



Taylor Wimpey - Former Wisley Airfield

Community Liaison Group – Meeting Minutes – Thursday 26<sup>th</sup>  
November 2020

Infrastructure and Utilities, Community Liaison Group Actions and Outcomes

Date: Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> November 2020

Time: 5:00pm – 6:30pm

Venue: Zoom

Project Team:

- Antonis Pazourou (AP) – Taylor Wimpey
- Lee Davis (LD) – Taylor Wimpey
- Katy Bennett (KB) – Cratus Communications
- Phil Hurst (PH) – GTA Civils
- Mark Asimakis (MA) – Energist

Group Members:

- DA – RHS Wisley
- MA – Ockham Parish Council
- Richard Ayears (RA) – Ripley Parish Council
- NB – Guildford Bike Users Group
- PB – East Horsley Parish Council
- Clare Goodall (CG) – East Clandon Parish Council
- HG – Ockham Parish Church
- Euan Harkness (EH) – Wisley Action Group
- LP – Surrey Chamber of Commerce
- AS – Guildford Society
- IS – Effingham Residents Association
- Steven Wood (SW) – Cobham and Downside Residents Association

Apologies:

- Alex Beames (AB) – Send Parish Council
- CC – Guildford Borough Councillor, Lovelace Ward
- CD – West Clandon Parish Council
- Basil Minor (BM) – Guildford Ramblers
- MO – West Horsley Parish Council
- KT – Enterprise M3

## 1. Introductions

- AP introduced the topic for the meeting: Infrastructure and Utilities, and Community Liaison Group Actions and Outcomes. AP discussed the agenda for the meeting.
- AP introduced IS and SW from Effingham Residents Association and Cobham and Downside Residents Association respectively.
- KB took a roll call of attendees.

## 2. Infrastructure

- AP noted that infrastructure has been mentioned several times by the CLG group and the community and Taylor Wimpey recognises the need to discuss it in more detail.
- PH introduced himself and explained that GTA Civils is supporting Taylor Wimpey with the flooding and drainage requirements for the site.
- PH noted the topography of the site, explaining the ridge east-west and north-south, with slopes which have led to historical water runoff. PH explained the water catchments which surround the site and how the site's development should work with these.
- PH talked through the Environment Agency's flood risk mapping, which shows areas surrounding the site as risk areas.
- HG asked what does AEP mean on the map?
- **Response:** PH explained that this is Annual Exceedance Probability.
- PH showed the historical flood records which highlight an area at Bridge End Farm from 1968 and incidences of highway flooding provided by Surrey County Council. These include one at Elm Corner and one at Ockham Lane.
- PH discussed the anecdotal evidence provided by local residents showing floods on Ockham Lane, which combine with the historical flood event at Bridge End Farm and the flood risk from the Stratford Brook to create a flood risk area along Ockham Lane. PH noted the foul sewer which runs close to Ockham Lane and has previously had problems with covers coming up.
- PH noted that Taylor Wimpey wants the development to improve this situation, rather than making it worse, even though only a small part of the site drains to this area. PH explained that the Group should continue to apply pressure to Thames

Water and Surrey Highways to ensure drains are adequately maintained, and Taylor Wimpey will do the same.

- PH explained that to connect Ockham Lane's drainage with the site, a new sewer would likely be needed.
- PH noted that building will start at Wisley Lane and work east. So some of these solutions could be several years away, which is why it is important for community representatives to continue their conversations with Thames Water regarding existing issues.
- PH explained the potential flood risk shown at the A3 and Ockham Interchange, noting that no floods for this area have been recorded by the Environment Agency or Surrey County Council. However, PH is aware of reports of flooding and encouraged residents to document any flooding here.
- PH explained surface water management, beginning with SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Water Systems). These replicate natural drainage patterns, capturing run-off and slowing it down and cleaning it up. Some SuDS techniques being considered include green roofs for the schools and commercial buildings, capturing rainwater for watering the landscape, permeable paving to promote infiltration, swales instead of pipes and gullies, and ponds to capture, treat and attenuate the water before releasing it. The benefits include slowing down run-off, improving water quality and capturing the pollutants of runoff from hard-standings. SuDS are also good for biodiversity and amenity.
- PH explained that the latest work-in-progress surface water management plan shows the attenuation measures installed in the lower lying areas and dotted around the site. PH also noted that Taylor Wimpey is bound to provide 'betterment' in relation to run-off rates, so that can only help flood risk locally. There are no attenuation controls in place currently, but the attenuation installed by Taylor Wimpey will have to meet greenfield run-off rates and therefore will produce betterment noting that the site currently has the concrete airstrip and hanger area.
- PH explained that the design standard is a 1 in 100 annual probability, but it also has to include +40% to account for climate change.
- In terms of wastewater, PH noted capacity concerns around the Ripley wastewater treatment works. Furthermore, PH explained that that the Local Plan requires Taylor Wimpey to review the capacity with Thames Water as part of the application. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan notes the need for upgrades to the foul water network connections and upgraded capacity at the Ripley wastewater treatment works.
- PH explained that as of last year, developers pay a charge per house for sewer upgrades which might be required, even if those upgrades are not required at the time.

