



Taylor Wimpey - Former Wisley Airfield

Community Liaison Group – Meeting Minutes – Thursday 5th
November 2020

Sustainability, Introduction to Transport, Community Liaison Group Actions and Outcomes

Date: Thursday 5th November 2020

Time: 5:00pm – 6:30pm

Venue: Zoom

Project Team:

- Antonis Pazourou (AP) – Taylor Wimpey
- Camille Soor (CS) – Taylor Wimpey
- Lee Davis (LD) – Taylor Wimpey
- David Parry (DP) – Cratus Communications
- Katy Bennett (KB) – Cratus Communications
- Rob Miller (RM) – Greengage Environmental
- Sam Luker (SL) – Greengage Environmental
- Colin McKay (CM) – WSP

Group Members:

- MA – Ockham Parish Council
- Richard Ayears (RA) – Ripley Parish Council
- Alex Beames (AB) – Send Parish Council
- Doug Clare (DC) – Guildford Bike Users Group
- CD – West Clandon Parish Council
- Clare Goodall (CG) – East Clandon Parish Council
- Euan Harkness (EH) – Wisley Action Group
- LP – Surrey Chamber of Commerce
- TR – West Horsley Parish Council
- AS – Guildford Society
- Robert Taylor (RT) – East Horsley Parish Council

Apologies:

- DA – RHS Wisley
- CC – Guildford Borough Councillor, Lovelace Ward
- HG – Ockham Parish Church
- Basil Minor (BM) – Guildford Ramblers
- KT – Enterprise M3

1. Introductions

- AP introduced the topic for the meeting: Sustainability, Introduction to Transport, and Community Liaison Group Actions and Outcomes. AP confirmed a further transport CLG will be held in early 2021 to build on the information set out in this meeting, and noted that the Community Liaison Group Actions and Outcomes have been incorporated after a suggestion by CG to demonstrate how the Group is working. AP asked LD, RM, SL and CM to introduce themselves.
- AP discussed the agenda for the meeting.
- KB took a roll call of attendees.

2. Sustainability

- RM explained that he has been working with Taylor Wimpey since the start of the project to make sure that sustainability is a golden thread running through the masterplan design, and ensure all of the different aspects of sustainability are pulled together to form a coordinated approach to sustainable development.
- RM invited the attendees to offer their views on the key topics and themes as set out in the presentation as the meeting progresses.
- RM noted that the team is at the start of the process and has set out its vision to Guildford Borough Council. Now the team is starting to develop a sustainability strategy which will flesh out that vision and provide a delivery framework to make sure sustainability measures are implemented.
- RM confirmed that the principles have been approved by Guildford Borough Council and the Design Review Panel. The key feedback involved setting clear outcome-based targets which the strategy now aims to address.
- RM noted that there has been collaboration with Guildford Borough Council and the strategy is now with the design team and they are exploring different topics and workshops including transport, Biodiversity Net Gain and health and wellbeing.
- RM added that the strategy is being developed in accordance with local policy and cross-referenced with the Making Sustainable Places in Guildford Principles and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The key policy documents have been used to inform the topics and areas of focus for the sustainability strategy.
- RM added that it would be valuable to get the input of the CLG attendees on each of the four key topics covered in the presentation: Resources and emissions,

enhancing natural habitats, healthy lifestyles and community services, and sustainable transport and connectivity.

