



Taylor Wimpey - Former Wisley Airfield

Community Liaison Group – Meeting Minutes – Thursday 10th
December 2020

Masterplan and Consultation Update, Community Infrastructure, and Site Naming
Strategy

Date: Thursday 10th December 2020

Time: 5:00pm – 6:30pm

Venue: Zoom

Project Team:

- Antonis Pazourou (AP) – Taylor Wimpey
- Lee Davis (LD) – Taylor Wimpey
- Camille Soor (CS) – Taylor Wimpey
- Katy Bennett (KB) – Cratus Communications
- Julian Seymour (JS) – Cratus Communications

Group Members:

- DA – RHS Wisley
- MA – Ockham Parish Council
- Richard Ayears (RA) – Ripley Parish Council
- NB – Guildford Bike Users Group
- Colin Cross (CC) – Guildford Borough Councillor, Lovelace Ward
- Clare Goodall (CG) – East Clandon Parish Council
- Hugh Grear (HG) – Ockham Parish Church
- Euan Harkness (EH) – Wisley Action Group
- MO – West Horsley Parish Council
- KP – Ockham and Hatchford Residents Association
- FP – Elm Corner Residents
- AS – Guildford Society
- IS – Effingham Residents Association
- RT – East Horsley Parish Council
- Steven Wood (SW) – Cobham and Downside Residents Association

Apologies:

- Alex Beames (AB) – Send Parish Council
- CD – West Clandon Parish Council
- Basil Minor (BM) – Guildford Ramblers
- LP – Surrey Chamber of Commerce
- KT – Enterprise M3

1. Introductions

- AP introduced the topic for the meeting: Masterplan and Consultation Feedback and Community Infrastructure, followed by Site Naming. AP discussed the agenda for the meeting.
- KB took a roll call of attendees.

2. Masterplan and Consultation Feedback

- AP noted that the masterplan has evolved since the previous consultation as a result of feedback and is expected to evolve further following this round of consultation.
- MA asked if it would be possible to date the masterplans, so everyone knows if they are viewing the most recent version?
- **Response:** AP confirmed that that could be done and would refer to the previous map as Revision 0, and the latest update as Revision 1. AP confirmed that the plan shown is the latest version as discussed in the November consultation.
- AP highlighted how the potential Wisley Lane diversion was a key topic previously, and although the decision from the Secretary of State is not expected until January, Taylor Wimpey is looking to work with RHS Wisley on the look and feel of the road if approved.
- AP noted that allotments have been mentioned by the community previously, and are included in this plan, along with sports facilities as also mentioned by the community.
- AP talked through the plan, noting how comments about opening up the Village Green to the views of the Surrey Hills to the south have been included in this design.
- AP noted how flooding around the Stratford Brook was mentioned by neighbours, leading to the team designing a raised boardwalk to ensure the area is useable throughout the year.
- AP commented on swales and ponds looking to retain surface water run-off from the site and asked FP if she could add a bit of detail about where her videos provided to the team were taken.

