
Town Centre Views SPD consultation comments report

Empty cell in "Respondent Organisation" column denotes that the respondent is a member of the public.

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
	GTCV19/8	<p>Following the abuse of public consultation process to dismiss 80,000 comments on the Local plan. Which you considered as the same level of importance as a single planning application. A truly amazing statement! The comment showing total disrespect for the importance of this very flawed document, forced through via an immoral (and legally debatable) process so close to elections. Noting The flaws in site selection coupled with lack of or inappropriate road proposals, and principles of development are so obvious, I am surprised any professional person put their name to it. The ability to go to Judicial review clearly shows there is legal opinion out their which seriously disagrees with the council's Barrister.</p> <p>As a result of this morally flawed process, I find it hard to believe that you are actually going to make changes to this obviously completed document which you claim as a 'draft'. – There was not one document you or your predecessor changed during the Local Plan process and you insult the community by claim to consult, when in reality all this is simply an 'informative' so you can claim 'due process' – until your department displays you are listening – I see no point in making sensible constructive detailed comment.</p> <p>Though I would observe as a keen photographer, observe The quality of the fuzzy pictures suggest a low cost 5mp or below camera phone, was used and is of unacceptable quality for such a document taking photos on polluted days ie zoom view 3 is great to display air pollution but not suitable for arguments of 'good views' and I would use the argument "what view?" its polluted already why are you worried about more pollution! I attach a quality I would expect in such a document as an example of clarity taken 2004 along the Wey only 10mp but a far better quality than used in this production</p> <p>I think you would be far better saying "This is our completed document for our library of SPD's, I trust you like it. This would be far more honest and reflect the true nature of the planning departments future intentions as to making amendments.</p> <p>I trust this Will be included in your comments report from a member of the public.</p>	17 Jun 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
	GTCV19/2	Several sections of the document relate; but only one issue - The Railway Station development proposal. It is simply too massive, particularly too high, and too long. Because it is orientated north-south, parallel to the river, it forms a block both in terms of views, but also perception in the town. The railway already creates a bit of a barrier in the town, and this development magnifies and re-inforces that barrier.	17 Jun 2019
Transport for London	GTCV19/7	Thank you for consulting Transport for London (TfL). I can confirm that we have no comments to make on the draft SPD	17 Jun 2019
	GTCV19/3	General comment relative to all views. Little or no consideration should be given to the presence of trees. They are short lived and liable to be blown down, ie or cut down. The cloud white is very obtrusive in the landscape and should be discouraged.	18 Jun 2019
	GTCV19/4	Guildford is a lovely town and the town centre and surrounding areas are something to be proud of and must be preserved for our children and our children's children. The cost of living in Guildford is higher than the national average but residents are prepared to pay the premium for having a "nice place to live, work and play". I have lived in the town for over 40 years and am passionate on preserving it "as is" for as long as possible. This SPD highlights the beauty of the town and why it remains such a great tourist attraction and money earner for businesses and GBC. You in the planning department must ensure that new developments do not blight our historic town and change its character. One accepts that there sometimes has to be change (especially with regards affordable homes for our young	20 Jun 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>people) but progress must not just take place for progress’s sake. Too many of our old historic buildings have already been lost (e.g. the old fire station) and once gone they can never be brought back.</p> <p>Examples of where you, in GBC planning, must ensure high rise does not occur (even if it is linked to high profit) include the proposed new Guildford railway station, the high flats proposed as phase 1 of SARP and the estate planned for Blackwell Farm.</p> <p>Also areas of beauty previously donated to the people of Guildford by benefactors (such as Pewley Down and the Chantries) must remain recreational areas for Guildford residents (and others) to enjoy.</p> <p>Our future is in your hands!!</p> <p>With regards the SPD I have some more specific comments to make:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - River Corridor section 5.1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Keep historic Dapdune Wharf “as is” with low rise around it (Viewpoint 1); o Ensure we keep the River Wey tow-path south to Shalford and Godalming open and tended and a lovely place to walk (and cycle) (Viewpoint 2). Also the tow path north to Stoke Lock and beyond should also be included in the document. Guildford would not be Guildford (Golden Ford) without the river Wey. - Section 5.2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The views from Pewley Down (viewpoint 4) and St Martha’s (viewpoint 5) are very important and must essentially remain as is; o I fear for the views from the Hogs Back (viewpoint 6) with the planned large Blackwell Farm development. - Section 5.3: 	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o I feel it is very important that the fantastic unrestricted and historic view from the top of the high street down over the Wey via the Old Town Bridge and up the Mount remains. (Viewpoints 9 and 13) No “blots on the landscape” to occur especially when any redevelopment of the Debenhams site is being considered. The Old Town Bridge, like our historic clock and the high street setts, are part of Guildford’s history; o Based on the above point, the opposite view from the Mount (viewpoint 14) should remain unobstructed; o We must not spoil the town centre river setting with a poorly designed footbridge or another road bridge (viewpoint 13+); o The view from Stag Hill will undoubtedly change if new homes are built there but the top of Stag Hill should not be built on. Our Cathedral must remain as an uninterrupted building to be seen from afar, not partly blocked by roof tops. 	
Highways England	GTCV19/5	<p>Guildford Borough Council - Draft Guildford Town Centre Views Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Consultation</p> <p>Thank you for inviting Highways England to comment on the above consultation.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>We will therefore be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case the A3.</p>	26 Jun 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>We have reviewed this consultation and its supporting documentation and have no comments. However, please do continue to consult us as this SPD progresses.</p>	
Natural England	GTCV19/6	<p>Guildford Town Centre Views - Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation request on the above dated and received by Natural England on 17th June 2019.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Our remit includes protected sites and landscapes, biodiversity, geodiversity, soils, protected species, landscape character, green infrastructure and access to and enjoyment of nature.</p> <p>While we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic this Supplementary Planning Document covers is unlikely to have major effects on the natural environment, but may nonetheless have some effects. We therefore do not wish to provide specific comments, but advise you to consider the following issues:</p> <p>Green Infrastructure</p> <p>This SPD could consider making provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development. This should be in line with any GI strategy covering your area.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should ‘take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure;’. The Planning Practice Guidance on Green Infrastructure provides more detail on this.</p>	3 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Urban green space provides multi-functional benefits. It contributes to coherent and resilient ecological networks, allowing species to move around within, and between, towns and the countryside with even small patches of habitat benefitting movement. Urban GI is also recognised as one of the most effective tools available to us in managing environmental risks such as flooding and heat waves. Greener neighbourhoods and improved access to nature can also improve public health and quality of life and reduce environmental inequalities.</p> <p>There may be significant opportunities to retrofit green infrastructure in urban environments. These can be realised through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • green roof systems and roof gardens; • green walls to provide insulation or shading and cooling; • new tree planting or altering the management of land (e.g. management of verges to enhance biodiversity). <p>You could also consider issues relating to the protection of natural resources, including air quality, ground and surface water and soils within urban design plans.</p> <p>Further information on GI is include within The Town and Country Planning Association's "Design Guide for Sustainable Communities" and their more recent "Good Practice Guidance for Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity".</p> <p>Biodiversity enhancement This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment. An example of good practice includes the Exeter Residential Design Guide SPD, which advises (amongst other matters) a ratio of one nest/roost box per residential unit.</p> <p>Landscape enhancement</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might makes a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts.</p> <p>For example, it may be appropriate to seek that, where viable, trees should be of a species capable of growth to exceed building height and managed so to do, and where mature trees are retained on site, provision is made for succession planting so that new trees will be well established by the time mature trees die.</p> <p>Other design considerations</p> <p>The NPPF includes a number of design principles which could be considered, including the impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity (paragraphs 172 and 180).</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment/Habitats Regulations Assessment</p> <p>A SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment only in exceptional circumstances as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance here. While SPDs are unlikely to give rise to likely significant effects on European Sites, they should be considered as a plan under the Habitats Regulations in the same way as any other plan or project. If your SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulation Assessment, you are required to consult us at certain stages as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>Should the plan be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then, please consult Natural England again.</p>	
Enviroment Agency	GTCV19/9	Draft Guildford Town Centre Views Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)	4 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Thank you for consulting us on 17 June 2019.</p> <p>We have reviewed the Draft Guildford Town Centre Views Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) with regards to our remit.</p> <p>Environment Agency position We have no comments to make in respect of the proposed SPD.</p> <p>Should you require any additional information, or wish to discuss these matters further, please do not hesitate to contact me on the number below.</p>	
	GTCV19/10	<p>A Town Centre Views SPD is certainly needed and this draft is very welcome.</p> <p>The view management guidance included is sound. I have made some specific comments on the text in the attached note (see below). it is surely important to include view that can and should be improved as well as those to be protected. Such an approach is relevant to dealing with redevelopment, including along North Street.</p> <p>1. Section 1</p> <p>Should the document containing the Townscape Character Areas be referenced, perhaps at the end of 1.2?</p> <p>2. Section 2</p> <p>This section needs careful editing for accuracy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Wey Navigation was established long after the Middle Ages o Why say 'Despite this,..'? o The establishment of the L&SW Railway mid-way through the 19th century led.. o Onslow Village, for example, was a response to the aftermath of WW1 not WW2 o The cathedral is not early 20th century, in fact 1936-61. 	9 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o ..push towards higher density ... o ...refurbished, rebuilt or demolished... <p>3. Section 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Can the second category be broadened somewhat? ‘Town Centre Approaches and Overviews’, i.e. including views from vantage points such as the downs o The category ‘Town Centre’ should be interpreted as including views that should be improved, where development is expected to take place o What is meant by ‘urban grain’? o The View Management Guidance is good in each case. o Please add two (at least) further views for guidance– one being from Bridge Street along the river and into the town, this being heavily used particularly by pedestrians, -and the other from the upper part of North Street, looking down and across the street. 	
	GTCV19/11	<p>GENERALLY</p> <p>This is in essence an excellent document. A deal of thought has gone into its format, and a deal of work into its presentation. I particularly note the way in which significant views have been photographed both in summer and winter - an important feature that must have required careful pre-planning. I have looked at similar documents produced by other towns, and suggest that this is pretty outstanding.</p> <p>IN DETAIL</p> <p>INTRODUCTORY - OMISSION ON 'HEIGHTS'</p> <p>I have found no mention of overall limits on height. This possibly is strategic, since this document focusses on 'views', as such, and it is arguable that the 'views' control possible heights. However most or many comparable documents [eg by</p>	9 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>CABE/EH, and other Planning Authority Guides] focus on height, and its total omission may be seen as conveying a message.</p> <p>Looked at differently, Guildford town is a historic creation of some importance in itself, with the characteristics of its kind and its periods - red roofs, three or so stories in the centre, closely knit streets. Because of this, it is, within its context, attractive and commercially attractive. Regardless of views, as such, there are aesthetic, historic and commercial drivers to resist change to the ethos and feeling of the town itself, and this suggests that high buildings, defined how you please, would not be appropriate. And the document should therefore say so. There are places where high buildings are or might be appropriate. Canary Wharf is a much quoted example, Woking may become so, and, arguably, Slyfield might also be a possible home for such developments. But not the old town!</p> <p>LISTING OF VIEWPOINTS</p> <p>ADD - THE RAILWAY</p> <p>For many tourists, passers through and residents, the view over the town towards the Castle from the train as it slows is highly significant. This, unheralded perhaps, is perhaps as important as any other view, because of its wide exposure to travellers. A continuous canyon from Ladymead to Platform 2 would not be good. Strategic viewing gaps should be retained.</p> <p>It will be difficult to define these viewing gaps but the attempt is important.</p> <p>BOOKERS TOWER</p> <p>I seem to think, without checking on the ground, that the frontispiece view over the town is from Bookers Tower. If so, perhaps it might say so. There is no analysis of Bookers Tower, but it does offer one of the most complete views of the town.</p> <p>VP04</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Is that "Claygate Common" in the distance beyond the Cathedral?</p> <p>VP 12 OLD TOWN BRIDGE</p> <p>Why no view towards the South, with The Arnaud, Millmead and the Locks?</p> <p>end></p>	
	GTCV19/12	<p>I refer to Page 41 where the Guildford Station Development scheme will be an enormous impact on the view. Apart from obstructing one third height of the trees on the opposite side of the railway, the new buildings won't just "be seen in context to other large scale buildings", they will positively dwarf the House of Fraser. In short, they will be a blot on the landscape and in this day of computer technology, it is a disappointment that Guildford Borough Council did not make proper 3D projections of this development available so that their impact on the town from all views and heights could be made for all to see, including the Planning Inspector who allowed this development. I hope that GBC will use every aid to allow the public and Councillors to have a much better insight into proposed buildings, particularly large buildings which can be difficult to envisage so that good planning decisions can be made. I do appreciate that the Station Development went to appeal but stronger arguments against the application might have been put forward in the first place, influencing the Planning Inspector's final decision.</p>	9 Jul 2019
	GTCV19/13	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above document.</p> <p>There are a couple of points which I would like to highlight:</p>	10 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>1) The document does little to support proper policies related to Mass and Scale which is where Guildford has run into serious problems in the past, most recently with the Solum (train station) development.</p> <p>2) The document concentrates only on the views from a long distance rather than how the views will change locally and/or from a shorter distance. e.g. the document shows views of Guildford Cathedral from Stoke Park & Pewley Hill but not from somewhere much closer.</p> <p>3) Whilst the document outlines views from main roads into Guildford it doesn't appear to show views from the main Guildford train line in and out of Guildford.</p>	
Ockham Parish Council	GTCV19/14	<p>Draft Guildford Town Centre Views Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>We refer to the consultation above and Ockham Parish Council responds as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We support the objective of maintaining the green vistas across the city. 2. We agree with the significance of maintaining the skyline to show legacy buildings and historic landmarks as well as the views to the landscape beyond the city. 3. We agree with the concept of keeping development to low level. 4. We support the objective of ensuring new development does not block existing legacy buildings or key views. 5. We support the importance of ensuring any new development is sympathetic to the conservation areas of the city and appropriately reflects the culture and character of Guildford today. 6. We support attention to the architectural qualities of historic Guildford when considering new development. 	11 Jul 2019
	GTCV19/15	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above document.	12 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Your document focuses on views that are deemed to be important in the context of Policy S3 and is very comprehensive but I think it could be improved by:</p> <p>(i) Page 61 Viewpoint 6 Hog's back Looking North East - need to add in wording concerning the impact of any proposed development on woodland on Stag Hill surrounding the Cathedral.</p> <p>(ii) Page 97 Viewpoint 11 Castle Motte Looking North West - again need to add in wording concerning the impact of any proposed development on woodland on Stag Hill surrounding the Cathedral.</p> <p>(iii) Show views from the main Guildford train line in and out of Guildford and not just views from main roads into Guildford.</p> <p>(iv) all the views are taken at daytime but nighttime views such as those from Viewpont 11 are important to include as well.</p> <p>(v) Don't just concentrate only on the views from a long distance rather than how the views will change locally and/or from a shorter distance. e.g. the document shows views of Guildford Cathedral from Stoke Park, Pewley Hill and the Hog's Back but not from somewhere much closer such as Onslow Village or Alresford Road/Ridgemount where the latter's semi-rural nature would be impacted by massing.</p> <p>(vi) The document does little to support proper policies related to Mass and Scale which is where Guildford has run into serious problems in the past, most recently with the Solum (train station) development.</p>	
	GTCV19/18	<p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the above.</p> <p>Page 39 describes the University as 'a unified and distinctive palette of warm buff coloured brickwork' - this is stretching the reality of jumbled hideous buildings only saved by the tree and shrubs that partially hide them.</p>	12 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>There are frequent views and descriptions of The Cathedral as a vital view point:</p> <p>Pages: 40/61/77/97</p> <p>‘many mature trees on and around Stag Hill’</p> <p>‘maintain the Cathedral as dominant feature’</p> <p>‘Cathedral needs to be on a green hill’</p> <p>‘ development should not rise above undeveloped wooded skyline’</p> <p>‘..or appear overly dominant by scale, height, massing or design’</p> <p>It is interesting to note there are no views of the Cathedral from the Hogs Back Downs, an important view emphasising the Cathedral on a green island surrounded by intense development. As well as the only main view of the entire building. This must be preserved.</p> <p>There are no views from the main Guildford Train line The views that are illustrated show the vital role of mature trees and shrubs in making Guildford better looking. So much so that steps need to be taken to ensure none are removed and more(especially in the case of Solum) should be planted.</p>	
Holy Trinity Amenity Group	GTCV19/20	<p><u>Response to Consultation on Draft Guildford Town Centre Views Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)</u></p> <p>Our group has about 450 household members and covers a large proportion of the Holy Trinity Ward. Our area adjoins the town centre and contains many of the views over the centre from the SE, as well as featuring in views from other places.</p>	14 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>We welcome any policies that attempt to preserve or enhance the quality of the town centre, particularly its historic character. However, while this SPD is valuable in informing planning decisions we believe that it should be subsidiary to a strong and detailed plan for the future of the town centre, and to a more energetically enforced Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal. If emphasis is placed on the building design within the context of its setting, and in particular the street scene, then distant views should also not be compromised; this must include the rear of a building.</p> <p>GENERAL.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The objective of the study, to educate viewers about Guildford, is narrow. The greatest benefit of the views is the sheer pleasure and interest they provide, through the seasons, particularly to pedestrians. 2. Views of the surrounding countryside are also important to emphasise the setting of the town. 3. Some views of the centre are only seen between houses on the elevated roads. Efforts are needed to prevent further loss, particularly from large side extensions, and to create new public viewpoints. 4. It is vital that the quality of viewpoints themselves be improved. Views from a car will always be fleeting, and a good viewpoint should have a seat, be separated from traffic, and be well maintained. Scrub that could block some of the view needs to be managed. 5. Improve and promote walking routes to viewpoints from the town centre. <p>A welcoming route to the top of Bright Hill could attract visitors here.</p> <p>The Stag Hill viewpoint (W end of the Cathedral) is special, and gives the best view into our area. However, it is not welcoming to the public and the attractive walking route to it through the University is no longer available. The somewhat lower viewpoint adjacent the University “Observatory” is also important, but is not obviously accessible.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Some locally listed buildings should be included in the “heritage assets”. The Harvey Road Adult Education Centre (ex. Victorian School), with its cupolas is prominent on the hillside and in distant views, particularly from Stag Hill. 	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>6. Trees are vitally important in the views, and many more are needed in the centre. They will obscure some buildings when in leaf, but they are revealed for almost half the year. This change of view with the seasons adds to the importance of views.</p> <p>7. No new buildings should have a long continuous length, to create a high “wall” in the view (as the Solum scheme). Nor should they be overdominant (as Waitrose). The eclectic mix of many small / modest buildings of different character is what underlies Guildford’s character as an historic market town – our main promotional tag. New town centre buildings should not exceed 4 storeys to ensure that the character is retained.</p> <p>8. The roofscape of the group of domestic buildings in Trinity Churchyard are a small remnant of that of pre-20th C Guildford. The view of this from Bright Hill has already been reduced by the overhigh Basket Works development. There must be no further loss.</p> <p>9. Stoughton Barracks is quite prominent in some views and should be recorded.</p> <p>10. The view to the town centre from the footpath over Pewley Downs to Warren Farm (FP37) provides fine views to the W towards the town centre and should be considered.</p> <p>11. Although the present bridge is not particularly ancient it is attractive and it maintains the river crossing as the heart of historic Guildford. We suggest that it is recognised as a legacy landmark.</p> <p>SPECIFIC VIEWPOINTS.</p> <p>Bright Hill.</p> <p>The importance of this view point has been the subject of many comments by our group over many years. It is unique in giving a good view of the centre and a long distance view to the North, while being only a few minutes walk from the High Street. It is essential that any redevelopment does not constrict or limit the view in any way, and that it provides an attractive walking route to the viewpoint. It is important to prevent scrub growth from screening part of the view. If part of the car park is to remain unused action is needed to counter its neglected appearance, that is becoming a distraction. Because of the trees that have been planted it appears as a green space for much of the year, in views from Stag Hill and this needs to be maintained.</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Town Bridge.</p> <p>This could not be a more crucial historic viewpoint. It displays the essential reason for the development of the town. Being traffic free it is a position where viewers can linger to absorb the view. It is vital that traffic is not reintroduced to the bridge as some are proposing, and that it retains its peaceful detached atmosphere to allow the view either way to be fully absorbed. It would be appropriate for the document to say this.</p> <p>Pewley Hill.</p> <p>Because the view can only be seen by looking down the road it is comparatively narrow angle. A much wider view can be obtained between the houses on Poyle Road. We hope a less cramped viewpoint can be created than the fairly narrow pavement.</p> <p>High Street.</p> <p>We support the removal of the cross-street banner, that impedes the view. We have asked for this many times. It is an outmoded and crude method of advertising events; we believe that it has also been used by commercial organisations, which is unacceptable. The ban on new projecting signs is reasonably well applied; there is no point in doing this if the view is spoilt by banners like this.</p> <p>The on-street parking that is allowed for all but 5hrs of a weekday also spoils the view. Parking must be restricted to deliveries only, and out of shopping hours - as it is in most High Streets. Reintroduction of traffic to the Town Bridge would spoil the view down the High Street.</p> <p>Quarry Street.</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted									
		The view is currently spoilt by the ever-increasing tarmac patching of the pavements, which should be maintained in the historic stone paving.										
The Guildford Society	GTCV19/24	<p data-bbox="483 480 1055 512">Appendix A - Viewpoints Detailed Comments</p> <p data-bbox="483 549 1055 580">Viewpoint 01 Dapdune Wharf Looking South</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="483 616 1915 1310"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="495 632 589 927">1.1</td> <td data-bbox="593 632 1332 927">Ensure new town centre development, which has the potential to form a component in the background of the view, is no higher than existing buildings and does not compete with the spire of St. Saviour's Church for prominence.</td> <td data-bbox="1337 632 1904 927">Suggest that new development in town should be lower to create a more natural view bounded by hills</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="495 930 589 1153">1.2</td> <td data-bbox="593 930 1332 1153">Maintain the verdant, well-treed riverside surroundings which helps frame and focus the view towards Dapdune Wharf, provide a scenic backdrop and contributes to the visual amenity of the viewing place.</td> <td data-bbox="1337 930 1904 1153">Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="495 1157 589 1310">1.3</td> <td data-bbox="593 1157 1332 1310">Ensure materials used in the public realm, for example, footways, walls and towpaths,</td> <td data-bbox="1337 1157 1904 1310">Need to understand how this relates to Environment Agency plans for Floodwalls.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	1.1	Ensure new town centre development, which has the potential to form a component in the background of the view, is no higher than existing buildings and does not compete with the spire of St. Saviour's Church for prominence.	Suggest that new development in town should be lower to create a more natural view bounded by hills	1.2	Maintain the verdant, well-treed riverside surroundings which helps frame and focus the view towards Dapdune Wharf, provide a scenic backdrop and contributes to the visual amenity of the viewing place.	Agree	1.3	Ensure materials used in the public realm, for example, footways, walls and towpaths,	Need to understand how this relates to Environment Agency plans for Floodwalls.	14 Jul 2019
1.1	Ensure new town centre development, which has the potential to form a component in the background of the view, is no higher than existing buildings and does not compete with the spire of St. Saviour's Church for prominence.	Suggest that new development in town should be lower to create a more natural view bounded by hills										
1.2	Maintain the verdant, well-treed riverside surroundings which helps frame and focus the view towards Dapdune Wharf, provide a scenic backdrop and contributes to the visual amenity of the viewing place.	Agree										
1.3	Ensure materials used in the public realm, for example, footways, walls and towpaths,	Need to understand how this relates to Environment Agency plans for Floodwalls.										

