, the subject of consultation, is intended to provide a pathway for further development until 2030: that is, 18 years. It is difficult and uncertain to see that far into the future, but thoughtless actions taken now can prejudice future proposals that would be of great benefit. Buildings, roads and other obstructions last a long time. It is right that a long term look into the future be made. This is a provident time, for the Review of Town Centres by Mary Portas has just been published. This sets out a series of statistics and proposals. None are, perhaps, wholly new, but putting them under one cover does focus thinking, more particularly because in total they reverse the conventional property and commercial wisdom of the last decade.	Agree with comments on Vision and particularly the masterplan strategy section. Agree. Vision and Strategy rewritten
Abbots Hospital	As a pre-eminent historic site at the top of the High Street, and an active, vibrant Almshouse, nearly 400 years old and firmly rooted in the history of the town, the community of Abbot's is keen to see its site and purpose properly taken account of in planning decisions.	As a listed Grade I building, it benefits from a very high level of protection, including its setting. No change required
Member of the public	Moving of present bus station absolutely ridiculous idea. you need to save the money and do a proper job upgrading the present one. you are proposing to put a bus station further away from shops and nearer to drunken louts on bridge street at night what a brilliant idea!!! this would make traffic flow even worse. You already have traffic backing up because of the traffic crossing at Debenhams.	The bus station needs to be moved from its current site to make redevelopment of the land more attractive financially and ensure viability. No change required
Member of the public	I live very near the town centre and my son is at school there. I am in the town every day and would not like to see it spoiled by unjoinedup developments.	Part of the need for a town centre plan is to help to provide some overview of potential development land and areas needing improvements. No change required
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	General Comments. We appreciate that this is not a fully developed document, but it needs to be much clearer, and more concise. The format, with issues spread over several different sections, makes response difficult, and some comments are therefore repeated. We suggest again that actual enforceable policy be separated from supporting information to make the document easy for all to use. Development objectives need to be quantified, e.g number of extra dwellings for the centre, and some timescales provided. "Sustainable Living" is not defined. We have given quotes from the document in italics and proposed changes underlined. Comments on Introduction. The suggested uses for sites will be given..". This is too weak, tentative, and will lead to the same lack of development control that we currently suffer. Suggest The proposed use of sites will be mandatory unless circumstances can be shown to have changed.	Agree with helpful comments on the structuring of the document. Although very desirable, we cannot yet quantify the likely number of new dwellings the town centre has potential for (in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment / SHLAA). As the land is not to be allocated by this non-statutory plan it cannot formally "allocate" sites for particular uses. This will be done through the new Local Plan in order to have the status needed. Reworking of structure of the plan. Removing of "Sustainable Living" as too vague.
Member of the public	There is much to commend many of the proposals but the Vision is not sufficiently far-reaching (see below). The time allowed for the consultation was much too short, overlapping as it did Christmas and New Year	Agree that the Vision needs more work. The consultation period was longer than that required for a statutory planning document to take account of timing of the consultation. New Vision
Member of the public	In general I agree with the plan	Noted. No change required
Member of the public	If the Masterplan is to be for 18 years it MUST be more strategic than this and it MUST be able to demonstrate that it has more to it than a site-by-site summary and disconnected development plan. The introduction should be much more clear in terms of who has been consulted and what it is expected the impact of the Masterplan (if implemented) is expected to have on the life and economy of our town and Borough.	Agree the Introduction needs to explain the intended effect of the plan. Note the plan is for the town centre only not the whole town or borough. Amended Introduction
Chairman of The Tyting Society	I find that there is insufficient analysis to understand how the demographic of Guildford are likely to change over the next 20 years. Appendix 1 is more historical than futuristic. Changes in working patterns and 'etail' are already having a dramatic effect. This feels like a plan for the next 3 years and not the next 20.	Other than an increasing elderly and college-age populations, detailed population projections for such periods are not available to us. "etailing" has been taken into account in establishing future retail floorspace demand (see Retail and Leisure Study 2011). No change required
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Maintaining Guildford Town Centre as competitive as it can be in the regional and national tables and by offering residents / workers and visitors to Guildford a real quality experience is essential.	Agree. This is one of the aims of the plan
House of Fraser	We support the development of a Town Centre Masterplan, provided that it doesn't not seek to implement policies which will have a detrimental impact on those users who are already located within Guildford town centre.	Any new retail development will have some impact on existing facilities either by diverting existing sales or by diverting future sales. which would otherwise arise as a result of future growth. However, additional future expenditure has been identified to support this. There may be some changes in occupiers of existing premises as the variety of retail units is increased. No change required.
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	The 'Introduction' confirms the proposed status of the TCM (Town Centre Masterplan). It would be helpful, and necessary to do so when TCM becomes a Development Plan Document, Although the Economic Strategy 2011 is referred to, other documents e.g. the Roger Tym & Partners' (RTP) Retail and Leisure Study, are not identified. We consider that it is important that there is clarity in relation to how the evidence base has informed the content of the TCM. The coordinated redevelopment of key sites is supported but it is also important to be explicit that the redevelopment of individual sites is intended to occur at different stages during the life of the Town Centre Masterplan (TCM).	Agree that more detail is needed on supporting evidence. Appendix 1 of the draft interim framework includes detail of supporting evidence studies. The start of the Strategy section discusses site delivery, although broad dates for most sites are not currently known.

Guildford town resident	The Town Centre Masterplan, within its proposed town centre boundary, is drawn up primarily for economic reasons, particularly retail. It is shaped by town centre policies for mixed development and change, following national planning guidance. However, national planning guidance is a 'one size fits all' guidance for all towns across the country, whereas Guildford is a unique town with a hilly topography, hemmed in by hills, narrow streets and with historic features. Strong local policies are needed to preserve its special character.	The national policies and guidance on drawing town centre boundaries has been applied locally using detailed knowledge of the area. Agree, although this plan does not include policies, rather they will be included in forthcoming Local Plan. Amended town centre boundary.
Member of the public	I have not had time to look properly at the plan. I do however have very real concerns about the possible/probable removal of the bus station to Bedford Road. My concerns are listed in the Arriving and Getting Around section. My other main concern is the poor state of pavements in the town centre.	Concerns noted. The location for new bus facilities has not yet been decided but is subject to further technical assessments and will be subject to public consultation. No change required
Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	The introduction suggests a bewildering array of plans for Guildford. Reform was supposed to simplify and streamline plans. We are bemused that in an era of the red tape challenge, our Council is not only producing so many plans but also so unclear as to their relative status. Oh for a simple local plan and a strategic county plan! We are also disappointed that there has been so little meaningful community engagement in preparing this Master Plan and that so many elements are being presented as "given" when the community has had no real say. The SWOT analysis seems to inject some recognisable community views but does not seem to be carried through into the policies in the Master Plan. Decisions appear to be being taken by the economic development part of the council, which lacks the consultative mechanisms of the planning department, or by the Local Enterprise Partnership which has no Residents' representation and is not grounded in community roots. This plan seems out of touch with Localism. The introduction epitomises the ad hoc nature of this master plan. It essentially proposes a string of disjointed development sites. This Master Plan should be an opportunity to identify, and at last address, the challenges and opportunities Guildford faces and agree priorities for shaping the future of our town. We have some major issues we need to tackle and this Plan largely shirks this task leaving the future of Guildford to site by site development with no coherent framework for developers to contribute to the wider well being, character and functioning of our town. We need a plan that enables each developer to contribute to delivery of a coherent strategy based on a shared vision with each development supporting community infrastructure and avoiding adverse cumulative and individual impacts.	Agree that the national planning system has become more complicated in recent years. Wide public consultation was undertaken at two stages (excluding the earlier two stages on the Town Centre Area Action Plan from which this document has evolved). Agree that the SWOT analysis did not sufficiently inform the strategy in the draft masterplan. The revised vision, objectives and strategy more clearly stem from the SWOT analysis and community views. The town centre framework is a plan for the town centre area only rather than the whole of Guildford town.
on behalf of MC Nominees owners of site at rear of Walnut Tree Close	The Adopted Masterplan will, once adopted, be a material consideration, however the draft clarifies that appropriate weight will be given to the content during pre-application advice and in determining planning applications.	Noted. No change required
The Guildford Society	The 'Introduction' to the Town Centre Masterplan (TCM) commences by identifying that "Co-ordinated redevelopment of key sites alongside infrastructure and environmental improvements are needed in the town centre" The general view of the Society is that whilst the Plan may set out policies for individual key sites there is little in terms of clearly-formulated proposals for infrastructure or environmental improvements and, furthermore, apart from being included as aspirations within the 'Opportunities' listed for the 25 sites, there is little or no indication as to how these proposed infrastructure or environmental improvements are expected to be achieved.	Agree. The interim framework includes much more detail on environmental enhancements, infrastructure and linkages of these to potential redevelopment areas, included in the Strategy.
Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (on behalf of the Guildford Society)	This section highlights the inherent complexities, if not dangers, of bringing forward non-statutory masterplanning guidance in advance of the adoption of Development Plan Documents in the Local Development Framework. Although the exact status and eventual material weight of the Masterplan is ambiguous, the Guildford Society recognises that this is an inevitable outcome of the current plan-making system. However, the absence of an adopted Core Strategy, up to date site allocations and Development Management policies places even greater onus on the Town Centre Masterplan to define a coherent, place centered vision which draws on sound economic evidence, detailed movement analysis and a sensitive appreciation of urban design and heritage context. As it stands, the document reads as a proxy for the Site Allocations DPD but lacks a thorough spatial narrative and vision, elements that would otherwise be dealt with comprehensively in the Core Strategy, and amplified in other DPD publications. Although the document will not be subject to Examination in Public, we would expect the Council to adopt an equivalent, albeit less onerous, self-assessment of soundness to ensure that the document is fit-for purpose as a tool to steer proposals and manage development. It is anticipated that the Council intends to cite the Masterplan as part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework, as well as a material consideration in assessing planning applications. As such we believe it is in the interest of the Council to ensure that the elements highlighted in this submission are addressed as this will help to avoid protracted debates, objections and appeals on future Development Plan Documents and planning decisions on key sites.	Agree, although without an up to date Local Plan / Core Strategy, and because of the national delay and confusion surrounding revocation of Regional Spatial Strategies, including the South East Plan, the only option for a town centre plan was for it to, at least for now, sit outside of the statutory land use plan system. Much work has been done on the Vision, which as explained in the interim framework, will be carried through into the new Local Plan. Noted - See amended Vision
Vision		
resident of Guildford borough	What vision? Make more shops and restaurants with less parking?	More shops is certainly an important part of the town centre's future. The amended vision does not include less parking. See amended Vision
Surrey Wildlife Trust	Yes broadly, however re. Environment; this could also be the place to mention opportunities to re-connect an increasingly 'urbanised' society with the natural environment/biodiversity via the Wey Navigation	Agree, greater emphasis given to the river and riverside in the amended Vision. See amended Vision
Member of the public	Add: park and ride site in North Guildford, Alteration to the gyratory system might improve traffic flow, but it will not reduce the amount of traffic: GBC & SCC must seek to achieve this by other means.	Agreed that other interventions are required, including signage to car parks and park and rides. Need and potential for a further park and ride north of Guildford town centre will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. For consideration in drawing up a movement strategy for the final framework.
Member of the public	broadly yes	Noted. No change required

Member of the public	1. I agree that the vision set out in section 2 is the right direction of travel for Guildford. I would particularly like to see more made of the potential around the river Wey to attract more tourists, eg river-view cafes/restaurants rather than offices in the old warehouses near the station. 2. On transport, we have to accept that public transport does not provide a door-to-door service and there is not much we can do to avoid people visiting the station car park for a short period to pick up and drop off train passengers. The entrance to and from the station car park can be grid-locked at rush hours. The root cause of this is the cars exiting Walnut Tree Close want to enter the most right-hand lane of the gyratory towards the Horsham Road. The only solutions I can think of are to: - re-engineer the entry onto the gyratory, eg by re-siting the traffic light nearby. This couldn't be done without a deal of disruption; - encourage Network Rail to run faster services to London from the London Road station or construct a new station in Merrow where they own the land by the railway bridge to divert some of the passengers out of the centre of Guildford, recognising that this is a commuter issue. This would involve the cooperation of Network Rail and possibly financial incentives (if this is affordable or allowed by the public expenditure framework); - redesign the station car park, again requiring Network Rail's co-operation. However you look at it, it's a tricky issue but a resolution would ease the pressure on the gyratory at rush hour.	1. Noted, vision includes making more of the river, and strategy includes making it more used and lively. 2. These points will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Amended Vision. Noted for future movement strategy
Guildford resident	It might be optimistic to think, for instance, that the addition of a single supermarket will greatly add to the visitor's initial impression of Guildford as a thriving shopping centre.	Opinion noted. This is not a view promoted in the draft masterplan document. No change required
<i>Guildford resident</i>	My comments on this Vision both as to its suitability and specificity has two strands: 1) Contrary to perceived trends, no allowance has been made for the fact that online shopping is now in vogue so, by 2030 if the trend persists, the High Street as we know it will have ceased to exist. 2) In this event, planners have to make a choice: what draws in the punters? a) a pleasant recreation area or: b) The leisure aspect of hands on shopping, often undertaken by parents with young children in tow. c)The public's enthusiasm for a good bargain and markets. d) People's innate desire to congregate en masse to celebrate eg Guy Fawkes Night or New Year's Eve.	1) Future Growth in Special Forms of Trading, including internet retailing has been taken into account in establishing future retail floorspace demand (see Retail and Leisure Study 2011). It is likely that the role of the High Street in 20 years time will be different to now, although it is still likely to be a key focus for town centre activities. 2) The High Street can serve many functions, including at different times of the day / evening. These options are not mutually exclusive. No change required
Guildford town resident	The Environment; I am concerned by these words "which will accommodate many more shops, predominantly of contemporary design". Is this the best way to approach creating a town centre with a difference?	Agreed. Removed from Vision
Guildford town resident	Not in favour of a fullsize supermarket at present because of the traffic congestion which already exists and the limited scope to resolve it because of geography of town. I would still opt to do any large grocery shopping out of town or shop online rather than wrestle with the Guildford parking and gyratory system.	Concerns noted. The planning application for a new supermarket will consider transport mitigation to minimise impact on traffic. These can be handy for those who do not own a car and / or the elderly / disabled who may not drive. No change required
Guildford town resident	I support the provision of more shops and would like to see some small startup premises made available. New supermarket welcome but full department store would be better. Improvement of riversides vital. Long term plan to remove through traffic from gyratory should be part of this overall plan. Great care needed to avoid 1960/80 architectural mistakes we are 'stuck with'. Must not be led by Architects dreams!	Provision for a range of types of retail businesses will be facilitated through the interim framework, for example in Phoenix Court. Vision to include diverse range of shops
Planning Development control regeneration specialists	The vision is not clear in what are uncertain economic times. The harsh reality is that to achieve all the objectives of the masterplan, finance is not going to be available for probably a generation. It may be better to have an evolving masterplan which recognises this.	The plan covers an 18-year period, in which improvements in the town centre will have begun to be noticeable. This period is likely to include both economic highs and lows. No change required
Member of the public	Why include a Supermarket? There are two out of town supermarkets and several medium size supermarkets in town already. The addition of a further large supermarket will impact your laudable aim of reducing traffic, and will stifle competition within the boutique food shop sector which could otherwise flourish in an affluent town like Guildford. The change of roads around the gyratory system would greatly improve the atmosphere and traffic within the town. Focus should be placed on this and the bus station redevelopment as priorities to ensure these key infrastructure projects are completed early on.	Need for more food store floorspace has been identified by our expert consultants. As required by government policy, if there is a suitable site in a town centre that is available and would be viable, this is preferable to sites outside of town centres. This "town centre first" approach aims to reduce car trips by encouraging people to do other things in the town centre during their visit. Agreed that supermarkets can impact on other food retailers. Noted, these will be identified as priorities in a movement strategy. No change required. Included as an objective and in the strategy.
Guildford town resident	Broadly agree. Include small shop units at reduced cost for local independent businesses as a step on from market/street stalls.	Agreed, strategy to include a range of retail unit sizes, including stalls and barrows.
Guildford town resident	The plan seems to have been led by a piecemeal developer led approach, rather than as an overall strategy for the Town Centre. The approach adopted is not appropriate to Guildford.	The focus of development of sites in the draft masterplan has been shifted to a more varied strategy with greater emphasis on other enhancements. Re-written strategy.
Theatres Trust	Vision: We are pleased that the Vision includes theatres and entertainment venues that attract both residents and visitors to contribute to a lively town centre, daytime and evenings. It is important that the town centre should not become 'dead' when shops and offices close for the night. A balance needs to be found between the main function of the town centre as a shopping and employment destination, the available amenities for the residential population, and the opportunities for people to enjoy an evening out.	Agreed, noted. No change required
Member of the public	Except for the theatre and a few pubs; there is little scope for entertainment for encouraging people into the centre in the evening's?	Opinion noted, see amended town centre management strategy. Town centre management strategy needed more emphasis on longer opening hours for shops, and a more diverse evening economy.

Guildford town resident	Transport and other infrastructure change to just 'transport', it is a key issue on its own. So we could have: To create a transport system that provides: · Little traffic congestion and predominantly pedestrian friendly routes; Excellent access to and from Guildford to main working and residential conurbations; · The main transport services (ie. Trains, buses, cars, cyclists) connected with each other and with clearly signed and safe and attractive routes to shops, businesses and town heritage sites; · Short-term town centre parking is supported by low cost frequent buses servicing the 4/5 main Park & Rides. Other Infrastructure - To have improved infrastructure of education, health and community facilities in line with a growing population and workforce.	Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed. Vision has been amended with last sentence dealing with transport infrastructure.
Members of the public	It is good to live in a vibrant town with a Vision! However, this comes at a cost to those of us who are continuing to live in the town which is already difficult to negotiate by car, on foot and is pandering to the needs of commerce and retail.	Achieving a successful balance of uses is a challenge facing all town centres. It is a major centre of commerce and generator of visitor trips, whilst also being home to many people. The improvements to the environment identified should make moving about the town centre easier and more pleasant for pedestrians. No change required.
Guide Dogs	Agree that the vision is suitable and specific – as long as it is inclusive for all regardless of their abilities	Noted, the interim framework aims to be inclusive, and to improve the town centre environment for all to enjoy. No change required
University of Surrey	The University welcomes the proposed vision for Guildford town centre in order to: • Make it a thriving place for businesses to locate to by reinforcing its retail and employment centre role, particularly through utilising links with the University • To improve transport infrastructure and ensure that it continues to play an important role as a transport interchange, with improved bus and rail facilities • Make it a place that more people can call home. The provision of more affordable housing will be central to this objective • Create inviting and comfortable public spaces and buildings that people want to use, whilst reinforcing local character and distinctiveness The University also welcomes Objectives 1 – 7 which focus the issues identified in the vision. However, Objective 3 could be strengthened by adding reference to the need to improve transportation connectivity between the town centre and the surrounding urban areas.	Providing more affordable housing is a priority for the council and is particularly important in areas with many service jobs, so is identified as one of the interim framework's objectives. Improved experience of getting to the town centre is included in the Vision. This may need to be addressed further in the Vision and objectives once transport evidence is completed. Vision has been greatly amended.
Town Centre Signage Group	The vision mentions attracting visitors from a wide area. This underlines a need for a signage policy to be carefully adopted. Transport vision includes reducing peak hour traffic and another Park and Ride facility. Correct signage and careful consideration of extending hours of operation to improve access to the night time economy would be beneficial to not only easing parking problems but also reducing our carbon footprint.	Agreed, improved signage is identified in the strategy as potentially improving traffic flows into and within the town centre. The Council welcomes working with the signage group and Surrey County Council to improve signage around and within the town centre. Picked up in strategy section
TURLEY ASSOCIATES on behalf of Hermes Real Estate Investment Management Ltd	Agree.	noted. No change required
Member of the public	Why is the vision concentrated on the provision of more retail and extending the night time economy. Retail is shrinking and likely to continue to do so under the pressures of home delivery and online purchasing. Efforts should be made to increase the provision of business areas within the town to expand upon the work carried out at the Research Park together with the provision of residential units. The agreement to allow a supermarket on the site of the Bellerby Theatre is misplaced. This area should be residential. Fails to consider problems arising from the existing road traffic. I understand Surrey County Council to be responsible for the road layout in the town. Surely they should have been involved in the preparation of the draft as they will have considerable influence on changes to the road layout in the period up to 2030.	The economy is a key element of the town centre. Its importance is highlighted in the interim framework. The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is future demand for more retail floorspace for comparison good. This is based upon increases in population and in disposable income within the area. This assessment includes consideration of growth in special forms of trading, including an increase in internet retailing (paras 4.20 and 4.21 of the study). There is a great need for more town centre housing. The Bellerby site planning application will have to deal with all aspects of transport and traffic related to any proposal. Surrey County Council was involved in transport issues in the framework. Once all the required transport evidence needed is available we will work with Surrey County Council to formulate a movement strategy. No change required.
Guildford Labour Party	We have examined the draft Guildford Town Centre Masterplan, and we believe that it contains a number of serious flaws. We will outline some specific comments, but our overall view is that there is no masterplan or vision for future development of the town centre area. There is no vision of what currently works and what doesn't, what should be left as it is and what should be changed. The plan seems much more of a piecemeal list of sites and possibilities for development – most sites list multiple possibilities. We believe the lack of vision is highlighted by the treatment of the River Wey – it is described as an asset that needs to be made more of, but then riverside sites are dealt with as sites for development of various types without any idea of opening up the river to the north of the old town bridge. A tourist centre - Visibility of assets – it is extremely unlikely that most visitors are even aware of the castle and museum (signposting is small and high up). Many residents are not even aware of them. G Live is so far away from the main shopping areas that visitors are very unlikely to stumble upon it. Many visitors will not be aware of the riverside amenities south of the town bridge, as they are not visible to visitors unless they come into Guildford from the Shalford direction. We need to make sure visitors in the High Street and the Friary are well aware that all 3 exist. As mentioned above, some proper visitor information boards in the area of the Friary Centre and the High Street are essential.	The draft masterplan did have a vision, although this did not adequately follow through into the objectives and strategy. A vision is how the community and other stakeholders and the council see the future of the town centre in year X, rather than what works and doesn't, as that is provided in the SWOT analysis. Agree that the River Wey was not given adequate focus in the draft masterplan. New Vision, re-working of SWOT analysis to make it clearer. Separate strategy section on the River Wey. Greater emphasis made in the interim framework on need to link up visitor attractions, including using signage to direct visitors between the town centre's various visitor attractions.

	The castle is a wasted opportunity and needs to be publicised. The museum is in a similar position. The Guildford area has a Saxon mass burial, a long history as a market and agricultural droving point, Roman buildings, a Royal castle, links with pilgrims going to Canterbury (although this is disputed), links to various aristocrats, the Lewis Carroll link, manufacturing of gunpowder and military vehicles, and much more. And the river is truly wasted – there are few rivers in the SE that are shallow and slow moving, with a large area of green space with free access, so the Wey should be much better publicised. And if tourists are a target, there do need to be sufficient car park spaces.	Agreed. Included riverside interpretation signs to inform in The River Wey strategy. Sufficient short stay parking is needed for all town centre users, including tourists, although many also visit the town centre by train.
	Congestion - The report says Guildford is the twelfth most congested place in the country, and admits that is worrying considering its relatively small size. Yet there is no vision here to do anything about congestion. The one Park and Ride site identified on the west of the town will not solve this problem, and its site on Manor farm is not ideal – traffic coming from the Aldershot Road or even Worplesdon Road would have to travel through Park Barn or Southway – roads that are often made single track by on-street parking. Traffic coming off the A3 would be directed along a road that is already seriously congested at peak times (the Highways Agency have objected to Royal Surrey plans in the past to increase car parking and other development because the agency said this junction is already at capacity). Routing buses around the gyratory system to the proposed new bus station in Bedford Road will only make things worse.	Agreed, the Council and Surrey County Council who is responsible for the roads in and around the town centre do not yet have the information needed to produce a strategy for roads and movement. As acknowledged in the interim framework, further evidence is needed on transport and parking in order to draw up a movement strategy. Both organisations will work with the Highways Agency on impact and mitigation on the A3.
Guilford town resident	Stoke Park is just an expanse of grass. Just boring. We need running/skating/cycling tracks. Safe, interesting areas for children to play. An attractively landscaped place with trees, shrubs, shade is needed. I have lived in Guildford for 27 years and have never felt the draw to go to Stoke Park!	Thank you for the time taken to respond. However, these comments do not relate directly to the draft masterplan. No change required
Guilford town resident	I don't agree with the focus on shopping. The town centre needs more businesses. There is a move to more shopping on line. Whilst shopping will continue to be a leisure activity, the proposal to increase shopping space seems out of step with the times.	Whilst we appreciate that many people have different, even conflicting views on how they want the town centre to change in the future, the 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021 (excluding the schemes already having planning permission). The Study takes into account special forms of trading, including an increase in internet retailing (paras 4.20 and 4.21). The identified demand excludes the approved Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permission. Guildford town centre has a very affluent catchment area, and tourists visit the town centre attracted by its High Street shopping environment. If new shops are not provided here, the extra available spend will result in new stores in competing town centres and in out of centre locations, which will compete with the town centre shops, potentially weakening its retail function. No change required.
Downsedge Residents Association	Whilst DRA does not disagree with the initial statement that "In 2030 Guildford town centre will maintain its role as the Key Shopping and Service Centre in the county...", we do take issue with the overarching emphasis on shopping that is given in the Masterplan as the nature of shopping is already changing fast and is very likely to change much more in the future due to the increased use of the internet for most if not all types of shopping. We believe it to be a mistake to plan for a major new supermarket in the town centre as this will undoubtedly bring more traffic into the centre creating more congestion than already exists. Three supermarkets currently exist in the town centre; a medium sized one (Marks and Spencer) and two smaller ones (Sainsbury's and Tesco) which cater mainly for residents living in or near the centre. Even though bulk food shopping for other residents is available via in-store on-line shopping, many residents are likely to continue to find large supermarkets outside the town centre more convenient where ample parking is available. We broadly agree with the vision for the Environment. However we do not agree that the town centre be filled with "many more shops". We would like to see more emphasis on independent and specialist shops in the town centre and much less on chain and/or franchised shops which seem currently to be taking over. This is a phenomenon now widely seen in many towns which undermines the local character of individual locations. In this context, Farnham is a good example of a town centre with many independent shops however traffic management in Farnham is perhaps not an example to be followed. To encourage independent and specialist shops, it may be necessary to provide some initial incentive such as a short term reduction in business rate. We welcome the concept of a new town square which has already been given planning permission in the Friary development.	Whilst we appreciate that many people have different, even conflicting views on how they want the town centre to change in the future, one of Guildford's Unique Selling Points is its attractive shopping environment. The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. The Study takes into account special forms of trading, including an increase in internet retailing (paras 4.20 and 4.21). The identified demand excludes the approved Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permission. Guildford town centre has a very affluent catchment area, and tourists visit the town centre attracted by its High Street shopping environment. If new shops are not provided here, the extra available spend will result in new stores in competing town centres and in out of centre locations, which will compete with the town centre shops, potentially weakening its retail function. Many town centre residents currently drive out from the town centre to visit the two out of centre superstores. These car trips will be re-routed to the proposed supermarket. Town Planning cannot be used to distinguish between national and independents, except for through its control over size of shop units. Variation in rates is note possible, as business rates are set by central government. Small businesses currently benefit from a reduced rate. Noted. Greater emphasis on broadening the range of shops, including markets to provide more variety.
Guildford town resident	Yes would just like to see something around 'living'. Amongst other things the town centre should be a great opportunity to provide more high density and sustainable dwellings although now see its an objective so support this	Whilst we are not yet in a position to identify the number of new homes that the town centre could potentially accommodate, the interim framework does promote additional homes, including affordable homes, as much needed. Included as an objective and in the interim strategy. Strategies for each geographic area now make clear what proposals could bring about the identified changes.

Guildford town resident	Don't think it is SUITABLE largely because of its emphasis on "more shops". In my view, Guildford needs more diverse and individual shops, not simply more of the same. Under transport, I would like to see the free shuttle bus reintroduced as a symbol of the borough's welcome to visitors Much of the wording of the Vision , and indeed of the whole plan, is UNSPECIFIC eg what is meant by "reinforcing of local character and distinctiveness"? In addition, while many of the sentiments are worthy, they are not fleshed out elsewhere in the plan. For example, the reference to utilizing links with the University and Guildford College is unsupported by anything that follows.	Whilst we appreciate that many people have different, even conflicting views on how they want the town centre to change in the future, one of Guildford's Unique Selling Points is its attractive shopping environment. Town Planning cannot be used to distinguish between national and independents, except for through its control over size of shop units.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	Excellent Vision	Noted. No change required
Member of the public	THE VISION High streets and town centres that are fit for the 21st century need to be multifunctional social centres, not simply competitors for stretched consumers. They must offer irresistible opportunities and experiences that do not exist elsewhere, are rooted in the interests and needs of local people, and will meet the demands of a rapidly changing world." Action for Market Towns (2011)	Agree that a mix of uses generally, and on most sites is needed to ensure the town centre's lively and successful future. The future of the town centre depends on having a broad range of attractions at different times of the day, and different spaces for all to enjoy. The Vision has been redrafted to emphasise the mix of roles that the town centre plays, not just in shopping. New Vision reworks emphasis away from shopping.
Member of the public	Leisure and culture: 'a world class tourist destination' is rather 'over the top' - a national / European tourist destination would be a better description. To meet this vision / aim, the town needs at least one additional high class (4 star) hotel in the lower part of the town within a short walk of the station and with integral secure car parking for hotel residents. The town could be promoted as a tourist destination to stay as a convenient alternative for visitors to London, as it is has a fast frequent train service to get there. Marketing could be aimed particularly at those motorists from Europe and the rest of the UK, who wish to tour southern England by car, but do not want to travel into London by car.	Agree a little ambitious. Need for more hotels has been noted and is included in the interim framework. Other than in town centre management, and potentially through the proposed Business Improvement District (BID) the document does not deal with tourist promotion. This aim has been removed and a new Vision written.
	Transport and other infrastructure: The vision needs to look beyond one new park and ride facility on west of town. The main access route into the town from other than local destinations is from the M25 at J10 and then the A3. A park and ride in the Burpham area needs to be planned within the timescale of the Masterplan. It is difficult to see how reduced peak hour traffic will be achieved with an extended retail area within Friary centre, attracting more staff and shoppers .	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	Additional railway stations at Merrow, Stoughton, Park Barn / Hospital for commuters coming into Guildford and going to London, Woking, Reading etc to relieve demand on Guildford railway station, in particular the traffic congestion surrounding station. (Plans were drawn up some years ago for a station at Merrow. It may be difficult to locate a station at Park Barn because the railway here is on a rising gradient, and this may not be allowed under railway rules.) Have a Guildford area joint bus / train season ticket valid on all operators in greater Guildford area.	New stations are very expensive to fund, but these issues will be considered in formulating a movement strategy. No change required
	Guildford Plus Bus Home and community: Need to have housing to include 'upmarket' accommodation with adequate on-site parking as well as affordable homes (i.e. local authority / housing association).	Agree, a variety of housing types are needed in the town centre. Included in strategy
	Environment: a town square suitable for outside community activities - either as part of the Friary area and/or at riverside near Town Bridge.	Agree, the strategy has been amended to include need for more spaces for meeting as an alternative to the High Street. Included in strategy
Abbots Hospital	The Vision has to ensure a proper balance between competing interests, including residential provision. Abbot's is a long-established home for an elderly community, Along with the housing around Holy Trinity Churchyard, it forms a distinct and longstanding area of residential property that warrants protection from intrusive elements of any increased commercialism.	Noted, the town centre is the location for a great variety of uses. This area being primary frontage albeit close to secondary frontage will be predominantly shops, which are unlikely to cause disturbance. No change required
West Horsley Parish Council	An increase in shops, development, business and more visitors all need a vastly improved transport infrastructure. An increased number of people will cause a rise in the number of vehicles, traffic planners need to design better designated queue lanes at car park entrances. Short stay parking needs to be retained or even added to in addition to better/increased levels of public transport .Train fares are too high, reduced fares would encourage people to use them. Guildford is a busy town that already struggles to cope with the amount of visitors it receives, people who can not easily park/ access the centre will vote with their feet and choose to shop at / visit other locations.	Agree, short stay parking levels will need to increase with new development, currently in line with the adopted maximum parking standards. The parking strategy revision is currently being prepared and is considering suitable level of parking. Public transport also needs improving. No change required
Guildford town resident	Parts of it are suitable but it is not specific enough	Opinion noted. Vision has been rewritten
Member of the public	I do not agree that the present bus station should be moved and that more shops should be built on the site there seem to be quite a few empty shops in the High Street and North Street already and more and more people are shopping online.	The current location of the bus station impacts on the viability of redevelopment of this land. High Street has very high rents, and older premises which are note suitable for some retailers. Increase in internet retailing has been factored in to future retail demand. No change required
Member of the public	Putting cafe/s restaurants down walnut tree close ?? another ill conceived idea. many in the town centre struggle how would these make a living	Agreed. These land uses have been amended for site Land at rear of Walnut Tree Close.
Member of the public	1. I do not agree with expanding the town centre economy. I do think that landlords and those setting rates should look at the rents and rates demanded and see if they can do more to encourage more interesting and independent retailers or operations. At the moment there are many empty properties and recently businesses have closed.	Agreed. Variation in rates is not possible, as business rates are set by central government. Small businesses currently benefit from a reduced rate. Rents can be varied by the landlord / owner although as most of the retail premises are privately owned, their aim is generally to maximise income. The Council is bound by "best consideration" to maximise its rents. No change required

	2. If we are to increase the town centre's retail offer then for goodness sake stop the Waitrose development and properly expand the Friary to incorporate a new bus station, proper car parking and encourage a big anchor store in. Commercial Street has been derelict for years, awaiting just this development. Look at Kingston, where John Lewis has underground parking right next to the river, so flooding is not a real excuse. People will not like Guildford because of its lack of accessibility by car, whatever we do with Park & Rides.	Any new major retail development should not be in the form of an indoor shopping centre, for example as an extension to the Friary. Agree, underground parking can be viable. Included underground parking in interim framework.
	3. The gyratory system and the traffic flow in Guildford can be scandalous. Probably a new road bridge is required. If there is any sort of accident in Guildford or the A3 the whole area solidifies very quickly. This is obviously not good for residents or visitors or business.	Traffic congestion is one of the main issues facing the town centre. Transport evidence will be produced and options for improving the situation considered before a movement strategy is formulated. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	6. If more housing is to be permitted in the town centre then proper accord has to be taken of car parking needs, for the new residents and their visitors.	Noted. Parking standards are to be reviewed, but national policy has changed recently from requiring maximum standards to requiring issues such as car ownership to be taken into account in setting new parking standards. No change required
	7. Take a look at what San Antonio in Texas has done with its river area delightful and attractive. Maybe we don't have the weather, but I feel sure more could be made of it, with imagination and investment.	Suggestion noted. River Wey now has its own strategy to improve its appearance and use.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	We disagree with some parts of the vision, as follows: 2.1 The first function of the Town Centre is to serve the Residents of Guildford. The needs and wishes of residents receives little if any attention throughout the document. This needs emphasis. Add, to the start of the document: In 2030 Guildford town centre will better serve the needs of Guildford Residents. It will maintain its role... 2.2 We welcome the more modest aspiration to ..maintain its role as the key shopping and service centre in the county.. We have always opposed the disproportionate expansion of Guildford. This is so important that some additional qualification is needed, add Expansion will not be allowed if it would compromise the quality and character of the town centre.	The town centre serves very many purposes, and is not solely a place to live, as are many residential areas. It is also very important to local tourism and to the economy of the area, being the largest town centre in the county. Notwithstanding, protecting the amenities of its residential community is very important, as is increasing the local population. Vision amended to "reinforce its position as a major and vibrant retail, leisure and cultural centre.
Member of the public	The "Vision" is not sufficiently visionary! Some of the components that should be included are:	These suggestions are too detailed to be included in a Vision. The rewritten Vision is much shorter, with these types of detailed points being picked up in the strategy. No change required
	1. Environmental sustainability -- making the transition to a low carbon, resource- and energy-efficient economy -- should be at the heart of the vision and guide all parts of future development. This will not always be compatible with the type of activities and growth which have been the drivers of Guildford's economy in recent decades.	These suggestions are too detailed to be included in a Vision. The rewritten Vision is much shorter, with these types of detailed points being picked up in the strategy. No change required
	2. As a contribution to this the aim should be to develop a "green, low carbon economy" and for Guildford to endeavour to become the environmental capital of the UK This will mean focussing policies, investments and spending towards sectors such as clean technologies, renewable energies, green transportation and green buildings. The University and Research Park could play a major role in this.	These suggestions are too detailed to be included in a Vision. The rewritten Vision is much shorter, with these types of detailed points being picked up in the strategy. No change required
	3. To help achieve these aims Guildford should collaborate with and learn from our twin city of Freiburg (which has become one of the greenest cities in the world)	These suggestions are too detailed to be included in a Vision. The rewritten Vision is much shorter, with these types of detailed points being picked up in the strategy. No change required
	4. This means relying less on the growth of retail activities and consumerism as economic drivers than in the past. The future expansion of shopping facilities must be strictly limited, with an emphasis on small, independent, specialist shops rather than national chains.	These suggestions are too detailed to be included in a Vision. The rewritten Vision is much shorter, with these types of detailed points being picked up in the strategy. No change required
	5. The stated vision includes the provision of a full-line supermarket. This would introduce more traffic into the town centre and require a large car park. This should not be part of Guildford's future -- the town is already well enough served with central supermarkets	Our retail planning consultants have advised that Guildford town centre is under-represented in food retailing compared to other town centres. Without a full line food store, many town centre residents have to drive out to the two out of centre superstores. No change required
	6. There should be a strong emphasis on the cultural, educational and artistic activities with which Guildford is well-served	This aim has been included in the reworded Vision. No change required
	7. The impact of traffic on the town must be greatly reduced with the present congestion and domination by the car tackled by greater (and cheaper!) use of public transport, more pedestrianisation, better cycling facilities, reduced speed limits and traffic calming.	Very interesting suggestions. These points will be included in consideration of transport evidence and formulation of a movement strategy. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	8. As a component of this the gyratory system, which at present cuts off the station and the adjacent area from the town centre, should be re-designed. Bridge Street should be closed to traffic and the rest of the gyratory made two-way.	Very interesting suggestions. These points will be included in consideration of transport evidence and formulation of a movement strategy. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	9. A much better linkage between the river and the town centre should be facilitated to enable the town to make better use of the river	Agreed. Strategy includes linking High Street with River
	10. There must be a high quality of design standards for buildings, the townscape, paving, street furniture etc. Again we should follow the example of Freiburg in these matters -- it was named by the Academy of Urbanism as European City of the Year in 2010	Whilst the interim framework does not include design standards, a Materials Guide is to be prepared with the final framework. No change required
Member of the public	Historic heritage of town should be given higher priority.	Agreed, vision amended to include this. Include in Vision "its distinctive historic character and landscape will be conserved and enhanced."

Member of the public	I think there should be more night time pop up toilets such as the single one on North street. This is because at night time all but the Bedford Road public toilets are closed and thus many people go to urinate around the town wharf/and the gyratory bridge by the electric theatre. Thus it is in these areas where there is the greatest need for one. Additionally a night time pop up toilet maybe useful in the zone between the Casino nightclub and the cinema but the need isn't as great here I don't think. Finally I think recycling around town should be more prominent with litter bin sized containers for cans in particular. Furthermore I think recycling banks should be installed at Guildford Station as they would be in a convenient place for people and I think they would get good usage.	The Cleansing Manager has advised that unfortunately these toilets are very expensive and locating these is very difficult. It took several months to find a location in the town that could hold the current pop up toilet due to planning, neighbour and underground piping issues. There is also limited pavement space in and around the Bridge Street area. Even were the money was available, finding a site would be very difficult. Issues of concern relating to the night time economy have recently become higher profile, include an independent review. Recycling litter bins - The Council is working to increase these and already has a number in the High Street. We are looking to expand these further through the town over the coming years as budgets allow. Guildford Station will not want be a chosen location as this is private land and down to Network Rail to provide facilities for their land, although we are likely to place them at places on the paths where we currently have bins, when we can. No changes required.
Member of the public	THIS IS NOT A VISION... A vision would be, say, Guildford will be an OPEN town - Open to business, visitors, shoppers and residents of all ages; it will be Open to developers who embrace the spirit and strategic direction of the town and its heritage, to investors, educators, researchers and worshippers; it will be Open to the countryside, the River Wey, amenities, arts and leisure; it will be Open and accessible by all forms of public transport and private cars, bicycles and pedestrians, and its roads will be managed to promote efficient, safe traffic management; it will be Open democratically and fully accountable to its users. There may be elements missing here but the intention is clear. It should probably also include what Guildford sees as its Unique Selling Point(s)	Opinion noted. This in itself has some conflicts. Vision has been rewritten, but does not include "open". Vision has been rewritten.
Quod on behalf of Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd	We agree that more shops and other uses will reinforce the town centre's role as the county's key retail and employment centre and that it is important to recognise that the town centre's historic environment can co-exist with proposals for regeneration and redevelopment.	Agreed, both included in the rewritten Vision. Vision has been rewritten.
Chairman of The Tyting Society	The demise of the 'Old style' retailing is not covered, nor is the impact of technological changes towards 24/7 working patterns. Otherwise the headings are fine but too equally weighted	The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is future demand for more retail floorspace for comparison good. This is based upon increases in population and in disposable income within the area. This assessment includes consideration of growth in special forms of trading, including an increase in internet retailing (paras 4.20 and 4.21 of the study). This is summarised in the Background Context on the Economy. No change required
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Providing the essential ingredients of daily life to create a vibrant town centre that is well used, prosperous and well regarded is fundamental to the continued success of Guildford. Recognising the additional element of the University in the Town is important too. The vision does not identify that the student life and the social economic benefit this brings to Guildford should be an element that is considered intrinsically linked to the success (and challenges) faced by delivering and running a successful town centre. We would suggest this element is recognised in the vision as no mention is made of this element that makes Guildford different from, say Woking / Farnham, etc.	The contribution of the university and students to the town centre is considered too detailed for the Vision, although they may contribute to the Vision in terms of job opportunities, homes, liveliness. Included in Analysis : Wider context section. Also detailed in the Background context section.
No name given	Whilst i agree with the general thrust I feel the vision lacks ambition and places too much emphasis on more and more shops rather than quality.	Agree. Vision has been reworded and rebalanced as suggested.
CTC	Mere 'alterations' to the one-way system will not be enough: the current situation is well described in the 'weaknesses' section and is a fundamental flaw in improving the Town Centre area beyond the High Street.	This is one of the main issues facing the town centre's future. This will be considered when more information is available. Will be included in a <u>Movement Strategy</u>
House of Fraser	The vision refers to a need for more shops in Guildford. We are concerned that a significant increase in the amount of retail floorspace in Guildford could have a negative impact on those retailers who are already in present in the town and who should be protected by this Masterplan. We therefore recommend that the Masterplan quantifies the amount of additional retail that that will be permitted in Guildford.	The demand for a significant amount of new retail floorspace in Guildford's catchment area has been quantified by expert consultants. New comparison retail floorspace in the town centre will provide efficient, modern retailing and promote choice, competition and innovation. Some impact on existing shops is inevitable. There has been no major new retail development in the town centre for several decades, with the consequence that the "spend" is being "lost" to other competing locations. The amount of retail floorspace for the town centre will be set out in the new Local Plan.
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	We consider the components identified which make up the 'Vision' for the TCM to be suitable and specific. However, in relation to the part that deals with the Economy we would suggest that the words "at least one" should be added after the word "including" on the basis that the RTP study confirms (para. 7.48) that there is a qualitative need for "at least one new foodstore" in the town to increase competition and choice and reduce overtrading and encourage linked trips as well as retail capacity for 6,776 sq.m. gross (4,044 sq.m. net) of additional convenience goods floorspace by 2021, even with the assumption that the Friary Centre extension site is built out to accommodate a large foodstore (Table 6.9).	The Vision has been rewritten and is no longer this detailed. Similar wording is included in Appendix 3 "Background Context" page 167. Appendix 3 "Background Context" page 167, first paragraph replace "a new food supermarket" with "at least one .."

Clandon society	<p>VISION The vision statements are worthy expressions and if delivered would significantly improve Guildford town centre. However we have several comments: It seems unlikely that spin-off businesses from the University, research park, hospital and Guildford College will locate in the town centre. Much better to provide pleasant easy access from them to the town centre so that they become more integrated. The requirement for much more retail space, justified on the basis of past information could well be misleading. If Guildford is such a hot destination, it seems odd that Westfield have sat on their hands for so long, blighting a large area. The current difficult economic times could well result in a real shift in retail behaviour and reduce the demand for existing high street offers. If the Guildford vision is to increase the retail space on North Street, add a new supermarket and develop the existing bus station and adjacent properties as predominantly retail one wonders where the trade will come from. The last thing we need is more traffic congestion. We quibble with the "world class tourist destination" – it isn't now and realistically it won't be in the foreseeable future and certainly not as a result of this plan. Much better to have achievable ideas, not pie in the sky. The vision for transport and infrastructure is very weak given that congestion is one of the town's most significant problems and that growth in both population and workforce is a given in the plan.</p>	<p>Westfield has recently focused its interests in larger retail and leisure schemes in the UK, such as Stratford and Croydon. It appears that Guildford did not fit the profile of schemes it was moving toward. Future retail demand (including current predictions of trends in special forms of trading such as internet shopping) was undertaken in 2010/11, a few years into the recession. This will need to be reviewed in 2015/16, providing the opportunity for any further shift in retail behaviour to be picked up. Sufficient comparison and convenience additional retail demand has been identified (from increases in population and disposable income) to support the quantum identified. Agree that more traffic congestion would harm the environment of the town centre. Agreed that "world class" was slightly ambitious. This has been removed from the Vision. The plan must be realistic and deliverable. It also needs to be aspirational in that what is desirable now many not yet be achievable, but may be so in the near future. The reworded Vision does not include details of transport infrastructure improvements to help reduce congestion in light of expected increases in residential and working populations. The strategy now includes improved 24 hour pedestrian links between Guildford station and the University of Surrey. These issues will be considered and included in a Movement Strategy in the final framework</p>
Environmental Forum	<p>Vision The vision set out does not really convey the vision the council has for the town centre or set out what the town would be like in 2031. We can see that the council is looking to provide specific examples of what the vision means but this detail distracts from the overall vision and should be removed. We believe that final vision should have been developed through additional consultation but we have identified some ideas for the vision below: - "Guildford will maintain and strengthen its position as a regional hub and strategic retail and employment centre in Surrey · The town centre will be a thriving place with a balanced sustainable economy · The town centre is a lively and fun place to be that meets the needs of all Guildford's residents · It works for people of all ages and provides the range of community, school, health and other services needed by local people in a joined-up way · Guildford looks and feels good and, by setting challenging standards of innovative design, becomes a place of special and varied character, with sustainability integrated into all aspects of design · Development of the town centre respects and integrates heritage buildings, landscape features and wildlife habitats as part of a well-planned layout · The town centre fosters a strong community with a sense of pride and local ownership from the local community and the wider town · It is flexible in design and resilient to change, and able to respond positively to advances in technology and changing working and daily lifestyles · The town centre will become a beacon for sustainable development and resource management demonstrating Guildford as a leader."</p>	<p>Agree that the vision in the draft masterplan was too detailed and specific. That Vision was developed from comments received on the draft Town Centre Area Action Plan, early engagement on the town centre masterplan and evidence. The re-worded Vision does not include such detail on building layout and design, including sustainable buildings. The Vision has been reworded and some of these points have been included, such as Guildford's position.</p>
Guildford town resident	<p>Vision, p.2 –Economy- The aim of the Town Centre Masterplan is to compete economically with other towns close by, but it is not possible to compete with a town such as Woking on its own terms. Woking has large car parks adjacent to large shopping areas. It does not have a hilly topography and the heritage concerns of maintaining a unique character. Guildford needs to concentrate on its own assets and strengths, such as its attractiveness as a town which provides a unique and different shopping experience to that provided by Woking, Basingstoke, Croydon and other towns. It must not become another 'clone town'. Vision – Heritage and Environment, p.2 - The town's assets of attractiveness need strengthening. This may not be possible in the short-term, but a long-term wider vision covering the next 40 to 50 years could turn Guildford into a town famous for its buildings and streets, ensuring its future as a thriving vibrant town to visit and shop. A way of restoring the town and of bringing about high standards of architecture using high quality materials needs to be found. The Town Centre Masterplan needs to be the beginning of such a vision.</p>	<p>Agreed. The reworded vision attempts to focus on Guildford town centre's unique aspects, such as its river, distinctive historic character and landscape.</p>
Guildford Business Forum	<p>There should be recognition in the opening paragraph of the document that the town centre and indeed, the wider Borough is under threat from both adjoining and regional towns and therefore, the vision should include an acknowledgement of this to emphasise the importance of delivering what follows in the report. It should stress the need to remain competitive and always exceed what can be delivered by the competing towns.</p>	<p>The need to retain Guildford 's competitive edge is highlighted in the reworded Vision. This is now included as Objective 8, and listed as a threat in the SWOT analysis.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>In general we are supportive of the vision and objectives, we would however, wish to make the following suggestions: Flood Risk - Overall we would like to see acknowledgement in the masterplan that; · there is a high risk of frequent flooding in the town centre; · surface water flooding occurs in specific town centre locations frequently; · there should be a greater emphasis on the potential of new/re-development to reduce flood risk. Biodiversity - We welcome the inclusion of an enhanced riverside in the vision, and hope that this means for wildlife as well as for people.</p>	<p>Flooding is acknowledged as a "weakness" of the town centre in the SWOT analysis. The particular vulnerability of each site is detailed in each site form (eg. highly vulnerable to flood risk), and the need for redevelopments to reduce flooding is outlined in the section on flood risk. The importance of the river to biodiversity is recognised in the River Wey Strategy and also in the Background section on the natural environment in Appendix 3.</p>
No name given	<p>No I do not believe that there is a clearly defined vision for the town. The starting point to produce the vision has to be up to date research including solving the traffic problems by conducting a proper traffic survey and analysis of bus journeys. The research will then inform the vision and the necessary strategy to deliver it. The master plan here is not a masterplan but a series of small initiatives which completely lack an overall vision</p>	<p>Agreed that the draft masterplan did not have a clear Vision. The Vision has been rewritten. Agreed the document was not really a masterplan, but the interim framework overcomes these concerns, with the exception of the traffic / movement issue.</p>

Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	We are troubled by the dated over- reliance on shopping with no recognition of the revolution in the role of the high street and of retail centres in this "bricks and click" era. Guildford should be leading innovation and planning a centre fit for the future that will be a centre of excellence for others to emulate. The arguments in GBC's consultant's report seem tired and overtaken by the pace of economic , technological and lifestyle change.	One of Guildford town centre's key strengths is its shopping and shopping environment. The shops are what brings many people to the town centre, and notwithstanding the changes to retailing driven by internet shopping and other special forms of trading, is most likely to continue to be so. Agree that the role of town centres is changing, and they will need to provide more of a "day out" in order to attract people in. However, many people still enjoy the leisure element to browsing in shops and enjoying lunch out. Assume this is a reference to Roger Tym's Retail and Leisure Study, which included an allowance for special forms of trading such as internet trading, in line with government guidance on the issue. The consultant used future levels from Experian, a nationally recognised source of retail statistics.
	This Plan should also be more clearly grounded in what makes Guildford a place where people want to live and work and do more to safeguard and enhance those qualities that are so important in underpinning economic success, but too easily overlooked. For example, why do so many well educated, highly skilled dynamic top executives want to live in Guildford?	We are aware of these issues, such as a very attractive environment in easy commuting distance of well paid London jobs. Agreed, that no town can provide everything.
	Growth is suggested as an end in itself. Why, what kind of growth and how much? -- especially given the physical constraints of a gap town, the insatiable demands for London overspill, the pressure on the environment and the legacy of congestion. Given that no town can provide everything, what should the relationship be between Guildford and neighbouring settlements? The focus on growth and visitors is at the expense of seeking to make Guildford a dynamic and attractive and accessible place for existing residents too.	Growth is not being suggested anywhere in Guildford as an end in itself. More housing is needed to provide for the increasing number of households in the borough as population increases and household size falls. More town centre shops are needed to ensure that it keeps up with its competing town centres and does not become an outdated centre with shop units that do not fit modern requirements.
	We want to be receptive and welcoming but this plan has the feel of a document written for visitors and newcomers. The traffic and congestion challenge should be addressed far more boldly. What is the mix of through traffic and local journeys? We need deliverable solutions clearly defined that future developers can contribute towards delivering. There are no magic solutions and it will be tough but we need to start now not delay further and allow problems to mount.	Potential solutions to the traffic and peak hour congestion problems are still being investigated by Surrey County Council and Transport for Guildford.
	We ask for the reference to a reduction in the number of long stay and commuter parking spaces to be balanced by a policy of increasing the number of medium and short stay open air car parks. Otherwise we fear the former policy will be used to justify redevelopment of existing car parks that are relied upon by locals. We have already lost too many car parking spaces in the town and many of the suggested development sites are car parks. Car parking is simply displaced onto residential roads or residents are deterred from making trips into Guildford going instead to facilities such as garage shops where they can park for a while. We need to support convenience shops in the centre. The loss of parking spaces when GLive and the Hotel were developed was shameful. Parking is a nightmare at the nearby Mandonlay yet expansion without parking is proposed. Parking provision policies need to be completely overhauled and are not fit for purpose. We need a commitment to increase park and ride and also to provide and retain central, accessible and affordable medium and short term parking for locals. Pricing can be used to shape behaviour. It is time to stop pretending cars don't exist and to stop allowing development with wholly inadequate parking.	This policy is set out in the borough parking strategy 2003 which is currently being revised. The reduction in long stay parking is aimed at encouraging more sustainable forms of commuting such as train, cycling or park and ride (although it recognised that businesses need a certain number of spaces to remain competitive). This reduction must therefore be linked to improvements in alternative forms of transport. The aim in maintaining the level of short stay parking is to ensure that visitors can park for a few hours in convenience locations, and that lack of spaces does not deter visitors. The majority of town centres experience on-street parking pressure during the day. The main solution to this is controlled parking for residents. Public short stay parking "lost" due to redevelopment of surface car parks must be reprovided elsewhere, although in proactive there may be some time lag in retaining levels. Pricing can be a powerful incentive for some, although is it would not affect everyone. National planning policy on parking has changed this year, from maximum (ie. no more than) to a more flexible approach.
	"Human scale of buildings" should be made more specific to withstand pressure for overly large buildings. We suggest buildings should not normally be more than four storeys high and should respect topography and views which are such features of Guildford. Eg no tall buildings at low lying, river level locations, such as the railway station, so that form follows topography and you can read the landscape from the roof line. Locations for "land mark" buildings should be chosen with sensitivity and enhance rather than harm views in and out of the town.	Building heights in the town centre already exceed four storeys in many locations, although agree that as a general rule, most buildings should be of "human scale". Some sites, such as Guildford railway station, due to their uses, may be suitable for higher buildings.
	There should be no more gross overdevelopment and theft of public space such as the Friary 2 consent or the hotel along Alexandra Terrace. The approved plans for the Radisson showed a roundabout with a fountain set in the middle of it at the end of Alexandra Terrace by the Hotel entrance with cars sweeping gently around it! In reality, the Hotel has stolen the pavement and overhangs the street oppressively , cars struggle to do five point turns in the road and the building rises up out of scale with its surroundings spoiling views for miles around. If a new application for Friary 2 is submitted, the pedestrian streets should be much wider than the dark, narrow alleys with tall buildings towering over them as proposed, and sadly approved, in the previous consent. There should be a clear expectation the building line should be moved back when buildings are re-developed over time. The Plan should also be much more ambitious for North Street and ensure any shopping centre to the Friary side has intimate, smaller retail, leisure, service and high tech units along its North Street façade. The Plan advocates modern design. Buildings in North Street should be a mix of modern and old, with traditional buildings fully respected. Very high quality paving should be used. The street should seek to become a visitor attraction for its adoption of environmental best practice.	The revised North Street brief deals with built form on this site, including a new street layout. Much of these ideas are picked up in the review of the North Street design and development brief.

	The Master Plan needs to be much more ambitious about the river corridor and specify celebrating the water front with attractive green space, squares, sensitive buildings and views. This amenity space will help to manage flood risk by accommodating flood water when required and enable the creation of a continuous pedestrian path along each bank of the Wey.	Agreed, the River corridor warrants its own strategy, which seeks amongst other things, to improve the appearance of the riverfront, and to reduce flood risk, in part through providing for floodwater storage areas.
on behalf of MC Nominees owners of site at rear of Walnut Tree Close	The vision is supported.	Noted.
The Guildford Society	The 'Vision' section of the TCM sets out a number of statements. The Society considers that whilst these statements are laudable and are to be supported the Vision has significant shortcomings. There is no vision in the TCM with regard to infrastructure and transport apart from the statement that it will be improved. There is nothing in the Plan to show how it will be improved apart from the possibility of some minor tinkering to the existing inadequate gyratory system. There is no analysis of the existing infrastructure and transport to enable appropriate solutions to be designed. e.g. no origin and destination traffic survey data, no O & D pedestrian data, no retail and land use floor space analysis and no assessment of what will be the impact of the growing trends in internet shopping (currently 11% of all shopping and growing) and how this and the 30% increase in floor space proposed for the Friary will affect the High Street. Without major improvement to roads and car parking we can add all the floor space we like but people will not be able to get there. Park and ride will have no effect on through traffic which contributes substantially to Guildford's traffic congestion. The vision statement is too broad and lacks explicit reference to achieving high quality design and exceptional development standards in this very special historic and landscape context. The vision should also be accompanied by a broad spatial plan which is an important omission. The lack of an overarching spatial plan is compounded by the absence of the following strategic elements: Public realm strategy and plan; Movement strategy and plan. The vision and objectives does not appear to be underpinned by economic analysis. This is a key gap which should also be assessed in relation to site selection and viability.	Agree that the Vision in the draft masterplan has shortcomings. The draft masterplan Vision includes a section on infrastructure, which mentions a new park and ride facility and alterations to the gyratory. We consider that Visions should be broad rather than very specific. The detail is better picked up in the objectives, and particularly in the strategy. The overarching strategy is mapped and included in the interim framework as Figure 7. The analysis of existing infrastructure capacity is being undertaken in the Infrastructure Delivery Framework baseline study. We do not anticipate origin and destination data being required, although Surrey County Council highways will advise if they would find this helpful. We have used retail and other floorspace data for the town centre. The consultant who prepared our 2011 Retail Study has taken into account future trends in special forms of trading including internet retailing, using Experian's data, which is a nationally recognised source for retail data.
The Guildford Society, Civic Society, etc. Notes of workshop 10 January 2012 facilitated by Allies and Morrison (with 80 attendees of which 14 were not members of the GS)	"Guildford - open for business, leisure and living." "Open Guildford" could form the basis of an overall vision, in relation to the type of place Guildford should be, and the means by which the Council and stakeholders engage and collaborate.	If this tag line is used, it must be for open for everything, including more bars and nightclubs, more takeaways, more shops, all types of housing, etc. This is unlikely to be agreed by most people.
	The group identified eight principal themes which should form the basis of the vision and objectives for Guildford town centre. These were prioritised as follows : - 1. MOVEMENT FRAMEWORK - There was consensus that major opportunities exist to enhance the movement network and reduce the impact of traffic on the town centre. Interventions to enhance connections and improve the pedestrian experience will play a key role in transforming Guildford. Connections between the station and town centre are particularly important. 2. THE RIVER WEY CORRIDOR - The River Wey should have a far greater presence in the town centre, and adjacent spaces and sites in the river corridor should be carefully planned to make the Wey more accessible and take better advantage of the river's potential to generate development value. 3. SUSTAINABLE GUILDFORD - The Masterplan should place sustainability at the heart of proposals and incorporate a genuine commitment to the incorporation of social, economic and sustainability principles and initiatives. 4. OPEN GUILDFORD - There was a general desire to promote "open" Guildford, a motif which underlines a desire to promote Guildford as a more open place in every sense of the word; openness to visitors, businesses and investors; a more accessible place for pedestrians; and a commitment to a greater spirit of joint working between the Council and civic / amenity groups such as the Guildford Society. 5. QUALITY OF PLACE - Attendees highlighted the importance of preserving and enhancing the town's assets including the historic environment and the dramatic setting of the Wey Valley. The Masterplan should provide a clear framework to steer proposals to ensure that new development produces a high quality townscape and public realm which preserves and enhances the town's heritage assets. 6. VIBRANT GUILDFORD - Attendees highlighted a need to make Guildford town centre more vibrant, taking advantage of its compactness by encouraging a greater mix of uses in central Guildford. There is a desire for the town's cultural offer to be expanded as part of this. 7. THE RETAIL EXPERIENCE - There is a strong consensus that the experience of shopping in the town centre needs to be carefully nurtured. This is considered to be a product of the six objectives above, as their implementation would play a key role in improving the experience of visiting Guildford. The consensus was that the creation of new retail floorspace would be detrimental to the town centre. 8. GUILDFORD ECONOMY - The Masterplan should adopt a coordinated approach to the growth of the local economy, particularly in relation to the University of Surrey.	The reworked Vision for the town centre in the interim framework picks up almost all of these. The Movement evidence is not yet complete, and we are not yet in a position to produce a movement strategy, although the Vision does include improvements to movement to, and around the town centre. 2. Improvements to the River are included in the new Vision. 3. The theme of sustainability, ie. the balance of the economy, social and environmental issues runs through the whole of the document, including the Vision. 4. see comments on "open Guildford" above. 5. The Vision refers to conserving and enhancing its distinctive historic character. 6. The need for greater liveliness and activity is promoted in the Vision and throughout the strategy. It promotes mixed use developments. 7. This desire to see no additional shopping businesses in the town centre appears to contradict point 4 above. 8. The interim framework deals specifically with the town centre economy and to an extent with those that closely influence it. This co-ordination of the economy of the whole town and borough is dealt with in Guildford's Economic Strategy.
Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (on behalf of the Guildford Society)	The emergence of the localism agenda presents an opportunity for the Council, the Guildford Society and other key stakeholders in the town to work much more closely together in articulating a shared vision for the town. A major concern is that, as currently drafted, the Masterplan does not set an adequate context for the future planning of Guildford town centre. The Guildford Society strongly recommends that the Masterplan is re-cast to articulate a clearer and more aspirational vision for Guildford. This vision should be supported by a clear identification of themes, objectives, guidance and interventions which capture the ambition for the area. Fundamentally, this requires far greater emphasis on the area's unique character in relation to the historic environment, townscape assets, landscape setting, views and the overall urban design context. There should be detailed research about Guildford's future economic and social role - what does the town centre need to enhance its role. The vision statement requires careful interrogation and re-drafting alongside the objectives to ensure that the guidance in the Masterplan is framed by an appropriate set of priorities and themes.	The vision is for the town centre area, not for the whole of Guildford town, which faces very different priority issues from the town centre area itself. Agreed that the draft masterplan lacked the cohesiveness needed in a plan for the town centre, it appears as a series of fragmented ideas. Agreed. The interim framework now includes a reworked Vision which is to be delivered by the objectives, strategy and identified projects.

	The vision statement should have far greater resonance with detailed strategies and guidance in the report, including the chapter on delivery. The vision statement should be supported by a very clear hierarchy of plans sitting under an overall spatial strategy. Key plans should be prepared to illustrate the movement strategy, public realm strategy and key development sites. It might also be appropriate to articulate guidance for tall buildings on a plan and to prepare an indicative roof plan Masterplan to steer development.	Agree. The Vision is now followed via the objectives throughout the document, including the Delivery chapter. The main reason for the change in name from masterplan to framework is that the Council never envisaged that this document would include design guidance such as building heights. A materials guide is to be prepared and appended to the final framework.
Objectives		
Surrey Wildlife Trust	Yes	Agreement noted
Member of public	No 2 An increase in the variety of shopping, including a supermarket, is desirable, but not a significant increase in quantity. There has been insufficient demand to support development "whilst the sun has shone" and there is little need for it now. No 4 This ought to be part of no 3: infrastructure is required now on a scale that development is unlikely to be able to support.	See Objective TC8
Member of the public	broadly yes	Agreement noted
Member of the public	3. I agree the objectives set out on page 4.	Agreement noted
Member of the public	I agree with the objectives, but in relation to the bus centre I do not think objective 3 will be met by the current proposals for moving the bus station	Agreement of objectives noted.
Guildford resident	Shoppers in a town make it hum. Other towns have introduced markets to revitalise High Streets. Ludlow is contemplating turning its old Town Centre into an indoor market. May I suggest, be bold, planners! Set, not follow, the trend and turn The Friary into a huge, permanent, living indoor market, with lowcost housing, in the lee of the Cathedral fronted by a modern bus station, to include a history centre (library, museum) so that visitors to Guildford embrace its past with its present. Young and old are attracted by quality and a good bargain. A dying High Street is a dead town. The Character Gates proposed by Guildford Borough are essential focal points to encourage visitors to filter through the town.	The interim framework includes objective TC 8 which includes more markets.
Member of the public	I suggest that simply providing a variety of shop sizes will not prevent their closure for lack of custom. A town is defined by its High Street: bustling, maybe raucous, always lively. The Masterplan acknowledges the importance of retail to it since people will not be drawn to office blocks. Two other objectives might be: 8 Find a focus for Guildford that will lure people to this town rather than others in pursuit of leisure, pleasure and celebration.(See Strategy) 9 Positively encourage the adoption of a monk's profile as a symbol for Guildford to emphasize Guildford's uniqueness.	The current perception of the town centre as the High Street should be challenged. The town centre experience needs to be more than this. This includes making more of the other of the town centre attractions, the River Wey, the Castle and museum, and ensuring these are all well signposted, and pleasant to walk between. This is all set out in the interim framework's strategy.
Guildford town resident	Objective3 & 5; Must create fluid links between different areas as & where possible, to give an overall character and cohesion to the Town	Definitely. That is one of the functions of the gateways, which are proposed to be enhanced.
Member of the public	I disagree with the objective to have a large supermarket in the town centre.	This is not an objective of either the draft masterplan nor the interim framework
Guildford town resident	Endorse riverside enhancement. Better design of buildings would be welcomed but also more careful choice of building materials to enhance historic centre and care to preserve views across the town. Less emphasis on large scale retail expansion parking and traffic already a problem. More emphasis on making Guildford different from other bland shopping centres.	Noted - this is included in the strategy. A Materials Guide is to be prepared to append the final framework as noted in Appendix 4. Its distinctive historic character is one of its selling points as noted in the Vision for its future.
Guildford town resident	THE BUS STATION! This must be large enough to be an interchange. Must be kept approx. where it is. On street stands undesirable and not in keeping with upgrading of North street.	View noted. The public will be consulted in late 2012 with potential locations for the town centre's bus facility.
Planning Development control regeneration specialists	Yes Mother and apple pie objectives the key is delivery and that is where the objective fall short.	Noted
Member of the public	What priority do these objectives have? There are no objectives relating to improving the accessibility or environment of the heritage of the town, much of which has already been previously spoilt. An objective should be added to ensure that the existing heritage is protected, promoted and made available. Another objective should also be added to promote individual, small businesses to flourish to discourage the homogenisation of the high street and to ensure that Guildford is an interesting place to shop as an alternative to the internet or other towns. The current raft of chain shops and restaurants does not differentiate Guildford from many other nearby towns.	None. The objectives are not prioritised. Objective TC10 relates to improving accessibility. Objectives TC1 and TC2 relate to the environment of the heritage of the town centre. Objective TC8 relates to providing opportunities for diversity of shopping businesses.
Guildford town resident	Broadly agree.	Agreement noted
National Trust	Objectives and Analysis We support the inclusion of Objective 7 - 'To enhance the appearance and use of the riverside including improved riverside boundaries and paths'. We also welcome the references in the SWOT analysis to the leisure potential of the River Wey and the potential opportunities for enhancement of the riverside environment.	This is now objective TC4 in the interim framework
Guildford town resident	There is insufficient emphasis on developing the heritage of Guildford and its cultural assets. Road and traffic problems seem to have been largely ignored in the plan – yet these are fundamental to Guildford. Will Surrey CC and the Highways Agency be fully involved in the plan?	We do not have the information we need to produce a full town centre strategy, including a movement strategy. They will both be involved in developing the evidence and a movement strategy.
Theatres Trust	Objectives: We support Objective 1 which recognises the importance of the evening economy. The evening economy should ensure that a range of leisure and cultural facilities are provided which offer jobs and entertainment for visitors and residents, including bars, clubs, music venues, restaurants, cinema and theatres. Together these support and strengthen the town centre's economic standing and attraction beyond its function as a day- time workplace and shopping centre.	Support noted. This is now objective TC7 in the interim framework

Guildford town resident	Swop around objectives 2 and 3 to indicate the priority that transport requires.	The objectives are not in any order of priority.
Member of the public	Objectives are fine if the town can cope with it but Guildford is a difficult location with river and Downs. You want to encourage more homes in the town but for those of us who have live here already, it has become increasingly difficult to get in/out/across and around by car, due to excessive traffic. Retailers are fine for those visiting but we have no proper baker, fish monger, butcher they have all been driven out by high rents. However many car parks or offstreet parking places you provide, and it would appear you are planning to develop over some existing, temporary sites, there are too many motorists coming into Guildford who are not prepared to use your park and ride sites. Evening parking charges, it would appear, are causing people to park on the streets, and this is particularly so in the High Street and at the Easter Fringe of the town.	Agreed the town centre and wider town has limitations due to its topography and historic environment. However, the population and number of the households are increasing, and this is a location with a range of services and good public transport. Across the country in large towns and in many other countries too, smaller independent retailers are often struggling due to higher rents and the costs of the food supply chain and economies of scale. The short stay parking spaces that are on sites to be redeveloped to improve the appearance and functioning of the town centre will be replaced elsewhere in the town centre, as it is recognised that these are needed.
Guide Dogs	Agree with the objectives – as long as it is inclusive for all regardless of their abilities. Would have liked to see something about 'making Guildford an accessible and inclusive place to visit'.	Noted, Objective TC10 in the interim framework is for all.
University of Surrey	In reality what happens inside the town centre boundary will have implications for the areas outside and vice versa. Improving connectivity between all urban areas in the town should be referenced, and in respect of significant facilities and economic areas outside the centre should be specifically included as an objective.	Linkages to the wider town, including the University of Surrey are considered in Objective TC6, as well as other sections of the interim framework.
TURLEY ASSOCIATES on behalf of Hermes Real Estate Investment Management Ltd	Agree.	Agreement noted
Guildford town resident	Something has got to be done about the volume of traffic in town it is chaotic - but as a disabled driver provision needs to be made for us.	The movement strategy to be included in a final framework which will be informed by transport evidence will consider how this situation will be improved. Parking for disabled drivers is considered in the strategy.
Guildford town resident	Encouraging a wider range of shops/enterprises of different sizes is good. More markets could contribute to this. I believe that variety will be the key to future successful shopping destinations as well as the quality of the environment.	Noted - See objective TC8 in the interim framework.
Downsedge Residents Association	We agree with the Objectives as stated on page 4 except for the second one which states that the "town centre's retail offer" will be increased. We are assuming that a development of the size of the approved Friary project does go ahead. However we firmly believe that a policy of continuing future growth in retail space and an additional full size supermarket in the town centre is out of kilter with the new and quickly evolving shopping behaviour of the public. The remaining Objectives as stated are clearly desirable but there is no indication of priority or scale. Are they all to be achieved simultaneously or is the plan to give a higher priority to some over others? In our view the Masterplan should include a carefully planned sequence of proposed projects which, if carried out, will achieve the desired vision that will make Guildford a really attractive and green place by 2030 in which to live, work, shop and enjoy life.	This objective has been reworded in TC8 in the interim framework to providing opportunities for a range of retail businesses.
Guildford town resident	Yes all good. Especially better bus facilities. Also include better integration between bus and rail facilities. Safer and more pleasant to move around yes but be clear is this by car (I presume not) so be specific that this is for pedestrians and cyclists.	Yes, in Objective TC10.
Guildford town resident	I disagree with Objective 2, and would wish this to be reworded as "to increase the diversity of the town's retail offer". Guildford no longer has a butcher or artisan baker in the town centre, and is about to lose its specialist electrical shop. The replacements tend to be national fashion chains, mobile phone shops or estate agents. While these may attract out-of-town shoppers (although since they are to be found in most towns of any size, that must be doubtful) they do not meet the everyday needs of residents. Moreover, there are now few independent small retailers of the kind which make a town distinctive.	Agree - this has been reworded in the spirit of that suggested, now as Objective TC8 in the interim framework.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	More open space less retail but you haven't excluded this	Agreed.
Member of the public	Objective 3 - can be misread as increasing traffic congestion. Suggest it reads as 'To improve streets and local transport, including bus facilities, and reduce traffic congestion Encourage / plan cycle routes away from main roads from town centre to areas north / east / west of town centre - where there are fewer hills to negotiate. (Cycle lanes on main roads are not cycle user friendly.) Additional objective needed to include an increase in high class hotel accommodation within lower town centre (see comment above).	Objective TC9 in the interim framework deals with this.
Guildford town resident	The objectives are very laudable, but as a regular bus user I will vigorously support all opposition to the proposal to move the bus station. It needs a great deal of work done on it, and the road plan will need alteration, but the cost of this would be nothing compared to the cost of resiting, which in any case is a totally idiotic idea. The present station is in exactly the right place relative to the railway station and the shops. I trust that bus users will be fully consulted, which does not seem to have happened yet.	Noted. This is not included as an objective in the interim framework, although TC9 relates to this. Consultation on bus station location will be held in late 2012.
Abbots Hospital	Objective 6 is important and if the objective numbering represent a ranking then perhaps it should move higher up the list.	Objectives are not in any order of priority.

West Horsley Parish Council	Objective 2:Over development will make Guildford another clone town with a plethora of chain stores. A smaller quantity of quality building using choice materials that will fit within the historic centre and not a bland landscape of tall towers is required. A heritage town needs small independent shops in small/medium premises with affordable rents, they will draw in visitors to Guildford. Add cafes, open green space and cultural events for atmosphere. Guildford has a very different feel from other shopping destinations, enhance this difference , do not destroy it.	Agree - see Objective TC8 in the interim framework
	Objective 3:The traffic congestion could be reduced in many ways. Bus services are too infrequent from the Eastern side of the centre for people to make regular use of, they do not operate for long/late enough hours. The Clandon Park and Ride stops too early in the evening, for example shoppers on Saturdays would stay in Guildford to use restaurants if the service lasted until 10pm.This Park and Ride stops at 7:15pm so people who want to extend their visit choose to travel in by car. The train services are too expensive. Note the comparison of train fares as follows, all prices taken from National Rail for travel at the same time of day 8 am and returning at 5pm week days : Horsley to Guildford Return ticket £7:50 (14 mins travel time), Kings Norton to Birmingham New Street Return Ticket £ 3:80 (15 mins travel time), Long Eaton to Nottingham Return £4:00(18 mins travel time).The train service is in operation, the infrastructure exists and will not create a cost for GBC to find, cheaper fares create more demand and would raise more revenue for South West Trains which in turn would benefit Guildford by relieving road traffic. Guildford Borough Council could put pressure on rail services entering Guildford from all directions.	See objective TC9 in the interim framework
Guildford town resident	More emphasis on pedestrians. The walk from the Guildford Park area is not pleasant. Bridge Street and the narrow pavement alongside the Friary and particularly unpleasant	See objective TC10 in the interim framework
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	Objective 1. We oppose open ended expansion of the town centre, the disproportionate expansion of the evening economy and the pursuit of more jobs in retail and leisure when the emphasis should be on manufacturing and the essential service sectors. Add expand the economy to meet local needs Delete: <u>...including the evening economy..</u>	See objective TC6 in the interim framework
	Objective 2. We oppose open ended retail expansion. <u>Replace by:</u> To support, expand, and diversify the town centre's retail offer as needed to meet consumer demand, and in particular to restore provision of convenience shopping, small and specialist shops, and independent traders.	See objective TC8 in the interim framework
	Objective 3. To improve streets, traffic congestion and transport. There is the implication that road alterations and expansion could improve the town centre environment. These might help, but they would be part of schemes for a much wider area than just the town centre; the main objective here must be to improve alternatives to car travel. Guildford's excellent rail services have great potential for exploitation, and are inexplicably ignored. Replace by two objectives: (a) Improve main shopping streets by removing domination by vehicles, with expanded pedestrianisation and improved pedestrian facilities. (b) Reduce traffic congestion on main thoroughfares by improving alternatives to car use, i.e. walking, cycling, bus services and in particular exploitation of rail services.	See objective TC9 and TC10 in the interim framework
	Objective 5. <u>...improve the quality of the area..through..creating spaces.</u> This is too vague. Most promises of provision of open space with new developments have not materialised. Add: The area of public open space within the town centre will be increased by () percent paved, and () percent green. Achievable targets need to be set.	See objective TC2 in the interim framework
	Objective 6. <u>..increase the number of homes...</u> This cannot be open ended, as space is limited, particularly considering the extra open space needed. A target or limit needs to be set, perhaps including a site dwelling density limitation of around 70dph.	Objective TC5. The issue of number of homes and densities for the town centre will be dealt with in the new Local Plan.
	Additional Objective. The shabby condition of the lower High Street surface (the sets) is so serious that it justifies being an objective to itself. This seemingly intractable problem will blight the High Street for ever, and spoil Guildford's reputation unless drastic action is taken. It creates the impression of a town that has no civic pride and doesn't care. This street is not only the heart of the historic town, but also the primary shopping street and shopper circulation area; no other town would tolerate this situation.	This is included in the strategy - reconnecting the town with its river
	Add: <u>The area of public open space within the town centre will be increased by () percent paved, and () percent green. Achievable targets need to be set.</u>	This approach is considered too be prescriptive
Member of the public	The Objectives which follow from the present Vision Statement need to be revised to take account of the above suggestions. Objective 3 should include: Modify the gyratory so that it becomes more pedestrian- and cyclist-friendly. A specific additional objective should be "To greatly reduce Guildford's carbon footprint.	Agreed, the objectives have all been revised.
Member of the public	Traffic must be highest priority as at the moment the bottom of the town is cut off from the rest by the one way system.	Objectives are not in any order of priority.
Member of the public	The objectives are geared too much to pre-answering the questions and uses of sites later in the document.	The objectives are what the strategy sets out to deliver - as indicated throughout the strategy.
	OBJECTIVE 1 - Enhance the town centre economy whilst ensuring a balanced and sustainable mix of uses;	Suggested objectives noted. See rewritten objectives in interim framework.
	OBJECTIVE 2 - To ensure the town's retail offering is, to the extent possible, in line with what Guildford needs to achieve its vision in terms of both quantity and retail mix;	Suggested objectives noted. See rewritten objectives in interim framework.
	OBJECTIVE 3 - To fix the gyratory system to ensure the free movement of traffic where possible and to protect pedestrian access between the station and the town centre;	Suggested objectives noted. See rewritten objectives in interim framework.
	OBJECTIVE 4 - To open up the Cathedral and University to the Town	Suggested objectives noted. See rewritten objectives in interim framework.

	OBJECTIVE 5 - to build on Guildford's strength and an attractive Gap Town with centuries of history and heritage;	Suggested objectives noted. See rewritten objectives in interim framework.
	OBJECTIVE 6 - To open up Guildford's green and riverside spaces to leisure and recreational users (Guildford could be a great centre for walkers, for example);	Suggested objectives noted. See rewritten objectives in interim framework.
	OBJECTIVE 7 - To provide a suitable legacy for our children and grandchildren through the strategic management of opportunity and resources in Guildford's town centre	Suggested objectives noted. See rewritten objectives in interim framework.
	OBJECTIVE 8 - To ensure Guildford is open and accessible to residents in our rural and village communities and to protect the accesses into the Town from unsuitable ribbon development.	Suggested objectives noted. See rewritten objectives in interim framework.
Quod on behalf of Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd	We agree strongly with Objectives 1 and 2 - that the town centre economy should be supported and expanded and to increase the town centre's retail offer in appropriate locations. We note the findings of the Roger Tym and Partners Retail and Leisure Study (May 2011) and the importance it attaches to delivering a substantial quantum of floorspace within the town centre, ideally at the Friary extension site.	See new Objectives TC6 and TC8 in the interim framework
Chairman of The Tyting Society	These objectives are worthy but without greater analysis and clearer vision, again it is difficult to comment.	Agree that the links between the objectives and the Vision were not clear. The objectives in the interim framework can clearly be traced back into how they would help to deliver the vision.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Agree with the objectives. Reference could be made to working in partnership with key organisations, land owners and developers in order to deliver the vision.	Noted
No name given 3	All except the need for more and more shops. We should be aiming for a better quality shopping experience rather than just quantity.	Agreed, see new Objective TC8 in the interim framework
Natural England	Objectives Natural England is disappointed that there are no objectives specifically relating to wildlife enhancement and biodiversity. Natural England is of the opinion that the objectives have not captured any opportunity to incorporate biodiversity enhancements and accessible natural greenspace into the Town Plan. The resume of the town on page 6 has highlighted the poor environment which exists for pedestrians and cyclists in Guildford and little amount of play space. Yet this has not been captured in the objectives. We advise that the plan includes scope for capturing any opportunities for public green open spaces where possible. These areas if well designed can have the dual benefit of providing opportunities for wildlife habitats and therefore providing the opportunity for biodiversity enhancements.	Whilst there is no specific objective relating to biodiversity, objective TC2 includes improving the quality of the environment with well designed spaces. The River Wey Strategy emphasises the importance of the river corridor for biodiversity and as a wildlife corridor. The Strategy also includes enhancement of "pocket" green open spaces, creation of new green spaces including a riverside green space at Portsmouth Road surface car park site.
	The Environment section of the Town's Vision mentions the river Wey area but only with reference to the appearance of this area. The report mentions the opportunity this area of the town has for recreation. Natural England advises that any focus on this area should provides the opportunity for sensitively designed enhanced greenspace to benefit wildlife and people. This could provide a focus for recreational enjoyment and the enjoyment of nature with quiet areas where wildlife can thrive. We fully support the town plans various plans to improve walking and cycling environments as this would encourage the use of sustainable forms of transport in preference to the car. We also support the suggestions on page 58 of the report to incorporate green rooves and living walls and encouraging car free zones. We note that the only scheme for open space delivery on page 64 is tree planting. This could also include the proposed extension to the riverside walk and potential to enhance accessible greenspace for wildlife and people. We would also advise that tree planting schemes use native species of local provenance where possible.	The interim framework promotes green roofs where suitable, for example at Millbrook surface car park, should it be decked. It also promotes "living walls" to improve the appearance of large unrelieved areas of brickwork, and potentially to improve air quality and provide wildlife opportunities. The interim framework includes a specific strategy for the River Wey and its corridor, including its greening.
CTC	Objective 3 should be modified to only relate to those travelling on foot, by bicycle or by public transport. Anything that makes it 'easier' to move by private motor vehicle is likely to make it dangerous and much less pleasant for those on foot or bicycle. However, since the current system of one-way streets around the town centre (Sydenham Road etc) allow high speed car movement and disadvantage cyclists, turning these back to two-way would probably serve the interests of other roads users as much as it would those of drivers. Another separate objective should be included: "to increase the proportion of those visiting the town centre by foot, cycle or public transport." Strongly support Objective 7 - the riverside paths are in a horrible state, muddy, dark, with unpleasant vistas (save the short stretch from the White House pub south)	See objective TC10 in the interim framework
House of Fraser	As per the above, there should be a confirmation that additional retail will not be permitted if it adversely affects existing retailers within the town centre and that existing retailers will be consulted on the location of additional retail space, size of units and type of retail that will be permitted.	Government practice guidance on "need, impact and the sequential approach" December 2009acknowledges that any new development will have some impact on existing facilities. Along with the NPPF, an impact assessment is required to be submitted for any retail development over the threshold set out in National Policy, or our own local threshold if we wish to vary it through out Local Plan.
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	Consistent with our comments above we believe that 'Objective 2' should be expanded to make specific reference to the need to address the absence of large foodstore provision within the town centre as well as the need to provide for other services and facilities, including hotels. We note that the 2009 Economic Development Strategy specifically recognises (para. 4.3.2) the need for additional hotel provision.	This level of detail is not suitable for inclusion in the Objectives.
Clandon society	OBJECTIVES Again, worthy ideas and we support them in principle. The questions we asked ourselves were- 1) if met, would they achieve the vision and 2) does the plan convince us that the objectives can be / will be achieved? The objectives are clearly directed to the elements of the vision and will presumably become more quantified as plans develop.	The strategy in the interim framework, when delivered will ensure that the objectives are delivered and therefore that the Vision is achieved.

Environmental Forum	Objectives We generally support the objectives set out in the plan but have 2 key issues: - 1) Objective 2 – we feel that the plan focuses too much on retail development and not enough on other uses. 2) Objective 3 – not only needs to improve the situation but should seek to solve a number of the problems.	Whilst retail is very important to Guildford, and is one of its key attractions, objective 2 in the draft masterplan has been reworked to be broader, including night time economy and other economic sectors.
	We also wish to add some additional objectives. 1) To create a vibrant hub and a sustainable mixed use environment. 2) The town centre development should have the highest standards of design. 3) The town centre development will either to minimise the resources required or become resources neutral by offsetting the additional demand through demand reduction strategies in the rest of the town.	New objectives TC5, 6 and 7 cover the issues in the first suggested objective. New objective TC2 covers design issues.
Guildford Business Forum	At the end of the first line, after the word “range” add “and number”.	This objective is taken from the Economic Strategy and is now objective TC6
Property Consultants	Objective 1 - to support and expand the TC economy, including the evening economy by stimulating new employment and broadening the range of jobs (where. what types of employment. clerical, blue collar. manufacturing. maJual. academic? IS there a definitive plan?) Objective 2 - To increase the town's retail offer to "maintain" (implies only maintaining status quo, surely one wants to 'promote' the retail and service role?) Objective 3 - To improve streets, public transport and bus facilities and reduce traffic congestion making it Objective 5 - To improve quality of the environment through encouraging maintenance, restoration and enhancement of historic buildings, redevelopment of inappropriate and inadequate buildings etc	More details about the future of the town centre economy are set out in the Economic Strategy. Objective 2 has been reworded and is now objective TC8 (includes "to retain the town centre's competitiveness"). Suggested objective 5 is included in objectives TC1 and TC2.
Environment Agency	In Section 3 : Analysis, Strengths and Opportunities for the river environment includes: · “Pleasant river location with opportunities for riverside walks, river sports and boating; · Some quiet places by riverside for relaxation; · Riverside and River Wey for recreation, sport and leisure; · Improve riverside environment in redevelopment of adjacent sites, particularly Portsmouth Road car park”.	Objective TC4 in the interim framework includes aims for the future of the River Wey and its riverside.
	We request that you add that the river will be enhanced for biodiversity/wildlife to objective 7. In addition strengths and opportunities could include; improving river side locations to provide more space for water to be stored during a flood (reduce flood risk), or multiple benefit schemes. The following could be added to weaknesses and threats: · In the town centre many areas of floodplain have been developed thus restricting the opportunities to reduce flood risk. Innovative development ideas are required to ensure no increase in flood risk through redevelopment · Increase in flood risk over time unless action taken to reduce it, potentially through redevelopment. Flood risk has not been identified as a weakness or threat, the River Wey floods regularly in Guildford town centre. We welcome Objective 4 with a possible change of wording– To ensure that new development supports the area's infrastructure, including minimising [reduce may be more appropriate here] flood risk [where, to who? Specific aim?].	The River Wey strategy includes emphasis on the biodiversity and wildlife corridor importance of the river. The relevant site forms include where a green, permeable "buffer" for water storage would be required. Flood risk is identified as a weakness in the interim framework. This is now included as Objective TC9.
Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	Why not incorporate these into the vision? Are you looking for retrospective endorsement of the LSP's objectives?	Although not clear in the draft masterplan, the objectives are aimed at trying to identify "aims" that will help to deliver the Vision. This is made clearer in the interim framework.
on behalf of MC Nominees owners of site at rear of Walnut Tree Close	The objectives are broadly supported.	Support noted.
The Guildford Society	This section seems to be superfluous. With slight modification the boxed Vision Statement can say it all. As it is the Vision Statement and Objectives repeat each other, and the Objectives are incomplete as a simple check between the two quickly shows. As with the 'Vision' section of the TCM the Society considers the Objectives are laudable and are to be supported. However, the Plan lists every strength and weakness that can be thought of and does not seek to give them weight. It is impossible therefore to identify which are perceived to be the key issues for the town centre. It should separate policies and projects and indicate which are most important. The most serious development problem for the town is traffic and traffic congestion. Yet, as the comments on lack of vision point out, this issue is effectively ignored except for references to the need for further studies. The geography and topography of the town limits options. This Town Centre Masterplan should be presenting solutions not proposing further studies. The Society considers the TCM should give much more attention to what the Society considers to be a key deficiency in the town – namely that of the need for the safe and convenient movement for pedestrians. The 'Objectives' of the TCM are stated as helping the Council to "...achieve the vision for the town centre in 2030." Objective 3 of the Plan sets out the need "...to improve streets ... making it easier, safer and more pleasant to move around the town." The objectives do not focus sufficiently on improving Guildford as a place, or safeguarding what is special. There is a sense that these objectives could apply to any town as they lack any sense of context.	Although not clear in the draft masterplan, the purpose of the objectives is to identify "aims" that will help to deliver the Vision. This is made clearer in the interim framework. The strategy is more specific about how this will be achieved.
Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (on behalf of the Guildford Society)	High Street is the historic core of the town centre and, despite its constraints given its topography and sensitive historic fabric; a High Street address remains the most prestigious retail address in the town. High Street is the town's principal destination - pedestrian connections to this historic route are therefore key to the success of the High Street. High Street is truncated by the river corridor. As a result, High Street bridge is an underused piece of town the A281 Millbrook which presents a major barrier between the town centre and centre infrastructure. North Street is less sensitive, particular on the north side. However the series of lanes and alleys connecting North Street with High Street is one of the key attractions of the town and provide floorspace best suited to smaller independent traders. There is a major opportunity to expand the quality of the range of shops through the expansion of the Friary Shopping Centre and the Society welcomes and supports this opportunity. However, this retail expansion should not be the overriding objective of the Masterplan. The river corridor is the town's largest open space. Its open aspect to the south narrows in the more urbanised approach to the town. North of Millmead the river presents a series of opportunities, some major and some minor, to improved spaces and places – linked by a continuous riverside walk/path.	Agree with comments about the importance of High Street - noted. The western end of the north side of North Street is part of the North Street redevelopment site. The quality and range of shops needs expanding in order to retain the centre's competitive edge, although this will not be through an extension to the Friary Centre. Agree that retail expansion is not the main objective of this interim framework, although an important element, the quality of the environment and improvements to movement into and around the town centre area also vital elements of the strategy. Improvements to the riverside, particularly in improving appearance and access to riverside sites are an important element of the interim framework's strategy.