- FP explained that the first video was in Elm Corner where the road bends and led down from the video with the water under a gate which is on the footpath onto the Wisley Airfield from Elm Corner, with the final video of the field behind that gate.
- AP added that those videos have been shared with Phil Hurst, the flooding consultant, and thanked FP and MA for sharing their evidence.
- FP added that the Airfield gates at Elm Corner have flooded into the nearby woods, and this is an issue every year.
- **Response:** AP thanked FP and noted that Phil is reviewing all of this as part of the flooding strategy.
- KP asked what assessments have been made about the visual impact of the high rise buildings that will have on Ockham? KP said that the current framework masterplan shows high density and we need to know what the visual impact will be on Ockham.
- **Response:** AP explained that as a result of feedback, the density will be spread with lower density around the periphery of the site and the highest density in the centre. The topography of the site, and in particular the hill, have been taken into account to ensure the density and height of the buildings works with the lie of the land. The architects are currently assessing the visual impact.
- **Response:** CS added that parameter plans will be submitted with the outline application. The plans will consider the heights, blocking and the parameters of the built development under the outline application. Each parcel then comes forward in detail under the Reserved Matter applications.
- **Response:** CS explained that there will not be any high-rise buildings on the site – most will be 2-3 storeys, with some 4 storeys.
- AP continued to explain the since the first consultation, the Neighbourhood Centre has been discussed using the community feedback. This feedback strongly recommended the school (currently planned to be nursery, primary and secondary but dependent on Surrey County Council's requirements) is placed at the heart of the Neighbourhood Centre. Cycle and pedestrian routes will then support access to and from this Centre to the existing communities to support community integration.
- AP commented on how conversations are ongoing with Guildford Borough Council about the southern SANG and how it can connect into existing routes to provide circular walks. AP noted that some of the southern part of the site is owned by third-party landowners and Taylor Wimpey is in regular contact with their representatives about the proposed masterplan.

- AP highlighted how a green corridor buffer is proposed along Ockham Lane to ensure the development is set back from the road and is low-density..
- AP asked the group for their thoughts on this updated emerging masterplan.
- NB mentioned the possible 'cycle superhighway' beside the A3, which would open up a route towards Cobham for the site. Could a reference to that proposed route be included?
- **Response:** AP explained that Taylor Wimpey met with Cobham Heritage who raised the same point, and the importance of a bus link to Cobham was raised in the first consultation event. Both options are being explored and considered.
- NB asked if the route of the Hatch Lane bridleway across the site will be preserved.
- **Response:** LD confirmed it will be preserved, along with the public rights of way across the site. LD noted that with permission, these existing routes through the site will be upgraded as well.
- NB highlighted the Hyde Lane and Ockham Lane joining section, which is continuously waterlogged.
- **Response:** LD noted that the team is looking at onsite drainage, swales and SuDS to achieve a 'betterment' for site run-off rates, so the area should be less flooded and waterlogged than at present.
- KP asked what planet the team is on to think that they can have cars, cycle ways and buses along the existing roads. KP said Taylor Wimpey would be causing deaths as it is already very dangerous without 10,000 + cyclists, cars and buses plus deliveries. Surrey County Council is aware of the dangers of Old Lane already, so buses every 7 minutes, with cars, lorries and deliveries will make it miserable for existing residents. Buses early in the morning and late at night will shatter my sleep.
- **Response:** CS explained that the transport model will come first – hopefully in January. The transport model then informs the Environmental Impact Assessment and resulting Environmental Statement which looks at noise, air quality, visual impact, and pollution. This Statement is then included in the application.
- **Response:** LD added that any intervention on the highway requires two road safety audits which examine the safety of proposed changes.
- KP asked if the team is proposing changing to existing roads.
- **Response:** LD explained that two accesses into the site need to be created and that may require some work to the existing roads.

- KP asked if this meant Taylor Wimpey would look to take parts of their properties.
- **Response:** LD confirmed that is not the case.
- EH said that there would be a lot of time in the future spent on transport, but it is important to note that there are few families or young people cycling in the area as it is dangerous.
- **Response:** LD noted EH's comment, and confirmed that when the assessments take place, only options which are safe and feasible will be included in the final masterplan.
- **Response:** AP added that as shown in the community consultation, some of the possible cycle routes are off-carriage and segregated as well as on-carriage, so these options will all be considered once the transport model comes back to determine which routes are realistic for the masterplan.
- **Response:** CS added that the consultant team is looking at creative ways to make it possible for young people and families to cycle safely around the proposed development.
- NB noted the Guildford Bike Users Group would like to see a legacy of improved cycling in the area if possible as a result of the development. NB agreed that the cycling provision within the site looks good for encourage cycling, but the off-site provision connecting the existing communities needs to be safe to ensure use.
- KP said this is green belt land, so even though the site has been taken out of the green belt, there is no opportunity to add streetlights and infrastructure for families to cycle safely.
- NB said KP may be right but is pre-judging the situation. NB added that it is possible to cycle on these roads, but it would not be safe during rush hour as it currently is.
- **Response:** CS added that it is Taylor Wimpey's aspiration to make the off-site cycling safer if it is possible to do so.
- MA said that the point about it not being safe in rush hour is critical, as commuters will need to go to Horsley and Effingham stations – but to expect them to cycle there is very unlikely. It would require floodlighting of the roads or it would be inconceivable that anyone would use it.
- NB said MA may be correct but it should be looked at.
- HG agreed that cycling onsite could work very well, but the off-site routes are very dangerous, particularly along Ockham Lane and Old Lane. To make these routes safe for families would require huge changes.