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted						
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>are given the highest level of consideration to maintain the unity, harmony and quality of the overall view.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.4</td> <td>For any development proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.</td> <td>Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?</td> </tr> </table>		are given the highest level of consideration to maintain the unity, harmony and quality of the overall view.		1.4	For any development proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?	
	are given the highest level of consideration to maintain the unity, harmony and quality of the overall view.								
1.4	For any development proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?							
		<p>Viewpoint 02 Wey -south Path at Shalford Park – Looking North</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>2.1</td> <td>Maintain the rural and verdant character of this view, with historic buildings (the Castle Keep and Holy Trinity Church Tower) the focus of the view.</td> <td>Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.2</td> <td>Ensure that any new development is not visible above the treed skyline.</td> <td>Agree</td> </tr> </table>		2.1	Maintain the rural and verdant character of this view, with historic buildings (the Castle Keep and Holy Trinity Church Tower) the focus of the view.	Agree	2.2	Ensure that any new development is not visible above the treed skyline.	Agree
2.1	Maintain the rural and verdant character of this view, with historic buildings (the Castle Keep and Holy Trinity Church Tower) the focus of the view.	Agree							
2.2	Ensure that any new development is not visible above the treed skyline.	Agree							

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted															
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 280 573 480">2.3</td> <td data-bbox="577 280 1337 480">Continue to use planting to screen built development along the banks of the Wey – ensure species are appropriate to their riparian context, drawing on locally occurring species.</td> <td data-bbox="1341 280 1910 480">Agree – need to understand how this relates to Environment Agency plans for Flood prevention on the meadows as well.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 483 573 735">2.4</td> <td data-bbox="577 483 1337 735">For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.</td> <td data-bbox="1341 483 1910 735">Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="483 738 1910 975" style="text-align: center;">Viewpoint 03 Stoke Park, looking South West</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 978 573 1134">3.1</td> <td data-bbox="577 978 1337 1134">Maintain the open character of the foreground so that this view can continue to be appreciated.</td> <td data-bbox="1341 978 1910 1134">Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 1137 573 1289">3.2</td> <td data-bbox="577 1137 1337 1289">Ensure Guildford Cathedral remains the key focus of this view, ensuring that new</td> <td data-bbox="1341 1137 1910 1289">Agree</td> </tr> </table>	2.3	Continue to use planting to screen built development along the banks of the Wey – ensure species are appropriate to their riparian context, drawing on locally occurring species.	Agree – need to understand how this relates to Environment Agency plans for Flood prevention on the meadows as well.	2.4	For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?	Viewpoint 03 Stoke Park, looking South West			3.1	Maintain the open character of the foreground so that this view can continue to be appreciated.	Agree	3.2	Ensure Guildford Cathedral remains the key focus of this view, ensuring that new	Agree	
2.3	Continue to use planting to screen built development along the banks of the Wey – ensure species are appropriate to their riparian context, drawing on locally occurring species.	Agree – need to understand how this relates to Environment Agency plans for Flood prevention on the meadows as well.																
2.4	For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?																
Viewpoint 03 Stoke Park, looking South West																		
3.1	Maintain the open character of the foreground so that this view can continue to be appreciated.	Agree																
3.2	Ensure Guildford Cathedral remains the key focus of this view, ensuring that new	Agree																

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>development does not compete for prominence – either through height, proximity, massing or materials/ colours – ensure developments blend with the generally muted tones typically found in the town, drawing on vernacular materials and features where appropriate to provide a sense of place.</p>	
	3.3	<p>Maintain the well vegetated character of the view, including the undeveloped and wooded ridge lines of the hills that surround the town.</p>	<p>Agree – need to understand how this relates to Environment Agency plans for Floodwalls.</p>
	3.4	<p>Aim to screen detracting buildings and structures where possible, for example using vegetation.</p>	<p>Agree</p>
	3.5	<p>For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.</p>	<p>Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?</p>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		Viewpoint 04 Pewley Hill looking North West	
		<p>4.1 Ensure that the prominence of Guildford Cathedral, as the key landmark feature within the view, is maintained. New development within the view should not compete with the cathedral, for example by rising above the otherwise undeveloped wooded skyline or appearing overly dominant by virtue of scale, height, massing or detailed design.</p>	Agree
		<p>4.2 Maintain the significant tree and woodland cover which occupies the slopes of the hills surrounding the town, providing a scenic backdrop and setting to the cathedral, and contributing to the overall townscape character by screening and breaking up areas of built development. Plan for next generation of trees to maintain a wooded character when existing trees come to the end of their life.</p>	Agree

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted	
		4.3 Maintain the undeveloped character of the distant ridge line, which provides an important element of the landscape backdrop of the view.	Agree	
		4.4 Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky 'block-like' town centre buildings as the opportunity arises.	Agree	
		4.5 Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning, design and materials of roof plant/enclosures.	Agree – needs to be extended to cover buildings that although they don't impact skyline by their height	
			clutter the landscape. Also roofs large flat roofs should be avoided.	
		4.6 There are a range of materials and colours in this view – aim to replicate the muted tones of the historic buildings which sit more comfortably than the light/ bright colours of some of the modern buildings.	Agree	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>4.7 Maintain the distant wooded backdrop – ensure nothing breaks the undeveloped wooded skyline.</p>	Agree
		<p>4.8 For any development proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.</p>	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?
Viewpoint 05 St Catherine’s Hill looking North			
		<p>5.1 Maintain the open character of the foreground so that this view can continue to be appreciated.</p>	Agree
		<p>5.2 Ensure the composition of Guildford Castle, the cupolas of Abbots Hospital and Holy Trinity Church tower continue to form the focus of this view. Ensure that new development does not compete with this composition for prominence by way of height, proximity, massing or</p>	Agree

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>materials/ colours – ensure developments blend with the generally muted tones typically found in the town, drawing on vernacular materials and features where appropriate to provide a sense of place.</p>	
	5.3	<p>Aim to create a fine grained and articulated roofscape with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from the historic town centre buildings.</p>	Agree
	5.4	<p>Maintain the well vegetated character and low density of the buildings in the garden suburbs.</p>	Agree
	5.5	<p>Preserve the undeveloped and wooded ridge lines of the hills that surround the town.</p>	Agree
	5.6	<p>Aim to screen detracting buildings and structures where possible, for example using vegetation.</p>	Agree