- PH commented on the Water Quality Assessment, which concluded there is capacity at Ripley for the planned growth, with some capacity beyond that, but treatment process upgrades will be required. The summary of the assessment is that there are available solutions for Ripley to support the proposed development and further growth in the local area.
- PH explained Thames Water's Sewer Impact Study from 2014 found a potential connection at Ockham Road north, along with upgrades off-site and at the Ripley Wastewater Treatment Works, could support the development. Taylor Wimpey has asked Thames Water to update that to a current Impact Study. The Wisley Lane Diversion could be used to lay the sewer, which would minimise construction impact. On-site treatment options are also still being considered, alongside the water conservation technologies which will be included as part of the scheme.
- AS asked if Taylor Wimpey has also engaged with Highways England, as they are also building the A3 junction? Earlier this year, the A3 Junction with the M25 was very badly flooded and I am assuming the rebuilt junction will fix some of that, but hopefully it won't knock the water back towards the interchange at Ripley.
- AP noted this and confirmed that Taylor Wimpey will discuss this at the next opportunity with Highways England
- MA commented that there is a long history of flooding at Ockham Park. I am amazed that it has not featured in any of your research. There was some serious work done to alleviate the flooding there and for the last few years it has been avoided. The other comment is that the airfield is shown as free from flooding, but that is not the case. North and south from the runway at the centre are both left with surface water when there has been heavy rain. There is plenty of history of flooding on the airfield.
- *Post-meeting note: MA shared photographs of pooling of water at the former Wisley Airfield. These have subsequently been shared with the TW design team for consideration. MA also kindly noted that from experience the top of the airfield is windy and TW should take this into account for the design proposals.*
- **Response:** PH responded that that is helpful information to have. The slide demonstrates records from the Environment Agency and Surrey County Council but we are aware that there are other anecdotal records. We welcome your records, as the more robust our flooding strategy will be.
- **Response:** PH commented that in terms of flooding on the site, the map shows where water accumulates, not that the areas of white have no water there. The amount of water gathering in those areas is just not significant enough to be classed as flooding – but it will still be wet.

- **Response:** PH said AP will be best placed to explain conversations with Highways England so far, but pressure has been added in regard to the maintenance issues. Taylor Wimpey has a responsibility not to add to the problem and the attenuation strategy will assist with alleviating the existing issues. However, the land is only a small part of the Stratford Brook catchment and a drain is only as good as its maintenance regime.
- **Response:** AP added that Taylor Wimpey will have that conversation with Highways England to find out more about their drainage strategy.
- RA commented to add that MA is correct regarding flooding at Ockham Park roundabout. Surrey County Council undertook works to. The other concern is that the waste from the development is likely to come to Ripley, where the treatment works are on a lane with quite restricted access. This presents an issue with the construction traffic there when works are undertaken, and also the issue of how extensive the works and whether Taylor Wimpey's funding will meet that cost in full.
- **Response:** PH responded that Thames Water is best placed to answer that – the responsibility lies with Thames for the infrastructure in Guildford Borough. The funding relates to that responsibility and Thames is aware the upgrades are needed. The only question relates to when it becomes necessary – and obviously Taylor Wimpey need it to be done in time for the development.
- EH added that you talk about maintenance as though it hasn't been done, when in fact last year, they lifted every cover along Ockham Lane and Ockham Road north, and we have still had the flooding problem. You are redirecting a lot of the flood water down to the Stratford Brook, but it is a brook and could not take anymore.
- **Response:** PH responded that the water is currently going into Stratford Brook as that is the lie of the land. Historically, sewers were constructed with surface water and foul drainage going to the same pipe. That changed 30-40 years ago, but the chances are that upstream there are surface water connections in that network, and we do not have any control over that. There is storm water getting into the foul sewer – that is what those residents' pictures show – but it is hard to pinpoint the source of that. Taylor Wimpey's role in helping this will only repair a small part of the problem as it extends beyond the site.
- AP asked EH if there is any available evidence which has or could be submitted to Surrey County Council to demonstrate that the recent repairs have not resolved the flooding issues in that area.
- LD added that the local pressure will be listened to within Surrey County Council, so Taylor Wimpey will look to restart the conversations around this drainage problem with the Council to add to that local pressure.