	Improving links towards the station by extending High Street south across Millbrook and over the bridge would provide a radically improved pedestrian experience. This would far better connect the river to the town centre, would raise the profile of the former Farnham Road bus station car park site and would help improve the linkages between the town centre and the station. interventions should be tested through the preparation of the masterplan. We acknowledge that these ideas will be difficult to implement. However, we feel it is this central ambition that is lacking in the draft document. This we feel, is one of the draft Masterplan's principal weaknesses - in the longer term there must be a means to remove traffic from Onslow Street :- Placing greatest priority on improving access to and the quality of the river corridor, a few key interventions are suggested. The costs and benefits of these 18th Century - relationship of the town centre and river corridor is more direct and accessible. Accommodating the exponential growth in vehicular traffic has resulted in greater priority and more space being allocated to roads. This has eroded the relationship between the town and the river and resulted in High Street and North Street being severed from the station gateway by a highway gyratory. Can the gyratory be unpicked? The gyratory denies the town centre a significant stretch of its riverfront. This is a major strategic issue which the masterplan fails to consider, investigate or question. Radical improvements to the pedestrian environment have been delivered in higher profile and, on the face of it, more constrained environments. Oxford Circus, the epicentre of London's retail environment, now benefit ts from a new X style pedestrian crossing arrangement which gives far greater priority to pedestrians than ever before. Exhibition Road provides access to some of London's largest and highest profile cultural attractions. The road is being transformed into an entirely shared space.	Agree, this important improvement is included in the strategy for the River Wey of the interim framework, and could be linked to the redevelopment and improvement of the former Farnham Rd site (also referred to as Portsmouth Rd surface car park). The redevelopment of this site will also improve linkages between Guildford Railway station and the shopping area. These improvements are all included in the interim framework's strategy. Downgrading Onslow Street or even removing traffic from it completely may well be a key part of the Movement Strategy in the final framework. Move evidence is needed on traffic movements and potential interventions.
	There are a number (four) of approaches that should be considered in Guildford – some more pragmatic, some more ambitious: 1. Downgrade Bridge Street - A stronger connection between the town centre and the river would be formed through downgrading of Bridge Street and re-routing of all through traffic over a 2-way Friary Bridge. This would liberate Electric Theatre site and its outside space and facilitate a new high quality pedestrian route to the station.	Agree that this should and is being considered. The interim framework does not include a Movement Strategy. However, making the gyratory two-way, and giving greater priority to pedestrians on Bridge Street are included in Section 6 on Movement.
	2. Upgrade High Street Bridge - The role of High Street bridge could be considered in delivering a radically improved river corridor. Whilst the concept plan highlights the opportunity to pull High Street across Millbrook in order to deliver a much improved connection between High Street and the river corridor, in the longer term, the gyratory could be completely unpicked through the upgrading / widening of the High Street bridge and its reuse for vehicle traffic.	Linking the River with the wider town centre, including High Street, is included in the interim framework in the River Wey Strategy.
	3. Reinstate Friary Street – The Friary Street retail block at the southern end of High Street and North Street is not identified as an opportunity site. However, this development creates a very hostile car-based environment on its riverside/Millbrook edge. Reinstating Friary Street as part of the local street network would create the opportunity to present positive edges to the river in this lost part of the town centre.	Friary Court is included in the interim framework as a potential site.
	4. New station link road. In the longer term, the Guildford Society is aware of the major opportunity to redevelop the station and its environs and the aspirations that Network Rail/Keir partnership have in this regard. As with all other town centre development sites, the delivery of this major development opportunity should be considered in the context of delivering major improvements to the town centre environment. The feasibility of a new link road that crosses both the river and the railway thereby removing the need for the gyratory should be considered in some detail. Whilst there would be many challenges to such an approach, the benefits should carefully be considered in view of the contribution such an investment could make in improving the town's position in the retail hierarchy.	Agreed that this should be investigated along with other potential measures to improve vehicle movement into and across the town centre. These will be considered alongside transport / traffic evidence of potentially including in a Movement Strategy in the final framework.
Analysis - Strengths and Opportunities / Weaknesses and Threats		
Surrey Wildlife Trust	Yes	Comment noted.
Guildford town resident	Why no mention of buses under "weaknesses"? The town does NOT lack a "public square". The High Street, with a proper surface, is the best public square in the South East! What nonsense the writers of this master plan have perpetrated.	Comments noted. The bus network is considered a strength. The reference to the lack of a public square has been removed and the weakness now reads 'Lack of focal points for informal meeting and relaxing, or more formal events, including markets. Markets and key events are currently held on the steep sloping High Street and North Street, which are not accessible to all, and do not provide people with places to stop and rest'.
Member of the public	Reduction of carriageway and widening of pavements is desirable in the High Street as well as North Street. Further periods of traffic closure might allow the area by the Guildhall and Tunsgate arch to become a virtual town square, a more natural development than other places that have been suggested for such use.	Agreed. This is included in the strategy.
resident of Guildford borough	4. I agree that Guildford is <u>generally clean</u> but I have noticed an increase in graffiti over recent years. I'd like to see this cleaned away more quickly as it does have an impact on visitors' impressions of the town. I would very much like to see more use of the library as a community hub. MY children loved this place when they were younger and still use it as teenagers. I agree Phoenix Court is visually unappealing and no business seems to thrive there, despite being between the two busiest streets in town. I'm content that no mention is made of trying to revive Guildford's aspirations to become a city, eg by building a football stadium close to town. We should accept Guildford as a town and not try to change it that drastically. The gyratory road system does divide the town bridge and Debenhams from the High Street but the useful subway has been decommissioned which is a shame as it's no further to walk and that did avoid stopping traffic flow on the gyratory. I'm not sure why the decision to replace the subway with a pedestrian crossing was made. I disagree that the town is a poor environment for pedestrians. With the High Street blocked off to traffic at weekends and the nature of the Friary Centre, I think the balance between pedestrians and cars is about right. I'd not want to see any further restrictions on roads.	A new community hub to include a library and to enhance Phoenix Court are included in the interim framework strategy. The masterplan, now the interim framework deals specifically with the town c entre rather than the whole town. View on pedestrian / car balance noted.

Member of the public	I suggest the difficulty of making areas pinpointed by the Character Gates a part of Guildford Town Centre will be a missed opportunity if not tackled.	These areas are highlighted as priority Areas for improvement.
Member of the public	Once strengths and weaknesses have been identified, I suggest it is helpful to devise a strategy to turn the weaknesses into strengths. Living working running a business shopping eating and drinking out cinema / theatre / other entertainment For instance, the elevated views enable the colourful markets to be seen from a distance. If it is inevitable that widening North Street will displace the ancient openair markets, the old Portsmouth Road car park might be a more suitable site, rather than fragment stalls and lose the market character. I suggest another style of market would not come amiss. Guildford's appeal to visitors lies in its market town roots.	Comments noted. The interim framework identifies opportunities which in effect address the weaknesses and threats identified. The desire for and benefits of markets are included in the strategy.
Guildford town resident	Very limited dedicated Motorbike & scooter parking; more is needed to prevent physical & visual obstructions around cycle bays. Poor external appearance of the Library and its immediate surrounds.	Comments noted.
Guildford town resident	Agree that something needs to be done to Phoenix Court eg. reinstatement of access into some more of the shops from the Court, landscaping, perhaps pavement café, etc. Current window dressing in the form of hoardings is flat and unimaginative. Similar method of using shop windows as advertising hoardings eg in Friary windows on to Onslow Street is very uninspiring.	Comment noted.
Guildford town resident	Agreed	Comment noted.
Planning Development control regeneration specialists	The master plan does not give sufficient weight to the weaknesses and threats e.g. no mention of the financial circumstances of the current owners of the various sites. It is now clear the Westfield will not be investing in the town centre which puts this plan in a particularly weak position. Most of the land owners in the plan area (except the state) cannot raise development finance in the pre 2007 way. Generally, banks are not providing funding for development projects only funding for revenue based schemes. So you need anchor tenants first before banks will provide any funding. Lack of funding is a serious weakness for which no creditable solution is proposed e.g local authority bonds or LA partnership as proposed by Government i.e. Council puts land in and only recognises the value once the development is completed.	Comments noted. The North Street site is considering an anchor tenant. Westfield's ownership was bought out by Hermes who could invest in the site.
Member of the public	The "strong tenant demand" forces out small shopkeepers and local businesses. The council should strongly support a "low rent" area for local businesses that will encourage individual specialist shops. The threats disregard the impact of the internet on the high street shops. This should be considered and mitigated by ensuring a vibrant independent shop sector.	Comments noted. Where properties are in private ownership the rent is set by them. The Council could look at reducing the rent for the properties within its own ownership.
Guildford town resident	Encourage a more diverse shopping experience - include small shop units at reduced cost for local independent businesses as a step on from market/street stalls to reduce the uniformity created by national chains. Improve traffic flow and transport services especially the buses. Could the Park and Ride buses make one or two more stops in the town centre and carry non car users on short town centre journeys before their non-stop run to the park and ride car parks say up North Street?	Comments noted. There are many existing smaller shop units in Guildford. The Retail and Leisure Study 2011 identifies the need for larger stores which is why we have seen the merger of some of the shop units on the High Street. Park and Ride buses tend to be direct routes with no stops to speed up the route and make it quicker than using your private vehicle. If buses make stops along the route it may result in more people driving their vehicles into the town centre. Park and Ride has to be an attractive alternative to the private vehicle.
CBRE for Merseyside Pension Fund, owner of Tunsgate Square Shopping Centre	Future form and layout of Tunsgate Square - At page 5, there is reference to 'open up Tunsgate Square to Castle Street to create a visual link to the Castle grounds'. We understand the desire to improve the approach and access to the castle gardens, but there can be no certainty that Tunsgate Square will continue to include an internal mall. For that reason, the reference to opening up Tunsgate Square to Castle Street should be deleted.	Comment noted and this point has been further clarified in new text. The interim framework now reads 'Modernising the Tunsgate façade along with resurfacing and potentially part-time pedestrianisation of Tunsgate or shared surface (see below) would greatly enhance this centrally located street. Opening up Tunsgate Square's Castle Street façade would greatly improve the setting of the castle grounds, and the pedestrian street environment, providing more interest and activity at ground level.' Whether or not the internal shopping centre is retained, the back of any new development should be much more open.
Theatres Trust	Analysis: We support a key strength of the town centre as being the cultural hub of the county. Cultural energy and creative activity is the mark of an innovative community, helping attract and retain well-qualified people and businesses. It fosters higher inward investment, more partnership working and greater diversity in the workforce.	Support welcomed.
Guildford town resident	Remove 2nd para 'Lack of a focal....' And replace with ... Lack of rest points, seating etc, in the High Street and North Street (refurbished?) tempts people away from the central attraction of the town.	Comments noted.
Guide Dogs	Agreed with the identified issues but would have liked more thought on how the topography could be made easier and more accessible for people with reduced mobility impairment. As this aspect seems to be used as a cop out.	Comments noted. The topography of the land is a natural barrier. There is however a bus that provides access around the town for those with impaired mobility.
Member of the public	How can a masterplan ignore the close relationship between the areas included in the plan and the Research Park, Hospital and University.	The town centre masterplan is concerned with the area identified as the town centre. The Surrey research Park, Hospital and University are not within the town centre but the wider Guildford Urban area. The Interim Framework recognises the connections.
No name given	Buses are far too expensive and this is a disincentive to their use.	Comment noted.
Guildford town resident	I don't think this comes across as a professionally managed project.	Comment noted.
Guildford town resident	Yes particularly re the difficulty of eastwest movement (esp by bicycle), the severance of the river frontage and large monolithic 60's 70's buildings,	Comment noted and agree that severance is an issue for Guildford.

Guildford town resident	Strengths: in my view, Guildford does not feel particularly "safe" on weekend evenings and the streets are not particularly "clean " Weaknesses: Many of the streets are in poor condition and there is a need for prompt removal of snow and ice from roads and pavements particularly on South Hill (where I live) and en route from the centre to the railway station which, scandalously, was left untreated after the early snow fall last winter.	Comments noted.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	The proposed train link to Heathrow (currently on hold according to Anne Milton) would bring significant business to Guildford	Comment noted.
Member of the public	Opportunities: Add: Provision of combined bus / train day/weekly /monthly ticket valid on all local bus/train operators within town/ borough area, including parts of Waverley borough area close to the town to encourage use of local public transport for journeys to and within the town.	Comment noted.
Abbots Hospital	With its iconic frontage, often pictured as representative of Guildford's heritage, Abbot's attracts strong visitor interest and indeed the trustees have made considerable effort over the past 7 years to make the site more accessible to the public whilst not compromising the Hospital's core role as a safe, secure home for the elderly of the town. Abbot's strong place in the town's history, in very any aspects should receive due recognition	Comment noted. This is referenced in Appendix 3 of the interim framework.
West Horsley Parish Council	Strengths: Yes there are two railway stations but the fares are expensive when compared to other similar journeys made into other large centres. The bus services are infrequent .Pedestrianising North street will cause problems for visitors from the Eastern side of Guildford. Steep shopping streets without a centrally located bus station will not provide connected public transport for the disabled, parents with pushchairs and the increasing number of elderly within the population. The young and fit can walk, for other groups especially the growing number of elderly within population this is discrimination.	Comments noted. The location of a bus facility is yet to be determined. The pedestrianisation of North Street is identified as an opportunity but the consequences of doing so would need careful consideration prior to implementing any scheme.
	Retention of open space near to the river is a good plan to promote quality tranquil areas.	Comment noted. Agreed.
Member of the public	Mostly	Comment noted.
Member of the public	Make sure that riverside properties do not all fall into the hands of private developers and investors. Resurfacing of many roads and pavements would make a huge difference to most of the people who use Guildford.	Comments noted.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	Strengths and Opportunities. 4.1. <i>Strong tenant demand (high investment yields).</i> This may be good for the "High Street Names" but not for the greater diversity of shops that is required. Delete.	Comment noted. No change.
	4.2 <i>Important shopping centre. Quality ..luxury shopping...</i>	Comment noted. No change.
	4.3. <i>Good bus network</i> . Relative to other towns it could only be described as reasonable, and is poor in some areas, e.g links to rail station, around the centre services. Suggest delete .	Comment noted. No change.
	4.4 <i>Great road and rail links</i> Reword <i>Good road connections and exceptionally good rail links.</i> Rail links are exceptionally good. Road links are not.	Comment noted. This has been reworded and now reads 'Good connections by road and rail, including two train stations, and proximity to London by rail'.
	4.5. <i>Opportunity to make more of links between Guildford and London Road stations.</i> Not understood. The rail service between them (which is frequent) is not really in the right place to serve as a major across town link.	This was suggested at the public engagement event. It may help with getting around the town centre for those who cannot walk up the hill to the top of town, For some visitors it may be easier for them to arrive at London Road station and leave from Guildford station. This potential opportunity will be considered in more detail when the Movement Strategy is formulated.
	4.6. <i>Reduce carriageway width and widen pavements, particularly on North Street Add <u>and on Sydenham Road</u></i>	Comment noted. This is a general statement that could apply to many roads.
	4.7. Add as a strength/opportunity: <i><u>Compact centre, rail station near centre, attractive countryside adjacent to centre, giving the potential, with necessary pedestrian improvements, to achieve national recognition as a "Welcome to Walkers" town. A good base from which to explore the area.</u></i> Visitors can combine a countryside walk with use of town centre facilities, without use of a car. Opportunities for hotels to promote short stay breaks.	Comments noted.
	4.8. Add <i><u>Exploit Bright Hill as the only close viewpoint with a view over the town, and with the adjacent Harvey Road Gallery, as a visitor destination.</u></i>	Comments noted.
	4.9 <i><u>Expand pedestrianisation.</u></i> This is the change, that would be easily achievable, that would most improve the town centre environment.	Comment noted. If this refers to lengthening the hours that the High Street is pedestrianised then agree that this is identified in the interim framework as a consideration.
	4.10. <i><u>20mph speed limit across most of the town centre.</u></i> This is a recommendation of the Conservation Area Appraisal.	Comment noted. The interim framework recognises the need for lower speeds on some roads. It reads 'Shared surfaces indicate pedestrian priority and act as a form of traffic calming, so reducing the dominance of motor vehicles. This is achieved primarily through removal of raised footways, resurfacing and sometimes include introduction of lower speeds.'
	Weaknesses and threats. 4.11. Add: <i><u>The centre is dominated by cars.</u></i>	Comment noted. The interim framework recognises that the dominance of the car is an issue and reads 'Unwelcoming pedestrian environment in some areas due to roads dominated by traffic with wide carriageways and narrow pavements'. No change.

	4.12. <u>Poor, sub standard, pedestrian facilities, particularly pedestrianisation.</u>	Comment noted. The interim framework identifies issues for pedestrians. No change required.
	4.13 <u>Inadequate Convenience and specialist shopping.</u> This is a particular problem for Residents, causing some to drive to shop in other towns.	Comment noted.
	4.14. <u>Compact town centre creates cramped and crammed-in areas, such as the canyon created by the Raddisson.</u>	Comment noted.
Member of the public	This is a mixture of micro 'opportunities' and macro issues. It is not complete and this should be a major piece of pre-publication research to understand what all parts of the community believe (employers, pensioners, children..etc.) One major opportunity should be that in the context of a development of the station, there should be a new road crossing over the railway to relieve the pressure on the Farnham Road Bridge and to potentially remodel the traffic flows across the town - this should also pick up on opportunities to finance infrastructure through BIDs and/or TIFs and would also provide opportunities to open up the Cathedral and University to the town The location of the bus station should be seen as a key opportunity (and threat) as it may be possible to use some of the wide streets (if traffic were resolved) to allow buses to stop along the major town centre routes (North Street, Millbrook, etc) and also for all buses to call at the mainline station. Too much of the information used in this document come from OLD studies (more than, say, three or four years) and do not adequately reflect the advancement of internet shopping, different means of communication, etc. Guildford has an opportunity to embrace the technology age - it could provide WiFi throughout the town to make it Open to information and data.	Comments noted. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed.
Chairman of The Tyting Society	These are almost impossible to comment on with both 30 plus S&W. Generally they are too detailed and short term	Comment noted.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	The analysis does not pick up the role that some sites have in implementing structural changes that are needed to facilitate new development and strengthen the economic prosperity of the town centre. The opportunities could include the role that key sites, such as the bus station and Bedford Road play in unlocking stagnant sites therefore releasing new opportunities that would be more beneficial to the town centre. As a visitor to the town centre, the experience of walking from the station to the High Street is particularly poor with narrow pavements, tight and inappropriate crossing places and a lack of legibility for those who do not know the layout of the town. This also affects residents and workers who experience this issue on a daily basis.	Agree that the inter-relationship between sites for development is important, and some will have more significant and wider impacts on other redevelopment areas. This is included in the Redevelopment section of the strategy.
No name given 3	More emphasis on the vehicle treat (too many cars/east west and north south routes) and more emphasis on opportunity of tourism and the uni and research park.	Comments noted. This document is about the town centre and does not include areas that fall outside of the town centre boundary such as the University and Surrey Research Park.
CTC	Strongly agree with the weaknesses - particularly the points about the dominance of cars, the poor east-west movement thanks to the one-way system and the grim conditions for pedestrians (and especially) cyclists.	Comments noted.
House of Fraser	There is a risk that additional retail space will not be developed in a sustainable way and or will be located in an area that pulls footfall away from the current shopping area. This risk should be acknowledged and all development should consider the impact on the existing town centre.	Comments noted. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	We would make the following comments in relation to the TCM SWOT analysis.	Comment noted.
	1. The RTP study (para. 7.48) has identified the lack of large foodstore provision in the town centre as a weakness which means as a consequence, that a significant proportion of convenience shopping is taking place in out-of-centre locations. This should therefore be identified as one of the town centre's weaknesses in the TCM.	Comment noted.
	2. Similarly, the 2009 Economic Development Strategy confirms (para 4.3.2) the need for additional hotel provision. This supports our view that there is a lack of branded hotels within the town centre. For these reasons we believe that the relative lack of hotel provision within the town centre to serve businesses and tourist visitors should also be identified as a weakness.	Need for hotels is outlined in Appendix 3 Background Context, it is not considered to be a weakness of the town centre.
	3. Reference is made to the opportunity to make more of the links between Guildford and London Road Station and improve London Road Station itself. A similar opportunity also exists in relation to Guildford Station through Site 09: Bedford Road Car Park. We would suggest that this should made explicit here.	Comment noted.
	4. The TCM should include the opportunity to meet part of the identified need for additional large foodstore provision for the town centre on the Guildford station site thereby retaining a greater proportion of convenience shopping spending and trips and enhancing the vitality and viability of the town centre.	Comment noted. The Guildford Station site is recognised in the interim town centre framework as having potential to meet some convenience shopping need. No change.
Clandon society	ANALYSIS The points made in the SWOT analysis are sound.	Comments noted.
Guildford town resident	Analysis, p.5 - Weaknesses and Threats, p.6 - It is written in the Masterplan that there is a fear of change. In Guildford this fear stems from the ad hoc development it has suffered from over many years, producing ugly buildings, which spoil much of the town, leaving the High St isolated in its splendour. Yet with a long-term vision covering the whole of the town over the next decades, Guildford could be restored to its former glory bringing with it long lasting economic strength. Every development which took place would need to fit in with the vision, and developers in advance would need to be aware of the vision and the need to comply with it.	Comments noted.
Guildford Business Forum	Add high up on the list that it is the chosen location for major corporate headquarters and there is scope to increase on the number.	Comment noted.

Property Consultants	Analysis - Strengths : Strong 'tenant' demand. Which (retail I, offices, services, distribution, manufacturing?)? A sweeping statement if it 's only prime High Street retailers.	Comment noted. Agree to clarify that this is strong retail tenant demand.
	Add "Key multi-purpose leisure and sports centre including ice, wet and dry sports facilities." (Whilst not town centre, Spectrum still serves it.)	Comment noted.
	Great' road ... links. (Contradicts comments about difficult topography and problematic traffic congestion!)	Comment noted.
	Shops could open later .. for greater activity'. They will IF there is business to be done. GBC can stimulate <i>footfall through generating</i> employment, entertainment, leisure and tourist stimuli hand in hand with BID schemes.	Comment noted. Agree that there is an opportunity for the shops to open later and this is referenced in the interim framework.
	Analysis - Phoenix Court. Should have been completely redeveloped with Friary Street refurb. A major opportunity lost. Its present format is hopeless. Tinkering will solve nothing. Vast volume of air space completely wasted.	Comment noted, agree. The interim framework identifies this as an opportunity area and suggests the following 'enliven spaces such as Phoenix Court with small temporary kiosks or market stalls'.
	Analysis - weaknesses. Lack of Market or town square. Totally agree, all the best shopping towns are 'market' towns, but topography problem. Farmers and North St markets supplement shops, relocating to a 'flat' and equally accessible site away form shops less attractive. Sites 09 (Bedford Road) and site 12 (Farnham Road bus station) are obvious prospects BUT loss of air space development an expensive option. Lower North Street merits examination coupled with Friary II building (frontage) lines.	Comments noted. The interim framework identifies opportunities for markets and public open spaces.
	Analysis - Gyrotory traffic conflicts. A HUGE problem. I wish you well! It's a problem for BOTH pedestrians <i>and</i> vehicles! Separation of both is the ONLY solution. Putting the only and major bus station on Bedford Road site <i>is a recipe for disaster, both practical, environmental and financial.</i> The CONFLICT between vehicles and pedestrians would be multiplied many times. <i>The pedestrian route</i> from Walnut Tree Close <i>through a bus station</i> would be most unpleasant and is contrary to many stated policies for promoting the riverside and creating, preserving and enhancing public spaces whilst aggravating existing vehicular traffic problems beyond comprehension. DONT DO IT! Bus passengers heading to and from the High Street would battle with buses and cars entering the site, in ADDITION to the existing car park etc., reducing road capacity and vehicular access causing uncontrollable backups into the gyrotory system, continuous 'gridlock' becoming an almost certain consequence. Not to mention added exhaust pollution! (See illustration).	Comments noted. The location of a bus facility is yet to be determined and the options will be fully tested to identify the most appropriate solution.
	Analysis - Alternative Bus Station sites. With so few possibilities, is there any merit in considering identifying bus routes that might terminate at route related locations rather than at one mega traffic intense bus station? This would only inconvenience passengers whose return journey is not via the same route.	Comment noted. Further work is being undertaken in relation to the bus facility and the subsequent routes. This information will be fed into the Final Town Centre Framework once the outcome is known.
	Analysis - Time taken to entre and leave town. It is a fact the trauma of shoppers queuing to access or exit a shopping centre (or town centre) will materially impact on the 'attraction' of that location in comparison to 'more accessible' centres, be it ease of access or exiting, parking facilities (including brightness, cleanliness and security) and cost. Shoppers will preferably travel further to more convenient and welcoming centres than ENDURE such frustrations. Hence the additional potential drawbacks of Bedford Road bus station. Be forewarned, this is all important issue.	Comment noted. Further work is being undertaken in relation to the bus facility and the subsequent routes. This information will be fed into the Final Town Centre Framework once the outcome is known.
	Analysis Peak traffic - Consider promoting the idea of staggered start/finish employment hours. Flexi working can produce benefits across the board (but school times aren't flexible).	Comment noted.
	Analysis Parking - My comments on the draft Town Centre Action Area Plan in September 2006 emphasized the need for sufficient shopper parking to support the retail economy. particularly in the light of proactive proposals by competing centres, views supported in the subsequent Cushman & Wakefield report. GBC have recognised that spaces lost through developing Friary II and other sites should be replaced. If equal importance is given, in supporting the local economy, to accommodating future employers/employees minimal parking requirements, the overall parking capacity may need expansion. Indeed th is may be necessary to attract new employers. otherwise developers will not build where there is little prospect of if ending tenants. Hence several suggestions for increased capacity on several peripheral sites follow. Consideration might previously have been given to adding a deck to the York Road MSCP, however, I enquire if lateral extension on all levels was considered. Minor modifications to nearby roads might make this feasible. Additional off street parking is required for some residential areas suffering from parking in front gardens. Difficult and costly, but saving the street scene. The environmental quality of some residential areas has plummeted tell the owners it will add value to their property.	Comments and suggestions noted.
	Analysis High (residential) Land Values. Revitalising and expanding the town centre and local economy will automatically stimulate high land values. You can't win! But overburdening new development with onerous 'social' costs may make development unviable and deter land coming to market, thus increasing scarcity and further increasing land values negating declared policy. (Remember DLT!) This suggests 'social' costs, particularly affordable housing (which is also important to the economy), should be shared by the entire local economy which benefits as a whole. Therefore refocus provision of urgently required affordable housing on key sites owned by the Borough which can be part (equitably) funded by S.106 and other agreement's. 'Insisting' residential is developed immediately above major commercial elements can be a fundamentally flawed short term fix designing in long term commercial and financial problems endangering future economic performance. How can you renew, say, a shopping centre in thirty years' time (which is ollen necessary) with dozens of families on long leases living above? (see Page 7 Property Week 06/01 12012 'Grosvenor Ponders Refurb'.). Yes mixed use schemes have been in vogue recently, and pre-war examples are read ily evident, in tertiary locations, but they will cause future problems for major town centre projects, perhaps renewal and therefore financial sterilisation. If you're the freeholder, and it's your investment, think very carefully!	Comments noted.

	Analysis - High rents deter small business. Whilst it is important any shopping/town centre provides a complete range of retailers, clearly it is impractical to think private owners will philanthropically give substantial rental discounts to achieve this objective for the common good. Nevertheless, whilst tertiary locations often provide affordable space, it is sometimes desirable to provide subsidised space in main centres to provide uses useful to the community in the town centre. Perhaps this should be part of the 'deal' for Friary II to provide say just six or eight small units for certain 'trades' at predetermined rents which are not related to prevailing rental levels. Some could also be incorporated in other GBC led schemes. These (nursery) shops often foster new businesses that grow and move on to larger premises. I persuaded a Council and developer to adopt this policy over twenty years ago with great success.	Comments and suggestions noted.
	Analysis - Play space. The new play space in the Friary illustrates how beneficial this can be. Not only can it provide both parents and children with respite, it prolongs shopper visits especially if supported by catering facilities. Well worth pursuing, but quality of management will always be a key issue.	Comments noted.
	Analysis - Market failure? Having regard to GBC's extensive land ownerships I can't agree 'market failure' has been responsible for stagnation. Constant interference by well-intentioned elected members, changing policy with every new election and 'lending their weight', has been a major factor. 'The new 'cabinet' system with top class consultants is now making more progress than in the last thirty years.	Comments noted.
	Analysis - Bridge Street environment. The place is a tip! Why is the north side a conservation area? 60-70% is modern buildings, others nondescript and Bar Mambo and the Casino desecrated to the extent of becoming a 'complete eyesore, tacky and socially degraded. The entire block should be demolished and comprehensively redeveloped with the Bedford Road site. Both carriageway and pavement could then be widened improving traffic flow, especially if pedestrians can be elevated over Onslow Road to the town centre. That would solve many problems you have highlighted caused by the conflict between pedestrians and traffic on the gyratory. CPO the lot!	Comment noted. Agree that this area has potential for improvements and it is identified in the interim framework as a potential site.
Environment Agency	In the Analysis, we welcome 'Improve riverside environment in redevelopment of adjacent sites'. We would like to be involved in future discussions on how improvements can be made. There is a lot of scope for improving the riverside for biodiversity which people will also appreciate.	Comment noted and support for this welcomed. The EA are consulted as statutory consultees on riverside applications where flooding is likely to be an issue.
No name given	No, the data being used is historic for population and retail. There is no account of the impact of internet shopping on the need for increased retail floorspace. Guildford is not similar to Cambridge apart from having an attractive and historic centre, as it is very close to a number of competing centres. It does need to focus on its unique characteristics and promote those.	Comments noted. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.
Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	Some good points but not really presented as a SWOT analysis. Perhaps the Plan can do a proper SWOT analysis. The advantage of the comments in this section is that they seem to be the one place where community views feed through and more should be made of the fact these comments have arisen in this way. Why not insert actions after each to demonstrate how community concerns and aspirations have been taken forward in various sections of the plan? If "improve" London Road station intends creating a more frequent train shuttle between the two stations we would support this. However, we urge that London Road station should retain its more residential character and would not support redevelopment. It plays a very important role in making Guildford an attractive place to live precisely because this station has a charm and character similar to more rural or provincial places such as Clandon. If it were redeveloped and made more urban in character, this would increase the draw of alternative locations to many residents in east Guildford.	Comments noted.
on behalf of MC Nominees owners of site at rear of Walnut Tree Close	The issues do not correspond with the designations as the designation of site 05 suggests matters not otherwise covered within the SWOT analysis. See attached letter. We agree with many of the identified issues within the analysis section of the Masterplan Consultation Document which makes a number of very prudent comments relating to the strengths, opportunities and weaknesses of the Town Centre. We agree with the analysis that opportunity exists to provide some quiet places by the riverside for relaxation. However it quite rightly does not refer to the need to a specific, proven need to provide more offices, restaurants, bars & pubs along the River Wey, therefore the suggested uses within the table associated with site 5 are flawed.	Comments noted. The interim framework provides for a range of future uses on the redevelopment sites.
The Guildford Society	The SWOT analysis should be subdivided into its four components. For example, it is not immediately clear where the strengths end and the opportunities begin. The opportunities listed are a subset of those given in the main body of the report: many of them are detailed and site specific. They are admirable, but on what basis was the selection made? Every development site listed in the Masterplan is an opportunity. The whole section needs re-writing in a less amateurish manner: the opportunities should be generic, like the listed Strengths. A specific comment: the road links are not 'great'. Again, the weaknesses and threats should be separated. The list of weaknesses is quite good. The list of threats is very deficient. How about adding: economic uncertainty, growth of on-line shopping, competition from nearby towns, failure of major foreseen developments to proceed (Westfield, Solum etc), lack of infrastructure funding from County and National budgets to name but a few.	Comments noted. This section has been re-written and is clearer.

	<p>'Opportunities' needs to place a much greater emphasis on improved pedestrian links, especially between the railway station and town centre. Here we have a current major weakness and major opportunity: hence the idiocy of joining strengths to opportunities. The 'Analysis' section of the Plan acknowledges (as a number of 'Weaknesses') that the steeply sloping streets "...makes getting around on foot difficult for some" and that it is "difficult for pedestrians to navigate around the town." The Plan is peppered with references to the poor environment for pedestrians (as in the section on 'Historic spaces' where reference is made to the "High volumes of through traffic (which) create barriers to pedestrian and cycle movement, and poor pedestrian environments, such as along Bridge Street." Thus the Plan recognises the generally poor environment of the town for pedestrians and recognises the need for improvements but the Plan makes no specific proposals for improvement. The Society sees the need to improve pedestrian movement as a matter of key importance which the Plan should address. Nowhere is that more in evidence than in the present route taken by pedestrians between the railway station and the town centre where the achievement of an attractive and safe pedestrian connection between the railway station and the town centre is urgent and crucial and should be one of the primary issues to be addressed as part of this Town Centre Masterplan. But it is not.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The interim framework recognises this issues and has the wording as follows 'The area includes several of the main arrival points in the town centre, the two railway stations and two large public multi-storey car parks. However, pedestrian routes from these main arrival points to the other parts of the town centre are poor, due to the dominance of roads with fast moving traffic c, from which pedestrians are excluded by barriers and underpasses, poor legibility and poor quality street scene.' and sets the objective 'improve pedestrian connections between the main arrival points and key town centre destinations'.</p>
	<p>In his 1987 book "Guildford: Town Under Siege" Russell Chamberlin pointed out how the Royal Fine Art Commission, in its letter to the Borough Council of December 1974, urged that "... thought be should be given to providing good pedestrian access to this (Friary) site ... since this is the main pedestrian route to the railway station". He (Chamberlin) went on "The crowds today scuttling through the murderous three-way traffic at this (Bridge Street/Onslow Street) juncture have good reason to wish that thought had indeed been given to this problem." Almost 40 years on, nothing has been done to improve the situation. And yet, as we stand, the Borough Council still does not seem to recognise the seriousness of the problem and, indeed, through its proposal to relocate the present bus station the Bedford Road, it appears that the Council is about to make the situation for pedestrians a whole lot worse. The proposal to move the bus station to Bedford Road is at an early stage but it is clear from the TCM that this proposal is intended to be pursued. But if this proposal is to be pursued, the need to create a safe, convenient and attractive pedestrian route to provide for pedestrians walking between a (Bedford Road) bus station, the railway station and the town centre shopping area is of critical importance.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There has been no decision made on the future location of the bus station and all potential options will be fully tested.</p>
	<p>Page 40 of the TCM talks about "Making better places through environmental improvements" with ten important principles for placemaking in the town centre including "celebrating arrival – create a positive first impression" and the general aim of achieving a centre that is pedestrian friendly. The Society is of the view that the continued absence of a safe and attractive route for pedestrians between the railway station (plus possibly a bus station at Bedford Road) and the town centre shops is a major shortcoming which fails to 'celebrate arrival' or make a 'positive first impression'. Indeed, in our view a continuation of the present situation seriously undermines the desire of Guildford to be perceived as a destination of quality. With plans for a new railway station currently being prepared; with Bedford Road as the possible site for the new bus station; and with the prospect of more shopping as part of a major development on the area of North Street/Leapale Road/Commercial Road, the Borough Council must recognise the critical need to create a good pedestrian link and not let this opportunity slip by.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The interim framework recognises this issues and has the wording as follows 'The area includes several of the main arrival points in the town centre, the two railway stations and two large public multi-storey car parks. However, pedestrian routes from these main arrival points to the other parts of the town centre are poor, due to the dominance of roads with fast moving traffic c, from which pedestrians are excluded by barriers and underpasses, poor legibility and poor quality street scene.' and sets the objective 'improve pedestrian connections between the main arrival points and key town centre destinations'.</p>
	<p>The TCM recognises, in the Section relating to the railway station, that "opportunities for routes between the railway station and the town centre are to be explored" (our emphasis). But nothing specific is proposed. The TCM refers to the investigations which have taken place to improve the gyratory but, nothing specific is proposed. The TCM identifies an "Enhanced Gateway" at the bottom of North Street but nothing specific is proposed. And, finally, Onslow Street (from Bedford Road to the bottom of North Street) is identified as "a placemaking priority" but, (aside from the absurdity of envisaging that the heavily-trafficked Onslow Street could ever be a 'place' of any quality) again, nothing is proposed. In the absence of any specific proposals to secure specific improvements - surely a key ingredient of a 'Masterplan', we conclude that the TCM is seriously deficient. If ever there was a matter which needed to be positively addressed as part of the Town Centre Masterplan then this is it. In the absence of anything specific, the Society is left to conclude that not only are there no clear ideas about what might be possible but that the Plan contains hollow words and there is no serious intention on the part of the Council to secure any meaningful improvement for this issue of key importance. The analysis section lacks a clear structure or purpose. In addition to the points raised above, the Masterplan lacks a clear summary of previous consultation and how this had informed the strategy.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Further work is being undertaken on a movement strategy. Once this work is complete the findings will be fed into the Final Town Centre Framework.</p>
<p>The Guildford Society, Civic Society, etc. Notes of workshop 10 January 2012 facilitated by Allies and Morrison (with 80 attendees of which 14 were not members fo the GS)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus facilities – careful consideration is required to ensure good connections to bus facilities. Potential for the bus interchange being arranged as conventional on-street stops in preference to a new bus station was highlighted. 	<p>Comments noted. There has been no decision made on the future location of the bus station and all potential options will be fully tested.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision – general concern for the lack of vision in the masterplan. 	<p>Comment noted. The vision has now been rewritten.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vibrant mix of uses – support for residential uses in the town centre. Opportunities also exist to enhance the evening economy. The town centre needs to work for different activities and different groups of people at different times of the day. 	<p>Comments noted. Agreed. This is reflected in the interim framework.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River Wey – make more of this asset. 	<p>Comment noted, agree. This is reflected in the interim framework.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment opportunities – promote the breadth of the local economy. 	<p>Comment noted, agree.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport and traffic issues – viewed as a constraint to the expansion of the University. 	<p>Comment noted.</p>

	• Vibrancy of High Street – recent development has spoilt the character of the town centre, development should be of a Listable quality in the future!	Comment noted.
	• Too much emphasis on retail – this is an outdated model and a supermarket would be a mistake.	Comments noted.
	• Cultural assets – make the most of existing assets and promote new ones including a flexible multi-purpose community and cultural centre.	Comment noted, agree. This is reflected in the interim framework.
	• Sustainability – the masterplan should make specific and genuine reference to environmental sustainability.	Comment noted.
	• Open Guildford – Guildford should be accessible, as a place in its own right, but also in terms of institutional openness.	Comment noted.
	• Traffic – Guildford is the 8th worst town for traffic in the UK according to a recent survey. The centre needs to be more open for pedestrians with tree-lined spaces and avenues and priority for public transport over private vehicles. Traffic needs to be “moved out”.	Comment noted. The interim framework recognises opportunities for improvements to be made however, further work is being undertaken to devise a movement strategy will inform the final town centre framework.
	• Pedestrianisation – thought should be given to extending the pedestrianisation scheme (as referenced in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan) and using other techniques such as shared surfaces in appropriate locations.	Comment noted. Longer hours for the High Street pedestrianisation is included.
	• Gyratory – the gyratory has a major negative impact on the town centre, constraining north south and east-west movement.	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	• Distinctiveness – Guildford must avoid being a “could be anyway” place or “clone town”.	Comment noted.
	• Transition areas – the location of the town in a valley and the historic development of the settlement has produced a compact town centre. The quality of the transition between the town centre, surrounding residential neighbourhoods and the countryside beyond should be a priority, with initiatives to green the corridors that traverse these transitional areas.	Comment noted. These transition areas are highlighted in the framework and have their own strategy section.
	• Planning for young people – it is important that the masterplan makes provision for the future needs of young people in Guildford.	Comment noted.
	• Scale of growth – there is a need to quantify the scale of growth that is envisaged in the town centre.	The amount of retail floorspace for the town centre will be set out in the new Local Plan.
	• Historical development and Unique Selling Point – There should be an emphasis on the historical success of Guildford and the reasons for growth. Themes 1 to 4 will continue to be instrumental, but the masterplan must consider the future role of the town in relation to (v) and (vi). Although these are important, some participants suggested that these latter activities may have peaked. Others were keen to emphasise that the University and Business Park, and shopping will continue to be important to the long-term prosperity of the town. i) Proximity to London for commuting; ii) Good schools; iii) Location adjacent to fine countryside; iv) The town’s culture and heritage; v) University and Business Park; vi) Regional shopping role.	Comments noted. The masterplan was focussed on the town centre and the Surrey Research Park and University fall outside of the town centre boundary. The interim framework acknowledges the important links between these and the town but the framework is not directly concerned with these areas and will be part of the Local Plan Strategy.
Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (on behalf of the Guildford Society)	GUILDFORD - POSITION AND ISSUES The principal town of one of the most prosperous counties in England. Set within a natural gap where the River Wey cuts through the North Downs the town has remarkable topography. Open countryside can be viewed from High Street and the centre of the town can be reached easily on foot or bicycle along the banks of River Wey and its Navigation. Its strategic position has always made it the centre for transport links. The narrow valley which the town straddles is a major north-south corridor for water, rail and road traffic. It is from this unresolved conflict between these transport corridors and the civic and commercial imperatives of a functional, attractive town centre that many of Guildford's problems stem.	Comments noted. These issues have been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	Apart from its historic fabric and natural environment, Guildford enjoys other considerable advantages. sits within a large and wealthy natural hinterland. It has few serious retail competitors. Reading and Bluewater are over an hour's drive away and Farnham, Woking, Basingstoke and Aldershot are considerably smaller. The nearest comparable shopping centre is Kingston. Guildford's competitive advantage is the quality of the town centre, its walking environment and the depth and variety of its shopping, services and cafe environment.	Comments noted. These issues have been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	Compactness of the town centre. It is easy to walk around the main shopping areas, but also to walk to nearby residential neighbourhoods, through a network of attractive lanes, alleyways and courtyards. With its proximity to London (Waterloo 40 minutes) its University, schools and science park, Guildford is an attractive location for businesses, particularly in the technology, research and development and HQ office markets that cluster to the west and southwest of London on the M25, M3 and M4 corridors. And yet there are significant problems here that are surprising given the inherent advantages of the town.	Comments noted. These issues have been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	Significant Problems - Severance and dislocation caused by the traffic and roads. This is most apparent in the gyratory which separates the town centre from the railway station and the river. Traffic severance is also apparent elsewhere. The over dominance of the car in the town centre has resulted in a fracturing of the urban fabric, for example around North Street and the separation of the High Street from the area around the theatres, the river and the castle.	Comments noted. These issues have been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	The lack of a co-ordinated intermodal traffic strategy is also evidenced in the inadequacy of the bus station. Guildford, as a transport interchange does not appear to be working as effectively as it might. Inappropriately sited surface car parks on key sites along the River Wey complete the impression that the balance between pedestrian and motor vehicle needs to be addressed.	Comments noted. These issues have been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.

	Quality of the public realm and the built environment. Although the town centre is compact and has a fine grain network of pedestrian routes, wayfinding is difficult. This is not a problem of the signage (which could be improved), rather a problem of how one reads the urban fabric and navigates the town centre. The route from the railway station to the High Street is particularly uncomfortable. The river which should be a major asset is all but invisible. Guildford requires a coherent urban design strategy to unite its separate elements into a town centre that is more than the sum of its parts.	Comments noted. These issues have been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	Design quality. Recent developments in the town centre, over the past 25 years, are almost without exception, mediocre. They are indistinguishable from the architecture in many other places in the South-east that lack the historical importance of Guildford. This is mirrored by the poor overall quality of the public realm, its disparate materials, haphazard design and poor upkeep. In short Guildford has not aspired to the level of design quality that it might have expected and a consequence of its real economic competitiveness is likely to be compromised. The SWOT analysis needs to be re-visited with a clearer and more consistent criteria, and a tighter set of conclusions. A number of elements require clearer identification, particularly the need for enhanced pedestrian connections from the railway station to the town centre. As identified above, interventions for the station area and central town centre, including the gyratory, should be informed by a hierarchy of fundamental design moves.	Comments noted. These issues have been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
Analysis - Boundary. Do you agree with this boundary? If not, which areas would you like to see included or excluded, and why?		
Guildford town resident	I have rarely seen anything as daft (apart from the idea of moving the bus station) as zoning the cricket ground as Town Centre	We have listened to feedback on the boundary and have amended the proposed town centre boundary to omit the cricket ground on Woodbridge Road.
Member of the public	5. I agree the boundary described on p.7.	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
Member of the public	I think this is a reasonable boundary.	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
Guildford town resident	Yes, it seems about right.	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
Member of the public	Yes	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
Guildford town resident	Difficult to comment because of scale of map and no road names.	Comment noted. Clearer map (Figure 1) provided in interim framework. For detail of town centre boundary see individual townscape area strategy maps. It is not possible to show all street names on these maps.
Guildford town resident	Agreed	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
Planning Development control regeneration specialists	Overall Yes	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
Member of the public	Yes, agree	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
Guildford town resident	Agree	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
National Trust	Boundary We welcome the inclusion of Dapdune Wharf within the Town Centre area.	We have listened to feedback from others on the boundary and have amended the proposed town centre boundary to omit Dapdune Wharf as being quite physically remote from the main town centre area. The interim framework text does, however, acknowledge Dapdune Wharf's close proximity as significance as a visitor attraction.
Guildford town resident	The Town Centre boundaries should be expanded in the Master plan to include the University, the Research Park, the Hospital and the land from the Cathedral to the Railway station.	Following national planning policy (NPPF), the town centre boundary has been drawn to meet a set of specific requirements. Whilst it is not appropriate to extend the boundary out as far as the University of Surrey, Surrey Research Park, Royal Surrey County Hospital or Guildford Cathedral, the interim framework features these more prominently, recognising these as main areas of influence upon Guildford town centre (see section 5.3 Wider context).
Member of the public	Yes	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
Guide Dogs	Agree with the boundary	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.

University of Surrey	To ensure that transport provision to serve the town centre is delivered some junctions and roads on the approaches should also be included in the masterplan area.	Relevant junctions impacting upon transport movement within the town centre will be considered in preparing the movement strategy for the final town centre framework. These do not need to be included within the town centre boundary, which is defined in accordance with national planning policy.
	The University welcomes the inclusion of the footbridge that links to the University campus to the north of the town centre. This route and the regeneration of the approach to it from the town centre could improve the use of this existing infrastructure. However the area to the north east of the bridge is excluded from the town centre boundary and to further improve the route it would be better if this area could also be regenerated over time to improve the level of natural surveillance along this route.	Welcome support for inclusion of footbridge within the town centre boundary. It remains in the interim framework. The area to the north east of the bridge does not need to be designated within the boundary for it to be regenerated (subject to the nature of any proposed redevelopment and normal planning considerations).
Turley Associates on behalf of Hermes Real Estate Investment Management Ltd, leasehold owner of the Friary Shopping Centre.	The proposed town centre boundary is adequately defined in accordance with PPS4.	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
TURLEY ASSOCIATES on behalf of Hermes Real Estate Investment Management Ltd	The proposed town centre boundary is adequately defined in accordance with PPS4.	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
Guildford town resident	This seems a bit academic why worry about boundaries? I don't think this should be an issue keep them fuzzy!	A boundary is required to define the area to which the interim framework applies and to meet the requirements of national planning policy (section 2 Town Centre Boundary of the framework explains).
No name given	Treating Guildford as, basically, the town centre is another illustration of the same point. The very successful University and Research Park, the Royal Surrey Hospital and the Cathedral have to be seen as an integral part of Guildford as outstanding aspects of its public face, employment and future wealth-creating capacity and have to be included in any genuine strategic overview.	Agree that these areas are of significant influence and the interim framework recognises this. However, the framework is targeted to address issues and coordinate improvement of Guildford Town Centre. Strategic issues relating to areas outside of the town centre will be fully addressed in the plan for the whole of Guildford borough, the new Local Plan and in particular in the Strategy document. No change required.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	The Town Centre Conservation Area includes South Hill, and Castle Hill so the Town Centre boundary on your map is incorrectly drawn	The town centre boundary is defined for the reasons set out in national planning policy. It does not necessarily have to follow the same boundary as the town centre conservation area, which has been designated for a different purpose. The boundary has however been amended to include Castle Hill.
Secretary of Surrey Archaeological Society	1. The town centre boundary at Castle Arch cuts the historic Guildford Palace site in two leaving a key part outside the area covered by the plan. A small change to include the Castle Gardens land south east of Castle Arch would ensure all the Guildford Palace site is taken into account. It would also mean an area which can be a focus of anti-social behaviour could be made less secluded.	The boundary has been amended to address this suggestion.
Abbots Hospital	The rationale for the boundary perhaps does not give enough emphasis to the existing residential provision. This encourages, for instance, a lack of awareness of the residential provision generally and, in practical terms, means works and street activity do not have sufficient regard for the impact of disruption and disturbance on a residential (and in our case, elderly) population.	Comment noted. The town centre boundary is defined in accordance with national planning policy (section 2 Town Centre Boundary of the framework explains). Agree, however, that it is important to recognise that a key aspect of the town centre is its residential community. The interim framework does this at Appendix 3 Homes and community.
Member of the public	largely	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	We are pleased that the Jenner Road houses have been taken out of the town centre. However Poyle Terrace is still included. This now has an approved residential scheme, and this is a good and established residential location. It is reasonable to include the Basket Works as this has to be redeveloped.	Whilst a scheme has been approved, both the basket works and the adjacent Poyle Terrace are in need of renovation / redevelopment, and so have been included.
	We ask that Poyle Terrace be removed from the Town Centre. Otherwise we consider the boundary satisfactory where it passes through our area.	Both the basket works and the adjacent Poyle Terrace are in need of renovation / redevelopment, and so have been included.
Member of the public	The Boundary should be expanded to take in the University, Research Park and the Cathedral	Following national planning policy, the town centre boundary has been drawn to meet a set of specific requirements (section 2 Town Centre Boundary of the framework explains). Whilst it is not appropriate to extend the boundary out as far as the University of Surrey, Surrey Research Park, Royal Surrey County Hospital or Guildford Cathedral, the interim framework features these more prominently, recognising these as main areas of influence upon Guildford town centre (see section 5.3 Wider context).

Member of the public	No, I think the university and the cathedral should be included as these are important assets of the town.	Following national planning policy, the town centre boundary has been drawn to meet a set of specific requirements (section 2 Town Centre Boundary of the framework explains). Whilst it is not appropriate to extend the boundary out as far as the University of Surrey, Surrey Research Park, Royal Surrey County Hospital or Guildford Cathedral, the interim framework features these more prominently, recognising these as main areas of influence upon Guildford town centre (see section 5.3 Wider context).
Member of the public	I do not see the need to stretch the town centre to include London Road station and the alignment should probably run along Dene Road and Denmark Road and the frontage of London Road as far as the York Road traffic lights.	London Road station continues to be shown within the boundary as the site represents a significant transport infrastructure serving the town centre.
Quod on behalf of Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd	We agree with the position of the town centre boundary	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
Chairman of The Tyting Society	This is history and not how a modern City should plan. The railway, River Wey, RSCH and Science Park axis are all integral to the next 20 years	Agree that these areas are of significant influence and the interim framework recognises this. However, the framework is targeted to address issues and coordinate improvement of Guildford Town Centre. Strategic issues relating to areas outside of the town centre will be fully addressed in the plan for the whole of Guildford borough, the new Local Plan and in particular in the Strategy document. No change required.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	The boundary appears realistic. It would be good to link to Ladymead as a part of the town centre experience but moving the boundary too widely will dilute the effect of improvements. However, improved connections/ linkages to Ladymead could be made as part of objective 3.	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended to exclude the most northern section. Whilst it is not appropriate to include Ladymead within the town centre boundary, section 5.3 Wider context recognises it's influence.
No name given	Ok	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	The Town Centre boundary is appropriate in relation to the Guildford Station site.	Agreement noted, no change required.
Guildford Business Forum	The town centre boundary runs from the York Road roundabout due north on the western side of Woodbridge Road, to include largely residential properties, the cricket ground and Dapdune Wharf. Given that residential on the east side of the road is excluded, then so should the residential on the west and unless there is a plan to develop the cricket ground, it should be excluded. We believe that the boundary should, therefore, go from the York Road roundabout westwards along the northern boundary of the Police station until it picks up Mary Road and then extend up to the bus station.	We have listened to feedback from others on the boundary and have amended the proposed town centre boundary to omit Dapdune Wharf and the sports ground. However land west of Woodbridge Road remains within the boundary given the mix of residential and non residential uses, including community uses, businesses and a bus depot.
Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	We do not support the boundary and we also ask for clear policies to guide the interface between the boundary and adjoining areas and the character of arterial routes radiating from the centre.	Objection noted. The Local Plan Strategy and Delivery documents will set out policy relating the town centre boundary.
	1- We ask for the area around London Road Station to be removed from the town centre. It is in a residential conservation area and reflects the character of the residential communities it largely serves. Its lack of town centre feel is its very appeal. (See section 4 above.) Designation as town centre site could result in detrimental and inappropriate, intensive redevelopment.	London Road station continues to be shown within the boundary as the site represents a significant transport infrastructure serving the town centre. Any development or improvement proposals will be considered very carefully, in accordance with normal planning policies and process.
	2- It should be made very clear that more intensive town centre type development will not be appropriate on sites that adjoin the town centre. We cite, as an example of bad practice to be avoided in future, the very intrusive and out of character new flats on Nightingale Road alongside London Road station. The applicant claimed high density was appropriate here because the site adjoined the town centre. Now that its impact can be seen, we submit granting consent here was a terrible mistake and we would hate to see this pattern repeated at other points along the boundary of the town centre.	Concern noted. Existing Local Plan 2003 policies promote high quality, appropriately scaled development within the urban area of Guildford. New planning policies will be established through the new Local Plan. The National planning policy framework is already a material consideration in making planning decisions.
	3 - Any transition should take the form of lower density development INSIDE the defined town centre area. There may be cases where "gateway" buildings are appropriate but for the most part, less intensive development will be appropriate near the boundary to soften the edges of the town centre as it leads into adjoining residential areas. This approach will dovetail well with the policy of greening the approaches into Guildford.	Comments noted. The interim framework recognises the change in land use mix and character as one moves out of the core of the town centre - see the Transition and Eastern Fringe areas.
	4 - There have been calls to include the University, Hospital and Research Park and Slyfield in any Mater Planning exercise. We agree these areas should be planned strategically and in a coordinated way. However, we would resist any suggestion of "linking" these, or any other business areas to the town centre. One of the valued qualities of Guildford is the residential and green character of most of the arterial roads. They have not succumbed to the sprawl of commercial development that you often get along main roads into towns. We suggest it is important to retain the residential character of arterial roads and believe this is best achieved by recognising there are business units throughout Guildford varying in scale from Slyfield and the Research Park, to the London Road and Upper Edgeborough Road Offices or Merrow Business Park. These do not need joining to the town centre and should be designed to sit comfortably within their residential or edge of town setting as appropriate. Linking policies are likely to lead to ribbon development	Comments noted. These areas are reflected in section 5.3 Wider context. No change required.

	5 - The town centre Master Plan should endorse the policy of "Greening the Approaches into Guildford" and guard against sprawl along connecting roads.	Comment noted. The interim framework focuses on the town centre, however the Council continues to support the principles of greening the approaches into Guildford town.
	6. We warmly welcome removal of London Road Offices from the Town Centre Area allowing this area to be treated as a business park within a residential area.	Agreement noted. London Road offices remain outside of the boundary in the interim framework. (They were originally shown within the boundary in the earlier draft Town Centre Area Action Plan).
on behalf of MC Nominees owners of site at rear of Walnut Tree Close	Our clients agree with the proposed boundary.	Agreement noted, however in light of other responses received, the boundary has been amended.
The Guildford Society	Boundary The Town Centre Masterplan defines the boundary of the historic town centre and its immediate environs. The Society considers that for a number of key considerations – notably in respect of traffic and the economy – the study area should include a wider area, to the north and north-west of the town centre, embracing land west of Woodbridge Road to the former by-pass (now the A25), the Cathedral, Surrey University and the Hospital/Research Park.	Following national planning policy, the town centre boundary has been drawn to meet a set of specific requirements (section 2 Town Centre Boundary of the framework explains). Whilst it is not appropriate to extend the boundary out as far as the University of Surrey, Surrey Research Park, Royal Surrey County Hospital or Guildford Cathedral, the interim framework features these more prominently, recognising these as main areas of influence upon Guildford town centre (see section 5.3 Wider context).
Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (on behalf of the Guildford Society)	The boundary for the Masterplan requires careful definition. In general terms, the Guildford Society would recommend a broader boundary for the study to ensure that functional linkages with wider destinations are fully integrated into the plan and opportunities for town centre enhancement, for example the station and University.	Following national planning policy, the town centre boundary has been drawn to meet a set of specific requirements (section 2 Town Centre Boundary of the framework explains). Whilst it is not appropriate to extend the boundary out as far as the University of Surrey, Surrey Research Park, Royal Surrey County Hospital or Guildford Cathedral, the interim framework features these more prominently, recognising these as main areas of influence upon Guildford town centre (see section 5.3 Wider context).
Analysis - Primary shopping area and shopping frontages.		
Guildford town resident	Waitrose site is excluded - is this right? Does this prove that this master plan is lagging behind events rather than leading them? Has anybody thought about the traffic implications of Waitrose or is this a false rumour?	The site is included in the town centre but not in as a shopping frontage. The site does not have permission for a supermarket.
Member of the public	Tunsgate should be fully pedestrianised. Living working running a business eating and drinking out cinema / theatre / other entertainment the alleyways between high street and north street need upgrading	Agree, partial pedestrianisation (need to provide for disabled parking bays) or shared surfacing is proposed in the strategy section (Pg 54).
Member of the public	6. P15. transition areas. I'd like to see more sympathetic development in transition areas. The photograph you've used to illustrate this, of the development on the old newspaper office clashes with the older style properties. I recognise we need development but perhaps something more in keeping such as the building around Artillery Terrace/Martyr Road (which replaced the old Territorial Army centre) blends much better with the older buildings.	Comments on the design of this building noted. Our Residential Design Guide SPG should be used in considering proposals for new housing.
Member of the public	I suggest that if shopowners could be encouraged to liaise with the Council to improve shopping frontages it will be in their interest. But they will only do that if they feel they are to be part of the revitalised town.	Agree. Often when companies see other units improving, they don't want to be left behind, so invest in their properties, improving the quality of the area.
Member of the public	Designating the area a leisure and service area might help identify it with the lower end of town. But, again, I suggest any redesignation is to no avail without custom. Guildford town centre's leisure industry, and commerce itself, has dramatically increased in line with Guildford's popularity as a shopping centre over the last 40 years, implying I suggest that success of retail in some form or other has a knock-on effect on all aspects.	The opening of G Live may stimulate changes in this area as more people visit it.
Member of the public	To the south west, I think the frontage of Quarry Street, Mill Lane and Millbrook could be included in the prime retail area so as to take advantage of the interesting streets and potential links down to Debenhams. This should perhaps also include St Mary's Church which should be encouraged to think about opening up to some heritage-sensitive retail (eg. National Trust shop or coffee house) to enable the church to be open to tourists for longer each day.	These are not really retail areas, and so have not been included in the primary shopping area. Interesting idea for increasing number of visitors to this important building, and something which the church might want to consider.
Guildford town resident	Yes to all	Support noted.
Guildford town resident	Would hope that when designating the leisure and service area, consideration would be given to local residents in adjoining streets as regards noise and nuisance at night.	Agree. This area is not proposed to have bars, pubs or nightclubs. All restaurants and cafes need to have licenses, and consideration for these issues would be given at that time, as well as in determining any planning application that may be needed.
Guildford town resident	Not in favour of a designated leisure and service area. Shops should be encouraged on all of 'upper' High street.	Opinion noted. The primary shopping area is drawn around areas with the highest concentrations of shops, and suitable areas where these should be encouraged. Other areas with different but supporting town centre uses are also required in order to have a balanced town centre.
Planning Development control regeneration specialists	Yes	Support noted.
Member of the public	Yes	Support noted.

Guildford town resident	Broadly agree	Support noted.
Guildford borough residents	Generally but smaller, independent businesses must be allowed to come back into the town we constantly hear that rents are too high and therefore it is only the larger organisations which can afford to come into the town. We have no butcher, proper baker, fish monger but so many coffee and fashion outlets.	Agree, only by adding to the amount of retail will more retail units be available for a variety of businesses at rents they can afford.
Guide Dogs	Partial agreement with the shop frontages. Reasons being if they are to be in line with the new shop frontages on Friary Street, there is a lack of signage (flag signs) to assist with identifying what shops are along the street. There is also a lack of manifestations on the glass frontages which could also be very reflective (especially if this is on the North side of North street) on bright days.	Agree that projecting shop signs would be helpful. Design for north side of North Street shop units noted. Large areas of unrelieved glazing should be avoided here.
Turley Associates on behalf of Hermes Real Estate Investment Management Ltd, leasehold owner of the Friary Shopping Centre.	Policy EC3.1 C and Appendix B PPS4 state that the Primary Shopping Area comprises both Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontages. Therefore any plan should show a Primary Shopping Area and Town Centre boundary rather than Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontages.	Agree, this is the government policy that the proposed frontages is based on (as informed by local shop survey data). Although this has since been replaced by the NPPF, the same definitions are included in the NPPFs glossary. Figure 6 of the interim framework shows the town centre boundary, the primary shopping area, made up of the primary and secondary shopping frontages.
Guildford town resident	The "Casino" on the main highway into Guildford is absolutely detrimental to presenting Guildford in its best light. It smacks of cheap "entertainment" as does the eating/drinking area around Bridge Street. They are depressing sights to be met with as the town is entered.	Agree this is an area that needs improving, and as such is included as Opportunity sites 5. Improvements around this area are also proposed in the strategy.
Guildford town resident	Not really the main concern for me which seems to be reflected elsewhere is the need to build active frontages open 24/7 and avoid the horrors of shopping malls (the Friary could be Dallas or Edinburgh)	Agreed. The North Street site is included as a potential redevelopment site, and is to have a revised site brief. This will not include an indoor shopping centre.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	No views	Noted
Guildford town resident	I hope that it will sink in to your planners that Guildford does not need more shops. There are quite enough to living working running a business shopping eating and drinking out cinema / theatre / other entertainment attract nearly all the visitors the town can cope with. The trouble is that there are too many of the wrong sort of shops: how is it that a town of our size and importance cannot produce even one decent greengrocer, fishmonger or butcher? All these could be accommodated within the existing shopping area without any need to encroach on the land currently occupied by the bus station.	The bus station is not of the standard and does not have the facilities to attract as many users as it might. By moving it, the land that it is currently occupying can be released for redevelopment to help to regenerate the North Street site.
Abbots Hospital	I would be concerned if commercial activity in Jefferies Passage, the top of North Street, plus the facades formed from the redeveloped former Barclays site all attracted activities that increased evening & nighttime noise and pollution. Residents facing North St and Jefferies Passage already suffer regular disturbance from the patrons of the night club opposite. I would also be concerned if the proposed 'leisure' zone at the top of the Upper High street 'sprawled' over time down towards Abbot's for the same reasons.	Jefferies passage is proposed to remain as secondary shopping frontage.
West Horsley Parish Council	The primary shopping frontages suggested for Commercial, Woodbridge, and Leapale Roads does seem to pull trade away from the existing shopping area of the town. We note that some shops have relocated to the remodelled shopping centre leaving empty premises on the High Street. The plan seems to suggest that the High street will become a more secondary site with North Street as the Central area. The leisure and service area is compact. We feel that more services would be required near to the river/historic area of the castle to make the most of that area.	This is not the intention and is unlikely to be the impact. The rents on parts of High Street are very high and preclude some retailers. There would be a greater variety of retail unit sizes, some modern and regular footprint, others smaller, and in older buildings.
Guildford town resident	I think there is too much emphasis on shopping and not enough on the arts, culture and entertainment.	Retail is very important as an attraction to the town centre, although the interim framework gives greater recognition and importance to its role as a key cultural centre in the area, including in its Vision. Also includes more about the evening economy.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	Upgrading of streets to Primary. We support increase of the retail presence in the established shopping streets. However the potential increase in shops, with the percentage retail frontage increased from a maximum of 67% to 100% in the many streets upgraded to primary (including also the fairly recently changed upper High Street) needs to be quantified and taken into account when assessing what additional retail expansion is realistically needed.	The designation of a street as primary shopping frontage will not automatically bring the proportion of retail units up to 100%. This will impact on redevelopment or applications for changes of use. These will be taken into account.
	Removal of Sydenham Road Designation. The SW end of Sydenham Road, mainly on the SE, side should remain a designated shopping frontage, now secondary, as it offers the potential for useful convenience shopping to local residents (Bar Centro, Laundromat, Orlandos, Garden Room). The Laundromat is considered to be a useful amenity for residents.	There is only one retail unit here to protect by such as policy, others are cafes and restaurants (A3) and other uses such as a launderette. The are would also be suited to residential uses.

	Change of the end of the upper High Street, and the adjoining Epsom Road / London Road from secondary shopping to a "leisure and service area". We strongly object to this change. This is the optimum location for convenience shopping to serve the large adjacent residential area, and this use must be pursued if any pretence of sustainability is to be kept. The failure to ensure that the five shop units provided as part of the Trinity Gate development remained in retail use (only 2 remain, and they are not in genuine retail use) is still regarded as a major planning failure. The implication of the statement that this change would "...balance the night time area around Bridge Street..." is of great concern. This location is adjacent to a dense and established residential area, with the Trinity Gate apartments right in the area, and is therefore totally unsuited to a "night time economy". An "evening" economy, based around G-Live and Raddisson entertainment, with evening restaurants, is acceptable, providing a clear distinction was made between evening and nighttime economies. We have argued that G-Live must remain active during the daytime, and be an all-day amenity for residents and visitors, and this appears to have been achieved. This would be spoilt by having nightclubs that would be dead during the daytime. The retention of a shopping frontage, now secondary, would not inhibit sufficient restaurants being available. The notion that a night time leisure area would form a useful barrier between residential and retail is bizarre; it is the opposite that is needed. We ask that all the frontage be retained as secondary shopping frontage, and restaurant provision be made within this designation.	There are currently a few convenience stores in this area, but is mostly an area of estate agents and restaurants. Concern is noted, but restaurants and cafes are considered to be suitable uses for this area, serving the local residential population as well as visitors to G Live, the Radisson, and to the wider town centre. Some of these would be open during the daytime. Possibly the draft masterplan did not make the distinction between night time and evening economy clear enough. The Table 3 on page 141 of the interim framework sets out what uses would be acceptable.
Member of the public	I agree that the High Street / Epsom Road / London Road area should be re-designated as a "leisure & service area"	Support noted
Member of the public	Interesting that this excludes the proposed new Waitrose store. Presumably the maintenance of a strong Conservation Area will be a critical component of the Town Centre and the frontages in that area should be highlighted as such. These defined frontages reflect very much what is there today but should include as a general rule any and every frontage in the Prime Main Shopping Area. In common with the findings of Mary Portas, however, it is important that this is not so prescriptive that it resists other uses that would introduce more 'life' into Guildford and its town centre offering.	The Bellerby Theatre site is on the edge of the primary shopping area and it is considered that this is not suited to including in the primary shopping area.
Quod on behalf of Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd	We agree with the location of the Friary Shopping Centre and Friary extension site within the 'Primary main shopping area'. It will be important however that the location within the 'Primary main shopping area' and 'Primary shopping frontage' does not restrict the flexibility for change in either the existing shopping centre or restrict the redevelopment of the extension site	The proposed change of the existing Friary shopping Centre is from secondary to primary. This is to retain it in retail use, with lower numbers of secondary uses (for example the food court area).
	Whilst understanding the objective of maintaining a majority of units in A1 retail use, this should not preclude the provision of other uses, for instance A3 uses from being located at ground floor or any other level. Modern shopping developments rely on a range of accessible uses to attract customers, especially in light of growing competition from internet sales and the existing Friary shopping centre contains a range of uses.	The proposed change of the existing Friary shopping Centre is from secondary to primary. This is to retain it in retail use, with lower numbers of secondary uses (for example the food court area).
	In order to ensure the successful functioning of the existing Friary shopping centre and a successful redevelopment of the extension site, we would request that additional wording is added to the table supporting Site 18 - 'Land bounded by North Street/Leapale Road and Commercial Road bus station' that recognises the need for flexibility in uses in the layout (including ground floor) of any proposals. The table on page 12 of the Town Centre Masterplan describes the Friary extension site as the town centre's most significant potential redevelopment site and a mix of uses is vital to the success of any scheme.	Agreed, the site is suggested as suitable for a retail-led, mixed-use development. Further detail is set out in the revised site brief.
	It is also stated on page 21 of the Town Centre Masterplan that "Mixed development will be encouraged as most suitable on town centre sites capable of accommodating major developments...Mixed use developments contribute to the vitality of the town centre and reduce the need to travel by encouraging linked trips". The Friary shopping centre and extension site would fall under this definition and therefore are appropriate for a mix of uses.	Agree that this is important. It is included in the interim framework at page 45.
Chairman of The Tyting Society	Most of us cannot comment on this level of detail. In theory it seems OK but life will be so different in 20 years time that this might work for 3 years but beyond?	We are currently working with the Local Plan 2003, of which some has since been overtaken by changes to national planning policy. When the new Local Plan is prepared and the interim framework updated to a final framework and then to an SPD, we will consider up to date data and evidence.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	The experience of shopping / restaurant / pub along the street fronting the Castle is a little poor with service yard activity and blank walls providing a less animated façade to the back of the town centre. This could be enlivened to contribute to a positive experience.	Agreed. This is included in the strategy page 51.
No name given	Happy to see north street improved and bus station redeveloped but care needed beyond that.	Comments noted.
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	We consider that Bridge Street should be defined as 'secondary frontage' given the town centre retail uses located on it (see attached GOAD plan extract) having regard to the PPS4 definition of secondary shopping frontages. We also consider that to be consistent with the definition of the eastern part of the PSA, which includes a significant element of secondary shopping frontage, that the PSA should be extended to include Bridge Street. Bridge Street is closely related to the primary shopping frontage and is located on one of the key pedestrian routes in the town centre. As such its inclusion would be consistent with the PPS4 definition and PPS4 Practice Guidance.	Bridge Street is physically and functionally very separate from the primary shopping area, and so is not recommended for any frontage designation. Its role in the evening and night time economy is recognised at page 111 and figure 15. Which does not include nightclubs, pubs nor bars.

No name given	Proposed Expansion of the Night Time Leisure Economy. (Objective 1, p.4) Weaknesses and threats, p.6) (Primary Shopping Area and Shopping frontages, p.12-13) (Townscape Areas – Eastern Fringe, p.16) (Boundary p.7). Large cities can accommodate night-time leisure by placing nightclubs and casinos in a selected area of the city, so that they do not impinge on other parts of the city. Guildford with its small town centre cannot do this. The night-time economy impacts on the town centre and many residents would not like to see it expanded further, and in particular to another part of the town. The Upper High St, Epsom Rd and London Rd junction: On page 13 of the TCM it is written: "We are proposing that this area be re-designated a 'leisure and service area', to complement the new G Live entertainment centre, Radisson Hotel and existing restaurants, and to balance the night time area that has emerged around Bridge Street."	As well as a main shopping area, a town centre the size of Guildford (which is the largest in the county and one of the largest in the south east outside of London) needs to have areas of uses to support the retail use, for example, places for shoppers, workers, and residents to eat.
Property Consultants	I suggest this area is extended to include Bedford Road and Bridge street (North side), and the Farnham Road bus station site which is almost pedestrian only linked to the High Street. I take issue regarding designating top of the High Street (near G Live) purely as a 'leisure and service area' in support of the G Live centre, insofar as it would be totally disagreeable for this zone to descend to the same unpleasant level as Bridge Street, management and control being the main issue. Permitting some retail to balance may help.	Bridge Street is physically and functionally very separate from the primary shopping area, and so is not recommended for any frontage designation. Its role in the evening and night time economy is recognised at page 111 and figure 15. The Table 3 on page 141 of the interim framework sets out what uses would be acceptable, which does not include nightclubs, pubs nor bars.
The Guildford Society	The Plan proposes a massive increase (33%?) in retail floor space. The justification for this increase is not shown in the Plan. Questions are raised about whether such a large increase is the right policy for the town given the current economic situation and future patterns of retailing.	There has been no major increase in retail floorspace in the town centre (the preferred location for retail development), as no sites are available, new retail floorspace has been approved and built. The plan is a long term one, not just for 5 or so years of recession.
	The Society considers that the map of the primary shopping area (on (un-numbered) page 10) requires amendment in that we consider :- The north end of Haydon Place contains so few shops that it does not justify its designation as a secondary shopping area.	This parade of local shops should be retained for lower rent options for independents, etc.
	Those sections of the upper High Street and the frontages to London Road and Epsom Road should be defined as secondary shopping areas. We recognise that there is a large percentage of units not in retail use but we are concerned that to remove the designation of these areas as shopping frontages will have a detrimental impact for prospective investors and tenants.	Restaurants and cafes are considered to be suitable uses for this area, serving the local residential population as well as visitors to G Live, the Radisson, and to the wider town centre. Some of these would be open during the daytime. Possibly the draft masterplan did not make the distinction between night time and evening economy clear enough. The Table 3 on page 141 of the interim framework sets out what uses would be acceptable.
	The frontages to Commercial Road, Woodbridge Road and Leapale Lane are, quite patently, not shopping frontages. If the Plan considers (as it does) that the area north of North Street to include Leapale Road and Commercial Road is suitable for shopping this should be provided for as a statement in the text of the Plan.	This is within the North Street regeneration site. As explained in Table 3, Appendix 2.
	The frontage to both sides of Friary Street should be shown as primary shopping frontage (at present they are without designation).	Agreed. It is in Table 3 in Appendix 2 as a primary frontage. Figure 6 will be amended to show this.
	Tunsgate Square should be shown as primary (not secondary) shopping frontage.	Agreed. It is in Table 3 in Appendix 2 as a primary frontage. Figure 6 will be amended to show this.
	It seems inappropriate to focus on the detailed issue of town centre frontages at this point in the document. In addition to the insertion of more strategic spatial plans, environmental and public realm issues should be identified in advance of frontage guidance.	These issues are not related, and we do not consider it inappropriate to indicate the changes we intend to make to the shopping frontages through the Local Plan.
Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (on behalf of the Guildford Society)	The identification of townscape areas is welcomed, although a number of references require review – for example the conflation of the 'Historic Core' with the 'Commercial Core' and the ambiguous definition of historic spaces. In general, the Masterplan needs to provide a firmer steer about the Council's expectation for high quality development, sensitive to character and historic values.	The interim framework includes this, for example in the Vision, objectives TC1 and TC2, and in the strategy.
Analysis - Townscape Areas		
Member of the public	I think it is regrettable that the specific character gates(natural entry points/bus stops) should have apparently been abandoned in favour of a more general description as above as the former would pinpoint a particular road that leads into town and give the opportunity for linking radial roads, perhaps traversing the "historic narrow lanes" en route.	Understanding how people (in particular pedestrians in the town centre) use and traverse spaces is indeed very important, however it has been necessary for the interim framework to take a wider and broader approach to the town centre as a whole - also considering the character and needs of different areas, and the potentially appropriate design and land-use solutions to problems. The strategy seeks to understand and address town centre needs holistically, and to build upon its strengths in a strategic, multi-faceted way. Poorly defined gateway areas are highlighted as opportunities on individual townscape area strategy maps and on Figure 4 Summary of key issues.
	In the light of the transparency afforded by the commission of the Masterplan, although not all suggestions by the public could be implemented, it might be helpful to explain the reasoning behind the apparent decision to dispense with the character gates in favour of townscape areas(landscape character assessment).	The draft masterplan and interim framework adopt a clearer, less complex visual presentation of the issues and opportunities in each townscape area, a change that has involved discontinuation of the character gates approach used in the 2006 draft Town Centre Area Action Plan.

Guildford town resident	I would like to see a plan that through opening up links, usage of signage and continuity of materials and planting, joins the important places in the town to become fluid and easy to navigate; not several indiscriminate ones linked by traffic!	A fragmented environment in the town centre is acknowledged as a weakness (town centre analysis); the town centre 'suffers from poor linkages between its constituent areas, with busy roads and large buildings acting as barriers to movement'. Objectives TC 10 and, in particular, TC 11, tackle this issue. TC 11 relates to the need for cohesion between key attractions. 5.4 - the townscape areas approach highlights a theme (running throughout the framework) regarding the need for reconnection of relationships between different town centre areas and attractions. A notable example of improvements to linkages is the need to improve access to the river from the High Street, via Town Bridge, and the interim framework's Strategy includes commitment to enhanced gateways, and improved routes around the town, including better connections, through crossings, signage, and landscaping measures.
Planning Development control regeneration specialists	See comments on making the river a central focal point of regeneration of the town centre.	Agree, see comment and response below.
Member of the public	Agree	Noted. No change required.
Guildford town resident	Town square as a focal point is a good idea. More small areas with seats in view of passers by but not in the mainstream.	Agree, the strategy has been amended to include need for more spaces for meeting. The inclusion of small landscaped and/or seating areas is included, for example, in the North Street improvement programme.
National Trust	Townscape Types - We agree with the inclusion of Dapdune Wharf within the Historic Area but suggest that this Area is extended all along the river to connect with the historic space to the south. This would give emphasis to the Plan's stated objective to enhance the river and integrate it into the town centre. It would enforce the continuity of the river and provide the framework for enhancement measures such as boundary treatment, planting, street furniture, access etc in accordance with its designation as Conservation Area.	Dapdune Wharf was included in the draft masterplan consultation document, but the boundary for the interim town centre framework has been amended to exclude this wharf from the town centre boundary. The interim framework places a large emphasis on the river and links with surrounding areas.
Guide Dogs	Agree with designating a leisure and service area, however, there are issues about the topography and access from the station up to the top of the High Street. This needs to be address so that it is not a barrier for disabled people to access these facilities.	Access into and around the town centre for pedestrians is a key consideration of the framework, in particular the effects of the gyratory and some large buildings on access for pedestrians, including the route from the station to the town centre, as well as general issues with the pedestrian environment, including that of narrow footways (pavements). Lack of pedestrian legibility is also recognised as an issue. The interim framework's Strategy seeks to address these issues through measures such as redevelopment of sites, and improvements to road crossings, as well as general environmental enhancements. The historic areas section includes, as part of the Strategy, improvements to connections such as the station and the High Street, and improved pedestrian environments on Bridge Street and the gyratory. Access for disabled people in the town centre should and will be considered as part of and integral to the provision for able-bodied people. In particular, the walking environment around the town centre should always be considered with the needs of sensory-impaired people and wheelchair users in mind. The actual topography of the town is fixed and not something the interim town centre framework can change, but all pedestrian improvements, including surfacing, will take into account the needs of disabled users. Commitment to disabled people's requirements as part of addressing pedestrian needs is specifically referenced on page 159.
Guildford town resident	Why has the large area on the left going away from the station on the Portsmouth Road been undeveloped for so many years? Is there a plan for this area?	The framework document includes two sites for re-development that could be the site in question. These are: the Portsmouth Road surface car park (site 4), or the Guildford Plaza site (site 15). The interim framework provides guidance to support future development of both sites.
Guildford town resident	No comment	Noted. No change required
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	No views	Noted. No change required
Abbots Hospital	The historic space is not all down at the foot of the High Street and along the river. Abbot's occupies a prominent position at the top of the High Street, opposite Holy Trinity where Archbishop George Abbot is buried, and close by the old RGS building where he was schooled.	Abbot's Hospital is recognised in the interim framework's strategy, as part of the historic core area (page 34) and the Castle is now part of the historic spaces area (page 58).

West Horsley Parish Council	Historic spaces including the castle should be opened up visually to the centre with the addition of several small cafes so that people are encouraged to stay longer. More green space and trees would soften the harsh paved area around the Electric Theatre and Millmead areas.	The historic spaces townscape strategy seeks to re-connect historic areas, and to create a major heritage hub tourist destination, linking the Castle and Museum, which were once both part of the castle bailey (page 59). The strategy for historic spaces is also to create an attractive and lively public space between the river and Onslow Street. This is to incorporate landscaping. Plans are also included regarding the implementation of riverside walking routes past the Electric Theatre. The Debenhams site (site 6) is located within the old Millmead conservation area; new planting is included as a consideration for any redevelopment of the site.
Member of the public	I agree that transition areas need to be relatively quiet and relaxing. Re. appearance, traffic, noise, density...	Support noted. The interim framework retains this point.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	Historic Core. We question the statement <i>The high quality of the historic High Street environment and its historic gates creates an overall feeling of quality.</i> It is the historic and distinctive character that makes the area attractive; currently there is much that prevents it being considered a "quality area". Achieving this must be a top priority. Rerword.	This statement has been amended during rewriting to prepare the interim framework.
	Eastern Fringe. As above we object to the aim of establishing a night time economy in this area. We do not recognise the statement that the residential areas are fragmented. We contest the apparent assumption that a buffer between residential and retail areas is desirable, it is the opposite that is desirable. It is essential that retail facilities are easily accessible to local residents by walking, and it should not be necessary to walk through an "leisure" area, dead in the daytime, to eventually reach facilities. We ask that this conception of the area be removed, and that it be returned to a secondary shopping area which would still provide scope for a significant restaurant presence	The Eastern fringe townscape area text has been updated. Whilst concerns are noted, the service and leisure functions of this area do need to be recognised. However shopping is also relevant - Parts of the Upper High Street's shopping function are recognised by its proposed designation through the Local Plan as a secondary shopping frontage; the interim framework published 20 August has an error on the key of Figure 6 Primary shopping area, this will be corrected. Agree pedestrian accessibility to services is important, and is reflected in the interim framework.
Member of the public	As indicated above our twin city of Freiburg is a shining example of good townscape	Point noted however no change required to the document.
Member of the public	Not sure that this should necessarily inform the future strategic vision - we should be considering what the townscape areas of the future will be and influencing the necessary changes. Again there are 'solutions' in micro detail such as the footbridge by the Yvonne Arnaud rather than the more general approach to ensuring there is great accessibility between the different parts of the town, the river and other amenities, etc. In assessing the townscape areas, therefore, this should be a 'strategy-free zone' simply outlining what the various areas are and their characteristics.	The townscape area approach aims to both identify the character of the various areas within the town centre and to understand the current issues and opportunities offered by each (the future of that area).
Quod on behalf of Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd	It is important that the location of the Friary shopping centre and extension site within the 'Historic Core' Townscape area in the Town Centre Masterplan does not place unnecessary restrictions on the site's redevelopment. The site is not located within a Conservation Area and is identified in the 'Historic Fringes' Character Area (3B. 'North Guildford Historic Fringe') in the Council's Landscape Character Assessment (2007). The 'North Guildford Historic Fringe' also incorporates the area to the west of Onslow Street which is identified as 'Commercial Quarter' in the Town Centre Masterplan and the area to the east of the Friary centre which is identified as 'Transition area' in the Town Centre Masterplan. The 'Historic Core' text should therefore acknowledge that the area includes modern developments and that subject to design quality and impact upon surroundings, modern design styles are in this area (as recognised in the Vision).	The historic core strategy recognises the potential of the North Street development site, much of which has been the subject of earlier planning permissions to extend the Friary shopping centre. The North Street design and development brief recognises the opportunity for contemporary design, which is referred to on the corresponding Key opportunity site table on page 56 of the interim framework.
Chairman of The Tyting Society	Unable to comment but heritage is worth integrating into all the thinking	Heritage is fully recognised in the interim framework. The framework's vision and objectives refer to the town centre's distinctive historic character.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	The western commercial quarter is too specific, as sites that are within the local authority's ownership may provide greater mixed uses combining living/working/learning and leisure activities rather than a mono-use such as commercial. This might need to have more flexibility in its terminology to increase the viability of development and to allow other uses to enrich these areas.	Comment noted. The text of the interim framework (6.3 Commercial quarter) recognises the range of uses and opportunities within this area of the town centre.
no name given	Improvements/ repair of the high street setts MUST be included.	Agree, the interim framework references this point.
House of Fraser	Any additional retail space that is to be developed should be within the Historic Core to maintain and enhance the primary shopping area and protect current retailers.	The sequential approach to retail development seeks to direct new retail floor space to the primary shopping area (see Section 3 of the interim framework). Edge-of-centre, then out-of centre, and finally out of town locations will only be considered where there are no more central sites that are available, suitable and viable. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 has identified demand for additional retail floor space.
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	We note that the Guildford Station site is located within the Commercial Quarter. We concur with the description provided of this townscape area (TCM, page 15) and the deficiencies identified. This confirms the considerable potential that the redevelopment of the Station Site and the opportunity to address these recognised deficiencies.	Comments noted, no changes required to the framework.

Guildford Business Forum	Townscape areas – the plan: The townscape type plan shows the London Road Station car park as being part of the commercial quarter. There is no commercial element to it other than a transport hub. In relation to the definition of the commercial quarter, this focuses on the station, which we understand is likely to be a more residential led scheme when it is redeveloped; the Farnham Road car park, which is a car park, not commercial and finally the Law Courts and cinema. We think most people understand “commercial” as being where businesses and in the main, big office buildings, are located and in this regard we believe that the map fails. The main commercial quarter runs from the York Road roundabout, down Onslow Street, around the one-way system into the station where Ranger House is located, across the road to include Smith & Williamson and back up to Bridge Street, returning to York Road roundabout.	The commercial quarter townscape area highlights an area characterised by over-dominant large, stand alone late twentieth century pavilion buildings, and rail infrastructure. Its name draws on the wide interpretation of commercial development used by the National Planning Policy Framework (as in ‘the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development’). The framework does not suggest this is the only commercial area of the town centre and the Business Forum’s comments in this respect are noted.
	The Bedford Road car park is shown as an historic space. Given the “ <i>history</i> ” of the town, are we trying to portray pieces of land that historically have been open or have historical importance? There is no distinction, for example, between the castle and the Bedford Road car park site, or indeed Woodbridge Road cricket ground and the land to the west of it. Accepting that the map cannot be all things to all people, it is confusing how it is currently laid out.	This townscape area reflects the history of the town and importance of its riverside setting. It also recognises that it is an area of great contrasts. No change required.
	Townscape areas – commercial quarter The description of our commercial quarter is a highly unattractive one. Given that we are wishing to attract occupiers into the town, this is a poor message to put out and we believe needs re-thinking.	Comments noted, however it is important to recognise the town centre’s weaknesses, as well as its strengths. These are clear opportunities for the future, which the interim framework details.
Property Consultants	Transition Areas - Agreed, there is plenty of scope for improvement.	Support noted. No change required.
	Eastern Fringe - Clearly the new G Live and Radisson Edwardian should succeed. Regrettably they are completely the opposite end of the town from the principal public transport facilities, even more so if the bus station relocates to Bedford Road.	The Eastern fringe area is within easy walking distance of London Road railway station. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. The movement strategy in the final town centre framework will consider accessibility and movement further.
Environment Agency	The Townscape Areas section includes the following: ‘Although the river appears in three townscape areas and has different characters as it passes through these areas, it also has a continuity that needs reinforcing. This can be aided by adopting a consistent approach to boundary treatment and planting, quality of riverside development, respect for views to and from the river, and riverside access.’ We will always seek to include a minimum 8m wide undeveloped buffer zone between any new development and the bank top of the river. This is the minimum width required for main rivers, to allow essential access for maintenance of the channel and banks as well as to retain a wildlife corridor. Indeed any works within 8m of a main river requires Flood Defence Consent from us. Planting within this buffer zone should be of native species only, preferably of local provenance.	Section 6.6 River Wey of the interim framework recognises the Environment Agency’s requirement for buildings to be set back from the riverside. Page 46 of the interim framework references the Flood Risk Reductions Measures document. It is a target of that document that when a site is redeveloped, the new building should not be any closer to the river than the existing footprint and should be set back at least 8 metres, and more where possible, from the river. One of the specific requirements of the document is that a natural or semi natural buffer zone, at least 8 metres wide when measured from the top of the river bank, should be included between development and the River. This zone can be designed for public access to the river and to enhance biodiversity.
Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	Disagree with the “commercial quarter” description of London Road Station which is in a conservation area and residential in character (See 5). It really does not fit the description of poor quality modern buildings with prominent blank facades and with no public permeability or legibility for pedestrians. It is an attractive traditional station in an open car park with historic landscape features and fine views over the cathedral.	London Road station is part of the Eastern fringe townscape area, not the commercial quarter. No change required.
The Guildford Society	Historic Core We question how the areas north of North Street (including The Friary) can be justified for inclusion as part of the Historic Core. It would appear that, in the context of this Plan, ‘Historic Core’ means the core of the commercial centre of the town and should therefore perhaps be re-named “Commercial Core”. This area also includes important open green spaces: the cricket ground and the Castle grounds.	The Historic core townscape area reflects the history of the town and importance of its riverside setting, it also recognises that it is an area of great contrasts. The framework recognises that commercial uses are situated in many areas of the town centre. Having regard to the historic and central nature of this area, the name Historic core is considered most appropriate. The Castle lies in the Historic Spaces area, not the Historic core. The cricket ground has now been excluded from the town centre boundary.
	Transition areas The Society notes the description of transition areas in the town as being “Their mixed use/residential environment provide a quieter, pleasant atmosphere within the town centre.” We simply observe that the ‘quieter, pleasant atmosphere’ of 6 Haydon Place and College Road may soon to be shattered by the arrival of a Waitrose Supermarket. (See the Society’s comments in respect of Site 19 (Bellerby Theatre).	Comment noted. A current planning application is being considered for this development.
	The Commercial area description should surely mention the railway station, much the largest of its components.	The Commercial quarter townscape area refers to the railway station. No change required.
	Historic spaces - The Society disagrees with the plan shown on (the un-numbered) page 14 showing the Debenhams Store, areas within the Gyratory and the area of Bridge Street and Bedford Road as ‘Historic spaces’ when they are not ‘spaces’ nor do these areas accord with the definition of such areas within the Plan (as being areas “retaining a sense of seclusion from the lively town”).	The text has been updated in preparing the interim framework. It explains that the Historic spaces townscape area comprises mixed commercial, entertainment, leisure and civic uses, within remnants of open space.
Analysis - River		
Surrey Wildlife Trust	Yes. There is an opportunity to introduce/familiarise the term ‘Biodiversity’ here as well as ‘Wildlife’.	Agree, as biodiversity is recognised on page 157 regarding the importance of the River Wey. It will be included in the River Wey Analysis section.