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted						
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 288 573 512">5.7</td> <td data-bbox="577 288 1339 512">Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning and design of roof plant/ enclosures.</td> <td data-bbox="1344 288 1910 512">Agree – needs to be extended to cover buildings that although they don't impact skyline by their height clutter the landscape.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 515 573 703">5.8</td> <td data-bbox="577 515 1339 703">For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.</td> <td data-bbox="1344 515 1910 703">Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?</td> </tr> </table>	5.7	Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning and design of roof plant/ enclosures.	Agree – needs to be extended to cover buildings that although they don't impact skyline by their height clutter the landscape.	5.8	For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?	
5.7	Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning and design of roof plant/ enclosures.	Agree – needs to be extended to cover buildings that although they don't impact skyline by their height clutter the landscape.							
5.8	For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?							
Viewpoint 06 Hog's Back Looking north east									
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 943 573 1134">6.1</td> <td data-bbox="577 943 1339 1134">Maintain open views from this location so it remains possible to appreciate panoramic views over the town to the distant London skyline.</td> <td data-bbox="1344 943 1910 1134">Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 1137 573 1329">6.2</td> <td data-bbox="577 1137 1339 1329">Maintain Guildford Cathedral as the dominant feature of the view – ensure new buildings do not compete with it for dominance.</td> <td data-bbox="1344 1137 1910 1329">Agree</td> </tr> </table>	6.1	Maintain open views from this location so it remains possible to appreciate panoramic views over the town to the distant London skyline.	Agree	6.2	Maintain Guildford Cathedral as the dominant feature of the view – ensure new buildings do not compete with it for dominance.	Agree	
6.1	Maintain open views from this location so it remains possible to appreciate panoramic views over the town to the distant London skyline.	Agree							
6.2	Maintain Guildford Cathedral as the dominant feature of the view – ensure new buildings do not compete with it for dominance.	Agree							

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		6.3 Make sure it remains possible to see legacy landmarks such as Abbot's Hospital, The Guildhall and Holy Trinity Church Tower.	Agree
		6.4 Aim to create a fine grained and articulated roofscape with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from or obscure, the key historic landmark buildings.	Agree - but the Solum site appears to break all the SPD proposals!!!!
		6.5 Ensure new developments blend with the generally muted tones typically found in the town, and are appropriate according to the townscape character area in which they lie.	Agree - but the Solum site appears to break all the SPD proposals!!!!
		6.6 Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky 'block-like' buildings as the opportunity arises.	Agree - but the Solum site appears to break all the SPD proposals!!!!
		6.7 Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning and design of roof plant/ enclosures.	Agree – needs to be extended to cover buildings that although they don't impact skyline by their height clutter the landscape.

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted						
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 288 577 443">6.8</td> <td data-bbox="582 288 1337 443">Maintain a wooded setting and a treed skyline backdrop to the view.</td> <td data-bbox="1341 288 1912 443">Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 446 577 635">6.9</td> <td data-bbox="582 446 1337 635">For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.</td> <td data-bbox="1341 446 1912 635">Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?</td> </tr> </table>	6.8	Maintain a wooded setting and a treed skyline backdrop to the view.	Agree	6.9	For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?	
6.8	Maintain a wooded setting and a treed skyline backdrop to the view.	Agree							
6.9	For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?							
		Viewpoint 07 Farnham Rd Looking east							
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 807 577 1031">7.1</td> <td data-bbox="582 807 1337 1031">Ensure it remains possible to view the key legacy landmarks such as Holy Trinity Church tower and the Castle Keep from this location.</td> <td data-bbox="1341 807 1912 1031">Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 1034 577 1326">7.2</td> <td data-bbox="582 1034 1337 1326">Ensure it remains possible to see the scale and grain of historic buildings along the High Street and encourage new development to respect this scale and grain of typically 2-3 storeys and on relatively narrow plots.</td> <td data-bbox="1341 1034 1912 1326">Agree</td> </tr> </table>	7.1	Ensure it remains possible to view the key legacy landmarks such as Holy Trinity Church tower and the Castle Keep from this location.	Agree	7.2	Ensure it remains possible to see the scale and grain of historic buildings along the High Street and encourage new development to respect this scale and grain of typically 2-3 storeys and on relatively narrow plots.	Agree	
7.1	Ensure it remains possible to view the key legacy landmarks such as Holy Trinity Church tower and the Castle Keep from this location.	Agree							
7.2	Ensure it remains possible to see the scale and grain of historic buildings along the High Street and encourage new development to respect this scale and grain of typically 2-3 storeys and on relatively narrow plots.	Agree							

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted												
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 280 577 515">7.3</td> <td data-bbox="582 280 1337 515">Aim to create a fine grained and articulated roofscape with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from or obscure, the key historic landmark buildings which can be seen along the High Street.</td> <td data-bbox="1341 280 1910 515">Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 518 577 753">7.4</td> <td data-bbox="582 518 1337 753">Ensure new buildings do not compete with existing historic landmarks for prominence –</td> <td data-bbox="1341 518 1910 753">Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 756 577 1066"></td> <td data-bbox="582 756 1337 1066"> <p>either through height, massing or materials/colours – ensure developments blend with the</p> <p>generally muted tones and rich reds typically found in the town, drawing on vernacular materials and features where appropriate to provide a sense of place.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1341 756 1910 1066"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 1069 577 1220">7.5</td> <td data-bbox="582 1069 1337 1220">Ensure materials used in the public realm are given equal consideration to maintain the unity of the historic core.</td> <td data-bbox="1341 1069 1910 1220">Agree</td> </tr> </table>	7.3	Aim to create a fine grained and articulated roofscape with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from or obscure, the key historic landmark buildings which can be seen along the High Street.	Agree	7.4	Ensure new buildings do not compete with existing historic landmarks for prominence –	Agree		<p>either through height, massing or materials/colours – ensure developments blend with the</p> <p>generally muted tones and rich reds typically found in the town, drawing on vernacular materials and features where appropriate to provide a sense of place.</p>		7.5	Ensure materials used in the public realm are given equal consideration to maintain the unity of the historic core.	Agree	
7.3	Aim to create a fine grained and articulated roofscape with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from or obscure, the key historic landmark buildings which can be seen along the High Street.	Agree													
7.4	Ensure new buildings do not compete with existing historic landmarks for prominence –	Agree													
	<p>either through height, massing or materials/colours – ensure developments blend with the</p> <p>generally muted tones and rich reds typically found in the town, drawing on vernacular materials and features where appropriate to provide a sense of place.</p>														
7.5	Ensure materials used in the public realm are given equal consideration to maintain the unity of the historic core.	Agree													

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		7.6 Aim to restore the prominence of visible (and currently hidden) heritage assets with future redevelopment opportunities.	Agree
		7.7 Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky 'block-like' buildings as the opportunity arises.	Agree
		7.8 Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning and design of roof plant/ enclosures.	Agree – needs to be extended to cover buildings that although they don't impact skyline by their height clutter the landscape.
		7.9 Maintain a wooded backdrop and skyline – ensure the suburbs that climb up the hillside remain at a relatively low density to that trees are plentiful and ensure that no new buildings break the skyline. Plan for replacement of trees so that there are replacement trees when the existing trees reach the end of their life.	Agree
		7.10 For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.</p>	
		<p>Viewpoint 08 Sydenham Road / Bright Hill looking North</p>	
		<p>8.1 Maintain Guildford Cathedral as the dominant feature on the skyline – ensure new buildings do not compete with it for dominance.</p>	<p>Agree</p>
		<p>8.2 Make sure it remains possible to see legacy landmarks such as Holy Trinity Church Tower and Abbot’s Hospital. Any development should take the opportunity to frame views of the legacy landmarks.</p>	<p>Agree</p>
		<p>8.3 Aim to create a fine grained and articulated roofscape with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from, or block, the key historic landmark buildings.</p>	<p>Agree</p>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>8.4 Ensure new developments blend with the generally muted tones typically found in the town.</p>	<p>Agree</p>
		<p>8.5 Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky 'block-like' buildings as the opportunity arises.</p>	<p>Agree - Impacts North Street Development?</p>
		<p>8.6 Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning and design of roof plant/ enclosures.</p>	<p>Agree – needs to be extended to cover buildings that although they don't impact skyline by their height clutter the landscape e.g. new flats in the view</p>
		<p>8.7 Maintain uninterrupted views across to the Hog's Back which provides a wooded setting and a treed skyline backdrop to the view.</p>	<p>Agree</p>
		<p>8.8 For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape</p>	<p>Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?</p>

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.</p>	
		<p>Viewpoint 09 High Street Looking West</p>	
		<p>9.1 Ensure the Guildhall Cupola and ornate clock which projects across the High Street from the Guildhall continue to form the central focal points in this view and that features in front or behind it do not interfere with this.</p>	Agree
		<p>9.2 Maintain the characteristic narrow plots along the High Street and the historic features including bays, gables, pediments, cupolas and original sash and casement windows.</p>	Agree
		<p>9.3 Maintain the predominance of muted vernacular materials, ensuring that any additions are in harmony with this.</p>	Agree

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>9.4 Ensure the tower of St. Nicolas Church remains a feature in the middle distance in the centre of the view and ensure that any new development is subordinate to this.</p>	<p>Agree</p>
		<p>9.5 Ensure new development in the background of the view along The Mount and neighbouring roads is sympathetic to the styles, scale, materiality and harmony of the existing townscape – highly contemporary design or bulky form, particularly at roof level, has the potential to visually jar or appear overly prominent within the view. This should be assessed in winter as well as summer as in winter buildings can be more visible.</p>	<p>Agree</p>
		<p>9.6 Ensure that seemingly small-scale changes, for example to signage, shop fronts or fenestration along the High Street, are carefully considered in terms of their contribution and impact on the overall view; avoiding overly prominent development that might compete with the Guildhall clock as a focal point, and block or</p>	<p>Agree</p>
		<p>significantly detract from the linear view and visual connection to the scenic landscape backdrop.</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted									
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 288 573 619">9.7</td> <td data-bbox="577 288 1335 619">Ensure that the undeveloped downland and mature treeline on the horizon, which forms the boundary of the Surrey Hills AONB, is protected from inappropriate development to maintain the unspoilt scenic landscape setting to the town as viewed from the High Street. Maintain views to this green backdrop, ensuring that buildings in front do not block views to the ridge.</td> <td data-bbox="1339 288 1910 619">Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 622 573 842">9.8</td> <td data-bbox="577 622 1335 842">Ensure materials used in the public realm are given the highest level of consideration to maintain the unity of the historic core.</td> <td data-bbox="1339 622 1910 842">Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 845 573 1034">9.9</td> <td data-bbox="577 845 1335 1034">For any development proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.</td> <td data-bbox="1339 845 1910 1034">Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?</td> </tr> </table>	9.7	Ensure that the undeveloped downland and mature treeline on the horizon, which forms the boundary of the Surrey Hills AONB, is protected from inappropriate development to maintain the unspoilt scenic landscape setting to the town as viewed from the High Street. Maintain views to this green backdrop, ensuring that buildings in front do not block views to the ridge.	Agree	9.8	Ensure materials used in the public realm are given the highest level of consideration to maintain the unity of the historic core.	Agree	9.9	For any development proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?	
9.7	Ensure that the undeveloped downland and mature treeline on the horizon, which forms the boundary of the Surrey Hills AONB, is protected from inappropriate development to maintain the unspoilt scenic landscape setting to the town as viewed from the High Street. Maintain views to this green backdrop, ensuring that buildings in front do not block views to the ridge.	Agree										
9.8	Ensure materials used in the public realm are given the highest level of consideration to maintain the unity of the historic core.	Agree										
9.9	For any development proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?										
		Viewpoint 10 Quarry St Looking north										
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 1206 573 1361">10.1</td> <td data-bbox="577 1206 1335 1361">Maintain St. Mary's Church as the focus of this view along Quarry Street towards the towns centre, and the most</td> <td data-bbox="1339 1206 1910 1361">Agree</td> </tr> </table>	10.1	Maintain St. Mary's Church as the focus of this view along Quarry Street towards the towns centre, and the most	Agree							
10.1	Maintain St. Mary's Church as the focus of this view along Quarry Street towards the towns centre, and the most	Agree										

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		prominent feature of the view – ensure new buildings do not complete for prominence.	
	10.2	Maintain the distinctive yew trees that mark the churchyard.	Agree
	10.3	Ensure the historic alignment of Quarry Street is maintained.	Agree
	10.4	Maintain the historic frontages and human scale along Quarry Street – ensure new development in the town centre does not detract from the historic skyline or change the human scale of the street.	Agree
	10.5	Ensure any new development is in material sympathetic to the existing palette in this historic location.	Agree
	10.6	Ensure materials used in the public realm are given equal consideration to maintain the unity of the historic core and avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning and design of street furniture.	Agree

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted												
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="488 288 577 480">10.7</td> <td data-bbox="582 288 1339 480">For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.</td> <td data-bbox="1344 288 1906 480">Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="488 483 1906 651" style="text-align: center;">Viewpoint 11 Castle Motte, looking north west</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="488 654 577 1050">11.1</td> <td data-bbox="582 654 1339 1050"> <p>Ensure that the prominence of Guildford Cathedral, as the key landmark feature within the view, is maintained. New development within the view should not compete with the cathedral, for example by rising above the otherwise undeveloped wooded skyline or appearing overly dominant by virtue of scale, height, massing or detailed design.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1344 654 1906 1050">Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="488 1053 577 1240">11.2</td> <td data-bbox="582 1053 1339 1240">Ensure new development does not obscure or otherwise detract from the visual connection between St. Mary's Church and Guildford Cathedral.</td> <td data-bbox="1344 1053 1906 1240">Agree</td> </tr> </table>	10.7	For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?	Viewpoint 11 Castle Motte, looking north west			11.1	<p>Ensure that the prominence of Guildford Cathedral, as the key landmark feature within the view, is maintained. New development within the view should not compete with the cathedral, for example by rising above the otherwise undeveloped wooded skyline or appearing overly dominant by virtue of scale, height, massing or detailed design.</p>	Agree	11.2	Ensure new development does not obscure or otherwise detract from the visual connection between St. Mary's Church and Guildford Cathedral.	Agree	
10.7	For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?													
Viewpoint 11 Castle Motte, looking north west															
11.1	<p>Ensure that the prominence of Guildford Cathedral, as the key landmark feature within the view, is maintained. New development within the view should not compete with the cathedral, for example by rising above the otherwise undeveloped wooded skyline or appearing overly dominant by virtue of scale, height, massing or detailed design.</p>	Agree													
11.2	Ensure new development does not obscure or otherwise detract from the visual connection between St. Mary's Church and Guildford Cathedral.	Agree													

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>11.3 Aim to create a fine grained and articulated roofscape to any new development with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from or obscure, the key historic landmark buildings.</p>	Agree
		<p>11.4 Avoid creating additional visual skyline clutter by carefully considering the positioning, design and materials of roof plant/enclosures.</p>	Agree – needs to be extended to cover buildings that although they don't impact skyline by their height clutter the landscape.
		<p>11.5 Maintain the significant tree and woodland cover which occupies the slopes of the hills</p> <p>surrounding the town, providing a scenic backdrop and setting to the cathedral, and contributing to the overall townscape character by screening and breaking up areas of built</p> <p>development. Plan for next generation of trees to maintain a wooded character when existing trees come to the end of their life.</p>	Agree
		<p>11.6 Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky 'block-like' town centre buildings as the opportunity arises.</p>	Agree

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>11.7 There are a range of materials and colours in this view – aim to replicate the muted tones of the historic buildings which sit more comfortably than the light/bright colours of some of the modern buildings.</p>	Agree
		<p>11.8 For any development proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.</p>	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?
Viewpoint 12 Old Town Bridge, looking East			
		<p>12.1 Maintain the uninterrupted visual connection along the entire length of the High Street within the view.</p>	Agree– need to understand how this relates to Environment Agency plans for Floodwalls.
		<p>12.2 Ensure new buildings do not compete with the landmark of Holy Trinity Church tower for prominence on the skyline – either through height, massing or materials/ colours – ensure developments blend with the generally muted tones typically found in the town, drawing</p>	Agree

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		on vernacular materials and features where appropriate to provide a sense of place.	
	12.3	Maintain the characteristic narrow plots along the High Street and the historic features including bays, gables, pediments, cupolas and original sash and casement windows.	Agree
	12.4	Maintain the predominance of muted vernacular materials, ensuing that any additions are in harmony with this to maintain the unity of the Guildford Historic Core townscape character area.	Agree
	12.5	Maintain the fine-grained and articulated roofscape, with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from or obscure, the key historic landmark features such as Holy Trinity Church tower, the Guildhall clock and Rodboro Buildings.	Agree
	12.6	Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning and design of roof plant/enclosures.	Agree – needs to be extended to cover buildings that although they don't impact skyline by their height clutter the landscape.