- MA noted that Church End still regularly floods and has been raised with Surrey County Council previously.
- **Response:** PH explained that anything on the other side of the Stratford Brook will not be affected by the development, but Taylor Wimpey will still raise it with the Council.
- HG added that it does prove the point that the amelioration of any flooding is only as good as the drain that is there and its maintenance, as the flooding at Church End happens regularly regardless of how often the drain is cleaned.
- MA commented that while the point about being the other side of the Stratford Brook is fine, the map shown has blue and pink showing risk areas and flood zones away from the former Wisley Airfield site itself so surely the reference to the other side of the Brook is not relevant.
- **Response:** AP suggested that the flood risk map is expanded to include Church End to see if the flooding is noted, and then any evidence from the locals can be taken back to Surrey County Council to demonstrate that the problem is not isolated.
- HG noted that Church End is a local name for Ockham Road north.
- **Response:** AP noted that and asked if HG could send through any evidence he has of the flooding, while PH reviews the existing records to see if the flooding is documented.
- MA added that the point was made about flood risk and wetspots being determined not just by the presence of water but the depth of it, so what is the depth to be logged? Surely the criteria is at least several inches deep, but even so the map shows no flooding on the Airfield which is not the case.
- **Response:** PH explained that the map is produced by the Environment Agency, and the areas in white could have sitting water but not be significant enough to be recorded on this map. It is based on computer modelling and deals with assumptions of what the ground is like, rather than being a reflective, detailed, topographical survey of what the land is like.
- MA commented that my experience is not based on a computer but walking across the Airfield.
- **Response:** AP added that the SuDS and other options which are currently being explored to respond to the ground contours could help with the land and sitting water.

- LD added that the key is “betterment” – whatever currently gathers on the site or runs off it will be reduced by the development due to the mitigation measures which will be provided.
- EH asked how much work is expected at Ripley with 4 or 5 thousand extra people using the sewage system.
- **Response:** LD responded that he cannot comment on Thames Water’s upgrade plans, but the incumbents are moving on to using more sustainable methods which might become part of the upgrade plan. As PH mentioned earlier, Taylor Wimpey will have to pay per unit for this upgrade to be provided.
- PBD commented that in West and East Horsley, there are around 400 new homes planned, which will go to the same sewage treatment works. After expressing concern, we have letters stating that the upgrades will require 3 years of planning and 5 years to implement. I appreciate it is a Thames Water problem but it needs considering.
- **Response:** PH explained that Thames Water will look to make the upgrades in time for when they are needed – so it will take 10 – 12 years to deliver all of the homes on this proposed site. So at the moment, Thames Water is forecasting and asking for phasing information from developers to find out when the upgrade will be required.
- MA asked if Taylor Wimpey has to tell Thames Water how many houses will be built, there is a plan spread out over the 15 years as to how many houses each year. Is that something you have had to give to Thames Water, and if so, is that something that can be made available to others?
- **Response:** AP replied that Taylor Wimpey is in the masterplan phase at the moment, and in regard to phasing, we know we will be working from west to east, probably around 150 homes per year subject to approval.
- **Response:** LD confirmed that, adding that 2000 homes cannot be installed immediately, which is where the phasing plan comes in. Placemaking triggers are then also built into that phasing plan. As an average, 150 houses a year is about right, but it will start off as far less when work first begins.
- SW commented that the same debate was had with him the previous evening with a developer looking to build at the end of Plough Lane, who also said that it was a Thames Water problem and that Thames Water had identified that surface water was going into the foul sewers. This suggests that this a problem spread across the area, not just around this site, which means Thames Water has a huge job. There are infrastructure delivery plans for Guildford, Elmbridge, and Spelthorne – but who brings this together? There must be a public body somewhere responsible for that.