Guildford town resident	Why no mention of the detrimental effect of a new and inappropriate bus station?	A study regarding the Guildford Bus Station is scheduled to conclude in late 2012. The study acknowledges that there are pros and cons of every option regarding the future location of the bus station.
Member of the public	Any improvement for park and seating areas and riverside pathways are to be welcomed. the riverside area in bedford road is a disgrace and will be further destroyed by a proposed bus station.	Comments noted. It is one of the objectives of the interim framework to enhance the appearance and use of the River Wey and its riverside
Member of the public	The river is a major asset to the town but I do not think its frontages reflect that.	Agree, many of the frontages do not reflect the river as a major asset of the town. The interim framework includes a strategy to improve and enhance this area. Frontages will start to improve as pedestrian access is improved and enhanced along the river, and key sites along the river are redeveloped.
Member of the public	The river is a natural asset that should be exploited.	Agree. It is one of the objectives of the interim framework to enhance the appearance and use of the River Wey and its riverside
Guildford town resident	I agree; an under exploited part of the town that could be used to link various areas.	Agree that the river is not currently used to its full potential. The interim framework and redevelopment of key sites along the river will seek to improve this.
Guildford town resident	Should be part of town not hidden away like a ditch as at present.	Comments noted. It is one of the objectives of the interim framework to enhance the appearance and use of the River Wey and its riverside
Planning Development control regeneration specialists	The river environments should be enhanced. The river should form a focus for provision of town centre amenity space e.g. river side walk supported by cafes, Hotels and restaurants etc. Any future development along the river should seek the transfer of 6m of the riverside land for future public amenity space i.e riverside walk.	Agree. It is one of the objectives of the interim framework to enhance the appearance and use of the River Wey and its riverside. Page 46 of the interim framework references the Flood Risk Reductions Measures document. It is a target of that document that when a site is redeveloped, the new building should not be any closer to the river than the existing footprint and should be set back at least 8 metres, and more where possible, from the river. One of the specific requirements of the document is that a natural or semi natural buffer zone, at least 8 metres wide when measured from the top of the river bank, should be included between development and the River. This zone can be designed for public access to the river and to enhance biodiversity.
Member of the public	Largely agree. However, any plan to improve the river area or develop it should very strongly take into account the natural environment. The area that has been reseeded with flowers (Woodbridge Meadows) is a good example of good maintenance that allows lots of wildlife to flourish. Strong resistance to greenfield development south of Millmead lock, should be exhibited. The area north of Friary Bridge needs attention but it should be attended to in a wildlife-friendly way.	Noted. These points are all dealt with in the interim framework's strategy.
Guildford town resident	Actively enforce access to and along the river both within the designated town centre and beyond.	Comments noted. It is one of the objectives of the interim framework to enhance the appearance and use of the River Wey and its riverside. One element of the strategy for this area is to improve connections between key destinations such as to and across the riverside, to the station and between the High Street / tourist information centre and Guildford Castle and museum.
National Trust	We have previously commented (July 2011) on an earlier draft of the Plan and are pleased to see that many of our comments have been taken on board. In particular we welcome the new emphasis on enhancing the setting of the River Wey and the proposed development of the potential of the waterway as a major environmental and amenity asset within the town centre. The section entitled The River (page 17 /18) should be called 'The River Wey'. By way of background we suggest that it is explained that the National Trust owns and manages the river and is the navigation authority. With regard to Policy G11 of the Local Plan we suggest that some clarification is given as to the future of this policy within the framework of the Core Strategy and Town Centre Master Plan. We firmly believe that it is important this policy is retained within the statutory development plan. We welcome the reference to the Trust's latest Planning Guidelines 2011 and would be pleased to see these appended to the final version of the Plan.	Thank you for your comments and constructive input regarding previous consultations and the progression towards this version of document. A new strategy has been drawn up specifically for the River Wey. This interim framework cannot and will not change policy. The policy will be considered in drafting the new Local Plan and a decision as to whether to replace it / update it or not will be made through the new Local Plan (on which you will be consulted).
Guildford town resident	The River Wey is a prime asset of the town. It needs to be opened up as a leisure and movement corridor.	Agree. The strategy promotes a continuous route alongside the river and more visitor moorings to encourage greater activity.
Guildford borough residents	Any improvement of the river side is good for the community and visitors	Agree.
Guide Dogs	Railings to the river are being discussed re removal this needs careful thought re the needs of the vulnerable / less sighted / low vision residents	Thank you for your comments. Although the interim framework discusses the possible removal of unnecessary riverside railing, it does say that any decision to do this would be informed by consideration of those with sight impairments. (p.100)

Turley Associates on behalf of Hermes Real Estate Investment Management Ltd, leasehold owner of the Friary Shopping Centre.	The River Wey is a key asset but is currently undervalued. Future development in proximity to the river should have regard to its setting and seek to enhance the riverside.	Agree. The interim framework includes a strategy to address this.
TURLEY ASSOCIATES on behalf of Hermes Real Estate Investment Management Ltd	The River Wey is a key asset but is currently undervalued. Future development in proximity to the river should have regard to its setting and seek to enhance the riverside.	Agree. The interim framework includes a strategy to address this.
Guildford Labour Party	The River Wey runs through the town centre area, but Guildford does not make enough of this wonderful feature. To the south of the town bridge, there is good access and many people use the riverside. However, visitors who come to Guildford town centre from the east and north may not be aware of this area. The High Street needs some signage to tell visitors about the riverside amenities. For example, visitor information boards in all main car parks, and outside the Friary Centre and in the High Street could be used to draw attention to the river (as well as the Castle and Museum). The River Wey should become a major feature north of the Town Bridge as well as south, by opening up access and making visitors aware of it. Development along the riverside to the north of the town bridge should increase access, not continue to hide the river as it does now.	Linking of the town centre's various visitor attractions is a key part of the strategy.
	The report says we need to make more of the River Wey and enhance its appearance, but there is little evidence of this in the document, with no unified plan. One of the few places where people can access the river to the north of the old town bridge is through Bedford Road – and the council want to block this in with a bus station. In describing riverside sites, there are piecemeal ideas for rebuilding, but not mention of opening up views and access. People will not use the riverside if they do not know it is there or they cannot access it. Any redevelopment should allow for a proper, wide riverside walkway – and we need to draw people to the river – through opening out the area between the town bridge, Bridge Street and Bedford Road. The current document has very little discussion of how to improve river access, and one of the main points it mentions is “potentially unnecessary railings”!	Agree that this was a weakness in the draft masterplan. The interim strategy includes linking of the town centre's various visitor attractions, and a strategy for improving the appearance, use and access to the River Wey.
Guilford town resident	We must be one of the few towns who makes so little of its river frontage.	Comments noted. The interim framework recognises significant opportunities to improve and enhance the river area, and cites the example of Kingston where the once industrial riverside has been transformed to a lively and attractive area (p.99).
Guilford town resident	I agree that more should be done to enhance use of the river frontage.	Comments noted. It is one of the objectives of the interim framework to enhance the appearance and use of the River Wey and its riverside
Guilford town resident	Yes agree make the most of this huge asset	Comments noted. It is one of the objectives of the interim framework to enhance the appearance and use of the River Wey and its riverside
Member of public	There is no acknowledgement of the importance of the River Wey and its potential for healthy leisure activities, a “green lung” and a tourist attraction. Even worse, the treatment of the river in the planning decisions of recent years has been a depressing case of “planning blight” and lost opportunities. Also, why no proper reference to Guildford's fine architectural heritage and other cultural assets, or its many outstanding schools, both maintained and independent, all of which make it a very pleasant place to live?	These are all acknowledged in the interim framework
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	Demolish Debenhams and remove Car Parks from prime riverside space	The Debenhams site is identified in the framework as having redevelopment potential. The site is privately owned. Many surface car parks close to the river have been identified for redevelopment, and therefore can take all available opportunities to improve and enhance the riverside.
Guildford town resident	The river is a tremendous asset and we do not make enough of it. It should be attractive along its entire length, with a safe towpath.	Comments noted. It is one of the objectives of the interim framework to enhance the appearance and use of the River Wey and its riverside
Abbots Hospital	We would support any plans to improve the recreational utility of the river and its environs.	Comments noted. One of the elements of the strategy for the river area is to increase use of the river with additional short stay / visitor moorings and increased leisure uses.
Guildford town resident	The Millmead car park should not be there. What a wonderful area to landscape, with cafes, galleries, so that people could enjoy the river. The river seems undervalued by the Council and should have much more focus in the town	Assume this comment is referring to the Portsmouth Road Car Park, close to Millmead. If so, Portsmouth Road Car Park is identified as an opportunity site with potential for development of riverside cafes/restaurants and community hub, recommending that a green open space, possibly with some landscaping along the riverside would create a pleasant area in which to rest and relax and would provide for emergency flood water storage. The framework says this could enhance the riverside and provide an attractive riverside walk between the railway station and the shops.

Member of the public	I have lived in the town centre of Guildford for over 40 years and have never understood why the riverside as not been used for housing. If you visit Oxford, Marlow and many other towns, much has been made of the river great housing schemes of good quality, environmentally sound, smaller homes (not just flats). I know of many older people wishing to downsize from large houses in the town but who want to stay in the town centre, close to the station, shops and theatres. In Guildford much of the riverside is used for factories, car showrooms, warehouses etc let's have some vision for the future!	Any land use close to a river is likely to be at risk of flooding, and this is particularly the case in some areas of Guildford Town Centre. Residential development close to the river cannot be given planning permission unless it can be demonstrated that the development will not increase flood risk on site or elsewhere and will where possible, actually reduce flood risk. To achieve this can sometimes affect the viability of development proposals, as it can be more expensive to design developments that reduce flood risk. However, given the attractiveness of riverside locations, the demand for housing in the borough, and the opportunities for development presented by the Flood Risk Reduction Measures document, the national planning policy framework and this interim framework, it is hoped that residential accommodation can be provided on some redevelopment sites close to the river. The situation regarding older people still wishing to live in the town centre but downsize is recognised.
Member of the public	I agree that the river is important for wildlife. As also is the railway line. Any developments and ongoing sites management should provide for and support wildlife.	Comments noted. The framework acknowledges the wildlife value of the River Wey. Planning applications for development would also have to consider this and most likely carry out an ecological assessment.
Member of the public	the river WILL flood! Anything that is done here will need to bear that in mind. Any work done to prevent flood damage will likely move the flood risk somewhere else. However there are other towns in the county where there are rivers and there are underground developments adjacent.	Comments noted. The National Planning Policy Framework does not allow planning permission to be granted unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant that development will not increase flood risk on site or elsewhere, and where possible, it should actually reduce flood risk on site and elsewhere (paragraph 103 NPPF).
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	8.1. The worst riverside area is between the Town Bridge and Bridge Street. Add: <u>environmental improvements will be made to the area between the Y and the Standard Life building</u> 8.2. A key route serving the riverside as well as the Town Centre is the "Riverside Route" from the station to the Town Bridge. Add The Riverside route will be adopted by the Highways authority and refurbished.	This area is included in the strategy for extension of the riverside walk.
Member of the public	The River should be much better integrated with the town centre	Comments noted. It is part of the strategy for the river area to improve access to the river. This will better integrate it with the town centre.
Member of the public	Access to the river should be signed more clearly e.g. with routes via the river signposted, or circular walks highlighted. Use of the river should be promoted further for recreation. Immediate access e.g. tourist rowing, and long term access e.g. local residents joining the kayak or rowing clubs.	Comments noted. It is recognised in the document as an opportunity to introduce a broad-based signage / information strategy to improve connections between currently disparate attractions /areas in the town centre. An element of the strategy for the river area is to increase use of the river with additional short stay / visitor moorings and increased leisure uses
Member of the public	We do not make the river an asset at present as it is surrounded by car parks and the access is limited. This area could be improved and made part of the town centre.	Agree. A strategy for improving and enhancing the riverside is including in the framework.
Member of the public	Interestingly, the river is so hidden from most people's experience of the town that they do not comment on it. This should be a key resource. The riversides are far less attractive and accessible than they should be and it should be a key part of the leisure offering of the town.	Agree. A strategy for improving and enhancing the riverside is including in the framework, including as part of the strategy for the river area to increase use of the river with additional short stay / visitor moorings and increased leisure uses
Chairman of The Tyting Society	Over the last 20 years this has majorly opened up; let's hope it can become even more utilised and be fully integrated	Comments noted. It is the intention of the strategy for the river area for it to be better utilised, enhanced and improved.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	The objective to enhance the experience for resident/worker and tourist is important to help enliven a crucial element of Guildford that has been discontinuous and under-used for many years. The ability to generate development to maximise site sales value with waterfront dwellings, vibrant cafes/restaurants and leisure activity is essentially a feeder for the success of the High Street. The river is a core experience, which if made more accessible, will open up other permeable ways to experience Guildford and move through the town centre. Good, safe cycle routes along the river's edge should be considered.	Riverside improvements and redevelopment of riverside sites, riverside walks, and new visitor moorings are highlighted in the strategy as ways to enliven the river. A continuous pedestrian and cycle route along the river is also part of its strategy.
No name given	No development should be allowed that does not enhance access and enjoyment of the river and it's frontage, especially Bedford road site.	Comments noted. Any planning application for development in the town centre must be determined in accordance with the Local Plan (2003) and the NPPF. The interim framework if adopted would be a material planning consideration (see page 4 of the framework).
CTC	The towing path provides the only decent opportunity for a shared use cycle/walking facility in the area. Unfortunately while useful it could be greatly improved, with better sightlines, width, better drainage and a proper surface, akin to the work done to improve the Basingstoke Canal in Woking. The use of an unbound dust surface makes this path unusable in very wet weather.	A continuous pedestrian and cycle route along the river is part of the interim framework's strategy.
Member of the public	The river is a real asset to our town.	Comments noted. The interim framework recognises this.

Guildford Business Forum	Whilst the opening line states that the river is a valuable asset for the town, the remainder of these two pages is simply descriptive and does not demonstrate the importance of the river and a changing attitude towards it. If it is an important feature, which it absolutely is, there needs to be a strong policy to enhance access to it, the visibility to it, repair and condition of it, setting of it and the way buildings address it. Developments should encourage pedestrians to enjoy the benefits of it wherever possible, Leisure/commercial development should be actively encouraged along the river and incorporated into any scheme.	The background description of importance of the river and its history are now included in the Background information in Appendix 3. A strategy for the River Wey itself has been drawn up and is included in the interim framework.
Environment Agency	We welcome the 'River' section in the document but think that it needs expanding to include a commitment to improving the biodiversity and habitats of the river corridor, and to contribute towards river basin planning under the Water Framework Directive (WFD). The biodiversity of the river corridor is poor in places, mainly due to the hard bank protection throughout much of the town and the paucity of shallow margins of the navigation. Whilst removal of the hard banks is not possible in many places for flood risk reasons, there are many ways that the corridor could be improved. These range from planting of marginal plants as has been done in the past at Millmead, to incorporating artificial nesting sites in the hard banks for species such as kingfishers and sand martins. Reference should also be made to the WFD and the target to reach Good Ecological Potential. The Wey through Guildford is a high priority water body for us in terms of WFD as it fails for a number of reasons including physical modification and diffuse pollution, both due to urbanisation. Securing habitat enhancements through redevelopments, and encouraging a Green Infrastructure network will help to achieve improvements to the water body and to deliver the objectives of the River Basin Management Plan.	A strategy section has been produced for the River Wey. This level of detail is not suitable for including in the town centre framework. We are currently working on evidence on green infrastructure for inclusion in our new Local Plan.
No name given	There does not appear to be a vision to develop the whole river side as an attractive leisure area by reserving a walk way	A continuous pedestrian and cycle route along the river is part of the interim framework's strategy.
Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	Need to be much more ambitious about the river corridor and specify celebrating the water front with attractive green space, squares, sensitive buildings and views. The building line should be moved back over time for the flood plain and to create a continuous pedestrian path along each bank as redevelopment allows.	Agree, the interim framework includes a strategy for the River Wey.
on behalf of MC Nominees owners of site at rear of Walnut Tree Close	The River Wey is noted as an area which offers a quiet place by the riverside to relax. The possible inclusion of restaurants, bars I pubs some distance from the central area of the town (and within a transition zone) does not support the opportunity for a quiet area (see covering letter).	Different sections of the River Wey could include more activity whilst other areas retain their tranquillity. The suggested areas for riverside cafes and bars are in the very centre, between the High Street and Guildford Railway station
The Guildford Society	River We are pleased to see and entirely endorse the statement in the TCM that 'The River Wey navigation is a valuable asset for the town centre'. We regret that for many years the value of this feature has not been recognised and, as a result, opportunities for enhancement and access have frequently been lost. (See also our comments in respect of Site12 (Former Farnham Road bus station). To make the TCM more positive the sentence "Where appropriate, public access along the river is to be provided as a continuous river walk ..." should be replaced by "Every opportunity should be taken to secure a continuous river walk with public access along both sides of the river..."	A continuous pedestrian and cycle route along the river is part of the interim framework's strategy.
	The Society agrees with the statement that the Millmead footbridge is important to the functioning of Millmead Lock and, in particular, we fully endorse the statement in the TCM that the present temporary footbridge at Millmead Lock is in urgent need of replacement with a new bridge of suitable design. The Society urges the Council to encourage the National Trust to secure its early replacement. The river should be the focus of the masterplan and the treatment of public spaces along it and removal of traffic from its banks should be one of the key spatial objectives of the masterplan.	Noted. This is included in the strategy. The interim framework has a strategy for the River Wey, to deliver objective TC4 and this element of the Vision.
Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (on behalf of the Guildford Society)	The river is the town centre's primary environmental asset and should be the central thread along which all proposals are connected. The identification of the River Wey as an asset is welcomed, and the Guildford Society is keen to promote a more explicit focus on the enhancement of the river corridor within the Masterplan.	Noted. The interim framework includes a River Wey strategy.
Strategy - Making better places through development		
Surrey Wildlife Trust	Biodiversity by Design (http://www.tcpa.org.uk/data/files/bd_biodiversity.pdf) / Design for Biodiversity (http://www.d4b.org.uk/keyConcepts/index.asp) key concepts should be referenced here.	Comment noted. This section has been rewritten in the interim framework.
Guildford town resident	Downgrading the bus system of the town makes a nonsense of some parts of the Parking Strategy. Do the writers of this half-baked plan use the buses themselves? "...property advisors new bus station in the current planning permission is a barrier to its implementation". Not proven and negated by App 1 page 7	Comment noted. The Council has been advised by specialist that the extant planning permission is not viable and one reason given is the bus station.
Member of the public	I suggest that 'retail need' given under Strategy is flawed in that it does not consider consumers' changing shopping habits. Given the perceived increase in online shopping and what motivates the public, plus the attraction of a good bargain, I suggest that turning the Friary lower ground floor into a huge indoor, continental style market will draw visitors. It could be fronted by a modern bus station to include library, museum on that floor. I envisage librarians playing an active historical role to welcome visitors. Upper floors could still accommodate retail and lowcost family housing. I am sure that eg M&S would alter its frontage to reflect Guildford Friary and monks if the company thought more shoppers would come and maybe install one or two in-house monks/nuns. M&S has excellent marketing skills and will set a precedent. In this way, Guildford's unique heritage will be celebrated to the advantage of its reputation without being 'tacky.'	Comments noted. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.
Guildford town resident	We have had some very good developments within the town in recent years; as long as these potential new areas are treated as part of a coherent plan then it can only be for the good.	Comment noted.

Thames Water	Policy NRM2 relates to Water Quality and lists a number of water quality/sewerage infrastructure issues which local authorities should take into account in preparing Local Development Documents including ensuring that: "...adequate wastewater and sewerage capacity is provided to meet planned demand...".	Comment noted. The interim framework does not form part of the Local Plan (Local Development Framework) as is therefore not a LDD.
Guildford town resident	Urgent need for completion of Manor Park 'Park and Ride'. Housing - Agree with comments but they are at odds with proposal to move the bus station to the edge of the town centre.	Comment noted. The Council is progressing the Manor Park and Ride.
Planning Development control regeneration specialists	There are short term measures which can make better places without the need for wholesale development. The document should make it clear that place making will be based on principles of sustainable development only. There is no high end hotel in the town centre and near the station.	Comment noted.
Member of the public	I support the Bedford road plan to redevelop the car park to a bus station. I also agree with the redesignation of surface parking to other uses, but only as part of an integrated transport plan including looking at the flow of traffic around the Bridge St gyratory.	Comment noted. Further work on a movement strategy is being undertaken.
Guildford town resident	New Friary area allowing maximum density of retail development will compromise the experience here there must be open spaces and squares within this new development	This site is identified for a mixed use development within the North Street Design and Development Brief 2012.
Guildford town resident	There is a need for greater emphasis on the preservation of long views into and from the Town Centre – this is a very important part of the ambience of Guildford. There should be more housing in the Town Centre – the recent moves (eg Bellerby site and Bus station) to create more retail space rather than housing runs counter to the need for housing. Especially as the retail markets are switching away from shopping centres to on line shopping.	The role of planning is to balance the competing demands for uses. We have a need for housing, retail and offices and we must try to meet all of these needs. Retail and office must be located in the town centre first in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. Housing is a less locationally sensitive use and can be located outside of the primary shopping area. There are many sites in the town centre with the potential for redevelopment to meet all of these needs.
CBRE for Merseyside Pension Fund, owner of Tunsgate Square Shopping Centre	Need for a coordinated vision for south side of town centre - In the introduction to the draft masterplan, the Council talk of the coordinated redevelopment of key sites to ensure the town centre remains a lively, attractive, economically robust and environmentally sustainable place. However the identified key sites are heavily directed to the north west side of the town centre (the station, Friary extension, new Waitrose, North Street regeneration, the Riverside). Whilst parts of High Street are very strong, adjacent areas on the south side are not, and although the draft masterplan has some proposals for improvements (including pedestrianisation and other placemaking initiatives for Tunsgate and Castle Street), there is little consideration of how sites such as those on Sydenham Road will collectively contribute to the vitality of this part of the town centre.	Comments noted. Sites on Sydenham Road have been included in the interim framework including the Old Basketworks and Bright Hill Car park.
	If the Council's various individual aspirations for this area are to be realised, a coordinated vision is required which will make this historic quarter of the town a distinctive destination able to hold its own in the face of the major developments on the north side of the town centre. The identification of Tunsgate Square as a key site can play a role in this, but it needs to be set in the context of a wider vision for this quarter. We recommend that a vision is developed. Identify Tunsgate Square as a key site - It is almost certain that Tunsgate Square will require refurbishment, reconfiguration or redevelopment in the next five to ten years, and we therefore recommend that it is included as a key site in the masterplan. Its inclusion in the masterplan would provide a basis on which Merseyside Pension Fund can work with the Council to make best use of the opportunity at the site to meet the wider aspirations set out in the masterplan vision.	Comments noted. Tunsgate is identified as a potential site in the interim framework.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	We have argued through many GBC consultations that the planned provision of additional luxury retail is too large. It is now increasingly out of step with national retail trends, and will not benefit Guildford or its Residents. We note that the high retail rentals and return on investment are regarded as indicators of planning success in the Masterplan; this is not the criteria that we would apply. The issue for shoppers and retailers in Guildford is not the quantity of retail space; it is the diversity of provision and the shopping experience that are the key problems. The continuing shrinkage of convenience shopping, and the disappearance of small independent retailers, now drives some of us to visit other towns, such as Godalming, to meet our needs. This problem has been identified in several retail studies, but is largely ignored. Our need is for greater retail diversity, not relentless expansion of "big name" luxury shopping.	Comments noted. The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sqm is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension.
	The shopping experience is blighted by traffic problems and lack of amenities around the retail areas which these plans do not address and in fact make worse. Another concern, expressed many times before, is that too large a proportion of Guildford's retail activity would lie in the hands of a single provider. The area that our organisation covers is adjacent to the centre, and many of our members chose to live here in order to minimise car use. Alternative transport provision, including bus travel, is therefore of great importance to us. The function of the bus station as a service to residents has been ignored. Its location is also of crucial importance to town development plans; it is regarded as a "transport node" the only other identified node being the railway station. The distance from these nodes is used as a criteria to set planning objectives, for example the acceptable density of housing. It is vital that the location matches future development plans, particularly for transport integration; it is wrong to relocate the station simply to increase the value of one commercial site.	Comments noted. A movement strategy is being undertaken and will inform the final town centre framework.
	We are shocked that the decision has been made before the Town Centre Masterplan has been developed, and without any consultation with interested groups such as ourselves and the other residents groups close to the centre, or TFG and the walking Forum. This seems to be flying in the face of the principles of the new Localism Act. We all have much local knowledge that if utilised could greatly reduce the cost of studies by external consultants. We consider that the proposed move, and the associated rerouting of the buses on the Eastern routes, would degrade our bus facilities.	Comments noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies.

Guildford town resident	Big mistake to move the bus station further away from the railway station. Should be like Reading where you can step out of one into the other.	Comments noted. There are many varying views of where the bus facility should be located and the Council will need to balance these views along with feasibility studies to determine the preferred location for the bus facility.
Guildford town resident (edge of town centre)	Making better places through development Site 02 A, B, C & Site 09 - Subject to traffic planning (see earlier) to add to both Site Areas in Opportunities and suggested uses 'That the key pedestrian route between the station, and at least the Friary, should be uninterrupted for all pedestrian users'. ie. Not having to cross traffic lanes in Onslow Street perhaps linking with the current route from the Bedford Row car park. Any change here will need to be made in the section Infrastructure Delivery Page 61/64.	Comments noted. A movement strategy is being undertaken and will inform the final town centre framework.
Guildford borough residents	The Parking Strategy, which indicates redevelopment of some existing temporary sites will have an impact on street parking for visiting motorists. This affects those already living in the town. More must be done to encourage motorists to use your Park and Ride Facilities.	The Parking Strategy is being updated the new study will inform the final town centre framework.
Guide Dogs	Equality and accessibility for all is critical consider vulnerable people please!	Comment noted, agree. All users will be catered for where possible.
Guildford Labour Party	The Masterplan does focus on retail, but it is obvious now that Friary Extension proposals will not happen as Westfield envisaged them. We need a new plan for the redevelopment of the town centre. This needs to replace the semi-derelict area between the Friary and Leapale Road. The priority in this area is to retain good access by public transport. The bus station should remain in the middle of the town centre & retail development be situated around it. If the bus station were to be substantially rebuilt & renovated in the same general area as it is now, it would be an attractive feature that could be valued by retailers. Guildford has fallen behind as a retail attraction as new development has happened in Kingston, Reading, and Basingstoke. We need to ensure that a new scheme is brought forward quickly – as the retail study indicated, no change is a step backward when rival centres are being improved.	Comment noted. The North Street Design and Development brief aims to bring forward and promote the redevelopment of this area.
	Parking and housing - The Masterplan suggests house building as an option on many of the surface car parks in the town (including the railway station car park). The Masterplan mentions the plan to reduce long-term parking spaces. However, we think this is a very short-sighted philosophy. Reducing parking spaces will deter shoppers and tourists from visiting the town. The park and ride schemes do help bring people into the town, but many of the routes used by visitors do not have park and ride car parks (from the A3, Worplesdon Road, Woking Road, the London Road/old A3 route from Burpham). We believe the current car parking provision should be maintained, so any redevelopment of existing sites should include retention of the same number of spaces.	Comment noted. The Council is currently producing an updated parking strategy and this will inform the final town centre framework.
	Housing is usually suggested for existing surface car parks sites. There is a massive shortfall of housing in Guildford and prices are out of reach of most first-time buyers. There are some town centre sites that would be very suitable for housing, but if development always replaces business sites and parking sites with housing, the town's economy will suffer. We must look at house building beyond brownfield sites in the town centre. The vision is for Guildford to improve its infrastructure to support a growing population. But even the waiting list for the most urgent housing cases is growing, the council's plan for house building is not ambitious enough and it is not even hitting that. At the same time, we cannot build houses on every site that becomes available if this means losing businesses on every one. House building on the edge of the town is still the best option.	Comment noted. Agree that housing is less locationally sensitive and can be provided outside of the primary shopping area and town centre, whereas other uses must be located in the town centre as a priority location before looking elsewhere. We must however create mixed sustainable communities and encourage a mix of uses.
Guildford town resident	See number 7	Comment noted.
Guildford town resident	This all seems excellent. Of course delivery is the key. Use compulsory purchase powers for this you will need a clear objective for the site and public support.	Comment noted.
Guildford town resident	It is difficult to comment on the parking strategy until the results of the review are known, but it is a key issue. I reiterate my opposition to the prioritisation of an increase in retail outlets over other initiatives such as improved traffic flow and transport services I am not in favour of the proposed move of the bus station to Bedford Road, and fail to understand why a "smaller facility" will operate more efficiently and effectively	Comments noted. The parking strategy review will inform the final town centre framework. An increase in retail has not been given priority over other uses or issues but the need for more retail is one issue that the framework considers. Any increase in retail will be subject to detailed transport and traffic modelling. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined.
Guildford town resident	The plan should look at development of all locations as a whole *as well* as looking at individual locations.	Comment noted. This is the aim of the interim town centre framework.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	None	Comment noted.
Member of the public	I disagree with statement on page 21 re new 'bus facility' at Bedford Road surface car park that it 'will operate more effectively and efficiently'. The restricted access to the location and potential conflict with cars entering and leaving the multi-storey car park is overlooked. The space is inadequate for future expansion of bus services which needs to be allowed for if it is intended that other road traffic in the gyratory system is reduced. The sentence 'Additionally there is likely to be some need for on street stands.' is ambiguous. The fact that under the MVA Consultancy report approved by the Executive in October 2011, several of these stands are planned for the upper High Street area where buses to and from the east of Guildford will terminate and start from is not mentioned. These statements do not support the statement in section 2, Vision on Transport and other infrastructure, (i.e. that the town centre will have improved infrastructure, in particular transport to support a growing population and workforce) and Objective 3.	Comments noted. This reference has now been removed. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is the subject of detailed studies to find the best solution.
Abbots Hospital	We would support moves to properly recognise the existence of defined residential zones in the town centre.	Comment noted. The boundary of the town centre in the interim framework is drawn to exclude areas which are mainly residential. It recognises the transitional zones between the primary shopping area and the surrounding residential areas.

West Horsley Parish Council	More short stay parking is needed if all the temporary sites are closed. The Park and Ride facilities are good for some people who work in Guildford but the service does not operate for long enough for workers in the service sectors or if the shops are to be open for longer. Improve these services first. Guildford has a personality, it is not bland like neighbouring towns. A bigger retail opportunity is not always better. Individual shops rather than chains have a big impact on the shopping attraction of a centre. No cars should be allowed at any time in the High street, deliveries should be before 8am or at very restricted times.	Comments noted. The framework recognises that there is an opportunity to extend the hours of the high street's pedestrianisation.
	Where is the evidence of good public transport? Bus services are too infrequent from the Eastern side of the centre for people to make regular use of, they do not operate for long/late enough hours. The Clandon Park and Ride stops too early in the evening, for example shoppers on Saturdays would stay in Guildford to use restaurants if the service lasted until 10/11pm. This Park and Ride stops at 7:15pm, people who want to extend their visit choose to travel in by car. The train services are too expensive. Note the comparison of train fares as follows, all prices taken from National Rail for travel at the same time of day 8 am and returning at 5pm on week days: Horsley to Guildford Return ticket £7:50 (14 mins travel time), Kings Norton to Birmingham New Street Return Ticket £ 3:80 (15 mins travel time), Long Eaton to Nottingham Return £4:00(18 mins travel time). The train service is in operation, the infrastructure exists and will not create a cost for GBC to find, cheaper fares create more demand and would raise more revenue for South West Trains which in turn would benefit Guildford by reducing road traffic.	Comments noted.
	Increased town centre living is important but think about who can afford the properties, young or elderly seem to be the obvious markets so smaller properties should be the main target market for any development.	Comments noted.
Member of the public	Bus station that is hidden and separate from both station and shops seems bad idea. Itself would separate station and shops	Comment noted.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	The strategy "strand" <i>making places better through sustainable living</i> has little meaning. The Masterplan must have a central objective of applying policies that aim at genuinely sustainable operation of the centre. However it must be recognised that many objectives of the plan, such as encouragement of consumerism by retail expansion, Park and Ride, are not sustainable.	Comments noted. The document has been reworked and no longer contains this stand.
	a) Making better places through development. Parking Strategy. The dominant objective must be to reduce the demand for town centre parking by improving and exploiting the alternative forms of transport, particularly rail. The aim to encourage improvements in pedestrian, cycle and public transport accessibility is too weak. Replace encourage by will achieve.	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	Retail need. The treatment of this issue, perhaps the most important for future town centre plans, is much too vague, with no quantification of needs or prediction of provision, in either the main document or the quoted Appendix 1. However the impression from this document and other sources is that open-ended expansion of retail is to be pursued. We strongly oppose this. In particular we object to further increase to the Friary expansion plans, and the relocation of the bus station to achieve this. The <i>objective must be to improve the quality and diversity of retail, and improve the shopping experience</i> . A properly considered prediction of quantity of retail needed must be made. We ask that this issue be properly considered and consumers consulted as well as retail providers, and a clear policy produced.	Comments noted. The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sqm is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension.
	<i>Housing. Guildford town centre is the most sustainable location in the Borough to live in.</i> This is not necessarily correct. Only if cars are not owned or used will a contribution to sustainability be made. The objective must be to provide housing for those meeting this criteria, without on-site parking or residents parking permits. To encourage more cars into the centre would be foolish, and street parking problems would spread out into the adjacent residential areas. The capacity for more housing is limited if quality of housing, with proper provision of outdoor amenity space is to be provided. An assessment of what could realistically be obtained is needed. An associated aim must be to improve walking routes to give town centre dwellers better access to the nearby countryside. We fully support the aim, within the above constraints, of increasing affordable housing.	Comments noted.
Member of the public	The key sites appear to be considered individually as not part of one overall plan.	Comment noted. The sites are now considered as part of the surrounding context and have a strategy associated with each area.
Member of the public	This non-strategic unintegrated approach to development will NOT tend to make better places - it is more of what has made Guildford disjointed and introverted than what makes it potentially a great place to live, work, shop, learn and play. Groups of sites in a similar location should be considered en masse rather than piecemeal.	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
Quod on behalf of Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd	We agree with the identification of Site 18 - 'Land bounded by North Street/Leapale Road and Commercial Road bus station' as a site which would bring benefits to the town centre through redevelopment. This is a strategically important site and as identified in the Retail and Leisure Study (2011) has the potential to accommodate a significant amount of town centre use floorspace. We support the statement that along with Guildford station, the redevelopment of the land to the east of the Friary Shopping Centre is the largest potential regeneration site and that it is important in ensuring a successful future for the town centre. We also agree that the development of the site is substantially affected by the position of the town's bus station and support the Council's intention to submit a planning application in 2012 for a bus facility at Bedford Road to help facilitate the redevelopment of the Friary Centre extension site.	Comments noted. The framework now considers sites in a similar location.
Chairman of The Tyting Society	THE GBC professional team are better able to comment on this huge subject. The money saved from moving the bus station to the end of the line will more than pay for 10 minute shuttles from all park and ride from end to end	Comment noted.

Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Guildford has identified a wealth of development opportunities that are in sync with the aspiration to improve the town and maintain its status as a principal high street in the UK. However, there are structural parts of the town that are hindering careful progress and wealth generation for the economic prosperity of the town. Appropriate development that unpicks areas, which are hindering economic improvement must happen to act as a catalyst for structural moves of uses around the town, opening up sites for more appropriate development.	Comments noted.
No name given	No mention is made of quality and this should be included in design/materials.	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
House of Fraser	We are concerned at the potential loss of short term parking spaces in Guildford which may have a significant impact on retailing. Given the Council's proposal to increase retail floorspace in Guildford, it is crucial that there is no net loss of short term car parking in the town.	Comment noted. There is currently a review of the parking strategy which will inform the town centre framework.
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	We consider the rationale for the TCM Strategy could be made clearer by being restructured to be consistent with guidance in relation to DPD's as follows.	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	1. Identify the relevant evidence base for the TCM.	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	2. Refer to needs which have been identified through this evidence base addressing all the different land uses and transportation matters.	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	3.. Strategic constraints, such as flood risk, are then considered.	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	4. Identify individual sites suitable to meet the various needs and opportunities having regard to the constraints.	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	5. Consider ownership and delivery issues. In particular, we would also suggest that it is the TCM which should inform your Council's Asset Review to determine which of its sites come forward for redevelopment .	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	We would also suggest that the text that deals with retail need in Section 4 should reiterate the qualitative and quantitative need identified for further retail provision in the RTP study. We note that reference is made in the text that deals with retail need to the redevelopment opportunity at land at Guildford Station. This site is recognised as being important in ensuring a successful future for the town centre. We support this reference to our client's site and suggest the following words are added at the end of the paragraph "the Station site being suitable for mixed use development, including a large foodstore, and the Friary Shopping Centre for comparison shopping". We would also concur that very sustainable locations with very good transport are suitable for flats with reduced car parking.	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
Motion Transport Planning	Motion's offices are located within the 'Upper' High Street. We welcome the inclusion of the Upper High Street as a 'Placemaking priority area'. In accordance with the vision of the Masterplan and the principles of 'Manual for Streets' we believe this area would be enhanced through the implementation of environmental improvements that focus on wider pavements, landscaping enhancements, quality paving and encouraging an outside eating/cafe culture. Such environmental enhancements could incorporate improved public realm, whilst reducing the amount of onstreet parking (complementing sustainable transport initiatives) to create an attractive and vibrant retail/commercial area. We have a vision to greatly enhance the attractiveness of this area as a retail and business place. As a local Transport Planning Consultancy, Motion is keen to work with stakeholders to deliver these environmental improvements that are required to ensure the future vibrancy of the Upper High Street.	Comments noted.
Environment Agency	We are pleased to see that the Flood Risk Reduction Measures document (FRRM) has been included in the Masterplan, page 21, and that all proposed development within the town centre must be considered against the FRRM document along with a sequential approach to development (seek the lowest flood risk sites for higher vulnerabilities). The vision of the FRRM is "to reduce the risk of flooding in Guildford urban area, using redevelopment opportunities to provide increased safety, additional flood water storage and improved flood water flows whilst making space for water and the enjoyment of the River Wey." We understand that you are considering the status of the FRRM document and are happy to work with you to ensure its continued usefulness.	Comments noted and support welcomed.
	The summary for each site includes whether a site is at risk from flooding however it does not go as far as identifying flood alleviation options through re/development. We would like to see an innovative approach to new development throughout the town centre that identifies and reduces flood risk in line with the FRRM. As part of the opportunities for each site the reduction of surface water run off should be listed and taken into account. Re-development is a really good opportunity to ensure surface water is managed at source and along the sustainable urban drainage management train to secure reductions in surface water run off to reduce both surface water and river flood risk. It is important that this takes place for all potential redevelopment sites.	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	Land Contamination and Groundwater Protection - Much of the town centre area is underlain by the Chalk Formation, a principal aquifer containing groundwater used for public consumption locally. Development may affect the quality of drinking water adversely if precautions are not taken to prevent polluting substances from entering the ground. On the other hand, benefits can be derived from the remediation of land that is known or found to be contaminated as a result of previous industrial uses. In the town centre area proposed, such land is more common close to the River Wey, in the area of Bedford Road, for example. We presume that the local authority would demand thorough risk assessment processes to be employed prior to detailed development proposals being agreed. More on the Guildford Chalk groundwater body and our objectives under the Water Framework Directive and Thames River Basin Management Plan can be found on our website.	Comments noted and agree that risk assessment would be undertaken.

	On page 19, Making better places through development, we request that you encourage developers to include artificial nesting sites for birds in any new buildings. We particularly encourage this for urban species that are in decline such as swifts, house martins, house sparrows and starlings. Artificial bat roosts should also be considered, as well as green/brown roofs that have a multitude of benefits including those for biodiversity, SUDS and insulation. For all sites adjacent to the river/navigation, please add/expand the comments above regarding the 8m undeveloped buffer zones and opportunities for ecological enhancements. Such sites include: · Land rear of 71 – 121 Walnut Tree Close; · Pembroke House, Mary Road; · Bedford Road car park; · Buildings north side of Bridge Street; · Portsmouth Road surface car park; · Debenhams; · Land adjoining Electric Theatre; · Riverside, Friary Street; · Millmead House and Old Millmead, Millmead; · Millbrook car park. Please add that any new planting within 8m of the river should be of appropriate native species, preferably of local provenance to Making better places through environmental improvements on page 40.	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
No name given	Lack of research again. need to be really clear on positive reasons to move the bus station not as a reaction to Westfield plans to sell The Friary	Comments noted. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. The Council have been advised by specialist consultants that the redevelopment of the site is unviable with a bus station.
Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	This is where the plan appears to collapse into a range of prospective development opportunities on council owned sites. GBC may need to retain many of these sites for wider community benefit. Parking Strategy: This section appears to support the case for short term parking, recognise the harmful impacts of losing council short term parking sites and then propose developing them anyway even though they are often in floodplain or on prominent hillsides where development would block views. The Council disregarded its own 2003 policy to safeguard short term parking when it developed G Live and the Hotel with adverse consequences and should not repeat this error.	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	Retail Need: we lack confidence in this analysis which seems to be based on outdated studies. We do not accept the rationale for moving the bus station. We would welcome a John Lewis straddling part of "Friary 2" and GBC land and do not see why retail development would necessitate moving the bus station. Westfield should be given clear parameters and we should not allow one company's commercial self interest to shape the future development of this key part of Guildford to such an extent. As we have learned, Westfield may sell its stake anyway and Guildford can enter into partnership with an owner more in tune with Guildford's needs and aspirations.	Comments noted. The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sqm is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension. The Council has been advised that a scheme including a bus station is unviable and therefore undeliverable.
	Essentially our residents would like a John Lewis, a Waitrose, a car park, a bus station and then an eclectic mix of smaller units and new generation businesses. We do not want a big, "could be anywhere" characterless shopping centre with ever larger shops and duplication of shops between the High Street and a major Friary development. Flood Risk: We welcome recognition of the risk and suggest guidance previously provided in PPS25 is clearly incorporated, especially given the interest in riverside development. The last paragraph is too weak and needs to reflect the sequential test before the exception test.	Comments noted.
on behalf of MC Nominees owners of site at rear of Walnut Tree Close	See attached letter in relation to Site 05 - Land to the Rear of 77 - 121 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford.	Noted.
The Guildford Society	An additional strand should be "making better places through high quality design and landscape". One of the key issues raised in the 'Vision' section of the TCM is the desire to improve the town centre through "improved infrastructure, in particular transport... with improved public transport facilities" and by achieving reduced peak hour traffic." No mention of these important aspects of the 'Vision' is contained in the 'four discernable strands' in 'The Strategy'. The achievement of improvements to secure a reduction in traffic congestion and/or improvements for cyclists and pedestrians is predicated on three proposals. Firstly, the stated intention to promote an additional Park and Ride facility on the west side of the town centre at Manor Park; secondly, on an intention to remove/reduce the amount of contract/long term car parking spaces in the town centre (through the redevelopment of council-owned sites); and thirdly, on a general intention to "...encourage improvement in pedestrian, cycle and public in considering (planning applications) for the redevelopment of town centre sites".	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	Whilst these intentions may be commendable, the Society takes the view that in the absence of any specific proposals for infrastructure improvements, these statements, in themselves, will have no meaningful impact on achieving a reduction in the problem of traffic congestion in Guildford. In our view, a substantial reduction in the impact of through traffic on the town centre is of critical importance and new infrastructure is required to achieve that objective. This is a central issue for the town centre which the Town Centre Masterplan fails to address. considering (planning applications) for the redevelopment of town centre sites".	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	'The Strategy' also sets out the Council's position in respect of the North Street/Leapale Road/Commercial Road site (Site 18) which notably includes the intention to remove the requirement, contained in the presently-approved development brief, for a bus station to be retained on this site as part of any redevelopment in order to allow more shopping floorspace. The Society's comments on this matter are covered in the comments set out in respect of Site 18 (below).	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	The Society notes, on page 21, the statement that the Council is to submit a planning application for a bus facility at Bedford Road. When (a) the bus station proposed for Bedford Road has a significantly reduced operating space from that currently available on the location adjacent to The Friary and (b) Bedford Road is seriously less convenient in terms of location for pedestrians wishing to access the town centre, the Society questions how the Plan can conclude that this "... smaller facility than the current bus station ...will operate more effectively and efficiently."	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.

Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (on behalf of the Guildford Society)	Although the plan identifies a series of potential development sites, there is insufficient definition of the collective opportunity presented by individual sites, and a lack of strongly worded principles to steer development proposals. The Masterplan should provide clear urban design principles and indicative uses for key sites and provide a clear indication of their potential contribution to the realisation of a wider vision (and by extension, the potential to contribute to infrastructure delivery). The Guildford Society has concerns about the approach identified on a number of sites including the railway station, Waitrose and Bedford Road car park. As noted embedded throughout the Masterplan, and it is vital that the site guidance facilitates these objectives. The Masterplan does not reflect on existing floorspace or projected trends in retailing which should be a major factor in the future positioning Guildford. In general there should be greater emphasis on improving the experience of shopping in Guildford, and less reliance on the expansion of retail floorspace which lacks justification. In addition, some amendments to primary and secondary shopping areas is recommended.	Comment noted. This issue has been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
Key potential redevelopment sites		
Alderman	Site 12 Portsmouth Road surface car park - Secret to the towns success Some years ago it was suggested that this area should be made into a working Town Wharf by the following: 1) Allowing holiday boats to moor and gain easy access to the shopping area. 2) Commercial use such as moving Yvonne Arnold scenery from Billings Warehouse 3) A river bus service from Ladymead to The Town centre and in so easing traffic congestion. The unsightly car park is a valuable trading area which could be graced with coffee bars and restaurants etc The possibility are endless. Need I go on ? Once again this could be "The Secret of Guildford's Success"	Comments noted and agree that this site offers a lot of potential for the town. This is reflected within the interim town centre framework.
No name given	You say you want to regenerate the centre by building and opening more retail outlets including a centre of town supermarket. When are you going to get the message, the reason people are deserting High Streets all over the country is BECAUSE THEY CANNOT PARK THEIR RUDDY CARS. Look at your out of town stores with big car parks they are FULL OF PEOPLE. How do suggest myself and my wife as OAP's do our monthly shopping ,in a centre of town supermarket when we cannot park the car in the supermarket car park and could not carry the weight of shopping to a park and ride.? All you planning people seem to want to do is ban the car or make it more and more expensive to park. With an aging population, where the car will be more and more essential, you are so enamoured with the green lobby that you don't seem to grasp simple facts. OUT OF TOWN WITH CAR PARKS = FULL. HIGH STREET NO PARKING = EMPTY. I don't think for one minute you will take any notice of my comments as you all seem to inhabit a parallel universe.	Comments noted. Shopping habits are a lot to do with personal preference. Those that have access to a car and wish to park close to a supermarket can choose out of town shopping. However, there is a large town centre population who don't have access to a car and want to walk to the local supermarket.
Member of the public	1] Whilst the plans for car parking are covered, I would stress the importance of ensuring that adequate car parking spaces are maintained or created for those people who find park and ride difficult. For example although my wife does not have a disabled licence card, she has lost her balance in both ears and cannot walk far without assistance. For someone such as her nearby accessible car parking is vital. 2] Although the plan does cover the importance of protecting the historical buildings etc., the thought of North Street having modern buildings worries us. It is vital for the cosy and historical character of Guildford to be maintained; don't let the town become another nightmare jungle like Woking and Leatherhead. Those two towns have been wrecked.	Comments noted and agree that adequate parking in the town centre is an important issue. There is currently a review of the parking strategy and the findings will be fed into the final town centre framework. Any new development must have regard to the scale and character of an area. The North Street Design and Development Brief sets out the design principles for the north street site.
Member of the public	Site 02 A B C - No mention on this opportunity and suggested uses does it mention the most fundamental and most obvious use. That is as a transport HUB including a place for buses to actually STOP adjacent the railway station, thus making an effort to integrated transport system removing the need for some Car Journeys to the centre of Town. If the park and ride buses visited the station then it would logically follow that commuters and travellers could park outside the town centre 'park and ride' to the railway station and get on the train –WITHOUT A HALF MILE WALK IN THE RAIN – as at present. Sites 03 and 04 - If available would make a good central site for use as car parking for the station when the station car parks are converted to allow Buses to visit and drop off at the station entrance Site 18 - This site is not best suited to a bus station and the bus station should be moved adjacent the Railway station with suitable designated bus routes through the centre of the town –predominately bottom to top such that people can catch the bus to the top of the town and walk back down. Noting that the town has a small enough foot print to allow all buses from all directions to pass both the railway station and the top of the town before departing to the outlying villages.	Suggested use for site 2 noted, however a study shows that the majority of bus users do not wish to go to the train station and their destination is the town centre itself. Sites 3 and 4 are key opportunity sites for residential and office development providing much needed homes and employment floor space. Site 18 is the North Street site and as such there is consideration of relocating the bus station from this site.
Guildford town resident	SITE 02 Railway station: No mention of road improvements/Farnham Road bridge. Why? SITE 09 Bedford Road CP: Constraints militate against bus station possibility. Any fool can see this.	Comments noted. A movement strategy for the town centre is being developed and will inform the final town centre framework. The interim document acknowledges that this evidence is currently missing. The final location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. Bedford Road remains one of the options being tested and the constraints of sites forms part of the studies.
Member of the public	site 09 bedford road is proposed as a smaller bus station but adds to gyratory congestion. do we need a bus station ? could we not have multiple stops / interchange points in north street (at least for the park and ride) and relocate the market see	Comment noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies.
	site 12 & 13 , Site 12 and 13 would make a good location for a permanent covered market (and market office) operating 6 or 7 days a week. given suitable access paths this could be an integral part of a riverside park with walking routes from the rail and bus station(bedford road ?) into the town centre via the town bridge	suggestion noted.
	site 18 hot potato but something needs to be done to give the friary a better looking face and sort out the bus station but bedford road is not the answer its a future nightmare !	Comment noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies.
	site 19 how is customer and delivery traffic going to access the new Waitrose supermarket ? from York road ? How will traffic choke points be avoided ?	Comment noted. This work will form part of the Waitrose planning application.

	site 20 how can GBC encourage BT to vacate the site earlier than projected. it is an obstacle to a better vision of what the overall town centre could be if developed as one zone rather than multiple adjoining plots	Comment noted. Unfortunately the BT sites is currently unavailable as BT have a long term future use for the site. However, it may become available for redevelopment in the future but will not be in time for the redevelopment of the North Street site.
	site 23 and 25 should be combined for innovative low rent housing, also knock down the pub. relocate the adult institute into a new modern purpose built location incorporated within that site, or elsewhere within the town centre I believe surrey cc controls the special needs school at the junction of south hill / pewley hill. surely there is a better use for this site which seems to be little used	Comments noted. The Adult education site has been removed from the interim town centre framework. Agree that if available for redevelopment the two could be combined to make one site.
No name given	Debenhams, this is a carbuncle and needs to be demolished/replaced with riverfront restaurants/small scale shops with apartments on upper floors & river side walkway for the first time. Debenhams could be resited on land North of the current bus station which was originally earmarked for Westfield shopping centre.	Comments noted, agree. This issue has been taken into account in drafting the interim framework.
Guildford town resident	Site 18. I am deeply concerned by the suggestion that an even bigger expansion of the Friary shopping centre is proposed beyond that hitherto envisaged. The issues this raises are:	Concern noted. The area is not for an expansion to the friary shopping area but a redevelopment site for a mix of uses. This is unlikely to take the form of a shopping centre but individual units with streets as an extension of the primary shopping area.
	1. There seems a strong risk that the retail centre of gravity of the town will be pulled away from the historic High Street, with damage to the retail environment in those areas furthest from the Friary, for example the upper High Street, Tunsgate Square and Tunsgate itself. The Retail and Leisure Study's estimates of demand for retail space seem now completely unrealistic, taking account of the downturn in economic expectations since the Study was prepared. The Study also purports to take account of changing methods of shopping by factoring in special forms of trading, such as online purchasing. Table 4.20 appears to suggest that online shopping for comparison goods as a proportion of the total will decline after 2016. This totally defies common sense. UK internet shopping increased by 18% in 2010 alone (http://dmionline.net/blog/2011/12/09/european-online-shoppers-to-spend-e52bn-in-run-up-to-christmas), far outstripping the growth in retail spend as a whole.	Comments noted. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floor space. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.
	2. It seems odd that it is the council's advisor's who are suggesting that the expansion as currently conceived is not viable. No evidence is produced to support this contention and, to the best of my knowledge, there has been no indication from Westfield that this is the case.	Comments noted. The Council have been advised by specialist consultants that the redevelopment of the site is unviable with a bus station and other supporting infrastructure. If the scheme had been viable there is no reason why Westfield should not have implemented the planning permission. However, they chose to sell the site instead.
	3. Moving the bus station away from the retail centre, and making it smaller, has to be a bad idea. It will do nothing to encourage people to use public transport to visit the town leaving aside the obvious access issues that arise with the proposed Bedford Road site.	Comment noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies.
Guildford town resident	Site 15. I'm not too sure about the sustainability of the living wall!	Comment noted. This is just an opportunity identified.
Guildford town resident	Not in favour of relocating the bus station to Bedford Road as this would neither be in the shopping centre nor particularly accessible for the station given the difference in levels and busy road in between. Inconvenient for town centre residents. Look forward to depressing access from the station via Guildford Park Road being improved in station redevelopment as it is the obvious exit to reach Farnham Road Car Park or buses to the university, hospital and sports park. In short term, better litter bins and cleaning at back of station would be welcome instead of pavement littered with cigarette butts.	Comment noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies.
Planning Development control regeneration specialists	The bus station needs to be on the railway station side if it needs to be moved at all. However, the current location was identified by a detailed masterplan and nothing in SPD provide good town planning reasons why it should be moved. If it needs to be moved, the obvious answer is to create a transport hub around the station.	Comment noted. Studies on the bus station and its users show that the bus users destination is not the train station and in fact the majority of users are trying to access the town centre.
Member of the public	Site 03 : surely there is not enough infrastructure to support even more houses or offices on Walnut tree close? The current light industrial use seems more appropriate as traffic flow will not peak at rush hour. Walnut Tree Close is a key "rat run" and any more traffic could cause gridlock on some days.	Comment noted. Agree that traffic down Walnut Tree Close is an issues and that it is used for a rat run. However, this site is appropriate for housing and any scheme will have to provide on site parking.
	Similarly with sites 04 and 05 – with site 05 the idea of restaurants or pubs is a great idea. There could easily be a great "entertainment hub" near the cinema, the Old Orleans site and any new bars / pubs on Walnut tree close. It would not cause any additional rush hour traffic and spread the load from the town centre.	Comments noted however, these uses are undeliverable on this site and therefore the suggestion is now for housing and/or offices.
	Strongly support the use of site 09 for cafes with a riverside walk if the bus station is moved elsewhere. Why can't a bus station also have offices above it and some interesting cafes? As above, a nice area with open spaces could be created near the cinema.	Comment noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies.
	Site 10 – strongly oppose a casino in Guildford. Best kept as a nightclub / bars / entertainment.	Comment noted.
	Site 11 – agree	Agreement noted.
	Site 12 – again, this is a key site that is currently doing nothing. Agree with the suggestions for riverside access with cafes, pubs, green open space.	Agreement noted.
	Site 15 – Debenhams is horrible. A real eyesore opposite some beautiful buildings. Ideally it would be knocked down and replaced, but if not then living walls at least are a cheap alternative.	Comment noted and this follows the opportunities identified in the interim framework.

	Site 18 etc – please, please, try and recreate some of the old feeling of North Street by improving the buildings, encouraging independent retailers in the alleyways with reasonable rent for local businesses and reduced traffic flow.	Comment noted. More detailed design principles are set out in the draft North Street Design and Development Brief. These have regard to the surrounding street structure and character.
Glitter Houses - Arts company	I request that my proposed art installation, <i>The Glitter Houses</i> , be included in the Guildford Borough Council Masterplan 2012 for Site 18. The Glitter Houses installation involves changing the façades, including the roofs and side wall, of the Victorian terraced houses at 26-33 Commercial Road, which is opposite the bus station. The changes to the façades involves the application of industrial glitter to the houses and applying other effects to make the houses glitter night and day. Screens installed at the second storey windows with computer controlled back projection will show animated images. This installation requires the participation of the general public in the selection of the images.	Comments and suggestion noted. This is really a consideration for Hermes the new owner of the Friary shopping area and some surrounding premises.
	It is anticipated that <i>The Glitter Houses</i> will be in place for some months and attract considerable footfall. I am unable to be specific about time frames of the installation, however, as there are many variables involved. This installation should be in place before demolition of the houses because, once the facades have been dressed, they cannot be restored to their original condition. I started work on this concept and proposal around 2005 when Westfield and the Guildford Borough Council began negotiations for a redeveloped of the centre of Guildford. Now new plans are in place, I have renewed my interest in this project. Westfield, the lease holders of 26-33 Commercial Road, have expressed interest in the project and I am talking this week with the Regional Managers in order to seek their permission to turn these houses into The Glitter Houses and secure written support.	Comments and suggestion noted. This is really a consideration for Hermes the new owner of the Friary shopping area and some surrounding premises.
	There have been indications that Westfield may sell the Friary Shopping Centre to their partner, Hermes (including surrounding buildings and the terraced houses). Should this happen, I will approach Hermes in the anticipation they will agree to become the new partner in <i>The Glitter Houses</i> . I am keen to work in partnership with both the Guildford Borough Council and the owners of properties to ensure The Glitter Houses achieves optimum effectiveness and excitement for the public. I have discussed this proposal with GBC Planning Department, who recommended that I send this request to the Planning Policy group for inclusion in the Masterplan. Should you have any initial questions about this proposal and request, please do contact me by email or phone. I appreciate being informed if I am successful in this request	Comments and suggestion noted. This is really a consideration for Hermes the new owner of the Friary shopping area and some surrounding premises.
National Trust	Site 5 - Land to the rear of 77-121 Walnut Tree Close. The plan proposes that this site may be suitable for offices, restaurants, bars/pubs and other town centre uses. We note that there is also the suggestion of a link to the town centre across the River Wey Navigation. The Trust would not support such a new link since this would, in our view, cause harm to the historic character of the Conservation Area. In the absence of such a link we do not see how the site can be regarded as suitable for the uses suggested. In the event of the site's development the Trust would wish to see the following: 1. building heights limited to two storeys; 2. parking, loading/unloading areas and access roads placed at the rear of the site away from the visual setting of the Conservation Area; 3. architectural design and building materials which respect the historic character of the Navigation; 4. the establishment of a landscape buffer alongside the Wey Navigation.	Comments noted. The uses suggested were not deliverable. In the interim town centre framework it is now suggested for housing and/or offices.
	Site 7 - Pembroke House, Mary Road. The Trust agrees that the uses proposed in the Masterplan are likely to be suitable. In order to enhance the visual setting of the Conservation Area the Trust would wish to see the following: 1. building heights limited to two storeys with the possibility of a third storey well setback from the river; 2. parking, loading/unloading areas and access roads placed at the rear of the site away from the visual setting of the Conservation Area; 3. architectural design and building materials which respect the historic character of the Navigation; 4. the establishment of a landscape buffer alongside the River Wey Navigation.	Comment noted. These detailed elements of design are all valuable issues that will need to be addressed as part of any future scheme and planning application.
	Site 8 - Mary Road Car park- The Trust believes that the development of this site to provide a multi-storey car park would - 1. make it more, not less attractive to drive into a congested part of the town centre, and 2. further intensify the urban character of the town centre in an area where there are civic uses. The Trust believes that a more enlightened approach, and one which would contribute to the establishing a distinctive sense of place would be to develop all or part the site as an urban park.	Comment noted. However, no change as this site provides an opportunity to provide more key town centre parking. The parking strategy is under review and the findings will inform the final town centre framework.
	Site 9 - Bedford Road car park - The Trust believes that the over-riding requirement in respect of this site is to ensure that any development fully respects the historic character, scale and massing of the Conservation Areas which abut it. There have been a number of proposals for development in the past, none of which have related satisfactorily to the Conservation Areas. In the Trust's view the essential criteria for development of this site are as follows: 1. building heights limited to two or at most three storeys on the frontage to the Wey Navigation; 2. building heights elsewhere related to the height of buildings in the Bridge Street Conservation Area and which preserve the views across the site of the Billings and adjoining buildings. The view from Bedford Road of this long line of historic riverside warehouse buildings is unique within Guildford. Nowhere else in the borough is there such a complete example of 19th century riverside warehouse architecture which can be viewed on the same scale. Nor is there anywhere else along the whole of the 20 mile length of the River Wey & Godalming Navigations where such a view can be experienced; 3. buildings that are well set-back from the Navigation; 4. architectural design and building materials which respect the historic character of the River Wey Navigation; 5. retention of the old auctioneers building; 6. design improvements to the adjoining public open space which establish a strong sense of place and enhance the sense of arrival from Guildford station.	Comments noted. These issues have been considered and addressed as part of the interim town centre framework.

	Site 12 - Portsmouth Road surface car park / former Farnham Road bus station - This site is very prominently situated within the visual setting of the River Wey Navigation Conservation Area. In that context the Trust believes that there are three important views which must be taken into account in any development of this site. These are the view from and along the footpath adjacent to the river towards the White House pub and the church, the view of the site from the Navigation itself and the view of the site from the Tread-wheel Crane (SAM) on the opposite side of the river. We also believe that the spaciousness of the views from this particular town centre section of the Navigation is a distinctive feature of the Conservation Area which should be preserved. As a result there is an opportunity to create a worthwhile public space adjacent to the Navigation. The Trust strongly believes that any proposals for development change at sites 12 & 13 (see comments on Riverside) should be prepared as a single exercise with a view to establishing architectural and design coherence between the two sites	Comments noted. These issues have been considered and addressed as part of the interim town centre framework.
	Site 13 - Riverside Friary Street - Whilst the existing building on this site once provided a valuable community resource it is an example of the inappropriate nature of some of the existing development abutting the River Wey Navigation. In the Trust's opinion the principal focus of this site should be the listed tread-wheel crane and the vacant community building is inappropriate in this context. We would encourage a long term vision which sees the existing building relocated and the site improved as a heritage site which respects its historic use	Comments noted. These issues have been considered and addressed as part of the interim town centre framework.
	Site 15 - Debenhams - The Trust agrees with the comments made in relation to this site. However, the site is physically cut-off from the town centre's principal shopping area and we suspect that it requires a 'destination' shopping experience, such as Debenhams, to make its use for retail purposes financially viable. We see potential for restaurant type uses on the riverside frontages but otherwise believe that the site is most likely to be suitable for office/residential use. The existing department store is very prominently situated within the visual setting of the River Wey Navigation Conservation Area. It is, in our opinion, inappropriate and overbearing in relation to the Conservation Area. Should the site become available for development we believe that the over-riding requirement will be to achieve a building form and design which: 1. respects the historic, small scale character of the other buildings located within the visual setting of the Conservation Area; 2. reflects the historic industrial character of the Wey Navigation; 3. enhances the character of the Conservation Area; 4. improves the quality of the river frontages; 5. continues to act as a buffer to main road traffic.	Comment noted and this follows the opportunities identified in the interim framework.
	Site 16 - Millmead House and Old Millmead - The Trust agrees that this site would make a very suitable site for residential development provided that architecture, design and materials respect the location within the visual setting of the River Wey Conservation Area	Comment noted and this follows the opportunities identified in the interim framework.
	Site 17 - Millbrook car park - This site also has a prominent location within the visual setting of the River Wey Conservation Area. The priority for the Trust is to strengthen and substantially deepen the landscaping buffer between the site and the Navigation. Glimpses through this buffer to the historic building in quarry Street and Guildford Castle beyond add to the special setting of the river in this area.	Comment noted. This site is no longer in the interim framework.
No name given	Potential redevelopment of Bright Hill car park - At page 39 the Bright Hill car park opportunity is listed as a housing opportunity, but with no reference to replacement of the existing car parking of 121 spaces. In previous documents, the Council has suggested that a residential development of this site will include replacement of car parking, and it is important that spaces are retained or replaced within the immediate locality, in order to help maintain footfall and, therefore, the vitality and viability of this part of the town centre. The masterplan should make this clear and identify how and where spaces will be provided.	Comment noted. There is currently a review of the parking strategy and the findings of which will inform the final town centre framework.
Theatres Trust	Under our remit please consult the Theatres Trust on the planning applications for Site 11 (Electric Theatre) and Site 19 (Bellerby Theatre).	Comment noted.
Member of the public	Site 24 Bright Hill is a view point across the town and should be retained. There is serious congestion already in Sydenham Road when motorists are waiting to enter the Castle Car Park. The redevelopment of Bright Hill will surely put more pressure on the multi-storey car park. Site 19 Leapale Lane area This is a very built up area with narrow approach roads, and access to and from any potential supermarket will surely make it difficult for vehicular access.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
Guide Dogs	Transport Infrastructure - • Accessible linkage of Guildford rail station and town centre needs clarity; • New Guildford rail station, the new bus station and the town centre more information on integrating these areas (nodes); • Impact on the new cycle ways on pedestrians e.g. Epsom road. More details on if they are to be separate or shared, our preference would be segregated; • A square in front of the rail station, concerns on the pedestrian access into town. • Resurfacing of Tunsgate shared space. Concerns about how vehicle management will be designed, what aspects of shared surface are to be implemented. • More details on the design of the new bus station and on carriageway bus stops.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
Turley Associates on behalf of Hermes Real Estate Investment Management Ltd, leasehold owner of the Friary Shopping Centre.	Site 18 is a key redevelopment site within the proposed Town Centre boundary and the Primary Shopping Area. Scope exists to promote and implement an appropriate redevelopment going forward and this should remain a priority of the Plan.	Comment noted. More detailed information for the redevelopment of this site is contained within the North Street Design and Development Brief.

TURLEY ASSOCIATES on behalf of Hermes Real Estate Investment Management Ltd	Site 18 is a key redevelopment site within the proposed Town Centre boundary and the Primary Shopping Area. Scope exists to promote and implement an appropriate redevelopment going forward and this should remain a priority of the Plan.	Comment noted. More detailed information for the redevelopment of this site is contained within the North Street Design and Development Brief.
Guildford town resident	To move the bus station to Mary Road Car park is quite nonsensical and achieves nothing. It looks as if the Waitrose project is settled but I do not feel that a supermarket at that point is right - much as I would like to see Waitrose in Guildford. Has the traffic situation been fully considered. With Westwood reconsidering their position about an extension I consider that more retail is not the answer for that area. A town square with associated amenities would be a better use. I would particularly like to see a community centre for all with an arts centre included. Small shops and amenity housing could also be there.	Comment noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floor space. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.
Guildford Labour Party	Railway Station redevelopment - This site is identified for major redevelopment. But whatever redevelopment is done, there must inevitably be an increase in traffic in the area. But the roads here are amongst the most congested in the town. The Farnham Road railway bridge is a major pinch point. Walnut Tree Close is effectively single track because of on-street parking. The gyratory system is jammed at peak times already. We should certainly consider widening the road bridge over the railway line. Car parking levels for station users must be maintained.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
	The Bus Station - Bedford Road is a terrible place for a bus station. The site is too small, it is too far from the town centre and it will block off one of the few access points to the river. The proposed move will also lead to increased traffic congestion on the gyratory as traffic lights will have to be installed, and increased pedestrian congestion on the crossing by Wetherspoons that is already overcrowded and with too small a pavement area. The move would also mean that bus services from the east of the town will have to terminate at the top of the Upper High Street rather than in the centre of town, and disabled, elderly and other bus users with mobility problems, including parents with young children, will have to walk much further to the town centre – and cross a very busy gyratory at the same crowded crossing point as mentioned above. The description of the site (site 09) says there is a high risk of flooding, making it unsuitable for house building. So why use it for a major transport hub such as a bus station? We believe that the bus station should remain in the existing area, and be improved.	Comment noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies.
	The Bellerby Theatre Site - As a party we have previously commented on this site. Current access to the site is through narrow streets – on-street parking makes them single track at the moment, but even if on-street parking is removed, access from Martyr Road around the right-angle bend is totally unsuitable. However, the biggest problem will be lorry access for deliveries. Access from Leapale Road would be OK for lorries coming from the gyratory, but there is insufficient room to allow articulated lorries to get down narrow streets, onto the site and also to turn round. Lorries leaving would then have to return to Leapale Road, but the turn back into Leapale Road is onto a narrow street at an angle beyond 90 degrees – impossible for articulated lorries or even larger rigid lorries. And the junctions at the top of Leapale Road into North Street would also be difficult for rigid lorries and impossible for articulated lorries. This site is totally unsuitable for lorry access. It would be possible to access the site from York Road if a new access road was created, but this could well lead to further traffic congestion – delivery lorries would probably need to come to the site up York Road from Woodbridge Road and then turn into the site across traffic. So any development of this site for a supermarket will need a proper traffic flow study.	Comments and concerns noted. Waitrose have carried out a full transport impact assessment in support of their planning application to address these issues.
	Guildford Park Road car park – keep it as a car park and add a second deck to increase capacity to replace parking being lost elsewhere. Land rear of 77-121 Walnut Tree Close (site 05) – this riverside site has been suggested for restaurants, bars/pubs! The site is across the river from the town, hidden away. There would be nothing to attract people to restaurants, pubs and bars here unless there was road access	Comments noted. Site 5 is now suggested for housing and/or office as other town centre use are not deliverable.
	Land adjoining the Electric Theatre and the Portsmouth Road car park and Riverside (sites 11 and 12 and 13) – these three riverside sites are not attractive. They are bleak, grey and dominated by concrete and hard surfaces. The plan talks about opening them up, adding green space. We agree completely – use them to give people access to the riverside and open up the riverside walks north from there by signposting of a “River Wey Trail” that links up to the green area by the bridge by B&Q and onwards	Comments noted and agreement acknowledged.
	Guildford Plaza (site 14 – the old CEGB site) – This site is ideal for housing. We don’t need more offices, as there are many vacancies already. There is also an error in the document when it says the site is 0.02ha in size.	Comments noted. The site area has now been corrected the site identified as suitable for housing and offices.
Guildford town resident	See number 7	Noted.
Guildford town resident	For the riverside sites it can only be positive to remove surface parking (what a waste of a huge potential) Portsmouth Road Surface Car park seems key along with Bedford Road Car Park strongly support proposals here. Debenhams is just terrible so anything to remove it must be good! Also any proposals on the Millbrook Car Park should include improvements to River frontage.	Comments noted. These suggestions are reflected in the interim town centre framework.
Guildford town resident	09: I oppose moving the bus station to this site and would prefer it to stay where it is 10: I oppose any siting of casinos on this site 11: I support the suggested use of this site 15: I support the proposed walkway	Comment noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	None	Noted.
Member of the public	Site 11 - Land adjoining Electric Theatre - this land is too close to the gyratory system with traffic noise, etc. to be used as an effective public open space.	Comment noted, agree. This site has been removed and is discussed in general in the interim town centre framework for open space.

	Site 12 - Portsmouth Road car park - use as open space for leisure / recreation with river side access. Ideal location for short term / overnight mooring of boats on the river. There are too few open spaces within the lower town centre area - not every space needs to be built on with offices etc. Also this site is liable to flooding from the river - so avoid developing it.	Comment noted. This is a prime site for redevelopment for suitable uses that are less vulnerable to the risk of flooding. The interim framework considers a mix of uses but also the opening up of the river frontage.
	Site 14 - Guildford Plaza (formerly Burymead House) site - this would be an ideal location for a high quality hotel - close access to the High Street, and within a short walk of the railway station. See my comments under 'Vision' re Guildford being a tourist destination.	Comments and suggested uses noted. However, the owners are progressing housing or offices.
	Site 18 - Land at North Street / Leapale Road / Friary bus station - either relocate the bus station within this site with access in and out from Leapale Road or construct a wide bridge over the existing bus station to join the upper floor of the Friary Centre to the extended development.	Comment noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies.
Abbots Hospital	As stated before, site 22 is an instance where the type and nature of any development should take Abbot's and its purpose into account, and hopefully help to reduce the current noise and ant-social activity experienced on a regular basis. We will also watch plans for site 18 with interest, and hope it becomes a welcoming destination for our residents.	Comments noted. The redevelopment of any site will have to have account of its surroundings.
West Horsley Parish Council	Site 9. Bedford road area is heavily congested, relocation of the bus station is not viable as access to town the centre will be difficult with busy road to cross causing heavy blockages at peak times. Site 9 moves the bus station from a central location to a position much further away from the two main shopping roads. Use sites 1,2,3,4,5 to build a new bridge to cross the railway line /river into Mary Road to rejoin near York Road traffic island, this will keep more through traffic away from the central town area. The A3 is already a very busy road and if accidents cause closure of either carriageway the town centre becomes gridlocked. Use this development to create an inner ring road. Site 15 is a monstrous out of character building, remove some of the height and rebuilt in a more sympathetic style. Offices could be built out of the centre.	Comment noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. A movement strategy will be prepared to inform the final town centre framework and will consider these issues. Agree that redevelopment of site 15 provides opportunities to improve the character of the area and this is reflected in the interim framework.
Member of the public	I understand the attraction of moving the bus station to the Bedford Road site but am concerned this is going to be too far away from the High Street and heart of the town. For less mobile people, it is important to make distances to their main targets as short as possible. However, the visions of public spaces where people can meet, relax and sit are an excellent idea.	Comment noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies.
Member of the public	**Bus station that is hidden and separate from both station and shops seems bad idea. Itself would separate station and shops	Comment noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	02. Railway station. <i>Proposals could also enable improvements...strengthening of pedestrian routes.</i> Improvements to pedestrian routes must not be conditional on station redevelopment. Reword: <u>Proposals will be integrated with developments made or in hand for the adjacent area.</u>	Comments noted. This site preformed has been reworked as part of the interim town centre framework. It now reads 'Redevelopment of this site could facilitate improvements to the wider area around the station. Possibly to include improving pedestrian routes to the town centre shopping area, new river footbridge and highways improvements'.
	09. Bedford Road car Park. We object to the relocation of the bus station to this site. Its location is of great importance and must be determined to ensure the best integration of the transport system, and not by the commercial viability of a commercial site. This location would clearly be less suitable than the present one.	The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. However, this site remains one of the options under consideration.
	12. Portsmouth Road car park. ADD to constraints <u>Building height constraint to avoid further undesirable enclosure of riverside</u>	These issues are relevant to the conservation area
	15. Debenhams. Replacement of the building would not be a sustainable option. We fully support the proposal to green the river frontage and open up the riverside path. We ask for a commitment to achieve this in the near future.	Comment noted and proposal for greening the river frontage remains within the interim town centre framework.
	16. Millmead House and Old Millmead. We see no benefit in developing this site and moving the Council Offices elsewhere. Council Offices are a vital amenity which are expected to be located in the Town Centre. They receive many visitors and must be located where access by non-car transport is easy; it is unlikely that the present location could be bettered in this respect. Delete this as a development site.	Comment noted. However, no change. This site represents opportunities for redevelopment and the council office could be relocated within the town centre as part of a community hub.
	17. Millbrook car park. The suggestion of the addition of an upper decked area is an interesting possibility that should be pursued. However the upper area should be mainly paved open space, with some greenery. Also add as constraint <u>A wide green area must be kept by the riverbank and the structure stepped back to avoid any appearance of walling in the riverside.</u>	Comment noted. This site has been removed from the interim town centre framework and decked car parking is being pursued.
	23. Former Basketworks. We reiterate our request that this be converted into an indoor market. This would bring many benefits including Preservation of an iconic industrial building Provision of much needed convenience shopping, particularly food, of particular values to the large adjacent residential area. Would help to rebalance retail provision in the centre to counteract the expansion to the North of the High Street. Is comparatively low rise, so does not intrude into views over the ancient roofscape of the houses around Trinity Churchyard.	The basket works site on Sydenham Road is suggested for non-retail uses (restaurant, residential, offices) - see site 17 in the interim framework, given its location on the edge of the proposed primary shopping area. The government's town centre first approach, directs retail development to the primary shopping area (PSA). Where no PSA opportunity exists for retail development, the edge of the PSA should then be considered, followed by out of centre locations. This approach helps to support lively and economically strong town centres.

	24. Bright Hill car park. Add as a constraint <i>Forms a conspicuous backdrop to the Town Centre Conservation Area</i>	Comment noted. The framework recognises the constraint of the conservation area. No change.
	Add as an opportunity <i>Creation of a high quality viewpoint that would be an attraction to visitors as well as residents (the only view over the town from within the Town Centre) with an inviting path to it, up through the centre of the site</i>	Comment noted. The viewpoint is an existing feature of the site. No change.
	25. Adult Education Institute We fully support the intention to retain these attractive Victorian buildings that are a major feature in local views. The present adult education use is successful and an important amenity to Guildford residents. The use of part of the top building as the Harvey Gallery is also a valuable amenity, which could be further exploited as a visitor attraction if the suggested attractive pedestrian route per 24 above was created.	Support noted.
Member of the public	Site No.09 -- I strongly disagree that this is a suitable location for the bus station. Access for buses would be difficult and more importantly the pedestrian link to the town centre would be lengthy and very unpleasant. Site No. 12 -- This important riverside site has been a car park for too long. Future development must ensure that there is a good allocation of open space adjacent to the river. Site No.17 -- More tree planting is required Site No.18 -- This area has been in limbo for too many decades. However there should be no grandiose development of the type proposed by Westfield. It should be much more modest, with renovation of some of the existing buildings and construction of others in scale with the rest of Guildford's townscape. Some of the space should be used for affordable housing Site No. 19 -- This town centre location should not be used for a supermarket and its concomitant large car park. This is not consistent with a desire to reduce the pressure of traffic in the town and town centre land should not be used for car parking. Some small shops and housing is much more appropriate use for this site. Site No. 23 -- The basket works would be a good place for an art gallery and / or space for artists and craftsmen	Comments noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. Agree that redevelopment of the sites along the river provide open space to create a pleasant river frontage. This theme has been incorporated into the interim town centre framework. Site 18 - more detail is set out in the North Street Design and Development Brief which is referred to in the interim town centre framework.
Member of the public	The sites must be very long term with ownership and historic and planning permission issues to be considered.	Agree that these are all considerations.
Member of the public	Sites 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 should be treated as part of a Station area masterplan and, to the extent that it may help to take traffic off the current gyratory system if there were a road across both rail and river, sites 7 and 8 may very well need to be considered in the same grouping. Sites 9 and 10 should be considered together and represent a major opportunity to improve the gateway from station to town, this should also include the road and the other frontages onto Bridge Street.	Comments noted and taken into consideration in drafting the interim town centre framework.
	Site 11 would make an interesting permanent market area with the opportunity to drive more business through the hospitality facilities at the Electric Theatre.	This site has now been removed as a site in the interim town centre framework. Agree that it is a good area for public open space.
	Site 12 should be opened up to the river and potentially could include residential and restaurant facilities facing the river but built along the Portsmouth Road and High Street frontages.	Suggestions noted and these have been taken into consideration when drafting the interim town centre framework.
	Site 13 could play a much stronger riverside role and could support having a floating restaurant moored alongside with a paved piazza and seating area fronting the river.	Suggestion noted.
	Site 14 should be developed as a quality residential scheme with some commercial use on the ground floor in front of resident parking along the Portsmouth Road frontage. It would be nice to think that Debenhams (site 15) could be relocated onto the Friary extension and that the existing site could be freed up as the town square, overlooking the river and with a real sense of cohesion - the basement car parking could remain in place and, by extending the retail frontage along that section of Millbrook, could enable a much more attractive environment to be created.	Comments noted and suggestions incorporated into the interim town centre framework.
	Site 16 should be redeveloped for residential use with good permeability through the development - I would relocate the council offices onto the station development (ideally across the railway so that the platforms would be covered and the council's facility would be all the more sustainable. Unless or until there is adequate out of town provision for park and ride that could displace Millbrook car park,	Suggestions noted. Agree that site 16 has potential for a residential scheme and there is an opportunity for the Council office to relocate to near the railway station and to form part of a community hub.
	site 17 should remain very much as it is. If the use could be displaced (and if Debenhams can be persuaded to move, a riverside residential development (relatively low rise) above retail (restaurant-style units fronting the river (with walking access along the river frontage) would be appropriate. Otherwise, a decked car park fronting Millbrook with retail/restaurant and riverside walk and seating would be an improvement over the current arrangement.	Comments noted and agree with the opportunities identified
	Site 18 should form part of a special study incorporating the future of buses in Guildford and taking in the telephone exchange (site 20) and potentially incorporating the unnumbered blocks between Site 20 and North Street. It would be desirable if BT could reorganise its exchange to a modern fibre-optic switching hub beneath a large-scale development. This could enable a more efficient and effective residential and retail development behind the Friary - which need not be owned and operated by the owner of the Friary centre.	Comment noted. Unfortunately the BT sites is currently unavailable as BT have a long term future use for the site. However, it may become available for redevelopment in the future but will not be in time for the redevelopment of the North Street site.
	Site 19 is already the subject of a regeneration plan - I do NOT support the proposed Waitrose development due to the inadequacies of the highways system and given that this plan has not seen fit to include that frontage in the primary retail area.	Comments noted. As part of the planning application Waitrose have undertaken detailed traffic impact assessment work.
	Site 22 is a key site which has been blighted by its current buildings and should be mixed retail and residential uses in the town centre.	Comment noted. Agree that this is a good opportunity for redevelopment to provide retail and extend the prime shopping area up North Street.
	Sites 23 (enlarged to take in the dilapidated residential to the rear), 24 and 25 should all be redeveloped for residential uses in as comprehensive and master planned a way as possible.	Comments noted. Site 25 has now been removed from the interim framework. Agree that sites 23 and 24 could provide an opportunity for comprehensive redevelopment.

Quod on behalf of Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd	With regard to Site 18 - 'Land bounded by North Street/Leapale Road and Commercial Road bus station', we note that the Red Line boundary is different to that shown in section 9.62 of the Adopted Local Plan (2003) as well as the red line boundary (Drawing ref. WGf (08)0001 Rev A01) [attached at APPENDIX 1] of the extant planning permission (LPA ref. 09/P/02043). The boundary of Site 18 should correlate with that of the extant planning permission 09/P/02043 as it is likely that the redevelopment of the Friary extension site will have links with, and potential alterations to, the existing shopping centre (as per the extant permission). The site boundary on page 42 of the Masterplan would also need updating. We agree with the text in the supporting table. However, as indicated above, we are of the view that the table should acknowledge that uses/frontages within the existing Friary Centre and extension site (including ground floor) should not be solely A1 retail use. We would also request that Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd are engaged on any future design and development brief.	Comments noted. The red line boundary has been changed for a few reasons. More information is set out in the North Street Design and Development Brief but the main reason is to increase the developable area.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	The bus station in its current location creates a blocker for many of the improvements to be made in Guildford. The bus station should be moved as a matter of urgency, which would allow the Friary Centre 2 development to start. This would then unlock the existing, poorly located Debenhams site and allow it to be relocated (as an anchor tenant) into the new, more appropriate location of Friary Centre 2. This would then release the Debenhams site allowing it to be used for a much more vibrant, waterfront, mixed use scheme and would place a large footprint store in a far more accessible and appropriate location.	Comments noted and agree that the relocation of the bus facility is being considered to facilitate redevelopment of these key sites.
House of Fraser	Site 18 - The amount of retail floorspace included within this development site and the size of individual shops should be reviewed to reflect the current economic situation and impact that this will have on the rest of Guildford. There is no benefit to the town if retailers just relocate into the new development and leave vacant units in the existing primary and secondary retail areas. The developer needs to prove that all the units can be filled by new retailers to the town and that this will not negatively impact on existing retailers.	Comments noted. More detailed guidance is provided in the North Street Design and Development brief which is referenced in the interim town centre framework.
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	As a general point, we believe that there would be merit in distinguishing between the 25 sites to identify those which are of strategically important sites so as to provide greater clarity to the TCM strategy. We observe that the Guildford Railway Station is inferred to be one of these sites, but clarity is welcomed in this respect. Site 02A/B/C - This site is described as being on the edge of the "Main Shopping Area". This text should be amended to make reference to the "Primary Shopping Area" given that the "Main Shopping Area" has not been identified in the TCM, nor is in a relevant definition in PPS4 terms. In relation to the identified 'Opportunities' we believe that given the size and location of the Guildford Station site and its excellent public transport accessibility, its suitability and potential to accommodate larger scale town centre uses should be specifically identified. In addition, reference is made to a planning application being submitted potentially in the next couple of years. We can confirm it is our client's intention to submit a planning application for the redevelopment of this site in 2012. We can confirm that we have also looked at the guidance provided for adjacent sites to Guildford Railway Station. In relation to Site 09: Bedford Road car park we would support the opportunity to enhance the access between Guildford Station and the rest of the town centre, noting that one of the key routes will run through Site 09.	Comments noted. These issues have been considered and addressed as part of the interim town centre framework.
Property Consultants	Site 1 Guildford Park Rd - Clearly readily suited to solve most of Guild ford's immediate affordable home requirements. What's stopping development?	Comments noted. This site is in the interim framework for a mix of uses including housing.
	Railway Station - All rail projects take decades to move forward. Don't make any GBC proposals elsewhere depend on this timing.	Comments noted. This is progressing.
	Site 3 Jewson's - A splendid prospect for residential in place of this non-conforming user (do GBC own FIH with lease expiring soon?) but where will Jewson's move to?	Comments noted. The relocation of Jewson's is one of the main reasons this site has not been redeveloped to date. It is important for the Borough to retail such premises when there is a strong economic reason to do so including occupancy.
	Site 4 Station View - This grossly underused area could readily merge with Jewson's. Perhaps London and Regional will buy Jewson's for a comprehensive commercial/residential scheme.	Comments noted. Agree.
	Site 5 Walnut Tree Close - An ideal location for off street parking to free Walnut Tree Close traffic plus residential, especially if the Lea's Road bus depot (another sordid nonconforming user) could be redeveloped and linked by bridge. I disagree town centre uses appropriate (they should be in the town centre!). Site constraints may prove problematical for commercial uses.	Comments noted. The site is now suggested for residential and/or office uses.
	Site 7 Pembroke House - The adjacent undertakers (Pimms) and houses should be included in any scheme. This could easily open up the whole riverside especially if the bus depot is added. Can the bus depot go to Slyfield?	Comments noted. The site shown is due to availability of premises. The Bus depot is required as there are no other suitable sites for relocation.
	Site 8 Mary Rd Car Park - This site can profitably be developed to provide B1 or residential (but no jobs) and a hotel with mixed parking linked into the Bedford Road car park at higher level providing additional access/exit points and additional parking income to GBC.	Comments noted. The site is within the interim town centre framework for decked parking.
	Site 9 Bedford Road - Totally inappropriate location and site layout for a major bus station which will generate very severe conflict between pedestrians and traffic. Designer madness! The air space and opportunity for a major 'Gateway' scheme with vital highway improvements would be thrown away. Granted identifying an alternative bus station site(s) is a huge challenge, but this is NOT the one.	Comment noted. The final location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies.
	Site 10 Bridge Street (North) - Should form part of a site 9 study for a comprehensive scheme.	Comment noted. These sites are in different ownerships and therefore have been split out for deliverability reasons. Agree, ideally the two together could form a comprehensive scheme.
	Site 11 Electric Theatre - Total agreement with suggested uses.	Agreement acknowledged.

	Sites 12 Portsmouth Farnham Rd Car Park - I have had a concept scheme on my files for twelve years which supports your suggestions. However tempted to move on this site the priority must be to solve the bus station dilemma. With so few vacant single ownership sites in or close to the town centre, this should wait.	Comment noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies.
	Site 13 Riverside, Friary St - This building should be removed and the rivers idea restored, thus also further improving visibility of and into the Friary Street underpass. The riverside café/restaurant can be provided on the site opposite (No. 12).	Comments noted and taken into consideration in drafting the interim town centre framework which now reads 'Opposite the Portsmouth Road car park, the design, materials and position of the existing riverside community building detracts from the riverside and from the setting of the Tread Wheel Crane, a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The building should either be demolished and the area resurfaced and landscaped, or the building refurbished and its surroundings landscaped.'
	Site 14 Plaza - The fact office development has not occurred over the last 10 - 12 years suggests potential occupiers do not prefer the location. Thus this important vacant site lies dormant. It could provide a valuable shoppers car park with residential or new GBC HQ over. This high cost site is totally unproductive for the Fund who might welcome the opportunity to grant a long ground lease to GBC which would provide GBC with an economical purchase and the Fund with a pre-let to an AAA tenant. Providing 400/500 shopper spaces here would relieve pressure on Bedford Road and the gyratory and replace spaces being lost through Friary II and generate substantial income.	Comments noted. This is in the interim town centre framework as a key site for housing and/or office development.
	Site 15 Debenhams - Agreed. The cantilevered walkway could also provide a mooring platform towards which Debenhams might contribute if adding custom and expansion to their riverside restaurant.	Agreement acknowledged.
	Site 16 Millmead - This suggestion offers considerable potential. The civic offices should be located in the town centre and close to the bus station if possible. Bedford Road, Mary Road, Millbrook Car Park and Portsmouth/ Farnham Road being obvious possibilities, not forgetting the Plaza site. Millmead would make an excellent high value residential development site to help fund the relocation, or devote it to affordable housing.	Support welcomed. The site is within the interim framework to provide for such uses.
	Site 17 Millbrook Car Park - An ideal site for decked parking due to topographical levels with little environmental impact. Air space above could also accommodate hotel, culture or other uses. Please note the potential for a new Yvonne Arnaud Theatre, the limited capacity of the present venue seriously hindering the type of presentations and thereby minimising its contribution to the night time activity and economy, and potential revenue, hence requiring constant subsidies. This venture could be supported and part funded by a focused mixed restaurant and hotel riverside concept. Another (part) option might be a new bus station, or part of one, being similar distance from the High Street as the existing bus station.	Comments noted. This site has now been removed from the interim town centre framework but reference is made to decked parking within the delivery chapter.
	Site 19 Bellerby Theatre, etc - Having originally introduced this site to Waitrose I am familiar with the reasons of GBC's new stance. However, before all irrevocable commitment is made, in view of the vital importance of identifying the correct location for a new bus station, thoroughly examine this alternative option.	Comment noted. This site is now in the ownership of Waitrose and is therefore not an option for a bus facility.
	Site 22 Dolphin House - This 'mish-mash' of buildings certainly warrants redevelopment Whilst providing popular catering units it fails as a retail destination and therefore has a negative effect on this end of North Street. The difference in levels between Chertsey Street and North Street presents problems but an alternative magnet in this location would help transform the area. Because of its high visibility a landmark design would also prove highly beneficial.	Comments noted. Agree and this has been taken into account when drafting the interim town centre framework.
	Sites 25 & 25 Bright Hill & Adult Education - Logically these two sites should be addressed as one. The topography provides plenty of scope for parking at lower level (with easy shopper access to the High St.) with residential above. Obviously the Adult Educational facility is important BUT is this location (with very minimal public transport access) the best possible? Could it form part of a new Civic office complex?	Comments noted. The Adult education site has been removed from the interim town centre framework. Agree that if available for redevelopment the two could be combined to make one site.
No name given	The summary details given for each site are not sufficiently detailed to include how a site could be redeveloped to ensure no increase in flood risk from the river. The description given in the site summary and the main body of text does not mention surface water or other sources of flooding. If there is information (such as flood map for surface water) available that any site is at risk of surface water or groundwater flood flooding this should be listed under constraints for each relevant site.	Comments noted. Detailed flood risk assessments would have to be undertaken as part of drawing up detailed proposals for the sites.
No name given	· Portsmouth Road surface car park/Former Farnham Road bus station – the photograph of 'An example of water front in Stockholm' shows mostly hard standing with just a few trees set well back, so does not reflect the text that proposes a green open space. Therefore we suggest substituting this photograph for a more appropriate one. · Debenhams – we welcome the specific reference to enhancements for birds and fish.	Comments noted. The image has now been replaced with an illustrative example of the car park.
Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	02 ABC Railway station - Oppose high rise redevelopment We like the scale and character of Guildford station and are not seduced by a major development here which will not sit well in the landscape and will change the character of the town at a key entry point. The priority in this area should be a new supplementary road bridge over the railway to which all developers in the town should contribute in a phased development over the next ten years.	Comments noted. Any development will have to have regard to the scale and character of the surrounding area.
	08 Mary Road Car Park - Retain as open air low rise car park in floodplain. This is a much needed open space in front of the courts and between multi-storey car parks	Comments noted. This is suggested as a decked car park in the interim town centre framework and removes references to offices and/or housing above.

	09 Bedford Road - No to a bus station here that would be too small a site to accommodate buses coming in from our side of Guildford. It is also not a good site for connectivity with the High Street. We rely on the current bus station to get buses to connect to the University or hospital or Surrey Sports Park or Spectrum. This site would lend itself to leisure related development or a hotel around a riverside public square. A bus station here would detract from that potential use. It would be more helpful to provide rear access for loading/unloading of the shops in Bridge Street, without blocking the gyratory system.	Comments noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. Bedford Road is however noted in the interim town centre framework as one of the options being considered.
	17 Millbrook Car Park - Strongly oppose extending or decking this. Leave as low level, open up better views of and access to the river side and landscape.	Millbrook car park has been removed as a site within the interim town centre framework.
	18 North Street / Leapale Road/ Commercial Road - Retain the bus station, encourage an imaginatively designed John Lewis and car park, and encourage small frontages along North Street façade as in comments under 2). Ensure any new consent is much lower than the excessive height secured by the misleading application from Westfield.	Comments noted. The interim town centre framework cross refers to the North Street Design and Development Brief which sets out more detailed design principles for the redevelopment of this area.
	19 Bellerby Theatre - If this becomes a Waitrose, need to provide on-site parking for the customers	Comments noted. There will be on-site car parking.
	20 Telephone exchange- Link in with car park and site for John Lewis such that a central bus station is retained	Comment noted. Unfortunately the BT sites is currently unavailable as BT have a long term future use for the site. However, it may become available for redevelopment in the future but will not be in time for the redevelopment of the North Street site.
	23 Former Basket works - Specify low rise to retain views from vantage points looking uphill onto this site and from vantage points looking downhill from viewpoints above this site too.	Any development will have to have regard for the topography and scale and character of the area to comply with Local Plan policies.
	24 Bright Hill Car Park - Retain as a much valued short term car park relied upon by locals from our side of Guildford. Retain views from this important vantage point	Comment noted. Any car parking lost will need to be reprovided. This forms part of the review of the parking strategy and will inform the final town centre framework.
on behalf of MC Nominees owners of site at rear of Walnut Tree Close	See covering letter. Our client has interests in site 05 - Land Rear of 77 -121 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford. The site is circa 0.68 hectares of land with workshops, offices and a showroom. The site is immediately adjacent to residential properties a number of which front Walnut Tree Close. The site is adjacent to the path which runs alongside the River Wey, however, it is circa 0.5km from the bottom of the High Street and accessed from Walnut Tree Close. It is clear that this is currently an 'underutilised site' with a miscellany of buildings which do not enhance the 'transition area' in which the site is located.	Comments and factual points noted. These are taken into account in the interim town centre framework.
	The draft National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') states that:-Using a proportionate evidence base, Vail Williams 27. Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated. and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals such as land prices to inform judgements about levels of demand. (my emphasis).	NPPF policy has been given regard to in the interim town centre framework.
	The 'NPPF' also confirms that sites should be viable and deliverable. The Masterplan vision does refer to the town centre being capable of providing a variety of residential development, including flats. The Masterplan, once adopted, will be a Council 'strategy' which in time will form part of the statutory framework allied to a Local Plan I Core Strategy and the document 'signals' future direction. As a result, it is important to undertake careful analysis of the viability of the uses proposed on site 5. The thrust of Government Policy in Planning Policy Statement 12 (,PPS 12') together with the emerging National Planning Policy Framework seeks to promote viable inward investment and development.	Comment noted and agree that viability is a key consideration. The interim town centre framework will be a formally adopted Council strategy, having similar status to the Council's Economic Strategy and Conservation Area Character Appraisals. However, it will not have statutory status, as the Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Document (SPDs) do. Once the new Local Plan strategy document is in place, anticipated to be in 2014, the final town centre framework is likely to be upgraded to a SPD. The Local Plan (consisting of Strategy and Delivery Plans) will be the land use strategy for the whole borough, and will have the highest level (development plan) status in determining planning applications.
	The site has been discussed at length with EWE Associates Limited, Flood risk Consultants and the Environment Agency. The correspondence from the Environment Agency dated 23 July 2010, EWE Associated dated 17th January 2011 (see appendix 1) and the response from the Environment Agency dated 10 February 2011 (see appendix 2) refers to flooding. The correspondence confirms that in the event of a 1 in 100 year flood the Environment Agency would have no objection to a mixed use development, including residential, given the ability to create a safe escape route together with a walkway at first floor level (as shown in appendix 1).	Comments noted. These have been taken into account in the interim town centre framework.
	The strategy site opportunities section of the Masterplan Consultation Document suggests that site 5 'could be more suitable for offices, restaurants, bars/pubs and other town centre uses'. Whilst it is within the Town Centre boundary, and whilst it is adjacent to the River Wey it is within the defined 'transitional' area where many of the suggested uses are simply not a viable or appropriate proposition in this location. The viability of these uses is questionable and in the absence of viability appraisals to prove demand and need which clearly support the proposals, my client is not supportive of the suggestions within the recent consultation document. The site is within close proximity to residential properties and the uses suggested would not be ideally located given the site is adjacent to existing residential properties.	Comments noted. These issues have been taken into account when drafting the interim framework. The site is now referenced for residential and office as suitable uses.

	The site lends itself to mixed use office and residential development, which would provide much needed residential property which can be provided on site taking into account flood risk matters (see above). The site could accommodate circa 35 flats and circa 432 sq.m. of B1, Office floors pace as identified on the indicative site plan attached. These uses would be ideally located given the site is within a sustainable location, benefits from an outlook onto the River Wey, gives opportunity for landscaping along this part of the River Wey for the broader benefit of the community and takes account of the site lying adjacent to residential properties.	Comments noted. These issues have been taken into account when drafting the interim framework. The site is now referenced for residential and office as suitable uses.
	The opportunities and suggested uses listed within the Town Centre Masterplan consultation document are not viable in this location. The suggested uses would not encourage investment and redevelopment of the site. The most appropriate use would be residential, with limited business (B1 - Office) development. The site is deliverable and viable for these purposes. The specific reference to the site should therefore be altered to refer to residential and office uses. The enclosed consultation response form refers to this covering letter (see appendix 4).	Comments noted. These issues have been taken into account when drafting the interim framework. The site is now referenced for residential and office as suitable uses.
The Guildford Society	The 'Introduction' to the Town Centre Masterplan states "Co-ordinated redevelopment of key sites alongside infrastructure and environmental improvements are needed in the town centre to ensure that it remains a lively, attractive, economically robust and environmentally sustainable place". The Society supports that statement but considers that the policies and proposals for the individual sites will not achieve that objective in that, in general, they contain no proposals to secure specific infrastructure or environmental improvements. This concern is reflected in the following comments and those made below in respect of the individual sites.	Comments noted. These points raised have been taken into account when drafting the interim framework. The opportunity sites are now split up by character areas and the relationship between these sites is now shown including pedestrian linkages. There is a section on 'delivery' which sets out how infrastructure and environmental improvements can be delivered.
	As with earlier plans, this Town Centre Masterplan simply provides a series of planning guidance in respect of a number of key sites within the town centre. There is no over-arching policy (certainly none in respect of highway infrastructure) and no coordinating proposals or strategy for improvements for pedestrians and cyclists which could be the subject of achievement through the proposal (on page 20) that "In the consideration of the redevelopment of town centre sites, the Council will encourage improvements in pedestrian, cycle and public transport accessibility." The sites section makes no reference to any strategic spatial plans and the relationship with the vision and objectives. There should be design guidance for each site, in terms of urban design principles, development and landscape.	Comments noted. These points raised have been taken into account when drafting the interim framework.
	Site 02 A, B, C (Guildford Railway Station) The TCM says:- "Proposals could also enable improvements (to be made) to the wider area around the station possibly (our emphasis) to include the strengthening of pedestrian routes to and from the station." This is weak wording. The Society notes (and agrees) with the statement, in Appendix 1 page 18, that "Guildford Railway Station ... does little to announce its presence in the town centre as a key point of arrival and departure." On this issue the TCM should have clear proposals in place showing how an improved inter-connection for pedestrians between the railway station and the town centre could be achieved and the TCM should say, as a matter of policy:- "The proposals for major development at the railway station should be linked to improvements to the wider area and should, as a key component, provide for the creation of a safe and attractive route for pedestrians to and from the town centre." We note that the "Local Plan allocates the Railway Station site for a mixed use development that could include offices, residential, hotel, leisure, retail (primarily food), improved transport interchange facilities, including retaining existing levels of commuter parking". The Society is concerned about the traffic implications of so much potential development at the station. We note that the "Local Plan allocates the Railway Station site for a mixed use development that could include offices, residential, hotel, leisure, retail (primarily food), improved transport interchange facilities, including retaining existing levels of commuter parking". The Society is concerned about the traffic implications of so much potential development at the station. The TCM should make reference to the need to strengthen the Farnham Road bridge over the railway, and identify the opportunity to enhance it with a new pedestrian footway on its southern side.	Comments noted. The site proformas have now been reworked and the issues relating to the wording you have raised have been taken on board when drafting the interim town centre framework. Wording can now be found in the 'strategy' section.
	Site 03 and 04 (Jewsons warehouse site and 1 and 2 Station View) The Society considers that there should be a proposal to reserve within the site a footpath/cycle path alongside the railway. This will facilitate pedestrian/cycle movement between the University via Yorky's Bridge and the railway station to avoid the need to walk or cycle along the narrow and busy Walnut Tree Close.	Comment noted. Suggestion incorporated into the town centre interim framework.
	Site 09 (Bedford Road Car Park) One of the major (and most controversial) proposals mentioned in the Plan is the intention by the Executive Committee of the Council to seek planning consent for the bus station to be relocated to Bedford Road. The views of the Society in respect of the proposal to relocate the bus station onto this site have previously been set out under the 'Analysis' section of this report (paragraphs 4.5 to 4.9) which set out the Society's serious concerns on the important issue of Pedestrian Movement. The Society is also seriously concerned about the wider traffic implications of locating a bus station at Bedford Road – not only in terms of traffic congestion in consequence of accommodating bus movements onto and off Onslow Street but for the safety for all road users. In this connection we draw attention to the reference in the TCM (Appendix 1, Page 11 of the TCMP) that "The highest number of traffic accidents relating to shunts in the one way system and pedestrians at road crossings occur at the three crossing points of the junction of Onslow Street with Bridge Street".	Comments noted. The final location of the bus station is yet to be determined and are subject to further studies.

	<p>This proposal also needs to be considered in the context of two issues raised in the TCM . Firstly, page 5 of the TCMP sets out an 'Analysis' of the town centre and identifies (as a 'Weakness') that:- "Main shopping streets slope steeply down to the river... This gradient makes getting around on foot difficult for some people, and also difficult to walk up/push a pushchair or wheelchair." Secondly, one of the 'Objectives' of the TCM (page 4) is:- "...making it easier, safer and more pleasant to move around." Judged against these two considerations the proposal to relocate the Bus Station to Bedford Road is deficient in two respects. Firstly it relocates the Bus Station from its present centrally-located position (part way up the steep slope) to a much less favourable position at the 'bottom' of the slope. Secondly, as presently conceived, the proposal not only makes no provision to make it "easier, safer and more pleasant to move around" but it requires pedestrians to cross Onslow Street 'at grade'. As a result the situation for pedestrians is made desperately worse as a result of requiring them to use unsuitably narrow pavements and exposing them to the noise and danger from the heavily-trafficked Onslow Street. It is important that proposals for the future of buses serving the town centre are considered in more detail. Such investigations may result in other options being explored such that the current intentions of the Council will be revised. However, the position of the Society is that if the Council continues to promote the relocation of the bus station to Bedford Road, it is of critical importance that the proposals must, as an integral part, provide for the achievement of a safe, convenient and attractive route for pedestrians walking between a Bedford Road bus station and the town centre shopping area. In order to assure this, the Plan should state that any planning application for a new bus station at Bedford Road is contingent on the application providing for a permanent 24 hour new pedestrian way through the Friary from the new bus station to North Street. Without such assurance the Society would oppose any planning application for a new bus station at Bedford Road.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The final location of the bus station is yet to be determined. Your concerns are all valid and are noted.</p>
	<p>Site 10 (Bridge Street) The Society considers the policy for this site should identify the opportunity for enhanced value as a result of this area forming a comprehensive development with Site 10 (Bedford Road).</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>Site 11 (the open area in front of the Electric Theatre) The Society considers that this site is not large enough to accommodate more development in the form of a bar/pub or café/restaurant. Any reduction in the size and extent of this open area will adversely affect its townscape value. The Society considers there is the opportunity to enhance this riverside site by the introduction of some tree planting</p>	<p>Comment noted. Agreed and this is reflecting in the interim framework.</p>
	<p>Site 12 (the former Farnham Road bus station). We are not opposed to some smallscale development – perhaps to provide restaurants and/or cafes - but we consider the emphasis should be on creating an attractive open space as a way of enhancing this important area of riverside land.</p>	<p>Comments noted, agree. This issues has been taken into account in drafting the interim framework.</p>
	<p>Site 14 (Guildford Plaza) The Society is very concerned that this large and important site remains undeveloped. The Society considers this site to be ideal for a housing development t and we consider the Council should use its powers and influence to unlock this site for development.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There is progression with the redevelopment of this site.</p>
	<p>Site 15 (Debenhams) The Society supports the statement in the Plan that the existing Debenhams building is "particularly bulky and monotonous".</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>
	<p>Site 16 (Millmead House and Old Millmead) The Society notes that this site is identified as a potential site for housing. Whilst not disagreeing that, geographically, this site is suitable for housing, the Society considers that if the Council Offices are to be relocated this should only be to a location which is suitable and accessible for the people of the Borough.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>Site 17 (Millbrook Car Park) The Society is opposed to the "Opportunity" for this car park being an "Extended/decked car park". In the view of the Society the development of a decked car park would interrupt important local views and generally be seriously detrimental to this area of open land adjacent to the river.</p>	<p>Comment and objection noted.</p>
	<p>Site 18 (Land bounded by North Street/Leapale Road and Commercial Road) The Society notes the intention in the Plan that "the existing 2003 designed development brief for this site is to be reviewed early in 2012". The Society has no objection to the concept of a revised brief particularly if it is seeks to produce a redevelopment scheme in keeping with the character of Guildford as an historic town. It will be critical that any proposals should incorporate and/or retain important planning benefits for the town which were secured as an agreement under Section 106 of the Planning Act. The new development brief should insist that any planning application for an extension to the present Friary must include a permanent 24 hour new pedestrian way through it from the railway station/proposed new bus station to North Street. Without such assurance the Society opposes the new bus station. [Note; Item 6 of the GBC Exec on 5.1.12 asks for funding for consultants to prepare the new brief: public consultation on draft brief timetabled for 10 April to 25 May.]</p>	<p>Comments noted. The North Street Design and Development Brief has now been produced and is going to 6 September Executive with a recommendation for adoption. I can confirm receipt of your response to this consultation and that these have been taken into account in the final Brief.</p>
	<p>Site 19 (Bellerby Theatre) The Society objected to the Planning Brief, agreed by the Council in 2011, which proposed that this area be made available for a supermarket. We took the view that this is an unsuitable site for a supermarket in that the requirements of access, servicing and provision of adequate customer car parking will be incompatible with the geographical constraints of the area. In the Town Centre Masterplan, Site 19 forms part of a "Transition Area". Such areas are defined as being "areas with a mixed use/residential character which provide quieter, pleasant atmosphere within the town centre". The Society remains of the view that this area is inappropriate for locating a supermarket. A supermarket here will destroy the "quieter, pleasant atmosphere" which the Plan recognises is a characteristic of the present area. The Society considers the area should be used in a way which accords with the Plan's designation of the area as a "Transition Area".</p>	<p>The Bellerby Theatre site brief explains why the site is now considered in planning policy terms to be suitable for a mixed-use development to include a supermarket. It explains that transport assessment would be required for any application for a mixed use development.</p>
	<p>Site 20 (BT Telephone Exchange) The Society agrees that this is a potential development site (if the telephone exchange equipment could be reduced in size).</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

	Site 24 (Bright Hill Car Park) The Society acknowledges that this land has long been identified for redevelopment with housing in recognition of a desire to recreate its historic use. However this site performs an important role in providing much-needed town centre car parking and any proposals for redevelopment with housing needs to be accompanied with clear proposals to mitigate the loss of car parking space, preferably by using the levels of the site to provide underground car parking.	Comment noted. This issue will be taken into account when drafting the final framework once the outcome of the parking strategy review is known.
	Site 25 (Adult Education Institute, Sydenham Road) The Society whole-heartedly endorses the proposal in the Plan that these existing buildings be retained for community use and we support the identified potential for further community/education uses.	Comment noted and support welcomed.
	Site 1 - Guildford Road car park - Agree with the suggested uses. Access could be improved by constructing a bridge over the tracks and connecting it with the site No.2 and so to Walnut Tree Close (WTC), the gyratory and the Ladymead (A25).	Agreement acknowledged and suggested use carried though to the interim town centre framework.
	Site 2 - Agree with the suggested uses. Very close co-operation and consultation between GBC and Solum Regeneration would be required to integrate developments. In addition to the new facilities on this site it should incorporate highway infrastructure improvements such as an access route to a road bridge over the tracks to connect with Site No. 1. Improvements to the Station forecourt should incorporate a comfortable waiting area for bus users. Bus stops should be created in the lane where the current taxi stand is located. Taxi stand then could be placed where the dropping-off parking is now situated and relocating this within the car park area. The station platforms require improved access for the disabled as the subway ramps are too steep (they do not comply with the current DDA requirements). An option would be to provide lifts to the footbridge level. Alternatively lifts could be provided from the subway level up to the platforms and structural work would be less disruptive for this option. New Ticket Office could be at the footbridge level and close to it and escalators, steps and lifts from the entrance area should be provided. A walkway from this level should be considered in order to provide a direct route to connect with the town centre. It would cross WTC, the river and run along Bedford Road but at a higher level, cross Onslow Street and terminate within a purpose-made building or the Friary itself if feasible. A separate footbridge from Guildford Park Road would connect with this walkway.	Agreement acknowledged and suggested use carried though to the interim town centre framework. The improvements to the platforms and internal access of the station are the responsibility of network rail as part of any improvements.
	Sites 3 & 4 - Agree with the intended use but puzzled by the inclusion of site No.4 as it has fairly new buildings on it already. Access to these sites should also be provided from the north by widening the road to Site No. 3 from WTC and possibly replacing the footbridge by a road bridge to connect with the access road to the University. This would provide a much better access from here to Site No. 1 and the facilities that would be built on it. A benefit would be to make the route safer for pedestrians and remove the isolated character of the existing footbridge which suffers from anti-social activities at night.	Agreement acknowledged and suggested use carried though to the interim town centre framework. Site 4 is known to be available for redevelopment and has outline planning permission for a mix of houses and offices.
	Site 5 - Agreed with the suggested use but a road connection over the river to the current Arriva Depot and Leas Road would improve access bypassing the gyratory. This route could also be used more conveniently by buses to the west when the new railway bridge is built and if Mary Road site is chosen to relocate the bus station instead of Bedford Road site.	Comment noted. Any such bridge and access through the Bus depot requires third party land and as such is undeliverable.
	Site No.7 - Planning permission has already been granted for offices, so how can housing be included unless agreed by the developer and enhancement to riverside area could be guided via detailed planning approval?	Comment noted. Planning permission being granted for offices does not prevent the site coming forward for housing. The planning permission has not been implemented.
	Site no.8 - In addition to the intended use, since this is within the commercial area, the bus station could be located here and multilevel car parks only on top could be advantageous by leaving Bedford Road site to include housing and offices etc. with architectural designs suitable for riverside developments.	Comments noted. Mary Road car park is not one of the option being considered for a bus station.
	Site No.9 - Should be developed as was intended as the site is not wholly suitable as a bus station. This site is within the historic area and it is smaller than Site no. 8 that could comfortably accommodate all bus routes. The bus bays could be arranged in a fish-bone fashion with pedestrian access through the spine and catering for drive in reverse out (DIRO) movements.	Comments noted. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. Mary Road car park is not one of the option being considered for a bus station.
	Site No.10 - Since planning permissions are extant is there seems an opportunity to change anything.? Eight storey high development is quite out of scale for the area. Don't know the history and the guidelines of the planning permission but it seems not right to have such a tall building at this location.	No other uses are suggested, just noted that this is an area which is likely to be redeveloped, and would benefit from redevelopment.
	Site No.11 - Agree with the suggested use.	Agreement acknowledged and suggested use carried though to the interim town centre framework.
	Site No.12 - Agree with the suggested use.	Agreement acknowledged and suggested use carried though to the interim town centre framework.
	Site No.13 - Agree with the suggested use but consider a cycle lane through the site to Town Bridge.	Agreement acknowledged and suggested use carried though to the interim town centre framework.
	Site No. 14 - Agree with the suggested use but consider making room for a mini roundabout on Portsmouth Road to facilitate entry to and exit from the site.	Agreement acknowledged and suggested use carried though to the interim town centre framework.
	Site No.15 - Agree with the proposal.	Agreement acknowledged and suggested use carried though to the interim town centre framework.
	Site No.16 - Change of use if GBC office is relocated. Not cost effective to demolish and rebuild considering buildings are about only 30 years old.	Comment noted. The site is suggested for residential use.

	Site No.17 - In addition to decked car park, housing with long distant view on the river-front would be a very good idea.	Comment noted, this site has now been removed from the interim town centre framework.
	Site No. 18 - This is a central high value area ideal for retail stores in the Friary Extension. Housing would be too expensive on this location but shops and some green open spaces surrounded by low-level small retail outlets, restaurants and cafes could make the eastern end by Leapale Road very attractive. Bus station should be relocated but strategically sited bus stops and comfortable waiting areas should be provided such that there would be virtually no change as far as the bus users are concerned.	Comments noted. The interim town centre framework cross refers to the North Street Design and Development Brief which sets out more detailed deign principles for the redevelopment of this area and suggests a mixed use scheme.
	Site No. 19 & 20 - Traffic implications of having a supermarket need to be considered.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
	Site No. 22 & 23 - Agree with suggested use and modifications.	Agreement acknowledged and suggested use carried though to the interim town centre framework.
	Site No. 24 & 25 - Agree with the suggested use.	Agreement acknowledged and suggested use carried though to the interim town centre framework.
	Rail - No proposals yet from Solum Regeneration. In addition to improved accessibility and improved facilities at the station, improvements to highway infrastructure are needed to reduce congestion in WTC and access to the gyratory for the emerging traffic from the station. A road bridge over the tracks would improve accessibility from the west as well as increase the value of the developments both sides of the track. Development of Site No.1 by GBC would also similarly benefit. The new bridge would enable improvements to the traffic in Farnham Road Bridge by making it one-way into the town centre. This in turn would increase the throughput and allow a set of traffic lights to facilitate access for the emerging traffic from WTC.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
	Planning application for a new bus station in Bedford Road etc. - This is not a good scheme. Curtailment of bus routes at the upper end of the High street coupled with the fact that no route would actually call in at the railway station and that the site is within the conservation area make the choice questionable. A set of traffic lights that would be required for buses to turn into and exit from Bedford Road would adversely affect the traffic in Onslow Street in both directions. The gyratory is already congested and this together with the proposal for straight across pedestrian crossings would probably stop the gyratory working at all at peak times!	Comments noted. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
	The relocation to Mary Road car park site would be a better choice provided strategically sited new bus stops and improved waiting areas around the Friary are provided such that the bus users would be dropped off and picked up from these and therefore they would not be inconvenienced at all. Additionally if the alternate buses of the routes from the north and the east go to the railway station on their way to the bus station, the objective of a Transport hub at the railway station would be achieved. Such an arrangement where the other half of buses go to Mary Road via York Road roundabout and Leas road would reduce their numbers in Onslow Street. Buses from the south and the west could of course easily call in at the railway station.	The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. However, Mary Road is not one of the options being considered.
	I would refer the reader to my website www.spanglefish.com/revampguildfordgyratory/	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
	where in the Bus Station section I've explained my ideas of the alternative choice of Mary Road as the bus station and associated bus stops etc. The website of course deals with improvements to the gyratory, and other congestion hotspots and those that are associated with the A3 through Guildford. The A3 is of course the Highway Agency (HA)'s responsibility and therefore GBC needs to engage with Surrey County Council and the HA regarding the congestion in the Guildford stretch of the A3.	Comments noted. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. mary Ropad is not an option being considered. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.

	<p>New park and Ride site at Manor Park - The access and exit from the P&R would be from the hospital roundabout altered to become a signalised junction. However, in order to reduce congestion at the Tesco roundabout and tailbacks on the exit slip road from the A3, it would be advantageous to have another access to the P&R via an off-slip from the A3. This should be considered in the design of the widening proposal of the A3 (currently Suspended following cuts in the roads programme) by the HA when the scheme is resurrected.</p>	<p>Comments noted and agree. This is a longer term consideration with the Highways Agency.</p>
	<p>Feasibility study to consider improvement of the gyratory - I am delighted that GBC has taken this on board. I have through my letters published in the Surrey Advertiser promoted the idea that the gyratory could be improved for the motorists, pedestrians and the cyclists. My website has ideas on such improvements by using road space more efficiently and utilising the existing traffic signal phasing at junctions to improve flow for the southbound traffic through the gyratory. This traffic would be taken away from Bridge Street and it would use Lower Farnham Road and the Friary Bridge converted to two-way roads. Guildford Society has also proposed improvements to the gyratory. These options need to be considered in the feasibility study.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>Junction improvement works at Egerton Road and Gill Avenue - Full benefit of this would be realised when the access to P&R is also provided directly from the A3.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>Improved pedestrian route between railway station and shopping area - The route via Bridge Street is the preferred route at the moment. The footway on the north side on Bridge Street is narrow but it could be widened if Bridge Street is reduced to two lanes. This is possible if the off-side lane direction on Lower Farnham Road and the Friary Bridge is reversed to make them two-way roads. If and when the station forecourt is redesigned, the entrance could be nearer the northern end so that when the passengers come out they would be at the head of bus lane and taxi stand rather than at the tail end. In that case a shorter route to the town centre would be via Bedford Road. If the ticket office is located at the level of the footbridge over the tracks, a high level walkway could be considered over Walnut Tree Close and crossing the river and going along Bedford Road and terminating at the Friary or a purpose built building adjacent to the friary. GBC and Solum Regeneration would need to liaise on these aspects if not already doing so.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>Cycling improvements - It is encouraging that GBC is considering these improvements. My website shows possible cycle lanes that could be accommodated in the gyratory as part of the overall improvements that enable these provisions.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>Realign pedestrian crossing of Onslow Street at Bridge Street to cross straight across - This requires careful assessment of the effect on traffic in Onslow Street. A Straight crossing would be that much longer and the extra time has to be allowed for the crossing. This would also result in northbound and southbound traffic becoming interconnected. The existing central refuge holds pedestrians and allows independent signalling of the crossings.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>SKETCHES SHOWING POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS - The attached sketches show some of the improvement ideas but fuller description could be found on the website</p>	<p>Comments noted and thank you for sharing your ideas and sketches. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>www.spanglefish.com/revampguildfordgyratory/</p>	<p>Comments noted and thank you for sharing your ideas and sketches. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>

	and the sketches in its Links.	Comments noted and thank you for sharing your ideas and sketches. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
Terence O'Rourke Ltd on Behalf of University of Surrey	The University of Surrey (UoS) generally supports the approach adopted by the Guildford Town Centre Masterplan 2012-2010, consultation draft December 2011. However, it wishes to make a number of focused comments.	Comments noted and support welcomed.
	The University welcomes the proposed vision for Guildford town centre in order to:	Comments noted and support welcomed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it a thriving place for businesses to locate to by reinforcing its retail and employment centre role, particularly through utilising links with the University 	Comments noted and support welcomed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve transport infrastructure and ensure that it continues to play an important role as a transport interchange, with improved bus and rail facilities 	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
	Feasibility study to consider improvement of the gyratory - I am delighted that GBC has taken this on board. I have through my letters published in the Surrey Advertiser promoted the idea that the gyratory could be improved for the motorists, pedestrians	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create inviting and comfortable public spaces and buildings that people want to use, whilst reinforcing local character and distinctiveness 	Comments noted. This aim is reflected in the interim town centre framework.
	The University also welcomes Objectives 1 – 7 which focus the issues identified in the vision. However, Objective 3 could be strengthened by adding reference to the need to improve transportation connectivity between the town centre and the surrounding urban areas. In reality what happens inside the town centre boundary will have implications for the areas outside and vice versa. Improving connectivity between all urban areas in the town should be referenced, and in respect of significant facilities and economic areas outside the centre, should be specifically included as an objective.	Comments noted and taken on board in the drafting of the objectives contained in the town centre interim framework.
	The University's views on the topics that underpin the Objectives are set out in further detail below.	Comments noted and each will be taken in turn.
	The University welcomes the objective to support and expand the town centre economy and the identification of a number of sites that could be redeveloped for employment generating uses. The University considers that a lack of suitable employment sites and / or modern office specification buildings could cause existing companies who wish to expand to look for accommodation outside of Guildford town, and this raises the possibility that, if forced into re-locating, they will consider locations beyond the Borough. Not only would this give rise to a reduction in business rates for the Council, it would also affect the reputation of Guildford as a good place for businesses to locate and grow. The future of the local economy will be influenced by the attractiveness of Guildford town centre as a place to invest, which is linked to the availability of a variety of types of business premises. It is therefore important that the supply of employment premises is maintained and enhanced, particularly in the town centre, which has the potential to be the most accessible location for businesses and their employees from a transport, housing and facilities perspective.	The Council does not benefit directly from rates, they are handed to central government who then redistributes them.
	A number of the sites identified for alternative uses in the masterplan are existing employment sites. If a particular site is poorly located and comprises poor quality buildings that are not suitable for modern needs, then it is right to consider the potential for other uses. However, allocations should be based on a robust, credible and up to date evidence base, which takes into consideration current supply and demand. Sites should not be lost to non-employment uses where there is an inadequate supply of employment sites to meet the needs of the Core Strategy DPD during the plan period. This would also bring into question the soundness of the masterplan in terms of whether it is flexible enough to deliver the Council's objectives. The masterplan would benefit from a town centre wide plan which shows the locations of the potential development sites identified on pages 23 – 39.	Comments noted. Agree. The town centre interim framework does not allocate sites for particular uses, this will be done through the Local Plan Delivery document. We are undertaking evidence base work known as the Economic Land Assessment which will provide evidence for the future need, demand and supply of premises.

	<p>The strategic benefits of building an improved town centre economy with more jobs and better retail offer will clearly complement issues around transportation. Overall the emphasis will be able to shift such that local trips for residents of the Borough can replace longer journeys to other centres further afield. This will of course require investment and action to deliver transport facilities and local connectivity to keep step with such changes. Traffic congestion in the town centre at peak hour times, and the impact that it has on journey times is identified as a weakness and threat within the masterplan. The University agrees that this is an issue and that it does have a negative impact on enjoyment of the town centre, whether travelling by private vehicle, public transport or as a pedestrian or cyclist. Works to alleviate these problems, such as feasibility studies to investigate possible ways to improve traffic flow with or without the gyratory and associated junction improvements in the town centre and improved connectivity for other modes are welcomed by the University (page 60). In summary, the overall objectives of improving the town centre are supported. Improving the retail, leisure and commercial offer should help to achieve a stronger economy and encourage reduced journey distances. This will in turn increase the opportunity for walking, cycling and bus journeys where local trips can be more readily accommodated by these modes. Encouraging more locally based jobs and facilities for local residents of the Borough with a better balance of provision for walking and cycling are important. In addition, rail and bus station improvements are welcomed as they will encourage more sustainable travel choices to be made by a wider catchment of people. More detail is provided below:</p>	<p>Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>The vision should recognise that there will be an increased desire for travel to the town centre and that this will not be accommodated solely by the private car. It should recognise that bus (both Park & Ride and regular services) will be an increasingly important means of travel to access the town centre for journeys from other parts of the town. The vision should look to improve access, facilities and provision for buses in the town centre. The University welcomes the proposal to improve bus facilities within the town centre. Many students and staff of the University and employees based at Surrey Research Park use bus services to travel between home and work, and improvements to facilities will improve their travel experience. Improvement measures that facilitate more efficient access, faster journey times and greater range and frequency of services will encourage a greater number of people to transfer from private car to public transport. The masterplan should aim to deliver an expanded bus provision in the future to serve the town centre and adjacent urban areas. Within this strategy there is a need to ensure wherever possible that bus corridors and priority measures are introduced on key approaches and not just within the town centre itself. There is a need for joined up thinking to ensure that travelling by bus (both local and Park and Ride) is encouraged and well planned.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position. The reworked vision in the interim framework with regard to movement now reads 'Getting to and around the town centre will be improved for the benefit of residents, businesses and visitors alike'.</p>
	<p>The strategy for car parking for the town centre is similar to many other town centres in terms of reducing long term spaces and providing short term spaces and Park & Ride. Getting the balance of enough short stay spaces to encourage shopping and leisure is important and the parking strategy should reflect this as well as the role for Park & Ride. The reduction of long stay spaces coupled with greater demand from development growth will arguably generate more demand for bus and rail travel to/from the town centre and the potential for this to increase will need to be accommodated. Similarly the provision for cycle parking (and connectivity) within the town centre and to/from surrounding urban areas will continue to encourage the increased trend in cycling as an attractive economic and healthy lifestyle travel choice. The University welcomes the proposal to increase park and ride space provision as a means to alleviate congestion on the gyratory and approach roads to the town centre. Reference is made to a forthcoming review of the 2003 Parking Strategy and in particular the need to take account of a proposed new park and ride facility at Manor Park. The University considers that park and ride is a valid way to reduce the number of cars accessing the town centre. However, the issue of park and ride for the western approach to the town should be reviewed to ensure that the best solution is arrived at to meet the town's needs. With regard to the potential benefits the park and ride sites will have on the masterplan, the review of the wider parking strategy should really include park and ride west of Guildford. If this is not included, the masterplan could be unsound because it may not deliver the objectives (particularly Objective 3) and the plan would lack flexibility.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>The University agrees that the railway station has an important role to play in the town centre as a focus for interchange. Bus and rail interchange for existing and potential future expansion of services, should form a fundamental part of the vision. The masterplan identifies that opportunities could exist to improve station infrastructure at Guildford Railway Station (site 02, page 24). The University welcomes improvements that would enhance capacity and improve the travel experience at the station to help meet the challenge of reducing town centre congestion. The train station is a gateway to the town and a modern, well-equipped station is essential to retain and attract investment in the town, and to ensure Guildford remains a well-connected and attractive place for people to live and work.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>The University consider that cycling will have an increasingly important role to play for local trips in the Borough. The masterplan identifies the need to improve cyclist and pedestrian accessibility to, and within, the town centre and lists a number of possible schemes in the table on page 61. These schemes are generally welcomed by the University, particularly the proposed new routes between the University / the hospital and the town centre; and Park Barn to Guildford Railway station via the University. However, it is not clear what demand related evidence base has been used to propose these routes and the associated costs, and whether alternative routes to the town centre from locations such as the University, have been considered. For example, there could be opportunities to create pedestrian and cyclist routes to the town centre which provide better connectivity and may require funding assistance from the Council. The masterplan could be improved through the addition of a plan that shows the location of the pedestrian and cyclist routes described in the table. It should be ensured that the need for suitable cycle routes (both quiet roads and more formal provision) and key locations for cycle parking or potential for community pool bikes is reflected in the masterplan.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>

	To ensure that transport provision to serve the town centre is delivered some junctions The University welcomes the inclusion of the footbridge that links to the University campus to the north of the town centre. This route and the regeneration of the approach to it from the town centre could improve the use of this existing infrastructure. However the area to the north east of the bridge is excluded from the town centre boundary and to further improve the route it would be better if this area could also be regenerated over time to improve the level of natural surveillance along this route.	Comments noted. Areas that lie outside of the boundary are not excluded from planning and from opportunities for improvement. These area will be covered by the Local Plan Strategy and Local Plan Delivery documents.
	The future assessment should consider the approaches to the town centre as well as the area of the town centre itself. Some modelling should be undertaken to inform decision-making in the town centre as a tool to help understand potential changes in the town centre network. The modelling is in itself not delivery, but should be used to inform options and choices for adapting and altering transport provision. Sustainable transport provision should be the cornerstone of the transport elements of the masterplan delivery. This should include the provision of bus priority within and on the approach to the town centre, the need for bus facilities to cater for increased levels of bus demand and the provision of safe, secure and covered cycle parking.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
	The University strongly agrees that very high land values and home prices that make it particularly difficult for young people and key workers to live locally to their work, are a weakness of the town centre. This is an issue that must be addressed through the masterplan. The University welcomes the objective to improve the town centre as a sustainable place to live and to increase the number of homes, including affordable homes. If more affordable housing is provided in the town centre there is a greater likelihood that University students and staff, and employees of tenants of the Surrey Research Park will be able to live close to where they work or study. This relationship is important if the University is to continue to attract new students and staff and also for other employers based in Guildford. If housing opportunities do not exist for the young and old, people and businesses could be lost to other towns or cities where accommodation is more available and affordable.	Comments noted and points relating to affordable housing supported. The town centre framework however, is not the tool to address this issues and affordable housing will be dealt with in the Local Plan Strategy and Local Plan delivery documents.
	The University supports the development of sites identified in the masterplan for residential uses. However this must not prejudice the achievement of economy and transportation related objectives. The allocation of sites of residential uses must be based on a robust, credible and up-to-date evidence base or the masterplan could be unsound. While the University supports the provision of new housing in the town centre, it is aware that there are not enough available sites in the town centre to meet the housing needs of the Borough up to 2030. The University considers that there is a need to identify sites on the edge of town where development would be well connected with the town centre and would complement the objectives of the town centre masterplan. In conclusion, for Guildford to continue to prosper and to attract inward investment, there must be an adequate supply of employment sites in sustainable locations, there must also be opportunities for people to access the housing market at an affordable price and the transportation system should facilitate movement to, from and across the town without undue congestion and delay and promote sustainable patterns of travel where possible.	Comments noted. These issues will all be dealt with as part of the preparation of the Local Plan Strategy and Local Plan Delivery documents and supporting evidence base documents.
Member of Public	Thank you for the opportunity to express some concerns about this development, of which the major ones are! The scale, especially heights, of the proposed new buildings, and consequent reduction of natural light around and within them; the lack of significant amounts of healthy indigenous plants, in particular, mature trees to absorb air pollution and muffle noise. also I wonder if the style of the new structures will complement, but not clash, with, that of our cherished" old Guildford with, that of our cherished "old Guildford".	Comments noted and we are sorry to hear your concerns. Any future development must have regard to its surroundings in terms of scale and character and we have Local Plan policies relating to design principles that I hope address your concerns.
Member of Public	As a resident of GBC in a rural area of the borough these comments are based on common sense and observations for the future of Guildford Town Centre. Emphaasis on retail development of the Friary should be limited in eth future as the influence of "on line" purchasing is increasing thus reducing the need for more shops. As a resident I find that shopping malls are boring with similar chains of retailers being repeated from town to town. Why can't Guildford be different? Guildford is an historic town and should place emphasis on this aspect and use Woking as an example of poor development and planning where houses are continually removed and replaced with flats and apartments with no provision of additional open space and with what green space there is becoming more congested. As an historic town similar to Canterbury, planners should study the bus station in this city but take into account the gradients of Guildford's shopping and business areas. GBC should act on the advice of local people with the first hand knowledge of needs of the town and not outside planners and developers who mostly prefer high rise buildings.	Comments noted. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floor space. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping. The area is not for an expansion to the friary shopping area but a redevelopment site for a mix of uses. This is unlikely to take the form of a shopping centre but individual units with streets as an extension of the primary shopping area. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies.
Broadway Malyan on behalf of Cheval Property Holdings Limited (CHPL); leasehold owner of Odeon cinema, former Old Orleans restaurant and the paved area in front.	I refer to the draft Town Centre Masterplan for Guildford which has been produced by your authority. I have been instructed by my client Cheval Property Holdings Limited (CHPL) to submit a representation to this document. CPHL holds the long leasehold interest in the land occupied by the Odeon cinema in addition to the land occupied by what was formerly the Old Orleans restaurant and the paved area in front of that. The attached plan delineates clearly the full land ownership. This representation addresses only the land occupied by the Old Orleans restaurant and the paved area in front; it does not seek to alter the use nor the form of the cinema building itself. The area of land in front of the Cinema is within an area designated by your draft Masterplan as a 'Commercial Quarter'. This document describes the area as containing 'over-dominant' buildings and also highlights that 'many of the more modern buildings are of poor quality, some with prominent blank facades ... surrounded by high levels of non-descript, underused space'. It also states that 'public spaces are generally of poor quality and lacking legibility for pedestrians', with the River Wey 'mostly ignored'. On these points stated we agree.	Comments noted and agreement with these points acknowledged.

	In particular, given that the Old Orleans restaurant has been vacant for 2 years and the cinema building itself is a functional and bulky mass, we also believe that more can be done to make this a quality pedestrian public realm and built environment. These are reasons why Broadway Malyan have been asked to examine the site's context, the opportunities it presents and for our client's perspective, the commercial opportunity to assist the Council in bringing forward a more satisfactory pedestrian environment. The Masterplan outlines an ambition to broadly improve pedestrian linkage from the railway station to the primary shopping area in the town centre and my client's site occupies a key location adjacent to this pedestrian route, which I am sure you will agree is an area in need of particular improvement and greater legibility.	Comments noted and agree that this area outside of the cinema and Old Orleans could be improved for pedestrian activity and this is reflected in the interim town centre framework.
	We recognise the Masterplan pays particular attention to the car park site on Bedford Road opposite my client's land (Site 09). Here it makes clear that opportunities exist for a development comprising ground floor cafes with office and/or residential above. It also outlines the potential to enhance the riverside and create complementary public spaces. The provision of a new bus facility is also mentioned and we are aware from the Council Executive's meeting of 20 October 2011 that the Council, being the landowners, aim to submit a planning application in the near future for a new bus station on this existing car park land. It was also noted in the report to the Executive that it was felt the bus station 'could initiate wider improvements to the river frontage'. With this in mind, CPHL welcome the opportunity to work with the Council to help achieve their objectives. We trust that you will agree that my client's site and the surrounding area present a significant opportunity to bring forward effective public realm and regeneration. The redevelopment of the adjacent Bedford Road car park provides a clear opportunity for joint working, with the possibility of adopting a holistic approach to regenerating this area. Furthermore, there is the potential for my client to deliver some of the objectives outlined in the Masterplan for the Bedford Road car park which the bus facility is unlikely to provide.	Comments noted and agree that this site presents significant opportunities to improve public realm in the area. The interim framework does not include this as a specific site but recognises the opportunities in terms of public realm and states 'The facades of the Bedford Road multi-storey car park and the area in front of the Odeon cinema will be improved to contribute more positively to the character of this area.'
	In order to successfully improve this key pedestrian route to the Town Centre, my client recognises the need to break up the plain and somewhat dominant front elevation of the existing cinema building and the expanse of brick paving in front of it. This also represents the opportunity to introduce more active frontage at ground level by removing the Old Orleans building and replacing it with a more contemporary retail and/or dining experience. Recognising the largely blank frontage which the cinema expresses and the Borough's increasing demands to provide new housing, we believe that residential development on upper floors would be appropriate and introduce increased passive surveillance. We also recognise the need to improve the surrounding public realm (including land outside our control such as the Bedford Road car park) and make better use and recognise the importance of the adjacent Wey Navigation, particularly given the Masterplan defines the site as a 'place making priority area'. To achieve this, CPHL is examining the opportunity to bring forward a mixed use scheme, comprising commercial units at ground floor level and residential and possibly office accommodation above. Not only would this provide much needed additional housing, but it would create a new, attractive and active frontage to the cinema building. My client is also examining the opportunity to create extensive public realm improvements which would create a new and vibrant riverside square, increasing the visual vitality of the area and strengthening the Council's ambition to improve this key pedestrian route.	Comments noted. The area in front of these buildings is protected open space and as such cannot be developed. However, there are no constraints on redeveloping the existing buildings and improving the wider public realm of the area. The interim framework does not include this as a specific site but recognises the opportunities in terms of public realm and states 'The facades of the Bedford Road multi-storey car park and the area in front of the Odeon cinema will be improved to contribute more positively to the character of this area.'
	Overall, we believe the site is a suitable location for a residential led mixed use scheme which meets Government objectives of creating sustainable communities, and ensuring that housing is developed in locations which offer good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. Furthermore, my client's objectives reflect the broad objectives outlined in the draft Town Centre Masterplan. We recognise that there are detailed development management and technical considerations which will need to be addressed prior to any detailed proposal coming forward; nevertheless we believe that the draft Masterplan is an important opportunity to recognise the Town's considerable potential and build on key strengths such as the Wey Navigation and sites such as my clients. We therefore trust that you consider my client's initial vision for this site favourably and ultimately incorporate it as one of the key areas and sites which can benefit from more detailed examination and expression. We therefore wish to see it assessed along the same lines as other potential master planning and redevelopment sites identified in the draft Town Centre Masterplan and suggest it is formally identified as such. In the meantime our technical and development management considerations continue and similar to the Council at Bedford Road car park may look to bring forward detailed plans in the near future.	Comments noted. The area in front of these buildings is protected open space and as such cannot be developed. However, there are no constraints on redeveloping the existing buildings and improving the wider public realm of the area. The interim framework does not include this as a specific site but recognises the opportunities in terms of public realm and states 'The facades of the Bedford Road multi-storey car park and the area in front of the Odeon cinema will be improved to contribute more positively to the character of this area.'
	Thank you for the opportunity to review and submit representation on this draft document. We look forward to reviewing other representations submitted as the Masterplan moves forward to adoption in May 2012 and wish to work with the Borough to achieve a more satisfactory pedestrian and built environment in this locality.	Comments noted.
Guildford Business Forum	Recommend deletion of "and will allow for a reduction in the number of long stay/commuter parking spaces" in the 5 th line. These need to be retained as they are important to businesses and fundamentally affect the ability to attract employers and therefore, jobs into the town. Expansion of the Park & Ride facilities are considered vital to achieve the aims of the Master Plan.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
	The words "with frontages that enable interaction of people with buildings". We have no idea what this means and unless someone can explain what it means, then we don't consider we should have a vision for it.	Comments noted and taken into account in the redrafting of the vision as part of the interim town centre framework.

	<p>Transition areas are described as providing a “pleasant atmosphere” and yet the photograph we show is a badly stained timber which looks highly unattractive. There is also a missing word in the last line above the photograph after the word “pleasant”. In the opening paragraph the existing mix is described as including “Government (Law Courts) and Community Facilities (Police station)”. This, in fact, is incorrect, as on the townscape plan, both the Police station and Law Courts are shown in the commercial quarter.</p>	<p>Comments noted and taken into account in the drafting of the interim town centre framework.</p>
	<p>Strategy - There are four discernable strands set out. However, none of those directly address the issue of traffic/congestion. We believe that there should be a fifth strand which should be “active management” of traffic. In practice, this means constant monitoring of traffic flows and ways in which we can improve it. We have been talking about the “BID” process and the office community not participating in that. The business community might be prepared to pay more in rates if it meant a dedicated Officer at Surrey County Council, who had the relevant expertise and whose role it was to permanently monitor traffic flows and alter the lights wherever there was an imbalance.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>Parking strategy - Given the lack of parking spaces with office buildings in the town, the public spaces become a very important asset to the town without which it will be very hard to attract occupiers into office buildings and other commercial premises in the town centre. The Borough had previously made a commitment to keep no less than 5,000 spaces in the town centre and this should be reiterated in this document. If the town centre boundaries have been expanded, then there should be a consideration of an expansion of this number to match. There should not be a blanket statement to reduce long-term parking spaces in favour of short-term. The long-term user makes two traffic movements in one day, to and away from that car space. By contrast, a shopper might stay in that space only one hour and therefore, short-term car spaces can multiply traffic movements by five or six times in a day. Full consideration of this needs to be taken into account.</p>	<p>Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>There is a statement that the sequential approach is relevant for leisure developments. This surely needs to be questioned as we have a number of out of town leisure developments, such as the Spectrum, obviously owned by Guildford Borough Council, Surrey Sports Park, The Gym at the end of Walnut Tree Close, Virgin/Esporta at Queen Elizabeth Park and Craggy Island on Slyfield Industrial Estate. Based on a sequential test, none of these buildings would exist. The Spectrum, for example, could have been located on the Bedford Road site or the Millbrook car park. The reality of life, however, is that leisure developments cannot afford the high land values associated with the town centre. The success of The Gym at the end of Walnut Tree Close is down to pricing because it is in a low rent environment. This means that it is highly successful in attracting large numbers to keep fit and surely this is something we need to be encouraging, rather than making harder by trying to force them into expensive locations.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The sequential approach is not a local policy but national as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework</p>
	<p>The next paragraph encourages mixed development. It is absolutely clear to us that office occupiers do not want to be in a residential environment and it is, therefore, very important that the needs of those office occupiers are not compromised, otherwise they will not be in a position to contribute to the expansion of the economy. Furthermore, residents are often in conflict with office occupiers over congestion and competition for car parking spaces.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Agree that some office occupiers do not want to be within a mixed use scheme.</p>
	<p>Sites 3 & 4 - These sites are stated as low flood risk under 'constraint'. Why? Has there ever been an example of them flooding, if not they should not be low risk, but no risk.</p>	<p>Comment noted. These sites are at low risk of flooding because they are in flood zone 1. This zone comprises land assessed as having a less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of river or sea flooding (<0.1%) All uses of land are appropriate in this zone. There are no sites or land that are at no risk of flooding as everything else falls into flood zone 1.</p>
	<p>Site-09 Bedford Road Car Park - Under the section “Opportunities and suggested uses” is a new bus facility, associated highways works and enabling development. We remain to be convinced that this is a suitable site for a bus facility not least because of potential conflict between buses such a facility and vehicles seeking to access Bedford Road MSCP particularly at peak times and potential for an adverse impact on traffic flows through the town. Should a new bus facility at Bedford Road be considered both suitable and viable, then it is crucial that such a relocation does not impact negatively on the operation of the gyratory. Access to Bedford Road is currently “left in” from Onslow Street which, if maintained, may be likely to result in additional impact on the gyratory and Onslow Street. Pedestrian access to the site, from the retail and commercial areas, is poor and again it would be necessary to enhance these pedestrian links. It is crucial that highway capacity is not compromised.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The location of the bus facility is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>Site 11 – Land adjoining Electric Theatre - Under the section “Opportunities and suggested uses” is “an improvement in public open space”. This is then totally and utterly contradicted by the concept of allowing development here and furthermore, you would be cutting off views of an historic and attractive building. The quantum of development that could be created would be relatively small and the damage potentially great. It would further restrict views of the river by “hemming in”. We set out three priorities for the town centre which we would wholly endorse. However, experience suggests that reality is a very different place. For example, priority no. 1 is to enhance publicly accessible open spaces. If you take the area outside the cinema and the Bedford Road surface car park, the proposals in relation to the bus station are to create development in this square immediately in front of the Old Orleans Restaurant. The second priority is to “reinforce the character of the townscape areas”. We have demonstrated over several years, an inability to look after the setts in the High Street and put in place a long-term, cost effective measure in this regard. The third priority is to “make the town centre easier to read, interpret and find your way around” and in particular from the station to the High Street. The reality of life is that Surrey County Council/Central Government is discouraging signage and making this job even harder. We need to ensure that this document is not just words, but actions.</p>	<p>Comment noted, agree. This site has been removed and is discussed in general in the interim town centre framework for open space.</p>

	Historic core - Under the section "Materials", advice is given that the preferred paving within the historic core should be natural stone. This historic core includes North Street, which is about to be re-paved and we question already, before this document is even produced, whether natural stone will be the material chosen. In this entire section, no mention is made whatsoever of the importance of the setts in the High Street. It is fundamental to the historic core and in particular, the High Street and furthermore, it is this area which defines Guildford as a town more than any other aspect. It should, therefore, feature highly in this document.	Comments noted. This has been taken into consideration when drafting the interim framework and there are now references to the setts within the strategy sections which reads 'The High Street footways are of York stone, a quality natural stone complementing the historic buildings and the setts. Natural stone is the preferred paving within the historic core, much of which is designated as conservation area, to enhance the quality of this historic area, and setting of the heritage assets. This will ensure quality and continuity. The granite sett paving is one of the most important visual features of the town centre's historic core, and contributes significantly to the High Street's distinctive character'.
Strategy - Making better places through environmental improvement		
Surrey Wildlife Trust	No reference to 'Green Infrastructure' as a concept here - although many of the functions of good GI are in fact covered (omitting biodiversity conservation, however). There are several references to additional tree planting throughout this section; some reference might be made to appropriate planting with regard to Climate Change/Adaptation strategy. We welcome references to the creation of 'New network(s) of open space and connections..' (eg.) 'A series of high quality pocket spaces linked by active pedestrian routes will be created.' Page 53; reference to 'Enhanced Riverside Lighting'. There is a concern that insensitive (downward-directed) lighting of the water surface may amount to disturbance of the behaviour of European Protected Species' (particularly Daubenton's bats), which is an offence under the Habitats Regulations 2010. Care/EcIA may therefore be required in association with such a proposal.	Note that the elements of effective green infrastructure planning are reflected in the draft town centre master plan. The term community infrastructure was used in the master plan, and remains in the interim framework, to refer to infrastructure including green open spaces. Welcome the masterplan's support for tree planting, networks of open space and links, and enhanced riverside lighting; these elements remain in the interim framework, as does reference to in particular the River Wey and Navigations' important contributions to local biodiversity. Note that Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) may be required to ensure lighting of water surface does not disturb protected bat species; this sensitivity is acknowledged, but as a detailed point this does not require reference in the interim framework.
Guildford town resident	For goodness sake sort out the High Street surface. The setts are not pedestrian friendly. "Natural stone will be the preferred paving within the historic core". with non slip surface. Thank goodness	The High Street setts make an important contribution to the historic environment of the High Street. There is no intention to replace these with stone paving, instead that both the setts and pedestrian pavements in the High Street are maintained to a high standard. Interim framework text amended to better reflect this, see section 6 Protect and enhance the historic environment.
Member of public	market stalls outside Debenhams are an awful idea tatty.	National planning policy (March 2012) advises that councils should retain and enhance existing markets and, where appropriate, reintroduce or create new markets. The area near Debenhams provides one opportunity to do this, in an accessible position within the town centre. No change required.
Guildford town resident	Protect views and vistas, facades, shop fronts and signage which enhance character, restoring distinctiveness, enclosure and definition ; I like this bit!	Support welcomed. Agree these remain important and these references have been strengthened in the interim framework, including through illustrations (for example see strategic views on Figure 4 Summary of key issues).
Planning Development control regeneration specialists	River should be a vital amenity in any master plan.	Agree this is a key point for the interim, and forthcoming final, town centre framework. This is reflected in the interim framework's vision (section 3) and in section 6.6 River Wey which has been strengthened.
Member of public	Strongly agree and these riverside improvements in particular can't come soon enough. However, I would want to see more details on the proposed "multifunctional use" of the cricket ground.	Welcome support for riverside improvements. Reference to multifunctional use of the cricket ground and Dapdune Wharf has been removed; these areas have been omitted from the town centre boundary.
National Trust	The Trust supports the concept of 'Placemaking' and broadly agrees with the ten principles suggested.	Support noted. The term placemaking has been removed in the interim framework, but these principles continue to inform the aspirations set out.
	In particular, we believe there is very considerable scope in Guildford Town Centre for the de-cluttering of streets, for the simplification of street furniture, for the creation of new civic spaces and for defining and establishing new views. In some cases this may require the eventual removal of buildings rather than the development of new ones. Removal, replacement or rationalisation of riverside railings should be based upon a risk assessment approach and replacement railing design led to ensure high quality and appropriate detail next to the river side setting.	Agree, whilst acknowledging the removal of any buildings will be subject to suitable scheme viability/funding and support of the relevant land owner(s). Delivery section 7 of the interim framework now details improvement works already underway and further planned in North Street.
	We also support the concept of 'Celebrating Arrival' and feel that this is something which has largely been ignored in the past. Taking the example of the pedestrian approach to the town centre from Guildford station across the River Wey Navigation. This is one of the most important visual arrival points in the town centre and yet from the nature of the development which has taken place in the past (and of the various development schemes which have been proposed) it would seem not to be recognised as such.	Agree, arrival points very important, including the pedestrian route from the main railway station into the town centre. The interim framework addresses these more clearly (see for example the section 6 strategy; Improve connections between key destinations).
	The Trust supports the proposal to remove unnecessary and unsightly railings where practicable. We also support proposals for tree planting, improved signage, enhanced but sensitively designed lighting schemes to minimise light pollution into the river area, use of natural stone wherever possible, co-ordinated good quality street furniture, additional seating and opportunities for relaxing by the river.	Support for these aspects welcomed and noted. No change required.

CBRE for Merseyside Pension Fund, owner of Tunsgate Square Shopping Centre	The lack of a coordinated vision is highlighted by the map at page 42. It illustrates the placemaking priority areas of Tunsgate Castle Street and Sydenham Road as well as the Gateway at their junction, but there appears to be a break between Tunsgate/Castle Street and Sydenham Road and, surprisingly, the placemaking initiative is not extended to Chapel Street. If the initiative is to succeed, the master plan needs to provide a vision for the way in which all these streets should work together. Improvements to Tunsgate and Tunsgate Arch (including cycle parking provision) - We welcome the reference at page 44 to improvements to Tunsgate and Tunsgate Arch. However, we have some reservations about the reference at page 61 to a cycle facility at Tunsgate Arch. This could hinder pedestrian movement between the High Street and an improved Tunsgate, and the draft master plan should make clear that any cycle facility should be designed in such a way that this is avoided or, if this is not possible, that an alternative site will be identified.	Comments noted. These will be considered further when detailed schemes are prepared for Tunsgate and surrounding streets. The strategy for the historic core townscape area is strengthened; see figure 8 and section 6.1 of the interim framework.
Guildford town resident	More trees and greenery centrally.	Support welcomed. New tree planting and landscaping will support the delivery of objective 2 of the interim framework. No change required.
Guildford town resident	Making better Places ...page 40/64 I am happy with most of this including the Traffic Management stuff but what does worry me is that I think that we will end up with 'enhanced gateways' 'public spaces' 'a pedestrianized Tunsgate Arch' 'a town square' because we can spend small amounts of cash on these things but still suffer congestion in the town centre. Let us seriously sort out the gyratory, bus station, pedestrian route from rail station then other things can follow. Transition Areas page 49/64 - Design. Walnut Tree Close cannot be called a main route without making it one. Perhaps it can only be effectively one way. We have allowed new builds to stop us doing much. Least we can do is stop the parking at the station end and offer house owners somewhere else, say discounted parking in part of the train station car park?	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
Guide Dogs	Street Design - • Removal of railings along the riverside. This needs to be thought through very carefully and an impact assessment to ensure the safety of blind and partially sighted people and other vulnerable pedestrians • Re cycling routes, need clarity as to where they will be located and if they are segregated or shared routes. Concerns about the space to provide a cycle route as Epsom road is very narrow in parts so including a cycle route would further restrict access for wheelchair or guide dog owners and other vulnerable pedestrians. • Signage – will tactile and audible signs be part of the interactive offer. • Street furniture details of the colour contrast and reflective features should be explored. • Re Highlight gateways and arrival space – reference to shared space with pedestrians and cyclists, does this mean shared surfaces? Clarity on the details of this is required. • On transition areas, we need more clarity on what aspects of shared space is to be implemented and where. • Traffic calming on Sydenham road, would need to consider other features along the road to determine if raised tables would be accessible for vulnerable pedestrians (delineation) especially as this is not a level stretch of road	It is proposed to remove only unnecessary railings along the riverside, recognising a careful balance is needed between de-cluttering and ensuring the safety of all pedestrians. The interim framework recognises this on p100; where safety is a concern, for example because of the implications for those with sight impairments, alternative remedial works will be explored. Comments noted in respect of cycle routes and traffic calming on Sydenham road will be considered within the movement strategy. The interim framework amended to state "Signs should be designed to be adaptable to display interactive material about history of the area and events, and be accessible to everyone in the community" (p53). Appropriate colour contrast and reflective features in street furniture will be considered as part of the materials guide to be prepared for the final town centre framework (p184). Reference to shared space in the master plan is referring to what is also known as shared surfaces. For consistency, only the latter term is now used in the interim framework, which also explains more about shared surfaces (see Figure 12 and sections 6.4, 7 Delivery). Investigation of potential shared surfaces in transition areas will identify the streets where this could be implemented.
Member of public	An opportunity to provide a link between the railway station and the prime retail area of the High Street has been missed.	The opportunity to improve links between the railway station and the prime retail areas of the town centre was recognised in the draft town centre master plan and is clearly set out in the interim framework. No change required.
Guildford Labour Party	Guildford town centre has become shabby – the state of pavements in the main shopping areas is a disgrace and North Street's road surface is very poor. Street cleaning is not happening often enough. Road surfaces and pavements need to be replaced not patched up.	Opportunities exist to improve the overall quality of the historic and wider public realm in the town centre. The document recognises and identifies what these improvements are for different areas. These references strengthened and illustrated in the interim framework.
Guildford town resident	In you future planning of the town centre would it be possible to include a market square where people can sit and relax after their shopping expedition in the town after all Guildford was in years gone by a market town. The town does lack any seating apart from outside Marks and Spencer where weary shoppers can have a sit down and rest. a reasonable sized area with seating and flowers planted tubs could surely be introduced. Horsham farfax is an example.	This is an interesting suggestion. North Street, being a wide space, was historically the site of the cattle market until the nineteenth century. The document recognises the need to create more places to sit and relax and the opportunity to create new public squares as part of the railway station and North Street redevelopments and, through environmental improvements, to re-balance key town centre streets and junctions towards the pedestrian (in North Street, Castle Square, Onslow Street and High Street /Chertsey Road junction).
Guildford town resident	All good	Noted. No change required.

Guildford town resident	Celebrate arrival (!) Please don't prioritise "excitement" and "fun". Is that really the image of Guildford you want to promote, rather than that of a vibrant but historic town, worth visiting because it is not like everywhere else Oxford, Cambridge, York and Chester, for example, do not need an artificial enhancement of emotion to welcome their visitors. Perhaps you do not believe Guildford has good enough attractions without Disneyfying the entry point? A tangible way of celebrating arrival at the station would be to reintroduce the free shuttle bus. Under "Activity", what is meant by "intense" interaction? I support improving the pedestrian environment between the station and the High Street/North Street, particularly the narrow pavement over the bridge I also support the partial pedestrianisation of Tunsgate What about ensuring that the High Street setts are maintained, not replaced with inferior materials?	Support for improved pedestrian routes and environment, including quality materials and retention of the High Street setts, noted. Agree Guildford's distinctiveness and vibrancy are key, the intention is definitely not to 'Disneyfy'. Interim framework rewritten to explain this more clearly.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	20mph speed limit will improve traffic flows, reduce the need for traffic light delays and improve the streets	The draft master plan recognises the potential to use lower traffic speeds in some areas, for example to help create people-friendly streets, and this is reference is continued in the interim framework. No change required.
Abbots Hospital	We support any actions that improve the environment for the elderly, especially those with mobility challenges.	Support noted. No change required.
West Horsley Parish Council	Mobility. We see no "connectivity" in the plan, instead we see discrimination for the elderly, disabled and parents with pushchairs entering the town centre from the Eastern side. Provision of public transport remains poor with an infrequent bus service. Termination of buses including the Clandon Park and Ride at bus hubs at the top of North Street is unacceptable. How can the elderly, disabled and parents with pushchairs transfer to other bus routes and the railway station if there is no interchange. Relocating the bus station at Bedford Road would require a shuttle bus to the top of North Street in order to provide connectivity for all. Disabled and elderly people entering the town from all directions terminating at the proposed bus station might also find use of these shuttle services. We do not see any proximity in the relocation site of the bus station with the exception of a direct link to the railway station. Proximity for shoppers will be reduced to just one side of the town centre.	Thank you for these comments, which will taken in consideration in developing the movement strategy for the final framework. The interim framework explains this position.
	Sense of Place: We suggest no cars at any time in the High Street or North Street. Deliveries to be at very restricted times. Streets as Places: We have concerns re shared use of spaces. The visually impaired / deaf would have difficulty negotiating these areas, lack of kerbs and designated safe walking areas. Column, feature and more sympathetic street lighting are good suggestions to provide safe and more attractive lighting. Quality paving and more way markings will help to improve the historic areas. The town centre would benefit from more linked green spaces and the planting of trees. Guildford is attractive to visitors because of its vistas and rural views as seen from the High Street and other vantage points, we welcome their continuing importance as included within the plan.	An appropriate balance needs to be struck between vehicle and pedestrian movements in the High Street and North Street. Access for cars and servicing is already restricted in the High Street. More explanation given to improvements to North Street in the interim framework (section 7 Delivery). Concerns about shared surfaces noted; agree any such schemes will need to carefully consider safety for all users, including those visually or hearing impairments. Note support for street lighting and pavement improvements, tree planting and recognition of important views. No change required.
Member of public	Follow Salisbury's example historic and ongoing quality of town centre maintained by no high buildings in area	Ensuring the design and height of new buildings are suitable was a key message raised by those responding to the draft master plan consultation, which has informed rewriting of the vision and objectives.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	9.1. We welcome the objectives of this section. However improvements to pedestrian and cycling facilities must be seen as a major component of transport policy, as well as improving the local environment.	Comment noted. References to pedestrian and cycle connections and improvements in each area of the town centre strengthened and shown diagrammatically in the interim framework. These will be further considered when developing the movement strategy for the final framework.
	Historic Core. Extended pedestrianisation must be a key part of environmental improvements, and we are perplexed as to why it is not included (except for Tunsgate, which we welcome). Shared surfaces might be the ultimate aim, but pedestrianisation must be a forerunner; it can also be achieved quickly at little cost. It might itself be created in stages, but the intention should be to increase hours to 09.00 to 17.00 Open hours to be for delivery / loading only Speed limit for open hours of 15mph All link streets between High Street and North Street to be included (their present status of being roads open to all traffic at all times causes much confusion) This would be a major contribution to solving the problem of damage to the sets . This level of control exists in many other towns, so is not radical. Implementation will need partnership with the Highways Authority.	An appropriate balance needs to be struck between vehicle and pedestrian priority in the town centre. Access for cars and servicing is already restricted in the High Street. These comments will be considered when developing the movement strategy for the final framework.
	9.3. It must be made clear to drivers that the upper High Street "raised tables" mark out pedestrian priority.	The raised tables are courtesy crossings, over which neither party has priority. However, they do helpfully provide a clear point and narrower road width for pedestrians to cross. No change required.
	Commercial Quarter. The most important "connection" to improve is the Riverside route to the station, this needs to be shown.	Agree. This is illustrated in Figure 11 Strategy commercial quarter of the interim framework.
	9.5. <i>The Council and its partners will explore the optimum route between the station and the main shopping area.</i> The objective should not be limited to a single route. It is clear that at least two are needed one to the Town Bridge (an upgraded Riverside Route) and one to the Friary.	Agree. Document updated to recognise its desirable to improve pedestrian connections (plural) between the main arrival points (including the railway station) and key town centre destinations.
	Historic spaces. The riverside walk by Debenhams, proposed in relation to development of site (15) needs to be shown as an "improved connection", together with the bridge over the millpool.	Agree, see Figure 9 Strategy historic spaces of the interim framework.
	Eastern Fringe. We welcome the designation of the Bright Hill site as a "Placemaking Priority Area".	Support noted. The updated interim framework uses a different name but similar approach for Bright Hill; see Figure 13 Strategy eastern fringe, which shows it as an 'Other site' offering opportunities to improve the streetscape, urban grain, and/or to contribute to the local economy or housing stock.

	9.8. <i>The area is emerging as an area of predominantly leisure, service and community use...</i> While this may be true of the area as a whole the value of the eastern end of the High Street as a convenience shopping area must be recognised, and this use developed alongside other uses.	The presence of a few convenience stores and their importance to the local community in this area is noted.
	9.9. <i>...introducing raised shared sections..</i> It appears that this is suggested for Sydenham Road. Shared surfaces only work where traffic flow is low and speed is less than 10mph. Experience with the raised tables on the upper High Street shows how hostile and dangerous for pedestrians these can be when not used in appropriate places. The objectives for Sydenham Road must be speed limit (20mph for the whole centre) traffic calming, widened pavements, and several pedestrian priority crossings.	Improvement of the street surface in Sydenham Road are no longer suggested (see Figure 13 Strategy eastern fringe, interim framework). Comments noted and will be considered as prepare the movement strategy.
Member of public	Traffic must be the most important issue here.	The interim framework recognises this as one of the key issue of concern for the community,
Member of public	This section needs rethinking to be more strategic - whilst the content is relevant, it lacks the insight that a bigger vision would give it and it seems to a large extent to reflect what good housekeeping and general management should achieve. HISTORIC CORE: should be enhanced by better organisation of traffic flows, developing new access points and permeability into and through the core; key strategic views within as well as to and from the core (either for protection or enhancement) should then be recognised and incorporated into the Local Strategy Plan as and when appropriate. COMMERCIAL QUARTER: This area is ruined by poor and outdated traffic systems; it should recognise the importance and accessibility of the Cathedral and University and a vital crossing over the railway (and river) of a new highway to enable Bridge Street to be fully pedestrianised and to reduce the burden on the existing gyratory system;	Agree that traffic is a key issue for the town centre. Transport studies will be completed and a movement strategy prepared to inform, and be included within, the final framework. The interim framework explains this position.
Quod on behalf of Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd	Historic Core - In relation to providing large areas of living walls on the western flank of the Friary Centre (page 43), it is important that any request to provide these as part of the redevelopment of the wider site is supported by evidence that living walls could actually work in this location. A desire for a living wall should not preclude other enhancements to this elevation of the Friary Centre. The text should make this clear. Transition Areas - It is unclear on the Transition Areas Map what the "Important view" passing across the northern part of the existing Friary Centre relates to. The view does not look out to anything, as the other views do, just the walls of the shopping centre. We suggest that this view be removed.	The master plan reference on p43 was to the potential for a living wall to the western flank wall of Friary Street facing Millbrook, not the western flank of the Friary Centre. Agree however feasibility of a living wall must be established. Also acknowledge there may be further opportunities to improve Friary Centre elevations. Interim framework updated to reflect these points (see Figure 8 Strategy historic core and section 7 Delivery)
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Agree with the priorities and principles set out.	Noted. No change required.
No name	Are there any long term plans for major road improvements to provide a north south by-pass?	We do not yet have all of the transport information we need to identify specific movement improvements. A range of potential options for improving traffic flows in and around the town centre will be considered. A movement strategy will form part of the final town centre framework.
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	We would endorse the views expressed on the need to improve the urban environment within this townscape area and recognise that redevelopment provides an opportunity to achieve this. In relation to the environmental improvements proposed for the Commercial Quarter, we would endorse the need identified to explore the optimum routes between the Station and the Primary Shopping Area either along Bridge Street or via the footbridge over the River Wey via Bedford Road or both. There is reference in text to the "Main Shopping Area" - this should be replaced by reference to the "Primary Shopping Area".	Support noted. Reference to main shopping area will be changed to primary shopping area.
Property Consultants	Making better places. Add to "Priorities"...To make the town centre (*) safer to use by resolving pedestrian use versus traffic (2) creating good public spaces conducive to peoples wellbeing. thereby <i>Attracting</i> use by residents and visitors, thus also stimulating economically.	This suggested amendment has been overtaken by the significant rewriting of the document. No change required.
	Ten principles for Placemaking in Guildford town centre - Agreed, suggest include promoting controlled outdoor theatre, busking etc., presently a vibrant High Street attraction. A town/market square in North Street would provide an additional venue. See the crowds in Covent Garden!	Support noted. The term place-making has been removed in the interim framework, but these principles continue to inform the aspirations of the framework. The Guildford Castle Grounds provide an existing location for outdoor summer theatre. There is potential to create an attractive public space outside the Electric Theatre and to create new public squares as part of the railway station and North Street redevelopments.
	Signage - Delighted this has been highlighted, it can make all the difference. Themed / co-ordinated pedestrian signage, perhaps period style, is vital and helps to 'brand' a centre, particularly if 'historical'. I suggest these are first 'tested' with children and senior citizens, for example the designs shown on p. 47 with upside down images would NOT be quickly interpreted by many in these groups. Onslow Street and the gyratory area are but two of many areas requiring complete overhaul, but pending (and potential) developments will also affect the overall scheme.	Support for signage improvements noted. Example image omitted.
	Historic Core Street scene / scapeing - All proposals highly laudable.	Support noted. No change required.
	Historic Spaces Riverside - The River Wey is a grossly under used natural asset which should be exploited. It deserves a really focussed endeavour alongside various development proposals and suggestions.	Agree making more of the river and riverside areas is very important. This is central to the town centre vision and objectives of the framework, strengthened section 6.6 River Wey and commentary on relevant sites.

	Eastern Fringe - York Road MSCP. Consideration has previously been given to adding a further deck. Would extending the existing structure sideways (towards the main entrance) be practical? Enlarging this facility would provide a valuable addition to the total parking stock with minimal impact on traffic volumes in the town centre. A modified road system here could be highly beneficial.	This has been considered, but would need to go into the quarry area under the existing open space, with a consequential loss of open space. It could be expanded upwards, but this would be very expensive, and it has already been expanded one floor downwards since being built. Agree that it would be useful if this could be expanded. The feasibility of expanding car parks will be considered following the review of the Parking Strategy. It is preferred instead to improve the York Road / Denmark Road street frontage and the open space and playground.
Environment Agency	Historic Core Pg 44 - please note that churchyards are ideal places for ecological enhancements within an urban setting.	Comment noted. Historic core strategy amended.
	Commercial Quarter - We welcome the new network of open spaces connections on page 47, but think it should be expanded to include green corridors that link open spaces and enable wildlife to migrate between them. This should link to a Green Infrastructure policy or strategy.	Support this suggestion however, whilst landscaping and other environmental improvements will be maximised, it has not been possible to identify opportunities to provide such corridors in this commercial heart of the town centre. No change required.
	Historic Spaces (pg 52) - It is not clear where these new open spaces or connections will be located – please expand on this. Please also add that green spaces are important for biodiversity too, which in turn increases the pleasure that people gain from informal recreation on these sites.	Interim framework makes clearer aspirations for the historic spaces (Figure 9 Strategy historic spaces). The benefits of green open spaces such as parks and the riverside to people's well-being is already stated.
	Historic Spaces (pg 53) - Enhanced riverside and lighting, please note that Bats use river corridors as navigational flight lines and some species feed along river corridors, either on insects alongside trees that line river banks or from directly above the water. Bats are nocturnal and lighting along river corridors can seriously disrupt their natural behaviour patterns. This does not mean there should be no lighting as we appreciate that it is necessary for safety reasons. It should however be appropriate lighting (such as no greater than Lux level 0-2), be directed away from the river corridor and focused with cowlings.	Note that any lighting will need to consider implications for bats, which will be considered in the design of relevant scheme(s). As a detailed point this does not require reference in the interim framework.
Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	Eastern Fringe - note Bright Hill as an important view point So called "Commercial Quarter" annex - Concern at proposed "enhanced gateway" by London Road Station if this involves development. Transition Area and Eastern Fringe - inadequate attention to York Road green enhancement . Ensure traffic is not deflected from centre to here. Mitigate pollution. Enhance residential quality and environment for children. See 14 (7)	Agree, Bright Hill is already highlighted as an important view. Any improvements involving development at London Road Station will require careful design and consultation before and during any planning application. The plan aims to be aspirational and so highlights improvement opportunities for which full details have not yet been worked up (for example improvements to York Road and extent of green enhancements involved). Other comments noted, some of which will be points considered in movement strategy in final town centre framework.
The Guildford Society	Pages 40 to 56 of the Plan set out policies and proposals for improving the town centre through environmental improvements. On this aspect the Society endorses much of the content of Appendix 1 of the TCM which relates to the history of the town and covers many issues which the Council must take into account in the future planning of the town. Whilst the Society supports all that is said in this section of the Plan, there are shortcomings in important respects. For example, one of the "ten important principles for placemaking in Guildford town centre", as set out in the Plan, is "Celebrate arrival – create positive first impressions..." and, under "Legibility and sense of place", "Provide a centre that is pedestrian-friendly, readable, convenient and accessible."	Support for the environmental improvements noted. The shortcomings mentioned are not explained. The term placemaking has been removed in the interim framework, but these principles continue to inform the document. No change required.
	The Society would agree that a prime objective of the Plan should be to reduce the amount of traffic in the town centre and hence redress the balance between vehicles and pedestrians. We consider that the only satisfactory long term solution is to enable traffic, particularly through traffic to avoid or bypass the town centre. This will require very substantial new infrastructure. The Plan should state this and put in place some long term objectives. In the first instance, studies should be carried out to determine the most cost effective solution, with a target delivery date of say 2014. Implementation could be phased with a first phase to be completed by 2030. The Plan should be bolder in its demands for funding from county and central government: there is nothing to lose by so doing. Demonstration of vision often achieves surprising results (the Watts Gallery refurbishment is a good local example).	Comments noted. All of the transport information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. A range of potential options for improving traffic flows in and around the town centre will be considered. A movement strategy will form part of the final town centre framework.
	The Society makes the point many times elsewhere in this response that a key place where people arriving at the town should be able to 'celebrate arrival' and experience, as they walk to the town centre, "...a (town) centre which is pedestrian-friendly" is the railway station. But this Plan contains no specific proposals for achieving any improvement in the quality of the pedestrian route between the railway station and the town centre. The Society is left with the clear conclusion that there is a wide gulf between these stated aspirations for the town centre, as set out in the Plan, and the actual desire and ability of the Council to secure the achievement of such aspirations.	The opportunity to improve links between the railway station and the town centre was recognised in the draft town centre master plan and is clearly set out in the interim framework, in clearer terms (including on a plan and section 7 Delivery). No change required.

	<p>The plan on page 42 of the document shows the 'Historic core'. This plan identifies Onslow Street, the eastern side of the gyratory and the north end of Millbrook as a "placemaking priority area". What does this mean? The Society not only questions what this means but asks what meaningful improvements in 'placemaking' can possibly be achieved given the very high volumes of traffic which uses these 'A' class roads. This plan also shows four locations for 'improved connections' across Onslow Street (at the junctions with Bedford Road and at Bridge Street), over the gyratory (in the area between the North Street and the Electric Theatre) and Millbrook (at the Town Bridge). Page 43 of the Plan states how improvements to these 'crossings' will "...seek to redress the relationship between the footway and the carriageway, and create a more inclusive environment." Without the Plan demonstrating how, in physical terms, 'improved connections' can be secured across the busiest 'A' class roads which bisect the town centre, the Society remains entirely sceptical of the value of these ideas. Furthermore, the three west-east 'improved connections' on the western side of the Historic Core map end up on the outside of the present Friary. All they demonstrate is that the Friary at present blocks the route from the station to the town centre: without modifications to the Friary there will be no improvement. The Plan should say this.</p>	<p>The terms placemaking and placemaking priority areas have been removed in the interim framework. This aspirations for the Onslow Street area are clarified in the document (Figure 9 Strategy historic spaces). Traffic issues will be considered through the outstanding evidence and will inform the movement strategy in the final framework.</p>
	<p>This said, the Society strongly supports the environmental improvements proposed in the 'Historic Core' text, including de-cluttering (pp43-44).</p>	<p>Support noted. No change required.</p>
	<p>The Plan also identifies "Enhanced Gateways". Aside from the Plan not being clear on just what this means, the Society notes (and agrees) with the statement (in Appendix 1 page 18) that the "Guildford Railway Station ... does little to announce its presence in the town centre as a key point of arrival and departure". We consider the town centre side of the railway station should be identified (on the plan on (un-numbered) page 45) as an 'Enhanced gateway' and the Plan should show specific proposals for securing a truly enhanced pedestrian facility to take pedestrians on a route free of conflict with traffic into the heart of the town centre.</p>	<p>Guildford Borough Council will work with the owners of the station to encourage creation of high quality spaces at gateways and arrival points. This is set out as an aspiration in the interim framework, at this stage therefore full details have not yet been worked up. No change required.</p>
	<p>The northern of the two 'improved connections' shown on the 'commercial Quarter' map again ends up outside the present Friary. We are strongly in favour of such a route, but it is useless as proposed. It requires a commitment from Westfield to enable the route to continue as a permanent 24 hour route to North Street. The Plan should say this.</p>	<p>The Council and its partners, including the owners of Guildford Railway station will explore the optimum route between the station and the main shopping area, and will work together to bring about its improvement. This is explained in the interim framework.</p>
	<p>The High Street, paved with setts and footways of York Stone, is an important feature of the historic town and needs to be maintained. Elsewhere within the town centre the possibility of 'introducing integrated streets and shared surfaces' should be investigated. There are plenty of examples now of removing kerbs to enable this (e.g. Exhibition Road in Knightsbridge, London).</p>	<p>These points are reflected in the document. No change required.</p>
	<p>Page 40 A number of points require clarification or re-drafting: • The principles should be more specific to Guildford - it would be helpful to insert both a schedule of the special areas of public realm and landscape in Guildford and their character and design proposals for how these can be improved, street by street. This section should explore the uniqueness of Guildford and the fact the town sits within a context where there is close proximity to residential uses and a fantastic landscape setting. • Placemaking also relates to urban design and not just to the public realm and specific urban design guidance should be added to the Master plan. • As noted above, the public realm section needs to respond to an overall spatial plan which forms the foundation for a public realm strategy. This section could also benefit from appropriate references to good practice and inspiration from elsewhere.</p>	<p>These points have been taken into consideration in rewriting the document, including the provision of clearer plans and schedules detailing public realm improvements.</p>
	<p>Page 41 The guidance needs to be set in context with a clearer relationship to the vision and objectives. It is recommended that the PRIAN reference is accompanied by an illustration. It is suggested that the proposals for the gyratory are accepted in the short term, with more comprehensive options for the re-routing of the road network considered in the longer term. The Master plan would benefit from a bespoke design guide for the riverside.</p>	<p>The updated framework has taken on board these points as far as is possible at this stage – making better use of the river and riverside is central to the vision and objectives and is explained in a dedicated section. The PRIAN findings so far have informed the framework. Changes to the gyratory are being considered; a movement strategy will form part of the final framework.</p>
	<p>Page 42 The plan on page 42 needs to be improved – some aspects are not clearly marked (e.g. the red area). In addition, the views from North Street (and other locations) are not shown.</p>	<p>Plan updated, see Figure 8 Strategy historic core in interim framework.</p>
	<p>Page 43 First paragraph – careful consideration is required in relation to the promotion of street trees. Although there are benefits in greening urban areas in this way, careful analysis needs to be undertaken to ensure that views to the countryside are not blocked. and these measures could detract from the place. The preference should be the creation of active frontage rather than mitigation of blank facades and inactive frontages. Final column - the use of logos can add to street clutter and may not be suitable. The use of "heritage" street could result in a pastiche design. It is recommended that the Council consider a more contemporary street furniture design as this can enhance an historic environment.</p>	<p>The document recognises both scope for street trees and the importance of retaining important views, for the use of logos (like Stop Sit) and the benefits of minimising street clutter. Opportunities to improve existing or create attractive new building frontages are shown. Selection of street furniture that is in keeping with its historic setting does not preclude the consideration of more contemporary designs, as the Phase 1 public realm improvements in North Street confirm.</p>

	Page 44 Further consideration about the planting and landscape strategy for North Street is required. Our view is that the public realm should have a simple with a high quality surface and minimal clutter. English Heritage streetscape guidance strongly recommends clutter free, simple street design - see Shrewsbury as an example. It would also be helpful to have further information about the type of lighting columns being considered. In our view, these should be of a contemporary design. Second column - There is a concern about the installation of more signs as this would generate further clutter. Second para - Increased space for pedestrians - The second para should commence with a guidance statement which sets out a coherent strategic approach for the removal of traffic, whilst allowing servicing. It should then set out guidance for the design of streets and pavements, with appropriate design guidelines and specifications. We do not recommend the universal segregation of cars, pedestrians and cyclists in central Guildford. With the exception of the High Street, the historic street environment provides an appropriate setting for a shared surface strategy. This section should also consider the introduction of a Historic Core Zone which would remove the need for yellow lines and street signs.	These points have been taken into consideration in rewriting the document, including the provision of clear plans and a schedule of the latest details available regarding public realm improvements in North Street. Traffic and shared surfaces will be amongst matters considered through the movement strategy that will form part of the final framework.
	Page 45 This plan is unclear and key views from High Street and North Street are omitted. The phrase "Placemaking priority area" should be defined more clearly.	The term placemaking priority areas has been removed. Plan updated, see Figure 11 Strategy commercial quarter in interim framework.
	Page 46 First column: The objectives set out in this section are generally welcomed, however there would be merit in making specific reference to the PRAN proposals as short term measures. In the longer term, consideration should be given to the removal of the gyratory with traffic rerouted from the historic centre. A clear strategy needs to be set out to achieve this. Second column: It is recommended that a design brief is prepared and options put forward. Further consideration and justification is required in relation to the proposed materials. As highlighted in the main submission, the master plan document should provide explicit reference to diagrams and design guidance including principles on development, landscape, public realm and movement strategies which should be the four pillars of the master plan. Without clear strategies, the statements as currently drafted could be challenging to implement.	These points have been taken into consideration in rewriting the document, as far as is possible at this stage. A materials guide and movement strategy will form part of the final framework.
	Page 47 The phrase high quality is welcomed The use of paving waymarkers requires consideration as these can be expensive to introduce and maintain and may add to visual clutter. The image on page 47 is inappropriate for Guildford and would detract from the historic context and should be removed.	Example way marker image omitted.
	Page 48 This plan does not appear to relate to any strategic objectives and highlights the need for a comprehensive spatial strategy and inset plans.	Plan updated, see Figure 12 Strategy transition areas in interim framework. Links to objectives made explicit.
	Page 49 Third para: shared surfaces are not necessarily appropriate for residential streets. Second column: There may be merit in considering alternative materials to asphalt. Third column Second para: The document should encourage use of a simple colour. Final para. – The Master plan should seek to give greater priority to pedestrians. This final statement on page 49 is potentially contradictory as there may need to be a negative impact on vehicular traffic capacity to realise the objectives of the Master plan.	Comments superseded by rewritten document. No change required.
	Page 52 The guidance under the Historic Spaces heading relates to public realm and sustainability principles rather than issues of historic value. It is recommended that this section makes greater reference to character assessments drawing on national policies and guidance. In general references to design should be more detailed and appear earlier in the document in a more comprehensive manner. Whilst the objective of the cantilevered walkway could have advantages, it would have to be designed carefully and should be considered in relation to the network of public routes that this forms part of. Consideration of cost issues is also required.	Comments noted. Historic spaces section and plan have been updated.
	Page 53 Further guidance is required in relation to street furniture. This part of the document refers to the inclusion contemporary artistic elements. It is recommended that this approach is considered in other locations as well. The approach to public art needs to be carefully considered to ensure high quality design.	Comments noted. Historic spaces section and plan have been updated.
	Page 54 The plan and key require clarification.	This plan has been updated, see Figure 13 Strategy eastern fringe in interim framework.
	Page 55 Further detail is required to articulate the spatial location and principles associated with these general statements. Column three: It is recommended that the 'natural assets' reference is explained in more detail, to clearly identify the individual assets and make reference to their significance.	The map for this area has been updated, see Figure 13 Strategy eastern fringe in interim framework. Asset reference removed in rewriting.
Strategy - Making better places through town centre management		
Member of the public	"will explore optimum route between station and shopping area and will promote its improvement". Not very convincing after 40 years, is it? Don't give up hope, though. Also mention of signposting, also unconvincing.	Section 6 "Strategy" of the Interim Framework includes proposals for the improvement of two routes from the railway station to the main shopping area.
Member of the public	a free electric hop on / hop off shopping shuttle should operate on the high street and north street. and help older residents get around road layout and one way for commercial road, leapale road and surrounding streets needs to be revisited in the light of the developments in north street and surrounding environs	Thank you for these comments, which will taken in consideration in developing the movement strategy for the final framework. The interim framework explains this position.

Guildford town resident	Please, Please encourage more diversity within retail outlets. No butcher, No Baker, No greengrocer! One or two independents! The markets are our only lifeline but they are not held often enough! Guildford won the title of THE most "cloned" town in the country. We TOTALLY agree. More diversity would encourage more shoppers.	Comments noted. Across the country in large towns and in many other countries too, smaller independent retailers are often struggling due to higher rents and the costs of the food supply chain and economies of scale. The interim framework's vision includes reference to more diverse quality shops. The NPPF says that Local Authorities should promote competitive town centres that provide customer choice and a diverse retail offer and which reflects the individuality of town centres.
Planning Development control regeneration specialists	I would like to see town centre management have a more democratic base with elected members from the business community and locals. e.g. town councils or a designation of a business improvement district. The current arrangement lacks the financial resources to do the "small things" quickly to improve the place. The would also help in the implementation of the New National Planning Framework the mechanism to make planning decisions more local.	Agreed. This proposal for a business improvement district (BID) and the forthcoming vote are now covered in the cross-cutting strategy section on town centre management.
Guildford town resident	Car traffic give pedestrians and cyclists greater priority over vehicles in the heart of the designated town centre. Pedestrians who can stroll without being run over will return again and again.	Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed. Vision has been amended with last sentence dealing with transport infrastructure.
Guildford Labour Party	We believe that we should pedestrianise the Upper High Street at the weekends 8am-6pm.	The high street is pedestrianised on Saturday from 9am - 6pm and on Sunday from midday to 5pm. The interim framework acknowledges that if shop opening hours are extended, consideration would need to be given to keeping the High Street pedestrianised later in the evening, potentially to 8.00pm. Servicing arrangements would also need to be considered.
Guildford town resident	Surely individual shops could be attracted to North Street if the rents were fair.	Comments noted. The High Street and North Street have the highest proportion of retail businesses and the highest footfall in the town centre. However, North Street is currently designated as secondary shopping frontage. There are plans to regenerate North Street through redevelopment and street enhancements. This town centre framework proposes to increase protection of the retail function of North Street, including the key regeneration site, by re-designating it from secondary frontage to primary frontage. The NPPF says that Councils should promote competitive town centres that provide customer choice and a diverse retail offer and which reflects the individuality of town centres. This will be considered as part of the new Local Plan.
Guildford town resident	All supported	Comments noted. No change.
Guildford town resident	am in favour of supporting and extending market provision. That should include an indoor market selling basic produce and household goods, such as fabrics, ideally open every day.	Comments noted. It is one of the objectives of the interim framework to provide opportunities for a wide range of retail businesses including markets to trade to retain the town centre's competitiveness
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	None	Comments noted. No change.
Abbots Hospital	Perhaps the BID board should include someone who could speak for the residential elements in the town centre to help make their voice heard where appropriate.	BIDs are funded by a fee levied on businesses in the area. It is proportional to the business rates paid, and so cannot include residential properties. It may be possible to have some representation in the BID.
West Horsley Parish Council	The food and craft markets offer high quality produce which is in keeping with the town centre. The Friday and Saturday regular markets similarly offer good produce adding to the street scene. We do not consider a separate daily market place to be important as this type of market tends to sell lower quality goods which would not create a good image for Guildford.	Comments noted. The town needs to cater for all people and offer a range of produce and range of prices. Not everyone can afford the high end high street stores.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	9.10. Town Centre Management and BID. It is important that Residents are represented, as they are the primary customers for town centre businesses. 9.11. We fully support the existing markets which provide some of the missing convenience shopping. We also wish to have a modest indoor market to make available some of the market goods every day of the week. Most other towns of Guildford's size have one. An ideal location would be the Basketworks.	Comments noted. It is one of the objectives of the interim framework to provide opportunities for a wide range of retail businesses including markets to trade to retain the town centre's competitiveness. The basket works is privately owned and may not be large enough to accommodate an indoor market.

Member of the public	Why are we writing the Town Centre Masterplan now when there are key components due in the coming months (eg., Town Centre BID District)?	Issues affecting the town centre are constantly changing. We recognise that a vote on a Business Improvement District (BID) is due in Autumn 2012, and that the review of the review of the Parking Strategy will also be completed in Autumn 2012. As consultation on potential options for the location of the bus facility will be held in late 2012. We recognise that local traffic issues including congestion, parking and public transport facilities such as the bus station are key areas of concern to the local public. We do not have all the information we need yet to develop a movement strategy for the town centre, but are working on this alongside Surrey County Council, which is responsible for most of the roads in the area, and also the Highways Agency which is responsible for the major roads, including the A3. A timetable is included as Appendix 4 for the timing of these studies and preparation of a final town centre framework which will include a Movement strategy.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Visual appearance is key to a quality built environment. The recent schemes in London where careful streetscape improvements have been made contribute to a quality setting and one where people respect the environment. The removal of street clutter, the re-laying of pavements to suit a Guildford High Street appearance and new public realm areas lining the waterfront should be considered. The town centre management is responsible for instigating quality environments and maintaining them through their lifecycle. Tourists will therefore see a better environment and residents / workers will have a better experience. This needs a holistic drive to coordinate all the surface areas and materials and furniture into a palette of materials.	The importance of shared surfaces, removal of unnecessary street furniture and signage and effective town centre management are all recognised in Section 6 "Strategy" of the interim framework.
House of Fraser	We have found that BIDs can be successful but they should not take responsibility for services that are provided by the Council e.g. street cleaning. It is important that Landlords (especially shopping centre Landlords) are required to contribute towards the BIDs as they will directly benefit from any BID initiatives through enhanced property values and ability and demand from occupiers. Given the current economic environment and pressure on costs that all occupiers are experiencing, it is important that any BID levy is low and that it is fixed for the duration of the BID so there is certainty on costs.	Agreed. The BID Group will draw up a business plan for the area to determine the group's priorities for the area. These will all be additional to the normal services carried out by the Councils.
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	We support the principle of managing the town centre environment, its parking and transportation to ensure that the town centre functions well as a whole. The introduction of more residential dwellings in the town centre is appropriate to enhance its vitality, but the first priority should be given to meeting the needs of all town centre uses (PPS4, paras 4 to 8) as the town centre is the preferred location for these uses.	Comments noted. No change. The various needs for different types of development need to be considered alongside each other, to identify the best uses for individual sites. Specific considerations also need to be taken into account such as flood risk and highway safety, which may significantly inform the most appropriate use for a site.
No name given	Page 57 First para It would be helpful to define a clearer framework and outline principles and issues to be addressed by a potential BID scheme. The mechanism for considering feasibility and future implementation should also be identified. In addition to BIDS and markets strategy, it would also be helpful to provide similar guidance for the evening economy, retailing, leisure, recreation and other activities. In addition to BIDS and markets strategy, it would also be helpful to provide similar guidance for the evening economy, retailing, leisure, recreation and other activities.	These issues will all be determined through the Business Improvement District (BID) process.
Strategy - Making better places through sustainable living		
Surrey Wildlife Trust	Here we welcome your reference to some of the concepts mentioned above (Biodiversity by Design/Design for Biodiversity), eg. benefits of Green roofs and walls. These will be delivered through enlightened development however, hence the suggestion they be covered elsewhere also.	The sustainable living section has been removed and references to green roofs and living walls, and other biodiversity improvements, explained for the relevant site/area in the town centre offering that opportunity.
Guildford town resident	I am a cyclist and appreciate the proposed improvements in cycle lanes. Anything that increases more use of our two legs rather than four wheels can only be for the good of the town.	Support welcomed and noted. No change required.
Member of the public	There is no reason why new developments can't have green roofs at the least – minimal cost and significant benefit both to wildlife and to heating bills. Strongly support the expectation of development meeting at least good BfL standard.	Support noted. Whilst reference to Building for Life (BFL) is now omitted from the interim framework, references to green roofs are made for the relevant site/area in the town centre offering that opportunity.
West Horsley Parish Council	Open spaces and small park areas are preferable to home zone streets. Children may forget the rules when entering other roads. Play areas and parks are for children, children should not be encouraged to play on roads.	Comment noted. The interim framework aspires to consider the potential benefits of both home zones and additional open spaces/pocket parks in the town centre.
Member of the public	I agree with the proposals except there is no reference to the use of solar energy: there should be -- solar energy costs are likely to be reduced and it will become more and more important. At the risk of repeating myself Guildford should look to Freiburg as an example of what can be achieved on sustainable living	The sustainable living section has been removed in the latest draft, however any development proposals for the town centre will be expected to have regard to the guidance of the Council's borough wide Sustainable Design and Construction supplementary planning document, which addresses the topic of solar energy in construction.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	The virtuous circle requires town centres to move away from monocultures, which have been proven not to work. For workers working in the town centre/residents living in town centre apartments and visitors spending in the town centre, amenities are critical. Each component supports each other with better facilities and more workers living in better and appropriately located apartments and visitors using enhanced quality amenities more regularly and therefore readily spending money in the town. This is a circle to be encouraged.	Comment noted. No change required.

Environment Agency	Pg 58 - We welcome and support the reference to the many benefits of green roofs, green walls, roof terraces and roof gardens.	Support noted, no change required.
Delivery		
Member of the public	Whatever the final outcome of the plan, I urge the planners to handle each phase in such a way that the change is not too dramatically fast for those of us who have lived in the area for years.	Comment noted
Guildford town resident	Assumes Bedford Road bus station going ahead '.... to facilitate redevelopment of land at Friary...' Why? What nonsense!	The bus station needs to be moved from its current site to make redevelopment of the land more attractive financially and ensure viability. The technical and operational issues relating to the relocation of the bus station are still under investigation
Guildford town resident	Using limited resources wisely will be the biggest challenge. We are in your hands! If we don't commit to taking action, we will never succeed in leaving Guildford a better place for those that follow us!	Comment noted.
Thames Water	Thames Water Utilities (Thames Water) are the statutory sewerage undertaker for the whole Borough and the statutory water undertaker for the southern part of the Borough and are hence a "specific consultation body" in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004 (as amended in May 2008). The provision of waste water and water infrastructure is essential to any development. A key sustainability objective for the preparation of the new Local Development Framework should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 5.1 of PPS12 relates to other Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and states: "LPAs should consider the following criteria when determining which DPDs other than the core strategy they produce:.....In considering these questions, the following issues should be considered: - the requirements of utilities/infrastructure providers....."	Comment noted. The sustainable living section has been removed in the latest draft, however any development proposals for the town centre will be expected to have regard to the guidance of the Council's borough wide Sustainable Design and Construction supplementary planning document, which addresses the topic of water infrastructure.
	Part 9 the South East Plan relates to Natural Resource Management and includes a separate section on Sustainable Water Resources and Water Quality Management. Policy NRM1 relates to Sustainable Water Resources and lists a number of water supply infrastructure issues which local authorities should take into account in preparing Local Development Documents including ensuring that development is directed "...to areas where adequate water supply can be provided from existing and potential water supply infrastructure. In addition ensure, where appropriate, that development is phased to allow time for the relevant water infrastructure to be put in place in areas where it is currently lacking but is essential for the development to happen." The list of issues covered in the Masterplan should therefore make reference to the provision of sewerage and water infrastructure to service development. This is essential to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment such as sewage flooding of residential and commercial property, pollution of land and watercourses plus water shortages with associated low pressure water supply problems.	Comment noted. The sustainable living section has been removed in the latest draft, however any development proposals for the town centre will be expected to have regard to the guidance of the Council's borough wide Sustainable Design and Construction supplementary planning document, which addresses the topic of sewage and water infrastructure.
	Water Supply & Sewerage Infrastructure - To accord with PPS12 text along the lines of the following section should be added to the framework: It is essential that developers demonstrate that adequate water supply and sewerage 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 water & 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 authority to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.	Comment noted. The sustainable living section has been removed in the latest draft, however any development proposals for the town centre will be expected to have regard to the guidance of the Council's borough wide Sustainable Design and Construction supplementary planning document, which addresses the topic of sewage and water infrastructure.
Planning Development control regeneration specialists	Ambitious masterplans will just end up as paper in a filing cabinet unless there are the resources to make it happen. The current economic climate make is virtually impossible to achieve the objectives in the time period proposed. Sometimes it is wiser to do a lot of little things better.	Comments noted. The Interim Framework includes a working list which is capable of update as timescales change.
Member of the public	Is the masterplan backed by a funded budget? If not then which elements of the masterplan have highest priority? If money was not available for all the plan, then how do you see Guildford in 2030? If £10M was available tomorrow, what would you fund first and why? I would like to see a priorities list and a clear list of what is funded, what is likely to be funded and when so that local businesses and residents can start to measure performance of the council based on implementation.	Comments noted. The Interim Framework includes a working list which is capable of update as timescales and priorities change.
National Trust	The Trust looks forward to working with Guildford Borough Council to secure funding through Planning Obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy for enhancements and improvements to the River Wey and its setting. The Trust will continue to comment on planning applications affecting our property and its setting.	Comment noted
CBRE for Merseyside Pension Fund, owner of Tunsgate Square Shopping Centre	Implementation of the vision - In the infrastructure delivery plan referred to in the draft masterplan, there is reference to pedestrianisation of Tunsgate but no item for improvements to Castle Street or Sydenham Road. The text also does not refer to how the influence of road traffic in this area will be limited, in order to achieve the placemaking ambitions. This needs to be addressed in the masterplan.	Comments noted. All proposed pedestrian improvements are listed in the Infrastructure Delivery working list which is capable of update as and when information becomes available or priorities change
No name given	Improved junctions Page 50/64 - I would welcome improvements for York Road/Stoke Road (Chertsey Street) the crossing is a nightmare and is heavily used by school children. Maybe just a change in traffic signal operation to match that of York Road/London Road is all that is needed.	Comment noted. The Delivery Framework lists road schemes for improvement/change with timescale and anticipated costs
Guide Dogs	Inclusive involvement critical architects and town planners that listen	Comment noted

University of Surrey	The future assessment should consider the approaches to the town centre as well as the area of the town centre itself. Some modelling should be undertaken to inform decision making in the town centre as a tool to help understand potential changes in the town centre network. The modelling is in itself not delivery, but should be used to inform options and choices for adapting and altering transport provision. Sustainable transport provision should be the cornerstone of the transport elements of the Masterplan delivery. This should include the provision of bus priority within and on the approach to the town centre, the need for bus facilities to cater for increased levels of bus demand and the provision of safe, secure and covered cycle parking.	Comments noted. The Interim Framework contains an infrastructure Delivery working list which includes bus priority and corridor improvements and the pedestrian and cycle environment. This working list is capable of update as priorities and timescales change. A detailed transport strategy will be included in the final version of the Framework
TURLEY ASSOCIATES on behalf of Hermes Real Estate Investment Management Ltd	The Council should engage with potential developers to discuss redevelopment options in the town centre in order to facilitate the regeneration of key sites.	The redevelopment of key sites in the town centre will be the subject of planning application and pre application discussion which will provide opportunities for further involvement and comment.
Member of the public	Until both the north-south and east-west through traffic is removed from the town centre it is unlikely that a masterplan for development will be successful.	The Interim Framework gives consideration to vehicle movement and to alternative sustainable forms of transport. A detailed transport strategy will be included in the final version of the Framework
Guildford town resident	As above please do use compulsory purchase powers. This is a hugely ambitious strategy. Prioritise and make things happen. Thank you Please see further comments	Comments noted. The Interim Framework includes a working list which is capable of update as timescales and priorities change.
Guildford town resident	Reiterate my opposition to moving the bus station to the Bedford Road site The replacement of the temporary Millmead footbridge should be made a priority. (Apart from anything else, the fact that it has taken so long to replace gives a poor image of Guildford - as a visitor recently remarked) The widening of the pavement in Bridge Street should also be made a priority	The bus station needs to be moved from its current site to make redevelopment of the land more attractive financially and ensure viability. No change required. Pedestrian infrastructure and improvements are listed in the Interim Framework Infrastructure Delivery working list which is capable of update as timescales and priorities change.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	None	Noted
Member of the public	The Masterplan does not adequately consider the transport issues - it is rather vague on how traffic congestion in the gyratory system and Onslow Street /York Road can be reduced, particularly with the likely increase in the number of people needing to access the town centre with an enlarged Friary Centre. One additional park and ride bus service is not going to solve the town's traffic congestion. The traffic flows within the town, particularly to and from the planned Waitrose supermarket, need to be identified - and where would traffic go if North Street is pedestrianised? York Road is already heavily used. Park and ride buses should serve more than one stop within the town centre - i.e. rearrange these services as cross town routes - e.g Spectrum - town centre - Artington, and Mellow P&R - town centre - Manor Park. Linking these routes across the town will increase the destination options within the town centre, and the routes would not necessarily need to serve the bus station.	Detailed suggestions are noted. The Interim Framework gives consideration to vehicle movements and to alternative sustainable forms of transport. It identifies the main problem areas and outlines funding issues .The Interim Framework includes an Infrastructure Delivery working list which is capable of update as timescales and priorities change or funding becomes available .A detailed transport strategy will be included in the final version of the Framework
	Use the local train services for park and ride from nearby stations - particularly on the line through Clandon, Horsley and Effingham where there is already a frequent all day train service (4 trains per hour). To facilitate travel opportunities within the town centre a free circular bus route should be reinstated within the town serving the main railway station, bus station, High Street and North Street and also London Road station. One solution to reduce traffic congestion within Guildford town centre, particularly for traffic coming from the A281 Horsham / Cranleigh road is to construct a relief road from the A3 at Compton, bypassing Compton village and following the B3000 road to the north of Farncombe and then towards Bramley joining the A281 south of Bramley village.	The Interim Framework makes reference to the use of train car parks especially at weekends to encourage residents not to bring cars into the town centre. It is recognised that better bus facilities will be required to encourage more people to use the bus service. A detailed transport strategy will be included in the final version of the Framework.
West Horsley Parish Council	Local business sponsorship should help to finance improvement. Infrastructure: we question the proposal to relocate rather than upgrade the bus station interchange. We acknowledge that a relocation would provide a good link to the central railway station but remind you that this new location would not be easily accessible to those entering the town from the Eastern side. Hence the proposals are offering only limited connectivity for some visitors to just one side of the town centre.	Funding comments noted. The bus station needs to be moved from its current site to make redevelopment of the land more attractive financially and ensure viability. The technical and operational issues relating to the relocation of the bus station are still under investigation
	An increase in the number of shops, development, business and more visitors all need a vastly improved transport infrastructure. An increase in the number of people will result in a rise of the number of vehicles, traffic planners need to design better designated queue lanes at car park entrances to prevent congestion. Short stay parking needs to be retained or even added to in addition to better/increased levels of public transport .Train fares are too high, reduced fares would encourage people to use them. Guildford is a busy town that already struggles to cope with the amount of visitors it receives, people who can not easily park/ access the centre will vote with their feet and choose to shop at / visit other locations.	A detailed transport strategy will be included in the final version of the Framework. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position'.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	10.1. Implementation. This is not explained. The experience with Development Briefs is not encouraging. It is vital that these and similar policy documents are much stronger and that their requirements are enforced on developers. We must expect that the document <u>will</u> eventually be part of the statutory framework. We need to know how designation of areas as "Placemaking Priority Areas" will affect planning, for example could this designation be invoked	The Interim Framework will be formally adopted by the Council and have similar status to the Council's Economic Strategy. It will not have statutory status until such time as the new Local Plan is in place (2014) and the final version of the Framework is upgraded to SPD.
	10.2. <u>The Council will use...CPOs..to facilitate redevelopment of key sites add and when necessary to overcome problems in provision of vital pedestrian routes and open space..</u>	This is detail that would be more appropriately included in the Design and Development brief for this site.

	10.3. Add. <i>All key pedestrian paths will be adopted as townpaths by the Highways Authority to ensure their future and provide proper control.</i>	This is detail that would be more appropriately included in the Design and Development brief for this site.
	Infrastructure Delivery. It was thought that there was pedestrian, as well as cyclist, funding from the Sustainable Transport Bid, but this is not listed.	The Interim Framework contains an infrastructure Delivery working list which includes pedestrian and cycling improvements to be funded by the Surrey travelSMART Local Sustainable Transport fund. This working list is capable of update as priorities and timescales change.
Member of the public	Some idea of the time scales for implementation of the proposals in the Masterplan would give the document greater credibility	The Interim Framework contains an Infrastructure Delivery working list This working list is capable of update as priorities and timescales change. A detailed transport strategy will be included in the final version of the Framework
Member of the public	This must be very funding dependent.	Noted
Member of the public	The Council has made proposals which on the face of it prejudice or fly in the face of the masterplan (eg., Bus Station relocation). Bearing in mind the masterplan is hardly ambitious, visionary or comprehensive and refers to multiple potential uses of sites which may or may not come forward for development, it is not clear what success would actually look like. There are no indicators as to what the resulting economic impact would be for Guildford (although some line entries have suggested costs associated) and it is very difficult, therefore, to identify how deliverable it is. It is easy to note, however, that this forms more of an estates management strategy for council-owned sites and it would, perhaps have been better published as a prospectus rather than dressed up as a masterplan. Guildford Society has held a workshop that highlighted many areas of concern and the imposition of this plan on Guildford would meet resistance from established bodies.	The bus station needs to be moved from its current site to make redevelopment of the land more attractive financially and ensure viability. The Interim Framework contains an Infrastructure Delivery working list This working list is capable of update as priorities and timescales change. A detailed transport strategy will be included in the final version of the Framework. Concerns about the Masterplan have been noted and addressed in the Interim Framework.
Quod on behalf of Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd	We note the reference to a new public square at the Friary extension site (page 62). Whilst any redevelopment would include areas of public realm, it is important that the details of, and commitments to, public realm requirements are not made until the detail of a redevelopment scheme and impact of such commitments on viability are understood. The table acknowledges that a redevelopment scheme is needed that is economically viable and can be delivered. We would request therefore that the reference to "public square" is changed to "public realm".	The North Street regeneration site is listed in the Interim Framework as an opportunity site. It is described as a major retail-led mixed-use development and no reference is made to a "public square". Specific detail of this nature will be included in the Design and Development brief for this site.
Chairman of The Tyting Society	The transportation issues seem to be missing from this section and are obviously key for considering any proposed development.	The Interim Framework contains an Infrastructure Delivery working list This working list is capable of update as priorities and timescales change. A detailed transport strategy will be included in the final version of the Framework.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Action is key! It has been demonstrated that inactivity means a backward step and the Town Centre Masterplan Consultation suggests the time is now for improved , strategic and structural changes to improve what Guildford has to offer. A big action is politically difficult but leadership in achieving the things that are right for Guildford Town Centre is important. When big steps are taken, (such as the 'GLive' complex with hotel and apartments) this demonstrates an evolution of Guildford that enhances and improves and does not take away from the real DNA that makes Guildford a 'highly regarded' environment. The delivery of major structural changes, such as the essential unlocking of the Friary 2 Centre by relocating the bus station to a more sustainable location is principally the first delivery element that will ultimately unlock a lot more sites for development and shows commitment to improving Guildford.	Comments noted. The Interim Framework includes an Infrastructure Delivery working list which is capable of update as timescales and priorities change or funding becomes available, and will facilitate and encourage action.
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	In relation to the 'pedestrian and cycling environments' we concur with the desire for pedestrian improvements between Guildford Station and the Main Shopping Area. Again we would suggest that the words "Main Shopping Area" should be replaced by "Primary Shopping Area". The TCM goes on to suggest that these improved pedestrian routes will be funded by planning obligations for railway station development. We would suggest that other developments, including the Bedford Road scheme, should also contribute to improving pedestrian routes between the station and nearby parts of the town centre.	The Interim Delivery Framework includes cycling and pedestrian improvements between the station and the town centre. These improvements will be funded by Surrey TravelSMART Local Sustainable Transport Fund.
Property Consultants	This pro-active approach to site assembly and development is a breath of fresh air, particularly when funding is unavailable in the private sector.	Comments noted and welcomed
Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	Infrastructure delivery is weak. Need break down of deliverable infrastructure packages that can be progressed through a phased but far sighted programme of contribution-funded works using, for example, Community Infrastructure Levy.	The Interim Framework contains an Infrastructure Delivery working list This working list is capable of update as priorities and timescales change. A detailed transport strategy will be included in the final version of the Framework.
The Guildford Society	Section 5 of the TCM is headed 'Delivery'. This section is very weak, with hardly any firm plans with dates. Here one would expect: (1) A set of prioritised items essential to fulfilment of the Vision, followed by a set of non-essential but desirable items. (2) Target timescales with the assumed means of delivery for most of the items. (3) Inclusion of many of the items described in Section 4 - Strategy. In particular:(a) The 11 Council owned development sites, and other sites where essential to the Vision. (b) Many more specific schemes relating to each of the headings used in 'Making better places through environmental improvements', namely: New street furniture High quality pocket spaces New green networks of open space and connections Tree planting Enhanced lighting Increased space for pedestrians Traffic calming without adversely affecting network capacity (c) Statements of specific cases where CPOs may be used to achieve essential items. It is extremely important that the delivery table sets out a more convincing and comprehensive set of details, particularly in relation to timescales and means of funding.	The Interim Framework contains an Infrastructure Delivery working list which includes costs and timescales where known . This working list is capable of update as priorities and timescales change. A detailed transport strategy will be included in the final version of the Framework.

Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (on behalf of the Guildford Society)	Linked to the general approach to sites, there is insufficient detail on how infrastructure and environmental improvements will be achieved and delivered. Congestion is a major issue to be addressed and further studies should be undertaken to inform the Masterplan. The Masterplan requires far greater clarity on proposals to enhance walking routes and proposals to improve the physical environment of streets and spaces. Specific analysis is required to set a clear context for a comprehensive package of proposals and strategies related to car parking, highways, pedestrian and cycling, station accessibility and public transport. The Masterplan suffers from a lack of details in relation to delivery and implementation. More specific details such as dates, sense of relative priority and delivery mechanisms / responsibility.	The Interim Framework contains an Infrastructure Delivery working list. This working list is capable of update as priorities and timescales change. A detailed transport strategy will be included in the final version of the Framework.
Any further comments		
interested individual	I am very interested in the idea of the coordinated long-term planning policy for Guildford. Is the building pictured in the TOWN leaflet due for redevelopment? It is the most ugly and intrusive piece of architecture possible. Is also very public and gives visitors quite the wrong impression of the town. I hope this nasty building is on it's way out.	The co ordinated long term plan for Guildford Borough will be the new Local Plan, consisting of the Local Plan Strategy and Local Plan Delivery documents. See the Council's website for more information - http://www.guildford.gov.uk/localplanstrategy
Member of the public	I have looked right through your Masterplan. Having allowed appalling planning over the years ,turning what was a very attractive Victorian red brick town into a dreadful mish mash of no particular style. I can see that you might at ,us council tax payers expense, want to rectify things as best you can. You have some great objectives ,new open spaces, more cycle routes, better river frontages and better park and ride.	Comments noted. No change.
Member of the public	I have now been through the plan as a layman and generally support the ideas put forward. However I have a few points of emphasis. wider area - I could see no mention of improving access to the Cathedral in the plans. I always feel that it was a huge mistake for the visitors to the town not to be able to use the Cathedral and it's grounds as a peaceful place to rest. At one stage a few years ago there was a concept of having a funicular connecting the town to the Cathedral. With the concept of increasing public open space could this be included in the plan?	Thank you for your comments about the Cathedral. This document is specifically about the future of Guildford town centre, not the whole of Guildford town so it does not include the Cathedral area. The area covered by the interim framework is shown on a map on page eight of the document. Most respondents to the consultation on the draft masterplan agreed with the suggested boundary. Any suggestion regarding the Cathedral can be considered in the Local Plan Strategy and Delivery documents which cover the whole of the borough.
No name given	Page 40 - Mobility – due to the steepness of the high street a simple cable car could be introduced (perhaps designed by the university) to aid visitors travelling the length of the high street – this could encourage additional tourists and visitor to visit the Tow Centre.	Thank you for your suggestion. Although this may aid people who find it difficult to walk up the high street, it is unlikely to be feasible, viable or suitable on the high street, which is in a conservation area.
	Traffic management – care must be taken not to 'exclude the car' at all cost and also care must be taken to ensure that there is availability for all vehicles to transverse the town which for all its internal delights is a 'Gap town' and until the need for the gap is removed by a substantial bypass at 90 degrees to the A3 then this fact will remain.	Comments noted. Whilst the interim framework seeks to reduce vehicle dominance in the streets, it is recognised that cars are the main form of transport for the majority of people.
	Page 41 - While much is made of removing railings and fencing one hidden effect of these obstructions is litter gathering and prevention of litter entering the river as wind blown debris of town life – consideration should be given to an automated sieve system (located on the outside of the river bend (s) to collect river born litter to prevent it travelling down stream past the town centre – during times of high influx of peoples to the town and in times of flooding.	Comments noted. If railings are removed, the implications will be fully considered and mitigated against.
	Page 43 - Materials – While suggesting Natural (and local) stone for use in the historic areas care should be taken on two points – that it is actually Local and not pseudo local and that its surface is laid in such a manner that wheel chairs and prams do not become vibrating torture chairs for their occupants as has occurred in Chichester Sussex where it is near impossible to use a wheel chair without tipping the occupant into the street.	Thank you for this helpful information. This would be a consideration when new stone is being permitted.
	Page 46 - The writer of this section has clearly forgotten that Guildford is a Gap town and no matter how one looks at this commercial sector including 'extra trees' 'narrowing roads' and 'harassing' the motorist will not remove the fact that people from Woking and travelling to Cranleigh and Horsham have little choice of route save through the town centre, Or through unsuitable narrow village roads outside Guildford. So Trees plant road side on Bends will be hit by heavy articulated vehicles traffic Islands will be run over if placed inappropriately and increase in pollution will occur as HGV's use lower gears to manoeuvre through narrowed streets. While a radical re-think is required of the gyratory system	Comments noted. It is noted that many people travel through Guildford town centre to get to other places. Further consideration will be given to transport issues, with the commenced of town centre transport modelling in Sept 2012.
	– perhaps to include a new road traffic bridge over the river between the railway station and site O3 / O4 specifically for 'through traffic' heading towards Woking, while the old routes are used for the Horsham bound routes. Caution is advised on any attempt to turn the through route from the A3 to Horsham into a plantation with goat tracks instead of a sensible clear run through the area – thus reducing pollution and noise created by low moving spaghetti of traffic going no where...	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
	– Perhaps a through half height tunnel (by lowering the through traffic road [by 50% of required height and raising the other cross roads by 50%] and allowing local traffic to go over the top) would solve the problem while not invading the view or causing a flooding problem.	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy

	<p>Conclusion - While in general the plan is well presented and researched, the transport sections leave a lot to be desired noting the following 1. There is no acknowledgement of the 'urgent need' to ensure that (like all other 'real' towns in the world) the 'Local' Buses meet the 'National' trains – probably the missing master stroke of the Town centre Plan. 2. Little weight is given to the outstanding and unavoidable fact that Guildford is a gap town and as such has extremely important 'through routes' which like it or not MUST be kept open to allow the surrounding towns and villages to survive. 3. The production of an area of 'quick park and buy' is not included in the plan so people (the workers) wanting a paper and a kit kat (the seven day a week customers low volume high repeat clients) are ignored totally in favour of the one big buy all day to spend 'off work' visitor – there should be provision within the plan for the "quick shop car driver" as well as the "all the time in the world shopper." 4. No mention has been made of the farce of the unused bus lanes, introduced so many years ago throughout Guildford, they have two main faults a. Drivers are unaware that some are timed and others are permanent – causing frustration and traffic queues when none should occur b. There are insufficient buses using these lanes to justify their existence, for example, i. The bus lane past the spectrum in Six years I have never managed to be in a car, bus, pedestrian, conflict past the Lido - The bus lane is simply not required save to claim there is one! ii. From the bus lane to the station – 50% of the buses appear to 'turn right' up Farnham road so sit in the car lane leaving the bus lane empty causing congestion as cars going to Cranleigh queue up to turn left when the road is actually clear. A Very badly through out situation.</p>	<p>These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>
business in Guildford borough	<p>1. To encourage the Evening Economy I would advise the Park & Rides stay open later in the evening 2. Don't protect the town from non-retail - the non-retail sector brings people. Hoards of people visit car boot sales on a Sunday morning, you could be cashing in on this foot fall.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Spectrum park and ride service runs until 11pm, but Artington and Merrow finish between 7.15pm and 7.30pm. These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>
GBC Councillor	<p>Having read the draft town centre master plan there is only one reference to taxis. This relates to the taxi rank at the main railway station. This rank is on private land that is in the ownership of SW Trains. Accordingly, this taxi rank is not under the control of GBC. Because of this fact SW Trains could close this rank if a higher level of income can be generated than as current through taxi permits. I can find no other reference to taxi rank provision within the town centre master plan. Taxis are an integral part of transport from the various ranks located through the town. Taxis are used by a variety of persons. i.e. Businesses, visitors and residents. What should also be considered within this plan is the night time economy is quite different from the day time. Within the changes proposed new ranks should be considered. An undersupply of taxi ranks will increase crime and disorder. The new G Live and Radisson hotel in the same area in the upper High Street area are examples of a lack of consideration and consultation of transport use both to and from these venues. It is clear taxis were not considered at the planning stage, evidence of this is clear no new ranks were created to cater for the numbers attending these two venues. Within the town centre master plan there are many suggested improvements that will enhance the town of Guildford however it appears taxis have been excluded from the list of proposals. This matter should be addressed in the final master plan for Guildford.</p>	<p>These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>
Guildford town resident	<p>PLEASE DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE BUS STATION!</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year, and a public consultation held later in 2012.</p>
Member of the public	<p>So in conclusion they are going to get rid of all the car parks as they might flood once a year and replace with restaurants and offices...which might flood to great expense once a year? Isn't there enough restaurants in Guildford and not enough parking? Hence the town jams up every Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday?</p>	<p>The parking strategy is currently being updated. Restaurants help to contribute to a diverse evening economy.</p>
Member of the public	<p>Strategy - Add: Making better places through infrastructure improvements. page 21 insert "in the position for which consent is given" before current planning permission. Sites 01, 02 ,03, 04 should be considered together in overall planning: there is potential here for a new road leading to Yorkies bridge and for a better track layout on the East side of Guildford station.</p>	
Guide Dogs for the Blind	<p>I am very concerned that, on pages 47 and 49, the Borough is considering introducing the discredited scheme of shared spaces to the detriment of the visually impaired. Did you know that Guide Dogs are trained to stop and sit at kerbs?</p>	<p>Concerns about shared surfaces noted; agree any such schemes will need to carefully consider safety for all users, including those visually or hearing impairments.</p>
Member of the public	<p>At the age of 89 I have become disabled so therefore, I will be unable to get down to the town to view the consultation draft document. However I am notifying appeal to the proposal to move the bus station on a number of grounds which have been fully expressed in letters to the "Surrey Advertiser" in which I fully concur.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments about the bus station. A decision has not yet been made regarding the future location of the bus station. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year.</p>
Member of the public	<p>In general, I agree with the main proposals of the document. Guildford would benefit from a sympathetic re-development of the station area, the bus station, the telephone exchange, parts of Walnut Tree Close and possibly the Bright Hill car park site. Guildford has a lot going for it, as evidenced by the number of people who live, and want to live, in the borough and, on the whole, I think the local authority has done much to make Guildford a good place to live.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. No change.</p>
Member of the public	<p>Most people using the bus station will be highly inconvenienced by moving it further from the main shops. Guildford is very spread out and hilly and it is unfair to expect people to carry their shopping even further. Relatively few people transfer from train to bus, or vice versa. Those working at the main employers of the hospital and university are already served by the station exit in Guildford Park Road which links up with buses. Local people will be less attracted to shop in Guildford as a result.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments about the bus station. A decision has not yet been made regarding the future location of the bus station. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year.</p>

	Idea of rethinking one-way gyratory system is very important - I rarely go into Guildford to shop because of the nightmare traffic, which isn't a problem in Woking (slightly closer to me although I live in Guildford Borough). Congestion needs to be reduced at ALL times, not just peak; and driving through the town needs to be made to feel more of a pleasant experience, integrated into the surroundings rather than something to dread and which only happens on the unattractive outer roads. Although I work on the UniS campus, I am also put off going into town at lunchtime by the dreary approach from the Odeon cinema area.	Comments noted. The interim framework recognises the issues associated with traffic congestion in the town. The framework states that the Council will work with Surrey County Council to improve traffic management in the town centre. Town centre transport modelling is due to commence in September 2012.
	Tourists can't access the TIC by car (although new location is higher visibility than previous). This is something that may put travellers off stopping in Guildford. As a frequent visitor to France, I expect to be able to stop at the TIC and find out if I want to stay in a town or move on. Guildford is described as the "key shopping and service centre in the county". Is everything being done to make it competitive with Kingston, which I would have thought more worthy of that description? Provision of more and more bars etc in the town centre will need careful policing. Older people consider the town centre a "no go" area on weekend nights.	Thank you for this useful information regarding the TIC. Part of the strategy for the historic area is to improve connections between key destinations such as to and across the riverside, to the station and between the High Street / tourist information centre and Guildford Castle and museum. Although Kingston upon Thames does not have a London postcode, and is widely perceived to be in Surrey, in 1974 when boundaries were change, Kingston upon Thames became part of wider London, and is not within Surrey. The vision includes reference to improving the competitiveness of Guildford Town Centre when it says "Guildford town centre will continue to be the premier town centre in Surrey and will rank amongst the leading town centres in the South East - an attractive place to live, work, relax and visit."
Member of the public	I strongly resent all attempts to relocate the bus station which is an ideal position at present. Older people particularly would really struggle if they had further to walk to access bus station particularly as the Town is very hilly. Many people would travel to Woking by bus where the Facilities are more compact. Why have not bus users been consulted, Surely the councillors are supposed to do their best for their electorates? How many of them use the buses I wonder?	Thank you for your comments about the bus station. A decision has not yet been made regarding the future location of the bus station. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year.
Member of the public	More WCs with the certainty that they will remain open 24/7 and kept clean.	The Cleansing Manager has advised that unfortunately these toilets (pop up toilets) are very expensive and locating these is very difficult. It took several months to find a location in the town that could hold the current pop up toilet due to planning, neighbour and underground piping issues. There is also limited pavement space in and around the Bridge Street area. Even if the money were available, finding a site would be very difficult. Issues of concern relating to the night time economy have recently become higher profile, include an independent review. Recycling litter bins - The Council is working to increase these and already has a number in the High Street. We are looking to expand these further through the town over the coming years as budgets allow. No changes required.
David Ogilvie Design	Map showing possible tunnel road under tc	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
	This my vision for Guildford for the next 40 years. Forty years ago there was a masterplan for Guildford that enabled the High Street to become pedestrianised this involved the extension of York Road, the creation of Onslow Street and a new bridge over the River Wey. Unfortunately this work created a road and traffic barrier between the town centre, the river and the station. At that time before the law courts, county court and flats in Walnut tree close were built the opportunity to cross the river and railway down stream was missed and we are now living with the consequence of a divided town and traffic congestion. As a result Guildford is one of the most congested towns in England. Employers and shoppers are already turning their backs on Guildford due to traffic congestion. This situation will only get worse as more shops, supermarkets etc. are added to the town centre without decisive traffic circulation and access improvements.	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
	We now have another opportunity for a new visionary masterplan to correct this situation and unleash Guildford's potential by redirecting traffic and pedestrianising and landscaping Guildford from the top of the High Street across Onslow Street across the river and to the station forecourt. This opportunity will be lost for another 40 years at least if the current plans by Solum Regeneration for the station go ahead without reservations for future road improvements. I attach a Drawing Ref. DOD1434/003A as a basis for discussion showing one way that this can be achieved. It is not going to be easy and it is going to cost a lot of money. However there is plenty of room in Onslow Street with other traffic removed, to take all the town centre bus stops. The existing bus station site, worth say £10 million, will then become available for development.	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
	Guildford is blessed with a chalk hill that is ideal tunnel material and with two existing tunnel portals these will enable the construction of a road tunnel to take north south traffic out of the town centre, out of sight and out of earshot without the need to demolish a single building. By using the excavated chalk to remediate Racks close to original levels not only will there be a huge saving in tunnel costs but also the potential for 6 house plots on Warwick's Bench worth say £5 million will be created. The cost of the tunnel has been estimated at £30million. This compares with £40 million recently spent by Westfield just to upgrade the Friary. The general lift in property values across the town due to better access and better town centre environment will dwarf the tunnel costs.	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy

	<p>Guildford lacks parking space with good access to the High Street and if the High Street is not to suffer serious decline when the Friary Phase 2 is developed this will have to be remedied. This can be done out of sight with a new car park for say 1,000 cars under South Street accessed from the new tunnel with direct pedestrian connection to the High Street via Tunsgate Square. Currently internationally known consultants are looking at these ideas, they include Quantity Surveyors who are refining costs and benefits, traffic engineers who are testing the new traffic proposals and tunnelling engineers are looking into the tunnel design.</p>	<p>These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>
Guildford Cycle Group	<p>Please can someone clarify:- 1. The route from Park Barn to the University</p>	<p>These are shown on the LSTF key competent BID Surrey Travel SMART</p>
	<p>2. The route from Walnut Tree Close to the town centre</p>	<p>These are shown on the LSTF key competent BID Surrey Travel SMART</p>
	<p>3. The route from Onslow Village to the town centre. I'm puzzled over the references to the "issue with crossing the A31. Also look at A3100 crossing."</p>	<p>These are shown on the LSTF key competent BID Surrey Travel SMART</p>
	<p>4. The route of the "New cycle route University/Royal Surrey Hospital to town centre. New shared surface footways adjacent to A25, improved crossings at major intersections (which ones?) and signage."</p>	<p>These are shown on the LSTF key competent BID Surrey Travel SMART</p>
	<p>5. New cycle route Spectrum and Guildford College to town centre. Where is a new pedestrian (Toucan?) crossing proposed for Walnut Tree Close? Where is the proposed 'improved crossing' of Woodbridge Road? Where are the new paths across Stoke Park?</p>	<p>These are shown on the LSTF key competent BID Surrey Travel SMART</p>
	<p>On matters other than cycle routes, can someone give me details (is there a plan?) of two other items listed on page 62, namely; the "New pavement east side of Millbrook" (which part of Millbrook?) and the proposal to "Realign pedestrian crossing of Onslow Street at Bridge Street to cross straight across"?</p>	<p>These are both referenced from the PRIAN Study report (se Appendix 1 of interim framework)</p>
Chairman, Puttenham Parish Council	<p>Guildford Master Plan. At present there appears to be a lot of widespread opposition to the new bus station at Bedford Road. I believe a better alternative could be made with satellite sites in the town centre in North Street after relocation of the current market to the current bus station site next to the Friary, this is a flat level site & is in the centre of town, farmers markets could be encouraged to use on Sundays etc.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments about the bus station. A decision has not yet been made regarding the future location of the bus station. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year.</p>
Coal Authority	<p>No objection</p>	<p>Comments noted. No change.</p>
Guildford town resident	<p>We have a beautiful Town, well looked after and cared for. If we could encourage more diversity within the town retail environment it would be a so much more interesting place.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The vision says, "More diverse, quality shops will also increase our visitor attractions alongside cultural and leisure opportunities."</p>
Member of the public	<p>This we attended the meeting held under the auspices of The Guildford Society with professionals in Urban Development. We hope you will take on board their comments. The many qualified and competent participants at the meeting put forward ideas and far reaching proposals which deserve to be considered. We felt that this was an excellent forum for the views of the informed residents of Guildford to have a say.</p>	<p>Comments noted. All comments received have been considered.</p>
Member of the public	<p>Overall a great plan. I have one major concern about the drive to have a 'full line' supermarket within the town centre. I think this is wrong for the following reasons. People generally make dedicated trips for their main grocery shop. Once they've done this shop they will leave they won't stay for some recreational shopping. The existing out of town major supermarkets at Burpham, Bellfields etc work well and are self sufficient for car parking. Putting a major supermarket in the town centre will just increase traffic congestion and pressure on scant parking spaces. The existing small Sainsbury in the High St and M&S at the station are sufficient for any forgotten essentials.</p>	<p>The Retail and Leisure Study (2011) found that both convenience and comparison floorspace was found to be overtrading. Guildford town centre would benefit from the provision of a new food supermarket or superstore in the town centre to relieve overtrading, improve consumer choice and increase linked trips spending. In a do nothing scenario, the centre will decline and over time will lose market share to competing developments as consumers seek enhanced choice and retailers seek improved accommodation.</p> <p>The NPPF directs main town centre uses (including supermarkets) to town centre as a priority location. Therefore if there is a need for a new supermarket in Guildford Urban Area, sites within the Town Centre should be given first consideration. Only if suitable sites cannot be found, should other sites be looked at. Traffic assessment would be part of the test of suitability.</p>
Guildford town resident	<p>On Guildford gyratory there is no provision for cycles. A simple and cheap improvement would be to paint advanced stop lines for cycles at all the gyratory traffic lights. The speed limit should also be reduced to 20 mph, which is more like the speed that a cycle can manage, and avoids cyclists feeling like they are being bullied out of lanes by impatient motorists.</p>	<p>These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>
	<p>University to Walnut Tree Close To get to anywhere in North Guildford, I cycle over the foot/cycle bridge connecting the Surrey University campus to Walnut Tree Close. This is an excellent route for cyclists to and from town, but this right turn (when coming down Walnut Tree Close towards the station) is very dangerous for a number of reasons: 1. The kerb is dropped here, but the tarmac below it is very broken and difficult for a cyclist to mount; 2. Oncoming traffic is in the middle of the road because of parking along the West side of Walnut Tree Close; 3. Traffic from behind is often reluctant to slow down as it's not clearly a junction; 4. Cars/pedestrians coming down the access road can be unaware of and obstructing vehicles turning in to the access road.</p>	<p>These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>

	The 'quick win' here would be to improve the tarmac/road interface with a simple repair to the tarmac. This would mean that cyclists could commit to the turn with confidence and concentrate on avoiding pedestrians/traffic, rather than having to concentrate on mounting the kerb. A good additional measure would be to build a pedestrian island in the middle of the road here with a 'right-turn refuge' marked out for cyclists on the North side of it. This would also help the many pedestrians who go up and down this access road to the university. A similar 'right-turn refuge' would be very welcome for cycles turning right on Woodbridge road into the path between the Woodbridge Cafe and the cricket ground. (this path is recommended by the council as a cycle route). There should be cycle parking by the George Abbot statue at the top of Guildford High Street. There is plenty of cycle parking at the bottom of the hill, but little at the top.	These points will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
Planning Development control regeneration specialists	The town centre is not the best that could be achieved but the blame for this is the public sector and the state. The council is not "sweetening" its own assets to provide a better place for all e.g. number of poor quality car parking space in the town centre.	Comment noted. The Council is currently producing an updated parking strategy and this will inform the final town centre framework.
Guildford town resident	Lots of places offer lots of shops, lots of traffic and lots of uniformity. Guildford doesn't need to do the same less would be much, much more if the Friary area was not overdeveloped, car traffic was better managed and public transport was treated as a true priority.	We appreciate that large scale retail development in the town centre is not a popular proposal with all of the public. The future demand retail has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology. Allowance has been made for special forms of trading such as internet retailing, and planning permissions that were approved but not built out at the time of writing. Lack of sites in the central retail area of the town centre is resulting in an increasing amount of new retail floorspace being developed in out of centre locations such as Ladymead retail park, leading to retail spend being diverted to out of centre locations and to other competing town centres. If this continues, other competing town centres and out of centre locations will gain visitors and expenditure relative to Guildford town centre, which will be relatively disadvantaged. As Guildford's 2006 Retail Study explained and the 2011 Retail and Leisure Study reiterated, "standing still is akin to decline in retail terms; if other centres continue to improve their retail offer, so must Guildford if it is to retain its current position."
National Trust	The National Trust welcomes this opportunity to comment on the draft Masterplan. As you are aware the Trust owns, manages and is the navigation authority for the River Wey and Godalming Navigations which passes through the heart of the Plan area. We have a statutory duty to promote its permanent preservation for the benefit of the nation in the long term.	Comments noted. The role of the National Trust is acknowledged in the framework
Guildford town resident	There are a number of issues which appear not to be adequately addressed and should be included in any later version of the plan.	We do not have all the information we need yet to develop a movement strategy for the town centre, but are working on this alongside Surrey County Council, which is responsible for most of the roads in the area, and also the Highways Agency which is responsible for the major roads, including the A3. The town centre does not however stand still, and there are numerous areas that have development potential or need enhancement. We need to ensure Guildford is an attractive place to live and to visit and a desirable location for business investment. We have therefore produced an interim framework to assist in coordination of redevelopments and enhancements.
Guildford town resident	I am a long term resident of Guildford and in that simple capacity attended the launch of the initial consultation in June of last year. I left that meeting feeling somewhat frustrated and concerned that the planning focus seemed far too narrow to be inspiring or motivating, and the consultation process too short and discrete to enable much meaningful engagement with the Guildford community. A long career in leading and supporting strategic change and development in major corporate organisations has taught me that addressing both these elements will be critical to the creation of plans that have any chance of success. At that time, I wrote to the Surrey Advertiser in an attempt to stimulate discussion of these matters. I attach a copy of my letter which they published on 15 July.	Thank you for your comments. The interim framework is however not a statutory document, and is not prepared in accordance with the regulations for preparation of a development plan document. It is the Local Plan Strategy that will be the overarching strategic policy document for the borough. The timescales for this work are on the Council's website at www.guildford.gov.uk/lds
	Reviewing your recently issued draft plan has confirmed my fears. The draft totally fails to bring to life any credible, distinctive vision of what Guildford could or should be in the future. Indeed the issues of vision, goals, strategic direction etc are dealt with so peremptorily that one is tempted to conclude that the real purpose of the plan is to get on with sorting out a list of developmental specifics as quickly as possible without having to deal with the challenge and possible constraint of fully understanding the wider context in time and space within which these decisions would best be made.	The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision.

	As a result, despite the significant efforts that your staff have clearly put behind the plan's creation, it strikingly fails to address a large number of critical issues. To illustrate, some of my concerns include: · There is a strong sense that retail continues to be seen as the principle driver of economic activity and social dynamic in the town centre. Yet the future viability of physical retail is highly uncertain, even excluding the short term consequences of the recession. It seems very likely that town centres will, within the next decade or so, have to reinvent themselves in dramatic ways if they are going to sustain their viability. There will be a need for much change and experimentation to find new models.	We appreciate that large scale retail development in the town centre is not a popular proposal with all of the public. The future demand retail has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology. Allowance has been made for special forms of trading such as internet retailing, and planning permissions that were approved but not built out at the time of writing. Lack of sites in the central retail area of the town centre is resulting in an increasing amount of new retail floorspace being developed in out of centre locations such as Ladymead retail park, leading to retail spend being diverted to out of centre locations and to other competing town centres. If this continues, other competing town centres and out of centre locations will gain visitors and expenditure relative to Guildford town centre, which will be relatively disadvantaged. As Guildford's 2006 Retail Study explained and the 2011 Retail and Leisure Study reiterated, "standing still is akin to decline in retail terms; if other centres continue to improve their retail offer, so must Guildford if it is to retain its current position."
	Is Guildford simply going to wait and see, hoping that 'me-too' solutions will be adequate, copied or imported from elsewhere. How confident can we be that the town's infrastructure would by then be appropriate for whatever is required? Or is there a much more stimulating alternative to such complacency; could Guildford move more to the vanguard of experimentation and creativity in addressing these challenges? These questions seems at least worthy of debate but none of this is reflected in the plan. · The vitality and viability of the town centre is enormously dependent on the wider transport infrastructure both within the town and beyond. There are evidently very major issues lurking here. Where is the larger vision for how this needs to be addressed and integrated over the relevant timescales?	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
	· The heart and identity of any town reflects a complex mix of the creativity and energy that underpins many aspects of the community, including its cultural, educational, social, entrepreneurial and commercial activities of all kinds. These are however not distinct areas, each of which can be addressed in isolation. Rather, they need to connect with and feed off one another in an integrated way that supports success in each but enables the whole to become something much greater. The town centre plan should surely play a key enabling role in this.	Agreed. The interim framework considers how these different activities can all be provided for and balanced within the town centre.
	I could go on to raise many more questions, but my purpose here is not to list deficiencies. I seek simply to illustrate the need for this plan to be rethought, particularly in relation to its vision, including and integrating a much broader range of aspects of the life of the town, and articulating more clearly the broad strategic priorities that result.	The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision.
	In parallel, there needs to be a much more meaningful process of engagement with the community and the full range of its diverse stakeholders. I am sure this would usefully generate much more creative thinking around future opportunity and potential and, in the process, would unlock greater energy and support for subsequent implementation. The task of undertaking this right now might look daunting and expensive, particularly in current economic circumstances, but I believe it would generate much of its own momentum if skilfully facilitated.	Wide public consultation was undertaken at two stages (excluding the earlier two stages on the Town Centre Area Action Plan from which this document has evolved)
CBRE for Merseyside Pension Fund, owner of Tunsgate Square Shopping Centre	CBRE act on behalf of Merseyside Pension Fund, owner of Tunsgate Square Shopping Centre on High Street, Guildford. Merseyside Pension Fund is committed to its investment in Guildford and believes that it can and should continue to form an important part of the town centre offer. For that reason CBRE is currently examining options for the refurbishment or redevelopment of the shopping centre. Merseyside Pension Fund welcomes the draft Town Centre Masterplan prepared by the Council, which aims to help secure Guildford's role as the county's key retail and employment centre.	Comments noted. Tunsgate square is identified in the framework as a potential site. Should it come forward for redevelopment, there is potential to improve the public realm and pedestrian connections in this area.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	We are writing to you to express our concern about the Council's decisions to move the bus station, and to further expand the Friary Development site together with the luxury retail provision in the town. We hope that the Council will take Holy Trinity Amenity Group's views into account and reconsider these decisions.	Thank you for your comments about the bus station. A decision has not yet been made regarding the future location of the bus station. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year.
Guildford town resident	I have lived on the edge of the town centre for 10 years and as a regular visitor to Guildford for an additional 25 years. Throughout this time the challenge with Guildford has been traffic congestion and some inappropriate development eg. Printing House Square. We now have another opportunity to think big and long-term to make Guildford the most attractive town in the South I feel that the current draft TCMP suffers from being a piecemeal approach to town planning as it is encouraging development to various pockets of land without a long-term view. In particular I do not feel that we can do much until a traffic solution is found. It would be a bold step for the council to say at this stage: 'we are putting the balance of the draft TCMP on ice until a clear long-term Vision for the town has been truly sold to stakeholders and a transport solution designed.' Now is the time to be bold.	This criticism has been taken on board, and the interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision. These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
Guildford town resident	My observations are:	Title field - no response required.
	1 There are far too many pages with much student text book material.	Comments noted. The document includes maps and photographs. Background information is in Annex 3. It is not essential that this information is read, it is there for further information if required.

	2 What is needed is a relatively brief even pithy statement setting out a vision for the Town Centre("TC") This should be in the following descending order of priority:	The rewritten Vision is much shorter, with detailed points being picked up in the strategy. No change required
	A Make Guildford a green and pleasant town. (See note 1)	see Vision and objective 4
	B The over-riding problem is to sort out traffic congestion, especially the so-called gyratory: if that were done almost every other matter would fall into place. (See Note 2)	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
	C Traffic free pedestrian route from the station to the Town centre. (See note 3)	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
	D Less emphasis on retail provision. (See note 4)	We appreciate that large scale retail development in the town centre is not a popular proposal with all of the public. The future demand retail has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology. Allowance has been made for special forms of trading such as internet retailing, and planning permissions that were approved but not built out at the time of writing. Lack of sites in the central retail area of the town centre is resulting in an increasing amount of new retail floorspace being developed in out of centre locations such as Ladymead retail park, leading to retail spend being diverted to out of centre locations and to other competing town centres. If this continues, other competing town centres and out of centre locations will gain visitors and expenditure relative to Guildford town centre, which will be relatively disadvantaged. As Guildford's 2006 Retail Study explained and the 2011 Retail and Leisure Study reiterated, "standing still is akin to decline in retail terms; if other centres continue to improve their retail offer, so must Guildford if it is to retain its current position
	E Emphasise that the future of TC cannot be divorced from the 4 great assets outside TC, namely Research Park, Hospital, University and Cathedral. (See note 5)	This document is specifically about the future of Guildford town centre, not the whole of Guildford town so it does not include these. The area covered by the interim framework is shown on a map on page eight of the document. Most respondents to the consultation on the draft masterplan agreed with the suggested boundary.
	Green does not mean just green spaces , eg maximising the visual and practical asset of the river corridor, but also 'green' infrastructure, and other initiatives of a green nature so that Guildford becomes a by-word for "greenness".	Comments noted. The Council is currently carrying out a Green Infrastructure study as part of the evidence base informing the Local Plan Strategy
	I cannot see the necessity for an increase of retail space either as to the viability of the TC or in respect of the rapid increase in internet shopping.	We appreciate that large scale retail development in the town centre is not a popular proposal with all of the public. The future demand retail has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology. Allowance has been made for special forms of trading such as internet retailing, and planning permissions that were approved but not built out at the time of writing. Lack of sites in the central retail area of the town centre is resulting in an increasing amount of new retail floorspace being developed in out of centre locations such as Ladymead retail park, leading to retail spend being diverted to out of centre locations and to other competing town centres. If this continues, other competing town centres and out of centre locations will gain visitors and expenditure relative to Guildford town centre, which will be relatively disadvantaged. As Guildford's 2006 Retail Study explained and the 2011 Retail and Leisure Study reiterated, "standing still is akin to decline in retail terms; if other centres continue to improve their retail offer, so must Guildford if it is to retain its current position."
	I suggest the masterplan produced by Geoffrey Jellicoe in the late '40s might be revisited for ideas.	Thank you for your suggestion. The study has been considered and referenced in the document.

Members of the public	Whilst this seems a great plan for those who do not know Guildford very well, for those of us who live here it seems you are doing everything you can to encourage more and more people to come into the town to spend money at the expense of everything else. We shop elsewhere for most things, because of the lack of individual retailers in the town who are, it seems, priced out of the market.	Comments noted. We appreciate that large scale retail development in the town centre is not a popular proposal with all of the public. The future demand retail has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology. Allowance has been made for special forms of trading such as internet retailing, and planning permissions that were approved but not built out at the time of writing. Lack of sites in the central retail area of the town centre is resulting in an increasing amount of new retail floorspace being developed in out of centre locations such as Ladymead retail park, leading to retail spend being diverted to out of centre locations and to other competing town centres. If this continues, other competing town centres and out of centre locations will gain visitors and expenditure relative to Guildford town centre, which will be relatively disadvantaged. As Guildford's 2006 Retail Study ¹ explained and the 2011 Retail and Leisure Study ² reiterated, "standing still is akin to decline in retail terms; if other centres continue to improve their retail offer, so must Guildford if it is to retain its current position."
Guide Dogs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The content and text reference is vary vague we would like to see more specific reference to vulnerable road users and pedestrians and how the design will cater for their wide and varied access requirements 	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to know if stakeholder engagement has taken place and whether the local access group have been contacted for their input. OUR UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THEY HAVE NOT AND YOU SPONSOR THE ACCESS GROUP!!! 	Stakeholder engagement has taken place and the access group has been consulted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to have sight of the disability impact assessment 	The equalities impact assessment is available online - http://www.guildford.gov.uk/Guildfordinterimtowncentreframework
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared space has been mentioned, would like clarity of the details of what aspects of shared surface is to be implemented 	Reference to shared space in the master plan is referring to what is also known as shared surfaces. For consistency, only the latter term is now used in the interim framework, which also explains more about shared surfaces (see Figure 12 and sections 6.4, 7 Delivery). Investigation of potential shared surfaces in transition areas will identify the streets where this could be implemented. Concerns about shared surfaces noted; agree any such schemes will need to carefully consider safety for all users, including those visually or hearing impairments.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More details on the signage, lighting and way finding and design of the surface used in the new developments 	The Council welcomes working with the signage group and surrey county council to improve signage around and within the town centre. Picked up in strategy section
University of Surrey	The University of Surrey (UoS) generally supports the approach adopted by the Guildford Town Centre Masterplan 20122010, consultation draft December 2011. However, it wishes to make a number of focused comments.	Comments noted. No change
	Parking strategy and the role of Park and Ride - The strategy for car parking for the town centre is similar to many other town centres in terms of reducing long term spaces and providing short term spaces and Park & Ride. Getting the balance of enough short stay spaces to encourage shopping and leisure is important and the parking strategy should reflect this as well as the role for Park & Ride. The reduction of long stay spaces coupled with greater demand from development growth will arguably generate more demand for bus and rail travel to/from the town centre and the potential for this to increase will need to be accommodated. Similarly the provision for cycle parking (and connectivity) within the town centre and to/from surrounding urban areas will continue to encourage the increased trend in cycling as an attractive economic and healthy lifestyle travel choice .	The reduction in long stay parking is aimed at encouraging more sustainable forms of commuting such as train, cycling or park and ride (although it recognised that businesses need a certain number of spaces to remain competitive). This reduction must therefore be linked to improvements in alternative forms of transport. The aim in maintaining the level of short stay parking is to ensure that visitors can park for a few hours in convenience locations, and that lack of spaces does not deter visitors. The majority of town centres experience on-street parking pressure during the day. The main solution to this is controlled parking for residents. Public short stay parking "lost" due to redevelopment of surface car parks must be reprovided elsewhere, although in proactive there may be some time lag in retaining levels. Pricing can be a powerful incentive for some, although is it would not affect everyone. National planning policy on parking has changed this year, from maximum (ie. no more than) to a more flexible approach.
	The University welcomes the proposal to increase park and ride space provision as a means to alleviate congestion on the gyratory and approach roads to the town centre (page 20). Reference is made to a forthcoming review of the 2003 Parking Strategy and in particular the need to take account of a proposed new park and ride facility at Manor Park. The University considers that park and ride is a valid way to reduce the number of cars accessing the town centre. However, it is considered that the issue of park and ride for the western approach to the town should be reviewed to ensure that the best solution is arrived at to meet the town's needs. With regard to the potential benefits the park and ride sites will have on the masterplan, the review of the wider parking strategy should really include park and ride west of Guildford. If this is not included, the masterplan could be unsound because it may not deliver the objectives (particularly Objective 3) and the plan would lack flexibility.	Support noted and welcomed. The parking strategy review is including consideration of this.

	Improving the Railway Station - The University agrees that the railway station has an important role to play in the town centre as a focus for interchange. Bus and rail interchange for existing and potential future expansion of services, should form a fundamental part of the vision. The masterplan identifies that opportunities could exist to improve station infrastructure at Guildford Railway Station (site 02, page 24). The University welcomes improvements that would enhance capacity and improve the travel experience at the station to help meet the challenge of reducing town centre congestion. The train station is a gateway to the town and a modern, well equipped station is essential to retain and attract investment in the town, and to ensure Guildford remains a well connected and attractive place for people to live and work. Encouraging cycling	Noted, we will work with Solum Regeneration to get station infrastructure and station development possible on this important site. The importance of the site is reflected in the interim framework in it being designated as one of only two Key opportunity sites.
	The University consider that cycling will have an increasingly important role to play for local trips in the Borough. The masterplan identifies the need to improve cyclist and pedestrian accessibility to, and within, the town centre and lists a number of possible schemes in the table on page 61. These schemes are generally welcomed by the University, particularly the proposed new routes between the University / the hospital and the town centre; and Park Barn to Guildford Railway station via the University. However, it is not clear what demand related evidence base has been used to propose these routes and the associated costs, and whether alternative routes to the town centre from locations such as the University, have been considered. For example, there could be opportunities to create pedestrian and cyclist routes to the town centre which provide better connectivity and may require funding assistance from the Council.	These improvements were all selected by Surrey County Council and are all to be funded by the Local Sustainable Transport Fund key component bid.
	The masterplan could be improved through the addition of a plan that shows the location of the pedestrian and cyclist routes described in the table. It should be ensured that the need for suitable cycle routes (both quiet roads and more formal provision) and key locations for cycle parking or potential for community pool bikes is reflected in the masterplan. In conclusion, for Guildford to continue to prosper and to attract inward investment, there must be an adequate supply of employment sites in sustainable locations, there must also be opportunities for people to access the housing market at an affordable price and the transportation system should facilitate movement to, from and across the town without undue congestion and delay and promote sustainable patterns of travel where possible.	Agreed that this would be useful. Further analysis will be included, along with a movement strategy in the final framework.
Town Centre Signage Group	Adopting a marketing policy where businesses and venues give parking directions rather than venue directions will ease traffic congestion. Promotion of out town from the major A roads is vital as is encouraging visitors who drive to use different exit points for different locations and car parks. Ensuring all signs are up to date is also vital. After nearly 6 months we still have signs advertising the 'Civic Hall' which is unacceptable. How many ways can one person travel from the station to the town centre? The majority will travel along the small footpath along bridge street. Street signage for pedestrians, along with attractive gateways from transport hubs into town will create a welcoming vision for our town. Has a park and ride train scheme ever been considered for Artington. The space and transport capacity must exist and would create a visionary parkway scheme. The viability of this should be investigated. Why is there inconsistent promotion of culture and heritage (brown signage) on approaches to the town. We must show uniformity and be proud of our town irrespective of which direction we come in from. If you are a first time visitor how easy would it be to find your hotel? the venues? the various shopping areas? 'secret Guildford'? The TIC? Again signage policy here would help.	Agree - good, up to date signage is very important. Details on how signage will be improved to promote the town's attractions and to direct traffic and pedestrians are included in the interim framework's strategy.
TURLEY ASSOCIATES on behalf of Hermes Real Estate Investment Management Ltd	Our clients are seeking early discussions with the Council to bring forward key development sites within the plan period. We request that the Council be mindful of our clients intentions and facilitate scope for future discussions.	Any development proposals are welcome to be submitted for consideration in evidence base work or engage with pre-application advice followed by a planning application.
Land owner Mr Harper, Star Oyster	I believe too much emphasis is being placed on the retail development of the Westfield's site and that the moving of the bus station is an unnecessary and disadvantageous to the users of the bus service. I believe that there has been a lost opportunity to enhance the riverside location of Bedford Road car park in doing a landmark redevelopment of this site in connection with my own which I have been advocating for many years. This is a leisure quarter of the town which is well serviced by the car parks, cinema, night clubs, bars and a large hotel complex would again enhance the Town Centre location or a possible mixed again focusing energy and vibrancy. Private enterprise should be promoted in developing area of Town Centre peace mail rather than trying to have one by shopping complex which can be found all over the country and adds no real character or commercial profit to the location to be redistributed against other businesses.	Agree with analysis of this part of the town centre. GBC Property Services decides what land should be redeveloped with other sites. Agree that a shopping complex is not needed.

Member of the public	Consultation period was too short, particularly with Christmas. I would suggest that this draft be fully reconsidered in conjunction with detailed public consultation. Why have the Council been involved in working up proposals for several areas of the town centre prior to consideration of the consultation on their masterplan. These proposals include moving the bus station to Bedford Road, extending the Friary to Hayden Place and permitting a supermarket development at the Bellerby Theatre. Why is the plan proceeding on a piecemeal basis with no apparent overall strategy?	<p>Consultation periods have to be balanced between ensuring people have sufficient time to engage with the process and the need to move the project forward. The consultation period was longer than that required for a statutory planning document to take account of timing of the consultation.</p> <p>We recognise that local traffic issues including congestion, parking and public transport facilities such as the bus station are key areas of concern to the local public. We do not have all the information we need yet to develop a movement strategy for the town centre, but are working on this alongside Surrey County Council, which is responsible for most of the roads in the area, and also the Highways Agency which is responsible for the major roads, including the A3. The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants. The town centre does not however stand still, and there are numerous areas that have development potential or need enhancement. We need to ensure Guildford is an attractive place to live and to visit and a desirable location for business investment. We have therefore produced an interim framework to assist in coordination of redevelopments and enhancements.</p>
Guildford town resident	I do feel that there has been insufficient time between the publishing of the document and when representations needed to be in. Whilst there had been previous mention of it I had not realised the full significance. Please get the powers that be to extend the consultation time and give more people the opportunity to comment on some of the other items. The document looks most impressive but is very large to download and difficult to read on a screen.	<p>Consultation periods have to be balanced between ensuring people have sufficient time to engage with the process and the need to move the project forward. The consultation period was longer than that required for a statutory planning document to take account of timing of the consultation.</p> <p>Reference copies of the document were made available at the Council's planning reception, for anyone without a computer to read.</p>
Guildford Labour Party	We do not propose to comment on every item in the plan, but we would suggest that the Masterplan needs much more work and thought to develop a proper plan to improve the attractiveness of the town centre area as a place to visit, to work and to live.	Comments noted. More work is intended. The evidence needed to draw up a movement strategy for the town centre is not yet available. Once further studies have been completed (detail is provided in Appendix 1), this interim framework will be revised. A final framework will be produced that will include addressing the current and potential future movement issues affecting the town centre.
Member of the public	There are those better qualified than I to write to you concerning your plans for the town centre, however I am interested and am of the opinion that a wider vision than that proposed is appropriate. There is a very good letter in the Surrey Advertiser this week (20.01.12) setting out many of the criticisms of your proposals. I support the sentiments expressed in that letter and hope that you are able to thrash out more appropriate proposals. I am confident this could be done given more time and some relevant professional input.	Comments noted. More work is intended. The evidence needed to draw up a movement strategy for the town centre is not yet available. Once further studies have been completed (detail is provided in Appendix 1), this interim framework will be revised. A final framework will be produced that will include addressing the current and potential future movement issues affecting the town centre.
Guildford town resident	In conclusion, more professional advice is needed to implement the necessary changes to Guildford taking into account its unique historical assets. We need to promote some individualism not just encourage high street chains!	We appreciate that large scale retail development in the town centre is not a popular proposal with all of the public. The future demand retail has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology. The vision includes reference to different types of shops, saying "More diverse, quality shops will also increase our visitor attractions alongside cultural and leisure opportunities" and an objective to provide opportunities for a wide range of retail businesses including markets to trade to retain the town centre's competitiveness
Guildford town resident	Could the main post office be brought back to an area of where it used to be. I am sure a lot of people i.e mothers with children, disabled and the senior citizens it is a long way to go for those who need it.	The relocation of the post office to the top of the high street is a relatively recent move and it is unlikely that the post office will move again in the near future. Its location is outside of the control of the council. Post offices are starting to share space with retailers, as is the case in Woking where the post office moved to be on the basement floor of WH Smith. It is not known whether this will be an option for Guildford Post Office in the future.
Guildford town resident	The purpose of the document is not clear. It does define boundaries, zones and frontages but everything else is vague.	It is a strategy rather than detailed proposals for sites. The framework has a clear vision and objectives. The framework is aspirational, and so considers what could be done to improve specific issues even those that are not possible at the moment. Over the next two decades things will change and what might not be possible now may be later. Movement is the key area where further work is needed.

Member of the public	There is a factual error in the diagram on page 82: the route to Bramley is not via the Portsmouth Road which serves Artington, Farncombe, etc.. It is via Shalford Road and Horsham Road (A281) through Shalford. It is quite difficult to reach Bramley via the Portsmouth Road.	This has been corrected.
Downsedge Residents Association	Guildford's limiting factor, in DRA's view, is the poor existing Transport Infrastructure which results in major congestion in the centre. This aspect should have primacy in seeking a coherent vision for Guildford in the years ahead. We feel that for too long transport provision and associated road modifications have been after thoughts due probably to cost and difficult local topography; the result has been a piecemeal and uncoordinated approach with the problem remaining unresolved. Traffic round the gyratory dominates the area and does not allow for quick, convenient and safe routing for pedestrians and cyclists to and from the railway station and main shopping areas in the High Street and North Street.	These points will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy. The town centre does not stand still, and there are numerous areas that have development potential or need enhancement. We need to ensure Guildford is an attractive place to live and to visit and a desirable location for business investment. We have therefore produced an interim framework to assist in coordination of redevelopments and enhancements.
	It would appear that a decision has already been taken by GBC to move the bus station from the Friary to the Bedford Road site for purely commercial reasons connected with making the already approved Friary development viable again with even more retail space. This is another piecemeal and uncoordinated response whilst at the same time consultation on the town centre's future is taking place with the community. Efficiently interconnected transport provision is vital to Guildford's future prosperity and we urge that no commitment be made to move the bus station until a proper traffic (rail, bus, cycle and pedestrian) analysis has been undertaken. We believe that an efficient bus service can be provided serving those travelling to and from the town centre without there having to be a bus station in the centre; this could easily be based somewhere on the periphery of Guildford. A new park and ride to the west of the town is to be welcomed.	Thank you for your comments about the bus station. A decision has not yet been made regarding the future location of the bus station. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year.
Guildford town resident	I have had insufficient time to read all of the document (apologies). If I was to choose a priority I would like to see improvements to pedestrian and bicycle access from the west to east and from the station to the town centre. Thus improvements to the 'horror of 60's and 70's car dominated planning' called the gyratory has to be a priority. Followed by riverside improvements.	Comments noted. These issues are covered in the interim framework
Guildford town resident	There are some very good aspects to the plan, especially those concerned with enhancing the area around the river. However, the fundamental assumption - that the town's retail offer should be increased - distorts the vision. I have not found the document easy to navigate. As a result, many of my responses are repetitive.	The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sqm is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension.
Guildford town resident	Please extend scope and timescale or consultation. I believe this is worth spending the time and money on and I believe that Guildford public opinion demands this more than at any other time.	Thank you for your comments. Consultation periods have to be balanced between ensuring people have sufficient time to engage with the process and the need to move the project forward alongside other key deadlines and projects.
Member of the public	With reference to the Master Plan for Guildford, there are many comments I could make regarding some of the points in the Plan. I will restrict myself to just two, but would add that I object to the short time the public has been given to provide useful and considered opinions on some of the major points in the Plan. Does the Master Plan undertake to provide protection for the long views of the surrounding countryside, which is such a marked feature of our town. Does Guildford really need more retail in the town centre? already the Bellerby Theatre is being replaced by a Waitrose, which I believe is out with the Master Plan.	Thank you for your comments. Consultation periods have to be balanced between ensuring people have sufficient time to engage with the process and the need to move the project forward alongside other key deadlines and projects. The consultation ran for 6 and a half weeks.
Member of the public	The Borough Council's Master Plan is a good idea but a missed opportunity. The draft has no genuine strategic content and consists largely of lowest common denominator generalities. It reads as though Guildford and its financial, social and demographic environment are stuck in a time warp, rather than being part of a continuous process of quite fundamental change. There is no sense of a "vision" for Guildford which could help it adapt successfully to this process. Reliance on encouraging more retail investment - No account is taken of the fact that Guildford already has more retail outlets than there are customers for. "More retail" is a tired response to one of yesterday's problems. A serious omission is the total lack of a co-ordinated long-term plan for road traffic or facilities for pedestrians linking all parts of the town and utilising its historic street plan to make walking efficient and safe, as well as a pleasant experience. The co-ordination of public transport within and to and from Guildford needs to be greatly improved, and does not need a bus station to be adjacent to the station in order to achieve it.	The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sqm is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension.
No name given	7. It was regrettable that the degree of prior public and stakeholder consultation taking place and the time allowed for representations on the draft plan before its publication fell significantly short of the principles underlying the recently passed Localism Act.	Thank you for your comments. Consultation periods have to be balanced between ensuring people have sufficient time to engage with the process and the need to move the project forward alongside other key deadlines and projects. The consultation ran for six and a half weeks. This is not a statutory document, although the consultation has run for longer than the recommended time in the regulations.

Guildford resident	<p>About half the shoppers arrive by car. Arrangements for these are barely adequate, and charging regimes for parking are seen as sources of income for the relevant authorities rather than a mechanism for bringing shoppers and patrons in. Successful retail in Guildford is therefore going to depend on a pro-active pricing policy for cars with the assumption that appropriate pricing will encourage a higher level of turnover, at the same time offering to those able to afford premium prices suitable facilities. This is a relatively straightforward exercise, already in part in action, that lies in the hands of relevant authorities and will need to be sharpened with a series of experiments over the next decade [by 2020] as the commercial situation changes. Meanwhile, the existing short stay car parks may be real-estate but are also exceedingly valuable: without these the High Street retail would be hard hit. Large cars and their owners are seldom suited to multi-story parks.</p>	<p>Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed. Vision has been amended with last sentence dealing with transport infrastructure.</p>
	<p>Bus - About a third of shoppers arrive by bus. Park-and-ride has been a success, but at the same time conventional bus services also provide an important access. The resiting of the bus station has been a subject for discussion elsewhere and will shortly be the subject of a planning application. There is no essential reason for the bus station to be sited where it is at the moment, although it has to be said that this is a convenient place. Proposals for the beneficial re-use of its present site will probably fall, which suggests that the default plan is to leave it where it is. However someone might just 'make a bid', in which case the planning proposal is for the bus station to be resited on the Bedford Road car park. This is inadequate in scale to accommodate all the bus movements, with a reasonable margin of safety [the Walsall problem], and it would also generate a considerable traffic problem for buses wishing to go to the south and west of Guildford. In order to achieve sufficient capacity, a smaller duplicate bus station needs to be re-established on part of the former Farnham Road site. Buses to the South and West will be able to short-circuit a considerable part of the gyratory and Onslow Street problems. Access between the two bus stations and from the railway station can readily and cheaply be improved by towpath improvements along the river. This will have the further advantage of providing alternative and attractive routes into town from the railway station and the bus stations, by bridging and using the Friary passage and, more significantly, using the pedestrian crossing next to Debenhams, thus relieving much pressure on the pedestrian crossing by the Friary. Debenhams is an important but underused major asset, and ways of increasing the 'footfall' are in everyone's interest.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments about the bus station. A decision has not yet been made regarding the future location of the bus station. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year.</p>
	<p>Rail - At the moment about 10% of shoppers, and a very considerable number of workers arrive by train. The railway provides a vital link to outlying towns and villages where worker housing is more affordable. Guildford as it stands would not be able to survive without the [excellent] rail network. This service is capable of being used for a considerable expansion of park-and-ride, as many of the country stations have underused car parks. Relevant authorities should negotiate appropriate charging regimes [if necessary promoting a Private Bill to obtain control over the non-rail arrangements]. A target of 2016 should be attainable for this.</p>	<p>These points will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>
	<p>For the last 30 years or so proposals and promises have been made for a link between the railway station and the town more directly and more satisfactorily than the existing system of pedestrian crossings, and the narrow footways to Bridge Street and along the side of Friary to Onslow Street. The existing Bedford Road multi-storey car park [now decades old] even has the "starter bars" for a high level walkway. This high level walkway should be physically implemented early in the development. If it does prove necessary to re-site part of the bus station to Bedford Road, plans should be brought up together. The two are mutually linked, because the commercial opportunities in any joint development are promising.. This walkway should be part of a substantial building. In any case it should provide a high level link between the railway station (the existing over-bridge) and the existing high level link into the Friary. The high level link will need to be open during normal commercial hours, and this should be made a condition of relevant planning consents. The present proposals to enlarge the pedestrian crossing at Friary will never pass the 'attractive' test, because, apart from the inherent traffic problems, they begin and end in very narrow sidewalks, incapable of taking a substantial flow of pedestrians. It goes without saying that any high-level way would need to be 'accessible', but this could be readily provided within the commercial development visualised.</p>	<p>A high level walkway is outdated and not suitable. Pedestrians should not be segregated with no where to escape if needs be. This is 1950s / 60s planning. The widening of the pavements is included in the strategy for Bridge Street.</p>
	<p>In common with a large number of other High Streets and town centres, the demand for small offices on the upper floors of buildings in the town centre has shrunk enormously over the last years. There are a considerable number of vacancies, and these are usually followed by planning applications to convert the upper floors into residential accommodation. It is unlikely that the office demand will reappear, and if by chance it does, conversion back presents no problem. This conversion programme will bring back into the town centre a considerable number of residents, which will be good both for the nighttime image and for informal security. It will also go some way to relieving the housing shortage that undoubtedly exists in this part of Surrey. It should therefore be encouraged, and it is understood that the government itself will encourage it by way of changing the criteria for Permitted Development. Obstacles that might seem appropriate in the more suburban areas in brackets such as lack of car parking) that will have to be put on one side for this kind of development in the town centre.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There is a demand for modern well located offices. It is acknowledged that office space that does not meet this criteria is often changed to a different use.</p>
	<p>Guildford is a sub regional entertainment centre, both formal and informal. This fits well with the image it is hoped to maintain. A major difficulty generated by the transport system is the very busy character of Bridge Street: a detail problem that has become exacerbated by the [welcome] way in which it has become a sort-of informal entertainment centre for the South East region. Not much can sensibly be done about Bridge Street until the major difficulties over traffic are reduced [see above], but a short-term palliative would be to establish planning criteria for that particular area that turns round the access criteria for the buildings on the north side of Bridge Street so that they face the cinema complex across what will become an 'entertainment' square.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is part of the strategy for that area to improve the quality of the pedestrian environment along the main roads, particularly around the gyratory and Bridge Street. New planning policies for the borough will be implemented through the preparation of the Local Plan Strategy.</p>

	I share the fairly generally held view that the present consultation draft needs to be withdrawn, pending a radical re-write.	Changes have been made to the document following receipt of consultation comments, and the document is being presented to the Executive for their consideration. The town centre does not stand still, and there are numerous areas that have development potential or need enhancement. We need to ensure Guildford is an attractive place to live and to visit and a desirable location for business investment. We have therefore produced an interim framework to assist in coordination of redevelopments and enhancements.
Member of the public	The Master plan needs to reflect the long-term vision and, if past mistakes are not to be repeated, any future changes must be very thoroughly thought through with the ramifications of the changes clearly defined before any change is agreed. Changes to the town centre cannot be planned in isolation and without reference to the whole of Guildford as any changes in the centre inevitably must impact elsewhere. It seems very short-sighted and wrong to ignore the valuable contribution that the University/ Research Park/Royal Surrey Hospital and the Station make to the prosperity of the town. They add much to the town's status as well as providing significant employment opportunities and an enviable health provision. Whilst the focus of this plan is the town centre there appear to be no references to areas outside of this	This document is specifically about the future of Guildford town centre, not the whole of Guildford town so it does not include these. The area covered by the interim framework is shown on a map on page eight of the document. Most respondents to the consultation on the draft masterplan agreed with the suggested boundary. The Local Plan Strategy will consider the whole borough. see www.guildford.gov.uk/localplanstrategy for more information
	It is important to resolve a few key issues with infrastructure ahead of any other proposed changes. It would seem sensible to facilitate the movement of rail and bus passengers into the town centre and between both modes of transport. We need balanced growth in all areas- housing-retail-light industry- offices- green spaces A town should evolve to meet the need not be artificially altered so, although housing is always in demand and more low-cost properties do need to be built, any significant increase will put additional strain on utilities/roads/schools etc, so should be done in a small-scale planned way to enable them to be absorbed into the life of the town. Policies developed which enable opportunities for future development without now specifying exactly what those developments must be this will have implications for planning consents/reserving land for housing development for example. This is to be a long-term vision for Guildford and what seems to be of importance now might not be the situation ten or twenty years hence.	Town centres do naturally evolve but also need to be planned in order to ensure that all uses are provided for and not just the highest value land uses, as well as co-ordinating with infrastructure. The interim framework does not include a Movement Strategy, as we are still looking at evidence. This will be included in the final framework.
	It is important to recognise that although parts of Guildford are very attractive and have historical interest this does not apply across the whole borough, there are many areas which would benefit residents - and visitors - by smaller scale improvements/better management of public areas- quality/safety of pavements, more trees within the town centre for example. Guildford in Bloom is always splendid, some additional planting - longer term, low maintenance - would enhance areas outside the usual areas. The current economic situation should give us pause for serious thought about the future of retail opportunities in the town. The loss of Habitat and Sony leave two large retail premises empty along with several smaller units in the High street and elsewhere. New ways of shopping - via the internet, for example - appear to be gaining popularity for many and may very well reduce the number of retail outlets the town can realistically support.	Thank you for your comments. The interim framework recognises that some areas of the town are not attractive and need improving. This can be primarily seen in the swot analysis.
	The loss of contract parking in the town centre will inevitably give many workers in the town a problem and although they may willingly use the park and ride facility, this will reduce the number of places available there for other users, which could prove counter productive. There was a town centre conservation appraisal of the historical/ architectural merit of buildings. This ought to be referenced alongside any proposed changes. What we most definitely do not want Guildford to become is another "could be anywhere" town. We should build on the reputation/status it has, improve the infrastructure, encourage more independent traders and businesses, value and preserve our history and maintain the pavements and public spaces and wherever possible adding "green" to make our town one that other towns would want to copy.	Comments noted. One of the objectives of the interim framework is to retain and enhance the town centre's distinctive character
Secretary of Surrey Archaeological Society	3. The report mentions the importance of conservation areas adjacent to the town centre in preserving the wonderful views which give Guildford so much character. We think this deserves more attention and the parts of the conservation areas which are most significant from the perspective of the town centre should be identified.	These are shown on Figure 19 - heritage assets
	4. The report does not mention proposals to develop the Museum and Castle and open the area so that it can be approached more easily from the town centre. Much good work has gone into producing a professional document to set a constructive way forward. These comments might help improve the result.	See page 65 - create a heritage hub.
Guildford town resident	The masterplan does not integrate its various components enough. The Council seems to do a bit here and a bit there and we hear for years about proposed improvements to areas such as North Street and its surrounding area which never happen. The master plan and this form are difficult to understand and not user friendly.	Comments noted. This is an interim framework, rather than a planning policy development plan document. The new Local Plan, to replace the Guildford Borough 2003 plan, will consist of the Strategy and the Delivery documents. The Local Plan Strategy, to be published in draft for consultation in the coming months, will include the vision and strategy for Guildford town, for Ash and Tongham, and for the rural parts of the borough. It will also include the vision for Guildford town centre, which will be taken from the interim town centre framework, as it appears on page 15 of the interim framework.
Member of the public	1. The Borough Council's draft Master Plan is a missed opportunity. The draft has no genuine strategic content and consists largely of lowest common denominator generalities. It reads as though Guildford and its financial, social and demographic environment are stuck in a time warp, rather than being part of a continuous process of quite fundamental change. There is no sense of a "vision" for Guildford which could help it adapt successfully to this process.	The revised vision, objectives and strategy more clearly stem from the SWOT analysis and community views.

	2. Reliance on encouraging more retail investment is an example of this. No account is taken of the fact that Guildford already has too many retail outlets, at a time when there is increasing reliance on internet and other more convenient ways of shopping. "More retail" is an inappropriate response to one of yesterday's problems.	The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sqm is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension.
	3. Treating Guildford as, basically, the town centre is another illustration of the same point. The very successful University and Research Park, the Royal Surrey Hospital and the Cathedral have to be seen as an integral part of Guildford as outstanding aspects of its public face, employment and future wealth-creating capacity and have to be included in any genuine strategic overview.	This framework concentrates on sites and areas within the identified town centre. The Local Plan Strategy and Local Plan Delivery documents will consider the whole of the borough. These are statutory documents that form part of the new Local Plan. The timescale for the preparation of these documents is set out on the Council's website at www.guildford.gov.uk/lds
	4. There is insufficient acknowledgement of the importance of the River Wey and its potential for healthy leisure activities, a "green lung" and a tourist attraction. Even worse, the treatment of the river in the planning decisions of recent years has been a depressing case of "planning blight" and lost opportunities. Also, why is there little proper reference to Guildford's fine architectural heritage and other cultural assets, or its many outstanding schools, both maintained and independent, all of which make it a very pleasant place to live?	The interim framework contains a strategy for the River Wey, of which one element is to increase use of the river with additional short stay / visitor moorings and increased leisure uses
	5. A very serious omission is the total lack of a co-ordinated long-term plan for road traffic or facilities for pedestrians linking all parts of the town and utilising its historic street plan to make walking efficient and safe, as well as a pleasant experience. The co-ordination of public transport within and to and from Guildford needs to be greatly improved, and does not need a bus station to be adjacent to the station in order to achieve it.	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
	6. It was highly regrettable that the degree of prior public and stakeholder consultation taking place and the time allowed for representations on the draft plan before its publication fell significantly short of the principles underlying the recently passed Localism Act.	Thank you for your comments. Consultation periods have to be balanced between ensuring people have sufficient time to engage with the process and the need to move the project forward alongside other key deadlines and projects. The consultation ran for six and a half weeks. This is not a statutory document, although the consultation has run for longer than the recommended time in the regulations.
	7. I fully support the representations by the Guildford Society, and hope that the Council will delay final approval of the draft master plan until there has been full consideration of their comments following the study by their appointed consultants Allied and Morrison.	Changes have been made to the document following receipt of consultation comments, and the document is being presented to the Executive for their consideration. The town centre does not stand still, and there are numerous areas that have development potential or need enhancement. We need to ensure Guildford is an attractive place to live and to visit and a desirable location for business investment. We have therefore produced an interim framework to assist in coordination of redevelopments and enhancements.
Member of the public	No attention has been given to the impact of internet buying and the potential collapse of retail shopping. The prospect of removal of the existing bus station to Bedford Road is daunting it being on the edge of the shopping area. I for one would now go to Cranleigh where I may get off the bus and visit Post Office and supermarkets all within easy reach of the bus stops goodbye Guildford.	The 2011 Retail and Leisure Study objectively assessed retail demand. The identified retail demand is for the whole catchment area, including Ash, East Horsley and local centres, and not just for Guildford Town Centre. This is based on projected changes in expenditure, accounting for special forms of trading (such as the increase in internet and catalogue sales) and changes in sales densities. Thank you for your comments about the bus station. A decision has not yet been made regarding the future location of the bus station. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year.
Member of the public	You mention problems with people moving around the town yet there is now no free bus any longer to aid people to do this. it would have been better to ask for a very small bus fare to be paid instead of scrapping it. you will not get people to come to Guildford until you look at the problems from the point of view of the elderly, disabled and young mothers. Trying to stop people coming in cars will never happen and if it did where would your revenue go to.	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
Member of the public	Would it be possible to have some secure cycle parking in the town centre for people who go shopping by bike. Maybe a small charge for a guarantee that the bike is 'watched' and not tampered with or stolen. Could all of the enhanced lighting, and existing lighting be turned off from midnight until 5am as in other parts of the country these days, as it spoils the night sky in the surrey hills at the moment and you are proposing to make the light pollution worse. Failing that make it movement sensitive so it turns itself off when not required.	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy. Lighting is required in places for security and safety.
Member of the public	I only found out about this through Surrey Advertiser this weekend. Why the big secret/poor communications with local people?	Thank you for your comments. Consultation periods have to be balanced between ensuring people have sufficient time to engage with the process and the need to move the project forward alongside other key deadlines and projects. The consultation ran for six and a half weeks. This is not a statutory document, although the consultation has run for longer than the recommended time in the regulations.

Member of the public	I should like to see Guildford as a pleasant place to live and visit. At the moment I find the shops generally rather tedious as the high street is just a clone of many other high streets. More interesting and independent shops would be a benefit but I understand that rents and rates are too high for many. I would also like to have seen the Thomas Thorp bookshop become an arts cinema and restaurant, instead of another shop, especially as there seems to be an emphasis on that part of town being more leisure oriented.. I should like the pavements to be better maintained. Whilst I understand some of the suggestions about North Street being wide, it needs to be if it is to house the market. Could the market move to the High Street and be there on a permanent basis, or move to a covered site. As North Street is principally commercial, if pavements are to be widened only do so a little. Don't forget, as much as Guildford seems to hate cars, if we force the cars to be stuck in traffic we will hate them more, and it may put people off returning to Guildford. Don't move the bus station to an area known to flood!! Rebuild it and incorporate it into the Friary properly. There is ample scope for retail and residential space in that area the Friary was going to be redeveloped into, so use it. It is an eyesore that has been allowed to fester because of inadequate strength of councils.	The interim framework says that the Council will work with its partner landowners to promote greater opportunities for more small independent shops and businesses. Thank you for your comments about the bus station. A decision has not yet been made regarding the future location of the bus station. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	Environment. 2.12. North Street...will accommodate many more shops The capacity of the street is limited, unless large multi storey units are built – which we would oppose. Replace many by some.	Not necessarily - see the draft revised design brief for the site.
Member of the public	Please suspend publication and finalisation of this plan until proper wide-ranging original research has been carried out to develop the Vision and opportunities in the context of available national grants, TIF funding, major infrastructure planning, etc. The masterplan as proposed is NOT a strategic document (albeit it contains some worthwhile micro-strategies for specific areas).	Changes have been made to the document following receipt of consultation comments, and the document is being presented to the Executive for their consideration. The town centre does not stand still, and there are numerous areas that have development potential or need enhancement. We need to ensure Guildford is an attractive place to live and to visit and a desirable location for business investment. We have therefore produced an interim framework to assist in coordination of redevelopments and enhancements.
St Catherine Village Association	We consider that the Council have produced a workmanlike document that addresses many of the concerns of residents. We recognise the hard work that officers and Councillors have put into producing such a challenging document. The future of Guildford as a vibrant town will depend on a mixed economy involving employment opportunities other than in retail. Retail activity, whilst vitally important, is unlikely to be a sufficient basis for future development and should not be the primary focus. A diversity of activity and employment is required and should be explicitly included in the analysis. It is also important to take fully into account the needs of Guildford residents who live in or travel to the town centre.	Comments noted. One of the objectives of the interim framework is to support and strengthen the diversity of the town centre economy and its contribution to the wider area, broadening the range of jobs
	Guildford is an attractive town with a rich heritage, historically, architecturally and culturally. The plan would be improved if more attention was paid to preserving and enhancing these aspects of Guildford, for example by identifying more key heritage sites and opportunities to develop open spaces in the centre and adjacent to the town and by paying attention to views of the town from the surroundings, and views of the countryside from key vantage points within Guildford. Economic health of a region depends, in part, on the ability to attract and retain able people - as entrepreneurs and managers. A town that is attractive with good communication and travel provision has a greater potential to be successful.	Comments noted. The strategy does give considerable regard to the attractiveness and rich heritage of the town. Many of the redevelopment sites provide opportunities for inclusion of open space.
	Although not in the centre, the University, the Research Park, the Royal Surrey Hospital and the Cathedral all have an impact on it, not least because of the traffic they generate and the employment opportunities they provide. The University, Research Park and Cathedral also provide cultural resources. We recommend that the effect of these institutions should be taken into account in the revised plan. The plan could be improved further by a closer consideration of road and traffic movements, linking these considerations with bus movements in particular. Traffic congestion is a major problem and the search for ways to enable motor traffic to bypass the town centre is essential. Elsewhere we have expressed concern that a proposal to move the bus station without such a study and consultation is premature. The transport needs of residents and visitors requires further consideration. We commend the Council for producing this draft plan and look forward to seeing the revised version in due course	This document is specifically about the future of Guildford town centre, not the whole of Guildford town so it does not include these. The area covered by the interim framework is shown on a map on page eight of the document. Most respondents to the consultation on the draft masterplan agreed with the suggested boundary. These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
Chairman of The Tyting Society	This has been a difficult form to complete electronically. There are also too many questions that most residents will have little knowledge. It all feels too rushed!	Thank you for persevering with the online response form and for taking the time to respond.
	I have had a number of concerns that hopefully are expressed in my detailed response	Noted.
	- Where is the demographic, technology and transportation analysis that is needed prior to making any judgements?	As explained in Appendix 3, the most up to date census data available has been used. These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
	- Is this really a 20 year vision or an adaptation of what might already be happening over the next three years?	The interim town centre framework will help to shape how our town centre will look, function, perform and prosper over the next 18 years, to 2030. This timeframe links with the Council's adopted Economic Strategy 2011 and with the forthcoming Local Plan strategy document.
	- Can the Town Centre be treated in isolation from the rest of Guildford and environs?	It is not, see section 5.3 of the interim framework. However, a boundary must be drawn somewhere.
	- A pilot study could have been helpful in trying to format the electronic response form to be more user friendly and enable most residents to answer more questions than they probably have	Comments noted. We will consider whether this might be useful in the future.

	Good fortune in collating the feedback.	Thank you.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Site 5 - Does not make reference to making direct connections from this site across the river by bridge for pedestrians. This is essential to improve the permeability across the River Wey (especially to site 7).	This is now referred to under improving connections between key destinations.
	Site 9 - As a bus station linked to the railway station is greatly appreciated as a good strategic move to develop better links and release land for better retail development.	Comments noted, however, there has not yet been a decision made on the future location of the bus station and all potential options will be fully tested.
	Site 10 - Should come forward as a comprehensive redevelopment with public uses on the ground floor (bar, restaurant and cultural uses with better and more dynamic commercial floor plates above). Some residential apartments fronting the river and future bus station should be sought.	Comments noted. The planning applications granted on the site have commenced, so there is no time limit for their implementation
	Site 11 - Needs a pedestrian dominant crossing implemented to unlock the whole of the roundabout island.	No longer identified as a specific site, see p.64 which discusses creating an attractive public space outside of the electric theatre.
	Site 12 - The suggested uses are welcomed.	Comments noted, no change.
	Site 15 - We disagree with the redevelopment of the Debenhams site for large scale retail. This is not a destination retail site as it is 'off pitch' and disconnected from the main shopping experience. Local café bar restaurants are suitable but the dividing road means that new retail will continue not to succeed as well as being integrated into a new Friary Centre 2 development (facilitated by the relocation of the bus station). This site is more suited to residential and commercial uses with street/waterfront café bars / restaurants, not shops.	Comments noted. Significant amounts of housing or office space could be provided alongside some retail space on this large site.
	Generally ok but more on quality and a better Vision and less on more and more shops	Comments noted. Re more shops - the 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sqm is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension.
	Objections to the Town Centre Masterplan Guildford town centre has a serious problem with traffic. Not only is this traffic problem one of congestion (which the Town Centre Masterplan fails to address) but I am particularly concerned at the way in which the heavy volumes of traffic on Onslow Street, Bridge Street and the Gyratory system creates such a north to south 'barrier' for pedestrians between areas to the west of Onslow Street (including the Railway Station) and the town's shopping centre.	The evidence needed to draw up a movement strategy for the town centre is not yet available. Once further studies have been completed (detail is provided in Appendix 1), this interim framework will be revised. A final framework will be produced that will include addressing the current and potential future movement issues affecting the town centre.
	The Town Centre Masterplan is peppered with references to the poor environment for pedestrians. The section on 'Historic spaces' makes reference to the "High volumes of through traffic (which) create barriers to pedestrian and cycle movement, and poor pedestrian environments, such as along Bridge Street." Page 40 of the Plan talks about ten important principles for "place making" including "celebrating arrival – create a positive first impression" and the stated general aim of the Plan is to achieve a centre that is pedestrian friendly. However, whilst the Plan recognises the generally poor environment of the town for pedestrians and recognises the need for improvements the Plan makes no specific proposals for improvement	The evidence needed to draw up a movement strategy for the town centre is not yet available. Once further studies have been completed (detail is provided in Appendix 1), this interim framework will be revised. A final framework will be produced that will include addressing the current and potential future movement issues affecting the town centre.
	One of the major (and most controversial) proposals mentioned in the Town Centre Masterplan is the intention by the Executive Committee of the Council to seek planning consent for the bus station to be relocated to Bedford Road. There is a huge body of opinion against this idea – from the general public and (I understand) from the bus operators. In addition, there are clearly issues relating to access and traffic which appear impossible to resolve. Aside from the above issues, three very relevant points are raised in the Masterplan. Point A, page 5 of the Plan identifies (as a 'Weakness') that the "Main shopping streets slope steeply down to the river... This gradient makes getting around on foot difficult for some people, and also difficult to walk up/push a pushchair or wheelchair." Point B, one of the 'Objectives' of the Plan (page 4) is "...making it easier, safer and more pleasant to move around." Point C, I draw attention to the reference in the Plan (Appendix 1, Page 11) that "The highest number of traffic accidents relating to shunts in the one way system and pedestrians at road crossings occur at the three crossing points of the junction of Onslow Street with Bridge Street".	Thank you for your comments about the bus station. A decision has not yet been made regarding the future location of the bus station. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year.
	Judged against these three considerations the proposal to relocate the Bus Station to Bedford Road is seriously deficient in three important respects. Firstly (in respect of the issues at Point A), it relocates the Bus Station from its present centrally-located position (part way up the steep slope) to a much less favourable position at the 'bottom' of the slope. Secondly (in respect of the issues at Points B and C), because of its proposed location, the proposal, as presently conceived, not only makes it a lot less "easier, safer and more pleasant to move around" but it also requires pedestrians to cross Onslow Street 'at grade' and, as a result, the situation for pedestrians is made desperately worse. It will require pedestrians to use unsuitably-narrow pavements and exposing them to the noise and danger from the heavily-trafficked Onslow Street. Thirdly (in respect of the issue at Point C), pedestrians moving between the proposed bus station and the town shopping area will be crossing at the junction of Bridge Street/Onslow Street and in so doing they will be crossing at the very point which the Town Centre Masterplan identifies as having the "highest number of traffic accidents" relating to "pedestrians at road crossings". I therefore object to the proposal to relocate the bus station to Bedford Road	Thank you for your comments about the bus station. A decision has not yet been made regarding the future location of the bus station. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year.

	<p><u>The need for a safe and attractive pedestrian route between the railway station, a (possible) bus station (at Bedford Road) and the town shopping centre</u></p>	<p>Agree. The interim framework seeks to enhance gateways and connections. One element of the strategy for this area is to improve connections between key destinations such as to and across the riverside, to the station and between the High Street / tourist information centre and Guildford Castle and museum</p>
	<p>Aside from the unsatisfactory idea of relocating the bus station to Bedford Road, there is the long standing issue of the quite dreadful conditions for pedestrians as they presently make their way between the railway station and the town centre. Nowhere in the town centre is the need to secure the achievement of an attractive and safe pedestrian connection more in evidence than in respect of the present route taken by pedestrians between the railway station and the town centre. This is not only long overdue but it should, in my view, have been one of the primary issues to be addressed as part of this Town Centre Masterplan. But it is not.</p>	<p>Agree re condition of walk way from station to town centre. One element of the strategy for this area is to improve connections between key destinations such as to and across the riverside, to the station and between the High Street / tourist information centre and Guildford Castle and museum</p>
	<p>In his 1987 book "Guildford: Town Under Siege" Russell Chamberlin pointed out how the Royal Fine Art Commission, in its letter to the Borough Council of December 1974, urged that "... thought be should be given to providing good pedestrian access to this (Friary) site ... since this is the main pedestrian route to the railway station". He (Russell Chamberlin) went on "The crowds today scuttling through the murderous three-way traffic at this (Bridge Street/Onslow Street) juncture have good reason to wish that thought had indeed been given to this problem." Almost 40 years on, absolutely nothing has been done to improve the situation. And yet, as we stand, the Borough Council's Town Centre Masterplan still does not seem to recognise the seriousness of this particular problem and, indeed, through its proposal to relocate the present bus station the Bedford Road, it appears that the Council is about to make the situation for pedestrians a whole lot worse.</p>	<p>We recognise that local traffic issues including congestion, parking and public transport facilities such as the bus station are key areas of concern to the local public. We do not have all the information we need yet to develop a movement strategy for the town centre, but are working on this alongside Surrey County Council, which is responsible for most of the roads in the area, and also the Highways Agency which is responsible for the major roads, including the A3. The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants. The town centre does not however stand still, and there are numerous areas that have development potential or need enhancement. We need to ensure Guildford is an attractive place to live and to visit and a desirable location for business investment. We have therefore produced an interim framework to assist in coordination of redevelopments and enhancements.</p>
	<p>Improvement of this long standing seriously unsatisfactory position for pedestrian movement between the railway station and the town centre is long overdue. But if, in addition, the Council is still minded to still continue to promote the relocation of the bus station to Bedford Road it becomes of absolutely critical importance that the proposals must, as an integral part, provide for a safe, convenient and attractive route for pedestrians walking between the railway station, a Bedford Road bus station and the town centre shopping area.</p>	<p>We recognise that local traffic issues including congestion, parking and public transport facilities such as the bus station are key areas of concern to the local public. We do not have all the information we need yet to develop a movement strategy for the town centre, but are working on this alongside Surrey County Council, which is responsible for most of the roads in the area, and also the Highways Agency which is responsible for the major roads, including the A3. The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants. The town centre does not however stand still, and there are numerous areas that have development potential or need enhancement. We need to ensure Guildford is an attractive place to live and to visit and a desirable location for business investment. We have therefore produced an interim framework to assist in coordination of redevelopments and enhancements.</p>
	<p>In my view the continued absence of a safe and attractive route for pedestrians between the railway station (plus possibly a bus station at Bedford Road) and the town centre shops is a major shortcoming which fails to 'celebrate arrival' or make a 'positive first impression'. Indeed, in my view, a continuation of the present situation will seriously undermine the desire of Guildford to be perceived as a destination of quality and, in the absence of any proposals to improve the town's traffic situation, people will increasingly choose to make other centres their chosen destination for both shopping and business</p>	<p>Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants. The town centre does not however stand still, and there are numerous areas that have development potential or need enhancement. We need to ensure Guildford is an attractive place to live and to visit and a desirable location for business investment. We have therefore produced an interim framework to assist in coordination of redevelopments and enhancements.</p>
	<p>The long term objective for the town must be to remove all the through traffic from Onslow Street (and the gyratory) which currently presents such a barrier to pedestrian movement. However, until that long term objective can be achieved, it is my view that what is needed is a pedestrian route leading from the railway station via the Walnut Tree footbridge to continue at 'first floor' level across the Bedford Road site and Onslow Street and into and through the Friary Shopping Centre. Not only would such a route provide a safe, convenient and attractive route for pedestrians (enabling them to totally avoid the danger of crossing Onslow Street) but, because the railway station and the town centre are at about the same level, it will also secure an important objective of the Town Centre Masterplan of making it easier and more pleasant (for pedestrians) to move around.</p>	<p>These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>
	<p>With plans for a new railway station currently being prepared; with Bedford Road as the possible site for the new bus station; and with the prospect of more shopping as part of a major development on the area of North Street/Leapale Road/Commercial Road, the Borough Council must recognise that for the future prosperity of the town the critical need to create a good pedestrian link and not let this opportunity slip by.</p>	<p>These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>

	Objections to the Town Centre Masterplan As with the earlier Town Centre Area Action Plan, this Town Centre Masterplan simply sets out planning guidance in respect of a number of key sites within the town centre. There is no over-arching policy (certainly none in respect of highway infrastructure) and no coordinating proposals or strategy to secure improvements for pedestrians and cyclists which could be the subject of achievement through the proposal (on page 20) that "In the consideration of the redevelopment of town centre sites, the Council will encourage improvements in pedestrian, cycle and public transport accessibility."	Comments noted. Improved vision and objectives.
Natural England	HRA Screening Opinion for Guildford Borough Council Town Centre Masterplan - Natural England notes that the Town Centre Plan does not include uses and numbers of new residential units which could potentially adversely impact on the nearby Thames Basin Heaths SPA and SAC. We understand that these will be specified later as the LDF is formed. Natural England would advise that any net increase in residential development must be in accordance with the TBH Avoidance Strategy.	Comments noted. As stated, the document does not include a proposed number of new homes in the town centre. These will be tested through the Local Plan and the draft of the final interim framework.
CTC	There is far too much open parking space in Guildford - I strongly support the moves to replace some of the smaller parking plots (Site 8 Mary Road/ Site 9 Bedford Road and particularly Site 12 Portsmouth Road) into either development land or public space. Huge improvements are needed to pedestrian and cycle access to the Town Centre to ensure that it remains a pleasant and safe place to move around. Much more should be made of the National Trust owned towing path. I understand that plans are afoot to improve this for cycling to the north, however, it should also be greatly improved to the South, providing an alternative south westerly route to the very grim A3100. The cycle path to Shalford is all very well, but accessing it when heading south is almost impossible, while sections of it are entirely unsuited to cycle traffic (steps!).	Comments noted. The interim framework identified car parks for redevelopment. These other points will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
Member of the public	I have read this document through thoroughly. I find it disappointing and dispiriting. Nothing about the document shows evidence of it being a "Master Plan". Economic conditions changed radically in 2008 and the effects are likely to last another 10 years. Studies and documents referred to date back to 2005, 2006 and even 2001 – hardly the basis for judgments to 2030! If it is intended as guidelines for the future of Guildford it is totally inadequate. It lacks vision and any sense of coherent purpose. Priorities are not identified. Its piecemeal approach leads to contradictions between different issues and strategies.	These comments have been taken on board. The document has been updated with a revised vision, objectives and strategy.
	Appendix 1, Page 10 refers to a traffic study that found Guildford town to be the 12th most congested in the UK and comments that "this is concerning". Without an effective solution to problems of traffic movement, improvements and access to Guildford town centre, to riverside areas, to Bedford Road, Bridge and Onslow Streets, and Millbrook have no chance of success. Increasing retail development and decreasing the number of car parks, with reliance on park-and-ride provision will be equally difficult.	These points will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
	Key development sites are considered individually with no assessment of their impact one to another, nor to the town as a whole. Guildford is extremely prosperous, but it is a compact small town governed by its topography and location. It is quite difficult to assess in advance the visual impact of any larger developments in the town centre, but viewed from surrounding areas, the dominance of the high glass extension to House of Fraser in North Street should serve as a warning.	Comments noted. Attempts have been made to address this in the updated version. The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision.
	Increased retail development seems to be viewed as the prime purpose of the town's future. Larger units selling bulky goods are perhaps better located at Ladymead and Woodbridge Road, than at North Street. Much of the town's retail character comes from the range of upmarket small and medium size shops found here. Night-time deliveries to Tesco do not make Bridge Street more pedestrian friendly and I dread to encounter a supermarket lorry on its way to the Bellerby site! With the Friary Development again stalled, it is time to consider whether it is any longer an appropriate scale of retail development for the town. I should like to see more emphasis on residential and community uses. Westfield's wish to move the bus station seems more a wish to maximise profit from selling on to another developer than any consideration of the needs of the town.	We appreciate that large scale retail development in the town centre is not a popular proposal with all of the public. The future demand retail has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology. Allowance has been made for special forms of trading such as internet retailing, and planning permissions that were approved but not built out at the time of writing. Lack of sites in the central retail area of the town centre is resulting in an increasing amount of new retail floorspace being developed in out of centre locations such as Ladymead retail park, leading to retail spend being diverted to out of centre locations and to other competing town centres. If this continues, other competing town centres and out of centre locations will gain visitors and expenditure relative to Guildford town centre, which will be relatively disadvantaged. As Guildford's 2006 Retail Study ¹ explained and the 2011 Retail and Leisure Study ² reiterated, "standing still is akin to decline in retail terms; if other centres continue to improve their retail offer, so must Guildford if it is to retain its current position."
	Whilst I commend some improvements for pedestrians in North Street, the value of half-hour parking spaces should not be underestimated. How else can we make a one-off visit to a shop, the bank, the library or the post office? As your figures show, most Guildfordians live in the suburbs (I live in Merrow) or outer parts of the town. Using buses or park-and-ride invariably adds 45 minutes or an hour to the trip! Integrating and extending the pavement in North Street down a slope may cause more problems than it solves. Also parking at right angles to the pavement (North Street) is far less intrusive than parking parallel (Upper High Street).	The parking strategy revision is currently being prepared and is considering suitable level of parking. Public transport also needs improving.

	I cannot share the enthusiasm for a Town Square artificially introduced into the townscape. People need a reason to gather in a town square. Few hill towns feature significant town squares. Successful town squares are often at the focal point of roads leading into a centre. Tunsgate Arch is already a meeting point. It is contradictory to suggest improving Tunsgate and reducing cars there and then propose 20 cycle parking spaces under Tunsgate Arch - quite apart from the fact that cycles should be banned from the pedestrian High Street. I currently use seating by Trinity Church and by the barrier on the pedestrianised High Street. Tunsgate Arch is a good half-way point. Seating there would be under cover away from wind and rain. I have not found any sheltered public seating in town.	These comments have been taken on board. The latest version no longer references a new town square.
	Buskers are another valuable asset and are often near Tunsgate. Better use could be made of open spaces at the bottom of town near Debenhams or across the Town Bridge. Although I welcome more seating and trees in the town centre. They must be located where people congregate. I rarely see more than one person, and mostly no one, seated in the area at the top of the High Street near Trinity Gate. Pictures I have seen of our twin town of Freiburg, suggest we could learn valuable ideas for a greener, more environmentally friendly town.	Comments noted. One of the objectives of the interim framework is to create an environment with lively streets and spaces to accommodate a wide range of activities and events
	Improved bus facilities should mean more buses in the town centre – not a bus station on Bedford road isolated from the High Street and North Street by Onslow Street, or used primarily to access the Friary Centre. There is a stated need to improve the riverside. I doubt a bus station would enhance the river, even if it improved access to the station. Is there any estimate as to the proportion of rail users to shoppers currently using the bus station? Improved pedestrian routes between the railway station and the town centre, including the High Street, are very important.	We recognise that local traffic issues including congestion, parking and public transport facilities such as the bus station are key areas of concern to the local public. We do not have all the information we need yet to develop a movement strategy for the town centre, but are working on this alongside Surrey County Council, which is responsible for most of the roads in the area, and also the Highways Agency which is responsible for the major roads, including the A3. The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants. The town centre does not however stand still, and there are numerous areas that have development potential or need enhancement. We need to ensure Guildford is an attractive place to live and to visit and a desirable location for business investment. We have therefore produced an interim framework to assist in coordination of redevelopments and enhancements.
	Very frequent buses (less than 5 minutes waiting time) around the town centre and links to buses in all directions from Guildford is more important than a bus station per se. The earlier circular town centre bus was limited in take up because of the long gap between buses. A new park-and-ride at Manor Park could add disastrously to traffic congestion to the west of the town, even with "junction improvements".	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy
	There should be fuller up to date studies on how the town is actually used by the residents of Guildford and visitors, as well as by workers and shoppers. Who uses the car parks, the buses, trains, the park-and-ride facilities? Lastly, the town centre cannot be considered in isolation. The Research Park, University, Hospital are all changing. More residential development in Burpham, Mellow and other areas all influence Guildford Town Centre.	These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy. This document is specifically about the future of Guildford town centre, not the whole of Guildford town so it does not include these. The area covered by the interim framework is shown on a map on page eight of the document. Most respondents to the consultation on the draft masterplan agreed with the suggested boundary.
	I reside in Mellow, but consider that I live in Guildford. I use the library, the Institute, theatres, cinema, banks, post office, restaurants, cafes, pubs and shops. I meet friends, attend classes and meetings, walk by the river and on the hills, use the car parks, buses, trains, hospital, attend concerts in churches and halls, enjoy festivals and festivities. Guildford needs to continue to fulfil all these needs. Else I and others may consider the high cost of buying and maintaining a home in Guildford is no longer worth it and move elsewhere. Guildford is more than a commercial destination. It is where I live and have lived for 15 years. I meet many people who have lived here for 20, 30, 40 years or longer. It will need real vision to create a better rather than a mediocre future.	Thank you for your comments and information about what Guildford means to you. We have taken comments like these on board and updated the vision, objectives and strategy. Whilst provision of retail space is one part of the framework, it is also intended to provide a wide choice of homes within the town centre too.
Member of the public	Below are my comments on your consultation on the above. I do not find your form easy to fill in – sorry. I have been a resident and council tax payer of Guildford Borough for over 25 years. Guildford is our household's main shopping area. I try to buy locally in the Horsleys where we live and at the Sainsbury's supermarket in your High Street. I have been a member of West Horsley Parish Council for at least ten years, but WHPC has sent in its comments, and I stress that these are my personal own.	Thank you for taking the time to respond to the consultation.
	1. Traffic congestion, and the problems of the Gyrotory system have not been addressed here: many pious points are made, but it would have been more correct to consult fully with Surrey County Council, the statutory authority, before the genesis of the Plan.	We recognise that local traffic issues including congestion, parking and public transport facilities such as the bus station are key areas of concern to the local public. We do not have all the information we need yet to develop a movement strategy for the town centre, but are working on this alongside Surrey County Council, which is responsible for most of the roads in the area, and also the Highways Agency which is responsible for the major roads, including the A3. These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy

	<p>2. The Retail Future of the town seems the Plan's main concern: it is ambitious in this. Yet the Economist Magazine of 21st January 2012 (yesterday) states Page 17 There is just too much capacity in the high street. How to reconcile a love for buzzing town centres with a revealed preference for out-of-town and Internet shopping?quality of Local GovernmentCouncils can do a good deal to spiff up town centres. Keeping streets safe and clean and building more parking capacity can bring the people that shops rely on.</p>	<p>We appreciate that large scale retail development in the town centre is not a popular proposal with all of the public. The future demand retail has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology. Allowance has been made for special forms of trading such as internet retailing, and planning permissions that were approved but not built out at the time of writing. Lack of sites in the central retail area of the town centre is resulting in an increasing amount of new retail floorspace being developed in out of centre locations such as Ladymead retail park, leading to retail spend being diverted to out of centre locations and to other competing town centres. If this continues, other competing town centres and out of centre locations will gain visitors and expenditure relative to Guildford town centre, which will be relatively disadvantaged. As Guildford's 2006 Retail Study explained and the 2011 Retail and Leisure Study reiterated, "standing still is akin to decline in retail terms; if other centres continue to improve their retail offer, so must Guildford if it is to retain its current position."</p>
	<p>Yet your Plan seems to over-rely on public transport (whilst leaving it bereft of connectivity) and I see little mention of new town centre parking sites , Indeed if buses from the east of the borough are indeed allowed to terminate near the Library (by turning round) the very Merrow Park and Ride will become less used and parking, which is already scarce and expensive, and its problems will deter shoppers from using Guildford as a shopping centre.</p>	<p>The parking strategy revision is currently being prepared and is considering suitable level of parking. Public transport also needs improving.</p>
	<p>3. The attitude in your Plan to developers seems positively craven: I can only assume that they are seen as a cash-cow to pay for some of the Plan's changes To the bus station siting and other so-called improvements.</p>	<p>The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision.</p>
	<p>4. I feel there should be some vision , including transport from all ends of town, for the Research Park, University and Sports Park, Hospital, and Railway : a sort of plan for the 'Brain and Train' side of town. This seems lacking.</p>	<p>The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision.</p>
	<p>5 The Bedford Road end of Guildford, by the river, is subject to flooding, and the river Wey is particularly regarded as an 'indicator' of the beginning of effects of global warming. A bus station there will slow traffic anyway and could be a disaster area. Decking is particularly unsuitable for wet areas as it rots.</p>	<p>There is a high probability of flooding at Beford Road surface car park, this is acknowledged in the interim framework. Any development for any use of this site would need to ensure that flood risk is not increased, and that every attempt is made to reduce flood risk, making sure that the development built is safe (in flooding terms). A decision has not yet been taken on the location of the bus station. A study on this is expected towards the end of the year.</p>
	<p>6. I like the 'green' and environmental 'prettying up' of Guildford intended in your Plan, but it all has to be paid for and some of it seems impractical. I cannot feel it would be safe for cyclists to operate in , and cycle racks are largely unsightly. Also your 'mixed uses' aim is dangerous for the hearing and visually impaired .</p>	<p>Any proposed landscaping scheme will have to have regard to the users of the area. Schemes that are unsafe for cyclists to pass through would not be carried forward. It is one of the core planning principles of the NPPF to promote mixed use development.</p>
	<p>7. I have left until last the two aspects I find truly lamentable about your Plan. First is the timing: it seems to me utterly wrong to appear to have decided (for example about the Friary extension and the moving of a (smaller) Bus Station to Bedford Road) and only THEN go to public consultation about what seems a key part of your Plan. This seems an insult to your voters and public, and to fly in the face of the new Localism Act.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There has been no decision made on the future location of the bus station and all potential options will be fully tested. A bus station study is being prepared, and will be finalised towards the end of this year. The town centre interim framework will be updated to incorporate a movement strategy when all the evidence, including transport modelling, is finalised.</p>
	<p>8. Finally, for all the reasons I have given above, it seems to me that this Plan actively discriminates, given Guildford's topography, against mothers – or grand-</p>	<p>An equality impact assessment has been carried out. Please see the Council's website for more information - http://www.guildford.gov.uk/Guildfordinterimtowncentreframework</p>
	<p>9. mothers – with pushchairs, the visually and hearing impaired, the elderly and the disabled: the very groups growing fastest in modern UK. Indeed I do worry that the Council may be laying itself open to legal challenge on this front.</p>	<p>An equality impact assessment has been carried out. Please see the Council's website for more information - http://www.guildford.gov.uk/Guildfordinterimtowncentreframework</p>
	<p>10 Please rethink your bus station planning – where it currently is in theory in the very centre of the town - listen to your public, - ask for Freiburg experts to come and advise you, in combination with Surrey County Council.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There has been no decision made on the future location of the bus station and all potential options will be fully tested. A bus station study is being prepared, and will be finalised towards the end of this year. The town centre interim framework will be updated to incorporate a movement strategy when all the evidence, including transport modelling, is finalised.</p>

Borough councillor	Having read this document several times plus the many letters and comments that have been made about the master plan, I find it hard to recognise the complaints that have been made as most of the comments are actually covered in the document. I have heard many complaints that such things as more green spaces, more community areas, more small units, more homes for older people to down size to and so on are missing – but I have found reference to them all. I wonder what other people have been reading?!	Thank you for your positive comments.
	My comments are as follows: Page 2 leisure and culture: I feel we don't make enough of the Lewis Carroll connection and this would be a good place to mention him. Transport and other infrastructure: we should also mention the need for a P&R site to the north. I am not sure that a reduction in long stay/commuter parking places is a positive move. We should definitely be discouraging people from driving in, but this can be done by promoting our P&R sites much more forcefully (there's no mention of them on any signage on the roads into town such as on the A3 before the Burpham turning). Drivers who come into town and can't find space in a car park will just drive round and round residential streets until they find a space or risk leaving a car parked illegally. We have seen this happening at busy times like Christmas when the car parks are full (not in 2011 though!).	The parking strategy revision is currently being prepared and is considering suitable level of parking. Public transport also needs improving.
	page 3 Heritage: we should mention the expansion and improvement of the museum and its' facilities Environment: is it wise to say many more shops when it may be one bigger shop? just leave out the word many ?	The latest version has been updated with this information.
	page 5 shame we haven't got an independent cinema to add to this list! while we have a good bus network in the town centre the fact that they don't all run late and some don't run at all on Sundays is a great disadvantage, can we add this as a weakness? The return of a viable, free town centre shuttle bus would be welcome.	It is one of the objectives of the interim framework to improve infrastructure serving the town centre, addressing traffic issues, improving access by sustainable travel modes, minimising flood risk, and ensuring adequate community infrastructure.
	page 15 the transition area photo is dreadful! The dentist on the ground floor with flats above on the corner of Martyr Road and Chertsey Street would look a lot better. The historic places image looks remarkably modern, I can see why it's there when you read the text but it isn't obviously historic, and there isn't any open green space there.	Comments noted, the photos have been updated.
	page 17 where can we say that commercial use of the river will be encouraged. There has been talk of a boat from the Artington P&R to Millmead lock. A local business could transport people and goods through to the Thames. We should also make more of creating access along the river for pedestrians.	Comments noted. The strategy for the area includes increase use of the River Wey with increased moorings.
	page 20 parking strategy: is this another place to include car clubs? More car club cars will reduce on street parking.	The parking strategy revision is currently being prepared and is considering suitable level of parking. Public transport also needs improving.
	page 50: The last part of the Improved junctions - Woodbridge Road between Dapdune Road and York Road isn't very clear. Do you mean the junctions along Woodbridge Road from Dapdune Road to York Road?	Comments noted, this section has been updated.
	page 64 Additional primary school capacity: it is completely impractical to expand Sandfield School, it already has a very small, tarmac covered play ground and no room for additional buildings or extensions. It is a highly successful single entry school. SCC should look at other areas close to the town centre for additional provision of primary school places. Perhaps the Adult Education Centre on Sydenham Road could be returned to its original use as a school? Too many Guildford primary schools have been closed in the last ten years and the sites sold. Thank you all for your work on this!	Comments noted. This will be considered through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This specific school is not referenced in the updated interim framework.
Member of the public	Not much time given ,and over the Christmas /New year period too, but no doubt that was intended. I do like the ethos- "celebrate arrival - create positive first impressionsand provide a centre that is pedestrian friendly" The problem is how do you achieve that. Maybe some of the problem is reflected in the website message inviting comments - addressed to those who " Shop , work ,live or play " in the town. Firstly change your perspective . To those that -Live , work , shop and play in the town. I realise that the Councillors and senior staff don't live in the town but please at least have the decency to try to put the people who pay your rates first.. and not third on your list of priorities.	<p>Consultation periods have to be balanced between ensuring people have sufficient time to engage with the process and the need to move the project forward. The consultation period was longer than that required for a statutory planning document to take account of timing of the consultation.</p> <p>Comments noted - the vision now reads "Guildford town centre will continue to be the premier town centre in Surrey and will rank amongst the leading town centres in the South East - an attractive place to live, work, relax and visit."</p>
	I want a thriving town but not one where the prime retail space flows away from the High Street to new shopping malls , thus seeing its decline and the isolation of the Tunsgate/Castle area from the central area. I want to see a town with an improved transport system. Not one that puts the bus station the wrong side of Onslow Street as though it is for the lower orders and needs to be put out of sight and mind , with people coming into town from the East of Guildford unable to link up with the station, the hospital or the University. The town's transport system should be public transport focussed with improved bus services and park and ride; improved rail station access to the town and an increase in the pedestrian crossing points across Onslow Street. If it slows the through traffic , well so be it. Maybe some of it will find other routes that avoid the town.	We appreciate that large scale retail development in the town centre is not a popular proposal with all of the public. The future demand retail has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology. Allowance has been made for special forms of trading such as internet retailing, and planning permissions that were approved but not built out at the time of writing. Lack of sites in the central retail area of the town centre is resulting in an increasing amount of new retail floorspace being developed in out of centre locations such as Ladymead retail park, leading to retail spend being diverted to out of centre locations and to other competing town centres. If this continues, other competing town centres and out of centre locations will gain visitors and expenditure relative to Guildford town centre, which will be relatively disadvantaged. As Guildford's 2006 Retail Study explained and the 2011 Retail and Leisure Study reiterated, "standing still is akin to decline in retail terms; if other centres continue to improve their retail offer, so must Guildford if it is to retain its current position."

	<p>And why oh why put a food supermarket in the middle of town. Waitrose should be in a town peripheral location which is readily accessible by car. Not on the Bellerby theatre site. It's madness. Retail is not a growth area. More so town centre retail, with large supermarkets taking an increasing percentage of retail spend and the internet's retail growth increasing all the time. A 33% increase in the town's retail space surely can't be sustainable. A town is its people, culture and heritage. As a Council that is what you should be putting first. Many of the little things in the plan are admirable but lets get away from putting shopping number one.</p>	<p>The Retail and Leisure Study (2011) found that both convenience and comparison floorspace was found to be overtrading. Guildford town centre would benefit from the provision of a new food supermarket or superstore in the town centre to relieve overtrading, improve consumer choice and increase linked trips spending. In a do nothing scenario, the centre will decline and over time will lose market share to competing developments as consumers seek enhanced choice and retailers seek improved accommodation.</p> <p>The NPPF directs main town centre uses (including supermarkets) to town centre as a priority location. Therefore if there is a need for a new supermarket in Guildford Urban Area, sites within the Town Centre should be given first consideration. Only if suitable sites cannot be found, should other sites be looked at. Traffic assessment would be part of the test of suitability.</p>
	<p>The report of a Transport workshop which took place in March 2011 initiated by SCC is referred to in Appendix 1, Page 11. Selected elements have been included in Sections 4 and 5 and indications of SCC's plan given. However, key information provided to that workshop has not been related to other transport implications in the Plan. For example, a traffic count for Onslow Street shows a total peak pm flow of 2695 vehicles/hour (v/h) in both directions, which represents 1 vehicle every 1.3 seconds passing the junction with Bedford Road. The MVA report, on which GBC is basing planning application for a bus station on that site, reports peak departures currently of 79 buses per hour (Bph), peaking at 123Bph. This represents one bus either arriving in or departing from Bedford Road every 23 seconds, eventually increasing to every 15 seconds. No consideration has been given to the interaction of these two features at the junction of Bedford Road and Onslow Street:</p>	<p>Comments noted. There has been no decision made on the future location of the bus station and all potential options will be fully tested. A bus station study is being prepared, and will be finalised towards the end of this year. The town centre interim framework will be updated to incorporate a movement strategy when all the evidence, including transport modelling, is finalised.</p>
	<p><i>One vehicle arriving every 1.3 seconds and one bus turning every 23 seconds now, and eventually every 15 seconds.</i></p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
	<p>The most likely effect of this is to bring traffic in Guildford to a standstill. Under 5. Delivery, only "suitable mitigation" is offered, should transport modelling "raise issues". There is no suggestion that the choice of site should be reviewed. A final opportunity for an alternative site lies in inserting a bus station option in the terms of reference for the review of the 2003 Design and Development Brief for Site 18 (revised). We believe that the selected site is totally unsuitable and that, if the current site is required for development and, should a bus station rather than bus stops be judged the best option, an alternative location could be sought close to North Street. The MVA report viewed favourably Site 22, Dolphin House, the only constraint being that it is under private ownership. A site offering even better conditions for a bus station is that on which Norwich House currently stands in North Street, which is within Site 18. Serious consideration should be given to relocating the bus station here and northwards along Leapale Road.</p>	<p>These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>
	<p>Pedestrian crossings. The various diagrams in Section 4 and details in Section 5 indicate proposed pedestrian crossing improvements as suggested in PRIAN, however there is no diagram in the Plan which shows the relevance of them all on one page. Thus the impact of a total of nine at grade crossings around or near the gyratory could be overlooked. It is our view that no additional at grade crossings should be considered until traffic flows are significantly reduced. Not stated in the Plan but indicated in PRIAN (3.2) is the clear intention to remove two pedestrian subways, referred to pejoratively as "underground passages". Clearly no lesson has been learnt from the consequence for traffic of removing the one below Millbrook. These are valuable capital assets and should not be removed until a proved satisfactory alternative can be provided. Until the traffic flows reported in Section 2 of PRIAN can be significantly reduced it would be totally unrealistic to do so. Eventually, once these subways are no longer needed for pedestrians, they should be adapted for use by cyclists.</p>	<p>These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>
	<p>Not included in PRIAN are the crossings of York Road, shown in the Transition Areas diagram. York Road forms a vital traffic artery now, as highlighted in the "Arriving and Getting Around" diagram, and probably even more so in the longer term. It is essential, therefore, that no new at grade crossings are introduced which will restrict the free flow of traffic. In particular, the two existing pedestrian subways to which the public has become accustomed, should be retained, and preferably enhanced.</p>	<p>These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>
	<p>Every opportunity should be taken to improve East-West transport and pedestrian links, using available development sites and existing rail or river crossings. Thus, the Yorkie's Bridge railway crossing, currently for pedestrians and cyclists, should be developed in conjunction with appropriate sections of Sites 1,2, 3 and 4 to create a through route to Woodbridge Road via Wharf Road, at least for pedestrians and cyclists but possibly for buses and other traffic.</p>	<p>The swot analysis in the latest version has identified poor east-west vehicle permeability; vehicles are funnelled through the one-way gyratory system as a weakness. These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>
	<p>Similarly, the perfectly acceptable <u>Friary Passage</u> route under Onslow Street should be extended with a bridge over the river at Site13 to Site 12 for access to the west and the Railway Station. This provides the best outlet from the west of North Street and removes the need for any additional pedestrian routes over Friary Bridge or across Onslow Street. There is a clear need for a new East-West major road link, crossing at least the railway, which could be done with minimum disturbance, but, preferably it should include a river crossing. Ideally this should run from Guildford Park Road to York Road. Land should be identified now so that longer term implementation is not inhibited by new development.</p>	<p>The swot analysis in the latest version has identified poor east-west vehicle permeability; vehicles are funnelled through the one-way gyratory system as a weakness. These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>
<p>The Gyratory</p>		<p>Title field - no response required.</p>

	<p>Guildford's traffic problems are clearly set out under Movement on page 10 of Appendix 1, but this is not new. Investigation into means for improving the operation of the Gyratory, in conjunction with the Railway Station re-development, the Farnham Road railway bridge, bus routes and services are long overdue, although they would have been addressed in connection with the Transport for Guildford exercise. We are somewhat sceptical, however, of the suggestions that these roads need to be made pedestrian friendly, at least, not until traffic volumes can be significantly reduced.</p>	<p>These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>
	<p>We fully support the project for a new Park & Ride facility at Manor Park and welcome the initiative to re-develop the junction of Egerton Road and Gill Avenue to remove congestion in that area as well as to provide the necessary capacity for the P & R. We also welcome the projected improvement of the Farnham Road mini roundabout junction west of the railway bridge.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
	<p>There is no mention in Appendix 1 of the excellent bus services which Guildford has to offer linking it to surrounding towns and villages. We suggest that a sentence is included in "Current strategic issues".</p>	<p>The swot analysis in the latest version of the interim framework recognises good bus network as a strength</p>
	<p>We welcome the projected 5 new or improved cycle routes indicated under Infrastructure Delivery in Section 5 which aim to improve connections between the Town Centre and the surrounding area, but we are unable to comment without having the details of the proposed routes within the Town Centre.</p>	<p>Comments noted. These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy</p>
Member of the public	<p>I live, run a business, shop, eat and use entertainment venues in the town.</p>	<p>Comments regarding your use of the town centre noted.</p>
	<p>Before bringing in more shops shops, there must be adequate facilities to enable residents, especially elderly and less able people, the chance to enjoy their home town. Seating in the town is already woefully inadequate. A 'square' as a focal point would enable people to meet or sit and socialise with perhaps somewhere for children to play safely. The River Wey is a much underused amenity, which needs more funds allocated and publicity which it doesn't have at the moment. The town must have more trees/shrubs/foilage and not just glass bricks and steel dominating. The castle grounds are beautifully kept and the flower containers in the summer a real delight, perhaps we could have more of this throughout the year. Our town centre must be 'easy on the eye' and a pleasant place to be.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision.</p>
	<p>Most thriving historic towns have very good and high profile tourist offices that are easily available and accessible throughout the year. This gives out a very positive message about a town so it's essential that we do not sideline our tourist office. The Guildhall would be an ideal spot. We must have more food stores or supermarkets in the town, why not one in the awful new Friary development? When the centre was first built there was a large supermarket downstairs but maybe this would not fit with the slick image it's trying to project! Without excellent transport infrastructure nothing will work, not now nor in the future when we anticipate people will flock to the town. Parking is already inadequate so before more development this should also be addressed. The bus station must be easily accessible within the centre and not along a busy road.</p>	<p>Thank you for all the points you have raised. Need for more food store floorspace has been identified by our expert consultants. Part of the strategy for the historic area is to improve connections between key destinations such as to and across the riverside, to the station and between the High Street / tourist information centre and Guildford Castle and museum. These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy The parking strategy revision is currently being prepared and is considering suitable level of parking. Public transport also needs improving.</p>
	<p>Many towns are becoming just commercial areas, each resembling the other and all looking exactly the same. The High Street is blessed with the Town Clock, Guildhall, Tunsgate, Abbots Hospital and of course our castle, all fine buildings which will soon be overwhelmed if unsympathetic development is allowed to happen. With a castle, cathedral, university, river, historic buildings the town will always have a buoyant economy but our environment mustn't be compromised just to bring in 'more of the same'. FINALLY - PLEASE DON'T ALLOW OUR FEW EXISTING GREEN SPACES TO BE GRABBED FOR 'DEVELOPMENT'</p>	<p>The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision.</p>
Labour Borough councillor for Stoke ward	<p>These are my personal thoughts. I feel that there is far too little mention of Arts and Culture and their value to Guildford's economy. And too much emphasis on retail. I will confine my comments on the draft document to aspects covering the Arts, although there is plenty to say on Housing and Traffic management. Others will cover those I'm sure.</p>	<p>The vision now reads "The town centre will reinforce its position as a major and vibrant retail, leisure and cultural centre in the South East. More diverse, quality shops will also increase our visitor attractions alongside cultural and leisure opportunities."</p>
	<p>On page 2, the Vision is thin and uninspiring, and makes no meaningful emphasis on the value and place of Art and Culture in the lives of residents and visitors. Street stalls hardly constitute 'culture' and to talk about a 'world class tourist destination' is somewhat over-blown. Guildford is NOT a world class tourist destination – just a medium sized town with 1000 years of history, and a river running through it. Some realism would be in order. A vision for Guildford based on retail is somewhat mundane.</p>	<p>The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision. The interim framework no longer refers to a world class tourist destination.</p>
	<p>Looking to the future, what does Guildford lack? A cohesive plan for the development of the Arts. Not just a classic Art gallery [a la Tate], but exhibition space in which exhibitions and events appeal to all. And G Live does not fit that bill. There is no Art gallery or even an Arts centre in Guildford. That is what we should be aspiring to. A long term plan, with an outline budget and nominated site, would be an inspiration. Ruthin Art Centre is one such example that does. Check it out. Guildford House is not an ideal location for an art gallery.</p>	<p>The interim framework identifies the development of a new library as a potential community hub. It is multi use buildings such as a community hub which could accommodate arts facilities.</p>
	<p>The historic sites we do have, which should appeal to visitors are the Castle, Museum, Dapdune Wharf. It is still not possible to get into the Museum from the Castle Grounds. When are we going to do something about that? Even better would be a modern fit-for-purpose museum. The Lawns outside the castle and the hidden Racks close garden are under-exploited. Perhaps another playground/picnic area would be in order.</p>	<p>Part of the strategy for the area is to create a major heritage hub and tourist attraction by reuniting the castle and museum sites, which were both originally part of the castle bailey (enclosed courtyard).</p>

	For too long Guildford has rested on the laurels of being a Historic Town. Better use could be made of The Guildhall. It is a most uninviting premises. So...it's historic etc, but is it open to the public? Who would know? The doors prevent inspection from the street, and the steps make access difficult. Once inside what greets the curious visitor? A desk of utilitarian appearance, an even more unattractive functional clothes rack; and some chairs. The historic inner hall is further inaccessible via steps and a narrow doorway. The whole inner screen and the unwieldy steps could be redesigned to show off the interior and facilitate access for all. Guildford's municipal treasures are upstairs in awkwardly placed cabinets – inaccessible to most. These could all be moved down stairs for display. Admittedly this is detail and minutiae, but if we want to broaden our appeal then we have to broaden access and use what we have much more effectively.	The interim framework does not go into this amount of detail for each feature of the town. Part of the vision is that "The town centre will reinforce its position as a major and vibrant retail, leisure and cultural centre in the South East. More diverse, quality shops will also increase our visitor attractions alongside cultural and leisure opportunities."
	A plan with vision for the riverside would greatly enhance the town's attractiveness. On both sides of the river from the upstream water meadows at St Catherines/Ferry Lane to the main traffic bridge at Ladymead the path could be widened to make it a strolling route, not just a cycle route. Currently it is not wide enough for two way/pedestrian traffic. In the town centre there could be a lot more cafes and local craft ware kiosks along the route so that the whole area is buzzing with activity. Licences for food kiosks on both parts of Millmead Island would attract more visitors; Items of sculpture could be placed along the route. Furthermore why not decommission the car park opposite the Britannia and make the space into another small park with a play ground – fun fountains – other play equipment. Make the entrance to GBC offices at Lawn Road the only traffic entrance, and remove the gate separating the two parts of the car park. Redesign the back car park to accommodate more cars – i.e. get rid of the straggly hedges. Demolish the Mayor's Limo Garage and relocate it. Keep a pedestrian entrance to GBC from the riverside car park. More hire boats on the river downstream from the lock. Another boat house? Work with Debenhams to complete a walkway round to the town bridge from the Mill Theatre.	A strategy for the River Wey area is now included in the document.
	Vibrant night-life needs late night transport – and not just taxis. Buses – maybe smaller than day-time buses - travelling out to the villages would ease the strain on taxis and be more affordable. A second cinema would make a valuable contribution to the arts-scene. This need not be a 'multi-screen', but seat 150-200 for example and show films that don't get to the high-profile outlets. This could be located on part of one of the car park sites; maybe built over the top.	Re cinema, such a use could possibly be provided in a community hub facility, that may also accommodate a library. Transport issues will be considered as part of the development of a movement strategy, once all of the evidence is finalised.
Clandon society	The online response form is so user unfriendly and the time for response so short that a brief view is provided below, using headings from the plan document. I hope that this will not preclude the comments from consideration. The Clandon Society is the amenity group for East & West Clandon villages. Although our members live outside the town centre, most make use of the centre and issues of access, congestion, facilities and environment are important to us.	Thank you for taking the time to respond to the consultation. Consultation periods have to be balanced between ensuring people have sufficient time to engage with the process and the need to move the project forward. The consultation period was longer than that required for a statutory planning document to take account of timing of the consultation.
	Regrettably, the body of the plan does not appear to offer much in the way of a clear overall view of the way ahead to achieve the objectives. There is very little on timescales or costs. The intentions with regard to visual improvements are laudable but beg the question of how we have arrived at the present state. High class materials and the like will be turned into expensive rubble, the tarmac infills, broken slabs and puddles will continue unless utility contractors are forced to properly reinstate pavements. Some town centre sites are named with ideas as to what might be appropriate development but it can't be said that this forms a coherent approach to Guildford's future.	The latest version has been updated to include timescales for finalisation of projects and production of the final framework. The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision.
	Perhaps we have misunderstood the purpose and status of the plan but a lofty vision is just a wish list without answers to the "how will...." questions. How will congestion be dealt with- both that existing and the additional pressures caused by the new supermarket, the moving of the bus station (both more or less a fait accompli), the additional retail space proposed and the predicted growth in population and workforce? On this critical issue, the plan has little to offer. Perhaps this is not surprising given that it seems that GBC is beholden to SCC, the Highways Agency and Network Rail for critical elements of infrastructure and that most redevelopment will be developer led. The Westfield case offers little hope for a good outcome.	We recognise that local traffic issues including congestion, parking and public transport facilities such as the bus station are key areas of concern to the local public. We do not have all the information we need yet to develop a movement strategy for the town centre, but are working on this alongside Surrey County Council, which is responsible for most of the roads in the area, and also the Highways Agency which is responsible for the major roads, including the A3. When we have completed these technical studies we will consider the technical evidence with Surrey County Council and will draw up a final framework, which will include a movement strategy. The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision.
	We would add a very specific comment about Objective 3 – transport and ease of access. The bus station plan would mean that Clandon residents (and others) would lose bus access to the bottom end of town from the Merrow park and ride. This is a very large penalty to pay and would reduce the utility of the park and ride for many of our residents	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
Defend our bus station group	In our view, public transport should be the most important component of the Masterplan & shopping facilities designed around it, rather than the reverse approach adopted in this consultation Masterplan. The bus station should remain in the middle of the town centre, so that bus passengers have easy access to the town's attractions & shopping facilities. If it were properly designed, this would be an asset to would-be developers.	Comments noted. These points will be will be considered with emerging transport evidence and in development of a movement strategy. Noted for future movement strategy

	There are many practical difficulties with the proposed move of the bus station to Bedford Road, with a number of services going elsewhere. The most important are listed in our petition	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
	1. It is too far from the town centre	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
	2. The less mobile will find it too far to walk	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
	3. It will cause severe pedestrian congestion on Onslow street – on the already very crowded pedestrian crossing by Wetherspoon's	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
	4. It will make more traffic congestion on Onslow street	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
	5. It is too small so some existing bus services won't go there	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
	6. It offers poor access for travellers to & from the top of the town.	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
	In addition to these practical difficulties, bus users want the bus station to stay in the middle of the town centre & do not want it moved to Bedford Road. We have carried out extensive discussions with the public, largely direct with bus passengers at the bus station on the subject of the Guildford bus station. We have undertaken these discussions on the basis of our rubric	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
	"BUS STATION - DON'T MOVE IT – IMPROVE IT"	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
	To date, 2173 signatures have been obtained on a petition to this effect. The overall total will rise as later forms arrive. These were obtained in a very limited time span – approximately 3 weeks. There is almost complete unanimity on the necessity of upgrading the bus station & overwhelming support for keeping the bus station in the middle of the town centre. People value the immediate access the current location offers to all of the existing town centre – High Street & North Street as well as the Friary.	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
	This is particularly so for the elderly & for those who are less mobile. There is a strong attachment to its staying in the current area. Bedford Road is disliked as a location for the bus station. People, particularly the less mobile do not want the longer journey to the High Street & North Street & particularly do not want it when they are loaded with shopping on the way back. Nor do they want to have to cross the very busy dual carriageway along Onslow Street, already heavily congested with pedestrians crossing. The move would also mean that bus services from east of the town, including the Merrow Park & Ride bus 300, will have to terminate at the top of the Upper High Street rather than in the centre of town.	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.

	Many passengers do get off at the top of the town now, walk to the bottom, doing their shopping & catch the bus back from the bus station. The disabled, elderly and other bus users with mobility problems, including parents with young children, strongly dislike the idea that in the suggested new arrangements, they would need to struggle uphill, fully loaded with purchases, back to the top of town. We believe that the bus station should remain in the existing area, and be radically improved. This could be achieved by using some of the money that would otherwise be spent on the proposed new bus station. Note. A blank petition form is attached. The signed petition forms will be presented to the Feb 9th Council meeting. John Armstrong already has possession of forms containing the 1st 1,000 signatures	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
Member of the public	I am writing with regard to the draft Masterplan put forward by the Guildford Borough Council for Guildford Town Centre. I attended a meeting of local residents called by the Guildford Society, to discuss the plan and gather feedback for submitting to the Council. Having reviewed the draft plan myself, I agree with a number of comments made at this meeting.	Agreement with people at the aforementioned meeting noted.
	First, it does not appear to actually be a master plan, as it puts forward no overarching vision for the town centre's future. The collection of development projects discussed are piecemeal. Second, it is nearly exclusively focused on building the retail environment of the town. I am not against retail development in any way. My concern is that this is being done to the neglect of, and sometimes at the expense of, other critical town assets that make Guildford a desirable place to live in and to visit.	The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision. We appreciate that large scale retail development in the town centre is not a popular proposal with all of the public. The future demand retail has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology. Allowance has been made for special forms of trading such as internet retailing, and planning permissions that were approved but not built out at the time of writing. Lack of sites in the central retail area of the town centre is resulting in an increasing amount of new retail floorspace being developed in out of centre locations such as Ladymead retail park, leading to retail spend being diverted to out of centre locations and to other competing town centres. If this continues, other competing town centres and out of centre locations will gain visitors and expenditure relative to Guildford town centre, which will be relatively disadvantaged. As Guildford's 2006 Retail Study explained and the 2011 Retail and Leisure Study reiterated, "standing still is akin to decline in retail terms; if other centres continue to improve their retail offer, so must Guildford if it is to retain its current position."
	My particular concern comes from the fact that I own a home in one of the 'Transition Areas' contained within the Masterplan. A number of people at the meeting raised the importance of maintaining attractive, well maintained in-town residential areas, as part of keeping Guildford a desirable place to be. There is much talk of developing new, affordable, in-town housing. But what about maintaining the (often historic) residential areas that already exist?	In the transitional areas, in the latest version, there is a strategy to create people-friendly streets that reflect the primarily residential character of the area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improve pedestrian connections to and from key destinations in other parts of the town (centre), and • improve the character and cohesion of the area through redevelopment of sites that are incongruous with their surroundings in form or function
	Where I live -- Millmead Terrace -- is a historical in-town neighbourhood; designated as a conservation area, due in part to the former GSA and the adjacent row of historical 19C houses where I live. This is a real neighbourhood, with mixed residence, including people like us, mid-career professionals and families. The people here know each other. And we care for these homes, many of which have been carefully restored and expanded. The area also serves as a pleasant walking transition between the town centre and other residential areas such as St. Catherine's. But instead of being cared for, the infrastructure here is completely neglected and is left to deteriorate. The streets and pavements here are in an appalling condition that our local government should be ashamed of. And I have recently learned that there is a proposal to set up a 'Pay and Display' parking scheme, despite the fact that this street is completely residential.	The Council recognises that there are individual areas specific to a location in the town, however, these can not always be dealt with through a framework such as this. Maintenance issues in relation to the condition of the roads is the responsibility of the County Council. However, the framework includes as an objective "Improve infrastructure serving the town centre, addressing traffic issues, improving access by sustainable travel modes, minimising flood risk, and ensuring adequate community infrastructure".
	This is not just about my street; I believe that other in-town residential areas are in a similar or worse condition. I am concerned that in the rush to develop Guildford's retail environment, the Council will treat transitional areas like mine as mere parking lots for those coming from out of town. I object to this for two reasons: a) Lack of inclusivity: in considering the future of where I live, you are representing the interests of those who park here before the interests of those who live here. b) Long-term development: by not valuing these areas and effectively creating ugly transition areas, you are undermining a vital long-term asset for the whole town -- the beauty that makes Guildford a place people want to come. Finally, I am concerned about the extremely short public consultation period, which does not give the impression that the Council actually wants any input from residents.	The framework now includes a strategy for transitional areas.
	Letter to David Hill	Title field - no response required.
	Thank you very much for speaking with me by phone several weeks ago about the 'Pay & Display' parking proposal mentioned in the LibDem circular, <i>Focus</i> . I appreciate your being accessible and hearing my point of view. I wanted to reiterate my view in writing (below), and I hope that it will be taken into consideration. (<u>Please note</u> : I also refer to the draft Masterplan and therefore copy the email address for this, and to road resurfacing, so copy Surrey Highways.)	Context of the comments noted.

	1. I am concerned about this lovely and historic in-town neighbourhood being undermined by focusing on its use for parking. I would therefore oppose any measure, including a 'Pay and Display' scheme, that would <u>further visibly identify Millmead Terrace as a parking area</u> . We already have parking signs in this street. Any more obvious signage or markings in the street -- in particular 'pay and display' boards, but also related markings such as numbered parking 'bays' or spaces - would, I believe, have an <u>significant negative impact on both the residential and historical character of Millmead Terrace</u> .	The Council is currently producing an updated parking strategy and this will inform the final town centre framework.
	a) Such a scheme is perhaps reasonable in front of the surgery or other commercial buildings such as exist in Bury Street. But <u>Millmead Terrace is entirely residential</u> -- all houses, no commercial buildings. I believe that any such action to make this a designated parking area would change the residential character of the street and neighbourhood.	The Council is currently producing an updated parking strategy and this will inform the final town centre framework.
	b) More than that, as I'm sure you know, this street is part of a <u>conservation area</u> . This means of course that I must apply for permission to make any changes to my own house that would be considered as changing its historic appearance and character. Any changes by the Council should be subject to the same restrictions and scrutiny. Visually obvious parking signs or markings could well have a negative impact on the historic appearance of the conservation area, and I think this should be properly and fully considered.	The Council is currently producing an updated parking strategy and this will inform the final town centre framework.
	2. I'm also simply disappointed that the Council would consider this <u>before even performing the minimum public duty of resurfacing the appallingly maintained road surface and pavements of Millmead Terrace, Bury Street, Bury Fields and Lawn Road -- which are both unsightly and unsafe</u> . Making this a designated parking area could also result in increased traffic, making these street even more unsafe. I am concerned that the Council is taking the interests of those who park here into greater consideration than those who live here.	Thank you for your comments. The Council is currently producing an updated parking strategy and this will inform the final town centre framework. Please note, Surrey County Council is responsible for maintaining the condition of the roads.
	3. These streets are within the <u>Guildford Town Centre Draft Masterplan, as a designated 'Transition Area'</u> . I believe that maintaining and improving the quality of this set of streets is not only in the interests of the residents here, but in the <u>long-term interests of Guildford as a whole</u> , to maintain this as an attractive edge-of-town residential area. I attended a gathering of the Guildford Society recently at which the Master Plan was discussed by about 100 people who live in and visit the town. A number of people commented on the importance of maintaining attractive, welcoming transitional residential areas, to ensuring Guildford remains a desirable place to live and visit. This is a real neighbourhood. Turning it into a neglected parking lot is not in anyone's long term interest.	Comments noted. The latest version of the interim framework includes a strategy for the transition areas to create people-friendly streets that reflect the primarily residential character of the area • improve pedestrian connections to and from key destinations in other parts of the town (centre), and • improve the character and cohesion of the area through redevelopment of sites that are incongruous with their surroundings in form or function
	Thank you very much for your consideration. You mentioned that residents would be invited to consider the proposal; I look forward to seeing and discussing it with other residents and our representatives.	Thank you for taking the time to respond to the consultation. All responses have been considered as the document has been updated.
Member of the public	Further to my previous comments on the Masterplan, the plan should not presume that the bus station will be relocated to Bedford Road surface car park until the Council has considered the many objections raised by local residents and people from nearby areas following the decision of the Executive on 20 October 2011 to relocate the bus station from the Friary Centre. Any amendments to the Masterplan should await a decision by the Planning Committee on the proposed plans which are yet to be prepared and published.	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
	The plans as approved by the Executive are as per the report of the consultants, who did not adequately consider the likely traffic congestion in the Bedford Road area where cars queuing to enter and those leaving the multi-storey car park will considerably conflict with the numerous buses entering and leaving the bus station. The consultant's report also overlooked the likely effect of pedestrian congestion and safety along the narrow pavements in Bedford Road and Onslow Street and at the crossing at the Onslow Street / Bridge Street junction where pedestrians will access the main shopping area.	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants. A bus station study is due to be completed by the end of the year.
	The consultations with Surrey County Council and the local bus operators should be published, as their involvement and agreement with the proposals to relocate the bus station is a fundamental essential of the plan. From information obtained from those who represent these bodies I am led to understand that the actual consultation on the proposals before approval by the Executive was minimal. The local transport arrangements for pedestrians, cars, buses, cyclists, and commercial vehicles are not adequately covered within the Masterplan, yet these are essential aspects to the long term future of pedestrian and traffic movement within and around the town centre.	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants. When we have completed these technical studies we will consider the technical evidence with Surrey County Council and will draw up a final framework, which will include a movement strategy.
Safeguard Coaches	I am responding to the Guildford Town Centre Masterplan consultation on behalf of Safeguard Coaches Limited, one of the three main bus operators in Guildford, which has operated in Guildford town centre for no less than 87 years.	Context of the comments noted.
	We broadly support Guildford Borough Council's desire that Guildford town centre maintains its role as a key shopping and service centre in the county, attracting visitors from a wide area (page 2). We concur with the Council's vision of 'reduced peak hour traffic congestion', an improved town centre infrastructure, in particular transport, and 'improved public transport facilities including bus facilities' (also page 2). In principal we support Objective 3 'to improve streets, traffic congestion and transport, including improved bus facilities, making it easier, safer and more pleasant to move around and through the town centre' (page 4).	Support noted.
	With reference to page 6 we also agree that:	Title field - no response required.
	· the one-way gyratory system (including Onslow Street) 'severs the town centre, separating the river from the main shopping area';	Agreement noted.
	· the current bus station has 'a poor appearance, condition and facilities';	Agreement noted.

	· 'peak hour congestion increases the time taken to enter and leave the town centre and to travel from one side to the other';	Agreement noted.
	· there are high levels of through traffic at peak hours'; and	Agreement noted.
	· there is a 'dominance of cars on roads, wide carriageways and narrow pavements'.	Agreement noted.
	However, in the context of your vision and objectives we believe that the proposal to relocate the bus station to the current Bedford Road car park site (site reference 09) is wrong and we cannot support it.	Comments noted. The document has been amended. Further work continues to investigate the best location for the bus station within the town.
	The vast majority of bus passengers want to access to the heart of the Town Centre. This was evidenced by a study in 2004 commissioned by Surrey County Council and bus operator Arriva. However, access to/from the Town Centre from the proposed Bedford Road bus station will require a significant walk and entail crossing a heavily-trafficked dual carriageway (Onslow Street) on the level while the solid wall of the Friary Shopping Centre presents physical and psychological barriers to direct and convenient access to the Town Centre.	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
	We believe that these aspects will deter large numbers of existing and potential passengers from using the bus as their mode of travel to the Town Centre because a key selling point – that of convenient access to the heart of the Town – will have been lost. Public transport will become increasingly marginalized and bus travel in particular will increasingly become a mode of necessity rather than one of choice, reversing current positive trends which have in no small part been driven by an effective partnership of public and private sector organizations including Safeguard Coaches.	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
	This will be particularly true of the many passengers who are either young, elderly or have mobility difficulties, numbers of which have grown considerably now that we and other bus operators use easy access buses. The consultation document recognizes all these issues, in particular pointing out the lack of direct and comfortable walking routes in this area of the town centre, the fact that the 'highest number of traffic accidents relating to shunts in the one way system and pedestrians at road crossings occur at the three crossing points of the junction of Onslow Street with Bridge Street' (Appendix 1, page 11) exactly where thousands of bus passengers would be expected to cross to reach the main town centre, and the uninviting rear wall of the Friary Shopping Centre (Appendix 1, page 17).	The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.
	Reduced bus use is likely to lead to reductions in bus service frequency and to an increase in car usage which will exacerbate Guildford's already chronic traffic situation (both of which the Masterplan purports to reduce/improve).	We recognise that local traffic issues including congestion, parking and public transport facilities such as the bus station are key areas of concern to the local public. We do not have all the information we need yet to develop a movement strategy for the town centre, but are working on this alongside Surrey County Council, which is responsible for most of the roads in the area, and also the Highways Agency which is responsible for the major roads, including the A3. When we have completed these technical studies we will consider the technical evidence with Surrey County Council and will draw up a final framework, which will include a movement strategy.
	Furthermore the effects would be socially divisive because the more marginalized in society who are more dependent on bus services to access jobs and other facilities would be disproportionately affected. It will ultimately increase car dependency and restrict the opportunity of public transport to support sustainable economic growth in Guildford town centre and its environs. In addition to the above we also have grave concerns about the proposed access arrangements to the Bedford Road and the size and hence operational characteristics of the proposed site itself. In particular we believe that creating another signalized junction to allow buses to make right turns from Onslow Street to Bedford Road and vice versa will reduce current road capacity – already at a premium in this area of the town – and cause delays for all forms of traffic.	An Equalities Impact Assessment will be required as part of the consideration of a location for a bus station.
	As mentioned above we strongly believe that, to be truly effective, bus-based public transport must be highly convenient at the town centre end of the journey, indeed more convenient than for the private car (if only to compensate for the fact that, unlike private transport, public transport cannot offer a doorstep service at the home end of the journey.	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	Buses must therefore be able to drop off and pick up passengers in the heart of Guildford town centre, ideally at a well-located bus station, at well-designed on-street bus stands complete with shelters and real time departure information or a mixture of the two.	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	To facilitate this adequate allowance is required for vehicle layovers in the close environs of the passenger stands so as to enable effective operation and, in particular, additional bus mileage in the town centre area. Along with Arriva and Stagecoach (the other main bus operators in the Town who together with us operate all but 3 of the town's bus services) we are currently in discussion with Chris Mansfield and your consultants MVA about practical ways in which this vision might be realized to support and strengthen your aspirations for Guildford town centre including reduced car dependency and the visual/psychological effects of heavily-trafficked multi-lane carriageways.	The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision
	We firmly believe that bus-based public transport has a vital role in supporting Guildford's economy, and that of the town centre particularly, and believe that generous provision should be made for it within the core town centre, ideally through the creative use of bus-only streets/links and bus/pedestrian shared space along the whole of a regenerated North Street.	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy

	Evidence from other towns (the High Street in Exeter is a good example) would suggest that allowing bus access to otherwise largely pedestrianised zones can be achieved without compromising safety while enabling a much improved street scape. In the spirit of partnership, we as a bus operator would be willing to consider meeting reasonable defined emission standards in respect of buses travelling through the pedestrian zone and commit to excellent staff training/management/control of driver behaviour when navigating such locations (giving you every confidence that the shared space concept could be made to work).	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	Bus access into the core of the town centre is paramount for the sustainable future development of Guildford town centre as a place to enjoy for shopping, leisure, work or simply to live in. While we are desirous of having a bus station in the core of the town centre we accept that the provision of excellent on-street facilities as described earlier would be a far better alternative to a bus station at Bedford Road which is on the wrong side of the heavily-trafficked Onslow Street and some physical/psychological distance from the heart of the town centre hence the destination of most bus passengers. I trust that all those concerned with the development of the Town Centre Masterplan will heed the contents of this submission.	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
Spatial Planner, Surrey County Council	The Draft Masterplan's aim to improve infrastructure including transport, education, health and community facilities, to support a growing population and workforce, is welcomed and we look forward to working with your council to deliver this vision. We would welcome the addition of the library service to this list, although we suggest that this might be more appropriately included under the "Home and Community" heading. Our comments on specific sites and topics related to County Council operational interests and activities are set out under the headings below.	Support noted.
	Guildford Park Road car park (Site 01) - We would welcome the inclusion of this site in the Masterplan's proposals for opportunities for a comprehensive co-location scheme, to provide an improved range of civic and community facilities. However, we would seek for an alternative library site to be located closer to the heart of the town centre.	Comments noted, the updated version suggests opportunities on this site could include - Flats (including or all affordable) and / or public services offi ces potentially with public car parking and / or open space, student housing
	Land bounded by North Street/Leapale Road and Commercial Road Bus Station Site (Site 18) - Accordingly, we would welcome alternative library provision being considered as part of the comprehensive proposals for the town centre. It might be appropriate to mention the community space allocation, proposed as part of the Friary Centre redevelopment, under the section headed, "Opportunities and suggested uses."	There are references to the library in the latest version of the interim framework, in particular, the opportunity for a library as part of a community hub at Portsmouth Road surface car park
	Adult Education Institute, Sydenham Road site (site 25) - In the previous Guildford Town Centre Masterplan document, produced for consultation in June 2011, residential development was proposed as an option for this site, dependent on the provision of alternative Adult Education facilities. We would support the reconsideration of this earlier proposal for residential use, which would seem in keeping with the proposals to redevelop the adjacent Bright Hill car park for residential use. The topography of the site presents potential challenges for its redevelopment for community/education use, as is suggested in the Masterplan. However, there is an existing shortage of primary school places, which will be exacerbated by additional housing. The borough has further identified Sandfield School for expansion. This proposal would necessitate the finding of an adjacent site. We would welcome working with the borough to identify additional suitable sites for additional primary provision.	Offer of joint working recognised. The latest version of the framework recognises that there may be potential to intensify the use of the Adult Education Centre, introduce some housing on the site.
	In accordance with our response to the Early Public Engagement on the Guildford Town Centre Master Plan in July, we reiterate our view that the Masterplan should incorporate and build on the principles of sustainable waste management to implement policies and guidance contained in PPS10 of the Surrey Waste and Minerals Plans. We would welcome the opportunity to work with the borough council to promote the general principles of sustainable waste management in accordance with the sustainable living and quality of the environment objectives of the Town Centre Masterplan. We would particularly welcome the borough council's support through commitment in the Masterplan to the following Mineral and Waste Plan objectives:	Thank you for these comments, however, this information would be far too detailed for this document.
	· encouraging sustainable construction and demolition techniques for town centre redevelopment schemes, in accordance with Surrey Waste Plan Policy CW1. This could be through a commitment to ensure that waste minimisation is addressed in all contracts for works and services, and by encouraging developers and contractors to design and to manage the subsequent construction contracts for housing, commercial and all other developments in Surrey in ways which minimise waste in the construction process; and	Thank you for you comments. This is the sort of detail that could be added as an informative on a planning permission.
	· promoting the efficient use of mineral resources in town centre redevelopment proposals in accordance with Surrey Minerals Plan Policy MC4 by promoting the use of sustainable design and construction that provides for efficient use of minerals and enables the incorporation of a proportion of recycled or secondary aggregate in new projects. It suggested that references which promote these aspects of sustainable development are included on page 58 through the insertion of additional bullet points setting out initiatives to improve the green credentials of the town centre.	This comment would need to be considered in reference to the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD, as it applies to the whole borough.
	As you are aware, our councils are currently exploring options for the town centre highway network, including the potential for changes to the town centre's gyratory system. The significant development proposals in the town centre will impact on the operation of the network, and any changes need to take these into account. The county council will be in a position comment in more detail to the Masterplan once our joint discussions on this are concluded. At this stage, our preliminary comments relating to the highway and transport aspects of the Masterplan are set out in the paragraphs below as follows:	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	· The need for feasibility studies to consider improvements to the gyratory system referred to in Paragraph 6 of page 59 page 60 are yet be resolved	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under Strengths and opportunities more detail would be welcome on the borough's aspirations for London Road station. 	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are several references (on pages 41, 61 and 62) to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund. These will need to be updated when the outcome of the bid is known. An announcement from the Department of Transport is expected in June 2012. Along with references to cycling improvements related to the LSTF bid, it should also refer to bus priority corridor, park and ride and other improvements forming the LSTF package. 	Comments noted. This has been done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With reference to Appendix 1 page 12, Park and Ride: reference to the 'existing four park and ride sites' needs to be amended to three sites, in view of the closure of the Ladymead site in spring 2011. Likewise, the diagrammatic map on the same page needs to be amended to reflect this change. 	Comments noted. This has been done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Masterplan could usefully outline what future plans the borough have to ensure that bus shelters are placed where they best meet the needs of bus passengers, and are of a sympathetic design. Especially given that a new contract will need to be signed with the next few years. 	Comments noted, this has been referenced in the document - "The Council will work with Surrey County Council and bus user groups to ensure that bus shelters are placed where they best meet the needs of bus passengers, and are of a sympathetic design. This is particularly important as that a new contract will need to be signed with the next few years."
Member of the public	I have made submissions to the Solum consultation and the earlier stages of the GBC consultation. Repetition would not gain much: my object was at least to air certain ideas. So while I will seek to recap briefly, primarily I would aim to add a few different perspectives. I am a member of the Guildford Society and know GSoc to be making comment. I am of the opinion that composite comment has a certain value, but that the more ideas are considered, the better the prospects for balanced and useful debate.	Context of the comments noted.
	1) Views of the future for Guildford must look at both "tactical" things that might be affordable and achievable in the short term, but only in the context of the "strategically" desirable, that is, things which should happen for the long term benefit of the town but are on nobody's budget in the short term. I am minded of the concept of the construction of the M25, which for many years had complete sections of road working very effectively in a local context before being joined up as the motorway; their construction then appearing as part of a long term, coherent plan. Accordingly, I am inclined to make certain pie-in-the-sky suggestions that nonetheless offer perfectly feasible component parts for short term action.	Context and background to the following comments noted.
	2) A clear aim of the GBC is to extend the commercial magic of the High Street to North Street, to revitalize the Friary Centre with its expansion and to clean up a couple of 1960s messes such as Dolphin House. The problem of the "flank of Friary Street facing Millbrook" is also mentioned. It is clear that people visit Guildford not for North Street or the Friary Centre, but for the High Street. I'm afraid that I must make the point that the High Street is the place least "improved" by GBC intervention over the last 50 years while it "improved" the whole north side and west side of North Street, the exact area it now wants to fix.	Noted, however, the town centre does not however stand still, and there are numerous areas that have development potential or need enhancement. We need to ensure Guildford is an attractive place to live and to visit and a desirable location for business investment. We have therefore produced an interim framework to assist in coordination of redevelopments and enhancements.
	And a certain level of caution is still in order. Whereas modern building is a touch better than in earlier years, the new façade of Friary Street, for example, is bland and uninteresting except for the two old buildings and only better by contrast with what went before. In looking at the effects of albeit well intentioned planning, one can't help thinking of Temple Bar in Dublin, which only thrived after the local authorities failed to knock it down to create a bus station. But, in general, I think that the concept of extending the architectural style of the High Street to North Street and beyond is highly desirable. In this context I would make the comment that "conservation area" can also mean improvement: the surface of Jeffries Passage has been improved from dirt and the Abbot Hospital increased in size in the same style. More of the same rather than Dolphin House, please. I would, rather than your models of Bath and the like, point you at Durham, which although it has never had any money (well not for a 1000 years or so) is remarkably stylish and blends modern and old very well, including entirely new but traditional looking shopping streets.	Thank you for this information. A north Street Design and Development Brief is currently being prepared by the Council, see http://www.guildford.gov.uk/NorthstreetdesignanddevelopmentbriefSPD for more information.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the viewpoint of TRAFFIC, I think that the boundary should be extended to cover Waterden Road, Harvey Road Castle Hill and Rack's Close. Because the aim is increasingly to throw traffic out of the High Street and now North Street, cognizance must be given the fact that they were thoroughfares to deal with traffic, and if they are no longer permitted to, there is still a need for E-W traffic. Sydenham Road and those adjacent to it inevitably take the strain. There is a strong argument in my view in pedestrianizing the area by Castle Arch and the museum, taking the link from Sydenham Road to Quarry Street by another route. I'll leave you to ponder on that, but with the thought that it would enable the gardens opposite to open up onto the museum frontage. 	The area covered by the interim framework is shown on a map on page eight of the document. Most respondents to the consultation on the draft masterplan agreed with the suggested boundary. One slight amendment made has been to exclude Dapdune Wharf and the Woodbridge Road sports ground, as these are considered to be too remote. These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy

	<p>From the viewpoint of RETAIL CENTRE, the boundary should cover the Ladymead stores. It is undeniable that these are a large draw. They are also a good potential source of service for the main centre and the two should be considered together. I believe that there should be large multi-storey parking facilities provided there (and proper traffic control, of which more anon) together with a good mass transit to the centre (tram or monorail, not bus I think). If you are concerned that Guildford should keep its lead over the rest, it should have a couple new sexy attributes and, above all, ease of access, which primarily means roads and parking. Large isolated French towns with large hinterlands that it is not possible to cover with buses deal easily with traffic by slotting it away into car parks that are frequently underground. Very popular towns like Bruges, which is well down in the water table, do exactly the same thing. [NB: Bruges has extremely cheap railway station car parking (available to all) with a shuttle into town. For them it's the more the merrier (very profitably so). I would suggest the same for Ladymead car parks].</p>	<p>The area covered by the interim framework is shown on a map on page eight of the document. Most respondents to the consultation on the draft masterplan agreed with the suggested boundary. Ladymead is not considered a town centre location in terms of planning policy. Lack of sites in the central retail area of the town centre is resulting in an increasing amount of new retail floorspace being developed in out of centre locations such as Ladymead retail park, leading to retail spend being diverted to out of centre locations and to other competing town centres. If this continues, other competing town centres and out of centre locations will gain visitors and expenditure relative to Guildford town centre, which will be relatively disadvantaged. As Guildford's 2006 Retail Study explained and the 2011 Retail and Leisure Study reiterated, "standing still is akin to decline in retail terms; if other centres continue to improve their retail offer, so must Guildford if it is to retain its current position."</p>
	<p>4) TRAFFIC VERSUS PEDESTRIANS Whereas in the 1960s provision for the car left pedestrians with subways and ugly zig-zag foot bridges, the reconquest of the roads in an obstructive manner is an over-correction. More than ever before the local population uses its own wheels and feet in combination.</p>	<p>These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy</p>
	<p>If I may, just one comment on presentation. The liberal and repetitive use of "sustainable" is vacuous. It is also incongruous in a document that also manages "sui generis". If you use the word once, with a brief explanation of what you consider it to mean in context, the IQ of your document would double. And where the required report style may be to use more words saying what you are going to do than doing it (and I may be guilty of the same) it might be useful to focus on actions a little more and slot away some of the truisms. (I remain aware however that the style employed is partially to defuse criticism in order to be able to get a few things done; and also to conform with general UK local government practice).</p>	<p>Thank you for all of your comments. These have been considered in the preparation of this latest version. The style of the document has been improved.</p>
	<p>(a) I've said above that new building consistent with old building is highly desirable. Features such as Milk House Gate, Jeffries Passage, etc should not be neglected in any new construction. Were you to end up with a mirror image of the High Street in North Street you would not do badly. But I would keep as far as Leapale Road open to traffic (it'll give flexibility on playing with buses) and only pedestrianise at the bottom (which would give more of a piazza effect).</p>	<p>The revised North Street brief deals with built form on this site, including a new street layout. Much of these ideas are picked up in the review of the North Street design and development brief.</p>
	<p>(b) Your ideas for mitigating the view of the Millbrook side of Friary Street and a producing a riverside walkway past Debenham's are at least interesting. A full makeover of Debenham's would probably only be feasible if the retailer quitted the site.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is recognised that the Debenhams site is privately owned.</p>
	<p>(c) In bringing in large retailers you run the risk of accusations of cloning. But your aim is to produce the sort of consumer demand that achieves high rents. I suggest that a way to ensure highly attractive mixed shopping is to make the provision of small low rent units integrated with the general development (to give it character, weft, warp, alleyways, whatever you call it) a condition of allowing the big units in.</p>	<p>it is a requirement of the NPPF for councils to promote competitive town centres that provide customer choice and a diverse retail offer and which reflects the individuality of town centres. The visions says more diverse, quality shops will also increase our visitor attractions alongside cultural and leisure opportunities.</p>
	<p>(d) A night time economy needs night time attractions. It's probably boring to say that an arts cinema at the junction of the North Street and High Street might help, but it'll help more than a failed clothes shop. The tendency for night-time venues to be along the river or at the other end of the High Street is an obvious cause of the High Street being quiet. If you look at Freiburg (as you suggest) it's central square is full of attractive, old looking (but reconstructed as we bombed it flat) buildings housing restaurants and bars. Perhaps you'd better re-invent the Bull's Head and a couple of others in the middle of the High Street. I must also say one other thing. A concentration of people is needed to create a demand for culture, goods and services. With large populations comes civilization. Guildford has a reasonable hinterland but not a big population. Its success therefore depends on bringing people in. Dealing with traffic and parking effectively are therefore as important as commercial retail and cultural development. People tend to want the advantages and buzz of London and the tranquillity of Godalming. It is not beyond the wit of man to combine these.</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestions. It is an objective of the interim framework to promote a diverse evening and night time economy, including later shopping hours.</p>
	<p>(e) I think you have your own ideas for town gateways and an attractive entrance to Guildford in the form of a landmark railway station building. I'm intrigued by your mention of a different future for Millmead in that context.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
	<p>One of the best improvements to Guildford is the treatment of Chapel Street. A complete success. Creation of urban oases by the river, specifically next to the Electric Theatre (where I believe that the Guildford Society has proposed an extension in similar style to the Rodboro building with arches underneath to close off the area from Onslow Street to create a Neal's Yard/ Paternoster Square sort of space) and the old Farnham Road bus station made into gardens, the two linked by a new, <i>low level</i> footbridge, would be first rate. Your plans for buildings (?) to house a new river side market between Debenham's and the Friary passage chime in very well. The Farnham Road Gardens, as they would be, might also benefit from a bandstand. One highly successful innovation in Godalming is the throwing open of a new bandstand for hire by local musicians. Guildford's bandstand in the Castle Grounds is associated with open air theatre productions. A second one in this new river side space for music would, I suggest, work well. You have good scope for something in Tunsgate too. The east side of Tunsgate is attractive, the west side less so (the back end of Tunsgate Square needs a facelift). It would not hurt to pedestrianise it. As a throwaway, there has been a flower stall under the arches for many years. Why on earth don't you give them a glass enclosure there? It would look much more attractive and give them more of a chance. You have something in mind for Tunsgate Square that will open up a view of the castle? Interesting.</p>	<p>Thank you for these suggestions. Tunsgate is proposed for enhancement, potentially by pedestrianisation or at least by shared surfaces in the strategy of the interim framework.</p>

	NB: I have elsewhere called for a new square in the Friary extension that would be as interesting and as much of a draw as the Plaza Major, Salamanca. In this country I suppose it might benefit from a British Museum Great Court roof to deal with the weather. In practice, unfortunately, this would attract rough sleepers and so would have to be closed at night, which is not at all desirable, so I'll retract and say open air square.	Thank you for these suggestions.
	NNB: Beautiful green spaces amongst East German buildings? Not so good: I know that you have ambitions for another urban space where Haydon Place meets North Street. Two comments: until you remake the buildings on North Street, it is too ugly there; and it remains that an important part of the utility of the town is ease of getting around it – on foot or wheels and if my concept of keeping the upper North Street open to traffic is allowed, there is less to gain there. Better if you had something closer to the Bellerby site.	The revised North Street brief deals with built form on this site, including a new street layout. Much of these ideas are picked up in the review of the North Street design and development brief.
	(a) The A3 through Guildford should really now be turned into a partially internal road, with a new A3 by pass road between Guildford and Woking dealing with A3 through-traffic and A31 traffic. This would release capacity on the old bypass to deal with a new N-S route and internal traffic and ease pressure on Ladymead, allowing it to become a local road (and to be able to deal with the new parking I suggest). The advent of the Hindhead tunnel made me feel as if I lived in a grown-up country. Guildford deserves to benefit from this type of development no less than Hindhead (and ideally without a 30 year wait).	We recognise that local traffic issues including congestion, parking and public transport facilities such as the bus station are key areas of concern to the local public. We do not have all the information we need yet to develop a movement strategy for the town centre, but are working on this alongside Surrey County Council, which is responsible for most of the roads in the area, and also the Highways Agency which is responsible for the major roads, including the A3. When we have completed these technical studies we will consider the technical evidence with Surrey County Council and will draw up a final framework, which will include a movement strategy.
	(b) The N-S route through Guildford and separation of through and local traffic would be useful:	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	· I have suggested a road bridge across the tracks to the north of the railway station to enable linking in of any development at the Guildford Park Road car park and with the possibility of a link road past the Cathedral to the A3 (which might also produce a good Easter processional route). It would ease pressure on Woodbridge Road and the main roundabout in the gyratory system.	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	· You may consider whether a new road link across Broadford from Shalford to Old Portsmouth Road at Pews Corner (following the railway line) would help shift through-traffic away from the roundabout towards the Cathedral link. The last part into Guildford could usefully follow the exact line of the railway and go above it with a new tunnel or cutting (so as to avoid too much on the Old Portsmouth Road past the Law College.	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	Please excuse this outrageous thinking, but if there is a chance of any of it happening, you can start to think about accommodating it piecemeal. If it's never suggested it will never be thought about. I have seen other plans for a great tunnel from Millbrook to York Road which make mine seem cheap by comparison.	Thank you for your suggestions, and for taking the time to respond to the consultation and give us your ideas. All comments have been considered.
	You have park and ride but you have traffic jams at the Sydenham Road car park. Only sufficient or innovative parking at the edge of the town centre will handle this. As a local I already find it pleasant and cheaper to meet some of my needs in Godalming rather than Guildford. In the final analysis the only way to deal with traffic that wishes to park is to slot it swiftly off-road into parking or price it to deter entry (not what you want, I think). You have my proposal for Ladymead multi-storey car parks plus transport link. NB: I think it is also sensible to co-ordinate edge of town parking with edge of town shopping or entertainment venues. I would have been inclined to have a decent multi-storey next to G-Live and you have taken on board some part of my suggestion for Millbrook car park for that side of town plus the Yvonne Arnaud (you have proposed double decking - but where's my roof garden?!).	The parking strategy revision is currently being prepared and is considering suitable level of parking. Public transport also needs improving. No change required
	I have suggested elsewhere two straight pedestrian routes into Guildford from the railway station (you call it train station if you must!):	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	(a) The one with a long sweep from the station to a bridge over Bridge Street, then following the line of the foot path down to the river, with a spur bridge across to the Electric Theatre and a continuation across Onslow Street, ending at the entrance to North Street (behind the restaurant piercing the façade there?). The other across your new pedestrian bridge from the station across Walnut Tree Close and the river, then cutting a new route through the Quadrant (with shops on either side) sweeping up to an open topped bridge across Onslow Street, then either piercing the Friary Centre or subsiding alongside it to reach ground level at the entrance to North Street. This ought to do away with much (though not all) pedestrian demand to cross at grade, such that pulses of traffic would move more easily...	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	...which improvement would be enhanced by the separately recommended proposal to make the Friary Bridge two-way. (No need to go into that again here. I see that you propose a review).	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	I like your idea that the pedestrian crossing at the Foot of the High Street should be lined up with the Town Bridge (so enable crossing Millbrook to either side of the High Street and preventing the traffic foul-up) but then I would, wouldn't I?	Support noted.

	There is only so much you can do by attempting to cut out road space for bicycles. I would concentrate on separate cycle routes where at all possible and leave those on the road to sort themselves out. Ultimately, if you are on a road there is little cotton wool that can be provided. But the route along the old railway line to Cranleigh and beyond is first rate. I have suggested a link from the Shalford Road cycleway to the Hog's Back via Millmead with a new path along the south side of the Millbrook car park (that could link also with your Debenhams walkway). Otherwise, simple, new, cycle and pedestrian routes through the back streets might be useful. New pedestrian and cycle routes have been suggested elsewhere, so I'll not repeat further.	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	I would only say that when buses were a serious part of most people's lives and a fully integrated service was a social necessity and duty, it took Onslow Street and Farnham Road bus stations to provide the service. You must make your decision on the level of service you feel possible and that people can be persuaded into and make your choices accordingly. My suggestion of remote depots and bus hubs in North Street and at the Railway Station as an alternative has been aired. I can't ask for more than that. I would say though, that if you run into flak because Bedford Road car park is deemed too small, you do have Mary Road car park as a back- up/extension. I really don't think it advisable to have a separated "eastern" service ending in the Upper High Street (hence the need to keep Leapale Road open). The alternative to the current arrangements and the improvement to the shopping centre in consequence must be very attractive to carry the crowd. Er, good luck!	We acknowledge that we do not have all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework. This is why the current document will be interim. For this reason, it is also most accurately termed a framework, not a detailed master plan. Thank you for the sentiments.
	8) HOUSING. We have in this country some of the smallest houses and flats in Europe. That is unforgivable and unnecessary. We kid ourselves that it is because of the lack of space/land prices or even the Green belt. Yet not only France but the more crowded parts of Germany, the low countries and Denmark do better than us. I think that Guildford should help to lead the way in what can be done to give our people decent living space. Where the clichéd slogan "affordable" appears, I should like it replaced by "decent and sufficient". I have seen a nominally two storey house in Germany (that here would be considered a small town house) that has a small garden and space for just one car in front, yet it actually has four floors including a basement, a very stylish large spiral staircase and excellently sized rooms. This is a question of design. In Guildford you have good scope to sanction large, well proportioned, rows or terraces of four storey town houses to replace two storey dwellings. These could have the facility to house wealthy families or be subdivided into flats, cheek-by-jowl, with reconversion as appropriate. Think Royal Crescent in Bath (but less grand) for the scope and flexibility in use. The latest development on the old Min. of Ag. and Fish site underwhelms a little and seems rather too urban and crammed in for the setting.	Comments noted. Given the need for housing, efficient use of space is a significant consideration. Affordable housing is a defined term in the NPPF.
	Once again, apologies for my lateness. Some of my comments have direct relevance to the town centre, some indirect, but I really think you have to consider the larger context.	Thank you for taking the time to respond to the consultation. All responses have been considered as the document has been updated.
Burpham Community Association	1. Commenting on the draft Master Plan is difficult, because the process by which the Master Plan has been constructed is itself deeply flawed. First, the process has failed to take advantage of the provisions for widespread public consultation and involvement under the Localism Act and the draft National Planning Policy Framework. Second, the Master Plan is based on inadequate research, out of data and inadequate analysis. Third, the area covered by the Master Plan does not understand how the social entity called 'Guildford' operates and how the central Guildford area is intrinsically connected with and is affected by the areas immediately surrounding it. BCA's concern is therefore that any public comment will be seen as modifications to the existing proposed draft plan, rather than recognizing that a totally new approach is required.	There have been four key significant stages of engagement, the responses to which can be viewed here: http://www.guildford.gov.uk/article/3969/Consultation-responses □ town centre area action plan issues and options (2005) town centre area action plan preferred options (2006) early engagement before drafting the master plan (June-July 2011) consultation on the draft town centre master plan (December 2011-January 2012).The interim town centre framework has evolved from the earlier draft Guildford Town Centre Area Action Plan and draft Town Centre Masterplan. Comments on these earlier draft documents have been taken into account in preparing this interim framework. These comments can all be viewed on the Council's website. The main issues raised are covered in this list of FAQs. the interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision.
	2. We are also deeply concerned that GBC seems to have pre-empted some crucial decisions, in particular the location of the bus station, in a way that completely undermines any claim to have carried out a proper process of public consultation.	There will be consultation with the public about location options for bus facilities in the town. These options will depend upon the results of transport modelling of potential options for this in the town centre. No decisions have yet been made about future bus facilities; the views expressed through the public consultation, which will take place later this year, will help to inform the Council's decision on the matter.
	1. Whilst BCA welcomes the emphasis on the importance of the River Wey, it asks that the way that the river connects with areas around the town centre is more fully recognized. The river Wey through Burpham is an important community asset and is a key link with Burpham and the town centre.	We agree much more needs to be made of the river. This is recognised and reflected in a separate strategy section for the river in the interim framework; see section 6.6 River Wey (page 97). The interim framework sets out aspirations to plan such improvements. The Delivery section of the interim framework explains specific projects already known to deliver these. Further work will then need to be brought forward to deliver these, in consultation with the community and other interested parties.

	2. The area covered by the Master Plan is itself part of its completely flawed approach. The area needs to be enlarged and the implications for transport and supporting infrastructure need to be more deeply and widely taken into contact. The absence of a comprehensive transport plan is a major weakness in the strategy.	The interim framework is a stand alone document and will not form part of the new Local Plan, part of the development plan for the whole borough. The interim town centre framework's vision will however be the vision used for the town centre in the draft Local Plan Strategy. As a formally adopted Council strategy, the interim town centre framework will have a similar status to the Council's Economic Strategy and Conservation Area Character Appraisals but it will not have statutory status, as the Local Plan and supplementary planning documents (SPD) do. Once the new Local Plan strategy document is in place, anticipated to be in 2014, we will consider adoption of the town centre framework as a SPD. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework.
	3. The proposed Master Plan is predicated on a retail strategy for the town centre which is not based on adequate analysis of either the needs or the opportunities. The need for more retail outlets is debateable and a well-founded case for this has not been established.	We appreciate that large scale retail development in the town centre is not a popular proposal with all of the public. The future demand retail has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology. Allowance has been made for special forms of trading such as internet retailing, and planning permissions that were approved but not built out at the time of writing. Lack of sites in the central retail area of the town centre is resulting in an increasing amount of new retail floorspace being developed in out of centre locations such as Ladymead retail park, leading to retail spend being diverted to out of centre locations and to other competing town centres. If this continues, other competing town centres and out of centre locations will gain visitors and expenditure relative to Guildford town centre, which will be relatively disadvantaged. As Guildford's 2006 Retail Study ¹ explained and the 2011 Retail and Leisure Study ² reiterated, "standing still is akin to decline in retail terms; if other centres continue to improve their retail offer, so must Guildford if it is to retain its current position." ¹ Chase and Partners, 2006 Guildford Retail Study ² Roger Tym and Partner, 2011, Guildford Retail and Leisure Study
	4. Of major concern to Burpham residents is that the proposed Master Plan completely fails to recognize the importance of Burpham residents having access to public transport routes that allow direct access from Burpham to the hospital and the university. For that reason, we request that our previous representations on the importance of cross-Guildford bus routes be taken into consideration and seen as part of the current consultation.	The interim framework focuses on the town centre. Other work, primarily, the Local Plan Strategy will consider the borough as a whole.
	5. The proposed Master Plan is lacking in vision, and fails to understand the nature and character of Guildford as a gap town surrounded by areas of outstanding natural beauty. Because it is based on a flawed vision, the proposed Master Plan inevitably comes to inappropriate proposals.	The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. The redevelopment of the identified sites, along with area enhancements and other interventions including town centre management interventions will together deliver the vision.
	BCA also fully supports and endorses the submission to the consultation made by the Guildford Society. Please would you regard this submission as part of our own response.	Noted.
Environmental Forum	The GEF supports the principle of regeneration of the town centre to ensure that Guildford has a successful town centre for all parts of the community for decades to come. We feel that there are some good elements within the plan. However, we have some concerns that the master plan in its current form will not deliver prosperity and a vibrant hub for the community. The plan also appears to be too retail focused and a more balanced view needs to be promoted.	Support noted. The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre. We appreciate that large scale retail development in the town centre is not a popular proposal with all of the public. The future demand retail has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology.
	Whilst the document follows a usual structure of:	Title field - no response required.
	1) Setting the vision	Title field - no response required.
	2) Undertaking an analysis of the issues	Title field - no response required.
	3) Defining a strategy	Title field - no response required.
	4) Defining the delivery	Title field - no response required.