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted												
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 288 600 480">12.7</td> <td data-bbox="604 288 1339 480">Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky 'block-like' buildings with finer grained forms more appropriate to the historic context as the opportunity arises.</td> <td data-bbox="1344 288 1912 480">Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 483 600 639">12.8</td> <td data-bbox="604 483 1339 639">Ensure new development does not dominate the open river views, including views from the towpaths.</td> <td data-bbox="1344 483 1912 639">Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 643 600 863">12.9</td> <td data-bbox="604 643 1339 863">Conserve, and seek opportunities to enhance, the street and riverbank tree cover and plantings, which have significant multi-functional 'green infrastructure' value and create visual interest and variety within the townscape.</td> <td data-bbox="1344 643 1912 863">Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 866 600 1051">12.10</td> <td data-bbox="604 866 1339 1051">For any development proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.</td> <td data-bbox="1344 866 1912 1051">Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?</td> </tr> </table>	12.7	Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky 'block-like' buildings with finer grained forms more appropriate to the historic context as the opportunity arises.	Agree	12.8	Ensure new development does not dominate the open river views, including views from the towpaths.	Agree	12.9	Conserve, and seek opportunities to enhance, the street and riverbank tree cover and plantings, which have significant multi-functional 'green infrastructure' value and create visual interest and variety within the townscape.	Agree	12.10	For any development proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?	
12.7	Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky 'block-like' buildings with finer grained forms more appropriate to the historic context as the opportunity arises.	Agree													
12.8	Ensure new development does not dominate the open river views, including views from the towpaths.	Agree													
12.9	Conserve, and seek opportunities to enhance, the street and riverbank tree cover and plantings, which have significant multi-functional 'green infrastructure' value and create visual interest and variety within the townscape.	Agree													
12.10	For any development proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?													
		Viewpoint 13 Old Town Bridge, looking west													
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="483 1225 600 1378">13.1</td> <td data-bbox="604 1225 1339 1378">Maintain the uninterrupted visual connection from the High Street across the bridge to the Mount.</td> <td data-bbox="1344 1225 1912 1378">Agree</td> </tr> </table>	13.1	Maintain the uninterrupted visual connection from the High Street across the bridge to the Mount.	Agree										
13.1	Maintain the uninterrupted visual connection from the High Street across the bridge to the Mount.	Agree													

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>13.2 Ensure new buildings do not compete with the landmark of St. Nicolas' Church Tower for prominence on the skyline – either through height, massing or materials/ colours – ensure developments blend with the generally muted tones typically found in the town, drawing</p> <p>on vernacular materials and features where appropriate to provide a sense of place.</p>	Agree
		<p>13.3 Maintain a wooded skyline at the top of the Mount</p>	Agree
		<p>13.4 Conserve, and seek opportunities to enhance, the river corridor views, taking into account the subtle changes in character from 'industrial heritage' to a less urban and more verdant character further south along Millmead. New development should not encroach on or dominate the open river views including the towpaths.</p>	Agree
		<p>13.5 Aim to restore the prominence of visible (and currently hidden) heritage assets with future redevelopment opportunities.</p>	Agree

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>13.6 Aim to create a fine-grained and articulated roofscape as part of any new development proposals, with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from or obscure, the key historic landmark buildings such as St. Nicolas Church, Rodboro Buildings and the Treadwheel Crane.</p>	Agree
		<p>13.7 Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky 'block-like' buildings as the opportunity arises.</p>	Agree
		<p>13.8 Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning and design of roof plant/enclosures.</p>	Agree – needs to be extended to cover buildings that although they don't impact skyline by their height clutter the landscape.
		<p>13.9 Conserve, and seek opportunities to enhance, the street and riverbank tree cover and plantings, which have significant multi-functional 'green infrastructure' value and create visual interest and variety within the townscape.</p>	Agree
		<p>13.10 Ensure materials used in the public realm are given equal consideration to maintain the unity of the historic core and settled river townscape character areas.</p>	Agree

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted															
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="488 288 600 480">13.11</td> <td data-bbox="604 288 1339 480">For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape</td> <td data-bbox="1344 288 1906 480">Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="488 483 600 600"></td> <td data-bbox="604 483 1339 600">character area in which the proposal lies.</td> <td data-bbox="1344 483 1906 600"></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="488 703 1906 743">Viewpoint 14 The Mount, looking east</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="488 775 600 967">14.1</td> <td data-bbox="604 775 1339 967">Maintain views towards and along the High Street from this viewing location at ground level – ensure the historic alignment of the High Street is maintained.</td> <td data-bbox="1344 775 1906 967">Agree</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="488 970 600 1219">14.2</td> <td data-bbox="604 970 1339 1219">Aim to create a fine grained and articulated roofscape with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from or obscure, the key historic landmark buildings such as St. Nicolas Church, Holy Trinity Church tower and the Guildhall cupola/clock.</td> <td data-bbox="1344 970 1906 1219">Agree</td> </tr> </table>	13.11	For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?		character area in which the proposal lies.		Viewpoint 14 The Mount, looking east			14.1	Maintain views towards and along the High Street from this viewing location at ground level – ensure the historic alignment of the High Street is maintained.	Agree	14.2	Aim to create a fine grained and articulated roofscape with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from or obscure, the key historic landmark buildings such as St. Nicolas Church, Holy Trinity Church tower and the Guildhall cupola/clock.	Agree	
13.11	For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?																
	character area in which the proposal lies.																	
Viewpoint 14 The Mount, looking east																		
14.1	Maintain views towards and along the High Street from this viewing location at ground level – ensure the historic alignment of the High Street is maintained.	Agree																
14.2	Aim to create a fine grained and articulated roofscape with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from or obscure, the key historic landmark buildings such as St. Nicolas Church, Holy Trinity Church tower and the Guildhall cupola/clock.	Agree																

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>14.3 Ensure new buildings do not compete with existing historic landmarks for prominence – either through height, massing or materials/colours – ensure developments blend with the generally muted tones typically found in the town, drawing on vernacular materials and features where appropriate to provide a sense of place.</p>	Agree
		<p>14.4 Encourage new development to respect the existing alignment of the High Street and its bordering buildings which are typically 2–3 storeys and on relatively narrow plots – maintain a human scale along the High Street.</p>	Agree
		<p>14.5 Ensure materials used in the public realm are given equal consideration to maintain the unity of the historic core.</p>	Agree
		<p>14.6 Aim to restore the prominence of visible (and currently hidden) heritage assets with future redevelopment opportunities.</p>	Agree
		<p>14.7 Maintain the strong visual relationship between the High Street and The Mount and ensure that any new development</p>	Agree

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		does not interrupt the visual connection from the Mount to the High Street.	
	14.8	Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky 'block-like' buildings as the opportunity arises.	Agree
	14.9	Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning and design of roof plant/enclosures.	Agree
	14.10	For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.	Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?
Viewpoint 15 Stag Hill, looking south east			
	15.1	Ensure that the prominence of the Castle Keep, Holy Trinity Church tower and Semaphore House is maintained so that these continue	Agree

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		to provide points of interest in the view. New development within the view should not compete with these buildings by virtue of scale, proximity or materials.	
	15.2	<p>Maintain the significant tree and woodland cover which occupies the slopes of the hills surrounding the town, providing a scenic backdrop and contributing to the overall townscape character by screening and</p> <p>breaking up areas of built development. Plan for next generation of trees to maintain a wooded character when existing trees come to the end of their life.</p>	Agree
	15.3	Maintain the undeveloped character of the distant ridge line, which provides an important element of the backdrop to the view.	Agree
	15.4	Aim to create a fine grained and articulated roofscape with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from or obscure, the key historic landmark buildings such as the Castle Keep, Holy Trinity Church tower and Sempahore House.	Agree