- RM explained that in terms of resources and emissions, the focus is on the buildings themselves. The goal is to create energy efficient buildings with very low carbon emissions, and move towards net zero carbon, whilst ensuring that the development is future-proofed to allow it progress with those goals.
- RM noted that the team is exploring zero emissions, not using fossil fuels and having a positive impact on air quality with technology playing a key role, through examples such as solar panels on some house types or heat and water recovery systems. The focus is to find innovative technologies which help Taylor Wimpey to deliver a sustainable and energy-efficient development.
- RM moved on to materials, explaining that where possible the strategy would be to use low carbon or recycled materials due to the growing awareness of the carbon associated with materials. This also feeds into the goal of minimising waste during construction and recycling as much as possible. Ambitiously, the team would look towards a zero waste to landfill target.
- In terms of water, RM explained that this would include low water fittings across the development, along with looking at using rainwater through methods such as water butts for irrigation or recycled water for the commercial areas of the site.
- RM also noted that the development would like to reduce surface water run-off to greenfield run-off rates by providing green and blue infrastructure across the site.
- AS asked if, as the price of battery storage is coming down, Taylor Wimpey as a developer would look at planning battery storage for parts of the site and develop a scheme where PV cells on top of buildings and other sustainable energy sources could be backed up by battery storage?
- **Response:** LD responded that Taylor Wimpey would love to use battery storage, but it is not quite as developed as needed at this stage. If that changes the team would love to use the technology.
- AS added that the technology is progressing very quickly, and in some cases sustainable energy is reported as far cheaper than oil. Perhaps Taylor Wimpey could leave space for equipment to be installed in five years' time, for example?
- **Response:** LD agreed, and noted that the development will be future-proofed as it would have an 8-12year build life. Taylor Wimpey will be preparing for sustainable technologies which might become available, so flexibility is required. For example, gas boilers will be cut off in 2025 and electricity is becoming standard preferred policy. Battery storage is a great idea, and we will provide a future option for that to be included.

- CG added that in response to the comment about gas boilers, can we take that as confirmation that the development will not be connected to the gas grid?
- **Response:** LD replied that there will not be a gas grid to connect to. The government is considering reusing existing gas networks in small developments but when calculating the energy performance of a building, use of gas will bring the rating down..
- CG asked if the ambition is to install heat pumps?
- **Response:** LD explained that Taylor Wimpey is exploring options but has not yet decided. He noted that the industry is using heat pumps more and more, whether that is ground source or another technology. Taylor Wimpey is about to submit two applications in London where air source heat pumps are used. LD added that the United Kingdom has bought into the Paris Climate Emergency so soon legislation will emerge making these methods the requirement.
- CG explained that because East Clandon is not on the gas grid, everyone in the village has an alternative solution. CG added that her home uses a heat exchange and they have had good experiences, but alternative methods need to be thought of as a complete solution for the homes.
- MA asked that as Taylor Wimpey has discussed the sustainability approach with Guildford Borough Council, will you also discuss with Ockham Parish Council?
- **Response:** RM responded that the team is developing an outline strategy for the full scope of sustainability matters so is not making fixed decisions. The conversation with Guildford Borough Council so far has been mainly around approach and how we put structure into the strategy, and then it will be shared with others.
- MA asked if it was suitable to talk through the approach with the Borough Council but not Ockham Parish Council?
- **Response:** LD responded that the approach needs to be agreed with Guildford Borough Council and then conversations can be had with the CLG attendees.
- EH asked if that was a bit late? Once Guildford Borough Council have given the go-ahead, isn't that a fait accompli?
- **Response:** LD said it is the opposite – it is about the approach, not about the answer. What runs this is the policy adopted by Guildford Borough Council, which sets out a hierarchy and eliminates certain technologies. The SPD goes through this process, so we want to make sure the strategy aligns with Guildford before we start consulting with other parties.

- RM continued on to healthy lifestyles and community services. He noted that health and wellbeing are important for a sustainable community, so the healthy street principles can support that by, for example, creating safe and inclusive streets for all users and defined routes for walking and cycling in the transport corridors and throughout the masterplan.
- RM noted that it is important to allow for flexible working across the development, which could be an Enterprise Hub within the Village Centre, and within the design of the new homes. During construction, there should also be opportunities available with regards to employment, training and skills and adding value to the local community.
- Within sport and leisure, RM explained that there will be scope for pitches dependent on the needs of the area, and more informally providing things like walking trails and running trails, and for children they will look to include informal, natural forms of play across the site in addition to the formal play provided.
- TR asked if Taylor Wimpey has worked out what the retail offer will be?
- **Response:** CS replied that the uses within Policy A35 are a split of comparison and convenience retail, but comparison would not really work in our location and Taylor Wimpey hopes to increase the community uses. There are also office uses to consider. Taylor Wimpey has to consider the changes to the use class order. It is too early to start getting any retailers or operators on board until permission is granted. Taylor Wimpey would be looking to complement, rather than compete with, those existing uses in neighbouring villages.
- **Response:** LD added that as a developer, Taylor Wimpey wants the areas to be active. He asked the group if they have any suggestions for Taylor Wimpey.
- TR asked how many people could live here?
- **Response:** CS said at the moment we think between 4-5000 people.
- TR asked if that is for 2,100 homes, as that is only two people per house. In terms of things to be provided, a dry cleaner for example would be useful. The retail needs to cover the necessities of life, and all be within walking distance without needing to go into neighbouring villages. Some of our local centres are struggling so we want to see what you will do to ensure you are self-contained.
- RA commented that we would like to encourage residents to come to Ripley and build links with the village, and not create a self-isolating community. Instead, we would like to involve them in the communities which make up Lovelace ward, Guildford Borough and Surrey. Many of our shops are struggling so we would like to see the community using the facilities.

- **Response:** CS agreed Taylor Wimpey is striving towards ensuring that links are created between the new and existing communities and complement each other.
- EH commented that the most important thing for that many people is to have a doctor's surgery, with more than one doctor.
- **Response:** AP responded that an update from the CCG would be shared at the end of the meeting.
- CD asked that if when referring to healthy lifestyles and community services in particular, Taylor Wimpey has mentioned a 10-year build out?
- **Response:** LD said that was correct, approximately, but it would depend on market conditions.
- CD asked whether it is true therefore, that most of these facilities will not be available as people move in. How will Taylor Wimpey ensure facilities keep pace with those new homes? Secondly, there is a site in the north west where build out took place from the front of the site to the back, and access is from the front through all of the new housing to the construction sites at the back. Will that be happening on this site? It is similar to this other site – long and linear with one access.
- **Response:** LD responded that Taylor Wimpey will always build in a phased manner, but customers do not want lorries going past them. Taylor Wimpey will separate construction traffic from the residential elements. Furthermore, placemaking is number one for Taylor Wimpey. In the nearby Hampshire development, Taylor Wimpey installed a skate park, 50ha SANG and pavilion with sports pitches before the first house. The goal is to provide the new residents with community facilities in the first elements of the site, and Taylor Wimpey as a larger developer has that option.
- **Response:** CS added that from a planning perspective, Taylor Wimpey has several options including temporary facilities which eventually become end-uses, for example. Preparing the Infrastructure Delivery Plan early is key to ensure everything is provided at the right time, and we are working on that Plan at the moment.
- **Response:** LD added that Guildford Borough Council will legally tie Taylor Wimpey into triggers for non-residential uses.
- CD responded that there may be people who are not convinced by the argument that the Borough Council will hold Taylor Wimpey to account, based on past performance with Guildford Borough Council and their ability to enforce things happening in the way that they were promised.

- RM continued to talk about enhancing natural habitats and look at the topic in terms of biodiversity, wildlife habitats and wildlife parks, hopefully building to a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) over the existing state of the site. Furthermore, the plan should allow people to connect with nature and biodiversity in a better way through learning opportunities, opportunities to engage with RHS Wisley, and embedding biodiversity into the masterplan – for example, putting green roofs on bus stops.
- RM added that edible landscapes also form part of that, through allotments and orchards or foraging trails. There is also overlap between green infrastructure and climate resilience and the benefits that can bring through things like urban heat island effects (modifying land surfaces to produce heat) or controlling surface water by gathering rainfall.
- MA asked when talking about creating habitats, how can you persuade the badgers to go and live in the habitat? How can you ensure suitable habitats and that they get used?
- **Response:** RM replied that the project team has a dedicated ecologist who is looking at the full scope of ecological surveys and protected species, and looking at opportunities for those species, including where they might need extra protection through limited development in certain areas. The proposal could also include offering new habitats for those protected species, which has been done very successfully elsewhere. The principle is to provide enhanced ecological value of the site.
- MA commented that you can give no guarantee. The skylarks will also all go, they will not come back whilst houses are there. How can you create a habitat for skylarks?
- **Response:** AP responded that this would be best taken up with the ecologist consultant, who would put together a separate response for MA.
- CG asked that in terms of foraging and sustainability, if you have a population of 5000 people on a foraging trail, how are they going to forage sustainably? In my view, a foraging trail for that many people would need to look like a supermarket shelf.
- **Response:** LD responded that in the Hogmoor Enclosure on the A3, which is a SANG of roughly the same size as the proposed one at the former Wisley Airfield, it feels surprisingly big. Furthermore, Taylor Wimpey has delivered one before and it works well to support the natural environment as people keep to the trails and plants and other wildlife can grow freely away from the trails.
- CD asked in your planning for natural habitats, what sort of number of cats and dogs will be generated by 4-5000 people?

- **Response:** AP replied that this was raised at the last CLG and Rebecca, the ecologist, is currently looking at this. Feedback will be provided at a later date.
- EH commented that a solution was proposed at the last meeting to address that.
- **Response:** AP asked if that was per the phone call they had earlier. If so, AP has raised with Rebecca and she is looking at it.
- RM talked about how transport and connectivity is a key theme of sustainability, with themes including encouraging reduction in reliance on car travel and therefore increasing the opportunity to rely on other methods, including providing electric vehicle charging, car clubs, and cycle hire and servicing. In addition, the site should provide priority for cycling and walking, particularly along the green corridors, so that there are safe and accessible routes to all facilities across the site.
- RM added that he hopes he can share the sustainability strategy with the group as soon as possible to get their thoughts and feedback.

3. Stakeholder Feedback

- MA asked if the plan for safe and accessible cycling routes has materialised yet?
- **Response:** RM said the team are looking at how this can be designed at the moment, and CM will talk about it more in the second part of the meeting.
- EH commented that this transport section should have come first, as you are bringing in 4-5000 people and will have construction going on for 10-12 years which has a massive effect. To most people in the area, there are massive credibility gaps in the theories that you are putting forward.
- **Response:** RM responded that while he appreciates the comment, the team do want to be aspirational as possible and as creative as we can with the site. We want it to be a leading example of sustainability, and while there are limitations and work needed around how we deliver this sustainability, we are looking at it and hope to do so collaboratively.
- CD commented that several times in Taylor Wimpey publications, the intention is listed as submitting a planning application in the early part of next year. With all of this undecided, or not ready for release, and huge issues about infrastructure off the site, you are running out of time to get feedback on your plans. This will not be consultation; this will be publishing what is going to happen.
- **Response:** CS replied that Taylor Wimpey will not be submitting until the team is ready, which will be when a robust application has been prepared. We have not committed to a month or date for that reason.

- **Response:** AP added that we are in the first third of the programme. The next public consultation will be held on 19th and 21st November, with invitations circulated next week. We will start to develop the detail now, as we understand what is there in terms of site constraints and opportunities. Then next year we will have another round of consultation, and only submit once we are ready and confident.
- AS asked if this upcoming application would conflict with the Weyside consultation and submission with Guildford Borough Council? Will the Council be in a position to run the process for you?
- **Response:** CS asked if AS meant the consultation process?
- AS explained that Guildford Borough Council, the councillors and the Planning department have to validate the application for the former Wisley Airfield and hold their formal consultation and determination, which looks to be almost at the same time as the Weyside application will be submitted for the same process, when the Council is very low on resource.
- **Response:** CS replied that Taylor Wimpey's understanding is that the Weyside application is due by the end of the year. Furthermore, Taylor Wimpey has a planning officer dedicated to the scheme, who will be different to the Weyside scheme's officer.
- AS added that they have a major issue in the town centre which they will need to take time out to work on.

4. Introduction to Transport

- CM explained that the transport strategy is currently in the first stages, so there will be a further CLG next year to discuss the proposals.
- CM continued by explaining that under Planning Policy A35, there are certain principles the site has to follow, beginning with two primary vehicle accesses via Old Lane and the A3 Ockham Interchange, which will also be the through-link through the site.
- CM added that the Local Plan identifies two new slip roads at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common). The allocation also requires an extensive bus network which could connect to Effingham Junction railway station, Horsley railway station, Guildford and other destinations. An off-site cycle network is also required, to places including Effingham Junction railway station, Ripley and Byfleet. It is important that these are attractive and safe for the average cyclist.
- CM explained that the planning context is the Strategic Development Framework SPD, which shows some of the key expectations of the Borough Council. The document also sets out the expectations for routes through the site and for off-site

destination, looking at bus routes as well. CM noted that the team will need to be conscious of the heritage and conservation area qualities in Ockham when designing infrastructure to support the delivery of the site.

- CM then explained the active travel links which link to Byfleet, Ripley and the railway stations at Effingham Junction and Horsley. As these are all in the planning domain, they will be routes the team look to provide. There are also internal routes through the site to improve the links and add to the sense of place within the overall masterplan.
- CM noted that the current transport assessment has reached the traffic modelling stage, which provides an objective measure of what the traffic flows on the roads could be. A new traffic model has been started, which is based on data from 2019 and some data from 2020. All of the data will be calibrated to take account of any potential effects from the pandemic. Some of the data comes from Surrey County Council as well as from mobile network data suppliers, all of which helps the team to build the matrix of movements and is built into the traffic model.
- CM explained that they are also looking at cycling measures for safe, attractive and accessible routes. The team is in discussion with Surrey County Council about the bus services and trying to find ways to bolster the existing local bus services so they are at least maintained, and hopefully enhanced. The masterplan is based on sustainable travel principles, and the provision for buses, cycles and connectivity through the site is crucial.
- CM explained that to confirm the processes required for the Burnt Common slips on the A247, the team is having conversations with all of the highway authorities. The effect of the slips would be to divert traffic and attract traffic to parts of the network that it would not usually be attracted to. The process is required to ensure the scheme is robust and deliverable.
- CM talked about the Burnt Common slips, which are a pair of slip roads which face north to allow movement on and off the A3. In effect, with the other southbound on-slip and Send off-slip, it would provide an all-movement junction south of Ripley.
- CM set out the overall concept approach for transport, which is to influence travel behaviours through intelligent design by encouraging travel by non-car modes and maximising opportunities to walk, or travel by bus or bike. It is a requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework that all opportunities to use alternative modes of transport are maximised, and car use is minimised. However, cars will be used for some journeys so we are planning for that and will be providing electric charging facilities. We are also considering the possibility of having parking spaces off-plot if over and above 2 parking spaces at each home, albeit that the parking standard requirements in this area are higher than those we would like to aspire to, so we will try to reach an agreed compromise on that.

- CM talked about the cycle routes within the development and local to the site, which will be to comply with Local Transport Note 1/20 which requires high-quality, safe cycle infrastructure. Furthermore, where traffic flows are highest, including off the site or along the main spine road, traffic should be segregated from cycle routes by some means. We want to provide priority for cyclists at junctions and across the main spine road to make sure each cycle journey is as continuous as it can be.
- CM explained that Taylor Wimpey wants to make it as easy as possible to travel without the car, including installing on-plot cycle storage, and secure and covered storage at on-site destinations, and have bus stops within easy reach of all homes. The layout of the site is particularly suited to that, as most homes are within 200 metres of the bus stop, and all are within 400 metres according to our early plans. We also want to provide safe cycle routes outside the site boundary, so some of the work recently has involved topographical surveys of the surrounding road network and to gather information from Surrey County Council about the extent of adopted highway. The team is using Local Transport Note 1/20 to find the most appropriate solution for the routes being looked at, and more information will be available once that work has been completed.
- CM talked about how through community facilities, services on site and opportunities for local businesses, Taylor Wimpey can look to maximise the opportunities for non-car travel. In terms of bus routes, the team is looking to dovetail with the train services at local stations and is aiming for a 15-minute service between the site and those stations, as well as making sure the bus service is started as soon as possible in the delivery of the development, so that those in the first 2-300 homes have the option of a reliable bus service.
- CM explained how Taylor Wimpey would also like to embrace the e-bike, which could even include hiring an e-bike from the site, especially as they extend the range that people are willing to cycle. They also increase the appeal of cycling to people who would not normally think of cycling. CM highlighted how quality way-finding information will be integral to supporting a network of cycleways and footways, with potentially an integrated travel planning app also made available to residents so that they can use e-bikes, use public transport, or check local traffic.
- CM set out the next steps for transport, which include the community consultation events in November, another transport CLG in early 2021 which would include more detailed designs and proposals, and ongoing stakeholder engagement until submission of the application in 2021.