- SW noted that routes to and from Cobham have been mentioned a few times, and there are several notes on the draft plan showing routes along Ockham Lane and Plough Lane for buses and cyclists. Plough Lane in particular is very unsuitable for buses and cyclists so that should really be removed from the proposed plans. Secondly, green villages like this embed car use as people cannot commute by bicycle to work, stations or the shops they need which adds to the dangers on the road by adding cars and making the routes busier.
- **Response:** AP explained that that is why sustainable transport is ingrained in the design, with bus stops in walking distance from everyone's properties, zip cars, cycle routes and e-bikes, and parking located to the rear of the plots with cycle storage at the front. All of this is designed to help people to make smarter choices and make it easier to choose sustainable travel.
- SW said people will still need to leave the site for things such as shopping, even with a Neighbourhood Centre.
- MA said that there was a reference to Hyde Lane and the muddy track but that it is not part of the site – it is privately owned. What are you proposing to do with it?
- **Response:** LD said if the owner does not want any work done to it, no work will be done. Taylor Wimpey would be willing to help if the owner wanted it, but not unless it was agreed.
- FP asked about the bridleways, noting that both bridleways from Elm Corner gates and Snakes Fields are mapped to go past the sports pitches and school playing fields respectively which is a lot of potential noise for horses and riders when this has been a quiet bridleway previously. It also seems that a bridleway goes through the middle of the Neighbourhood Centre with buses and cycle routes around it is as well which is a potential concern.
- **Response:** CS said the Taylor Wimpey team would take that away for consideration.
- FP added that there are concerns as well when discussing a possible school on the site, as that will add more traffic to the roads heading towards the site.
- MA agreed with FP's query about the bridleway, noting that previously a rider from his yard encountered the archaeologists onsite near the airstrip.
- **Response:** AP confirmed Taylor Wimpey would take those comments back to the wider team.
- HG asked if there would be cyclist access to Ockham Lane from the site.

- **Response:** LD noted that the only vehicle access from Taylor Wimpey's part of the site onto the existing roads is the east and west entry points. From the southern part of the site, where the third-party land is, there is an access onto the existing road but only for a small number of properties. This is in line with the Guildford Borough Council's policy.
- **Response:** AP added that that would not be a through-route but would be for those properties only.
- HG asked if there was access from those properties by the other developer into the main Taylor Wimpey site.
- **Response:** LD explained that the only link between the third-party land and Taylor Wimpey land is pedestrian and cycle, so cars will not be able to access Ockham Lane from the Taylor Wimpey site through that third party land.
- EH asked that if the development could take 15 years, what is the noise level going to be as a result of the construction?
- **Response:** LD agreed that if approved, there will be some construction noise but Taylor Wimpey will use limited suppressors on the equipment to help that and no generators onsite.
- KP asked if the team meant a 10-year period.
- **Response:** LD said it would be 10-12 years, give or take.
- KP said that would make it blight for the neighbouring properties to live with noise for that long.
- **Response:** CS said that that point had been discussed previously with KP offline, and it was not the topic of today's meeting. Taylor Wimpey do not agree that there will be blight.
- KP asked for it to be minuted that she thinks it will be blight.
- **Response:** CS added that the construction noise will also be assessed through the Environmental Impact Assessment.
- CC asked about the access shown along Hatch Lane, which is an unmade dirt track which is narrow, steep, and dangerous. CC asked if it is still the plan for this to be used as the main access for pedestrians, cyclists, and all traffic except cars. At the bottom of that road is a hamlet of houses who will be subject to hundreds of walkers and cyclists each day on a road with no pavement.

- **Response:** CS explained that this is what the transport model is looking at – what is deliverable and safe, and what needs to be done to make potential routes safe and deliverable.
- **Response:** LD added that it is a bridleway so there is a limited amount that can be done as it will be maintained.
- MA added that there are some houses along Hatch Lane as well, which means that there are cars and refuse lorries using the road.
- **Response:** AP thanked the group for their comments and noted that these would all be fed back and addressed in a post-meeting note or in the transport CLG in early 2021.

3. Community Infrastructure

- CS explained that the Design Review Panel has asked Taylor Wimpey to look at the integration between the existing communities and proposed new community, and this builds on the community stewardship and legacy discussion from a previous CLG.
- CS talked through the Policy A35 allocation for commercial uses, noting that the team is pushing to increase the community use to 1500 sq m from 500 sq m, and to lessen the amount of comparison retail in favour of increased convenience retail.
- CG noted that although she is familiar in thinking about area, it is hard to measure that in terms of retail space based on sq m.
- **Response:** CS explained that the 600 sq m of convenience retail is about the size of a Tesco Express or Sainsbury's Local, and 550 sq m of other retail uses is likely to be about 5-8 units. CS added that hearing the group's views on what could potentially work is part of the reason for including this topic in today's meeting.
- CS explained that the socio-economic team has looked into what is provided in the local area in terms of services and facilities. The data shows pubs, cafes and outdoor sport space so now the team want to understand what could complement the existing offer, rather than competing with the other local centres.
- CS continued to show the areas where there are potential gaps – things such as Multi Use Games Areas (MUGAs), table tennis and 5-a-side.
- IS asked why Effingham is not included in the analysis of neighbouring communities.
- **Response:** CS said she would get Effingham added into the analysis.

- CS noted that this was conducted as a desktop exercise due to Covid-19. CS added that a GP surgery and health/pharmacy services has been mentioned previously, and Taylor Wimpey is in touch with the Clinical Commissioning Group about this already and has been asked to provide data to understand which doctor's surgeries residents might use. Taylor Wimpey is working with them to understand if an onsite facility is possible – which is the team's preferred option.
- MA asked how can you come up with an e-forecast as to where the residents will go?
- **Response:** CS explained that a tool called Mosaic is used, which gives understandings of demographics and travel patterns and can provide this as a starting point.
- MA added that the locals have a lot of scepticism about models and desktop research and do not want to see them relied upon as fact.
- AP added that a lot of the spaces are being considered in terms of how they can be multi-functional and provide a variety of uses for different people.
- IS said he was surprised that Effingham and Bookham are not included in this research, given that there are secondary schools in the area.
- **Response:** CS agreed Effingham and Bookham would be included and an updated version would be shared in a future CLG.
- CC said that there is a gap between proposed educational facilities, going from nursery to primary and missing pre-school.
- **Response:** CS explained that the pre-school would fall under the nursery – there could potentially be one private nursery and one maintained nursery as part of the primary school.
- CC added that for the research exercise, both nurseries and pre-schools need to be looked at, as for example in Ripley, there is a pre-school but no nursery.
- EH asked if the team can be categorical that there will be a GP surgery.
- **Response:** CS said that the team would love to be able to guarantee that, but the decision is with the Clinical Commissioning Group. Taylor Wimpey is doing what it can to get a GP surgery on site, but the approximate population for the proposed site sits below 5000 people which is the threshold for beginning to consider a new surgery on a new development.
- KP asked the team to be mindful of not speaking as if they already have planning permission.