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>15.5 Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky ‘block-like’ town centre buildings as the opportunity arises, and seeking to open up views to historic buildings along the High Street where possible.</p> <p>15.6 Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning, design and materials of roof plant/enclosures.</p> <p>15.7 There are a range of materials and colours in this view – aim to replicate the muted tones which sit more comfortably than the light/ bright colours of some of the modern buildings.</p> <p>15.8 For any development proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Reference relevant sections of Townscape Character Assessment?</p>
Stoke next Guildford Residents Associati	GTCV19/17	<p>Dear Guildford Borough Council.</p> <p>5.2 P30 Approaches to Guildford.</p>	13 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Stoke next Guildford RA would strongly urge the council to consider adding its historic northern Green Gateway to the list of views to be considered for protection by policy S3. Since the last ice age 12,000 BC a river crossing of the Wey at Stoke became the northern Gateway to Guildford. Palaeolithic encampment of Nationally important finds at the old fire station site was discovered in 2014 and the whole area was designated in 2017 An Area of High Archiological Potential, a project on which I worked with both GBC and SCC. (Image 1) There has been crossing continually since. Heritage statements are required by law on development sites more than 0.4 hectares within AHAPs.</p> <p>2.2 p6 Key Legacy landmark Buildings. St.Johns Church.</p> <p>Stoke church and two mills were listed in the Domesday book and explains stages in Guildfords development. Grade II* listed c15 St.Johns church and curtilage listed churchyards are amply described by Pevsner in Architecture of Surrey as part of what remains of the village of Stoke. Listed buildings and their settings especially grade II* and I (Architectural and cultural significance only 6% of listed buildings are given this level of high significance) are protected by law however lip service is often paid, in planning applications with partially written or totally missing Heritage Statements. The 2007 landscape Character Analysis failed to recognise the significance of St. John's Grade II* listing merely calling it an "old church" and stating that the Lido was of greater significance though it is not even locally listed. It also failed to recognise that the rest of what remains of the old village of Stoke in Josephs Rd dates from c15 and wrongly categorised this as 6C p44 with Stoke Fields Victorian /Edwardian suburb (image 2 early map showing separate northern gateway village at Stoke) see Pevsner and Lynn Clarke's Stoke next Guildford chapter The Village.</p> <p>St.Johns church and churchyards were saved from development at Westminster in 2015 by Guildford residents. Including the largest collection of native evergreen church Yew trees in Guildford. 7 Yew trees up to and over 300 years old and Iconic Surrey Box tree, now have TPOs thanks to GBC tree officers working with residents.</p> <p>The church and churchyards are enjoyed everyday by hundreds if not thousands of people who pass through this historic gateway. All publicly accessible.</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>(Image 3 St.Johns sunset historic approach view since 1800 Mr Aldersay had the new road built. Yews always planted to the west of churches.)</p> <p>(Image 4 Yews & Box with TPOs view green approach to Guildford curtilage listed Bargate stone wall)</p> <p>3.1 p7 Selection Criteria</p> <p>Selection Criteria: “Important Views” Focuses on views that are deemed to be important in the context of Policy S3. Assessed against the following selection criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o ...view of a legacy landmark and could ... promote an understanding of Guildford and its historic development? o ... promote an understanding of the relationship between Guildford and its landscape setting? o ... reveal an architecturally or culturally significant heritage asset? o ... a designed view? o ... reveal an unexpected view of any important building? o ... publicly accessible and experienced by a large number of people <p>St.Johns fits with Town Centre Approach views Stoke Interchange being the major entrance to Guildford from Working A3 and M25 beyond, works nearing completion on slipway widening to stop traffic queuing on A3. Guildford's Green Gateway, the church's setting "view" was considered by GBC and SCC after ward councillors working with residents pointed out its significance, and that Guildford should have an exemplary contemporary retail building to both contrast and compliment the church at this most prominent gateway site. The proposed stolid flats application was withdrawn by SCC and instead the G.Soc award winning Barker Stonehouse building was approved. Facilitated by Caroline Reeves representing the RA I was able to work on maximum tree retention and planting to keep this gateway green and inviting to visitors and resident alike.</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>(Image 5&6 The significance of the view into town along north Stoke Rd of St.Johns church is enhanced by the group value of Stoke next Guildford War Memorial listed grade II in 2014 by residents working with Historic England surrounded by verdant Lime trees on its green and Stoke Park Mansions original Gateway Lodge locally listed with its TPO Yew tree.)</p> <p>(Image 7 Stoke Church)</p> <p>Also looking left or right down Josephs Rd the historic view is further enhanced by grade II listed c16 7-11 Josephs Rd also stated by Pevsner as part of the old village of Stoke. No 7 being owned by GBC.</p> <p>(Image 8 view from Stoke Rd of listed 7-11 Josephs Rd)</p> <p>Detractors</p> <p>Collectively these designated significant heritage assets and their views are blighted by the terrible condition of the roundabout which has been broken for at least the last ten years. Too big so lorries drive over it, as GBC leader Caroline Reeves has witnessed.</p> <p>(Image 9 destroyed roundabout with too much signage clutter. Looks just as bad from approach view)</p> <p>(Image 10 map of listed buildings and TPO trees within the key northern town centre approach view)</p> <p>(Image 11 inline with the Governments and SCCs climate change emergency Stoke next Guildford west churchyard is allowed to grow as a wild flower meadow to attract bees and all insect species and enhance biodiversity within the urban environment)</p> <p>Further specific protection via S3 would be highly desirable for this gateway view of collected significant assets especially St.Johns church and churchyards legacy buildings your consideration is most gratefully appreciated.</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Key landmark legacy buildings: Guildford Castle * Treadwheel Crane * St. Mary's Church Tower * The Guildhall * Clock and cupola * Trinity Church Tower * Guildford Cathedral * St. Nicolas' Church Tower * The Angel Hotel * Bookers Tower * Farnham Road Hospital * Rodborobuilding * The Semaphore House * The Yvonne Arnaud Theatre * Tunsgate Arch * Abbots Hospital * Dapdune Wharf</p> <p>With Kind Regards</p> <p>Donna Collinson BA (Hons) Chairman Stoke next Guildford RA Stoke AHAP mayors Award for Services to the Community</p>	
	GTCV19/19	<p>Thank you for sending me the Draft Guildford Town Centre View document.</p> <p>I am pleased to see that important considerations on views are being made.</p> <p>However, the only thing that concerns me is that all the good ideas are about to be nullified by the monstrous station development which goes against so many of the recommendations in the document. eg</p>	14 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>4. Requirement for planning Applications impacting important views.</p> <p>"A high quality scheme will have a positive relationship with its context, including impact on the skyline"</p> <p>Picture on p78 of station shows an extremely negative impact.</p> <p>The view is blocked. The long horizontal line of the station cuts off the Cathedral from the rest of the view and Holy Trinity tower is cut in half. This must be stopped before building starts.</p> <p>Picture on p60 makes me cry. What a monstrosity. This must not be built.</p> <p>p43 Point 4 "Aim to improve the view through replacement of bulky 'blocklike' town centre buildings as the opportunity arises."</p> <p>Do not build the station building in the first place.</p> <p>P43 Point 1 "new development ... should not appear overly dominant by virtue of scale"</p> <p>Picture on P60 shows station doing exactly this.</p> <p>And hardly an "interesting roof form" either.</p>	
	GTCV19/16	<p>This document could be helpful in ensuring a view of a distant building such as the cathedral was not obliterated when seen from a particular distant point by a tall building in the middle ground, or perhaps prevent some monstrosity that would stick out like a sore thumb, but I think it will be of limited effectiveness.</p> <p>The risk is it comes to be relied upon as a catchall and more effective policies become neglected. Or that it becomes open season on properties not included within a particular view.</p>	13 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>It points out a number of detractor buildings in various views. Is the purpose of this to identify the historic planning shortfalls, or provide examples of what would not be acceptable in future. Or is the idea that the detractor buildings can be replaced on redevelopment by ones that are similarly bad, but no worse?</p> <p>Policy could be to ensure that on redevelopment of such buildings the design ensured detracting was less. This could be implied in relation to comments regarding some views e.g Point 6 to Farnham Road viewpoint page 69 (“aim to restore the prominence of visible (and currently hidden) heritage assets with future redevelopment opportunities”). Why does this principle not apply universally; and where detractors are specifically identified why not explicitly in relation to them.</p> <p>Much of it is too vague, for example point 5, page 84 talks about development on “the Mount and neighbouring roads” and risks of highly contemporary or bulky design detracting from the townscape. How far round on the southern slopes of Guildown does this neighbouring continue.</p> <p>There is no view of the Guildown area, say from St Catherine's Monument, whereas there is of Pewley down and other areas included within the Farnham Road review on page 69. Would a glass box Huf house all the existing lighthouse on the guild downhill side fall foul of the policy if this view added. I believe such development would detract from the established view which is a function of the local building materials and traditional construction techniques and is on a human scale and characterised by a large degrees of openness and mature trees. This view should be added.</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Many of the views are glimpses above treetops. There could be a policy of managing the height of such trees to ensure adequate cover but where appropriate to lower them in order to open up the views of the conservation assets. The trees will grow over time so do the allowable building heights also grow? If the trees are not regularly lopped the policy will not realistically be enforceable.</p> <p>For example, Viewpoint .2, management guidance 2 on page 25, is too imprecise. The trees will get higher. A height should be set now relative for example to the castle keep.</p> <p>In conclusion this must not become a substitute for clear policy guidelines as to heights, materials, density and use etc. applied to clearly defined geographic areas by reference to maps or addresses.</p> <p>There needs to be more guidance in how the guide will be used. For example the view down the High Street towards the Downs excludes those two intrusive blocks of flats which one would expect such policy to prevent today, but the fact they are outside the view in the guide could make it more difficult to resist such things. Whilst I recognise you are looking for clarity, I believe nevertheless there could be a statement that the general principles enshrined in the document are applied in areas that are not within the depicted views, otherwise there is a risk that it could make matters worse.</p>	
Downsedge Residents' Association	GTCV19/27	<p>Background</p> <p>DOWNSEGE Residents Association was formed 10 years ago to represent the views of Guildford residents in the area in the east of Guildford, bounded by the Epsom Road, Warren Road, St Omer and Tangier Road, including Gateways and</p>	15 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Broadwater Rise, as well as The Ridgeway, Little Warren Close and Downside Road joined the Association more recently.</p> <p>The area covered by our Association forms part of the easterly urban fringe of Guildford. We currently have around 80 household members, are members of GRA (the Guildford Residents Association) and support their responses to the Guildford Town Centre Views Supplementary Planning Document Draft. The specific points below, made by GRA in their response have particular relevance for the residents of Downsedge RA area and we support the suggested changes wholeheartedly.</p> <p>Overall we are highly supportive of the decision to write an SPD on Town Centre Views, and hope it will be used to protect the town from further unsightly development such as the Solum Development.</p> <p>Comments by theme:</p> <p><u>Views not selected:</u></p> <p>Selecting “important” views will unavoidably have an effect in downgrading the value placed on other highly valued, but not selected, views. This effect/risk should be mitigated by greatly strengthening the reference to the importance of views and roofscapes in Guildford more generally. The SPD should be much stronger in setting out that view assessment matters for all development in Guildford given</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • its setting in a gap in downland designated as AONB (the highest landscape designation for natural beauty) • the rich legacy of its historical centre, verdant surrounding residential areas and the Wey Corridor (as identified in the saved policies of the 2003 Local Plan). <p>Views are part of the character that underpins Guildford’s economic success and make people want to live and work here and visit the town.</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Reference: “<i>Not preclude other views being requested as part of discussions on individual planning applications.</i>” This is not strong enough to reflect the weight given to views more generally.</p> <p><u>More views should be identified as important in the SPD including:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from much used AONB locations where the view is fundamental to the quality of experience e.g. <u>from the open spaces of Merrow Down, Pewley Down and the Mount</u> so frequented by residents and visitors. • Views from the railway track and <u>the approach on foot to London Road Station, the latter having been identified as a significant viewpoint in previous GBC planning documents</u> • There is a road bias in the document: many arrive and appreciate views by train. • Views beyond the town centre given the importance of the link between town and country, <u>and between town centre and surrounding residential areas</u>, in Guildford. Either the scope should be extended beyond the link to S3 or a complementary SPD document produced. The SPD should include important approaches to Guildford including where important views will change in order to guide development – eg the view along the A3 across Gosden Hill, the view of the river by Slyfield <u>and of Slyfield from Merrow Down</u> <p>The points made by GRA concerning the colour of buildings and retaining or creating tree cover, have particular relevance for the views of Slyfield from Merrow Downs.</p> <p><u>Trees:</u></p> <p>The desirability of retaining tree cover in views is notable. We welcome the way this is captured and linked to references to the desirability of maintaining and managing cover in relation to specific views. Given the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dynamic nature of tree cover, • importance of management to diversity the age structure of stands, • fact strategic trees can be felled without notice given that so few are protected by TPOs, 	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>We suggest an annexe is produced which maps all the trees identified in significant views and that this is used as a resource to promote and target positive measures to promote management and retention. This should be drafted in a way that makes it explicit that other trees matter too.</p> <p><u>Colour of buildings:</u></p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of observations on impact of choice of colour and materials in views and propose this aspect of the guidance is expanded given the impact of pale buildings that reflect light and detract. The onus should be on developers to ensure any paler buildings that attract the eye merit this attention due to outstanding form, design and context.</p> <p><u>Character assessment:</u></p> <p>We warmly welcome the references to the Character Assessment for every view in the SPD and trust this will be accompanied by greater use of this assessment in all aspects of planning and development control in Guildford.</p> <p>Reference: <i>“For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.”</i></p> <p>Extracts from the draft SPD: In addition to these suggestions by theme, which GRA hopes will be picked up in changes throughout the draft SPD as appropriate, GRA also offers a number of specific suggestions. These GRA comments/suggested changes are in red.</p> <p>Town Centre Approach</p> <p><u>Viewpoint 03: Stoke Park, looking south west</u></p> <p>Avoid tall bulky buildings around the periphery of Stoke Park that diminish perception of the extent of the open space Stoke Park offers.</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
The Guildford Society	GTCV19/25	<p data-bbox="483 325 1688 357">Consultation on Draft Guildford Town Centre Views Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p data-bbox="483 395 1877 459">This is the response to the consultation on the Draft Guildford Town Centre Views Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p data-bbox="483 497 1861 561">The Guildford Society welcomes the Town Centre Views studies and believes it is a valuable adjunct to the Policy S3 included in the latest Local Plan 2015 (adopted 2019) and the reserved policies still in force from local Plan 2003.</p> <p data-bbox="483 600 1883 740">We believe the SPD demonstrates the Council's commitment to ensuring that design development contributes to distinctive, sustainable and attractive places in the Borough. It also meets the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) which stresses the importance of good design and the need to refuse permission for poorly designed proposals.</p> <p data-bbox="483 778 1742 810">However, the Society believes there are several areas where the SPD could be made clearer and/or stronger.</p> <p data-bbox="483 849 748 880">Viewpoints Selection.</p> <p data-bbox="483 919 1895 1059">Paragraph 3.1. mentions other view assessments can be requested as part of planning applications. The society proposes that this phrase is strengthened so that the that the council can explicitly request that individual sites may be subject to 'view management guidance', including the provision of a site views study. There is high risk that applicants will claim they meet the guidance in the SPD (tick the box), and then ignore other damaging visual impact not covered by the SPD.</p> <p data-bbox="483 1098 1883 1161">The Society also believes the SPD has not covered several key views, which could be usefully included, at this stage, to increase coverage of key views.</p> <ul data-bbox="555 1200 1912 1327" style="list-style-type: none"> • Millbrook Looking north; relates to publicly accessible view and experienced by many At present it has limited historic building BUT the document refers to aspirations to maintain views and reduce building blocks thus there should be an assessment of the views, and indication as to how these might be managed to open-up views in the future. 	15 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hogs Back looking east; relates to publicly accessible view and experienced by many This is a view of Guildford experienced whilst driving along the A31 where the cathedral and town can be seen prominently. • Woodbridge Road looking south; relates to how Guildford relates to its landscape e. North downs. As a major thoroughfare to Guildford coming into Guildford the views should be at least reviewed and proposals to improve these views longer term implemented. • North Street Looking West – realise it has limited historic building BUT the document refers to aspirations to maintain views and reduce building blocks thus there should be an assessment of the • Farnham Rd looking east --- the views as you come down this road can vary considerably and even change depending on which side of the road you are if you move to the other side of the road a different view including Solum opens up. <p>Document References</p> <p>The SPD references other documents and also has what we believe are omissions. <u>Townscape Character Assessment</u></p> <p>This is referred too, the Society assumes that this is the document published in 2007 as published on the GBC website as https://www.guildford.gov.uk/landsapecharacterassessment. It is not clear, from the SPD, what status this document has. The 2007 document appears to be a series of aspirations but not firm policy.</p> <p><u>Local Plan References</u></p> <p>The SPD refers to the 2015 local plan specifically Policy S3. In addition, Policy D1 also seems to be of direct relevance to the SPD particularly as its para 4.5.9 on reasoned justification states:</p> <p>“We will expect development to respond to local character and history, reflecting the identity of its context whilst allowing for innovative and forward-thinking design. This should include taking account of the existing grain and street</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>patterns and established building lines, local building vernacular and considering the effects upon views, topography, natural features, skylines, landscape setting and character, and the setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets. The relationship of the built environment to the landscape must be taken into account and the transition from urban to rural character will need to be reflected in the design of new development with the green approaches to settlements respected. Balanced with this is a requirement to develop with flair, imagination and style, reflecting our position as a regional centre and County town. These design considerations will be set out in more detail in the Development Management Policies DPD. This approach is not confined to our urban areas but will be applicable throughout the borough.”</p> <p>The 2003 Plan has several policies remain in force and to understand all the GBC policies related to planning both the 2015 plan and the 2003 plan need to be read in conjunction. Related to the SPD are policies in the 2003 plan are G5 (2) scale Proportion and Form (4.35), and G5 (7) Materials and Architectural Details</p> <p>The Society believes the relationship between the SPD and other documents needs to be well defined</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Plan policies, DPD’s and SPD’s so that all readers are clear as to the weight given to statements in an <p>Practical Application.</p> <p>The SPD references two aspects of the view, broadly the skyline e.g. major features such as the cathedral, and the general townscape e.g. roofscapes and to an extent mass and bulk of buildings. The society is pleased that the SPD highlights where opportunities might arise to break up building mass as redevelopment occurs</p> <p>Heights</p> <p>The document in several of the views refers height being limited to existing heights for new developments. The Society believes this should be developed to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Provide indicative height limits for areas in the town either by amending the SPD of as a separate 	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>The society notes that other towns have documented height limits, as an example Oxford has views protection based on the height of the existing key building which is not to be exceeded in the city centre and further away from the city centre- no building is allowed to exceed 18.2m (which is 5 residential floors and 4 commercial. Guildford should consider creating similar guidance for the town centre based on the Views SPD.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As redevelopment occurs there may be a opportunity to reduce heights in some cases to create a less jumbled townscape, and also ensure ‘signature’ buildings are more easily If an SPD is created for Building Heights (Para a, above) there should be consideration given to heights that are desirable in the longer term. 2. The Society is not totally against high buildings in Guildford but believe they need to be of very high quality and situated away from the Town Centre so they don’t compete with views or <p>Materials</p> <p>The SPD has a catch all statement used often - <i>development does not compete for prominence</i></p> <p><i>– either through height, proximity, massing or materials/ colours – ensure developments blend with the generally muted tones typically found in the town, drawing on vernacular materials and features where appropriate to provide a sense of place.</i></p> <p>The society proposes the term ‘vernacular materials’ might be replaced by ‘natural materials’</p> <p>The Society believes these statements cold be usefully documented as a series of design guides for areas of the town. Note this is a guide i.e. a presumption of what is acceptable. Developers can propose alternatives as modern materials can be a useful counterpoint in a townscape.</p> <p>Visual Clutter</p> <p>Several of the views propose a policy of <i>Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning, design and materials of roof plant/enclosures.</i></p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>The Society proposes that the SPD is strengthened to state:</p> <p><i>Avoid creating visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning, designing and selecting materials of roof plant/enclosures that don't exceed the height of the building and are integrated into the height of the design of the building. As the views over the is so important roof design should be subject to design guidance and comparable to relevant surrounding buildings. Every opportunity should be made to reduce existing clutter as plant is renewed or renovated.</i></p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>This SPD is a valuable addition to the planning framework for Guildford. We hope our comments are a positive contribution to the consultation process.</p> <p>For completeness attached at Appendix A are more detailed notes with comments on individual views.</p> <p>Finally, the Society is aware that other authorities (GLA and Woking in the near vicinity) are now using computer models of their locales. There is an opportunity to use this technology to make understanding and managing views a more dynamic process e.g. you could move through a townscape. We believe this is an area that the Borough Council should explore; the cost savings could be substantial.</p>	