5. Stakeholder Feedback

- AB chat comment: The Burnt Common slips are not in Roads Period 2, assuming they are put into Roads Period 3, they are unlikely to be in place until at least 2030.

- CG chat comment: Given Alex's comment, do we have a traffic model which excludes these junctions, so we can see the impact if they are not delivered?
- **Response:** CM responded that they introduced the Burnt Common slips as a study for potential implementation within Roads Period 3. The team is considering the implications and need to understand what the Burnt Common slips deliver in terms of traffic impact and benefits. Highways England may use the work within Roads Period 2 to inform their study but we do not know when Highways England will start their work. The effects of the slips could be felt away from the former Wisley Airfield site, so the whole area needs to be captured in the model when we test with and without the Burnt Common slips, along with any other identified options.
- *AS chat comment: A3 is a key issue as the local plan delivery is based on assumptions for delivery. Gosden and Blackwells are at risk due to non-delivery. Need to watch like a Hawk.*
- *AB chat comment: I should disclose that I am employed by Highways England.*
- AS asked if Taylor Wimpey is making assumptions about where people on this development will work? It seems fast access by car to work will depend on cars using the M25, and for Guildford it will be through Ripley onto the A3.
- **Response:** CM explained that to access the A3 southbound from the site, it is possible to travel up Old Lane and join the A3 from there, and should the Highways England scheme be approved in January, that junction at Old Lane onto the A3 will also be improved.
- AS replied that that is quite a lot of pressure on Old Lane, depending on numbers.
- **Response:** CM responded that it could increase the traffic on Old Lane, but that is the purpose of the modelling so we can see the potential impact and mitigate that if required.
- *RA chat comment: LNP12 sections e & f have requirements for public electric car charging points for visitors/trades people along with Car Share Parking Facilities, will these be part of your planning?*
- MA said that in the stub road application, you seem to suggest that the roundabout coming off the airfield in the morning rush hour will produce a queue of less than one car. I would have thought that with 5000 people living there, the queue would be more than one car in the morning rush hour. Your traffic modelling has been a problem for many years, so I am finding it hard to believe some of the figures you come up with.
- **Response:** CM explained that the figures used there were preliminary figures based on the Highways England modelling. That was used initially as the traffic model was not available for our own figures, and the figure of less than one car is

from a piece of software used by lots of developments. It shows that the capacity of the roundabout is high enough that there would be very minimal queues, because when we come to do our own transport assessment, the flows may vary from that which we received from Highways England. We need to know that there is some capacity within that junction so it gives us the confidence of knowing that when we do our transport assessment, we will look in more detail at that roundabout and know that it works.