- **Response:** The team agreed.
- CS continued to explain that the proposal is to have a GP surgery, but the decision is with the Clinical Commissioning Group.
- AP added that the team has been meeting with the existing medical practices to discuss potential local need.
- KP said that the local GP surgery told her that the conversation with Taylor Wimpey was presented as if the site had been given planning permission.
- **Response:** AP explained that the meetings with the GP surgeries have been taking place with the Clinical Commissioning Group and officers from Guildford Borough Council in attendance.
- KP asked if there will be minutes of these meetings with Guildford Borough Council because it sounds as if Guildford Borough Council is in favour of these proposals to have a GP surgery onsite and therefore is a *fait accompli*.
- **Response:** AP noted that healthcare is included in the Local Plan.
- CC added that it is not in Guildford Borough Council's gift to create GP surgeries.
- **Response:** The team agreed, and AP explained that the Council attends the meeting to ensure discussions are collaborative.
- KP asked the team to assess what traffic the retail would create as part of the transport assessment.
- **Response:** The team confirmed that would form part of the transport assessment.
- DA noted that the outdoor Wisley sports facilities are private, and there are no indoor sports facilities.
- SW asked what Cobham Medical Centre said about the requirement for a GP surgery at the proposed development.
- **Response:** AP explained that the team asked the medical practice for a meeting but it has not yet happened, but Elmbridge Borough Council is now meeting with them to discuss it further. AP invited SW to speak to the Cobham Medical Practice about setting up a meeting.
- SW agreed that he would assist if he could, and noted that despite the fact that the predicted potential population for the site is less than 5000, there is an excess of people already in the area for the existing surgeries so that should also be taken into account.

- CC added that there is no library in Ripley.

4. Site Naming Strategy

- AP explained that in a previous CLG, it was suggested that the team start to look at naming parts of the site.
- KP said that was premature, and things such as transport and infrastructure should be addressed instead.
- **Response:** AP explained that this was brought up in an earlier meeting with Guildford Borough Council as well.
- KP asked if there were minutes of the meeting where Guildford Borough Council suggested names of the site.
- **Response:** AP explained that the Council was not recommending names, but building on comments made in the last Design Review Panel which recommended a richer sense of place and to begin thinking about character and legacy. As a result, the CLG will be given the opportunity to look at ways to give the masterplan more of an identity.
- KB explained that this was mentioned in a previous CLG and some suggestions have been submitted on the back of that and logged.
- KB continued to explain how the team will be asking anyone they engage with to think about ideas for the proposed development, or roads, or the three villages. KB added that these suggestions could be linked to the heritage of the site, or be connected to its airfield history, as an example.
- KB explained that these names would then be gathered into a shortlist by Taylor Wimpey and put back to the CLG for them to vote on the final name.
- KP said that it was insulting to not give detail on transport, biodiversity, or noise, but to name the site.
- CC added that the meetings with Guildford Borough Council did not include councillors.
- KP said the team need to be more careful that this is not presented as a *fait accompli*.
- **Response:** AP agreed and said these conversations are pre-application discussions based upon set topics.