Historic England	GTCV19/26	<p>Draft Guildford Town Centre Views Supplementary Planning Document</p> <p>Thank you for your email of 15 June 2019 inviting comments on the above document.</p> <p>As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process, and welcomes the opportunity to comment upon this key planning document.</p>	15 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Historic England welcomes this document that provides an additional level of guidance in support of the local plan's policies on protecting the historic character and appearance of the county town of Surrey. Despite post-war change to the urban character of the town, much of which has been detrimental to its historic core, and the ongoing significant pressure for development some of which is of a form, bulk and height that is out of character with the prevailing scale, Guildford retains a great deal of the historic character and heritage that defines it as a special place. In particular, its historic core based around the setted high street and nationally significant heritage assets such as the castle keep, the cathedral, and the numerous historic buildings throughout the town centre require particular recognition in the application of planning policy, especially in respect of near and long views of them within and across the townscape. This is essential in ensuring that the history and legacy of the town's development continues to be legible and recognisable as inevitable pressure for change continues to occur. We agree that the Town Centre Views SPD provides a valuable and practical tool to help ensure this.</p> <p>While Historic England is not in a position to offer detailed advice on individual views we would strongly advise that the Council's own conservation staff are closely involved throughout the preparation of the SPD, as they are often best placed to advise on local historic environment issues and priorities, and consideration of the options relating to the protection of views and settings of specific heritage assets and of the historic urban character in general.</p> <p>These comments are based on the information provided by you at this time and for the avoidance of doubt do not reflect our obligation to advise you on, and potentially object to, any specific development proposal which may subsequently arise from this or later versions of the planning document and which may, in our view, have adverse effects on the historic environment.</p>	
Guildford Residents Association, EGRA	GTCV19/28	<p>GRA warmly welcomes this initiative and the Council is to be congratulated for bringing this forward as a priority. We note the way places such as Oxford have benefitted from such an approach. We consider a number of changes are required to make this document effective in achieving its stated objective and that the scope should be increased, or an accompanying document produced to extend the scope. This response includes comments relating to a number of themes and, in addition, some comments on the approach to specific views.</p>	15 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Comments by theme:</p> <p><u>Views not selected:</u></p> <p>Selecting “important” views will unavoidably have an effect in downgrading the value placed on other highly valued, but not selected, views. This effect/risk should be mitigated by greatly strengthening the reference to the importance of views and roofscapes in Guildford more generally. The SPD should be much stronger in setting out that view assessment matters for all development in Guildford given</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • its setting in a gap in downland designated as AONB (the highest landscape designation for natural beauty) • the rich legacy of its historical centre, verdant surrounding residential areas and the Wey Corridor (as identified in the saved policies of the 2003 Local Plan). • the “green approaches” to Guildford – a distinctive landscape feature relating to greenery at gateways, along road corridors and softening the boundaries of the built area. <p>Views are part of the character that underpins Guildford’s economic success and make people want to live and work here and visit.</p> <p>Reference: <i>“Not preclude other views being requested as part of discussions on individual planning applications.”</i> This is not strong enough to reflect the weight given to views more generally.</p> <p><u>More views should be identified as important in the SPD including:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views to be enhanced/created, eg North Street. There is no reason why the view along North Street should not be as attractive as, and a modern accompaniment to, the High Street. It has an attractive incline and the potential for attractive views. Historical images of North Street show how attractive this view was and can be again in modern form. • Views from much-used AONB locations where the view is fundamental to the quality of experience eg from the open spaces of Merrow Down and Pewley Down which are so frequented by residents and visitors. 	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Views from the railway track and the approach on foot to London Road Station, the latter having been identified as a significant viewpoint in previous GBC planning documents. There is a road bias in the document: many arrive and appreciate views by train.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views of stepped development with the “stacked effect” of interesting, super-imposed, textured roofscapes that enable you to appreciate the rise of the land where roads run parallel with the view eg the roof line south of the upper High Street southward or east of Millbrook. Currently views of hills in the draft SPD tend to run with the line of the road placing more emphasis on the street scene whereas in some views it is the tumbling, stacked roofscape that gives character and identity. • Views beyond the town centre given the importance of the link between town and country, and between town centre and surrounding residential areas, in Guildford. Either the scope should be extended beyond the link to S3 or a complementary SPD document produced. The SPD should include important approaches to Guildford including where important views will change in order to guide development – eg the view along the A3 across Gosden Hill, from the Hog’s Back towards the town, the view of the river by Slyfield and of Slyfield from Merrow Down. The view from Tangier Road is also highly significant, expansive and appreciated by many. • There are too few views along the Wey. There is a real danger that the highly selective approach in this document will detract from the importance of views along the Wey corridor. Reconnecting with the river, rather than turning our back on it as in the past, was an important objective for the new Local Plan and this SPD should guide that process. We cannot reconnect with a river we cannot see. This SPD should be a resource for guiding new development throughout this corridor, including for example at Millbrook. The saved policies in the 2003 Local Plan promote a comprehensive approach to this landscape. <p><u>Viewpoints:</u></p> <p>The cone selection for certain iconic views is too specific and a more dynamic approach to the vantage point for some views should be adopted. For example, in practice important views from the High Street include the incongruous and detracting tower blocks on the Mount at various vantage points. Reference should be made to this and these tower blocks should be referred to as detracting buildings. These are likely to be high on most people’s list of detracting buildings (along with the office oversailing Millbrook). They are a mistake from the past to be corrected not replicated because the</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>cone has been selected to edit out the detractors. The form of any redevelopment of the old CEGB site may also be relevant on this context.</p> <p><u>Detractors:</u></p> <p>Reference to detractors is welcome. In every instance, the SPD should refer to the outcome desired when redevelopment occurs. We welcome where such references are made but the approach is inconsistent.</p> <p>The reference to the station development is welcome. There is a danger that, because this building is consented but not yet constructed, the SPD does not refer to this consented building as a detractor and include guidance on the desired form when this site is re-developed or a revised application submitted. The relevant advice and views should also include the Guildford Road car park development so the impact on views of this bulky linear form can be appreciated.</p> <p><u>Buildings heights:</u></p> <p>Where reference is made to building heights this is welcome eg Quarry Street. The Oxford SPD is more specific about refence heights. There are several views where the objective to achieve or retain a view in the SPD has implications for the height of future buildings, but the advice offered is very vague. For example, there are welcome references to the House of Fraser building and the Police building as detractors, but the implications for heights in future, to avoid such harmful impact, are insufficiently clear.</p> <p>Any more explicit wording on height should acknowledge that articulated form would result in a variety of heights and it is important not to give heights that are treated as a height to design to across a site.</p> <p><u>Landform and bulky buildings:</u></p> <p>We warmly welcome the recognition that “larger blocky buildings” detract from views in Guildford. We also welcome the references to the valued contribution of “fine grained and articulated roofscape ...with pitched and interesting roof forms”. Given the prevalence of proposals for large blocky buildings, we consider the SPD should be explicit that such</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>buildings can both obscure views and, <u>also</u>, degrade views by obliterating any sense of the topography that is so fundamental to appreciation of Guildford’s downland landscape. We attach very high importance to including, for each view, wording which promotes development of a form that retains a sense of the rise and fall of the land. It is not just a matter of articulation; it is also about reflecting incline so it is possible to read the landscape in views. Eg The abandoned North Street development proposal worked against and obliterated, rather than reflected, the gradient of North Street.</p> <p><u>Trees:</u></p> <p>The desirability of retaining tree cover in views is notable. We welcome the way this is captured and linked to references to the desirability of maintaining and managing cover in relation to specific views. Given the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dynamic nature of tree cover, • importance of management to diversity the age structure of stands, • fact strategic trees can be felled without notice given that so few are protected by TPOs, <p>we suggest an annexe is produced which maps all the trees identified in significant views and that this is used as a resource to promote and target positive measures to promote management, including new planting, and retention. This should be drafted in a way that makes it explicit other trees matter too.</p> <p><u>Colour of buildings:</u></p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of observations on impact of choice of colour and materials in views and propose this aspect of the guidance is expanded given the impact of pale buildings that reflect light and detract. The onus should be on developers to ensure any paler buildings that attract the eye merit this attention due to outstanding form, design and context.</p> <p><u>Night views:</u></p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>References to night and winter views should be strengthened. For example, we welcome the numerous objective references to the impact of the House of Fraser building. Its impact is also very great when illuminated. The SPD should provide guidance on illuminated views to enable development of sites such as Casino/Quadrant to be assessed.</p> <p><u>On street parking:</u></p> <p>We welcome recognition of the impact of on-street parking on views and propose this should be followed through with proposals on designing out this deleterious impact in future.</p> <p><u>Timing:</u></p> <p>It will be desirable for the SPD to be in a form that gives it sufficient weight to be considered as helpful guidance and a material consideration by the Inspector at the Quadrant appeal in September.</p> <p><u>Character Assessment:</u></p> <p>We warmly welcome the references to the Character Assessment for every view in the SPD and trust this will be accompanied by greater use of this assessment in all aspects of planning and development control in Guildford.</p> <p>Reference: <i>“For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.”</i></p> <p>Further comments linked to extracts from the draft SPD:</p> <p>In addition to the above suggestions by theme, which GRA hopes will be picked up in changes throughout the draft SPD as appropriate, GRA also offers some specific suggestions. These GRA comments/suggested changes are in red. These comments are illustrative, are not repeated for all views and do not pick up on all instances where our “comments by theme” apply.</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>AIM:</p> <p>“guidance ... on how to manage change in key views with the aim to retain the character of Guildford and what makes its special, including the ability to appreciate key heritage assets, and to understand the relationship of Guildford with its landscape setting.”</p> <p>SCOPE:</p> <p>“The focus of the SPD is Guildford town centre, which is defined by the ‘town centre boundary’ Guildford Local Plan 2019. Some views have been identified from locations outside of the town centre, but are generally focussed towards the town centre.” Too narrow (see “comments by theme” above). Eg Should include important gateway views and views along approaches that will be affected by significant development in order to ensure change is managed consistent with specified valued landscape characteristics.</p> <p>“All the views included within this document help to reveal how Guildford developed and the importance of its relationship with the countryside beyond.”</p> <p><u>Key landmark legacy buildings:</u></p> <p>Guildford Castle * Treadwheel Crane * St. Mary’s Church Tower * The Guildhall * Clock and cupola * Trinity Church Tower * Guildford Cathedral * St. Nicolas’ Church Tower * The Angel Hotel * Bookers Tower * Farnham Road Hospital * Rodboro building * The Semaphore House * The Yvonne Arnaud Theatre * Tunsgate Arch * Abbots Hospital * Dapdune Wharf * Christchurch, Waterden Road * Holy Trinity Church * St John’s Stoke-next-Guildford * Clandon Park Gates, Merrow</p> <p><u>Selection Criteria: “Important Views”</u></p> <p>Focuses on views that are deemed to be important in the context of Policy S3. Too narrow (see “comments by theme” above)</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Assessed against the following selection criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...view of a legacy landmark and could ... promote an understanding of Guildford and its historic development? • ... promote an understanding of the relationship between Guildford and its landscape setting? Yes, but centre-only focus does not achieve this. • ... reveal an architecturally or culturally significant heritage asset? • ... a designed view? • ... reveal an unexpected view of any important building? • ... publicly accessible and experienced by a large number of people? Not just from roads, also from popular downland open spaces and railway <p><u>Grouped into three categories:</u></p> <p>River Corridor – views along the River Wey</p> <p>Town and Town Centre Approach – views from key approaches to Guildford</p> <p>Town Centre – views within, or focussed on, the town centre.</p> <p>Manging Change – important views facing significant change</p> <p><u>How will it work?</u></p> <p>SPD - a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>Any development proposal likely to affect one or more of the views identified in this document will be expected to have regard to the view management guidance set out in this SPD and, through the planning submission carefully assess the impact of the proposals on the view.</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>A high quality scheme will have a positive relationship with its context including; topography, height and scale of surrounding development, urban grain and streetscape, impact on the skyline and heritage assets and their settings</p> <p>...used ... to consistently and fairly assess the impact of development proposals on the identified important views.</p> <p>River Corridor</p> <p><u>Viewpoint 1: Dapdune Wharf, looking south</u></p> <p>Detractors: The modern town centre office buildings that are visible above the treeline (i.e. the Surrey Police and Onslow House office buildings). These are bulky buildings that compete with the church spire on the skyline and appear incongruous within this otherwise rural view, comprising river-related small-scale buildings, features and trees.</p> <p><i>1) Ensure that any new development is not visible above the treed skyline.</i></p> <p><i>2) Ensure new town centre development , which has the potential to form a component in the background of the view, is no higher than existing buildings and does not compete with the spire of St. Saviour’s Church for prominence <i>and is lower and less bulky than the existing modern town centre office buildings (i.e. the Surrey Police and Onslow House office buildings) that are visible above the treeline and appear incongruous within this otherwise rural view, comprising river-related small-scale buildings, features and trees.</i></i></p> <p><i>3) Maintain the verdant, well-treed riverside surroundings which helps frame and focus the view towards Dapdune Wharf, provide a scenic backdrop and contributes to the visual amenity of the viewing place.</i></p> <p>Ensure materials used in the public realm, for example footways, walls and towpaths, are given the highest level of consideration to maintain the unity, harmony and quality of the overall view.</p> <p><u>Viewpoint 2: Wey-South Path at Shalford Park, looking north</u></p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>1) Maintain the rural and verdant character of this view, with historic buildings (the Castle Keep and Holy Trinity Church Tower) the focus of the view.</p> <p>2) Ensure that any new development is not visible above the treed skyline.</p> <p>3) Continue to use planting to screen built development along the banks of the Wey – ensure species are appropriate to their riparian context, drawing on locally occurring species.</p> <p>Town Centre Approach</p> <p><u>Viewpoint 03: Stoke Park, looking south west</u></p> <p>Detractors: Generally limited by trees and hedgerows around the park boundary. Duke of Kent building at The University of Surrey (at the foot of Stag Hill) detracts from the view as a result of its architectural style and light coloured materials, as do the greenhouses at Stoke Park Nursery and electricity pylons. Follow this up below with references to opportunities to reduce detracting impact when redevelopment occurs – eg lower, less bulky, less intrusive colours, undergrounding/ redesigning of overhead cables as technology allows</p> <p>1) Maintain the open character of the foreground</p> <p>2) Ensure Guildford Cathedral remains the key focus of this view, ensuring that new development does not compete for prominence – either through height, proximity, massing or materials/ colours</p> <p>3) Maintain the well vegetated character of the view, including the undeveloped and wooded ridge lines of the hills that surround the town.</p> <p>4) Aim to screen detracting buildings and structures where possible, for example using vegetation. Inadequate – link to intention to reduce impact when redevelopment occurs</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>5) Avoid tall bulky buildings around the periphery of Stoke Park that diminish the perception of the extent of the open space Stoke Park offers.</p> <p><u>Viewpoint 04: Pewley Hill, looking north west</u></p> <p>Detractors: House of Fraser building, which appears bulky and prominent, and</p> <p>other relatively large-scale modern commercial buildings which obscure views or glimpses of the more modest historic buildings and fine-grained roofscape within the historic core.</p> <p>Too few of the detracting buildings are identified in this description. Also specify station development as a detractor consent to be improved (see relevant paragraph in our “comments by theme” above)</p> <p>1) Ensure that the prominence of Guildford Cathedral, as the key landmark feature within the view, is maintained. New development within the view should not compete with the cathedral, for example by rising above the otherwise undeveloped wooded skyline or appearing overly dominant by virtue of scale, height, massing or detailed design. Give more explicit guidance on height and bulk.</p> <p>2) Maintain the significant tree and woodland cover which occupies the slopes of the hills surrounding the town, providing a scenic backdrop and setting to the cathedral, and contributing to the overall townscape character by screening and breaking up areas of built development. Plan for next generation of trees to maintain a wooded character when existing trees come to the end of their life.</p> <p>3) Maintain the undeveloped character of the distant ridge line, which provides an important element of the landscape backdrop of the view.</p> <p>4) Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky ‘block-like’ town centre buildings as the opportunity arises. This is welcome and should be expanded upon in line with our “comments by theme” (eg articulation and</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>reflecting landform). Clear parameters for future improvement should be pursued for the many views throughout the SPD where such issues are relevant.</p> <p>5) Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning, design and materials of roof plant/enclosures.</p> <p>6) There are a range of materials and colours in this view – aim to replicate the muted tones of the historic buildings which sit more comfortably than the light/ bright colours of some of the modern buildings.</p> <p>7) Maintain the distant wooded backdrop – ensure nothing breaks the undeveloped wooded skyline.</p> <p><u>Viewpoint 05: St. Catherine’s Hill, looking north</u></p> <p>Detractors: House of Fraser arched roof and communication masts which extend above the wooded skyline.</p> <p>1) Maintain the open character of the foreground so that this view can continue to be appreciated.</p> <p>2) Ensure the composition of Guildford Castle, the cupolas of Abbots Hospital and Holy Trinity Church tower continue to form the focus of this view. Ensure that new development does not compete with this composition for prominence by way of height, proximity, massing or materials/ colours – ensure developments blend with the generally muted tones typically found in the town, drawing on vernacular materials and features where appropriate to provide a sense of place.</p> <p>3) Aim to create a fine grained and articulated roofscape with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from the historic town centre buildings. Also include that building form and roofscape should reflect/ not mask the rise and fall of the land.</p> <p>4) Maintain the well vegetated character and low density of the buildings in the garden suburbs.</p> <p>5) Preserve the undeveloped and wooded ridge lines of the hills that surround the town.</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>6) Aim to screen detracting buildings and structures where possible, for example using vegetation.</p> <p>7) Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning and design of roof plant/ enclosures.</p> <p>8) For any building proposed in this view also refer to the guidance given in the townscape character assessment for the townscape character area in which the proposal lies.</p> <p><u>Viewpoint 06: Hog's Back, looking north east</u></p> <p>Detractors: Europa Park and other large scale warehouses and commercial units situated within industrial estates around the fringes of Guildford. The Electronic Arts building detracts from the generally pale tones of the roofscape with its bold design and reflective materials. The House of Fraser building and other large 20th century buildings also compete with the historic buildings in terms of scale and prominence within the town centre.</p> <p>Refer to station development. Other detractor buildings should be specified to encourage future improvement.</p> <p>1) Maintain open views from this location so it remains possible to appreciate panoramic views over the town to the distant London skyline.</p> <p>2) Maintain Guildford Cathedral as the dominant feature of the view – ensure new buildings do not compete with it for dominance.</p> <p>3) Make sure it remains possible to see legacy landmarks such as Abbot's Hospital, the Guildhall and Holy Trinity Church Tower.</p> <p>4) Aim to create a fine grained and articulated roofscape with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from or obscure, the key historic landmark buildings and appreciation of landform.</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>5) Ensure new developments blend with the generally muted tones typically found in the town, and are appropriate according to the townscape character area in which they lie.</p> <p>6) Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky ‘block-like’ buildings as the opportunity arises.</p> <p>7) Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning and design of roof plant/ enclosures.</p> <p>8) Maintain a wooded setting and a treed skyline backdrop to the view.</p> <p><u>Viewpoint 07: Farnham Road, looking east</u></p> <p>Detractors: The pronounced arch of the House of Fraser building and other large scale bulky ‘block-like’ 20th century buildings along the High Street and North Street that compete with the historic buildings in terms of scale and prominence. Street signage and lighting columns lining Farnham Road also creates visual clutter in the foreground.</p> <p>1) Ensure it remains possible to view the key legacy landmarks such as Holy Trinity Church tower and the Castle Keep from this location.</p> <p>2) Ensure it remains possible to see the scale and grain of historic buildings along the High Street and encourage new development to respect this scale and grain of typically 2-3 storeys and on relatively narrow plots. Welcome height reference.</p> <p>3) Aim to create a fine grained and articulated roofscape with pitched and interesting roof forms which complement, rather than detract from or obscure, the key historic landmark buildings which can be seen along the High Street and which also enable appreciation of the rise and fall of the land.</p> <p>4) Ensure new buildings do not compete with existing historic landmarks for prominence – either through height, massing or materials/colours – ensure developments blend with the generally muted tones and rich reds typically found in the</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>town, drawing on vernacular materials and features where appropriate to provide a sense of place. Be more specific about height and bulk.</p> <p>5) Ensure materials used in the public realm are given equal consideration to maintain the unity of the historic core.</p> <p>6) Aim to restore the prominence of visible (and currently hidden) heritage assets with future redevelopment opportunities. Welcome</p> <p>7) Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky ‘block-like’ buildings as the opportunity arises. Welcome</p> <p>8) Avoid creating additional visual clutter by carefully considering the positioning and design of roof plant/ enclosures.</p> <p>9) Maintain a wooded backdrop and skyline – ensure the suburbs that climb up the hillside remain at a relatively low density to that trees are plentiful and ensure that no new buildings break the skyline. Plan for replacement of trees so that there are replacement trees when the existing trees reach the end of their life.</p>	