- **Response:** LD - it is the local authority who bring it forward and establish it within their Infrastructure Plan. Guildford Borough Council would not have allowed this site within their Local Plan unless they had prepared a robust Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and that will apply to other local authorities as well. In terms of the application itself, Taylor Wimpey will submit a more detailed infrastructure plan for the site, along with triggers which will tie us into what needs to be delivered by when.
- AP added that Taylor Wimpey should go back and find out who governs Thames Water.
- PBD noted that when working on a Local Plan for East Horsley Parish Council, Thames Water had written to Guildford Borough Council but not undertaken any consultation – in reference to any site across the borough. Therefore, we cannot guarantee that Thames Water will have spoken extensively with Guildford Borough Council.
- **Response:** AP confirmed Taylor Wimpey would take note of that.
- AS added that Taylor Wimpey should note that the Guildford Sewage Plant is being moved as part of the Weyside development in your timescale. Thames Water seem to have a lot of work to do in the Guildford area – it might be worth getting the local authorities and Thames Water around the table to agree what needs to happen and when.
- **Response:** LD agreed and said it would be in Taylor Wimpey's interest to do that.
- PBD noted that the current Ripley treatment works might be in the Green Belt, which could affect any expansion.
- **Response:** LD explained that housing is treated differently to other works which fall within the Green Belt so it will be reviewed in a different way to housing proposals.
- AP introduced MA to discuss energy.
- MA explained that he works for Energist which is supporting Taylor Wimpey with the proposals around energy and sustainability for the site.
- MA noted that the new building regulations will come into force in the near future. A strategy is being drawn up to comply with these new regulations and also to consider LETI – the London Energy Transformation Initiative – which the development proposals will target compliance with.
- MA highlighted that the site is promoting sustainability, through initiatives such as a 'fabric first' approach which means that high-performance building fabrics will be used and that will reduce demand for energy for the buildings.

- MA explained that future-proofing will be important as well, utilising low and zero carbon systems and which technologies will work best on the scheme. This could be air source heat pumps, ground source heat pumps, or ambient loop heating systems, for example, along with examining individual and communal systems.
- MA noted that waste heat recovery systems are also being considered. Along with this, battery storage systems and PV arrays will be examined to find ways to reduce energy waste and ensure it is only used as required.
- AP noted that battery storage was mentioned in a previous Community Liaison Group meeting, which is why it is being explored further now.
- EH explained that heat pumps work for the first year and then absorb the heat from the land and lose efficiency. A lot of money will be invested in looking at hydrogen and other sources so he is sceptical about heat pumps.
- AS added that air source heat pumps have been mentioned as a possibility, but have visual constraints in terms of building design. Taylor Wimpey also needs to look at waste heat recovery systems in terms of design and the systems to run in the homes. AS suggested speaking to the Dunsfold development which is already running a PV array for the commercial properties there.
- **Response:** AP and LD thanked AS for the insight.
- CG noted that there is an air source heat pump on her home, which is fan-free and a thermodynamic panel, which has saved £500 on her energy bill this year, so there are some more attractive options on the market which could be considered in the design for these buildings.
- **Response:** LD added that a collective air source heat pump is also being considered, and the development is considering all technologies to see which works best for the site with the aim of being net zero carbon by 2050 as per the Government guidance. Options include a combined air source heat pump with pipes under the ground and a small facility serving a collection of housing, and different hydrogen systems. Hydrogen technologies are not quite there yet but are an option for the future.
- **Response:** AP added that CG's comment around the benefits of the technology for her home is valuable for future customers.
- CG asked what Taylor Wimpey's record is like around green energy, after finding a report for a site in Great Wakering on the feasibility of different technologies. That report settled on using a large amount of solar panels across the site but the homes do not look as if they have panels on them – have they been installed, or placed elsewhere?

- **Response:** LD noted that the development is from 2018 and a couple of hundred homes which would have been consented under a planning policy of 10% for PV panels so that would have been dotted around the site. For this proposed development, Taylor Wimpey is looking for every home and every commercial facility to achieve green status and is going above previous Taylor Wimpey schemes. The Government has a range of targets between now and net zero carbon in 2050, including new parts to the Building Regulations. Those updated Regulations will require higher levels of energy efficiency, plus there will be no new gas boilers in new homes from 2025, so new sources of heating need to be found. Outside London, where a heat network is in the ground and heat sources can be found in a variety of locations, developers are finding new and robust technologies to meet the targets.