	<p>We feel that the plan does not actually follow through this process and does not demonstrate how the vision will be delivered. Therefore the plan and its associated evidence base is deficient in a number of areas and could be reinforced to make it a suitably robust document that will withstand public scrutiny, the planning process and the test of time. Lastly, whilst the master plan asks for comments on a number of issues it is not clear if this is actually the final master plan or a working interim version for consultation.</p>	<p>Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council (the highway authority) do not currently have all of the transport evidence needed to produce a movement strategy, to include solutions to existing transport issues. No plan for the town centre at this moment in time can provide all of the solutions needed to issues affecting the area. Work is ongoing to investigate potential solutions to reduce the impact of the car on the town centre, including reducing the level of through-traffic (journeys which neither start or end in the town centre). Further studies are in hand and will inform a comprehensive transport strategy for the town centre, to be set out in the final town centre framework. Progress in implementing the interim town centre framework's vision and objectives will be reported in the Council's annual town centre vitality and viability report. Outstanding evidence studies will be completed, before further public engagement takes place in 2013 to inform preparation and adoption of the final town centre framework.</p>
	<p>We have identified the key areas where we feel that the plan needs to be supplemented. - The strategy section of the plan appears to be missing a number of key elements. We understand and fully support the principle of using development to create a better place. However, the plan does not set out either the quantum for each development that is being proposed or the quantum of infrastructure required to resolve the current problems and facilitate the new development. Additionally the strategies do not demonstrate how the vision will be delivered and therefore need to be reinforced.</p>	<p>This information would be detailed for a document of this nature. Housing numbers will be included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the Local Plan Strategy and Delivery documents, all forming part of the new Local Plan.</p>
	<p>To have a robust approach the council needs to identify - 1) the quantum of development</p>	<p>This information would be detailed for a document of this nature. Housing numbers will be included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the Local Plan Strategy and Delivery documents, all forming part of the new Local Plan.</p>
<p>a. retail</p>		<p>This information would be detailed for a document of this nature. Housing numbers will be included in the Retail Needs Survey, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the Local Plan Strategy and Delivery documents, all forming part of the new Local Plan.</p>
<p>b. employment</p>		<p>This information would be detailed for a document of this nature. Housing numbers will be included in the Economic Land Assessment, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the Local Plan Strategy and Delivery documents, all forming part of the new Local Plan.</p>
<p>c. residential</p>		<p>This information would be detailed for a document of this nature. Housing numbers will be included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the Local Plan Strategy and Delivery documents, all forming part of the new Local Plan.</p>
	<p>We would question the long term viability of the retail expansion and suggest a more mixed and flexible approach is required.</p>	<p>We appreciate that large scale retail development in the town centre is not a popular proposal with all of the public. The future demand retail has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology. Allowance has been made for special forms of trading such as internet retailing, and planning permissions that were approved but not built out at the time of writing. Lack of sites in the central retail area of the town centre is resulting in an increasing amount of new retail floorspace being developed in out of centre locations such as Ladymead retail park, leading to retail spend being diverted to out of centre locations and to other competing town centres. If this continues, other competing town centres and out of centre locations will gain visitors and expenditure relative to Guildford town centre, which will be relatively disadvantaged. As Guildford's 2006 Retail Study¹ explained and the 2011 Retail and Leisure Study² reiterated, "standing still is akin to decline in retail terms; if other centres continue to improve their retail offer, so must Guildford if it is to retain its current position."</p>
	<p>2) Infrastructure strategies required to support this level of development. These need to be defined and costed to ensure that any proposals are deliverable. These infrastructure strategies should include:</p>	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the new Local Plan</p>
<p>a. Transportation strategies</p>		<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the new Local Plan</p>
<p>a.i. Highway strategy to address the current problems</p>		<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the new Local Plan</p>

	a.ii. Public transport strategy demonstrating that any alterations proposed to the location will actually work, and will support the parking strategy.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the new Local Plan
	a.iii. Demonstration that the desired modal shift can be delivered and therefore the reduction in the parking numbers will not adversely impact on the economy of the town centre.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the new Local Plan
	a.iv. Slow mode strategy to support the place making work	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the new Local Plan
	a.v. Provision made for electric vehicles and infrastructure provided to support the use of non carbon vehicles.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the new Local Plan
	b. Green Infrastructure Strategies	A Green Infrastructure Study is currently being prepared and will feed it into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan
	b.i. How the council will deliver the improvements to the river.	A Green Infrastructure Study is currently being prepared and will feed it into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan
	b.ii. How these improvements relate to the wider green network.	A Green Infrastructure Study is currently being prepared and will feed it into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan
	b.iii. How this infrastructure can be used to reduce the flood risk to the town centre (we understand that a solution to this problem is very expensive).	A Green Infrastructure Study is currently being prepared and will feed it into the Infrastructure Delivery Plan
	c. Social Infrastructure	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the new Local Plan
	c.i. The social infrastructure needed to addresses both the deficiencies in the existing infrastructure and the needs of any future increase in population.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the new Local Plan
	c.ii. The role of the town centre as a hub for everybody to use and the tangible benefits of this.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the new Local Plan
	d. Utility and Resource management infrastructure and policies	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the new Local Plan
	d.i. The plan needs to have a strategy defining how it will minimise the amount of resources it requires, particularly the use of energy and water. Town centre developments have the density and scale to deliver community based renewable energy projects in a cost effective way. This has to be led by the council and not delivered in a piecemeal way.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the new Local Plan
	d.ii. GEF historically provided funds for the council to support this work we would like to see this work updated and integrated into the plan.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be prepared as part of the new Local Plan
Economic and Sustainable Property Consultant	I have been asked to write and support the Guildford Societies re - think regarding the Master Plan. Much of this needs urgent consideration. Here are a few points:	Context noted
	1. What is the long-term vision for Guildford, beyond the next 25 years? I have no idea.	This document covers up to 2030 and will be monitored through the Annual Monitoring Report and updated when needed.
	2. In the last 25 years the traffic from the Science Park & University has increased dramatically. Much of this come into and through the town centre, as well as creating major congestion on the west side of town. What is the 25 year traffic plan?	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy
	3. Sustainability is to do with people, place and property. There is no vision as to what type of people (rich, poor, resident, shoppers?) should use the town, no vision as to what sort of place (another Tottenham High Road or another Freiburg?) and no vision regarding property (more & more shops and traffic, and no residents, or vice versa?)	The interim framework now includes a much stronger vision for the town centre.
	4. I have looked hard but can find any WHOLE-LIFE CARBON ASSESSMENT (embodied, in-use, traffic & redevelopment carbon) for Guildford. If we are worried about the environment, pollution, climate change, the cost of energy, a healthy city etc....., why is this missing. Is it because we don't care? I hope not.	The NPPF requires Councils to plan for new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This is a consideration for the Local Plan Strategy and Delivery documents.
	5. As our neighbour is Woking and our twin town is Freiburg, why aren't we learning from both these to create a long-term vision. They have one - as does Godalming; why not Guildford?	A long term vision for the borough will be prepared as part of the Local Plan Strategy. The timetable for the preparation of this document is available on the Council's website at www.guildford.gov.uk/lds
Member of the Public	I am a member of the Guildford Society and attended their meeting on Tuesday 10 January 2012 at St Nicholas Hall when we heard from Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners, who have been asked to prepare a critique of the GBC's proposals.	Context noted
	I am very concerned about various aspects as follows: - 1. Road and traffic problems are a very high priority because of Guildford's situation at a break in the Downs, which has the effect of funnelling road, rail and water routes into a tight space.	These issues will be considered with transport evidence in formulating a movement strategy in the final framework. Will be included in a Movement Strategy

	2. The retail economy, including the night scene is also critical to ensure Guildford's survival as a living town.	It is an objective to promote a diverse evening and night time economy, including later shopping hours, and to provide opportunities for a wide range of retail businesses including markets to trade to retain the town centre's competitiveness
	3. The leisure aspect is important to attract visitors; this includes the Heritage industry, which is well represented in Guildford. The river Wey, running through the town is also a tremendous asset.	Agree.
	I am particularly concerned that, because we are at such a critical time, enough time is given for discussions to take place before decisions are made which would affect future generations of Guilfordians	There have been four key significant stages of engagement, the responses to which can be viewed here: http://www.guildford.gov.uk/article/3969/Consultation-responses <input type="checkbox"/> town centre area action plan issues and options (2005) town centre area action plan preferred options (2006) early engagement before drafting the master plan (June-July 2011) consultation on the draft town centre master plan (December 2011-January 2012). All comments received through community engagement have been fully considered in the preparation of the interim town centre framework.
Guildford town resident	Lost and ugly views - (Objective 5, p.4) (Weaknesses an threats, p.5) (Townscape Areas – Commercial Quarter, p.15) (Boundary, p.7) Views and Vistas, p.55). One of Guildford's greatest assets is its views. Sadly, monolithic, over-bulky buildings replace once much-loved views. The rural view from North St has almost been obliterated by ugly development. The rural view to the right as one leaves the front of the railway station has been replaced by a bulky and unworthy building. Even the much-loved view from the High St has been marred by unsightly high rise buildings. The High St was once awesome with its far-reaching view which swept downhill across the Town Bridge and up again. This magnificent view has been destroyed, and the High St scarred and cut in half by the Millbrook Rd with its continuous heavy traffic. Large buildings, such as Debenhams, have been built right up to the river destroying precious riverside scenery and ugly multi-storey car parks have added to the unsightliness of the town. The over-bearing bleakness of the Friary Centre when entering Guildford from Farnham Rd, the block monolithic buildings in Onslow St and the much-disliked riverside development on the Bedford Rd Site have over the years added to the despair of the Guildford people. Bland unattractive development has marred the Upper High St as well as Tunsgate. The view of the only remaining church steeple, as seen from Swan Lane connecting the High St and North St, and from Commercial Rd and Woodbridge Rd, will unfortunately be lost when the Friary extension development takes place. The impact of the Friary Development on views, both short and long-distance, is of the greatest importance.	Comments noted regarding views. Important views are recognised in the document.
	North St - (2 Vision, p.3 – Environment) (Site 16) (Objective 5, p.4) (Historic Core – Design) (4 Strategy, p. 19) (Retail Need, p.21) (Views and Vistas, p.55). North St was once lined with Victorian buildings built with Bargate stone, while a church with a steeple at the bottom gave the street a strong focal point and character. The once rural view at the end added to the street scene. The poor quality developments which replaced these buildings and the ugly buildings which have obliterated the rural view have destroyed North Street as a street of civic pride. North St could once again be recognized for its enormous potential as a street of the future. It has an excellent setting in the centre of Guildford, not unlike the High St in that it is on a slope with a view. With a vision continuing for the next 40 to 50 years, its view could be restored, a focal building of great interest and high quality architecture could be built to once again act as a focal point. The unattractive developments, which have done so much damage to North St and its setting, could be replaced by not just 'well-designed' buildings, but buildings of outstanding merit, which themselves might in the future become listed. The old carefully mixed with the new could create an outstanding street to complement the High Street, bringing about another great shopping experience.	The revised North Street brief deals with built form on this site, including a new street layout. Much of these ideas are picked up in the review of the North Street design and development brief.
	Parts of North St are old or historic and must be preserved, either because the buildings are in their own right of historical worth or because they will give the street atmosphere. There is the house built by George Abbot for the cotton worker's, Jefferies passage, the back of Guildford House area which has enormous potential, Quaker's Acre, the old Mechanics Institute building (now a bank), the old fire station built by Henry Peak (now public toilets) along with three other Peak buildings, the former Horse and Groom pub, bombed by the IRA (now Lombok furniture) with the 17 th C Childe/Martyr barn behind, the police station (now Laura Ashley), the French Connection and many other old buildings which will enhance any future redevelopment of North St.	The revised North Street brief deals with built form on this site, including a new street layout. Much of these ideas are picked up in the review of the North Street design and development brief.
	New development of the very highest quality needs to be carefully planned to complement these old buildings. Modern shop fronts, just because they are modern, do not automatically mean that they are of merit. North St is closely connected to the High St and bus stops in North St bring in people to both these streets in the centre of the retail area and town amenities. Buses arriving from the east side of the town need to be retained. A benefit to North St would be shared space with a 10 mph speed limit, so that only essential traffic such as buses would use it, and it would become pedestrian dominated.	Comments noted. The North Street Design and Development Brief sets out more detail relating to the design principles of redeveloping the North Street site including having regard to the surrounding character and scale of buildings.

	<p>The High St - (Historic Core Map) (Objective 6, p.4) (Historic Core, p.15) (Views and Vistas, p.55) - In a long-term vision, both the rural view from the High St and the magnificent view which once swept down the High Street and across the river could be fully restored. A tunnel even a short one, which would take the traffic under the High St rather than across it, needs serious consideration in a long-term vision. The High Street could benefit from extra liveliness and movement brought about by residents living above its shops; from later and longer opening of shops, later opening hours of cafes and later hours of pedestrianisation. Cafes and restaurants at the top and bottom of the High St benefit the street atmosphere.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>The Bus Station and High St shops (Object 3, p.4) (Retail need, p.21) (Infrastructure Delivery, p.60) (Site 09) The present bus station is positioned in the best and most pleasant position to serve shoppers (and those working in the shops) in all retail areas in the centre of the town. A move to Bedford Rd could impact on where people shop, channelling shoppers into the Friary Centre and extension, rather than serving the High St, at present the main shopping area. Shoppers only have so much time and energy in which to shop and many may not venture beyond the Friary Centre shopping complex, particularly if, as expected, popular shops from the High St move into the Friary – plus the farmer's and craft markets at present held in the High St. (p.5)</p>	<p>Comments noted. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>It is a considerably longer walk from Bedford Rd to the High St shops and its connecting passages, to Tunsgate, the Upper High St, Castle St, the Adult Education Centre, and to the Post Office, library, tourist office and banks. It would be more difficult and take longer to reach Debenhams and the Yvonne Arnaud theatre. Particularly if retail forecasts proved over-optimistic Guildford's famous High St and connecting areas could be at risk. It needs to remain vibrant with as many popular and varied shops as possible. A dead High St would be a blight on the town.</p>	<p>Concern noted. The area is not for an expansion to the friary shopping area but a redevelopment site for a mix of uses. This is unlikely to take the form of a shopping centre but individual units with streets as an extension of the primary shopping area. The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sqm is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floor space. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping. The interim town centre framework identifies opportunities for a new community hub including meeting places for local communities.</p>
	<p>Town Centre Seats, Cafes and Markets (Townscape Areas, p.15) (Historic Core) (Analysis – Weaknesses and Threat, p.5) (Tree planting, p.44) (Markets, p.57) There are seats at the top of the Upper High St by Trinity Gate, in the middle of the Upper High St by the Royal Grammar School, at the upper end of the High St outside Holy Trinity Church, in Tunsgate, in Milkhouse Square, at the bottom of the pedestrianised area of the High St, in Millbrook opposite Debenhams, in Quaker's Acre in North St and many by the river. Much of the seating is in quiet places away from traffic. In the Masterplan extra seating is proposed to be added in North St. This should not take away space needed for those visiting Friday and Saturday markets.</p>	<p>Comments noted and the provision for markets is addressed in the interim town centre framework.</p>
	<p>There are all numerous cafes in the town centre, including in the Yvonne Arnaud theatre, Debenhams, House of Fraser, Marks and Spencer, Waterstone's Bookshop, Guildford House, and the Angel Hotel (the latter five in the High St), by the junction in the middle of the High St, Chapel St, White Lion Walk, Angel Gate, Milkhouse Square, Tunsgate Square (a large covered café area) and Chapel St. There are cafes in upper and lower North St, the Guildford Institute and the Friary and so on. There are also pubs and restaurants. It would be a shame, if the much-loved markets in the scenic High St and in the setting of North St were moved to the Friary extension square due to a perceived lack of seating on the High St/North St slopes. The craft markets in the High St are much enjoyed, and North St nearby becomes a welcoming and busy street on market days. It is a joy to show visitors around on market days</p>	<p>Comments noted and the provision for markets is addressed in the interim town centre framework.</p>
	<p>The High St, together with Tunsgate, provides a large area of public space, and the width of North St also provides public space. Furthermore markets, to keep high streets vibrant, were strongly recommended in Mary Portas' report. It is essential that no actions which would damage the vibrancy of Guildford's famous High St are taken. The former round-the-town bus which started from the railway station was a benefit for Guildford's hilly town centre. A station bus needs to run frequently. It may have been more used if it had run every ten minutes instead of twenty minutes.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
	<p>Chapel/Castle St (Primary Shopping Area and Shopping Frontages, p.12) The restaurants in the scenic area of Chapel St/Castle St make an extremely convenient and pleasant area to visit for a meal out for those who want to enjoy a quieter atmosphere. They are close to shops in the day, and yet in the evenings far enough away from the noise and brashness of the nightclub area around Bridge St. This quiet area of restaurants in a historic scenic part of Guildford, close to the High St, needs to be treasured.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

	<p>Guildford's Victorian Heritage Much of Guildford's Victorian heritage has, without thought, been destroyed. There was a condition in the first planning application for development of the Friary extension that the façade of the picturesque Victorian police station in Woodbridge Rd was to be kept. But this was knocked down to provide a temporary car park. The very small Victorian houses on Bright Hill cascading down to Sydenham Rd were demolished to provide another temporary car park. It has left a gash in a Victorian area of the town comprising the Adult Education Centre and Harvey Rd Gallery, the Victorian streets running down the hill between Sydenham Rd and Harvey Rd (part of Charlottesville area), the Victorian houses in Sydenham Rd – and further into the centre the Victorian part of Holy Trinity Church and the church hall. Much of Guildford's Victorian heritage has been destroyed, including villas and houses. We cannot bring back buildings which have gone, but in any vision we need to be extra vigilant to protect our Victorian schools, the Victorian London Rd Railway station and our Victorian houses.</p>	Comments and concerns noted.
	<p>The Adult Education Centre and Harvey Rd Gallery (<i>Eastern Fringe Map</i>) (<i>Site 25</i>) The Adult Education Centre and Harvey Road Gallery is a much-loved and much-used, locally listed landmark and community building. It is prominent in views from Sydenham Rd, particularly in winter. Any development on Bright Hill needs to fit in with and complement the Adult Education Centre and Harvey Road Gallery. The combined buildings are one of the finest examples of a Victorian school and the art facilities of the Harvey Rd Gallery are second to none along with the gallery.</p>	Comments noted.
	<p>Bright Hill Car Park (<i>Site 24</i>) (<i>Eastern Fringe Map</i>) (<i>Views and Vistas, p.55</i>) Bright Hill is a busy street, both for pedestrians and cars. It needs planning and developing with high standard buildings which take careful regard of its surroundings. It has a magnificent 80% panoramic view and of particular significance, besides the cathedral, is the rural and green view of the Mount from Bright Hill, which is much enjoyed by many people. With a shortage of green space in the town, such green views are extremely important. It is not clear from the Eastern Fringe map that the view of the Mount is to be retained. Any car park under Bright Hill needs to be well underground, so as not raise the buildings above it and cause damage to the view from the hill as it descends, or from Sydenham Rd up the hill.</p>	Comments noted. The interim town centre framework acknowledged that views are one of Guildford's assets and would seek to retain such important views.
	<p>Lewis Carroll's House It would be a huge benefit to the town if the house, where Lewis Carroll spent his vacations from Oxford and where his sisters lived, were owned by Guildford. It would put the town firmly on the tourist trail. The house has added interest for Guildford as Lewis Carroll preached at St Mary's Church and is buried on the Mount. Furthermore the house is built in the castle grounds, linking it with the castle and to Guildford Museum, where artefacts of his are displayed. The acquisition of this historic house should be part of the long-term vision for Guildford. Guildford is selling off many of its owned assets. Perhaps money from the sale of such assets could be put aside for the future acquisition of Lewis Carroll's house.</p>	Comments noted.
	<p>Guildford's Roofscape The town's roofscape, through careless ad hoc development over the years, is unattractive, yet with its hilly topography Guildford's roofscape is of the utmost importance. Every planning application for development needs to be scrutinized for its impact on the roofscape and views. A wider vision needs to cover the roofscape in hilly residential areas adjoining the town centre, where it is in views of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the river. For many years the houses in these areas and on the hills have been built into the hillsides and have merged in harmony with short and long distance views - but now houses which are over-high and over-bulky, are being built in residential gardens or replacing already well-established houses. Even if a few infill houses jut up in an ugly manner over the established roofscape, much-loved views from the river area and surrounding AONB are spoilt. Modern designed houses are promoted in National Planning Guidance, but houses with large areas of glass glinting in the sunlight, whilst causing light pollution at night, can be detrimental to views, and on hillsides are not suitable for Guildford.</p>	Comments noted.
	<p>Guildford's Art Deco Architecture Guildford has little Art Deco architecture left. A part of the now demolished cinema in the Upper High St should at least, as planned, have been incorporated into the outside wall of Trinity Gate (which replaced the cinema) in a prominent position to be seen by all those passing by. The Art Deco cinema (now boarded up) with its columns in Woodbridge Rd, or part of the cinema, could be highlighted in any new development. Its façade could make a historic gateway.</p>	Comments and suggestions noted.
	<p>Former Basketworks (Site 23) Guildford's industrial heritage could easily disappear little by little. The Basketworks building on Sydenham Rd, when repainted, is an unusual and not unattractive building. It adds to the variety of buildings in the area and is part of the town's industrial heritage. The building should be retained.</p>	Suggestion noted.
	<p>Town, River and Countryside (Objective 7, p.4) (River, p.17) Magnificent countryside once came into Guildford right up to the town lock. Suddenly an overload of heavy picnic benches standing in concrete were installed across this area and a wide path, which somehow hardened the scene, was built across it. The area turned from unspoilt countryside into a park-like area. Perhaps this is acceptable as this river area is within the town and a park area was perhaps needed. However, great care needs to be taken that the river as it leaves the town and winds its way to Shalford, is kept as magnificent rural countryside for the benefit of walkers, visitors and boaters. Established gardens backing onto the river act as a buffer between town and countryside, and vigilance is needed against inappropriate development.</p>	Comments noted. Upgrading the riverside is a key element of the strategy in the interim town centre framework.

	<p>Guildford's setting Guildford is fortunate in being in a scenic setting, surrounded by AONB, Green Belt and countryside on three sides. This asset needs to be part of any wider vision. The AONB, Green Belt and countryside surrounding Guildford is still rural and unspoilt, and comes right up to the town's edges. This is a wonderful feature of Guildford. It needs to be fiercely protected and not chipped away at the town's edges with ad hoc development caused by Local Plan reviews over the coming generations. Guildford is in one of the most densely populated areas in Europe. As a result its surrounding villages are very close together, enabling walkers to walk easily from one village to another through protected Green Belt. The town needs to strongly preserve these green spaces from being infilled and obliterated.</p>	<p>Comments noted. These environmental designations are a key consideration in the preparation of the Local Plan but the town centre does not lie within these and therefore these issues do not form part of the interim framework.</p>
	<p>Housing in the town centre (2 Vision – Home and Community, p.2) (Objective 6, p.4) (Housing, p.22) The town centre is small with narrow streets and an over-large night time economy impacts on the whole town, giving it a reputation which is not conducive or appealing to would-be residents (nor to those wishing to eat in restaurants in the town in a less noisy and more sophisticated environment.). The town needs housing, as well as shops, culture and entertainment, the latter particularly for young people. However, the town will not be appealing to live in, if it is dotted with bars with late night opening and drinking, affecting areas which could also be residential and suitable for town flats.</p>	<p>Comments noted and agree that there is a need for housing and other supporting uses.</p>
	<p>Amenities in the town centre (Objective 6, p.4) Amenities, such as the library, Guildford Borough Council offices, theatres, cinemas, Adult Education Centre and Harvey Rd Gallery, and shops, need to stay within the town centre, so that the town remains convenient for those arriving by bus, and for those within walking distance. The closeness of the town centre with its amenities is one of the reasons why Guildford is such an attractive place to live and visit.</p>	<p>Comments and support for uses noted.</p>
	<p>Millmead House and Old Millmead (Site 16) Guildford Borough Council Offices are in an ideal setting, which is welcoming and attractive for visitors. For residents the walk to the offices over or along the river is most enjoyable and for those arriving by bus or rail. The Council Chamber itself is enhanced by a green view. Old Millmead is a fine building and it comes into its own in the view across the river from Millmead Lock. Any high or bulky building, or building out of character with Old Millmead, would destroy this view. The present building next to it is a low level building.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Any redevelopment must have regard to the setting of the listed building.</p>
	<p>Library (Strengths and opportunities, p.5) (p.64) The library is in an ideal position in North St. It is close to the Post Office, banks and shopping. It is central for those walking into the town and arriving by bus. It is easy to combine a visit to the library with shopping.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
	<p>Guildford House and the Library: (p.64) It is not indicated in the Town Centre Masterplan where the library would move to and what would happen to its present building behind Guildford House. Any new development on the library site would have an enormous impact on Guildford House. It would need to be planned with care, ideally providing an attractive entrance to Guildford House from North St. The site could link up with Guildford House, the only Grade 1 listed building in the centre of the town open to the public. It is further written on p.16: <i>"Eastern fringe: This area is a transition zone whose character forms the eastern edge between the town centre and the adjacent Epsom Road and Charlottesville residential areas. Residential areas have been fragmented. Leisure developments provide a buffer between the predominantly retail and residential areas"</i>.</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted. The exact location of the library is yet to be determined. Agree that the redevelopment of its existing site must have regard to its surroundings.</p>
	<p>As written, there is already a cluster of restaurants giving this area a lively atmosphere. However, it is not detailed what type of night time leisure economy is envisaged. It would be extremely unpopular to have a night time leisure economy at both ends of the town, such as that in the Bridge St area (which is already considered to be over-large by many living in or near the town centre). Residents do not like living near a night time leisure economy with late drinking hours, noise and anti-social behaviour, which can extend to their front gardens. They do not need a buffer between shops and certainly not a night time leisure buffer, such as that in Bridge St.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The night time economy can consist of leisure uses such as G Live for example. Please refer to the night time economy section of the interim town centre framework for more detail.</p>
	<p>Retail (Objective 1, p.4) (Retail need, p.20) Many residents do not wish for an overload of similar shops in Guildford, particularly as further expansion of retail may not benefit the town. Expansion of retail in the town beyond that planned in the present Friary extension application would not be welcome – and even less retail would be preferred by many. The town would benefit from regeneration with housing, rather than an overload of retail.</p>	<p>Concern noted. The area is not for an expansion to the friary shopping area but a redevelopment site for a mix of uses. This is unlikely to take the form of a shopping centre but individual units with streets as an extension of the primary shopping area. The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sqm is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floor space. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping. The interim town centre framework identifies opportunities for a new community hub including meeting places for local communities.</p>

	<p>Friary extension: (Site 18) What makes a town in the long-term is its architecture, and the impact on views of such architecture. People enjoy seeing and shopping among beautiful buildings. This will become even more important in the future as retail in the town competes with internet shopping. Westfields designed the new Friary development within a budget which allowed them to meet their profit margin at that time. This included a new bus station and the renovating of North St. However, in the present recession Westfield as the developer for this site is now in doubt, and GBC is proposing to build a new bus station and renovate North St, it appears out of their own funds. If a high standard of architecture is of the uppermost importance and is given priority, perhaps money spent by developers on infrastructure that could and would normally be paid for by the Council, could instead in a long-term vision be spent on the architecture and quality of materials used in the buildings. The Friary extension could benefit from a focal building of much interest to lift the development and the area. This would help to add to the attractiveness of the town in a central area of great importance. Also the facades of old buildings integrated into the frontage of new shopping centres can enhance them greatly.</p>	<p>Concern noted. The area is not for an expansion to the friary shopping area but a redevelopment site for a mix of uses. This is unlikely to take the form of a shopping centre but individual units with streets as an extension of the primary shopping area. The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sqm is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floor space. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping. The interim town centre framework identifies opportunities for a new community hub including meeting places for local communities.</p>
	<p>Car Parks (Parking Strategy, p.20) (Millbrook Car Park – Site 17) Ugly car parks need to be rebuilt to fit in and enhance Guildford, and where possible put underground, allowing development to take place above. The Castle Car Park is a multi-storey car park which unusually is an attractive building and fits in well with Sydenham Rd. It provides a good back-drop to Holy Trinity Churchyard. Millbrook Car Park, which is an ugly sight on entering Guildford, is proposed in the Town Centre Masterplan to be decked. It is not written whether it is to be decked to provide more car parking spaces or as a design feature. The latter would be a much needed improvement in views both from the river and from the road. Steps leading up to a grassed area above could be considered or an attractive decking infrastructure bordered by trees on the roadside. Many towns in Europe have green space above car parks.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>Open Spaces (High Quality Pocket Spaces p.44) (Appendix 1, p.21) Guildford's open spaces are delightful and charming, each with their different characters. It is important not to spoil these spaces and their special characters with unnecessary enhancement.</p>	<p>Comments noted and views supported in the interim town centre framework.</p>
	<p>Holy Trinity Churchyard: This is a much-loved green space which has mellowed over the years from medieval times. It provides a green haven in the centre of Guildford and many people walk through it on the way into town from Castle Car Park, Bright Hill Car Park and residential areas. It is surrounded by listed buildings, a listed public house and listed housing. The churchyard is particularly lovely because of its simplicity, its greenness of trees and grass with its memorials rising out of the grass adding to the scene. The romantic green mound in the middle conjures up images of the Black Death, but instead it contains bones among debris found during the Victorian extension of the church. It is at its best in the spring when the leaves on the trees have just opened and the daffodils on the mound are in bloom, but it is very special all the year round. Enhancement (particularly infrastructure) would spoil its natural charm and simplicity, in its setting of listed buildings.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
	<p>St Mary's Churchyard: St Mary's Church, Grade I listed, is the oldest church in Guildford, and its churchyard has a darker and heavier atmosphere. It once benefitted from a beautiful display of flowers at the front, similar to the displays in the Castle grounds, whilst yellow tulips were planted on the other side of the church. Tourist, visitors and passers-by were welcomed by colourful flower displays fitting to a church of such importance to the town. These planted displays could be re-introduced to add beauty to the ancient church. It is on a pedestrian route to Rosemary Alley which leads to the town lock river area, to the shops in Quarry Street, the King's Head public house and to an Italian restaurant. It is in the oldest historic part of Guildford and can be seen from the High St.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
	<p>Roads affected by traffic (Objective 3, p.4) (Traffic Calming...p.46 and 56) The problems of congested traffic or over-dominance of traffic in roads in Guildford and in the town centre are well-known, and have been written into the Masterplan. However, even attractive residential roads close to the town centre, such as Sydenham Rd (within the town centre boundary), Jenner Rd, Harvey Rd, South Hill, Castle Hill. Warwicks Bench and Pilgrim's Way, are downgraded by rat runs during rush hours. Attractive road calming measures worthy of these roads need to be designed. The pavements on Harvey Rd leading from the bottom up to Jenner Rd could perhaps be widened and the trees, which once lined the road, replanted.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>Enhancement of the Town Centre (2 Vision p.3 – Heritage) (Weaknesses and threats, p.5) (Making better places through environmental environments, p.40) (Introduce signing and way marking, p.56) Town centres, open spaces and even natural unspoilt countryside, such as the river area, can suffer from unnecessary fussy enhancement. Often these areas have their own character and are already naturally beautiful. Care needs to be taken that the town centre should not be taken over, controlled and presented in an over- vigorous effort to promote it. Signage and gateways, if needed at all, should not be over-blatant, but discreet where necessary. A balance is needed. (Visitors interested in history on arriving in a town usually go straight to the tourist office for information, maps and leaflets with self-guided walks, etc.) Interactive signage can impinge adversely upon the atmosphere of an area or building, particularly where the area or building already has natural attributes and character. Simple wooden benches often blend in better with scenic surroundings, rather than sculptured or ornamental seats. Gravestones in churchyards and cemeteries, such as in Holy Trinity Churchyard and the Mount Cemetery, give atmosphere and history to the town. It needs to be borne in mind that enhancements which are in vogue now may not be in vogue in years to come.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

	<p>Artwork: Artwork in parks and urban areas is more appropriate than in rural areas and countryside bordering rivers. (Trees and live animals enhance natural countryside, whereas man-made artwork can detract from it.) But even in urban areas, too much bulky or fussy artwork can overload an area and add to town clutter, particularly where streets are narrow. It is more meaningful and gives pride to a town, such as Guildford, if public art reflects its history. Guildford has been most successful in doing this with its George Abbot statue close to Abbot's Hospital and Holy Trinity Church, where he is buried, the Bargeman on the Town Wharf, Henry Peak plaque in the Victorian garden which he designed, and the interesting historical plaques in the town. The Alice in Wonderland and the Alice Through the Looking Glass statues, the sheep and sheepdog in Eastgate Gardens, depicting Guildford's history as a wool town (the latter gives great pleasure to visitors, who are asked to spot them!). It could enhance Guildford more in a long-term vision, if funds were built up for a more expensive statue or artwork, rather than spending on a greater amount of cheaper artwork, which would clutter the town. A less attractive part of the town could be improved with a high quality statue, and the placing of a statue/artwork on a roundabout entering the town could be explored.</p>	Comments noted.
	<p>Enhanced Lighting (<i>Night time, p.40</i>) (<i>Enhanced lighting, p.44, 46, 49 and 55</i>) Enhanced lighting needs to take account of Guildford's hilly topography. Over bright lighting can impact on night-time views. Bright lights on Bright Hill once prevented the magnificent night-time view across the town from being enjoyed. One over-bright building or area can also mar a night-time view. Historic streets also need sensitive lighting, so as to not create an over-hard scene.</p>	Comments noted.
	<p>The University The university is not within the Town Centre Masterplan boundary, but it could and should be part of a wider vision. The university has brought much economic benefit to Guildford and has created the environment for the Surrey Research Park. It is still expanding and its large car parks could be built underground, bringing it more space for development above. There is much traffic congestion affecting the university. The amount of cars brought to Guildford by students, which are then used to drive short distances between lodgings and university are often parked in residential roads causing a nuisance to residents. They add to the already huge amounts of traffic and need to be strongly controlled. Businesses, such as the university, need to be aware of the impact that over bulky buildings have on views to the Mount and the AONB. Designs need to be such that they are in harmony with views and care needs to be taken against light pollution. The impact on views from business developments needs to be part of a wider vision. A peak could be reached when the expansion of the University brings more disadvantages than advantages, such as traffic, noise and over-crowding.</p>	Comment noted. The definition of town centres is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Local Plan Strategy will cover the entire borough.
	<p>Stag Hill Development on Stag Hill impacts on views over a very wide area. Much care needs to be taken regarding any new development.</p>	Comment noted. The definition of town centres is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Local Plan Strategy will cover the entire borough.
	<p>Comments The Town Centre Masterplan earmarks individual sites for development with different options on how they could be developed. It is not known how much retail versus housing there will be, and solutions to Guildford's traffic congestion are not outlined. Ambitions for Guildford, such as high quality architecture in new developments, are not emphasised and the Masterplan does not encompass a wider vision for Guildford. Ugly buildings are noted, but a firm plan is needed to replace them, particularly those blocking important views. A concern is how developers can be prevented from putting in ad hoc applications as has happened over the years, even when an excellent brief has been produced. In any vision each known development site needs to be analysed, and the impact on views and the disadvantages of development on that site known and recorded, before a developer puts in an application. The Town Masterplan is however a good document for discussion and has caused serious thought on how Guildford can be shaped. I hope the discussion will continue in the ensuing weeks and in particular that a long-term vision for the whole of Guildford can also be brought into being, with a very strong emphasis on roofscape, good architecture and beautiful buildings to upgrade and restore the town. Debenhams - Whilst spending time by the river last weekend, I noticed what an excellent sound barrier the Debenhams building provides for the river, protecting it from the noise of very heavy traffic on Millmead Rd. I understand that there have been some thoughts of demolishing Debenhams, which is very close to the river. However, whilst the traffic remains (and with the back of Debenhams made less ugly with plants growing on its walls), as a noise barrier providing a peaceful river scene, on balance at present, keeping Debenhams might be the best option.</p>	Comments noted and issues considered in the drafting of the interim town centre framework.
	<p>Guildford's Character and Public Open Space - There has been much talk of a town square for Guildford, providing public open space and a focal point. However, Guildford has not grown up around a town square, as has happened in other cities and towns with a square. Guildford's character is in its streets and connecting alleyways and small spaces. The High St, Tunsgate, Tunsgate Square, Milkhouse Square and all the alleyways provide a large area of public open space, in addition to its green spaces. It is important that this area with its unique character remains the focal point of Guildford, and that markets continue to be held in the scenic High St and North St. Guildford High St - The scenic High St and its connecting passages provide a great shopping experience which is unique and different. The shopping experience is increasing in importance as competition increases. It would be disappointing if the popular shops at present in the High St disappeared into a new retail centre, leaving the High St dead with many charity shops, as has happened to the once thriving High St in Leatherhead (resulting in adverse national press coverage). Good Design and Architecture - While there is provision in the Local Plan to ensure good design and architecture, in practice this often does not happen. Perhaps the Local Plan could be strengthened further to ensure good design and architecture, and a way of putting this into practice found. Meeting Places - While the church halls and public houses with extra rooms provide meeting rooms for groups and societies, payment for which goes towards their upkeep, thereby benefitting the town, a community facility providing a different type of meeting room could be useful.</p>	Comments noted. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floor space. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping. The interim town centre framework identifies opportunities for a new community hub including meeting places for local communities.

Council for the Protection of Rural England	At CPRE we recognize that there is a close interdependence of town and country throughout the county and this is reflected in our tag line which reads "Standing Up for Surrey's Countryside & Towns". Many members of CPRE Guildford District live in the town and are closely linked with other organizations such as the Guildford Society, the East Guildford Residents Association, and other amenity groups. We like to think that our members are well informed. All our members recognize that a Town Centre Master Plan has value in itself, but we are also concerned about a wider context for Surrey's county town as a whole and its surrounding countryside. Unless a master plan can be established on a wider basis, we believe that many current problems will remain unresolved. Guildford has been characterized as a "slow motion" town where long outstanding problems take too long to solve, partly because major decisions about the town involve so many outside bodies, including for example the Government in power, the Environment Agency, the Highways Agency, Surrey County Council, and Thames Water. Any worthwhile vision for the town and its surroundings is going to be expensive to agree and implement, especially in a time of austerity. No one pretends that planning for Guildford is easy.	Comment noted. The definition of town centres is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Local Plan Strategy will cover the entire borough.
	CPRE believes that the Master Plan for Guildford has to recognize some tough realities relating to the need for infrastructure provision. The main problem appears to be that the Guildford Borough Council does not have control over its own destiny as it depends on so many outsiders for expertise, input and financial support. Here are a few of the issues:	Comments noted and issues taken in turn.
	(a) WATER : Problems with water supply are a common feature in the South East. Planning for growth at both Basingstoke and Horsham has already been constrained by this. CPRE has published a report that is relevant on this topic, entitled "A Water Resource Strategy for the South East of England", which is being updated at this time. The new DEFRA White Paper headed "Water for Life" also requires consideration. Surrey is lucky to have its rivers and aquifers in place but the topography of its gap towns like Guildford makes expansion difficult. We are now experiencing a winter drought and Thames Water has already announced that further shortages are likely in the future that are likely to affect planning for building provision. Thames Water has also indicated that they cannot afford to proceed with the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project which is critical for the residential planning of the whole town. Furthermore, Guildford needs up to date sewage treatment to replace obsolete facilities. It is not good enough that storm water containing waste is running down the streets when flooding occurs.	Comments noted. It is incorrect that Thames Water have indicated that they cannot afford to proceed with the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project.
	(b) FLOODING : The Environment Agency has made clear that they can afford to take little further action as regards flooding in Guildford. One of the effects of climate change is more severe and abrupt storms which cause high run-off. It appears that the Master Plan accepts that there is nothing more that can be done. Is this correct?	Comment noted. Every development proposal can help reduce the risk of flooding.
	(c) HOUSING : CPRE is particularly concerned about the need for more residential development in the town centre so that pressure for urban sprawl into the countryside is constrained. It is vital that change of use for empty offices of obsolete design is encouraged. We assume that a careful up to date analysis has been made of the use of all employment land. Our philosophy remains that a sequential approach is essential for development with brown field sites within the town being used as a priority. Water, sewage, and flooding issues have to be tackled. Affordable housing is needed near where jobs exist.	Comments noted. There is a need for a mix of uses in the future. All cannot be met within the town centre.
	(d) ROAD TRAFFIC : The town centre of Guildford is overwhelmed with traffic at peak hours and whenever accidents occur on the A3. Whilst the opening of the Hindhead tunnel can be seen as a major achievement for the countryside, growing congestion at Guildford remains a challenge apparently untouched by the Highways Agency. A more imaginative and radical approach seems to be called for, which enhances the town centre and makes it a pleasant place in which to walk to and from the railway and bus stations. Underground parking is expensive to provide (where flooding permits this) but is not uncommon in other parts of Europe. Key open sites by the river at ground level and elsewhere in the town centre should not be reserved for parking cars. If Park and Ride is thought to be the answer, then site locations near the A3 must be given priority to the SW and NE of the town. We endorse the concept of "shared space" so that the principles espoused in the Government's "Manual for Streets" are followed in such a way that roads are made pedestrian and cyclist friendly. Cluttering the public realm with advertisements on roundabouts is neither safe nor attractive.	Comments noted. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
	(e) RAIL: Guildford has an excellent train service. We are pleased to see that at last the station is receiving planning attention which is long overdue. Forecasting future demand is a priority. Improvements at the Waterloo terminus will be necessary. The cost of CrossRail and the HST project make any Heathrow to Guildford service unlikely.	Comments noted.
	National planning policies governing the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) should continue to be major planning elements influencing the decisions now to be taken for the town. The current Natural England decision to undertake a preliminary review of the boundaries of the AONB so as to absorb Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) are directly relevant to Guildford, especially if some additional countryside beyond the AGLV is also considered for inclusion, which qualifies on the basis of new criteria relating to heritage and biodiversity as well as rural environmental quality. It is a difficult time to draw up a Master Plan when there is so much uncertainty as to what will be the outcome of the National Planning Policy Framework consultation, let alone fix dates for implementation. There is also no clear picture as yet about what the implications of the Localism Bill and the Big Society are for planning.	Comments noted. However, the town centre falls outside of these environmental designations and are therefore not a consideration in the interim town centre framework. However, they are key considerations for the Local Plan Strategy that is currently being prepared.
	The Town Centre Master Plan restricts its investigation to 25 sites which are all worth consideration. However, CPRE would argue that the extent of this study is too limited. Other areas of the town need further analysis. Surely, the extent of the Town Centre boundary needs to be reviewed to take account of how Guildford has grown and developed.	Comment noted. The definition of town centres is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Local Plan Strategy will cover the entire borough.

	(a) UNIVERSITY OF SURREY The impact of the University of Surrey on the town is very significant since it first appeared in the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003. Its success has, however, generated additional challenges for town planners. The prospect of having a traffic free campus at Manor Farm seems less and less likely. The future location of a Park & Ride site in the vicinity of the campus near the A3 remains unresolved. It has to be recognized that growth at the University has led to housing in the town being switched from affordable homes for young families to multiple occupancy for students, thus increasing housing shortage problems. The University depends financially on the Research Park it manages. This and the campus itself generates road traffic. The new sports park also will increase traffic further, especially when sporting events cater for spectator interest. The provision of a large area of surface car parking on the Stag Hill campus seems over generous if one considers that some of this land could be used for teaching and student accommodation, freeing up housing space in the town. On the other hand, the move of the Guildford School of Acting to Stag Hill campus has freed up a number of brown field sites which are included in the Town Centre Plan.	Comments noted. The University have planning permission for student housing within their site that has not yet been built out.
	(b) ROYAL SURREY HOSPITAL This important centre of employment also generates traffic congestion. Staff parking is being provided on land which would be an appropriate site for housing development near the former site of the Tony Purslow Mercedes dealership on Aldershot Road, which is ideally located for nearby shops and schools.	Comment noted. This site lies outside of the town centre.
	(c) THE CATHEDRAL ON STAG HILL No reference is made to the proposals that have been discussed for a possible housing development on part of this site. CPRE has reservations about this proposal, but again this should surely be at least considered in the Town Centre Master Plan.	Comment noted. This site lies outside of the town centre.
	CPRE has long supported the National Trust in its campaign to ensure that the Wey Navigation is given the priority it deserves in Guildford town and district. We regard the river as a green ribbon running through the town which should be protected and enhanced. Insensitive development on its banks has done nothing to give this feature of the town the attention it should have, or the pedestrian access it calls for. We therefore welcome the support given in the Town Centre Master Plan for matters to be put right. We would have preferred to see this commitment underlined by a fuller illustrated indication of what is proposed for development along the length of its banks in the future. More attention is required about the quality of the roofscapes in the centre of the town when viewed from the river.	Comments noted. The improvement of the riverside forms part of the strategy in the interim town centre framework. We agree much more needs to be made of the river. This is recognised and reflected in a separate strategy section for the river in the interim framework; see section 6.6 River Wey (page 97).
	Visitors to Guildford are always charmed by the views from the High Street of the surrounding countryside. Those who climb to the top of the castle keep, or other high buildings in the Town Centre, are amazed at the extent of the views that can be seen over the town and beyond to green open space. This is a feature of smaller market towns such as Dorking or Godalming and is characteristic of Surrey. It must be protected at Guildford and not lost in the pursuit of economic growth and housing development. Very great care must be given to the height of new buildings in Guildford. The town has no affinity with the design approach followed by Woking. One of the most admirable features of Guildford is that the countryside is literally within walking distance of the Town Centre. Long may this remain so for the benefit of the community.	Comments noted and these issues and concerns have been addressed within the interim town centre framework.
	Guildford is at a critical moment in its history. This brief commentary does not pretend to be comprehensive. We accept that there are many points in the Master Plan which are valid, but much more has still to be done in terms of research to go forward. For example, CPRE believes the formulation of design principles, together with a detailed building strategy and associated guidelines needs to be established. The "Residential Design Guide" published by the GBC is a model supplementary planning document. We are impressed by the wider vision of the Allies & Morrison Review prepared for the Guildford Society which we endorse in approach. We are concerned that so many of the buildings in the centre of Guildford built since the war are undistinguished in architectural design. We have to question how many of the buildings built recently will be treasured by Guildford's inhabitants and visitors in 250 years time in the way that we value the Guild Hall, the Castle, and Abbot's Hospital. Not many in CPRE's view. We have to accept that over many years there has been a failure to solve the traffic problem, to provide the infrastructure needed for the town, to add distinction in our modern building which complements and contributes to the attractiveness of the town, the river that runs through it, and its outstanding surrounding countryside. We are facing a planning challenge and an opportunity which we have to embrace with a broader vision and a wider and more creative eye. We have to do better in the future!	Comments noted. Detailed design will be dealt with at the pre-application stage and planning application stages and any development must comply with the Council's design policies and that of the National Planning Policy Framework.
Merrow Residents Association	Following a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Merrow Residents' Association, I have been asked to write to you to express our concerns about some elements of the Town Centre Masterplan. In particular: -	Comments noted and each taken in turn.
	· We believe that any Masterplan for Guildford should not only cover the town centre itself but also include the surrounding areas such as Merrow, the University and Cathedral and, of course, the Royal Surrey Hospital.	Comments noted. Please be advised that the interim framework is about the town centre only. The plan for Guildford is known as the Local Plan which is being prepared. This will be subject to wide public consultation.
	· We are very concerned that no transport plan has been produced in parallel with the Town Centre Masterplan. We note that the Masterplan indicates that a 2001 census indicated that the parking needs are sustainable with good public transport links. We are a long way from 2001 and those assumptions need to be re-examined in the context of present traffic flows to ensure that traffic congestion in Guildford does not get any worse.	Comments noted. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Masterplan indicates that there should be another large superstore in Guildford and we doubt whether this is wise since it would only increase current problems of traffic congestion. 	<p>The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sqm is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We also see no reason for more and more retail outlets; what we need are more high quality outlets and provisions of further residential accommodation. 	<p>The 2011 Retail and Leisure study found that there is demand within the comparison catchment area additional comparison goods of 36,200 sqm (gross) to 2021. This excludes the Friary extension permission and the B&Q extension permissions. Therefore the demand of 36,200 sqm is on top of the existing commitments including the Friary extension.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration could be given to a covered market where smaller organisations and groups would be able to offer their products and produce for sale. 	<p>Comments noted. The issue of markets is addressed within the interim town centre framework.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notwithstanding the decision of the Executive Committee in November 2011, we take no view on the site for the Guildford bus station although we are surprised that money is being spent on a planning application for the Bedford Road site even before the Masterplan has been discussed and the content agreed. 	<p>Comments noted. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our primary concern is to ensure that Merrow is not side-lined in any discussion of the Borough and that residents in Merrow who use the Park and Ride would be able to drop off and pick up the bus at convenient sites in Guildford from which they can get access to all parts of the town without having to walk too far. We have raised this issue in a written question to the Council but our concerns remain to ensure that the present arrangement for the Merrow Park and Ride are not changed in a way that will affect the accessibility of our residents to all parts of the town. 	<p>Comments noted and there are no plans to alter the park and ride at Merrow.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the MRA is primarily concerned with Merrow we feel that it would be a great shame if the ambience of the town were to be adversely affected by the Masterplan and hope that the River Wey will become a centrepiece of the plan. 	<p>Comments noted. These issues are addressed in the interim town centre framework.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For those of us in Merrow who visit the town centre it is important that the historic views are not affected and that our green spaces in and around the town are not only maintained but increased in size. 	<p>Comments noted. These issues are addressed in the interim town centre framework.</p>
	<p>In summary we hope that the Council will consider a plan for the whole of Guildford and the surrounding area together with a transport plan to ensure that all residents of Guildford feel that they are included in this discussion.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Please be advised that the interim framework is about the town centre only. The plan for Guildford is known as the Local Plan which is being prepared. This will be subject to wide public consultation.</p>
Member of the Public	<p>I am submitting the comments below in a personal capacity. They refer to a few of the site specific policies. I am a resident of Guildford and a member of the Guildford Society Committee. I am in agreement with the Society's Response to the Guildford Borough Council draft Town Centre Masterplan. Site 09 (Bedford Road Car Park) I wish to register my objection to the proposed relocation of Guildford Bus Station to Bedford Road on a site that would occupy land now used as a temporary car park plus space adjacent to it. This site is adjacent to the river and for many years any proposed use for this site has recognized the importance of its relationship to the river as a town amenity. The bus station proposal completely ignores the amenity value of the riverside location which is used by many pedestrians each day as a major "entry route" to the town centre from the rail station.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>

	<p>It also should be noted that this site is susceptible to flooding and development that has been granted planning permission in the past has had limited uses at ground level. The site is also far too small for use as a bus station since it only accommodates 14 bus stands rather than 23 bus stands that currently operate from the bus station in its central location on Commercial Road within the town centre. It is proposed that buses from the East of Guildford would terminate and depart from the upper High Street or possibly upper North Street, not in Bedford Road Bus Station. This would make it impossible for passengers from East Guildford to change buses with any ease in order to access other parts of Guildford. Many people do not have the town centre as their final destination but wish to access the railway station, the University campuses, the Hospital and Research Park to the West of the town as well as destinations to the East, South or North of the town including schools, places of employment and other towns and villages. In effect, Guildford would no longer have a bus station that would allow many passengers to change buses to reach their destinations.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>An extra junction from Bedford Road into Onslow Street to serve the proposed bus station with its estimated 150 bus movements per hour will cause even more traffic congestion along this major traffic artery feeding into the gyratory system, already designated as the 8th busiest junction in the country. Pedestrians wishing to access the town centre will also be disadvantaged with significantly greater distances to walk using inhospitable and inadequate crossings on Onslow Street and narrow pavements on Bedford Road for the foreseeable future. A reason given for considering the Bedford Road site for a bus station is to remove the present bus station from land in Commercial Road that theoretically could be added to the proposed extension of the Friary shopping centre. It would be foolhardy to move the bus station from its present location in the absence of planning approval and building approval for an expanded shopping precinct as well as approvals for a bus station that adequately serves bus operators' and passengers' needs; works to move the bus station should be part of enabling works when construction work is started on the Friary site.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The location of the bus station is yet to be determined and is subject to further studies. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.</p>
	<p>The Friary extension site has already been granted planning approvals over the past 15 years and the project has never been close to commencement on site. Site 14 (Guildford Plaza) This cleared site at the beginning of the Portsmouth Road was formerly used as an office building for the CEGB (now the National Grid). The site is a central location that is ideal for residential accommodation and, in fact, was the subject of a planning application several years ago for a residential development that would have provided both social and private housing with flats facing onto Portsmouth Rd., 2 to 3 storey mews housing at the rear in keeping with the scale of the surrounding buildings and underground parking. I am extremely concerned that this important site remains undeveloped and would hope that the Council will be able to use its skills to ensure that this site can be made available for residential development. Site 17 (Millbrook car park) I am opposed to the construction of an "Extended/decked car park" being built on this riverside site. I am of the view that of a decked car park would be seriously detrimental to this area of open land adjacent to the river that would be highly visible both at ground level at the river valley as well as from higher land that rises quickly to the East of this site.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Site 14 remains in the interim town centre framework for residential. Site 17 has now been removed from the framework and decked parking is being pursued.</p>
	<p>In addition, this site is susceptible to flooding and has been turned down for development in the past for that reason. Site 18 (Land bounded by North Street/Leapale Road and Commercial Road) I agree with the Guildford Society's comments regarding this site that noted that "the existing 2003 designed development brief for this site is to be reviewed early in 2012". The Society stated that a revised development brief should be in keeping with the character of Guildford as an historic town; should incorporate and/or retain important planning benefits for the town which were secured as an agreement under Section 106 of the Planning Act; should ensure that any planning application for an extension to the present Friary includes a permanent 24 hour new pedestrian way through it from the railway station to North Street. In addition, this new brief should refer to or produce a viable solution to a bus station and bus stops that adequately serve passengers' and bus operators' needs to access all of the town centre in a comfortable central location and to be able to change buses in order to access destinations in addition to the town centre. Site 19 (Bellerby Theatre)</p>	<p>Comments noted. The new Brief has now been drafted and has taken these comments into consideration in the final draft.</p>
	<p>I objected to the proposal to use this site for a supermarket with an associated surface car park during the Consultation in 2011. This site is designated as a 'Transition Area' in the Town Centre Masterplan; such sites are characterised by a mix of uses including residential, community and retail which "provide a quieter, pleasant atmosphere within the town centre". This site is accessed by narrow local roads built to service a residential neighbourhood built in the late 19th/early 20th centuries. The introduction of a supermarket, car park for circa 130 cars and its requirement for servicing by large vehicles are not suitable for these narrow local roads. Moreover, the one-way traffic patterns that connect the site with the larger road system will make access both in and out of the site inconvenient and circuitous. A medium-sized supermarket is certainly an appropriate use within the town centre shopping zone, especially if it has visibility for shoppers on one of the main shopping streets such as North Street and can be serviced without using narrow neighbourhood roads. I believe that the Bellerby Theatre and adjacent sites are ideally located to serve as a mixed use/mainly residential 'transition area'.</p>	<p>The brief for the site explained why this site is suitable for a mixed use development including a supermarket, its location and lack of any available more centrally located sites.</p>

Member of the Public	1. The town centre could not be developed successfully unless the overall strategy for Guildford is first established. A piecemeal approach would and could prejudice future developments and adversely affect their outcome.	This interim town centre framework is based on evidence that was available at the time of writing. This necessarily represents a snapshot in time. There are some important evidence studies still in progress, and some that are yet to commence. Most of these relate to traffic c, highways and parking issues and / or to future uses of sites. Most of these evidence studies are expected to be completed in 2013. Rather than wait until we have all the evidence available to develop a final strategy, we consider it to be valuable to develop an interim framework for the town centre to help in guiding planning and investment decisions based on the evidence currently available. This framework will therefore have interim status, and will be reviewed and updated following completion of these studies to reflect all available evidence. The framework will replace this interim framework. A list of these studies, their anticipated completion dates, and date for adoption of the final framework are set out in Appendix 4. Sites allocated for development by the 2003 Local Plan will remain until superseded by the new Local Plan Strategy and Delivery documents. <u>Where a site is allocated by the current Local Plan and the town centre</u>
	2. Developments of sites within the town centre would generate extra traffic and therefore its impact on the network needs to be very carefully considered at the outset. Guildford town centre is already congested due to large volume of through traffic that uses the gyratory. Town centre could not be effectively planned unless the through traffic issues are addressed which originate outside of the central area and bus routes if and when the bus station is relocated away from the Friary. There is little mention of the traffic issues and necessary road network improvements that require Surrey County Council and the Highways Agency input.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
	3. Retail business is largely a daytime activity whilst night-time economy is leisure oriented apart from a few small food stores which tend to have long opening hours. Part of the development could focus on night-time facilities possibly on the eastern end adjoining Leapale Road whilst large stores are housed in the Friary extension and become integrated with the existing set up. Housing in the main core area where the bus station is currently located would be too expensive unless controlled by GBC. Perhaps leasehold ownership transfers would have to be restricted and back to GBC only, otherwise a free system would push up the prices up to reach market prices if the housing were decent and desirable. This would negate the purpose of building low cost housing. I do not know how the flats above the Friary are managed but if the system is working well maybe the same could be adopted for any housing that are developed on the sites within the town centre area.	Comments noted. The town centre interim framework deals with both the day time and night time economy.
	4. We do not necessarily need more people living in the town. Because property value is high in the centre, it makes sense for housing development to be on lower value sites on the outer areas and thus they are more affordable and yet within reasonable walking distance of the centre.	Comment noted. It is important to provide for mixed communities and therefore a mix of land uses. There is a need for housing within Guildford Borough including in the town centre. On sites large enough there will be a need for the developers to provide a proportion of affordable housing.
	5. Apart from jobs in the retail sector, high value of land precludes developments of job creating businesses operating from within the core central area. The outlying areas with good transport facilities are ideal for such developments. Site Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 4 are better in this respect. It is therefore vital that the buses call in at the railway station and connect up with development on Site No.1 by means of a new road bridge over the tracks.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
	6. Guildford attracts shoppers from a wide surrounding area. Whilst Park & Ride reduces congestion of shopper generated traffic, equally if a direct access from the railway station to the prime retail areas is provided, shoppers from outer areas using the trains and those parking within the redeveloped Sites mentioned above would benefit from a safer route without having to cross WTC, the river and Onslow Street. A completely separate footbridge close to the footbridge that connects the platforms could be built to provide a direct pedestrian route from Guildford Park Road right up to Onslow Street by connecting it with the direct route from the railway station. Please see my suggestions contained in my comments on Site Nos 1 & 2.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
	7. Green spaces wherever possible should be created specially on sites along the riverbanks.	Comment noted. This point is supported by the interim town centre framework.
	8. Long views from the street level only exist at a few of the development sites. Again wherever possible these should be exploited.	Comment noted. The topography and views are identified as strengths within the interim framework and as such will be protected.

	9. Town centre boundary is about right. The Research Park, Hospital, University and Cathedral areas need to have closer links through better transport access. Again I would stress the need for a new road bridge and a new footbridge over the tracks to provide improved access to prime retail areas as well as access to retail and other facilities at Site Nos 1 & 2.	Comments noted. We acknowledge that all of the transport and parking information that we need to prepare a final town centre framework is not yet available. The main outstanding pieces of evidence are transport modelling, the parking strategy review (vehicle movement/gyratory study, and the bus facility study). This evidence is required for a movement strategy to inform, and be included within, the final framework, that will seek to address issues such as these. The interim framework explains this position.
	10. I guess the development of heritage and cultural assets of the town has a lower priority by virtue of the fact that they do not generate extra income directly. However, they are part of the attraction for visitors and therefore opportunities should be taken to promote these. New theatres, museums, art galleries and craft centres should be included along with other developments to make Guildford a more interesting place to visit.	Comments noted. Heritage forms an important part of the town centre and is not given a lesser priority within the town centre framework. Please see the section on heritage and streetscape.
	11. GBC appears to have pre-empted consultation on a number of important development opportunities. The Friary centre extension, Bellerby theatre site, proposed relocation of the bus station to Bedford Road site, Millbrook car park site development should all be open for consultation. The current consultation on the draft Master plan appears to be rushed and apparently decisions have been taken on some of the sites before consultations have been concluded.	This interim town centre framework is based on evidence that was available at the time of writing. This necessarily represents a snapshot in time. There are some important evidence studies still in progress, and some that are yet to commence. Most of these relate to traffic, highways and parking issues and / or to future uses of sites. Most of these evidence studies are expected to be completed in 2013. Rather than wait until we have all the evidence available to develop a final strategy, we consider it to be valuable to develop an interim framework for the town centre to help in guiding planning and investment decisions based on the evidence currently available. This framework will therefore have interim status, and will be reviewed and updated following completion of these studies to reflect all available evidence. The framework will replace this interim framework. A list of these studies, their anticipated completion dates, and date for adoption of the final framework are set out in Appendix 4. Sites allocated for development by the 2003 Local Plan will remain until superseded by the new Local Plan Strategy and Delivery documents. Where a site is allocated by the current Local Plan and the town centre framework suggests different uses, it will be for either the Council, or in the event of an appeal, the Planning Inspectorate, to determine the relative weight to give to each document. The development plan status of the allocations will be weighed against the town centre framework as an adopted Council strategy based on more up-to-date government policy and evidence studies.
Guildford Business Forum	The document is a very good document and well thought out and clearly a massive amount of work has gone into it. However, there is no recognition in this document whatsoever of the importance that office employers play in the town. Huge amounts of money are injected into the economy because of these office occupiers and the workforce they employ. That workforce uses the restaurants, both lunchtime and evening; that workforce spends their earnings in the shops during the day; that workforce uses the train station, creating a volume of people through the station that warrants a redevelopment which will enhance the town. That workforce provides this town with its wealth and vitality and needs to be focussed on in this report. The residents of this town all too easily forget all of the above factors and the absolutely vital role that employers play in ensuring that we do not have empty shops and that we have a wide range of restaurants and employment opportunities for the residents of this town. This document should redress that imbalance and wherever possible, undertake a re-education, an appreciation and importance of all employers, not just in the town centre, but within the urban area. The business forum is looking to maintain Guildford's pre-eminence, not just in the County but also in the region and far beyond. At every opportunity, we should shout at its successes in attracting employers, many of whom have chosen to create their headquarters' operations in the town. Whilst many other towns are saddled with empty office buildings and empty shops, Guildford does not suffer in this way because of the number and diversity of occupiers we have in the town and the wealth they generate for this town and for its retailing operations.	Thank you for your comments and for taking the time to read the document. The importance of the business community and forum is recognised and appreciate the essential contribution employers and employees make to the vitality and viability of the Guildford Town Centre. The importance of the office and Research and Development sectors are recognised as a Strength in the SWOT analysis and in Appendix 3, page 164. The importance of new job opportunities is included within the vision of the revised document and TC6 focuses specifically on supporting and strengthening the Town Centre economy. Page 27 of the revised document recognises the dynamic knowledge based industries as a strength and page 47 and pages 109 to 111 address the Guildford Business Forum, the Elevate Guildford steering group (to build upon the Business Forum work) and the potential to create a Business Improvement District with associated funding. Page 31 summarises the Wider Context.
Alderman	I have tried to reply on the OBC web site but' could not locate the appropriate site. I would be grateful if you could take the following into account:	Thank you for your comments which have been taken into account. The appropriate webpage was www.guildford.gov.uk/Guildfordinterimtowncentreframework .
	In order to prepare a plan one should understand the underlying economic factors which have led to the emergence of Guildford as an important economic centre. These issues are well set out in the Guildford Economic Development Study of 2009.	The 2009 Economic Study has been taken into account and referenced (for example page 164 of the interim framework)
	The most important facts emerging from this excellent study are that the economic drivers of economic growth are knowledge/science/finance based enterprises which account for over 50% of the income of the Borough, followed by public services which account for around 33%, and retail around 15%. The report highlights a survey which identifies the main problems affecting the development of Guildford as 1) traffic Congestion(63%), 2) lack of affordable Housing (63%), and 3)Planning (29%). The importance of congestion is mentioned by several times the major factor leading businesses to moving elsewhere.	Comments noted.

	<p>Yet in the "Plan" none of these issues are recognised and it concentrates on supporting a massive increase in retail by well over 25.000sm - this could be as much as 33% of existing retail. Nowhere is it recognized that such an increase would create massive congestion problems which would affect all businesses adversely. Furthermore the forecast increase in demand for retail space at 3.3% pa over the next 16 years is, to put it mildly, optimistic. In view of the rapid increase of internet sales and a long term recession existing Guildford Town centre shops will be hard pressed to survive. The forecasts need urgent revision.</p>	<p>The future demand for retail floorspace has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology. Allowance has been made for special forms of trading such as internet retailing, and planning permissions that were approved but not built out at the time of writing.</p> <p>Lack of sites in the central retail area of the town centre is resulting in an increasing amount of new retail floorspace being developed in out of centre locations such as Ladymead retail park, leading to retail spend being diverted to out of centre locations and to other competing town centres. If this continues, other competing town centres and out of centre locations will gain visitors and expenditure relative to Guildford town centre, which will be relatively disadvantaged. As Guildford's 2006 Retail Study explained and the 2011 Retail and Leisure Study reiterated, "standing still is akin to decline in retail terms; if other centres continue to improve their retail offer, so must Guildford if it is to retain its current position."</p>
	<p>The Plan identifies various sites for development but there is nothing in the plan which indicates what priority uses are - should they be used for offices, housing, retail, leisure ? There is no phased plan indicating development let alone setting out priorities.</p>	<p>The interim framework has more detail but still aims to have a degree of flexibility where several uses may be possible.</p>
	<p>The proposal to move the bus station is based on specifications which restrict it to be within 5 mins walk of the town core. This leaves it conveniently 5 mins from the Friary site - much further from the High st. This would entail a major shift in favour of Westfields away from the traditional High St. which is unacceptable.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments about the bus station. A decision has not yet been made regarding the future location of the bus station, and public consultation on possible locations will be held in late 2012. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year.</p>
	<p>The movement of the bus station toward the railway station disbenefits all current users most of whom are from north Guildford and many of whom are elderly, and understandably they are much opposed to the change. Yet why is this highly controversial move not entered for comment ? The link with the railway station is only partial, and since the railway itself is restricted in its catchment area to a few stations it does not provide such a widespread service for users as buses.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments about the bus station. A decision has not yet been made regarding the future location of the bus station, and public consultation on possible locations will be held in late 2012. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year.</p>
	<p>What is required at the railway station is a regular bus service to the top of the town.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>There is no reference to the appalling state of the High St.setts and pavements . Why not?</p>	<p>The granite setts are specifically referred to on page 55 of the revised document: "The granite sett paving is one of the most important visual features of the town centre's historic core, and contributes significantly to the High Street's distinctive character. Their regular maintenance is therefore very important to this area, and requires co-ordination between the borough and County Council as well as businesses and service providers. Guildford Borough Council will work with Surrey County Council to maintain the quality of the setts and footways of the High Street."</p>
	<p>The withdrawal by Westfield from Guildford is an excellent opportunity to reconsider the use of this site and propose a plan more appropriate to the town centre. This should include the GBC funding a refurbished bus station (using funds allocated for the Bedford Rd Bus site), carrying out environmental improvements in North st (also from earlier mentioned funds. There should be a far larger allocation for housing (say 220 units with max affordable), and a town square. Since the developer would no longer need to fund these facilities the amount of retail should be reduced accordingly - to maybe 12.000 sm. Consideration should be given to offering Debenhams a location on this site and converting their current site into attractive riverside residential accommodation.</p>	<p>Comments noted. North Street is specifically mentioned as a focus for improvements in the revised document.</p>

Property Consultants	<p>The Consultation Draft was very helpful and informative, the explanation of the town's history of considerable significance. I suggest a change of emphasis to certain Objectives and Strengths and Weaknesses where I think that is pertinent, and also make the following summary comments. The opportunity sites and plan of the Borough reflects many of the problems which affect the entire Borough, not just the Town Centre. Summary comments -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The town's geography and topography imposes severe constraints on overall growth potential. • Its historical fabric imposes further physical constraints. • The limited availability of 'brownfield' sites for future development will impose further constraints on economic growth. • Stimulating the Borough's economy will generate demand for housing and associated infrastructure which should be addressed at the policy formulation stage. • Assuming economic 'normality' will return in due course, stimulating the local economy will also inflate land and house values. • Such growth, including additional retail facilities, will generate additional traffic which must be planned for now, accommodated and managed. • Urgently review bus terminal options together with traffic, development and parking priorities. • Failure to accommodate some of the increased parking requirement may seriously undermine the entire economic strategy. • Consider supporting town centre retailers with some shopper 'Free Park' promotional days in low demand periods. • Consider potential site specific development formats for estimating job creation, housing and parking/traffic requirements. • Consider identity of jobs reflecting employment needs i.e. manual, blue or white collar, services, academic etc. • Consider whether future employment should be market led or stimulated by a prescribed 'Technology Hub' type concept (with UniS). • Housing needs should identify potential student demand (potentially in thousands). <p>Strategy - Suggest adding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making better places through • the maintenance and restoration of Guildford's historical fabric, • generating sustainable employment and • stimulating tourist, leisure, entertainment and cultural attractions. 	<p>Thank you for your comments and taking the time to read the draft document. The Guildford Bus Station study is not yet finalised (due later this year). Student demand will be considered in the borough-wide Core Strategy. The revised document focuses a section on movement and traffic. Many of your points are now addressed in the revised document Town Centre objectives.</p>
No name given	<p>There was a very good analysis in this week's Surrey Advertiser 20th Jan</p>	<p>Opinion noted.</p>
Member of Public	<p>I write with reference to the public consultation on the draft Town Centre masterplan prepared for Guildford, which ends this Monday 23 January (www.Guildford.gov.uk/towncentremasterplan). As a local resident and someone involved in the property industry, I am deeply concerned about the quality of this document, and the missed opportunity if not detrimental effect it could have on our town over the next 20 years. Guildford is an attractive and prosperous town, surrounded by rolling countryside and blessed with many fine historic buildings. But there is so much room for improvement - the town centre is blighted by traffic congestion, and effectively cut off from the railway station, cathedral and university. The River Wey is a completely underutilised asset, overlooked by surface car parks, derelict sites and poor quality industrial units. There is a pressing need to consider public transport accessibility, town centre improvement and the myriad of other issues that are holding Guildford back from achieving its true potential - to rank alongside Bath or Cambridge. What we need to address this is a truly visionary Town Centre masterplan. I fear the current draft tabled by Guildford Borough Council to be sadly inadequate on nearly every level. I cannot call it well researched, or considered or having vision. As a consequence, if right, our town could suffer two further decades of mediocre, piece-meal development. I urge local people to study the proposals and write appropriate representations if Guildford is important to you. What might be your concerns having looked at other such plans (see Wokingham as an example)</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to read the draft document. The revised document is much more detailed, based on studies and feedback from this consultation and addresses the surface car parks and their relationship to the River Wey, reconnecting the town with the river, traffic congestion, pedestrian accessibility, derelict sites such as Guildford Plaza site amongst other issues.</p>
	<p>1. Process - A masterplan is not just a document containing proposals that set out and control change in an area, it is also the process by which organisations (in this case Guildford Borough Council) undertake analyses and prepare strategies that inform change. Recent government legislation (the Localism Act and the draft National Planning Policy Framework) are concerned with decentralising government power, and placing decision-making back into the hands of local communities - allowing them much greater influence over their neighbourhoods, towns and cities. These new policies present the people of Guildford with a golden opportunity to take responsibility for the future of the town centre and ensure they get the type and quality of development they and the town deserves. While I appreciate that some effort has been made by the Borough Council to involve local people in creating the masterplan, one might feel this has been weak in comparison. Other programmes of stakeholder engagement allow local people to fully participate in the process, with Steering Committees and Focus Groups helping to drive the master planning agenda, in a manner reflecting the true spirit of Localism. Your draft Town Centre masterplan has been largely the result of an internal process at the Borough Council, put out for public consultation over the Christmas period for a short time when most people are rather busy with other commitments to comment.</p>	<p>Whilst this document is not a statutory document the Council has made significant efforts to involve the public and interest groups in its formation. The public has been involved at two stages of its preparation, at early engagement stage (with round table discussion groups, hailed as a real success) to define the key issues of concern and what people's priorities are for the town centre. The second stage was this consultation on the draft masterplan which was open for six and a half weeks to allow additional time to reflect the time year. This work has all been developed from the 2005/6 draft Town Centre Area Action Plan (TCAAP) which was also subject to two stages of public involvement.</p>

	<p>2. Research & Analysis - A Town Centre Masterplan that sets urban strategy for 18 years should be based on excellent research and analysis. Evidence of this in the draft document is light. At a most basic level you would expect analysis of the challenges the town might face externally over the next two decades, such as the threat posed to High Street shopping by the Internet, shifts in patterns of working, or the rising levels of environmental sustainability being set by the government. Other issues you might have expected to see include: · Mapping showing Guildford in its context within the county, with London or the rest of the South East; the Centre serves a wide area; · There is a history of the town in the Appendix, but no conclusions are drawn regarding what makes Guildford the place that it is - what is locally distinctive or special about our town, and therefore what should be done to preserve or enhance this; · The unnecessary and worrying timescale of your masterplan means G B C are relying on population figures and other data from 2001 Census, despite the 2011 information being available in Spring 2012, which we are told 'if possible' will be used in the final masterplan; · One might have expected an analysis of the town's distinctive topography, the influence this has on the nature of the place, and the relationship it creates with the surrounding countryside in terms of views, landmarks or skyline; · Given the problems facing the town one might have expected an analysis of vehicle movement, identification of congestion areas, or identification of existing bus and cycle routes. Traffic is our number one issue and it is surely addressed somewhere? · A parking study is being undertaken, in early 2012. I wonder if this might inform the draft masterplan; · Landscape open spaces areas are merely identified and described rather than investigated for their current role or future potential in the Town Centre offer; · One piece of analysis might have been relevant, that is on the local economy! The figures presented are five years out of date. I suspect the economy may have changed a little meantime. There is no listing or mapping of local firms and forms of employment; · Evidence of a cultural audit having been undertaken might be normal or appreciation of the nature or role of the night-time economy; · Figures given for Tourism are from 2003 - nine years out of date; · No analysis seems to have been undertaken of the nature of the residential community in the town centre, and how their needs are being met in terms of social infrastructure.</p>	<p>We want to ensure Guildford is an attractive place to live and to visit and a desirable location for business investment. We have therefore produced an interim framework to assist in coordination of redevelopments and enhancements. A revised framework will be written once additional studies are completed. When we have completed these technical studies we will consider the technical evidence and will draw up a final framework, which may reflect up to date census findings. A regional picture is now presented within Chapter 5 'Analysis'. The interim framework refers to the 2010 Study The Economic Impact of Tourism.</p>
	<p>3. Vision & Objectives - Because research and analysis of the existing situation is a mystery, and community/stakeholder engagement limited, the Vision and Objectives of the masterplan are unambitious and lack any degree of specificity. The proposed Town Centre boundary mostly expands on the existing designation but is not bold enough to capture key future development areas to the north along the river, or create connections with the university or the cathedral, so that a more holistic approach to the non-residential areas of Guildford could be developed.</p>	<p>Appendix 1 lists the evidence documents referred to within the revised interim framework. These are referenced throughout the document. The interim framework includes a section on community priorities. The town centre boundary demarcation is explained; This document is specifically about the future of Guildford town centre, not the whole of Guildford town so it does not include the University or Cathedral. The area covered by the interim framework is shown on a map on page eight of the document. Most respondents to the consultation on the draft masterplan agreed with the suggested boundary.</p>
	<p>Strategy - The masterplan 'strategy' is divided into four different themes: Development, Environmental Improvements, Town Centre Management and Sustainable Living. Because the Vision & Objectives are vague and generic (they could equally apply to Swindon or Basildon), none of the themes approaches a coherent 'strategy' demonstrating how the town will move from a current situation to any future identifiable goal.</p>	<p>The interim framework now takes a different approach and structure to the draft masterplan, and is a more coherent strategy. It includes a section on delivery.</p>
	<p>Development - For the sake of brevity it is not possible to comment on the 25 sites identified for development within the town centre totalling around 14.5 hectares (36 acres). Should all of this come forward over the planning period it would have a major impact on the town, and yet each site is considered individually, with no attempt at 'joined up thinking' around the Railway Station, or visionary planning of the River Wey corridor. Do residents really want a new bus station on its banks?</p>	<p>We do not have all the information we need yet to develop a movement strategy for the town centre, but are working on this alongside Surrey County Council, which is responsible for most of the roads in the area, and also the Highways Agency which is responsible for the major roads, including the A3. The Council is aware that the potential relocation of a bus facility to Bedford Road surface car park is generally unpopular. Options for location of a bus facility are limited, and these continue to be explored with bus user representatives, bus operators and specialist transport planning consultants.</p>
	<p>Environmental Improvements - Although perhaps the best considered aspect of the masterplan, the proposals for Environmental Improvements lack ambition, and in other places like Scarborough, have been used as part of a raft of strategies aimed at stimulating the economy in lower value parts of town.</p>	<p>Comments noted. More specific details on areas to be enhanced is included, and some are aspirational.</p>
	<p>Town Centre Management - This theme includes two strategies, the opportunity for an enhanced market offer in Guildford, and the potential for a Business Improvement District (BID). Given the fact that the structure, remit and funding of the BID is currently being developed, and will not be voted upon until Summer 2012, is it sensible for the Borough Council to adopt a masterplan before it is clear what impact a BID would have on the future shape and functioning of the town centre?</p>	<p>The section on town centre management has been considerably reworked for the interim framework. The BID note is now likely to be held in October 2012 (see update in the interim framework). As an interim town centre masterplan, it is a living document which will be reviewed and informed by further studies.</p>
	<p>Sustainability - This section of the Town Centre masterplan is at best inadequate given the national significance of this issue. Many people will know that Guildford is twinned with the historic city of Freiburg in Germany – but perhaps less will know that Freiburg is recognised as being at the leading edge of sustainable urban planning in Europe. It is unfortunate that to date the opportunity seems to have been missed to engage with Freiburg, and learn from their considerable experience.</p>	<p>The revised framework has been subject to Habitats Regulation Assessment, Strategic Environmental Assessment, and Equalities Impact Assessment screening. Sustainability is addressed in more detail by the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD. This section of the draft masterplan is therefore not included in the interim framework.</p>

	<p>Way Forward - People can embrace change in the town centre – but only if it is for the better – magnificent new buildings, excellent streets and squares, access to the countryside, new public spaces, high quality retailing, residential and commercial office space, unique cultural attractions, and well integrated public transport facilities - all carried out in a manner sympathetic to the existing scale and character of Guildford. To achieve this kind of development, and a step-change in the profile of the town, we need a visionary masterplan created through a large-scale process of public engagement (Collaborative Planning). To do this the Borough really needs to appoint a highly skilled master planner (plus traffic engineers!) with experience of such processes in towns addressing issues similar to Guildford. Some of these places have used a Charter to enshrine the key objectives of the masterplan, which is then governed by a Town Team, a group of enthusiastic individuals drawn from local businesses, leading institutions, resident associations and special interest groups. To me, this sounds like the true spirit of Localism and an approach people might embrace immediately. If a real masterplan takes additional time and money - then so be it – in the bigger picture it will be a small price to pay to ensure that every development in the town enhances the quality of the environment, the economy, vitality and national standing of our town. We should have a greater sense of ambition. Our wonderful town has been in existence for over 1000 years - let's not allow it to decline under our stewardship. Let us all raise our aspirations for Guildford.</p>	<p>The aim of this Guildford Interim Town Centre Framework is to guide suitable development and improvement whilst preserving and enhancing the valued character of our town centre - it's the culmination of detailed studies, public involvement and local knowledge.</p>
<p>Abbotswood Residents Association – Central Crescent</p>	<p>1. Our main comment is that the order of preparation of the town's strategic documents seems to be wrong. The preparation of this well crafted document should have followed the preparation of a longer term plan for the town as a whole. Only in the preparation of a town wide plan can the major issue restricting the development of the town centre be tackled; this major issue is traffic flows. The last local plan is now some nine years old and since then many issues have changed. In the view of ARA-CC, traffic impacts negatively on both the enjoyment of the town centre for leisure purposes and its economic development. The Masterplan as proposed includes a series of major expansions in retail and commercial space however to be economically viable such expansions will require significant additional access capacity to get the new shoppers/employees to the new developments. Consequently any new Masterplan needs to not only address the existing traffic problems that plague the town but also needs to include a plan to handle the increased traffic the proposed new developments will create. Addressing the traffic issues in Guildford is not only necessary for any future commercial development but is also required as traffic issues are impacting negatively on the residential areas outside of the town centre and are a major restriction to any coherent plan to significantly increase house building. The solutions are not trivial. The A3 bisects the town, causes immense traffic jams after accidents and brings noise pollution to dwellings from Burpham to Onslow Village. The junction at Ladymead is overcapacity – one impediment to plans to develop Slyfield. The lack of a North-South route across the town brings much traffic onto the gyratory and separates the town from the river. The solution to these issues involves bodies outside of GBC's control and could take years, just as it took to find a solution at Hindhead, but if we do not start to tackle these matters now then we will forever have to live within the restraints they pose. The Town Centre Masterplan seems to accept these restraints largely as a given, and we believe that is the wrong starting point.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The interim framework has been produced to assist in coordination of redevelopments and enhancements in the Town Centre, further studies and a Local Plan Strategy will look at the borough-wide picture.</p>
	<p>2. In the same vein as the above comments we also think that a plan for the town centre needs also to take into consideration the plans for the University, the Science Park and the Hospital. These are three of Guildford's success stories and will be an important source of work and Central Crescent economic growth for the town. We understand from briefings we have had that the growth of all three is limited by traffic congestion. Also, cycle and foot links between them are currently not as green and inviting as they could be.</p>	<p>This document is specifically about the future of Guildford town centre, not the whole of Guildford town. The area covered by the interim framework is shown on a map on page eight of the document. Most respondents to the consultation on the draft masterplan agreed with the suggested boundary. The new Local Plan, to replace the Guildford Borough 2003 plan, will consist of the Strategy and the Delivery documents. The Local Plan Strategy, to be published in draft for consultation in the coming months, will include the vision and strategy for Guildford town, for Ash and Tongham, and for the rural parts of the borough. It will also include the vision for Guildford town centre, which will be taken from the interim town centre framework, as it appears on page 15 of the interim framework</p>
	<p>3. The Town Centre Masterplan document itself is well crafted but, as it was given the current traffic flows to work with, it can only make limited progress in its proposals to modify these and to better utilise town centre underdeveloped sites.</p>	<p>We recognise that local traffic issues including congestion, parking and public transport facilities such as the bus station are key areas of concern to the local public. We do not have all the information we need yet to develop a movement strategy for the town centre, but are working on this alongside Surrey County Council, which is responsible for most of the roads in the area, and also the Highways Agency which is responsible for the major roads, including the A3.</p>
	<p>4. Regarding the vision, we believe that, to “maintain its role as the key shopping and service centre in the county” only a limited number of additional shops are required, e.g. a John Lewis. What we need is a better quality of shopping experience. This entails keeping and adding to our stock of individual smaller shops and making shopping more attractive, involving improving access to the river, increasing places to have a break, as well as improving the appearance of North Street and the other streets long overdue for development (sites 18, 19 and 20).</p>	<p>The revised document is much more detailed and addresses the surface car parks and their relationship to the River Wey, reconnecting the town with the river, pedestrian accessibility, and improving the appearance of North Street.</p>
	<p>5. Regarding the move of the bus station, we question whether we need one at all in the town centre. Certainly we need bus stops and we would not like to see deterioration in the service along the London Road connecting Abbotswood with the university, Royal Surrey hospital or train station. However, we question whether rest facilities for staff need to be actually inside the town centre. We are not competent to add to the debate as to whether the proposed site for the new bus station is viable or not.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments about the bus station. A decision has not yet been made regarding the future location of the bus station. The Guildford bus station study is due to be finalised towards the end of this year.</p>

	6. We have studied the response from the Guildford Society which includes proposals to make major reductions to the gyratory system, increasing the priority to pedestrian traffic and improving the link between the railway station, the town centre and the river Wey. We strongly support the ambitious thrust of this document. We believe that such major changes must be considered for "the town centre to be a pleasant place for an increasing number of people to call home" and a more attractive place to visit for shopping and recreational purposes.	Comments noted. Movement is a chapter in the revised framework.
	7. The Wey is a neglected asset at present and more should be made of the river frontage, integrating it better into the town. The comments of the Guildford Society provide a way to achieve this aim	The importance of the River Wey and reconnecting it to the town is addressed by the revised strategy.
	8. Better cycle lanes are needed not only in the town centre but also on the main approach roads to the town centre to encourage more local journeys to be undertaken by bike.	Comments noted. Cycle routes are addressed on page 105 of the revised interim framework.
	9. We are uncertain about the need for a major supermarket in the town centre (in addition to the existing Sainsbury's and Tesco Express) for traffic reasons, and we see no need for further office space in the centre; however, we do support the growth of accommodation planned for the town centre, provided the quality of design is high. Truly vibrant towns need people not simply to shop and work but to be actually living in them.	Comments noted, and some of the sites within the Town Centre are suggested for use as new housing sites, such as Bright Hill car park.
Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	CRARA represents residents in an area between the Epsom and Boxgrove Roads and the railway line. We have a thriving active membership of over 200 households.. We held a special meeting to consider our response to this consultation. We urge Guildford to guard against dropping standards in this plan or when granting consents in these challenging economic times. We will live with any over development negotiated or poor design with adverse impacts conceded for years to come. Many permissions will be "banked" and not result in construction until the economy picks up. Guildford should continue to strive for high quality character development and should expect contributions to well defined infrastructure investment.	Thank you for your comments. One of the main purposes of this framework is to encourage good design and outstanding developments which contribute to and respect the character of Guildford.
Arriva	We have studied the above document with much interest and can confirm that we are in discussion with Guildford Borough Council and its consultants, MVA, to find an acceptable solution for replacement facilities for buses in Guildford town centre. So far, these have been constructive and we trust that they will enable an effective solution that is attractive for our customers and efficient to operate. I must stress that the stated plan for all buses to serve the Bedford Road site without stops in the town centre itself is not acceptable to Arriva and is highly unlikely to be acceptable to the vast majority of our customers. Whilst we fully support the aims of improving and developing Guildford's shopping offering and town centre infrastructure and reducing peak hour congestion, relegating most passengers to a location on the wrong side of Onslow Street is not a workable solution. Buses are accessible in the modern day and forcing passengers to cross this road to access the town centre is just not acceptable.	Comments noted and work on the bus station study ongoing.
	We would therefore urge the Council to work with the operators to ensure that there are convenient town centre bus stops. Indeed, not all services, particularly the local town services need to serve a formal bus station site if on road stops have high quality passenger facilities and convenient interchange links with other services. We would therefore suggest that a solution that allows town centre access stops that are close to North Street and the proposed Friary Extension site with an adjacent smaller bus station, preferably on part of the Friary site but utilizing a smaller footprint than the current bus station. We therefore look forward to continuing discussions to reach a solution on this very important issue for town centre visitors and employees. Arriva support most of the proposed redevelopment proposals within the document. However, we note that on page 45, a link across the river is indicated which seems to go through our bus depot site. This is surely an error!	Comments noted and discussions will continue. The improved links, now shown in Figure 11 on page 72, relate to the pedestrian bridge to the front of the cinema site.
The Guildford Society, Civic Society, etc. Notes of workshop 10 January 2012 facilitated by Allies and Morrison (with 80 attendees of which 14 were not members of the GS)	Lack of overall vision. This is brought home with particular force in Section 5 'Delivery' The difficulty is the draft TCM does not contain a vision sufficiently thought out to enable a list of priority items and their date order to be identified. The TCM is not a 'Masterplan' in the usual sense of the word. The CABA document 'Creating successful Masterplans' is very instructive in this regard. The TCM ignores many of CABA's precepts – the need to look 'even decades' ahead, for 'up front strategic thinking', to be 'visionary' and 'fully integrated', and perhaps above all to express the Plan in three main elements (ref Box 10 of the document): 1. A Strategic Framework which 'may consider a much wider area than the Spatial Masterplan'. 2. A Spatial Masterplan. 3. An Implementation plan. The Society urges the Council to review its Town Centre Masterplan both in respect of identifying a strategic vision for the town centre and in respect of the concerns raised by the Society about the many points of detail.	The interim framework include a re-worked, tighter Vision for the town centre. The Delivery section has been expanded and more detail listed where possible. The interim framework is forward looking and aspirational. It will be updated to include a movement strategy. The change in name from a masterplan reflects that we agree that it does not cover all the issues, eg. detailed design, that a masterplan. Professional urban planning / architecture consultants have been employed by Guildford Borough Council to assist in drawing up the interim framework.
	1. To establish and prioritise the key elements of the Vision and Objectives for Guildford. 2. To highlight the best and worst things about Guildford. 3. To identify the key elements of a strategy for Guildford. 4. To distil the main opportunities for the town centre and the masterplan.	These are included in the interim framework in 1. Vision and Objective section, 2. the SWOT analysis, 3. Figure 7 - Summary of town centre strategy, and 4. the individual strategy sections and the SWOT analysis.