	GTCV19/29	<p>This is a welcome, well-written and well-researched Supplementary Planning Document. I very much hope that it will carry weight and that there will be an over-whelming desire to follow its recommendations.</p> <p>The SPD needs to be put into action immediately to safe-guard against poor quality, over-high and bulky buildings being built, which will act as a precedent for other developments. A pro-active desire and strongly enforced policy to protect Guildford’s views will be needed.</p> <p>Both large and small views are important in maintaining the overall character and landscape of Guildford in town and countryside views. Emphasis on large views must not cause the many smaller views to be overlooked.</p> <p>General Comments</p>	15 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits to height and bulk of buildings: Even if these are to be written into another SPD, limits are so important that in addition they need to be written into this SPD to give strength in negotiations with developers and in appeals. Developers need to be aware of them at a very early stage and of Guildford’s determination to protect its views. <p>However, heights in the town centre must not become uniform, with all new buildings reaching a specified height limit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supplementary Planning Documents have at times been overlooked <p>A large part of Guildford’s views are made up of residential areas. An SPD, such as this, needs to be part of every planning application in case it is relevant, such as views contributed by residential houses to, across and from the river, views to and from hillsides, or to and from estates close to the AONB and countryside, as well as estates which chart the historical growth of Guildford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stronger wording is needed in ‘View management guidance sections’ in the SPD <p>Words such as ‘aim to’ should be omitted or avoided (if not needed) or replaced with stronger language wherever possible, as ‘aims’ can too easily be ignored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of replacement buildings <p>Emphasis is needed that buildings which replace bulky over-high buildings need to rectify the height and bulk in the original design and be of high quality to enhance Guildford’s views.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views into and out of the AONB are extremely important as they link town and countryside S <p>Such views shape Guildford’s character not only in the larger views described and identified in this SPD, but in smaller views as well.</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green views on entering Guildford need to be preserved • Large Trees: Large trees (in addition to those identified as needing replacing now or in the future) planted in suitable places, such as by the river, enormously enhance views and should be given high priority as long-term investment in green infrastructure. • North Street: North St runs parallel to the High St and has a very similar topography. It should be enhanced by the view of the Hog's Back, but unfortunately large bulky buildings have impacted on the view, as well as on street views. The church with spire (once a focal building in the street) and Victorian buildings have been demolished. Even so plans could be made to reinstate the importance of North Street views, taking advantage of its exceptional topography to create once again a street view worthy of Guildford. Modern buildings of great quality and character could be built to offset the remaining older buildings of merit, representing a different but modern era to complement the High St and raise Guildford's attractiveness to another level. An exceptional building could be built to act as a focal point in the street view. A limit on the height of buildings is needed. (Not just shops and entertainment bring people to Guildford, but scenery and fine views made possible by the town's topography.) • Replacement houses and large extensions, which are over high, with out of character roofs and large American style windows, should be avoided on scenic housing estates seen in views and from the AONB. Chimney pots, which are part of Guildford's heritage, also add to views. <p>Over-bulky houses built, where the roof is level with the top of a tall chimney on a neighbouring house, are over-high and out of character with carefully stepped houses in hillside (and street) views, particularly when fronted by large glass windows prominent in the view.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenic and heritage streets without far-reaching views in themselves can provide views which are important to the town. 	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emphasis on avoiding unattractive flat roof tops and bulky ventilation equipment is much welcomed. Roof gardens could help to alleviate unsightly flat roofs. <p>Detailed comments:</p> <p>Purpose of the Guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section is extremely well-written in that it captures the essence of Guildford, which relies heavily on its views for its beauty and character, and shows why these assets must be protected. • It also emphasizes how town and countryside views are inter-related and make Guildford what it is. <p>Historic development of Guildford and Legacy Landmarks</p> <p>2.1 Historic development of Guildford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An interesting write-up of Guildford’s development, which shows the importance of keeping Guildford’s views which record its heritage. <p>2.2 Not only Landmark Legacy buildings, but all buildings which together add to Guildford’s heritage and views need protecting. Their importance should not be diminished by landmark buildings being identified.</p> <p>Conservation Area Appraisals and Character Landscape Assessments, etc. could be listed here as a quick check when checking for important landmarks and views referred within them.</p> <p>Selection of Important Views</p> <p>3.1 Selection Criteria</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the unexpected views glimpsed from the town up or down the hills and along streets, which enhance Guildford. Guildford relies upon these views which together are important as well as the more obvious identified views. This needs to be emphasised in the SPD. It is the many hilly views which cause Guildford to be so sought after as a place to live, work and visit. • The words: <i>“All views included within this document help to reveal how Guildford developed and the importance of its relationship with the countryside beyond. It does not preclude other views being requested as part of discussions on individual planning applications”</i> are weak and could be strengthened. A view which should be kept may be spoilt simply because it was not requested for discussion. Each planning application needs to be checked for its impact on views, which otherwise will over time disappear and despoil Guildford. <p>Some other views are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An unexpected glimpse of the spire of St Saviour’s Church seen from an alleyway leading off the High St. (The spire is the only remaining church spire in the town.) • Scenic view up the hill of stepped houses on the steep hillside from Cooper Rd in Charlotteville to Pewley Bank. Views of houses built in a different era, such as those which rise up above the Victorian houses are important. (The view is enjoyed by those visiting St Luke’s Surgery and the Spike on Warren Rd, as well as local residents) • View of the AONB from Charlotteville Conservation Area. The small Victorian houses in Charlotteville, on the edge of the AONB, incorporate both countryside and street views. • View of the river area from Old Milmead occupied by GBC offices <p>View of Harvey Rd Gallery seen from Sydenham Rd in winter, when the leaves have dropped, while the summer view is of trees. The view of the gallery is also a good view from Sydenham Rd at night time when it is lit up. A locally listed</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Victorian school landmark building from the Henry Peak era, it is viewed by many pedestrians walking to and from town from houses on the hillside and en route from Castle Car Park via Holy Trinity Churchyard to the High St.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • View from the passageway between Semaphore Rd and Harvey Rd leading to Bright Hill to both the Lower and Upper High St via Baker’s Passage or the lower High St via Holy Trinity Churchyard. <p>The Harvey Rd Gallery is viewed when walking down the passageway between Semaphore Rd and Harvey Rd to Bright Hill. It is an uplifting walk with glimpses of far- reaching views. As the end of the passage way is approached, a large and attractive Victorian window in the Harvey Rd Gallery is framed in the view before descending the steps into Harvey Rd with further views from Harvey Rd to the Hog’s Back.</p> <p>The Harvey Rd Gallery is an established and much-loved landmark in this Victorian area of Guildford of little Victorian houses running down the hillside in narrow streets between Harvey Rd and Sydenham Rd (adjacent to Bright Hill). The Harvey Rd Gallery itself, together with the Sydenham Rd Adult Education Centre, extends down the hillside from Harvey Rd to Sydenham Rd alongside these houses. The listed Robin Hood pub is also part of this Victorian area.</p> <p>The views over Guildford from the top of the side roads of Victorian houses running down the hill from Harvey Rd to Sydenham Rd are beginning to be blocked by extra height being added to buildings in Sydenham Rd.</p> <p>Holy Trinity Churchyard provides a scenic and heavily used route from Castle Car Park into the Lower High St with fine short term views into the ancient churchyard surrounded by listed buildings, grass and trees. It contrasts with the bulky Castle Car Park next to it in Sydenham Rd, but is complemented by the listed Royal Oak pub on the right.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The view from London Road of the Cathedral across Stoke Park is a striking view as Guildford town is approached along London Rd. • Views of residential areas from the AONB. The trees and greenery in the gardens of Pewley Hill and Fort Rd provide a green view as seen from Pewley Down, which merges into the AONB landscape and acts as a buffer 	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>between town and countryside. Houses built or extended, which are over high and bulky, can impact badly on views from the AONB. Similarly such houses built in other roads impact upon views from Chantry Wood.</p> <p>More gardens, particularly front gardens, are being paved over as new people move into houses already established, and as new replacement houses are built. The paved areas, causing less greenery and loss of trees, impact on views from the countryside and on street views.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approach view to Guildford by train with open and green views to the hills provides a welcome to Guildford, as well as an advertisement for the town. It is enjoyed by the many who travel by train. London Rd Station views are important too. <p>4. Requirements for planning applications impacting important views</p> <p>The following words in the first paragraph of this section are weak:</p> <p><i>“Any development proposal likely to affect one or more of the views identified in this document will be expected to have regard to the view management guidance set out in this SPD</i>”</p> <p>The words <i>“will be expected to”</i> could be strengthened and perhaps replaced with the word ‘should’.</p> <p>The sentence also does not give sufficient protection to the many views which make up Guildford and is an open invitation for developers to ignore consideration of other smaller views.</p> <p>All views within and from outside Guildford need careful preservation from obtrusive development and this needs to be insured in this section.</p> <p>5. Views Analysis</p> <p>5.1 River Corridor</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>A striking riverside view: The steep hillside with its stepped houses rising up the hill towards Semaphore House, amongst trees and greenery, is a prominent and striking view as seen from the river as it leaves or enters Guildford. It rises up to the highest point in Guildford and is seen from the river by those on narrow boats and walkers on the river bank.</p> <p>To safeguard this view, houses newly built, replaced or extended, should not be over-high, bulky, or with windows out of character in style and size with the hillside view. This important view needs to be protected in the SPD.</p> <p>Green riverside views: This viewpoint of the river shown in ‘5.1 River Corridor’ illustrates how gardens with fences and walls topped by greenery, which back onto the river, give a good background to views of the river towpath and the river scenery. Development is kept away from the towpath edge by gardens which allow green space between houses and the river.</p> <p>This contributes to the rural atmosphere of the river coming into the town, which is a remarkable feature of Guildford. Green views, contributing to natural riverside scenery, need protecting.</p> <p>Development needs to be set back from the river and kept to an appropriate height.</p> <p>Viewpoint 01: Dapdune Wharf, looking south</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a historic site with natural riverside scenery. Over-high, bulky and out of character buildings within view of this area would spoil it. Its natural beauty should be preserved. The words “<i>expected to have regard to</i>” could be strengthened. Perhaps the words ‘have regard to’ could be omitted. <p>Viewpoint 02: Wey-South Path at Shalford Park, looking north</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car park views: Over-high and bright lights with unattractive lamp posts in or near riverside open space, such as Shalford Meadows car park, damage views and river scenery. The naturalness of river scenery in meadows and the countryside is more important than providing bright lights for commuter parking. 	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Car parks should be built as natural as possible with sympathetic lighting (if needed), if built in scenery encompassing countryside views.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tow paths: Towpaths are heritage paths which were made for a horse and one man to pull boats. They feature in riverside views, but are now becoming more heavily used for recreation such as cycling and walking. They need to be maintained with sensitivity, so as not to distort and spoil the river scenery. <p>The River Wey is a narrow river and over-wide towpaths maintained with unsuitable materials would impact on views of the river.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural river scenery: Natural countryside river scenery and views should not be littered with urbanising statues and artwork, unnatural in the countryside. The natural beauty of the riverside seen in views is sufficient. <p>Viewpoint 03: Stoke Park, looking south west</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The view of the cathedral seen from London Road by those approaching the Town Centre on foot, by transport or by car, is a magnificent view for those coming into Guildford. • As much as possible of the greenness on Stag Hill, which is a special feature, should be kept. <p>Viewpoint 04: Pewley Hill looking north west</p> <p>Views from Pewley Hill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The view from Pewley Hill of the Cathedral is another important view of the Cathedral. (A landmark legacy building). As much of the greenness on Stag Hill as possible, a feature which enhances the Cathedral view, should be kept. 	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The view of Semaphore House, both looking up Pewley Hill, and looking along Pewley Hill from Pewley Down past the reservoir, adds interest to this area for those walking from or to Pewley Down and beyond. (A landmark legacy building) <p>View from Semaphore Rd over London: When Semaphore Rd is approached from Pewley Hill, there is an unexpected view over Woking's cluster of high rise buildings on the left and London to the right. At times the sun can be seen glinting on the Shard. The view will be seen by all those who walk or drive to Pewley Down School and by those who use this route to Holy Trinity School, as well as local pedestrians.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Far ranging view from upper Pewley Hill reservoir over London: The view from the highest road in Guildford emphasises the height of Guildford and its position regarding London. <p>Unfortunately this high part of Pewley Hill has been diminished by large out of character replacement or new houses. Some have high functional brick walls, gated gardens or paved gardens and garage walls seen sideways from the road, with unsuitable roofs, colours and materials. Even though the original houses in the road were all different from each other, they were all stepped and in harmony.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roads approaching the AONB, particularly those on hills, are part of the views which link town and countryside, and extra care is needed that the balance and harmony of the street is kept. Pewley Hill is always busy with pedestrians walking to Pewley Down. Pewley Hill is well-used by many local residents in the area and visitors walking to Pewley Down. It is also used by those walking or driving to Pewley Down School. <p>Viewpoint 06: Hog's Back, looking north east</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial buildings, which feature in and create views, should be broken up to avoid appearing block like in views and built with varied and interesting roofs. 	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Some views of the University and Surrey Research buildings could be improved, perhaps by screening with greenery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • View from the Mount graveyard over Guildford in winter. (There used to be a most enjoyable view from the graveyard in winter) • The Solum Station development, if built, will be most detrimental to Guildford’s views, particularly the Hog’s Back view, with its height, bulk and ‘wall like’ design. <p>Viewpoint 07: Farnham Rd, looking east</p> <p>No.9: Where houses on hillsides in views are carefully stepped and in harmony with each other, care needs to be taken that over-bulky and over-high houses, or buildings do not break the harmony. The words “<i>remain at a relatively low density</i>” need to be strengthened and defined to prevent this happening. One house building upwards destroys the harmony and acts as a precedent for other hillside houses to follow suit.</p> <p>In some views, such as the view of the elevated houses on entering Guildford from Shalford benefit from roofs of different heights which give interest.</p> <p>5.3 Town Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road signs in front of the gate approaching uphill in the High St detract from the view of the High St. <p>Viewpoint 08: Sydenham Rd/Bright Hill, looking north</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The view from Bright Hill is one of the two best views of town and countryside in Guildford. It is the only panoramic view in Guildford. It is viewed by the many who walk up and down Bright Hill or drive down it by car. (A good view point is from the bench outside the Harvey Rd Gallery. The bench with its fine view of the Hog’s Back provides a welcome rest for those walking up the hill.) 	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The view looking to the north east whilst climbing Bright Hill is of the much-loved locally listed landmark Victorian school building, which is solidly built and one of the finest of its kind. Its interesting roof can be seen in the foreground of the panoramic view from Bright Hill. • The functional looking Bath Store in Sydenham Rd with its flat roof, large plate glass window and garish blue colour detracts from the view from Bright Hill. Any redevelopment of the Bath Store needs to be in character with development in Sydenham Rd and must not block views of Holy Trinity Church Tower and Abbot's Hospital from above with height and bulk. There are already over-bulky buildings in Sydenham Rd which must not act as a precedent. • Castle Car Park in Sydenham Rd is too high with a not very attractive roof. Ideally, the car park needs to be built partly underground to lessen its height and bulk in the view. <p>Viewpoint 09: High St, looking west</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Old Town Bridge, without being intrusive, is an important view in the lower part of the lower High St, as it rises up the hill. It is not as old as the previous bridge, but it is attractive. It is in keeping with the character of the High St, and will age over time. • The 'Wagamama' red brick listed building is the last building in the lower part of the High St before the Town Bridge and adds to the mix and harmony of the High St in the view. It contrasts with the white building next to it. • Signage by the white gate in the High St looking east up the High St detracts from the view of the High St. <p>Viewpoint 10: Quarry St, looking North</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After the High St, Quarry St provides the finest heritage view in Guildford for those approaching it from the High St with St Mary's Church on the right. (It is the second oldest street in Guildford.) 	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Castle Hill which winds its way down the hill from South Hill past Lewis Carroll’s house and the Castle area, and through the arch into Quarry St is another scenic Guildford St with heritage and character, and street views. • Castle St, with two old pubs, which runs past the Castle grounds and with the view down Chapel St has heritage and character, which has been somewhat diminished by bulky buildings. • South Hill is an imposing approach road into Guildford with fine street views, somewhat diminished by out of character replacement houses. <p>Viewpoint 11: Castle Motte, looking north west</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The view from the top of the Castle Keep, which rises above the Castle Motte is also an important view, which visitors pay to see. Care needs to be taken that ugly, over bulky buildings and an overload of flat uninteresting roofs do not spoil such a view. <p>Viewpoint 12: Old Town Bridge, looking east</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The redbrick listed building, which is the first building on the left after the Old Town Bridge, is the beginning of the High St view. (The white van in the view is unfortunate, but any traffic crossing the High St at any angle would diminish the view. It is at the lowest point on the High St which lessens its impact on the view from the High St above. (Ideally a tunnel could take traffic away from the High St) • In the sentence: <i>“Aim to improve the view through future replacement of bulky ‘block-like’ buildings with finer grained forms more appropriate to the historic context as the opportunity arises”</i>, the words <i>“Aim to ……”</i> are rather weak. Could these two words be left out to give greater strength and incentive to replace these buildings in the future? <p>Viewpoint 13: Old Town Bridge, looking west</p>	