- EH added that Taylor Wimpey has been very good, but you did represent the previous owners. At the appeal, RHS Wisley and ourselves appointed our own transport consultants who said your figures were totally wrong. Again, there is a credibility issue.
- **Response:** AP added that a further meeting is being held with RHS Wisley with their transport consultant so that will be an opportunity to discuss any questions, comments or disagreements around this topic. AP asked CM to summarise how the model is validated.
- **Response:** CM explained that the traffic model is built by his colleagues, using data gathered from different sources, and then they go through local model validation. This sets out how well the model replicates the base conditions, and one of the reasons we are updating the model from the Highways England model is to use the 2019 data. The model will then have to go through the process of sign-off by Surrey County Council and Highways England to make sure they are comfortable with the model. It also looks at the correlation between journey times through the network, and all of these parameters need to fall within a small margin of the existing measured traffic flows and journey times to be accepted. Therefore, there is very little room for the model to be incorrect and it will be in line with the industry standards which are pretty rigorous.
- **Response:** AP added that it is unlikely CM will be in a position to provide the model to Taylor Wimpey before early next year. CM agreed and explained that the model validation process is the longest time period in the first instance, but once the model is approved and can be applied to the site as a whole, the transport strategy can be set out fully.
- **Response:** AP explained that this shows that Taylor Wimpey is still in the first phases of the masterplan design, and that while it must be frustrating that the team do not have all of the answers just yet, he hopes that this shows how important it is to get the data completely right first.
- DC asked if in reference to the design guide LTN1/20, CM can confirm that all cycle routes will be segregated from traffic, well-lit and well-surfaced and at appropriate widths? Will there be traffic calming on roads neighbouring the cycle routes?

- **Response:** CM responded that the cycle environment is changing, with the Government putting time and money into policy and research to ensure cycling is taken seriously as part of new developments. As part of that, an appropriate cycle network must be designed for the traffic flow conditions on the site. The routes will be segregated and could include stepped-cycle lanes – so they are separated from the traffic by a height difference. In some areas, where the flows are low, it could be appropriate to have cycle routes within the road, but, for example, remove the main central road markings and put cycle lanes on either side so that the priority is for cyclists, instead of cars. The space for passing cyclists would then be delineated on the carriageway. The Highway Code consultation makes it clear that the responsibility is on drivers to give cyclists enough space, and to make sure that designers prioritise cyclists at junctions, for example. The team will be implementing all of the standards in LTN1/20, with traffic flows and modelling being worked on currently along with road layout and road adoptions. In terms of lighting, that depends on the location – after all, just because the route is lit does not make it safe. The key is to provide appropriate guidance for cyclists, so if we cannot provide overhead lighting, we might be able to provide low-level lighting or lights in the surfacing. We will be looking at all of these options in detail with the external cycling consultant.
- *RA chat comment: Let's hope the Guildford Borough Council/Taylor Wimpey suggestion of a bus service to West Byfleet down Wisley Lane does not get stuck on the bridge over the Wey Navigation!*
- DC asked if CM could talk more about the cycle routes to the stations? Will they all be segregated to allow cyclists to travel to Effingham, Horsley, and Byfleet stations safely? I appreciate the surveys could limit your options somewhat but we will be campaigning for those segregated routes. In addition, will you be providing cycle storage for each house?
- **Response:** LD confirmed Taylor Wimpey will, and CM noted that it is a policy requirement now.
- DC asked if the team has considered e-scooters?
- **Response:** CM confirmed they have and are on the radar, but e-scooters are currently restricted around highways, for example. However, the team will continue to monitor it and look forward to the eventual legalisation. E-scooters will be a good option for lightweight, convenient, and sustainable travel.
- DC added that they would be another solution for the development to encourage non-car travel. Could I have a separate meeting with CM and the team to discuss the cycle routes in more detail?
- **Response:** AP and CM agreed and will schedule a meeting with Guildford Bike Users Group.

- AP asked the group if they would agree to move the Community Liaison Group feedback section to the next meeting, and if in the meantime anyone wishes to comment on that part of the presentation, please do send comments through.
- AP added that Taylor Wimpey has been meeting with the Clinical Commissioning Group, local medical practices, and Guildford Borough Council to emphasise how strong the community desire for a medical facility is.
- CS added that the Clinical Commissioning Group is the decision-maker, but Guildford Borough Council does note that a medical practice should be an on-site requirement in Policy A35. The Clinical Commissioning Group will be conducting a demand-capacity study, but if any of the attendees wish to submit letters of support it would be greatly appreciated.
- LD explained that it is still Taylor Wimpey's intention to provide medical facilities on the site.
- Next meeting date – Thursday 26th November 2020
- Topic – Introduction to Infrastructure and Utilities and Community Liaison Group feedback review.

AP closed the meeting at 6:45pm.