	<p>A. Positioning - Attendees indicated that fundamental direction and decisions are required to steer the direction of the masterplan including the following: • What is the University Business Plan? Are there wider interventions required to facilitate the aspirations of the University? • What role will the town centre have in the future? How do we plan for future retailing trends? Environmental and transport improvements which improve the shopping experience are considered more important than additional retail development. • What are the needs of employers? Most employers recruit within an hour's travel time from Guildford.</p>	<p>Page 36 addresses the University of Surrey and throughout the document, particularly page 183 where it is noted that the University has identified demand for further student housing. The future demand for retail has been objectively assessed by expert consultants in retail planning using the government's published methodology. Allowance has been made for special forms of trading such as internet retailing, and extant planning permissions. The Guildford's 2006 Retail Study explained and the 2011 Retail and Leisure Study reiterated, "standing still is akin to decline in retail terms; if other centres continue to improve their retail offer, so must Guildford if it is to retain its current position." Therefore additional retail development is equally as important as environmental and transport improvements - all matters need to work in combination to ensure the vitality and viability of Guildford Town Centre. The needs of retail employers will be represented by the Elevate Guildford project steering group (page 113). Affordable housing is recognised as a key need to support many of the town centre businesses.</p>
	<p>B. Strategic movement network - Transport and movement issues are considered to be extremely important. Participants indicated the need for a comprehensive movement framework drawing on appropriate traffic survey information. Participants indicated that the following components should be included: • Strategy for pedestrian and cycle movement in the town centre – considering shared surface options in appropriate locations. • Comprehensive traffic strategy – considering options for "moving" or reducing the level of traffic in the town centre, and addressing access issues to the A3, A31 and A281. • Bus strategy – consideration of alternative bus stopping arrangements (e.g. conventional on-street stops on North Street, rather than developing a new bus station on a valuable riverside site). • Station strategy – ensure that the station continues to be convenient for commuters and pedestrians walking to / via the town centre. • Liaison with University and businesses to establish a town wide Green Travel Plan Framework.</p>	<p>We recognise that local traffic issues including congestion, parking and public transport facilities such as the bus station are key areas of concern to the local public. We do not have all the information we need yet to develop a movement strategy for the town centre, but are working on this alongside Surrey County Council, which is responsible for most of the roads in the area, and also the Highways Agency which is responsible for the major roads, including the A3. Movement is addressed on page 101 of the revised framework.</p>
	<p>C. Other strategies and guidance. The following elements were highlighted by attendees: • Building height and views guidance including reference to key views, vistas and skylines to ensure that development does not have a negative impact on the valley setting. • Economic strategy – facilitating and supporting entrepreneurialism. • Landscape and Green Infrastructure Strategy; • Infrastructure requirements – physical and social requirements; • Townscape and heritage strategy – to ensure that heritage assets are preserved and enhanced. • Urban design and sustainable design principles – to promote high quality development and steer proposals for key sites.</p>	<p>Building heights and views and vistas are addressed in detail by the Residential Design Guide and also in the interim framework's section on townscape area approach on page 33. Other strategies and guidance noted and evidence documents referred to in the interim framework are listed in Appendix 1 page 132.</p>
<p>Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (on behalf of the Guildford Society)</p>	<p>The Guildford Society would like to take this opportunity to promote a broader and more open approach to the preparation of the Masterplan in the spirit of the emerging Localism Act which seeks to encourage greater involvement of community groups. The Act will make provision for the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans and the Society feels strongly that there should be a closer and more open and transparent relationship with the Council in preparing the Masterplan.</p>	<p>Whilst this document is not a statutory document the Council has made significant efforts to involve the public and interest groups in its formation. The public has been involved at two stages of its preparation, at early engagement stage (with round table discussion groups) to define the key issues of concern and what people's priorities are for the town centre. The second stage was this consultation on the draft masterplan which was open for six and a half weeks to allow additional time to reflect the time year. This work has all been developed from the 2005/6 draft Town Centre Area Action Plan (TCAAP) which was also subject to two stages of public involvement.</p>
	<p>A robust masterplan is based on thorough research and a series of baseline reports which typically cover property and commercial issues, landscape and townscape, transport and public realm and sustainability. The existing masterplan does not appear to be based on the type of research one would expect of Guildford's importance and also for the duration of the plan period. An overriding imperative is to address the traffic problems of the town centre. A thorough traffic study is required in order to look at mid to long term solutions to: • The levels of through traffic. • Reductions in traffic entering the town centre. • Vehicle speeds. • Existing road infrastructure and geometries. • Parking, including park and ride. • Interchange between modes of public transport and the requirements and location of the bus station in relation to the railway station.</p>	<p>See Appendix 1 for evidence studies used to formulate the It is recognised that local traffic issues including congestion, parking and public transport facilities such as the bus station are key areas of concern to the local public. The Council does not have all the information it needs yet to develop a movement strategy for the town centre, but are working on this alongside Surrey County Council, which is responsible for most of the roads in the area, and also the Highways Agency which is responsible for the major roads, including the A3. Movement is addressed on page 101 of the revised framework.</p>
	<p>In parallel with this a series of smaller scale design studies and proposals should be developed. The sequencing is flexible and can, to an extent, be opportunistic depending on available funding. Each proposition would require a detailed study and a carefully phased implementation plan. Allies on Morrison on behalf of the Guildford Society included several pages of guidance explaining how to prepare a very robust and thoroughly researched masterplan with extensive stakeholder input and consultation.</p>	<p>The document, because of its nature has been retitled a framework rather than a masterplan in reflection of its contents and focus.</p>

	2. Undertake thorough and extensive traffic studies and transport modelling and research about the future role of Guildford's economy and its role in the region and beyond. 3. Connect the High Street to the River. Redesign the end of the High Street and introduce a shared surface crossing to link it to the River Bridge. 4. Improve pedestrian routes. 5. Insist on good design. Set up a Guildford design review panel (along the CABA model) to provide effective design advice on all new developments. Appoint a "Design Champion" in the council.	The revised framework has a section on reconnecting the town to the river, the river side settings and pedestrian movement. Work is also ongoing on technical studies with Surrey County Council to feed into a final framework, which will include a movement strategy. Good design is important to the Council and the interim framework reinforces this in its vision: new mixed use development will be well designed and provide pleasant places and spaces to meet, relax and move around easily. Objective TC2 is to improve the quality of the environment with well designed buildings and spaces that compliment and enhance the character of the area. Guildford Council do have a design champion, Councillor Melanie Bright.
	6. Improve pavements. Produce a simple and robust streetscape design manual (base on TfL or English Heritage models). Produce a "surfaces plan" and implementation programme based on skewing routine maintenance programmes over a 10 year period. Audit and rationalise street furniture and reduce unnecessary signage, guard rails, etc. Agree all streetscape proposals through the design panel.	The final framework will include a materials guide identifying the most suitable materials for footways, roads, walls, railings, and so on in the different areas of the town centre.
	7. Develop new public spaces. Remove surface car parking from key sites along the River Wey. 8. Improve way finding. Produce a detailed urban design study to "knit" the town centre together through a series of small scale, interventions (ref Bankside Urban Forest). Design simple interventions to link North Street and The Castle more closely to the High Street. Calm traffic at key points on the gyratory. Address north-south routes along the River.	The revised document is much more detailed and addresses the surface car parks and their relationship to the River Wey, reconnecting the town with the river, and pedestrian accessibility.
	10. Promote infill development on key sites. Promote smaller, specialist, independent retailers. The range of uses on the town centre should be extensive and should include a mix of specialist and other retail uses, office, tourism and visitor attractions, the evening economy, cultural and residential uses. Small scale high quality retailing is particular suited to Guildford.	The revised interim framework has a specific section on enlivening small spaces on page 54. This states the Council will work with its partner landowners to promote greater opportunities for more small independent shops and businesses. The evening economy is addressed on page 111 of the revised interim framework.
	11. Promote residential development in the town centre. Consider key town centre sites for housing. Promote mid density residential development close to the station and on riverside sites to the north of the town centre. Consider the potential for student housing.	Residential use is suggested on several key town centre development sites. Student housing is a specialist form of housing that will be addressed in greater detail in the Local Plan Strategy.
	12. Choreograph the town. Develop a programme of temporary and seasonal events to utilise underused sites in the town centre including markets, kiosks, stalls, events, installation art and festivals. Open up small scale site opportunities for temporary use, aimed at local entrepreneurs.	Markets and events are addressed in the revised interim framework on page 114 and 115.
	The Masterplan puts forward an improvement strategy for the town centre comprising four strands – development, environmental improvement, town centre management and sustainable living. The focus and emphasis is placed on the development strand with 25 sites being identified across the town centre.	The revised interim framework has a new layout and approach compared to the original draft framework.
	The Guildford Society believe that too much emphasis has been placed on the redevelopment of key sites, many of them Council owned, and that the Masterplan fails to clearly articulate a high level overarching vision for the town centre which seeks to address directly the town's key opportunities. Giving serious consideration to the opportunities there might be to improve the town's relationship with the River Wey corridor and create better pedestrian links between the commercial core of the town and the station are both high level objectives that transcend the benefits of redeveloping any individual site. All the sites identified have an important role in delivering these primary objectives – either directly or indirectly. But it is the lack of higher level primary objectives which undermines the Masterplan and this is the Society's principal concern.	An improved section on the River Wey has been included in the revised framework (page 97) which includes riverside to and across the river and enhancing views to and from the river. There is also a section on reconnecting the town with its river (page 61 and 62). There is also a section on movement, in particular walking and cycling, and a section on improving pedestrian connections (page 84).
	The Masterplan, as currently conceived, lacks focus and a sense of priority. The four strands of the improvement strategy are generic and lack any reference to Guildford as a place. The River Wey is Guildford's principal environmental asset. The relationship between the town centre and the river corridor has been eroding for many years. This relationship is at its weakest in the very heart of the town centre. We believe the Masterplan should confirm that improving the relationship between the town and the river is its primary objective. Other issues such as improving the links to the railway station, giving more priority to pedestrian as well as more strategic objectives including the strengthening of the town's position in the retail hierarchy are all addressed by this primary objective.	Objective TC4 on page 19 is 'Enhance the appearance and use of the River Wey and its riverside.' Please also see comments above. The pedestrian links to the railway station are addressed on page 105 and 106.
	The Guildford Society acknowledges the engagement and consultation which has been undertaken to date. There is, however, a general concern that local people, stakeholders and Public Amenity Groups such as the Guildford Society have not had an adequate opportunity to feed into the evolution of the Masterplan in a meaningful way. The current consultation process is a case in point, with many stakeholder groups finding it challenging to mobilise and prepare coherent representations to the draft during a consultation period which has straddled the Christmas and New Year's break. The Localism Act will make provision for the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans and the Society feels strongly that there should be a closer and more open and transparent relationship with the Council in preparing the Masterplan. Some parts of the report require further editing and honing to achieve a consistently professional voice. The Masterplan should play a key role in encouraging investment and the document should set the right tone and impression for Guildford.	Whilst this document is not a statutory document the Council has made significant efforts to involve the public and interest groups in its formation. The public has been involved at two stages of its preparation, at early engagement stage (with round table discussion groups) to define the key issues of concern and what people's priorities are for the town centre. The second stage was this consultation on the draft masterplan which was open for six and a half weeks to allow additional time to reflect the time year. This work has all been developed from the 2005/6 draft Town Centre Area Action Plan (TCAAP) which was also subject to two stages of public involvement.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group (HTAG)	In no particular order of priority the following points were made at HTAGs meeting-	

	1. More should be made of exploiting the river, in particular planning to acquire more river frontage to increase pedestrian access along the length of it	An improved section on the River Wey has been included in the revised framework (page 97) which includes reconnecting the town with the river, enhancing views to and from the river and improved access to the river. There is also a section on reconnecting the town with its river (page 61 and 62). There is also a section on movement, in particular walking and cycling, and a section on improving pedestrian connections (page 84).
	2. The plan is too piecemeal and does not address the issues of traffic flow and the additional traffic generated by town centre development sites.	There is a section on movement in the interim framework, plus additional work is taking place with Surrey County Council on technical studies to feed into a final framework, which will include a movement strategy.
	3. No priority in the sites referred to and no recognition of the external pressures upon town centre development	The section on infrastructure delivery, page 120, gives an approximation of when schemes contributing to delivery objectives could be delivered/approximate timescales where known.
	4. The plan should not encourage any retail development which impacts on the vitality of the High street	Lack of sites in the central retail area of the town centre is resulting in an increasing amount of new retail floorspace being developed in out of centre locations such as Ladymead retail park, leading to retail spend being diverted to out of centre locations and to other competing town centres. If this continues, other competing town centres and out of centre locations will gain visitors and expenditure relative to Guildford town centre, which will be relatively disadvantaged. The aim of the interim framework is to enliven and vitalise the High Street and encourage appropriate development to help this aim.
	5. There is insufficient vision expressed in the TCMP	The vision is specified in Chapter 3 on page 15 of the interim framework.
	6. How can more independent shops be encouraged as this contributes to the unique attraction of the town	The revised interim framework has a specific section on enlivening small spaces on page 54. This states the Council will work with its partner landowners to promote greater opportunities for more small independent shops and businesses. The evening economy is addressed on page 111 of the revised interim framework.
	7. Cycling provision needs to be included in the traffic modelling plans, including provision of cycle parks at the top of the High street	Cycling is addressed on page 105 of the interim strategy. New cycle parking facilities are identified for the east and west of North Street, Tunsgate and Portsmouth Road in the infrastructure delivery table on page 122 and 124.
	8. The plan needs to encourage more amenity space within the town centre	A new square at Guildford Station and improvement to the public square on Friary Street are identified in the infrastructure delivery plan page 126. There are also opportunities to improve the amenity space outside of the Electric Theatre (page 64) and fronting the riverside (page 62).
	9. Community would like to see greater use of CPOs to encourage points 1 and 8 above	The revised interim framework has a section on land assembly which states that when required for wider public interest Guildford Borough Council will consider use of development agreements or if necessary compulsory purchase orders (CPO) (page 46).
Appendix 1 - Historic Evolution		
Member of the public	The Friary heritage (its medieval past and the monks) is something unique to Guildford that could be emphasized.	Noted, and interesting part of the town centre's history. However, a balance needed to be struck between including detail and its length.
Member of public	The lessons of the 1960s and 1970s should be learnt. The awful demolition and unsympathetic replacement of North St, Friary centre and the gyratory show what can happen with poor forethought.	Agree. This part of Appendix 3 provides detail of these interventions. The Strategy in the interim framework includes detail of how these can be remedied. The gyratory needs further technical evidence and feasibility studies before solutions are put forward in the final town centre framework.
No name given	Please ensure that you consider the long term implications for Guildford, rather than any short term commercial benefit, so that Guildford is still a pretty place to live and one that attracts people for the right reasons.	Comment noted. We aim through this document to strike a balance.
Guildford town resident	Too dominated by the needs of road traffic in the last 50 years.	Agree. The interim framework aims to begin to rebalance this dominance through improvements to the environment. Further improvements, including possibly the downgrading of the gyratory, will be put forward in a Movement strategy to be included in the final town centre framework.

Town Centre Signage Group	Many historic towns have great signage that is fitting and unique to the location. This adds to the history of the town rather than 'cluttering' the streets. A good example is Stratford Upon Avon.	Need for review of signage, including directional signs to the visitor attractions is part of the strategy, aimed at improving connections between the attractions.
Guildford town resident	Don't spoil the Castle Grounds!	Noted.
Secretary of Surrey Archaeological Society	2. Some of the earlier Guildford history quoted in the document is questionable. It would be useful to have the wording checked again especially where definitive statements are made about points which are mainly speculation.	This has since been amended / corrected with the helpful input of representatives of the Surrey Archaeological Society, Surrey County History Centre and other specialists in this area.
Surrey History Centre	Suggested wording for correcting and improving this section.	This has since been amended / corrected with the helpful input of representatives of the Surrey Archaeological Society, Surrey County History Centre and other specialists in this area.
Heritage Enterprise Manager, Surrey History Centre, Surrey County Council	Suggested wording for correcting and improving this section.	This has since been amended / corrected with the helpful input of representatives of the Surrey Archaeological Society, Surrey County History Centre and other specialists in this area.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	11.1. This section could be drastically reduced by making reference to the Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal.	It could be, although it also includes much information which is not in there.
	b) Current strategic issues 11.2. <i>Guildford stations.. are on the SW Trains service.</i> This illustrates the lack of interest in rail services. Reword <i>Guildford has exceptional rail connections, with frequent services provided by both SW Trains and First Great Western</i>	Its good rail links are noted as a strength in the SWOT. Wording will be added to the interim framework regarding First Great Western services.
	Retail Demand. 11.3. This is obsessed with comparison demand and the severe lack of convenience shopping is largely glossed over. The predicted demand for comparison shopping is too high in view of recent documented trends, and the rush to obtain more retail floorspace is not appropriate. Plans need to be based on realistic predictions, not on a paranoic desire to keep a perceived position in the hierarchy.	Future demand for comparison and convenience has been forecast by specialist consultants, who took into account changes in special forms of trading including growth in internet sales (for more detail, see the Retail and Leisure Study 2011). This is the Council's chosen strategy, to reinforce the strength of the town centre with a mix of uses, including more retail floorspace.
	Service and Leisure sector. 11.4. The claim that the area around the Epsom Road /London Road junction is one of three locations where <i>...night- time uses..is focussed...</i> is not correct, and could have serious consequences for our area. All the restaurants operate all day, and do not operate beyond the evening. There are no regular late night public bars. The only entertainment venue is G-Live; the Radisson Hotel is primarily a hotel, and any other functions, including entertainment, are ancillary. The area must be regarded as mixed use, primarily shops and restaurants, with some evening entertainment.	This has been reworded to explain more clearly (see page 92 "Reinforce emerging leisure and service hub" of strategy for the Eastern Fringe area).
Member of public	I think where possible all historic buildings should be retained.	The presumption for listed buildings of those of heritage importance is that these will be retained. Protected under legislation.
Member of public	This highlights that almost everything before 1945 was to be celebrated but recent developments have damaged the operability of the town centre and therefore impaired its attractiveness. Highways were the major issues and these MUST be addressed head on in this strategy document.	Agreed, as summarised in Appendix 3 of the interim framework, the post-war period has resulted in many of the key issues of concern in the town centre. Highways and transport issues are one of the key issues needing to be addressed. As explained in the interim framework, the final framework will include a Movement strategy, all informed by transport evidence.
no name given	More should be made of Guildford's major asset it's historic environment and this should be enhanced at every opportunity. With the new hotel and G live tourism should become a greater part of the economy. The high street setts whilst acknowledged should also be repaired properly with an agreed standard repair.	These three issues are all included in the interim framework.
Appendix 1 - Current strategic issues - Economy		
Guildford town resident	Would not like to see retail development swamping the scale of the town. Would like to see individual specialist shops encouraged to introduce variety as well as the usual high street shops perhaps a covered market as well as the north street market? Steps to increase our desirability as an historic tourist destination rather than just a shopping centre.	Comments noted. Agree. The potential development sites in the town centre will provide for a mix of uses. The desire for and benefits of markets are included in the strategy
University of Surrey	Economy - The University welcomes the objective to support and expand the town centre economy and the identification of a number of sites that could be redeveloped for employment generating uses. The University considers that a lack of suitable employment sites and / or modern office specification buildings could cause existing companies who wish to expand to look for accommodation outside of Guildford town, and this raises the possibility that if forced into relocating they will consider locations beyond the Borough. Not only would this give rise to a reduction in business rates for the Council, it would also affect the reputation of Guildford as a good place for businesses to locate and grow.	Comments noted. Agree. It is important that a number of the sites in the town centre are redeveloped to include employment generating uses and to help meet the future demand for modern employment floorspace.
	The future of the local economy will be influenced by the attractiveness of Guildford town centre as a place to invest, which is linked to the availability of a variety of types of business premises. It is therefore important that the supply of employment premises is maintained and enhanced, particularly in the town centre, which has the potential to be the most accessible location for businesses and their employees from a transport, housing and facilities perspective	Comments noted. Agree that it is important that the supply of employment premises is maintained and enhanced.

	A number of the sites identified for alternative uses in the masterplan are existing employment sites. If a particular site is poorly located and comprises poor quality buildings that are not suitable for modern needs, then it is right to consider the potential for other uses. However, allocations should be based on a robust, credible and up to date evidence base, which take into consideration current supply and demand. Sites should not be lost to no employment uses where there is an inadequate supply of employment sites to meet the needs of the Core Strategy DPD during the plan period. This would also bring into question the soundness of the masterplan in terms of whether it is flexible enough to deliver the Council's objectives. The masterplan would benefit from a town centre wide plan which shows the locations of the potential development sites identified on pages 23 – 39.	Comments noted. Agree that decisions around future allocations will be based on sound evidence. The Economic Land Assessment will provide the appropriate evidence.
Downsedge Residents Association	On the Economy we agree that "it will be a thriving place to locate businesses, with a focus on creativity and developing employment sectors, utilizing links with the nearby University of Surrey and Guildford College" but it is not clear whether this means locating these new businesses in the town centre (as defined in the Masterplan) or at the University research park. We suggest that the latter is the better option but that there needs to be a well designed and laid out physical green corridor between the town centre and the university comprising dedicated routes for pedestrians, cyclists and shuttle buses. Such a corridor could also include residential buildings and related service facilities to avoid the creation of a narrow and unattractive thoroughfare. To relieve congestion, much better separate access for vehicular traffic between the university, hospital and research park area on the one hand and the town centre on the other needs to be planned.	Comment noted. To clarify it means locating these new businesses in the town centre.
Guildford town resident	This should question whether retail, leisure or other areas of income are what is best for the town. I do not believe it does so.	Comment noted.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	The proposed train link to Heathrow (currently on hold according to Anne Milton) would bring significant business to Guildford	Comment noted.
Member of the public	The UK economy is in recession. This is common knowledge. How long the recession will last is a subject of debate, but the Chancellor has suggested [hinting at more and deeper cuts to come] that it will continue until after the next election. This hinted limitation may be optimistic. The world economy is in recession, and again its duration is unknown. However studies suggest that the period of continued growth enjoyed by the mature economies of the west is over, possibly for a very long time, to be replaced, if at all, by the eastern new-economies of China and India, and possible South American [Time magazine]. The most probable future is that of no growth overall in public funding for Guildford during most of the study period. There may be some growth in some parts of private disposable income, as the relevant catchment area is to some extent insulated from the general recession by the nature of employment.	Comments noted.
	It has been known for some time that less than half of retail spending now is on the 'High Street', and that this trend downwards is continuing. To the extent permitted by local planning restrictions, there has been a continued move of share towards out-of-town sites, and a dramatic increase in share by way of internet shopping [web based shopping was particularly marked over Christmas 2011]. Major shopping chains [John Lewis, Marks and Spencer, et al] are now opening up serious internet facilities, and beginning to see their High Street premises as showrooms and collection points, rather than self-contained emporiums. Retailers need fewer and smaller shops. The construction industry is well aware of this - industry market analysts note that new retail development opportunities are seen as out-of-town warehouses to service home delivery rather than expansion of in-town shopping [Building magazine]. Mega-malls on a regional scale remain successful, but they need a particular situation, and the property world has become exceeding cautious. Pension funds stand to lose a lot of money as the present trend in vacancies continues. They will become ever more cautious	Comments noted. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.
	Similarly, the demand for in-town offices is fragile. In the present market situation, the thrust by firms is for 'rationalisation' rather than expansion. While large floor out-of-town office space is still of occasional interest where firms are expanding or rationalising, the outskirts of towns show much unlet space in major developments. Small offices on the upper floors of in-town premises are of little or no interest to the market. Most planning authorities will report a stream of applications to change use to 'residential', following several years of fruitless marketing.	Comments noted. Agree that small offices on upper floors in-town are not attractive to the market. This means that there is a need for new purpose built modern office space.
	SOME PRELIMINARY DETAIL FOR GUILDFORD Guildford has not been as badly affected by the recession as many towns. The setted High Street itself has a good record: we see very few vacancies, and those that we do see are probably that way for a transitional reason. However, behind, the alleyways and Malls shows a less sanguine picture. There are a considerable number of vacancies, although even so nothing like the numbers that haunt towns in, for example, the North West. It is clear that Guildford, although insulated from the worst of present developing trends, is nevertheless part of an overall picture.	Comment noted.
	If then the mass-market moving to out-of-town and the Internet, the role of mass-market town centre shopping will inevitably decline in the absence of herculean efforts [Portas]. However Guildford starts by being fortunately placed. The town centre High Street has long established itself as a particularly up-market 'product'. In this, it has already a unique trading asset. Guildford is surrounded with some of the wealthiest population in the UK (and therefore, perhaps, in the world); this hinterland is exactly what one would be seeking to service a particular product of this kind. And it is not a product that lends itself to out-of-town sheds or the internet. A first conclusion, therefore, must be that any developments need to point up the particular relationship between a unique upmarket product and a unique upmarket customer base.	Comment noted.

	The other issue is the middle and cheaper end of the market, where Guildford is in more direct competition with some of the neighbouring towns and out-of-town's, such as Woking and Farnborough. Given the declining picture of this market, the most probable scenario is that Guildford would be lucky to hold on to its existing product and would have difficulty in sustaining any growth. This cuts right across earlier consultant reports, plans, and planning permissions, which, based on pre-recession assumptions, suggest a marked increase in retail sales in the town [<i>eg papers re Friary extensions</i>]. Unless John Lewis or Selfridges decides something major and presently unexpected, existing planning permissions seem unlikely to be implemented in the foreseeable future. A re-think of where we are going seems overdue.	Comments noted. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.
	The future, as the present, of commercial success in this new world will depend on the town's being a uniquely attractive place to visit. For the public domain, there are two key aspects in this. The first is the historic charm of the High Street and the alleys off, particularly the setted part of the High Street, the steep hill and the green hilltop opposite. There is a commercial imperative that this character be preserved and developed as far as is possible. The other key feature is the river, bringing green remarkably right into the town centre on the south side. This acts as a key image for a large number of visitors. This character can be built upon, by working along the river towards the north as far as possible in order to complete this very attractive gateway to the town.	Comments noted. Agree, greater emphasis given to the river and riverside in the amended Vision
West Horsley Parish Council	Retail demand: Recent figures show that internet shopping has grown rapidly with less money being spent on the high street.	Comments noted. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.
	Bulky items are best sold in out of town locations such as Ladymead .	Agreed - these are complementary to the town centre's shops
	A larger central supermarket would be necessary if living accommodation is increased within the town centre	Comment noted.
	Leakage of shoppers to other centres like Kingston is due to the John Lewis store.	Comment noted.
Member of public	you need more homes less offices . already office space not taken up	Comment noted. The need for more homes is recognised. There is also a need for more modern office accommodation. A lot of the vacant space is due to it not being of the right type and quality.
Member of public	why is the latest tourist data so old? (2003/04) Look at The Peoples Supermarket a great idea could that be sponsored in Guildford? There are enough employ properties to enable such a thing	Comment noted.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	2.3. <i>The town centre will have more shops...etc.</i> Replace by: <u>The number of shops will be increased as needed to meet local consumer demand. The diversity of shopping will be restored, in particular provision of convenience shopping.</u>	The vision has been reworded and the reference now reads 'More diverse, quality shops will also increase our visitor attractions alongside cultural and leisure opportunities.'
	2.4. <i>...the town centre's role as the county's key...employment centre.</i> This might be an objective for Guildford as a whole, but not for the town centre as such. Replace <i>town centre's</i> , by <u>town's</u> . or delete.	The vision has been reworded and the reference now reads 'The town centre will reinforce its position as a major and vibrant retail, leisure and cultural centre in the South East.'
	2.5.. <i>a thriving place to locate businesses.</i> The function of the town centre is to provide services and amenities to residents, and where needed, to local businesses. There is a benefit for business to be close to the rail / bus station, but this is not, per see, obtained by being within the designated town centre. More non-retail or service businesses, particularly manufacturing, would create traffic problems.	The vision has been reworded and the reference now reads 'Town centre improvements and new mixed use development will be well designed and provide pleasant places and spaces to meet, relax and move around easily and new job opportunities'.
Member of public	Given the good quality of this document, I can't believe that a cinema at 170 High St was not promoted by the council. Although it is not the Eastern leisure area of the town centre, it would have been a wonderful community enhancing cultural gem to have in the town. More like this should be considered.	Comment noted.
Member of public	Is the research in the masterplan up to date with current retail trends which are changing rapidly partly to do with the economy and online shopping.	Comments noted. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.
Quod on behalf of Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd	The owners of the Friary shopping centre and extension site are looking to redevelop the site as soon as possible and major retailers are currently being engaged as part of this process. Westfield Shoppingtowns is keen work with the Council, including input into the design and development brief, to bring redevelopment forward and the relocation of the bus station is a very important part of any future proposals.	Comments noted and partnership working welcomed.
No name given	The retail study is out of date following the change in the economy and the ongoing rise of the web. Quality shopping experience should be our usp. We should look to tourism and the uni/ research park and new industries like software.	Comments noted. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.
House of Fraser	There needs to be further analysis of the retail capacity study as we are still in a very difficult economic environment and it is likely that increasing the retail floorspace in Guildford will have a negative impact on existing retailers. This document should also discuss the size of retail units which are needed in Guildford as identified by the capacity study.	Comments noted. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace. This has taken into account special forms of trading which includes an increase in internet shopping.

NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	We suggest that the text which deals with retail demand (at Appendix 1) should be amended to reflect the key conclusions of the RTP study. In particular, there is a qualitative need for "at least one new food store" in the town to increase competition and choice, reduce overtrading and encourage linked trips and retail capacity for 6,776 sq.m. gross (4,044 sq.m. net) of additional convenience goods floorspace by 2021, after an assumption that the Friary Centre extension site is built out to accommodate a large foodstore (Table 6.9).	Comments noted. This section has now been reworded as follows 'The Retail and Leisure Study found the quantitative demand of comparison goods to be fairly limited to 2016 assuming that the approved Friary extension scheme is implemented and claims a large amount of the expenditure growth to 2016. However, the study acknowledges that the Friary extension scheme is unlikely to proceed in its current form. This was originally confirmed by the 2010 Town Centre Development Study, which recognised that failure to implement the approved scheme, even at during economic boom times was due to its lack of economic viability. The value of the scheme once built is less than the cost of acquiring the land, infrastructure costs and build costs. Assuming that this planning permission is not implemented in its currently approved form by 2016, comparison need would be 24,700 m2 to 2016, 57,200 m2 to 2021, and 94,300 m2 to 2026 (cumulative). The need for bulky goods floorspace is included within comparison goods need figures due to difficulties in defining exactly what comprises bulky goods and a lack of guidance on this.
	We note that reference is made to the Guildford Railway Station site potentially meeting the need for foodstore provision. We would support this. However, we would suggest that the TCM deletes the word "potentially", so as to make the sites suitability for meeting the foodstore need clearer and consistent with the continued long-standing planned approach to supermarket development on the Station site i.e. Policy GT8 of GBC Local Plan and 2006 Town Centre Action Area Plan, 2006. Whilst there is also reference to hotel provision within Appendix 1, there is no specific encouragement provided for additional provision in this respect. We would suggest that reference should be made to additional hotels being encouraged, in order to support businesses and tourist visitors. This would be consistent with the conclusions of the GBC 2009 Economic Development Strategy as well as enhance town centre vitality and viability.	Comment noted. No change. Page 77 of the new document refers to the possible mix of uses on the site which includes a hotel and cross refers to the Local Plan 2003 Policy.
Guildford Business Forum	Within the second sentence it should be emphasised that the town will continue to be the County's key employment centre with policies to both retain existing companies and encourage new ones.	Comment noted.
	Retail demand - I was surprised The Retail and Leisure study identified Godalming as a major benefactor of expenditure leakage from Guildford Town Centre when a recent study by me indicated some 43% of shop units were occupied by non-traditional retailers, i.e. charity shops, opticians, estate and travel agents, betting shops and banks, hardly magnet traders, although the Waitrose and Sainsbury supermarkets would benefit. In fact, looking at the distribution of bulk purchase food retailers, a Waitrose in Guildford town centre will attract traffic from the suburbs which might otherwise head for Tesco at Egertoll Road or Sainsbury at Merrow or Godalming. Therefore a supermarket SOUTH of Guildford could both mitigate any increase in traffic attracted by the new Waitrose and reduce leakage to Godalming.	Comments noted.
	Service and Leisure - Clearly attracting 4.2 million tourists boosting the local economy by over £250 million is a major source of satisfaction and incentive to build on this Success. Key to this is the provision of sufficient choice of modern hotels of all grades (NOT FORGETTING a large percentage of tourists require parking) and high quality catering offers. Whilst there is currently wide choice of restaurants, much is randomly scattered throughout the town, the total capacity and breadth of choice needing to be expanded in tandem with other measures boosting the local economy.	Comments noted.
	Theatres - Looking to the future highlights the need to address a replacement Yvonne Arnaud Theatre which is a very valuable element of the arts scene but woefully inadequate and uneconomic. As the present site is totally unsuited for a larger venue it is essential, even though no time frame can be identified, to ensure a suitable site is reserved for its replacement together with supporting catering and parking facilities, with easy access to the main transport interchanges. Failure to do so will rebound on the town's cultural qualities and economy in due course. Woking's highly successful New Victoria Theatre impact fully raised that town's profile and status, extracting considerable expenditure (leakage) from Guildford's leisure economy. I seem to recall it was part funded by development of The Peacocks Shopping Centre, suggesting a similar arrangement may be possible in Guildford. Perhaps The Academy of Contemporary Music would be interested in purchasing the old YAT thus part funding the new venue?	Comments noted.
	Employment - Although this study relates specifically to Guildford Town Centre, employment obviously affects the whole Borough, with the conundrum that sustaining or enhancing the local economy by generating jobs increases pressures on all other related issues viz housing, traffic, infrastructure etc. thus it seems likely that in view of the town's green 'belt' there are probably measurable limitations on just how big, physically and economically, the town can become. Therefore studies such as those assessing likely future parking and traffic requirements will provide for these future additional requirements. otherwise such projects may be jeopardised from the outset.	Comments noted. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed.
	Parking Needs - It is refreshing the Parking Strategy Review will focus on both current and future requirements to 'attract' visitors and support business. This is particularly pertinent as competing centres have, or are doing so, which is even more important in straightened economic times when competition is most threatening.	Comment noted.

	Parking Space - A cursory indication is that current 'car park' spaces totalling 5, 150 could drop to 4,776 with development of Friary II, without one additional town centre space for shoppers following the addition of 250,000 sq. ft. of retail space. Acknowledging the success of Park and Ride, I respectfully suggest that is an impractical scenario that contradicts the declared policy of supporting the town centre economy. A shopping centre with inadequate parking immediately becomes vulnerable to alienating customers to the great satisfaction of competing centres providing superior customer facilities. Sorry, but that's the way it works! Such factors may lead developers to consider whether such a high cost development risk is, justifiable. As developers depend entirely on the capital value of a completed development covering all development costs and providing a profit/buffer to cover cost over-runs and vacancy risks etc., a difference of between 1/2% and 1% on the final valuation capitalisation rate reflecting unattractive aspects of completed development could, on something the size of say Friary II, reduce its value by between £20,000,000 to £40,000 000. That may be a risk too far. The same principles apply to other development. Not providing parking or imposing punitive charges is almost the same as not providing electricity or doubling its cost!	Comments noted. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed.
Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (on behalf of the Guildford Society)	The town of Guildford has many different areas of activity and investment. The University and the Research Park have attracted significant levels of inward investment in recent times that has played a very significant role in strengthening and broadening the town's economic base. The Society believes the Masterplan is too focussed on the retail economy and would benefit from taking a wider perspective. In particular, we believe the river corridor north of the town centre offers a range of strategic opportunities for delivering improvements to the river environment and delivering housing growth that could help meet local priority housing needs.	Comments noted. Agree, greater emphasis given to the river and riverside in the amended Vision
	Figure 2 highlights the key nodes of investment and commercial activity which underpin the town's economy. The core retail area of the town centre is just one of these areas. Other key nodes have tended to develop along the A3 corridor and include the University and its affiliated Research Park; the Hospital which is a major employer in the town; Slyfield Industrial Estate for which an AAP is currently being prepared; and the office and retail parks located immediately south of the A3 corridor. As the terrain levels out north of the core town centre, the river and rail corridors create new opportunities for investment (see Figure 3). Low grade employment uses currently occupy a string of attractive riverside sites north of the town centre. The uplift in values released from their redevelopment for housing and other higher value uses could make a significant contribution to delivering the core objectives of improving the quality of, and access to, the river corridor in the town centre.	Comments noted. Greater emphasis given to the river and riverside in the amended Vision
Appendix 1 - Current strategic issues - Homes and Community		
Member of the public	see site 24 and 25 (Bright Hill car park and Surrey Adult Education Centre) low cost housing for essential workers is needed	included
Guildford town resident	None	No comment
Guildford town resident	Library is poor and uninviting incorporate tourist information into it and relocate?	The interim framework recognises an opportunity to develop a new Guildford Library as a community hub. It says that this could include staying open in the evening with events and activities, could include meeting rooms for community groups, and that there is potential to achieve this by creating a new building thus releasing the North Street site for redevelopment. There is more information about a new modern library facility on page 51 of the framework.
Member of public	Guildford has a strong community of residential areas in the town centre which has helped to make it the town it is. This should not be compromised by a need to continue to encourage more and more retail, commerce and traffic without considering the impact on those that already live here.	Comments noted. The town centre is the most sustainable location in the borough for new development, however redevelopment of key sites will be considered alongside infrastructure and environmental enhancement projects. The interim framework seeks to improve the town centre for current and new residents. This is recognised in its vision, which says that getting to and around the town centre will be improved for the benefit of residents, businesses and visitors alike.
No name given	I do not think we need any more housing in the town centre which will only encourage more traffic and parking issues.	The NPPF says, "allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community and residential development needed in town centres." (paragraph 23). Town centres and urban areas are the most sustainable locations for future residential development. There is a significant need for new homes in the borough, and housing that cannot be provided in sustainable locations, will need to be provided in less sustainable locations such as countryside land and Green Belt land. Redevelopment of key sites will be considered alongside infrastructure and environmental enhancement projects.
University of Surrey	Housing	
	The University strongly agrees that very high land values and home prices that make it particularly difficult for young people and key workers to live locally to their work, are a weakness of the town centre. This is an issue that must be addressed through the masterplan.	Comments noted. It is recognised as a weakness of the town centre that very high land values and home prices make it particularly difficult for many younger people and for and key workers to live locally to their work.

	The University welcomes the objective to improve the town centre as a sustainable place to live and to increase the number of homes, including affordable homes. If more affordable housing is provided in the town centre there is a greater likelihood that University students and staff, and employees of tenants of the Surrey Research Park will be able to live close to where they work or study. This relationship is important if the University is to continue to attract new students and staff and also for other employers based in Guildford. If housing opportunities do not exist for the young and old, people and businesses could be lost to other towns or cities where accommodation is more available and affordable.	Agree. Providing affordable housing for local people is of great importance to the Council. It is a key delivery target (2012-2015) of the Council to enable the provision of affordable homes to address identified housing needs.
	The University supports the development of sites identified in the masterplan for residential uses. However this must not prejudice the achievement of economy and transportation related objectives. The allocation of sites of residential uses must be based on a robust, credible and up-to-date evidence base or the masterplan could be unsound. While the University supports the provision of new housing in the town centre, it is aware that there are not enough available sites in the town centre to meet the housing needs of the Borough up to 2030. The University considers that there is a need to identify sites on the edge of town where development would be well connected with the town centre and would complement the objectives of the town centre masterplan.	Agree. The Council acknowledges that it is likely that countryside land will be needed during the plan period to help meet the need for new housing in the borough. This is being assessed as part of the evidence base supporting the Local Plan Strategy.
Downsedge Residents Association	Regarding Home and Community we agree that there is some scope for additional residential facilities in the town centre but given the principal limiting factor of topography, we consider it prudent to allocate some numbers for a planned increase in residential units. We also consider it to be prudent to allocate in the masterplan suitable sites for such units (where ownership and current developments plans allow) rather than to await intermittent and uncoordinated proposals from developers. It should after all be straightforward to specify GBC owned sites in the town centre area which are suitable for residential development and consistent with an optimised masterplan	The interim framework will be a material planning consideration when determining planning applications, but it is not a development plan document and does not have statutory status. It therefore cannot allocate sites. Site Allocations will be made in the Local Plan Delivery document.
Member of public	Is any proper analysis of the demographics of Guildford undertaken on a regular basis for the purpose of planning housing development, roads and other public facilities, provision of education, the needs of the elderly and disabled, etc?	The National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to "plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends" (paragraph 50). Demographics inform the preparation of a housing number for the borough. See the topic paper supporting the Who Needs Housing consultation that took place in spring/summer 2011. www.guildford.gov.uk/whoneedshousing .
Member of public	Follow Salisbury's example historic and ongoing quality of town centre maintained by no high buildings in area Bus station that is hidden and separate from both station and shops seems bad idea. Itself would separate station and shops Golfbuggy style transport for elderly and disabled like Woking?	Ensuring the design and height of new buildings are suitable was a key message raised by those responding to the draft master plan consultation, which has informed rewriting of the vision and objectives. The future location of bus facilities has not yet been decided, several options are being considered.
Member of public	data from 2001 !!!! If more town centre residential building is to take place it is essential that adequate parking is provided for the residents and guests and also that any car parks that are built over to make the housing are replaced with adequate and sensibly priced parking	Comments noted. The level and pricing of parking in the town centre is recognised as a community priority in the interim framework. A revision of Guildford Parking Strategy 2003 is due to be completed at the end of September 2012.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	2.9. <i>It will have more housing....</i> This cannot be an unqualified aspiration, as space is limited. A large increase in car movements in the town centre would be a problem. Reword: More housing will be provided, aimed at non car owners, and recognising the constraints of the need for amenity space and building height limitations. 2.10. Add: It (the centre) will provide enhanced amenities and facilities for the many local residents within walking distance of the centre who expect it to meet most of their needs.	Agree. We are currently preparing a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to identify sites in the borough suitable for housing. This will inform the number of new homes we anticipate will be developed in Guildford Town Centre. This number will be included in our draft Local Plan, which is likely to be subject to consultation in Winter 2012/13.
Member of public	Figures appear rather out of date.	The Census data for 2011 was released in summer 2012 by local authority area only. 2011 census data for these much smaller areas has not yet been released. When it is available, it will be used in place of the 2001 data.
No name given	Need to keep town centre alive at night with people living in it.	Agree. Part of the vision states that Guildford town centre will be lively both by day and in the evening and it is one of the objectives of the interim framework to promote a diverse evening and night time economy, including later shopping hours
Appendix 1 - Current strategic issues - Movement		
Member of the public	Appendix 1. Page 13. Parking no's at the Tunsgate car park incorrect. Not stated - 64 actual ?	Comment noted. The map appears to read 164 spaces. 64 spaces is the correct number. Ensure that appendix 1, page 13, the tunsgate car park, reads as showing 64 spaces.
Member of the public	although not part of the town centre a park and ride is proposed at manor farm and has an impact on reducing traffic movement into the town good news . will this site have access from the A3 both north and south. can a link road be incorporated into the site to give a southerly access / exit to the science park and relieve peak time traffic flow at egerton road / gill avenue and consequent back up to the town centre and gyratory site 17 could millbrook car park have a southern exit, controlled by traffic lights, so that southward bound traffic does not have to go around the gyratory	Comments noted. The park and ride will not have direct access from the A3. There are improvements being made to the roundabout.

Member of the public	Car movements should be reduced as much as possible as Guildford is notoriously congested in the busy times.	Comments noted. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed.
Guildford town resident	You are right, few cyclist tackle the gyratory. Parking for Motorcycles & Scooters needs to be increased & signed better. Buses need an easier route through North Street congestion	Comment noted.
Member of the public	A Park and Train scheme from Horsley station (also Effingham Junction and Clandon) could be arranged at a relatively low cost to operate on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays using the existing train service and station car parks. The current train service from Horsley, Effingham Junction and Clandon could be used to create an alternative park and ride service accessible from the A3 London direction on Saturdays / Sundays / public holidays (and possibly on weekdays between Christmas and New Year) There would be relatively low setup costs compared to constructing new park and ride sites and no additional operating costs. The trains from these stations serve both London Road and Guildford stations, both within reasonable walking distance of the town centre. The park and train service would be based on Horsley station, with the alternative of Effingham Junction station as an overflow.	Comment noted. The framework now makes reference to the point that train car parks could be promoted at weekends at some of the train stations surrounding the town centre to encourage Guildford borough residents not to take the car into the town centre. However, these car parks are owned by private landowners including Network Rail and therefore such a scheme is dependant on their agreement. Pricing of parking and train fares is outside the control of the Borough Council.
	Advantages: Easy access from the A3 at Wisley / Ripley via B2039 to Horsley station. Frequent train services 4 trains per hour weekdays / Saturdays to / from Guildford (half hourly service on Sundays). This is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future as train service levels are set by the South West Trains franchise agreements. Limited expenditure required to set up: Mainly road signing (to and from A3 and other main roads, and from London Road station towards High Street); also advertising. Car park at Horsley station has 170 spaces; space available at Effingham Junction as an 'overflow' this has 160 spaces (this would need road signing from Horsley station). An alternative location at Clandon station has 91 spaces – this could be signed as a park and train for users from Send / Ripley / Old Woking.	Comment noted. The framework now makes reference to the point that train car parks could be promoted at weekends at some of the train stations surrounding the town centre to encourage Guildford borough residents not to take the car into the town centre. However, these car parks are owned by private landowners including Network Rail and therefore such a scheme is dependant on their agreement. Pricing of parking and train fares is outside the control of the Borough Council.
	Disadvantages: Walking distance from London Road and Guildford stations to the town centre is further than other park and ride schemes. (But many people already come to Guildford by train for shops.) Can only operate on Saturdays and bank holidays plus weekdays between Christmas and New Year. On normal weekdays the station car parks are required for regular commuters. On Sundays there is a less frequent train service (every 30 mins.) Horsley and Effingham Junctions stations are currently staffed on Saturday mornings – stations are unstaffed at other times on weekends. Tickets purchased from self-service machines at other times (This is not really a problem as many rail users purchase ticket from machines). No toilet facilities when stations are unstaffed. The current trains on this line do not have toilets. The stations are not currently fully accessible for disabled passengers – there are steps to one platform at Horsley and Clandon stations, to both platforms at Effingham Junction.	Comment noted. These car parks are owned by private landowners including Network Rail and therefore such a scheme is dependant on their agreement. Pricing of parking and train fares is outside the control of the Borough Council.
	To be negotiated with South West Trains: Free car parking at the named stations on Saturdays (already free on Sundays). Reduced rail fares to Guildford – ideally these should be comparable with the park and ride bus fares. Total revenue to South West Trains needs to be more than the current business to Guildford from these stations, otherwise there is no incentive for them to participate in the scheme.	Comment noted. The framework now makes reference to the point that train car parks could be promoted at weekends at some of the train stations surrounding the town centre to encourage Guildford borough residents not to take the car into the town centre. However, these car parks are owned by private landowners including Network Rail and therefore such a scheme is dependant on their agreement. Pricing of parking and train fares is outside the control of the Borough Council.
	Information from South West Trains website : Effingham Junction = 160 places = parking currently £2 Saturday / free Sunday. Fares (2011) = £4.90 day return to Guildford, £4.80 to London Rd Horsley = 170 places; parking currently free Saturday and Sunday. 2011 Fares (2011) = £4.80 day return to Guildford, £4.40 to London Road Clandon = 91 places = parking currently £2 Saturday / free Sunday. Fares (2011) = £3.90 day return to Guildford, £3.30 to London Road. Sign the Park and Train to Horsley station off A3 at Wisley / Ockham if the car park here is full, then have signs to direct users to Effingham Junction as an overflow.	Comment noted. This suggestion could form part of a wider transport strategy for the borough.
	Advertise Park and Train at Clandon – accessible from A247 / Woking, and from south (A246, but this would be in competition with Merrow P and R – but could avoid having to expand this P and R site). Weekday / Saturday train services from Effingham Junction, Horsley, Clandon to London Road and Guildford: 4 trains per hour, each direction (but not at 15 minute intervals). Trains now run at 12 / 18 / 12 / 18 minute intervals each hour to Guildford, 10 / 20 / 10 / 20 minute intervals each hour from Guildford.	Comment noted. This suggestion could form part of a wider transport strategy for the borough.
Member of public	The gyratory is awful and the cause of much traffic. Unless congestion is seriously addressed then the other improvements you suggest will not bear much fruit.	Comments noted. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed.
Guildford town resident	The plan should place greater emphasis on linking the prime retail areas with the Railway station. The present situation requires considerable improvement.	Comment noted.
Guildford town resident	Traffic problems would be relieved by reopening the subway to Debenham's.	Comments noted. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed.

University of Surrey	Transportation The strategic benefits of building an improved town centre economy with more jobs and better retail offer will clearly complement issues around transportation. Overall the emphasis will be able to shift such that local trips for residents of the Borough can replace longer journeys to other centres further afield. This will of course require investment and action to deliver transport facilities and local connectivity to keep step with such changes. Traffic congestion in the town centre at peak hour times, and the impact that it has on journey times is identified as a weakness and threat within the masterplan. The University agrees that this is an issue and that it does have a negative impact on enjoyment of the town centre, whether travelling by private vehicle, public transport or as a pedestrian or cyclist. Works to alleviate these problems, such as feasibility studies to investigate possible ways to improve traffic flow with or without the gyratory and associated junction improvements in the town centre and improved connectivity for other modes are welcomed by the University (page 60).	Comments noted. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed.
	In summary, the overall objectives of improving the town centre are supported. Improving the retail, leisure and commercial offer should help to achieve a stronger economy and encourage reduced journey distances. This will in turn increase the opportunity for walking, cycling and bus journeys where local trips can be more readily accommodated by these modes. Encouraging more locally based jobs and facilities for local residents of the Borough with a better balance of provision for walking and cycling are important. In addition rail and bus station improvements are welcomed as they will encourage more sustainable travel choices to be made by a wider catchment of people. More detail is provided below:	Comments and support welcomed.
	Buses. The vision should recognise that there will be an increased desire for travel to the town centre and that this will not be accommodated solely by the private car. It should recognise that bus (both Park & Ride and regular services) will be an increasingly important means of travel to access the town centre for journeys from other parts of the town. The vision should look to improve access, facilities and provision for buses in the town centre. The University welcomes the proposal to improve bus facilities within the town centre. Many students and staff of the University and employees based at Surrey Research Park use bus services to travel between home and work, and improvements to facilities will improve their travel experience. Improvement measures that facilitate more efficient access, faster journey times and greater range and frequency of services will encourage a greater number of people to transfer from private car to public transport.	The interim framework now make reference to the point that modal shift to public transport, the train and bus will require better bus facilities to encourage more people to use bus services.
	The masterplan should aim to deliver an expanded bus provision in the future to serve the town centre and adjacent urban areas. Within this strategy there is a need to ensure wherever possible that bus corridors and priority measures are introduced on key approaches and not just within the town centre itself. There is a need for joined up thinking to ensure that travelling by bus (both local and Park and Ride) is encouraged and well planned.	Comments noted. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed. The interim framework now make reference to the point that modal shift to public transport, the train and bus will require better bus facilities to encourage more people to use bus services.
Town Centre Signage Group	Please include a policy to aid pedestrians, cyclists and vehicle movement through signage policy.	The interim framework strategy includes the need for a more co-ordinated and thorough approach to signage.
Member of the public	Why has the area of land above the railway station and main railway line towards the Wooden Bridge not been utilised for residential and/or traffic rerouting.	Comment noted. It is likely that the land you refer to is in the control of a private landowner.
Guildford town resident	I don't agree with adding shared (I assume raised) road spaces and traffic calming to Walnut Tree Close, Mary Road and Haydon Place. The traffic is slow enough in these areas. In my experience share space makes the pedestrians more nervous and raised road sections add visual clutter.	The interim framework makes reference to the opportunity for shared spaces and that this will be investigated. It no longer specifies specific streets.
Guildford town resident	Holistic traffic/congestion plan required.	Comments noted. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	Reclaim the streets from Surrey County Council Highways department	Comment noted.
Member of the public	WHERE ARE WE GOING? The first major consideration has to be through traffic- a very particular local issue [Guildford's problems with congestion figure on a European scale]. Every planning study has noted that the town is riven by the A281 and the gyratory - many studies have made suggestions as to how to tackle this, but, effectively, all these [except, perhaps, Buchanan in the 1960's] have done is to propose tinkering at the edges. Without 'sorting' this, there are serious limits on the future. The transport system in Guildford is dominated by the gyratory road system and its peripherals. Apart from the vehicular traffic problems. it be-devils any attempt to improve the town for the pedestrian – the actual shopper.	Comments noted. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed.
	There are three fundamental difficulties here with making changes. The first is that responsibility is uneasily shared between multiple agencies [Surrey CC, GBC, Highways Agency, etc]. The responsibility for local highways should be brought in-house to GBC. This can be put in hand more or less immediately. The second is that the gyratory system forms part of a sub regional network. This can be seen by the heavy lorries working their way through from places like Cranleigh to Wisley for the M25.	Comment noted.

	The third is that the gyratory also acts as a focal point for cross town journeys There is no ready way to avoid it and such ways as there are have their own problems. The lead example here is the slip roads onto and off the A3 at Wooden Bridge and the Cathedral. At its busiest point the A3 narrows to two lanes in each direction. With the opening of the Hindhead tunnel, the A3 has more to do than act as a Guildford distributor road. On the agenda, therefore, must be a proposal to increase the capacity from the Wooden Bridge roundabout to the junction with the Hog's Back A31. This could be achieved either by adding a third [and fourth?] lane in each direction, or by inserting a completely new highway between the Wooden Bridge roundabout and the Cathedral Roundabout. The detail needs further examination – that can be started now -, and the construction should be early brought in to the 2020 (ie post immediate recession) programme for negotiation between the highway authorities and others concerned.	Comments noted. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed.
	With this established for the A3, the next issue becomes that of the Horsham Road and its tributaries, and the completion of a southern route round the core of Guildford. There is already in existence a suitable pattern of roads (the A248 - B3000) going from Shalford through Peasmarsh and Compton. There are capacity problems at the junctions on this and a serious environmental issue for Compton village which will need solving. With these two external moves executed in or before, hopefully, the 2020 programme, it then becomes possible to establish the very substantial changes suggested elsewhere to the gyratory in the middle of town to make the situation more comfortable for all, and particularly for pedestrians.	Comments noted. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed.
West Horsley Parish Council	The consultation notes the busy gyratory system but plans little to reduce the problem. Cycle routes/provision of racks are good for people living centrally but of little use if you live 6 miles or more outside the centre.	Comments noted. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed.
Guildford town resident	Trains, cars, buses and other road transport need to be planned for as an integrated whole. There should be parking on both sides of the station and provision for buses to stop at the station too. This does not have to be a bus station as such. The town centre is frequently congested and traffic needs to pass through more easily. There should be greater consideration for pedestrians. The walk from our side of town (Guildford Park) should be more pleasant. Walking over Farnham Road Bridge, along Bridge Street and along the narrow pavement by the Friary is difficult as there are so many pedestrians walking in a confined space. A walk over Walnut Tree Close from the station through to Bedford Road should be considered.	Comments noted. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed.
Member of public	what is the point of even referring to census data of 2001? How can you justify dependence on a parking survey from 2003? Can you make the cycle lanes clearer and repaint the white lines so motorists know what's what?	The references to the census data will be updated once the 2011 data is available. The Council is currently working on updating the parking strategy. Transport infrastructure is one of the key issues facing the town centre. The details of transport infrastructure will need to be included in a movement strategy once we have all the evidence needed.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	<i>Transport and other Infrastructure. 2.7..with improved public transport facilities...Add and pedestrian and cycling facilities ..including bus facilities and Guilford railway station.</i>	Comment noted. The vision has been rewritten and now refers to 'Getting to and around the town centre will be improved for the benefit of residents, businesses and visitors alike.'
	Reword. <i>...including bus and rail facilities</i> There is much potential for exploitation of rail services that goes far beyond improvement of the station and walking routes to it. These offer the best opportunities for improving the quality of the town.	Comment noted. The vision has been rewritten and now refers to 'Getting to and around the town centre will be improved for the benefit of residents, businesses and visitors alike.'
	<i>2.8. It will be an easy and safe place for pedestrians and cyclists to find their way and to move around. It is not enough for walking and cycling routes to be passable. They must be welcoming, reflect the policy requirement that they are at the top of the Transport hierarchy and make users feel valued. Reword: <u>Pedestrians and cyclists will be placed at the top of the transport hierarchy; facilities will be improved to make them safe and welcoming. Pedestrianisation will be increased and pedestrian priority introduced wherever possible. Routes not currently adopted by the Highways authority will be.</u></i>	Comment noted. The vision has been rewritten and now refers to 'Getting to and around the town centre will be improved for the benefit of residents, businesses and visitors alike.'
	<i>2.9. <u>Routes that provide for residents from the surrounding area to walk to the centre will be improved.</u></i>	Comment noted.
	<i>11.5 ..poor walking routes across the (gyratory)..neither direct nor comfortable... The Riverside route from the Town Bridge to the station is direct and reasonably comfortable – its problem is the inadequate maintenance. Replace <i>These</i> by <u>Some</u></i>	This has been reworded and now reads 'One of the main issues facing the town centre is the quality of the pedestrian environment, particularly for people with disabilities. The key pedestrian routes across the town centre are between Guildford railway station, the Friary shopping centre and North Street and High Street. Walking routes across these areas are not direct, comfortable, nor easy to read. Few cyclists venture onto the gyratory.'

	11.6. <i>Pedestrian and Cycle Environment.</i> Add: <u>Walking routes into the centre from adjacent residential areas, which many residents use, or would like to use, to access the centre, are very poor. A similar criticism applies to routes from the town centre to places that should be an attraction for visitors, such as Pewley Down, the Spike, the cathedral.</u>	This has now been reworded and reads as 'One of the main issues facing the town centre is the quality of the pedestrian environment, particularly for people with disabilities. The key pedestrian routes across the town centre are between Guildford railway station, the Friary shopping centre and North Street and High Street. Walking routes across these areas are not direct, comfortable, nor easy to read. Few cyclists venture onto the gyratory. The most heavily used pedestrian route between Guildford railway station and the main shopping area is across Walnut Tree Close, over Onslow Bridge, along Bridge Street and onto Onslow Street. The highest number of traffic c accidents relating to shunts in the one way system and pedestrians at road crossings occur at the three crossing points of the junction of Onslow Street with Bridge Street.'
	11.7. Add: <u>All main paths that are part of the main pedestrian routes that are not yet adopted by the Highways Authority as Town Paths will be so adopted</u>	Comment noted.
Member of public	There should really be more emphasis on helping pedestrians and cyclists move around the town. Getting from one side to the other is particularly difficult if you need to cross the gyratory. Cycling around the town is difficult and dangerous which puts most people off.	Comment noted. Agree. This has now been reworded and reads as 'One of the main issues facing the town centre is the quality of the pedestrian environment, particularly for people with disabilities. The key pedestrian routes across the town centre are between Guildford railway station, the Friary shopping centre and North Street and High Street. Walking routes across these areas are not direct, comfortable, nor easy to read. Few cyclists venture onto the gyratory. The most heavily used pedestrian route between Guildford railway station and the main shopping area is across Walnut Tree Close, over Onslow Bridge, along Bridge Street and onto Onslow Street. The highest number of traffic c accidents relating to shunts in the one way system and pedestrians at road crossings occur at the three crossing points of the junction of Onslow Street with Bridge Street.'
Member of public	Traffic congestion is bad and the fact that the roads cut the river off from the town centre.	Comment noted. Agree regarding the issue facing Guildford town with regard to the physical barriers.
Member of public	Traffic and the short legs on the gyratory system (including the addition of the pedestrian crossing in front of Debenhams).	Comment noted.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Guildford does have a problem with traffic; however, this is seen across all successful towns and cities. It is a factor of daily life that the roads are busy and in effect, shows that Guildford's economic prosperity is good. Buses do serve most places to enable a choice, however, the impact of the Hindhead Tunnel on transferring traffic congestion from the Devil's Punch Bowl to Guildford's outer roads, such as Stag Hill (and by a small increase, through the town) will need to be considered. Improved waterfront walkways, which are 6m wide, enabling cycle, pedestrian and leisure uses to happen, will create an open space that is key to the experience of Guildford Town Centre. Better pavements and experience from the train station to the High Street and commercial quarters is essential as the experience at present is not pleasurable or safe.	Comments noted and points agreed.
No name given	It may need more than improvement of the gyratory but I support this as a first try.	Support for this noted.
CTC	The document states that 'few cyclists venture onto the gyratory'. This is not true - most cyclists who are trying to make east - west movements, and many making north - south ones do HAVE to use the gyratory for lack of suitable alternatives. The fact that there aren't very many cyclists in Guildford is because the gyratory (and other roads in the town) are so grim. The parking strategy needs to take account of the needs of cyclists. Provision for cycle parking in and around the town centre is appalling. There is parking at the foot of the High Street and a little at the foot of North Street but otherwise parking is absent. It is interesting to note the number of bikes leaned (precariously) outside Sainsbury's - the only decent town centre supermarket - every evening.	Comments noted.
Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (on behalf of the Guildford Society)	The Bridge Street Gyratory has created an environment that gives priority to vehicular traffic to the detriment of the town centre environment and experience. The gyratory may not even be fulfilling its role as a traffic distributor.	Comments noted.
Appendix 1 - Current strategic issues - Heritage and streetscape		
Member of the public	museum needs updating and interactive exhibits	Noted. Plans are being progressed to improve Guildford museum. see Historic Spaces strategy (page 65-666 of interim framework) about museum and castle hub.
Guildford town resident	I am surprised a new town square is required. We have such a beautiful hub around the High St/Tunsgate/Castle area. If this is developed as suggested surely this area could be our Jewel in the Crown? A Self-guided walk leaflet (via information Plaques in the pavements) to show off all our important bits!	The new framework document has left aside the idea of a town square in favour of improvements to and linking together of smaller town centre spaces.
Guildford town resident	Commercial developers of all sorts identify Guildford as a priority make the planning requirements such that materials, finishes and streetscapes really do reflect this. The external elevations of the Friary Centre, even after the facelift, are still tacky.	This has been noted in the framework as a community priority and the plans for North Street's environmental enhancement includes these considerations. A materials guide will be produced as part of the final town centre framework (see Appendix 4).

Downsedge Residents Association	Tourists are attracted to Guildford by the historic environment and buildings whereas shoppers are attracted by the retail offering; generally the two categories of visitor are not combined simultaneously. If tourism is to be encouraged, a proposition with which we firmly agree, a more adventuresome vision for Guildford's Heritage is required. We would like to see imaginative development of the River Wey banks, particularly downstream the Town Bridge, specifically mentioned in this section.	In reality there is no clear separation between tourists and shoppers (see "the Economic Impact of Tourism" report). The river is a main focus in the framework, and creation of a more lively, accessible river is an important theme in the document. The overall vision for the town centre includes: "The river and riverside will become a pleasant, accessible place for all to enjoy", and followed into a specific River strategy and some of the area strategies through objective TC4.
Guildford town resident	While many of these aspirations are worthy, GBC's shilly shallying over Guildford House and auctioning off of 170 High Street raise questions about how seriously it really takes its heritage	Comment noted.
Member of the public	MAKING THE HIGH STREET VALUABLE The most vibrant town centres offer a wide range of locally responsive services that create a comprehensive retail, cultural and Guildford town centre is already a vibrant place. Stalls [the frequent Farmers and Craft Markets], musicians, buskers, events, eateries. Pavement cafes become meeting places, town bridge becomes home to craft markets. Cinema a little off-centre, theatre a little off centre, music halls. This needs nurturing - a truly positive approach. community hub. This is crucial for the future of the High Street as it is an offer that its competitors struggle to match. Future Government policy must acknowledge this, not treating retail in isolation, but empowering councils to integrate the shopping offer effectively alongside other cultural and community services." Local Government Association response to The Portas Review	The purpose of the town centre framework is to build upon everything that works well for the town centre (see town centre analysis) and to consider ways to improve it where it works less well. The Community Hub is suggested as a possible opportunity for redevelopment of the library, and it is listed as a potential use for the Portsmouth Road surface car park opportunity site (4).
Guildford town resident	It is disappointing to see the Guildford House shop moved to the back courtyard. Would it be possible to access it from North Street? It is also a shame that Constitution Hall has been sold. It should have been kept for community use (the idea of an independent cinema there was excellent).	Noted. This has been investigated although the Council's Property Service has not been able to open the link. Many people raised the issue of an independent cinema, including at this location, although it was unsuited to this purpose because of fire safety standards.
Member of public	Follow Salisbury's example historic and ongoing quality of town centre maintained by no high buildings in area	Ensuring the design and height of new buildings are suitable was a key message raised by those responding to the draft master plan consultation, which has informed rewriting of the vision and objectives.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	Heritage. 2.11. A serious omission of the Masterplan is the absence of any reference to the three Conservation Areas, and the Town Centre CA in particular. Add: The recommendations of the Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal, and others when made, will be pursued. 11.8. The need to rigorously apply the conditions that apply to the Conservation Area must be a key part of the main document, and not just given a passing reference in the Appendix. 11.9. The Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal is ignored; is there a conspiracy to suppress this? It must be endorsed by the Masterplan. This section could be much reduced by reference to the Appraisal.	As noted in the revised framework, we have identified the key elements of the town centre's townscape from the relevant Conservation Area Appraisals and the townscape volume of the Guildford Landscape Character Assessment. The Conservation Areas are shown on Figure 19, and referenced throughout the document. They have helped us to identify priority areas for enhancement and regeneration (see page 44). We are committed to preparing a Material's Guide as part of the final town centre framework (see Appendix 4 for timing), and this will build on relevant Conservation Area appraisals. Conservation areas are also mentioned as appropriate throughout the document.
	11.10. ..there are important long distance views from the High Street..Add: <u>The view from Bright Hill is exceptional and has great potential for exploitation.</u>	This is now acknowledged in the revised framework in the section on the Bright Hill gateway area. This site could be redeveloped for housing to exploit the views if not needed for car parking. Enhancement of the Bright Hill gateway is a key part of the strategy for the Easern Fringe (page 93).
	11.11. As attention is drawn to the poor state of paving slabs in North Street the similar condition of those on the North side of the upper High Street must be also recorded.	As noted on page 55 of the revised framework: As well as seeking to improve areas of weak character, the strategy seeks to protect, enhance and maintain the areas which benefit from an attractive and historic environment and provide cohesion with other areas in its approach to lighting, street furniture and street surfaces. ...Natural stone is the preferred paving within the historic core, much of which is designated as conservation area, to enhance the quality of this historic area, and setting of the heritage assets. Improvements to the High Street in the delivery plan also include refurbishment of the footways.
	11.12. <i>Guildford railway station, with its relatively low building...does little to announce its presence..</i> The implication must be that the building needs to be higher so that it can be more easily found. We disagree with this argument. Many visitors will now print off a map of the town from the web before travelling, or obtain it on an e-device; it is much more important to improve the GBC web map that shows walking routes (very poor at present) than raise buildings or add to signage. The most important requirement is to make the station welcoming to both arriving and departing passengers – which currently it is not.	The reference to the low station building was made in the context of pedestrian 'legibility', ie how well an area is set out in order for people walking around it to naturally find a key destination, such as a railway station. It was not meant that the building literally needed to be taller in order for people who are walking to actually see it from a distance. The interim framework emphasises the need for a legible town centre, and improvements to the walking route from the station (including legibility improvements) are included in the delivery plan for pedestrians and cyclists. Opinion noted, although not everyone visiting the town centre will bring a map with them. Improved signage is a key component of the strategy. Comments regarding improvements to the web page have been noted.

	11.13. Heritage assets that are within easy walking distance of the centre need to be identified and considered as potential destinations for town centre visitors – in particular the Cathedral and the Spike	Agree that visitor attractions, including those nearby to the town centre need improved cohesion. Objective TC11 concerns this.
No name given	De-clutter and maintain/ repair high street setts.	Decluttering is part of the revised framework regarding plans for the North Street improvements, and as a general aspiration for improved main road corridor environments for pedestrians (see page 61). The importance of the setts and their continual maintenance is included in the interim framework, in particular page 55. Repairs to High Street setts are included as part of the framework's delivery plan.
CTC	The streets of Guildford are despoiled somewhat by the presence of double yellow lines, uniform ugly black top and parked cars. A properly signed 'no parking or waiting zone' should be implemented together with changes to street surface in historic locations, not just North Street.	Concerns noted. Highway control markings are the responsibility of Surrey County Council. In working to develop a Movement Strategy this issue will be considered.
The Guildford Society	The Society fully supports this section of the Plan and, in particular, those parts which refer to the Council's aspirations to remove clutter and to repair and renew paving.	Support is welcomed; decluttering is part of the revised framework regarding plans for the North Street improvements, and general aspiration for improved main road corridor environments for pedestrians (see page 61). Repairs to High Street setts are included as part of the framework's delivery plan.
Appendix 1 - Current strategic issues - River and green spaces		
Surrey Wildlife Trust	Note relevance of some of the comments above to this section.	Noted.
Member of the public	The cycle path from Shalford sees cyclists dumped onto the A 281 and then face the hazard of the gyratory or find another awkward route through the town. Could the cycle track not cross the river at the bridge by the rowing club if the barriers on the A281 side were removed and suitable ramps provided. cycle traffic could then access millmead and follow a riverside track out of the town centre this could have north and south routing feeder tracks joining it. More cycle parking areas are needed in the town centre. The river could also benefit from more footbridges along its route out of town to the north.	This design of this bridge is stepped. People can carry their bikes over the bridge and continue cycling using the towpath or alternatively there is a share pedestrian/cycle path up to the Yvonne Arnaud Theatre, cycle over the bridge at the lock and along millmead to the river towpath by portsmouth road car park. This comment suggesting possible reroute of cycleway has been passed to Surrey County Council for its consideration. As detailed in the interim framework, the successful LSTF key component bid will increase number of cycle storage spaces in the town centre (see Delivery section).
Guildford town resident	As identified, more should be made of this asset. A river walk and cycle path/boat rides/picnic areas/cafes & bars; easily and clearly accessed from the High Street would be a real draw and encourage more to relax and exercise out of doors	The River Wey strategy in the interim framework details improvements to make more use and to improve the appearance of the river and riverside. This includes extending the riverside walk. Development sites adjacent to the river also have potential on their redevelopment to enhance the riverside.
Guildford town resident	I agree with adding more pocket spaces and trees.	Comments noted.
Downsedge Residents Association	We agree with the general statement on Leisure and Culture but are surprised that there is no mention of the provision of restaurants, coffee shops, public bars and gambling facilities. These are all in varying measure important for any town centre but some facilities can cause anti-social behaviour and potential crime. A masterplan should include how such facilities are planned and accommodated; it should not be left to developer led incidental planning applications. We find the statement that Guildford is "a world class tourist destination" somewhat excessive particularly as so little has been done to date to develop the potential of the River Wey downstream of the Town Bridge. We would argue for some modesty and some indication of what is possible to create world class status.	The interim framework recognises that the town centre is very quiet in the early evening. The swot analysis does recognise the lack of outdoor eating areas places and that the town is very quiet in the early evening. The strategy proposes ways of improving this, including opening shops later, and designating an area for restaurants, cafes and services. The reference to a world class tourist destination has been removed from the document.
Guildford town resident	More should be made of the river. The large area of Millmead Car Park is wasted on cars. If the car park is needed could it not be underground? To develop the site with cafes, shops, galleries, community spaces fronting the river would be excellent. So too should the Bedford Road site. That the Council should even consider a bus station there is preposterous. The Old People's Centre by the river could be put to day and evening community use.	The interim framework includes a strategy for the River Wey. Underground parking is very difficult to achieve on sites close to a river, and if possible, can often make a development unviable. The amount of development needed to make underground parking pay can be large scale, for example as seen at key riverside sites in Kingston. The location of the bus station has not yet been decided, and will be considered in a forthcoming bus station study.
Member of public	I agree that the river is important for wildlife. As also is the railway line. Any developments and ongoing sites management should provide for and support wildlife.	Agree. Any development proposals where there may be an impact on wildlife would require an ecological assessment. The strategy recognises the importance of riverside vegetation to provide a wildlife corridor.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	Leisure and Culture 2.6.... <i>successful markets and street stalls</i> ... We fully support markets, and street stalls as part of these, but not randomly located street stalls. Delete <i>street stalls</i> . 11.14. The map of Natural Environment needs to show the public green space in the centre, and would reveal how little there is. Many of the spaces shown are not even seen by the public	All street stalls would require a user license and so would not be able to randomly locate. Agree that many green spaces are private and so not seen by the public, but they still have benefits in relation to biodiversity, green networks and movement of wildlife.
Member of public	Fantastic asset to the town which is not fully utilised.	Agree. The strategy recognises the river as a valuable asset and seeks to enhance and improve the riverside area.

Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Devising a sequence of spaces along the river with 'bronze plaques' that tell a story of the River Wey and all the history attached as a tourist and educational element provides a 'necklace' of experiences with key spaces improved and enhanced for all to enjoy, which includes redevelopment of some sites to contribute greatly to the success of the waterfront.	Comments noted. The strategy says "A series of educational interpretation plaques along the River Wey to tell the history of the riverside and the flora and fauna of the river and its banks would be an interesting and informative addition to the riverside."
No name given	The more greening the better	Comments noted. One element of the strategy for the river wey is to add suitable new planting.
Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners (on behalf of the Guildford Society)	Guildford's primary environmental asset should be the central thread along which all proposals are connected.	Comments noted. Any development proposals along the river will have significant regard to enhancing the riverside area.
Appendix 1 - Current strategic issues - Managing the town centre		
Member of the public	Appendix 1. page 24. Public toilets. Mention of the public wc's at the Tunsgate, then mention wc's and baby change in the Tunsgate shopping centre - there are none provided	These are in the locations stated in the interim framework
Member of the public	town centre signage could be improved as an example see Antwerp	Agree, the interim framework acknowledges this. No change required.
Guildford town resident	More Markets. More pedestrian direction signage. Less retail signage. Less clutter & Cars. 20mph speed restriction. If only people would stop dropping litter!	Agree points raised, the interim framework reflects these points.
No name given	Public toilet provision - In the appendix at page 24, the draft masterplan notes that the Council is undertaking a review of public toilet provision. Current options being considered for Tunsgate Square include the opportunity for the redevelopment of the Tunsgate public toilets with the shopping centre, in order to enhance the street frontage and retail environment. We would be grateful if the review could consider this opportunity.	Comment noted and this suggestion will be considered as part of any redevelopment or other improvement works to Tunsgate Square.
Guilford town resident	Street cleaning at the outer edges of the town centre boundary, and snow clearance everywhere need more prioritisation	This comment has been passed to the Council's Head of Operational Services. No change required to the framework.
Member of public	could we turn the old basket works into a covered market?	The basket works site on Sydenham Road is suggested for non-retail uses (restaurant, residential, offices) - see site 17 in the interim framework, given its location on the edge of the proposed primary shopping area. The government's town centre first approach, directs retail development to the primary shopping area (PSA). Where no PSA opportunity exists for retail development, the edge of the PSA should then be considered, followed by out of centre locations. This approach helps to support lively and economically strong town centres.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	Public Toilets. 11.15. 6pm closing is too early. 11.16. The bus station must have toilets.	This suggestion will be considered should there be a bus facility, but may not be possible if on -street provisions is chosen.
Member of public	Desperately need a Town Council to provide direct accountability for the town to its residents as well as	This suggestion is beyond the scope of the framework.
No name given	Need quality developments with good design and material that blend with best of what we have especially the historic.	Agree, this is supported by the interim framework.
Member of Public	More retailers should be encouraged to move into the High Street/North Street.	Agree, this is supported by the interim framework - see the proposed primary shopping area.
Completed developments and completed improvements		
Guildford town resident	All in all some great improvements. Thank you. I particularly like the Millbrook crossing (C)	Positive feedback noted.
Guildford town resident	No more developments like the disgraceful Printing House Square which is a visual disaster.	Comment noted. New development/environmental improvements often attract a range of views. No change required.
Members of the public	Completed developments, such as G Live and Radisson, both successful developments, have already brought a considerable amount of extra traffic to the area which affects access from the Eastern end of the town when motorists etc. park on busy roads during the evening (Epsom and London Roads) and are a serious problem. More must be done to encourage motorists to park in car parks.	Comment noted. Further studies on transport, traffic and parking need to be completed which will inform a movement strategy for the town centre.
Guilford town resident	The recent Friary Centre "facelift" just papers over the cracks, hardly an improvement on the old facade.	Comment noted. New development/environmental improvements often attract a range of views. No change required.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	Not reviewed. We assume that a critique of the developments is not being invited. This would be an exercise in itself.	Noted. No change required.
Member of public	The pedestrian crossing at Debenhams has been poorly conceived (the underpass should NOT have been filled in) and there is no co-ordination between traffic signals at Debenhams, Bottom the High Street and the Gyrotory System to enable traffic to flow without clogging up the gyrotory system. Friary passage would have benefited from having retail frontages on either side and would enable a more enticing route to the riverside.	Comments noted. New development/environmental improvements often attract a range of views. Further studies on transport, traffic and parking need to be completed which will inform a movement strategy for the town centre.

Scott Brownrigg Ltd	'G Live' is a very successful, new addition to the town centre and the associated hotel and apartments really add to the diverse offer in the town centre. Whilst not correct across all the areas of the High Street, the new developments of the Friary Centre 2 development could be equally as brave, bold and exciting as the 'G Live' complement of uses.	Positive feedback noted. A similarly high quality improvement in North Street is sought.
No name given	Friary street was good. Other sites lacked quality and distinction.	Comment noted. New development/environmental improvements often attract a range of views. No change required.
Map - Town centre boundary		
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	The Town Centre Conservation Area includes South Hill, and Castle Hill so the Town Centre boundary on your map is incorrectly drawn 14.1 We are pleased that the Jenner Road houses have been taken out of the town centre. However Poyle Terrace is still included. This now has an approved residential scheme, and this is a good and established residential location. It is reasonable to include the Basket Works as this has to be redeveloped. We ask that Poyle Terrace be removed from the Town Centre. Otherwise we consider the boundary satisfactory where it passes through our area.	Comment noted, taken into account in preparing the interim framework (Castle Hill included in town centre boundary). Poyle terrace is included as being directly behind the Basket works site, both of which are redevelopment sites.
Quod on behalf of Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd	Please see comments under part 5 above.	Noted, see above.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Agreed.	Noted. No change required.
Map - Primary (Main) Shopping Area and primary and secondary retail frontages		
TURLEY ASSOCIATES on behalf of Hermes Real Estate Investment Management Ltd	As noted before, Policy EC3.1 C and Appendix B PPS4 state that the Primary Shopping Area comprises both Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontages. Therefore any plan should show a Primary Shopping Area and Town Centre boundary rather than Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontages.	Comment noted, since this comment was made, PPS4 has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
West Horsley Parish Council	Road names would have been helpful.	The plan would have needed to be very large scale, which is not possible in an A4 or A3 document, without having a separate map.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	14.2. Removal of Sydenham Road Designation. The SW end of Sydenham Road, mainly on the SE, side should remain a designated shopping frontage, now secondary, as it offers the potential for useful convenience shopping to local residents (Bar Centro, Laundromat, Orlandos, Garden Room). The Laundromat is considered to be a useful amenity for residents.	The shopping frontages are aimed at controlling the proportion of retail uses at ground floor level, and ensuring that other uses introduced are appropriate for a town centre. There is only one shop in this frontage, the launderette and restaurants and cafes are not protected from a change of use by being in a designated frontage.
	<u>14.3. Change of the end of the upper High Street, and the adjoining Epsom Road / London Road from secondary shopping to a "leisure and service area". We strongly object to this change.</u> This is the optimum location for convenience shopping to serve the large adjacent residential area, and this use must be pursued if any pretence of sustainability is to be kept. The failure to ensure that the five shop units provided as part of the Trinity Gate development remained in retail use (only 2 remain, and they are not in genuine retail use) is still regarded as a major planning failure.	Opinion of local residents group noted. This is not a key area in which we protect retail uses.
	The implication of the statement that this change would "...balance the night time area around Bridge Street.." is of great concern. This location is adjacent to a dense and established residential area, with the Trinity Gate apartments right in the area, and is therefore totally unsuited to a "night time economy". An "evening" economy, based around G-Live and Radisson entertainment, with evening restaurants, is acceptable, providing a clear distinction was made between evening and night-time economies. We have argued that G-Live must remain active during the daytime, and be an all-day amenity for residents and visitors, and this appears to have been achieved. This would be spoilt by having nightclubs that would be dead during the daytime. The retention of a shopping frontage, now secondary, would not inhibit sufficient restaurants being available.	Agreed. This area is not intended to be for night-time uses such as nightclubs, bars, pubs, and takeaways. Rather uses such as restaurants and cafes and the other uses listed in Appendix 2 of the interim framework will be suitable. This would only take effect once the Local Plan Delivery plan has been through independent examination.
	The notion that a night time leisure area would form a useful barrier between residential and retail is bizarre; it is the opposite that is needed. We ask that all the frontage be retained as secondary shopping frontage, and restaurant provision be made within this designation.	The uses that would be permitted are listed in Appendix 2 of the interim framework.
Quod on behalf of Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd	Please see comments under part 6 above.	Noted
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Friary Centre 2 will stitch together secondary streets that will not succeed whilst the bus station divides and reduces the appeal of this part of the town centre. The primary shopping area needs the second phase of Friary development to consolidate the shopping areas together with secondary streets being improved through this new development.	Agree, although moving from calling the site "Friary 2" to the North Street regeneration site.
NATHANIEL LICHFIELD & PARTNERS	Consistent with PPS4 definitions we would suggest the word "main" should be deleted so that there is only reference to the PSA.	Agree, change made. Since this comment was made, PPS4 has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
Map - Townscape Areas		
Member of public	Follow Salisbury's example historic and ongoing quality of town centre maintained by no high buildings in area	Ensuring the design and height of new buildings are suitable was a key message raised by those responding to the draft master plan consultation, which has informed rewriting of the vision and objectives.

Quod on behalf of Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd	Please see comments under part 7 above.	Noted.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Agreed.	Noted. No change required.
Map - Historic core sites and priority improvement areas		
Quod on behalf of Westfield Shoppingtowns Ltd	Please see comments under part 9 above.	Noted.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Agreed.	Support noted. No change required.
Map - Commercial quarter sites and priority improvement areas		
Member of public	The primary use of the gyratory is to aid traffic flow. The 1960s view that pedestrians and cyclists are best separated from road vehicles is still correct. Onslow bridge is not the Rialto, nor should there be any attempt to convert Friary bridge. Alternative routes should be provided for pedestrians and cyclists. The proposal shown on page 20 of the PRIAM report would ensure gridlock in Guildford.	Comment noted. Further studies on transport need to be completed to inform the movement strategy for the town centre.
Members of the public	The number of retailers leaving the centre of Guildford (High Street) as a result of High Rents is worrying if it results in this core of the town becoming devoid of any kind of shops. There are already a number of empty offices in the town centre. Do we need any more?	Retail vacancies in the town centre are closely monitored, forming a consideration of the annual report on the vitality and viability of town centre. The Retail and Leisure study 2011 identified sufficient additional expenditure in the catchment area to support the existing shops and the additional floorspace.
Member of public	Follow Salisbury's example historic and ongoing quality of town centre maintained by no high buildings in area	Ensuring the design and height of new buildings are suitable was a key message raised by those responding to the draft master plan consultation, which has informed rewriting of the vision and objectives.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	14.4. The most important "connection" to improve is the Riverside route to the station, this needs to be shown.	Agree. This is illustrated in Figure 11 Strategy commercial quarter of the interim framework.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	The areas covered by the words 'commercial quarter' promotes a singular use typology whereas some areas covered by the commercial quarter description would perform much more successfully as mixed uses including residential, leisure, education and commercial uses. The term 'commercial quarter' limits the opportunity on some of these sites to a mono-use that could be harmful to the success of these areas.	Comment noted, however commercial uses are a dominant characteristic of land use in this area of the town centre and the term is considered to be appropriate. None of the townscape area titles are intended to suggest those are the only land use type found in that area.
Map - Transition areas sites and priority improvement areas		
TURLEY ASSOCIATES on behalf of Hermes Real Estate Investment Management Ltd	The transition area policy should not seek to identify specific uses on individual sites but encourage a range of acceptable town centre uses.	Potential, opportunity and other sites are marked within the transition townscape areas (see Figure 12 Strategy transition areas) in the interim framework, including suggestions for potentially suitable uses. This approach is used for consistency for all parts of the town centre.
West Horsley Parish Council	Unhelpful rotation of map, inconsistent with other maps.	Agree, taken into account in preparing the interim framework; see Figure 12 Strategy transition areas.
Member of public	I agree that transition areas need to be relatively quiet and relaxing. Re. appearance, traffic, noise, density... Follow Salisbury's example historic and ongoing quality of town centre maintained by no high buildings in area	Ensuring the design and height of new buildings are suitable was a key message raised by those responding to the draft master plan consultation, which has informed rewriting of the vision and objectives.
Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	We are very concerned that schemes to move vehicles out of the town centre, to accommodate the expanded Friary and to change the gyratory, all too often propose diverting more traffic onto York Road instead. This suggestion is completely ill conceived. We would oppose any plan to move vehicles from the centre and onto this residential road which is in a conservation area and also has many facilities for young children and families. It is already very congested and has air quality issues. With existing traffic levels, this road faces major problems regarding access to the children's play area in the park and to the infant, primary and nursery schools. Noise and air pollution already exceed acceptable standards. We do not think the designations as "transition area" and "eastern fringe" adequately meet or describe the needs of this area and the outline policies will simply oversee its further demise into grid lock and loss of any sense of residential community. Moving traffic from one town centre area should not be allowed to transfer problems to adjoining, more residential areas. especially in conservation areas.	Comment noted. Further studies on transport, traffic and parking need to be completed which will inform a movement strategy for the town centre. Any development proposal for the North Street development site will require detailed transport assessment.
Map - Historic spaces sites and priority improvement areas		
West Horsley Parish Council	Unhelpful rotation of map, inconsistent with other maps.	Agree, taken into account in preparing the interim framework; see Figure 9 Strategy historic spaces.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	14.5. The riverside walk by Debenhams, proposed in relation to development of site (15) needs to be shown as an "improved connection", together with the bridge over the millpool	Agree, see Figure 9 Strategy historic spaces of the interim framework.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	The area is constrained into a roundabout location. Better, safer and more generous crossing spaces (similar to the development at Oxford Circus and Kensington High Street) to improve the street in favour of the pedestrian is needed to 'open up' access and success of the historic area around the River Wey and Rodborough Building.	Comments taken into account in preparing the interim framework. See Figure 9 Strategy historic spaces.
Map - Eastern fringe sites and priority improvement areas		

Members of the public	The approach to Guildford from the Eastern Fringe is good from an aesthetic point of view but is made more hazardous by inconsiderate parking along London and Epsom Roads, especially in the evening.	Comment noted. Further studies on transport, traffic and parking need to be completed which will inform a movement strategy for the town centre.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Agreed.	Noted. No change required.
Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	See 14 (7) above regarding approach to York Road. We are wary about development of London Road Station. We are also dubious about developing "shared space" if this means mixing people and cars and losing dedicated pavements. We strongly disagree with the suggestion surface car parking is "dead space". Residents value small open surface car parks for relatively short stay trips. Such facilities are often relied upon by locals, distinguish Guildford from places such as Woking and Kingston and give Guildford character and quality of life more often associated with slightly smaller settlements such as Weybridge or Godalming. These open air parking areas are valued by residents, are part of what attracts people to live in, use facilities in and contribute to civic life in Guildford. These parking areas therefore help to underpin the town's economic success.	Views noted. Any improvements involving development at London Road Station will require careful design and consultation before and during any planning application, including regarding to parking needs. The potential use of shared surfaces in some areas will be amongst matters considered through the movement strategy that will form part of the final framework.
Map - Arriving and getting around		
Members of the public	As a resident, getting around Guildford on foot is not a problem but access across town from the Eastern fringe is not easy, with little choice between a congested town centre, access through Castle Arch or the seventeen speed humps in Warwicks Bench road. etc. The provision of a bus station in Bedford Road, an area traditionally subject to flooding in the past is short sighted, costly and will still leave pedestrians a fair distance from the High Street. Across town travel by bus may be accounted for in the scheme, but will surely add extra time to the journey as buses would be exiting into an already congested traffic area which will add time to journeys.	It is not entirely clear as to whether the first comment relates to walking from the Eastern Fringe or driving, but the reference to speed bumps suggests this is an issue regarding vehicular access from the Eastern Fringe. The key issues of congestion in the town centre is recognised in the interim framework. However, at present is not possible to include a strategy for dealing with this because there are various outstanding transport and other evidence projects that need to inform a full movement strategy and the final framework. It will therefore be a later version of the framework that will deal with this issue. A public consultation on future location of new bus facility(ies) will be held in late 2012. This will be included in final framework.
Guildford town resident	The bus and railways stations should have much clearer and more prominent guides showing how to reach places of interest shops, cinemas, river, historic buildings, etc. Some visitors do not realise how much there is to see.	Agree, many people arriving at the station are not aware of all the town centre has to offer. The Tourist Information Office is on the High Street. Town centre information may provided by the Tourist Information office, although signage at the actual railway station is for Network Rail to decide. The interim framework includes reference to the opportunity for a 'broad based signage/information strategy' (page 29) to improve connections between currently disparate attractions in the town centre. The issue of better signage is taken up in the framework's strategy, including through enhancement of gateways to different areas, including information displays.
Member of public	Bus station that is hidden and separate from both station and shops seems bad idea. Itself would separate station and shops Golfbuggy style transport for elderly and disabled like Woking?	At present it is not possible to include a strategy for dealing with this because there are various outstanding transport and other evidence projects that would need to inform it. The final framework will include a Movement Strategy which will include the location of the bus station. A public consultation on the location of the bus facility will be held in late 2012.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	14.6. It would help to show, perhaps on a separate map, the 7 directions of travel by rail, the "spokes" of the rail hub. 14.7. Similarly it would help to show the entry points of the main walking and cycling routes.	Agreed that this information is needed.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Gateways are very good at improving the initial experience of the town centre. The arrival from the railway is quite poor compared with some towns. The public realm, legibility of routes, access to public transport and general safety on narrow pavements dominated by vehicles needs sorting. The relocation of the bus station to Bedford Road may well provide the vital improvement and route improvements.	Policy TC10 in the new framework document is about improvements to the environment for pedestrians, as well as cyclists, and their ability to move around the town. The framework's analysis highlights the route from the station to the town, and the issue of narrow footways, as a weakness for the town centre. This is followed into the strategy regarding improved connections, including signage, in general, and improved connection between the station and historic centre in particular. The Movement section also covers pedestrian issues (page 105).
Member of Public	The proposed move of the bus station to Bedford Road would make life very difficult for those of us who work and shop in the town centre. It's bad enough having to lug stuff down to the existing bus station without having to cart shopping across the roads. It is difficult to cross outside St Saviours and I can envisage people taking risks by not using the lights. The existing bus station is dirty, run down (although I know it is supposed to have been cleaned) and is not a nice place to be in the evenings. Lighting is poor and the enclosed walkways are narrow. Money should be spent on improving it, not moving it. Why overhaul a shopping centre with the advantage of a bus station then move the bus station? The Friary Centre now apparently caters mainly for those of 30 and under. It's nice but older people need the 'High Street' to shop in. They won't come to Guildford if it's not easy to get around and they can go somewhere flat like Woking or Kingston where buses are easier to access.	At present it is not possible to include a strategy for dealing with this because there are various outstanding transport and other evidence projects that would need to inform it. It will therefore be a later version of the framework that will deal with the issue of the bus station. Nonetheless, your comments regarding the need for access to facilities are pertinent and will form a part of the consideration with regard to bus station locations.

	I have a vested interest. Despite having a mobility problem I manage to keep on working because my office is adjacent to the bus station. When I food shop, in Marks or Sainsbury (High Street) and get my library books I am unable to face getting them home from the bus stop to my house. If I go to Marks I walk from the bus station. If I go to the bank, library or Sainsbury I use one of the buses such as the 37 or 515. My son comes to collect the shopping from the office for me. If I didn't have his support I would have to use a taxi even more than I do now. I don't drive and it is too much for me to walk across the green at Tesco, walk round the store then carry stuff back across the green and then from the bus stop to my home. The railway station is already well served by bus stops at the Guildford Park entrance. Guildford is a lovely town which should be enjoyed by all, visitors, businesses and more importantly local residents who are here year round.	At present it is not possible to include a strategy for dealing with this because there are various outstanding transport and other evidence projects that would need to inform it. It will therefore be a later version of the framework that will deal with the issue of the bus station. Nonetheless, your comments regarding the need for access to facilities are pertinent and will form a part of the consideration with regard to bus station locations.
The Guildford Society	Appendix 1 on page 13 The Plan headed "Arriving and getting around" should be corrected to show Onslow Street, Park Street and the whole of the Gyrotory system as "Main vehicle routes".	These will be added to Figure 21 in the interim framework.
Map - Historic assets		
Guildford town resident	These should be much more clearly signposted. For instance, St Mary's Church is the oldest church, indeed the oldest building, in Guildford, and has been described in guidebooks as the most beautiful church in the area, but beyond a plaque on the wall there is nothing to indicate its importance or where it is. Even to museum is hard to find for someone unfamiliar with the town.	The interim framework now recognises as a weakness of the town centre 'A fragmented environment, with poor links between the key attractions within the town centre, including Guildford Castle and museum, the High Street, G Live, Guildford railway station, and riverside green spaces' but also as a strength the presence of 'the nationally important historic High Street, with many well-preserved Grade I and II* historic listed buildings'.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	14.8 The locally listed buildings should also be shown; present policy states that they will receive the same protection as buildings with statutory listing, and some would be of equal interest to visitors. 14.9 Heritage assets that are within easy walking distance of the centre need to be shown as potential destinations for town centre visitors – in particular the Cathedral and the Spike	The most significant historic assets are designated and are protected by law; these are shown on Figure 19 and include statutory listed buildings. Whilst local planning policies recognise the importance of locally listed buildings, as well as buildings of townscape merit, these are non-designated heritage assets. The Cathedral is given greater emphasis in the interim framework (see 5.3 Wider context). Agree the Spike is important heritage feature, however not considered to be a 'main area of influence' upon the town centre to the same extent as the Cathedral and other areas set out in section 5.3.
Guildford Business Forum	In the second paragraph reference is made to mixed development sitting within "remnants of often green, open space including the Electric Theatre". As far as we are aware, it is completely paved and there is no green open space left. But the next sentence adds "a variety of historic buildings create focal points and local landmarks". Underneath this statement is a picture of the Electric Theatre and yet in your proposals, you are seeking a thin ribbon development immediately adjacent to the Electric Theatre, which would completely hide it from view. The quantum of development that could be constructed on that site would inevitably be relatively small and therefore, there is a strong argument to say that the detrimental effects far outweigh any beneficial effect.	Agree, points taken into account in drafting interim framework.
Map - Natural environment		
Guildford town resident	Great improvement have been made here.. Stoke Park is a beautiful, versatile space, and there are many others.	Comment noted. The interim framework recognises Stoke Park as a publically accessible green open space close by to the town centre.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	14.10 The map needs to show the public green space in the centre; this would reveal how little there is. Many of the spaces shown are not even seen by the public, and so contribute little to the public realm	Comment noted. See Figure 20 Natural environment, which includes publically accessible open space in the town centre. The interim framework identifies a number of opportunities to create additional public spaces, through redevelopment and improvements. Objective 2 seeks to 'improve the quality of the environment with well designed buildings and spaces that complement and enhance the character of the area'.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	Greening up routes is essential. Guildford is a Surrey town and trees contribute to the microclimate and sense of greening the environment. Better trees included in new developments and the greening of the River Wey waterfront is essential in areas, which are very urban.	Agreed. This has been taken into account in drafting the interim framework; see in particular objectives 2 and 4.
Map - Completed development and street improvements		
Guildford town resident	It is a great pity that the High Street, one of the town's greatest assets, is so frequently being dug up, and that when this happens the setts are rarely replaced properly.	This issue is acknowledged in the interim framework (appendix 3) - Guildford Borough Council will continue to work with Surrey County Council to maintain the quality of the setts and footways of the High Street.
West Horsley Parish Council	Millbrook pedestrian area is a vast improvement on the underpass but the two sets of traffic lights one on Millbrook and the other towards the very bottom of the high street are not synchronised and cause a build up of traffic. This could be improved by removing all vehicle access to the High Street. at all times with the exception of the Emergency services .	Suggestion noted. This will considered as the movement strategy is prepared.
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	14.11. Friary Bridge, blue lighting (E). We question the claim that this is an improvement. While it has been more reliable in recent months the percentage of time when all the lights have been operating, since commissioning, is less than 50%. The assumption of users of the route is that it is a cheap gimmick intended to distract attention from the innate shoddiness of the area. Energy usage is high. It is particularly galling that money is squandered on this scheme when the lighting for much of this route is permanently broken so that parts of it are in almost total darkness.	Your opinion on this lighting scheme is noted. The scheme is maintained as required, including replacing any lights which are not working at the earliest opportunity. Any future refurbishment of the scheme will take account of opportunities to use energy saving specifications.

	14.12 G-Live, Improved pavement (A). This is a very minor improvement that does not justify its place here. We are still bewildered by the refusal of the Council to provide proper pedestrian crossings, preferably pedestrian priority, but at least light controlled, as an integral part of the development. These were repeatedly requested. There are few venues of this size where it is so dangerous to cross the roads to get to it.	The enhanced pedestrian environment around G Live involved significant upgrading of open space, landscaping as well as new co-ordinated footway resurfacing. A light-controlled pedestrian crossing was not required for safety by the highway authority, Surrey County Council.
Scott Brownrigg Ltd	'G Live', Mal Maison and the apartment area at the Eastern Fringe is a very good and welcomed enhancement in a specific area of Guildford – a model of how the Friary Centre 2 and Bedford Road could be improved.	Positive feedback noted. A similarly high quality improvement in North Street is sought.
Cranley Road Area Residents' Association	This section includes a mix of welcome schemes such as the paving along Friary Street and very bad developments such as the new Radisson Hotel. The latter should be used as an example of very bad practice and of mistakes to be avoided in future not an enhancement that other developers might seek to emulate. It is overdevelopment, being far too tall and large for its setting, effectively steals a street from the public and makes a road constricted and largely unusable.	Comments noted. New developments will often attract a mix of views (see contrasting feedback above). No change required.