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Old Town Bridge is an integral part of the High St, which continues over the bridge and ends at the Portsmouth Rd/Park St Junction. • Portsmouth Rd Car Park, opposite St Nicholas Church, could be turned into a green open space in line with riverside scenery and character, creating a riverside view to be seen from the opposite bank where the Treadwheel Crane is situated. A green wall to screen the Treadwheel Crane area from traffic approaching Friary Bridge would further enhance this view. 	
Guildford Vision Group	GTCV19/21	<p>Consultation on Draft Guildford Town Centre Views Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>Comments by The Guildford Vision Group (GVG)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GVG’s mission is to persuade the Council to instigate and progress a professional masterplan for the town centre. 2. GVG trusts that adoption of the Views SDP does not frustrate or inhibit the progress of such a masterplan. 3. GVG is sympathetic to the adoption of guidance on views, but also on building heights, massing and materials. 4. Policy D1 of the new Local Plan states, inter alia, the following: <p><i>‘4.5.8a We will expect development to respond to local character and history, reflecting the identity of its context whilst allowing for innovative and forward thinking design. This should include taking account of the existing grain and street patterns and established building lines, local building vernacular and considering the effects upon views, topography, natural features, skylines, landscape setting and character, and the setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets. The relationship of the built environment to the landscape must be taken into account and the transition from urban to rural character will need to be reflected in the design of new development with the green approaches to settlements respected. Balanced with this is a requirement to develop with flair, imagination and style, reflecting our position as a regional centre and County town. These design considerations will be set out in more detail in the Development Management Policies DPD. This approach is not confined to our urban areas but will be applicable throughout the borough.’</i></p>	15 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>5. See (GVG) <u>underlined sentences above</u>. Why is a Views SPD being brought forward when D1 speak of the topic being covered in the Development Management Policies DPD? GVG suggests a DPD is the more powerful tool.</p> <p>6. Recently GVG has been studying the utility of modelling to help residents and others to better appreciate the impact of new development in the town centre. GVG will be asking for the town centre to be covered by a digital 3D model, using software employed by other major centres.</p> <p>A 3D model, regularly updated, would allow instant replication of the views studied in the draft SPD, and others. In particular cases, a physical model could be printed to aid appreciation of major planning applications – the SOLUM development springs to mind. It begs the question whether the draft SPD, should it have been in place, would have been effective enough to forestall SOLUM?</p> <p>7. GVG supports the detailed comments made by The Guildford Society.</p>	
Stoke next Guildford Residents Associati	GTCV19/23	<p>Apologies one of Stoke next Guildford RAs comments failed to send.</p> <p>We applaud the council for its recognition of Trees Importance in relation to views.</p> <p>Trees: Will become more important in a heating world.</p> <p>Further the Governmnets and SCC's Climate Change Emergeny Trees and clean air become a public priority. Tree cover should not only be retained in selected views areas it must be increased.</p> <p>Few trees in Guildford have TPOs, using GBC online planning site it is possible to overlay TPOd trees in suggested view areas. We strongly urge GBC to identify other Important trees within views as well as those presently TPO, those meeting the criteria qualifying for TPOs can be put forward to have TPOs. A list added to the Views document.</p> <p>Presently trees without TPOs yet qualifying for them are felled by developers sometimes prior to applications, during or after. Too many important trees are lost presently. Eg Copper beach Recreation Rd.</p>	15 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Trees as a store of carbon capture are identified by environmental scientists as possibly the greatest way of combating climate change. The desirability of retaining and managing tree cover in views is essential. Focus on urban areas of open space within town centres views, where more trees can be planted. This percentage of open space is notably shrinking.</p> <p>North Street - Opportunity for Boulevard style tree planting with redevelopment. The wide open space that is North Street lends itself to tree planting not only in the design context of soft landscaping contrasting hard built rectaliniar buildings but as a way of enhancing visitor experience and dwell times. Providing shade and biodiversity habitats, carbon capture and colour.</p> <p>Views - General suggest cone views are widened.</p>	
Stoke next Guildford Residents Associati	GTCV19/22	<p>Stoke next Guildford RA really appreciates the time and effort the council has put into its views research and consultation, to meet present and future needs, by protecting key views.</p> <p>This most welcome after Solumn and the Guildford College Student Beds Blocks.</p> <p>Further to previous comments about additional tree planting for North Street development.</p> <p>Looking forward it is suggested that upto 50 % of retail shopping will be done on line, and that temperatures will rise. Therefore to Enhance shopper experiences of Guildford our RA strongly urges GBC to plant many more trees throughout the town centre.</p> <p>Tungate Quarter - This redevelopment with the relaying of the pavements and road to be the same height has created a wide open space. This would be hugely enhanced by boulevard style tree planting with seating in some cases around the trees, to increase dwell times.</p>	15 Jul 2019

Respondent Organisation	Comment ID	Comment	Date Submitted
		<p>Too wide and open a space is uncomfortable and shoppers pass through quickly. Example Plymouth which was redesigned after heavy WW2 bombing, with wide open pedestrian areas, with minimal soft landscaping. This was corrected in the late 1980s with wide boulevard style areas having central ribbons of landscaped garden areas.</p> <p>Soft landscapind of trees enhances hard rectalinier towns capes, adds colour clearer air shade, and helps to create contained comfortable spaces.</p> <p>Trees would hugely enhance Tunsgate.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	

Report run at 27 Aug 2019 15:32:31. Total records: 28.