

DON'T WRECK GUILDFORD

www.guildfordresidents.org.uk

Unless we act now to shape events,
**GUILDFORD BOROUGH WILL BE FORCED TO FIND ROOM FOR A
STAGGERING 13,400 TO 16,000 NEW HOMES BY 2031.
THAT'S AN INCREASE OF ABOUT 25-30%
GUILDFORD TOWN COULD EXPAND BY 50%**

**THIS WOULD BE THE EQUIVALENT OF ABOUT 80 "BOXGROVE GARDENS"
OR 30 "QUEEN ELIZABETH PARK" DEVELOPMENTS**



**IT COULD MEAN ABOUT 24,000 MORE CARS ON OUR ROADS,
LOSS OF COUNTRYSIDE &
PRESSURE FOR HIGH DENSITY ON BROWNFIELD SITES**

PLEASE URGE OUR COUNCILLORS TO:

- 1) GET A GRIP ON CONSULTANTS' REPORTS ADVOCATING **671-800** HOMES A YEAR
- 2) ENSURE THE DRAFT LOCAL PLAN HAS A MORE REASONABLE HOUSING TARGET OF ABOUT **300** HOMES A YEAR - WITH PRIORITY GIVEN TO LOCAL NEEDS

In 2002 and 2007 residents spoke up successfully against plans by outside bodies to expand Guildford by 322, then 422, homes a year. There were no safeguards to protect the character of town or country and no plans for essential infrastructure investment.

In 2014 Guildford is at risk again, this time much more so.

PLEASE ACT NOW TO PROTECT GUILDFORD - WE CAN SUCCEED AGAIN



Dear Cllr Mansbridge

I would like to ask you, as Leader of Guildford Borough Council, to agree a target of about 300 homes a year for Guildford. I find a high figure of 500-800 unacceptable.

Yours sincerely Name

Address.....

post to **Millmead, Guildford GU2 4BB** or email committeeservices@guildford.gov.uk

Residents' Associations have put a lot of effort into engaging positively to shape the new Local Plan.

29 RAs and 4 Parish Councils worked together to agree shared aspirations for Guildford (See our Aspirations, Issues & Options Response and Summary at www.guildfordresidents.org.uk)

Our aim has been to achieve a balanced mix of

- locally needed affordable homes, infrastructure and promotion of our high value economy
- caring for the character & countryside that make Guildford borough a great place to live and work
- joined up, imaginative planning to create a forward looking, enhanced and distinctive place.

It has now become clear, none of this is possible and we are all wasting our time unless we get a sensible housing figure.

It seems regional planning has been replaced by centralised control through the back door!

We had all been led to believe planning is now much more local and have been working closely with the Council to agree priorities for a positive and balanced Local Plan.

To our dismay, we discover the process is centrally directed and inflexible.

Rather than local decision making, the Plan is controlled from the outset by consultants' "evidence" reports that determine targets based on a national formula and enforced by Inspectors.

Targets are fuelled by international migration and London overspill.

Councillors are under pressure to accept high national figures and to focus locally on:

- whether and where to sacrifice Green Belt and
- how to rebuild parts of the town avoiding high rise, town cramming & traffic gridlock.

We want our Councillors to press for a housing target that makes sense locally.

WHAT CAN YOU DO?

SEND IN THE FORM OR WRITE NOW TO YOUR LOCAL COUNCILLORS AND MP. THE SOONER YOU WRITE, THE MORE EFFECTIVE YOUR LETTER WILL BE.

Housing target:

It will really help if you just email or write one sentence to say you want the Council to agree a target of about 300 homes a year and that you find a high figure of 500-800 unacceptable.

Elmbridge has a more reasonable target of 225, Woking 292, and Epsom & Tandridge 181

- all agreed before March 2012 when the new top down approach was introduced.

Further ideas for your letter:

Consultants' housing figures: You may want to say you are worried by the high housing figures being suggested for Guildford by consultants using a national formula and inflationary assumptions, and failing to consider students separately. Their suggestion of 671 to 800 homes a year would put unrealistic pressure on the town and cause unacceptable damage to the countryside.

Balance and character - or high rise and sprawl? Do you want Guildford to be dynamic but to retain its character, or to become a dense, high rise town like Woking or Reading and ever more congested? Should we value our countryside as an asset that helps our economy and well being?

Localism: You may like to share your thoughts on whether Localism is working, especially with your MP. Is it working if the figures are fixed by a national formula, driven by "evidence" reports, and enforced by advisors and inspectors who check the national approach is used?

Please copy your letters to us at chair@guildfordresidents.co.uk We'd love to see your thoughts.

To write to your Guildford Councillors use the formula firstname.secondname@guildford.gov.uk
eg Stephen.Mansbridge@guildford.gov.uk; Monika.Juneja@guildford.gov.uk; Jenny.Wicks@guildford.gov.uk;

✉ Guildford Borough Council, Millmead, Guildford GU2 4BB

Find your Councillors on the GBC website <http://www.guildford.gov.uk/councillorsearch>

For Anne Milton MP use: anne.milton.mp@parliament.uk ✉ House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA