



## Taylor Wimpey - Former Wisley Airfield

### Community Liaison Group –Meeting Minutes – Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020

#### Planning Process and Community Integration

Date: Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> October 2020

Time: 5:00pm – 6:30pm

Venue: Zoom

#### Attendees:

#### Project Team:

- Antonis Pazourou (AP) – Taylor Wimpey
- Camille Soor (CS) – Taylor Wimpey
- Molly Chadwick (MC) – Taylor Wimpey
- David Parry (DP) – Cratus Communications
- Julian Seymour (JS) – Cratus Communications
- Katy Bennett (KB) – Cratus Communications
- Katherine Munro (KM) – Savills
- Mark Patchett (MP) – MPCS

#### Group Members:

- MA - Ockham Parish Council
- Richard Ayears (RA) – Ripley Parish Council
- Alex Beames (AB) - Send Parish Council
- CD – West Clandon Parish Council
- Clare Goodall (CG) – East Clandon Parish Council
- HG - Ockham Parish Church
- Euan Harkness (EH) - Wisley Action Group
- MO - West Horsley Parish Council
- KP – Representative of the Old Lane Residents
- AS - Guildford Society
- Robert Taylor (RT) - East Horsley Parish Council

## 1. Introductions

- AP introduced the topic for the meeting: Planning Process and Community Integration. AP also identified an amendment to the presentation as sent out via email, noting that the timescale for the submission of the stub road and enabling works applications should have read October 2020, not December 2020 as listed on the presentation.
- AP outlined that as per the request of members at the last meeting, an explanation of the planning process would form the first half of the meeting, with MP leading on Community Integration for the second half of the meeting.
- AP introduced four additional attendees from the Taylor Wimpey team:
  - Katy Bennett (Cratus Communications)
  - Katherine Munro (Savills)
  - Mark Patchett (MPCS)
  - Molly Chadwick (Taylor Wimpey)
- DP outlined that the meeting was being recorded for the purpose of creating meeting minutes which would then be published on the dedicated site website.
- DP took a roll call of attendees.
- HG asked if he would be able to bring a guest to some of these meetings, as he will be leaving in a year and would like to do a full handover. AP confirmed that would be fine.

## 2. Planning Process

- CS outlined the masterplan area for the site including land represented by Hallam Land Management and CBRE. CS also outlined the collaborative relationship between Taylor Wimpey and the third-party landowners to ensure that the eventual masterplan comes together as one cohesive whole.
- KM explained that in Guildford Borough, development is guided by the 2019 Local Plan, the Saved Policies in the 2003 Local Plan, and will also take into account the Lovelace Neighbourhood Plan, which is likely to go to Referendum in May/June of

next year. It was noted that Guildford Borough Council is giving significant weight to that plan.

- KM explained that the Development Plan is supported by a suite of Supplementary Planning Guidance, which includes both the Strategic Development Framework SPD and Climate Change, Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy Supplementary Planning Document. Both of these documents were adopted recently and will be used when masterplanning the former Wisley Airfield. It was noted that there are also material considerations in the National Planning Policy Framework, and the emerging Development Management Policies document which is due to be adopted in September 2022.
- CS discussed how the Strategic Development Framework (SDF) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out the planning process for strategic sites before and after a planning application is submitted. She explained that Taylor Wimpey is on the first stage (collection of evidence base) of the process following the adoption of the Local Plan and SDF SPD. The Design Review Panel will review and assess the team's proposals within three separate Design Review sessions.
- CS explained that the community engagement process, with mechanisms such as this Community Liaison Group, sit alongside this technical work to provide both qualitative and quantitative data to inform the masterplan.
- CS noted a first Design Review Panel was held in August 2020, and there will be another held before the end of the year. There will then be a final Panel in early 2021 before the planning application is submitted.
- CS explained that the planning as submitted will be supported by the documents set out in the presentation (Design and Access Statement Incorporating Development Framework Plans and Master Plans, Environment Statement, Infrastructure Delivery Plans, Drainage Plans, Transport Assessment, Travel Plan, and Planning Statement), and parameter plans which set out the locations of residential and non-residential uses.
- CS explained that the planning application will be supported by a list of conditions, and a Section 106 Agreement. This will be enforceable by the council to ensure that Taylor Wimpey deliver what is set out in their planning application.
- Taylor Wimpey is working closely with the other two landowners to ensure the Infrastructure Delivery Plan delivery fits together and is cohesive. Work on this will start shortly.
- CS explained that Design Code(s) is an umbrella document which all of the Reserved Matters applications will have to adhere to. The team is beginning to develop the Code and is in the process of confirming whether this will be delivered as a planning condition or as an additional document to the application.

- CS gave the example of if a Reserved Matters application were to be submitted for 200 homes and the community space linked to the homes, the Design Code would influence the detail included in that application, such as the configuration of the homes and the road layouts.

### 3. Planning Timeline

- As per the presentation, KM outlined that two planning applications had been submitted on 2<sup>nd</sup> October for the stub road and the enabling works. The applications have been submitted early to ensure that the Stub Road and roundabout can be tied into the Highways England proposed DCO works if those works are approved in 2021. It was noted that the applications are not yet online as they have not been validated by Guildford Borough Council.

### 4. Stakeholder feedback

- CS asked the attendees if they had questions about the planning process which had been outlined.
- AS said that there had been nothing mentioned on the National Design Guide or the Planning for the Future White Paper, and the impact of zoning, and asked how this would be fed into the plans.

**Response:** KM explained that the team are regularly holding workshops with the council and their planning officers, and are mindful of the White Paper, albeit there is limited detail at present. Savills will be briefing Taylor Wimpey as and when more detail is released to understand any implications.

- KP said the Design Review Panel is not independent, and asked who pays for it.

**Response:** CS said the Panel is independent and run through Design South East, who were appointed by Guildford Borough Council. It is funded by Taylor Wimpey, as per every developer on every site through the Planning Performance Agreement. This is a standard arrangement.

- KP asked at what point is transport to and from the site considered?

**Response:** CS answered that within the SDF SPD there is a section on transport, so as part of the masterplanning process, the transport will be taken into account as described in the timeline. Taylor Wimpey is currently at the technical evidence collection stage to inform the masterplanning process. The SDF SPD plan is now online for anyone who wishes to view it.

- RT asked if a transport assessment will be submitted with the planning application, and if so, will the CLG attendees get to see it first?

**Response:** AP confirmed that a transport assessment will be submitted with the planning application, and Taylor Wimpey will be holding a Community Liaison Group specifically about the transport – at least one, with optional further meetings if needed – to make sure that the transport assessment and wider transport concerns are addressed before the planning application is submitted.

- RA said he noted that Taylor Wimpey had acknowledged that Guildford Borough Council is giving significant weight to the Lovelace Neighbourhood Plan and that due to Covid it will not be made before May 2021, but asked them to be aware that it does contain design codes for Ockham Parish which Taylor Wimpey could use.
- **Response:** CS confirmed that Taylor Wimpey will be looking at all the policies and all the ideas in the Development Plan, including the Lovelace Plan, so this will be taken into account. AP added that the team is planning to meet with neighbours in the Lovelace Ward to discuss the plans further, and to understand what it means to be part of the ward.
- RA said that while it has been explained that the Section 106 Agreements are also included in the planning process, the community is concerned about affordable housing specifically for the local community. He asked if Taylor Wimpey has made a provision in the masterplan process for a community land trust (or similar) to hold a small portion of the affordable properties for rent and shared ownership in perpetuity for the local community?

**Response:** CS said that while MP can touch on that in his section, the scheme does have 40% affordable housing with the Housing Association VIVID already on board as a partner. She noted that from the White Paper, Taylor Wimpey is aware that first homes are a big priority and that a 30% market value reduction is among the measures being considered for first time buyers by the government. Taylor Wimpey also offers a 5% discount for key workers and is exploring if this can be applied to the former Wisley Airfield site. CS will take RA's ideas away, and MP and the Taylor Wimpey team will have a separate meeting with RA to discuss his ideas further.

- CG and RA added that in East Clandon Parish and in Ripley Parish, surveys have been done on housing needs and affordable housing. They will provide these to Taylor Wimpey.
- HG asked the team to avoid using technical language as it is not always clear to those outside of the development team what things like a Section 106 Agreement are.

**Response:** AP, CS and KM all agreed and noted. KM explained that a Section 106 Agreement sets out planning obligations for Taylor Wimpey to sign up to, and covers things like affordable housing requirements or offsite highways work.

- HG asked if the team had a name for the site yet.

**Response:** AP said no, but we did want to ask the CLG if they support creating the naming shortlist. He suggested that we could perhaps set aside part of a future meeting to talk about potential names.

- MA said the team should note that referring to the site as Wisley is misleading as there is a nearby village called Wisley.

**Response:** The team acknowledged that, and said they would ensure it was referred to as the former Wisley Airfield as per the Local Plan.

- HG noted that Ockham has hamlets named based on location, such as Church End and Bridge End, which could be an idea for naming the neighbourhoods within the site. He also noted that airfield references could be incorporated, for example Hanger End.

**Response:** AP agreed that something like that could be discussed, and encouraged attendees to review with the groups each member represents so they can work together on a shortlist of proposed names. All members are to email DP with suggestions.

- KP asked why the two planning applications submitted on 2<sup>nd</sup> October are not yet online.

**Response:** KM explained that the applications were submitted last Friday, and payment was made on 8<sup>th</sup> October, so once that is received, the applications will be validated in the next week or so and shared online.

- HG asked what is required in terms of the green aspects of the homes.

**Response:** KM said there is an open space requirement as part of the Local Plan, so that will form part of the masterplan. AP added that there will be a CLG dedicated to sustainability on 5<sup>th</sup> November and he would speak to the consultants to ask them to look at green homes in advance of the meeting.

- KP said the Taylor Wimpey team is speaking as if they have got planning permission, but should remember that is not the case and the land is agricultural at the moment and should be referred to like that and not as a settlement.

**Response:** CS said she was correct, there is no planning permission or submitted planning application for the site, but the Taylor Wimpey team is here because the site is allocated in the Local Plan and want to give the community the chance to shape the plan for the site and welcome any feedback on those plans.

- MA said that the Taylor Wimpey is presenting this as if it is a done deal, and that because it is in the Local Plan, it is treated as if it is guaranteed, which is not the case.

**Response:** AP agreed that was accurate, the site is not guaranteed permission, but the Taylor Wimpey team do want to develop a plan for the site in partnership and consultation with the site neighbours and stakeholders.

- MA noted that the stub road and access road applications are dependent on the proposed Junction 10 and Ockham Interchange works, which will not be approved until January if at all. He asked how can this stub road application go through before that of Highways England, noting that objections could push that timescale back, and end up in bird breeding time which could have an effect on the whole timetable.

**Response:** CS explained that Taylor Wimpey has used the basis of the DCO from Highways England to submit the application, and the stub road application will not be decided until the DCO is decided. KM noted that the Local Plan Policy A35 and SDF both show an access from those works and therefore our application is in accordance with those policy documents. CS added that the stub road application is with Guildford Borough Council for review, while the DCO decision will fall to the Secretary of State for Transport.

- KP said that until Taylor Wimpey show residents how the site will impact their properties, urbanise the roads, install pavements outside their houses and put up streetlights, how are residents meant to make proper objections?

**Response:** AP responded that all of those issues are about transport, which is why there will be at least one CLG about transport, as soon as we have enough information about the transport assessment to share.

- KP said that the team are progressing without considering the transport and by putting in the applications now without doing anything further, people's property value is being frozen.

**Response:** CS explained the stub road application is based on the Highways England timescale and is therefore intrinsically linked to that.

- KP said that the team acting as if the road is approved, and local people have no faith in the decision of the Secretary of State regarding the Highways England application.

**Response:** CS explained that the alternative to submitting the stub road application now would be to submit exactly the same application later, but having to dig up newly completed roads.

- KP asked what happens if that application means I have streetlights and buses right outside my house on Old Lane? Residents need facts to object properly to the application.

**Response:** CS explained that the stub road is not access to the development - it is the enabling works for the roundabout which connects to the Wisley Lane diversion

/ Ockham roundabout. The stub road application deals with an element of the transport strategy which is separate from bus provision, spine road, public rights of way. CS noted that the stub road is so intrinsically linked to the DCO that it needs to be in consideration at the same time in order to avoid unnecessary disruption to local road users, primarily visitors to RHS Wisley.

## 5. Community Integration

- MP explained that he is a specialist in stewardship and legacy, focused on what happens in the long-term for the site and how the team can ensure that this new site becomes a community with all of these initial aspirations maintained in perpetuity.
- MP said in response to the earlier question raised about the Community Land Trust (CLT) that the charitable stewardship trust model which is currently being considered for the former Wisley Airfield is different to the CLT model as it will own and manage all the public facilities and open spaces. MP confirmed he will discuss the Land Trust suggestion separately with RA and the Taylor Wimpey team.
- MP explained he is passionate about ensuring this is a community where people can thrive, and delivering the full participation of all people in community life. He defined 'community' as a sense of identity and belonging for families, individuals and groups, and 'all people' as for new residents of former Wisley Airfield and residents from neighbouring homes and communities. MP expressed the importance of integration within the former Wisley Airfield and between the new and existing communities.
- MP explained that integration can be achieved in different ways. Physically, through the design of neighbourhoods, streets, open spaces, and facilities, and he is working closely working with masterplan designers to ensure this. Socially, this can be achieved through proactive intervention to enable people to make connections, build relationships and feel part of the community. Taylor Wimpey takes this very seriously and is looking to build a place that works for everybody. Organisationally, the integration must involve existing local organisations with the Community Trust (such as Parish Councils and Church Groups), as well as the residents in the new homes.
- The Stewardship Trust has 5 main principles: Connection, Facilities, Participation, Organisation, and Influence. For facilities, the Trust will own and manage SANG, the children's play areas and green and open spaces for those on and around the site. For connection, the strategy should pull together all stakeholders to oversee, initiate and deliver the stewardship strategy. For participation, the Trust will be hosting events and building community groups, activities, and things to do to create a community. Taylor Wimpey will provide some funding for this, and the team is acknowledging the active community surrounding the site so will look to work with this rather than compete against it. For organisation, governance and staff structures are set up to enable participation, including appointing a

Community Development Officer. Finally, influence is covered by enabling the Trust to measure and report on outcomes, empowering the community to influence the Trust to respond to their needs. MP outlines that this an entrepreneurial model which can be responsive and adapted.

- AB asked how this will be funded, and whether it would be through an allocation of precepts?

**Response:** MP replied that while the exact details for the former Wisley Airfield are still being worked out, on similar sites, there are three main sources.

- One will be a resident contribution from those who live on the site.
  - The second is income from endowment, as Taylor Wimpey could invest some funds in assets to generate income.
  - Thirdly, some facilities will generate income, such as the community hall or sports pitches.
- CD asked if the part of the funding which will come from residents is in addition to council tax, and if it would be graded in terms of contribution for the 40% affordable housing, for example, to ensure their housing is truly affordable.

**Response:** MP replied yes, the residents of the development will pay this fee in addition to the council tax and parish precept, but in some places, part of the parish precept from site resident properties has been redirected to the Trust to lessen the fee to the residents. Those living in the affordable housing will still pay a contribution, and further work is still to be done to set those costs and ensure it is appropriate.

- CD said that the structure which is being suggested, and words such as 'charity' and 'trust', imply reporting structures and accountability. Who is accountable, and how democratic is this structure?

**Response:** MP replied that he would be happy to explain this in more detail offline, but there is an online presentation on the website. In short, the proposal is to create a charitable trust which is made up of stakeholders and a number of residents. The trustees will then be responsible for this, and employ a staff team. It will be a sizeable operation, and it is working very well on other sites. It is democratically accountable and can be joined by existing and onsite residents.

- CD asked if there is an equivalent example in Guildford or Surrey?

**Response:** MP said he was not sure of one in Guildford, but he will share links to his case studies, including Chichester Community Development Trust.

**Post meeting note:** MP shared this link – [www.chichestercdt.org.uk](http://www.chichestercdt.org.uk).

- AS noted that Onslow Village ran one as a business organisation to enforce standards, which ended about 25 years ago.
- AP added that the Taylor Wimpey team is looking into this trust with MP to see how the funding and logistics will work, plus what the facilities might be. He invited the attendees to send through suggestions of what the community like to do, and what they feel is needed or currently missing.
- MO asked about self-supporting facilities, such as doctor's surgeries, pharmacies or libraries.

**Response:** MP replied that those are things in consideration, and it would be helpful to know what gaps there are locally in terms of facilitating community integration?

- KP said that was a non-question, as the residents like living in a rural environment and seeing green fields, biodiversity and trees, so this is the wrong audience.

**Response:** AP said the next CLG is about open space and the SANG, which is large part of the masterplan will be made up of, but this meeting is about community facilities and what is missing to see how our site can help locally. CS added that we are trying to tease out what we can provide in terms of tangible facilities to ensure the existing community is heard.

- KP said the existing services will be crippled by the development, due to the 2000 new homes and 10,000 residents. Everyone is well-served by the East Horsley doctor's and pharmacy but it will not cope when the new site comes.

**Response:** CS replied that Taylor Wimpey is working to ensure that as much as possible there is limited additional pressure placed on existing services as a result of the development. The team is looking to ensure the uses proposed are as efficient as possible.

- AB asked if the team could look at things like non-essential services, such as hairdressers, which are needed but not included in planning.

**Response:** CS replied that that was a very good idea and the team would take it away.

- RA said that Ripley was affected when the doctor's surgery was lost in the village, and most now go to Send which is full to capacity. Things like that are problems, however, most of the people who use those facilities are unable to access things further afield and need transport. Something like Ripley Good Neighbour scheme to help with that would be good, and for integration, cricket clubs work well in Ockham and Horsley. He noted that while many in the community would like the proposed development not to happen, but if it does, these sorts of things that could be truly beneficial for people.

**Response:** MP noted these as good suggestions to take away.

- CG said that green spaces, allotments, and 'grow your own' should be a priority for the new residents, especially given the world class horticultural space next door. She suggested working with RHS Wisley on the shared community space and possibility of training or courses for the new residents.

**Response:** MP noted this and said growing produce together has worked well on other sites as a form of community integration for all ages. AP added that the next CLG will cover this in more detail but Taylor Wimpey is very keen to work in partnership with RHS Wisley.

- KP said that the land would surely be better kept for viable agriculture land to produce food for the community.
- CD said that it is a difficult balance to strike, as it is a large community with no existing discernible facilities, and surrounding communities with some but not all facilities. Therefore, it is important that the new site does not become full of shops, redirecting business away from the existing local shops and end up crippling them. How do you see this community integration going on? As sucking people in from East Horsley and Ripley could be very dangerous and lead to polarisation if it seems viable communities are being drained by the development.

**Response:** CS explained that Taylor Wimpey will be carrying out an audit to understand the non-residential provision and make sure their services complement, instead of compete with, the existing facilities. MP added that this goes beyond the commercial to things like play areas and ensuring that a new community hall, for example, does not undermine an existing one. In addition, there is a cricket club on the peripheral of the site so there is a relationship to be had there.

## 6. Q&A

- MA asked how the Neighbourhood Discussion Group is proposed to work – will the residents have a chance to express their views?

**Response:** AP explained that Taylor Wimpey is looking to give their immediate neighbours an opportunity to talk to them and get updates on where things are right now.

- KP said that she was concerned about that, as she had an hour-long conversation with the team last week who could tell her nothing while surveyors were on her land and on her neighbour's land. She said Taylor Wimpey should be better informed during these meetings.

**Response:** AP explained that the Neighbourhood Discussion meeting is to give the direct neighbours information about things coming up, like surveys for baseline assessments.

- KP said that the value of her property has taken a nosedive so she cannot move away, and that the team should speak to people who might want to move away, but they do not seem to believe that the properties are blighted by the site. All of the parish councillors need to realise of the strength of feeling in this local community, and understand that we need to have a say as well.

**Response:** MA invited KP to get in touch with Ockham Parish Council and himself directly.

- CD said that the site desperately needs to offer high bandwidth broadband, not leave it to OpenReach.

**Response:** AP agreed that broadband will be a priority for the site, especially with the switch towards more home-working and greater need for connectivity, and added that this will be discussed more in the CLG on 5<sup>th</sup> November.

- CD asked what Taylor Wimpey will do to address the sewage and drainage system, which is already an issue in the area.

**Response:** AP explained that Taylor Wimpey has an infrastructure management plan which will include that, and we will have a separate CLG meeting on the drainage and SUDs, and other matters like that.

- CD said the slip roads to the A247 is detail which is required and included in the Local Plan, so I don't understand how it can be treated separately.
- KP added that Taylor Wimpey cannot give us any information on how we are going to be affected, including transport and access or light pollution, noise pollution, and dust pollution during 10 years of construction, let alone details of mitigating the environmental damage. There is no date for the transport CLG and that is appalling from Taylor Wimpey.

**Response:** AP said those would be addressed when the plans have progressed to give us enough information to discuss the transport. The next CLG is on the SANG and open space, so we do encourage questions and feedback via email before and after that meeting. We have invited our landscape architect and ecologist to attend that CLG as well. On 5<sup>th</sup> November, we will be discussing sustainability.

- AP thanked members for attending, and confirmed that Taylor Wimpey is listening and taking comments on board. He reminded members to contact DP with thoughts on naming.

**AP closed the meeting at 6:45pm.**

**Taylor**  
**Wimpey**