

Madame Mayor, Councillors

I speak as a resident of the Borough, who attended the stakeholder meeting referred to in the Council's response. I have read the numerous reports that support the petition, which were sent to Councilors, and the findings give me no option but to oppose the motion proposed by Council. The consultation cannot be relied upon IF the evidence given is inaccurate. The inaccuracies are numerous, the ones I am particularly concerned by, relate to the lack of differentiation between LOCAL NEED and GENERAL DEMAND

Particularly;

Slide 1

1. The apparent random choice of statistics in order to demonstrate maximum need.
2. The 30% growth figure in Guildford's housing stock when government figures indicate growth of only 10-12%
3. The inexplicable hike from 671 to 800. Even without constraints applied, there is no explanation for the huge increase.

Addressing local housing need is widely supported and in the public interest. Proposals addressing economic need may or may not be in the public interest. For clarification and transparency, there should be a **clear differentiation between the two**. I believe that failure to do so, may invalidate responses given to questions 1 & 4 of the consultation.

Clarification was given last August in the case between Mole Valley Council and Cherkley developers, when the judge stated - **Need means "required" in the interests of the public and the community as a whole – It does not mean interest or desire**

This is particularly important for areas that are within 30-40 minutes commute of London, where the DEMAND could be never ending.

slide 2

It would also be useful to explain the correlation between the NEED for thousands of new homes when there are over 5,000 currently for sale within 10 miles of Guildford, of which 900 are within the affordable price bracket - Three thousand are available to rent, a thousand of which, are less than £1000 a month

Slide 3

Rightmove also shows that in the GU1 postcode alone, there are 300-400 properties for sale at any one time and this is in February, which is a quiet period.

I support the request by GGG for inaccuracies in the SHMA to be dealt with sooner rather than later, as Council is suggesting. The SHMA must state clearly what proportion of the housing figure reached, will tackle the need for its primary objective, which must be **Guildford's growing and aging population** and what proportion addresses economic and external population needs.

Upwards adjustments have been made to account for unmet need, but the report should also make reductions for;

- Student housing
- Windfalls
- Existing permissions
- And available rental accommodation

All have been omitted and when included, will make a significant difference to the need for increased housing. I ask you to oppose the motion

Thank you for listening