### 3. Site Utilities

- AP discussed site utilities, noting that resident reports have suggested poor mobile phone signal at the site and emphasised the need for high-speed and reliable broadband – especially given the increase in home-working. AP asked if there is anything else Taylor Wimpey should be aware of or should explore in relation to this.
- AS noted that it might be worth peaking to University of Surrey as they are establishing a 6G research centre.
- AP asked what the internet is currently like for the site neighbours.
- EH explained that it varies depending on where you are.
- RA commented he gets 78mgb.
- MA noted that it depends how close you are to the fibre optic connection for internet, and in terms of phone signal Vodafone is the only one which just about works.
- RA explained that there is fibre in Ripley village and when you live close, the connection is good.

### 4. Community Liaison Group Actions & Outcomes

- AP explained that to demonstrate the Community Liaison Group is working, highlights from each meeting will be documented and talked through every three meetings to show actions taken.
- AP commented in meeting one, an update was asked for in terms of healthcare, and since then Taylor Wimpey has met with Guildford Borough Council, the CCG and the existing medical practices to see whether Guildford and the CCG would

support having a healthcare facility on the site. Guildford Borough Council is in favour, and it is noted in the Local Plan, but it will come down to the CCG. Conversations are still ongoing and the medical practices have been onsite.

- LD added that Taylor Wimpey support the provision of a healthcare facility.
- AP asked the Group to send through comments on what the facility should include to inform the ongoing conversations.
- AP continued to note the meeting which was held on infrastructure and utilities following a request, and the meeting on community integration and stewardship. AP noted that the meetings are currently anticipated to continue post-submission to discuss construction if permission is granted, and to keep the community well-informed as the application progresses.
- AP explained that the meeting with RHS Wisley and WAG regarding the stub road application was held, and there are further opportunities to continue these conversations if desired. In terms of establishing if these meetings are working, this feedback section is designed to demonstrate that.
- AP continued to explain that a meeting was held to answer questions on transport, with a future planned for early 2021 to discuss the transport proposal. The masterplan was published on the website following a request, and shared in the newsletter over the summer. A meeting was held about the planning process following a request from the Group. Further to this, and as outlined in the second round of consultation, the application is currently expected in the second quarter of 2021.
- AP explained that meeting topics are now shared in advance at the end of each meeting, following a request from the Group, and workshops were held on sustainability, SANG and landscaping. There was also feedback around respecting the character of Ockham Lane, so Taylor Wimpey has been exploring a deep buffer between the existing housing and proposed new homes to keep Ockham Lane feeling rural. If there is an opportunity to work more closely with RHS Wisley on this, it would be welcomed by Taylor Wimpey.
- AP continued to discuss the green areas which are proposed to separate the three villages within the emerging masterplan following suggestions by the Group.
- For meeting three, AP set out how the naming of the site will involve the Community Liaison Group attendees, and how the suggested commercial uses are being taken into consideration – and Taylor Wimpey continue to welcome suggestions for these.
- AP noted that the community land trust suggestion will be discussed in a separate future meeting with RA.

- RA commented that the Ripley Community Land Trust has been formed and is currently going through the registration processes.
- AP noted the local broadband infrastructure as the final point, which is why feedback was requested from site neighbours in relation to the existing broadband. AP added that he hopes this demonstrates that Taylor Wimpey is listening and acting on the comments received, either by feeding back to local authorities or through further individual meetings.
- LP added that there is a missing action about the Surrey Chamber of Commerce noting that advertising should take place for businesses to get involved in the delivery of the site in the early stages.
- EH commented that the way these consultation meetings are held and perceived by the community has led to cynicism about the whole process mainly because they have to submit questions. There have been several instances where representatives of the area submitted several questions, none of which were answered. There are several things missed off this list as well, and I understand you could not mention everything but for example, I feel strongly about the fence bordering the site and the need for self-closing gates to protect the SSSI.
- **Response:** AP explained that that was raised in Community Liaison Group meeting four, so it will be discussed in the minutes for that meeting and recorded in the future actions and outcomes.

- AP thanked the group for their comments, particularly around the public consultation, and for sharing the invitation with their group members. AP explained that the reason for the managed Q&A during the consultation events is to ensure that questions are answered from a variety of individuals and across a range of topics, rather than focusing on one individual or topic. AP noted that that on 27<sup>th</sup> November, a full Q&A document will be published on the website answering all of the questions raised during both consultation events.
- MA commented that it is great to see Effingham Residents Association join the group, but can you explain why Ockham and Hatchford Residents Association were refused permission.
- **Response:** AP said that was not the case – they have been offered a place on the group and have yet to accept.
- Next meeting date – Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> December 2020
- Topic – Community Infrastructure, Consultation Feedback, and Planning Update.

**AP closed the meeting at 6:30pm.**