- **Response:** CS added that the officers do not include councillors in the meetings – it is the planning team and the urban designer, along with external consultants advising on specific topics.
- AP asked the group if they had any topics they would like to propose for January, whilst noting that the team knows we are due to hold further meetings on transport and design once those details are available.
- MO said that topics mentioned previously have been covered, but design is the outstanding one. Until that meeting, topics such as retail, employment, healthcare, education, sports could be discussed further.
- **Response:** AP thanked MO for the feedback.
- NB asked if there would be a transport CLG.
- **Response:** AP explained that there was an introduction to transport meeting, and as soon as the transport model is available, a CLG will be scheduled to discuss it.
- **Response:** LD noted that the model is expected at the end of January next year.
- AS added that the decision may have been made on the A3/M25 junction proposal by then as well.
- DA said that 12th January is the backstop deadline for the Secretary of State, but does not include the consent period for Balfour Beatty or the judicial review period so if those things get extended, the decision could not be due until March.
- MA said that a lot of topics have been covered but they have raised questions. The Q&A summary from the Neighbourhood Discussion Meeting has questions to which you could not provide answers. MA acknowledged that it understands it takes time, but the questions are clear so maybe come back to us once you have answers.
- **Response:** AP said the team would take that away, but do want to keep the line of communication open.
- KP said residents are most interested in transport.
- **Response:** AP agreed it is an important topic which is why a meeting will be held once the model is available.
- KP said the team was taking away significant issues rather than providing answers, whilst residents cannot let or sell properties.
- **Response:** AP explained that the team cannot change the timeframes on the model.

- **Response:** LD explained that the existing data from Highways England, Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council is very out of date, so Taylor Wimpey is funding the production of a new model to find out exactly what the existing problems are and what is a realistic proposal for the proposed development. Producing this model is very time-intensive and therefore it will not be available until the end of January.
- CC added that he appreciates Taylor Wimpey spending the time and money on a new survey as it is vital for the scheme.
- **Response:** LD explained that the team is going through different survey models to ensure the data is solid and to find out if there are problems which can be fixed.
- KP asked if the team will be factoring in moving houses away from the roads.
- **Response:** LD explained that this meeting is for the masterplan, not individual properties.
- KP said some properties will be blighted if this development goes ahead, and she will not get any sleep if a bus goes past her house 7 days a week from 5/6am until 12am. KP added that these are Ockham brick properties with single glazing and every time a car goes past the foundations shake.
- AP noted that the team will soon be carrying out targeted stakeholder engagement for the Ripley Study and potential mitigation methods with groups such as Parish Councils. AP asked for any information or feedback on this to be provided to the elected representatives, and invites will go out in the next few days.

- Next meeting date – Thursday 14th January 2021
- Topic TBC.

AP closed the meeting at 6:40pm.

Meeting Chat Record

KP: What assessments have been made about the visual impact of the high-rise buildings that will have on Ockham?

KP: The person who wanted allotments lived in Clandon. Locals prefer the existing agricultural land. Please minute this.

KP: Well, if additional run off occurs in Elm corner from building over this land Taylor Wimpey will be liable.

KP: When you cover the whole area with houses additional land will flood.

KP: Is that not the wrong way round?

KP: That is very late in the day! This should not be a reserved matter!

KP: Two to three storey buildings will be highly visible from Ockham - a complete eye sore in fact.

KP: What assessments have you made of the noise from the school?

NB: Will Hatch Lane bridleway across site be preserved?

KP: The light pollution will kill every view in Ockham. What assessment has been made of this?

KP: You are never clear on any detail which affects existing 18th century Ockham.

KP: You do not own the cycle ways?

KP: No one in Ockham wants a bus link 7 days a week starting early in the morning and going onto late into the night, how will you compensate the residents who are close to the road getting no sleep.

KP: You will be creating run off with all your housing.

RT: Sorry, but neither Old Lane nor Ockham Road North are wide enough to take an on-carriage cycle lane.

AS: There are new DFT standards for cycle tracks on roads etc see <https://www.guildfordsociety.org.uk/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-1-20.pdf>

KP: There will be deaths if you allow people to cycle on these roads.

KP: The weekend cyclists will not be able operate if there are buses on the weekend.

KP: Plough Lane is too narrow for buses.

AS: Remember people coming into the site especially the children at the school.

KP: The site is landlocked.

KP: What about all the deliveries to 10,000 people?

KP: Absolutely!!

KP: We don't want buses on the roads.

KP: Buses are inconsistent with cycle routes?

KP: Existing residents were quite happy as they were, thank you.

KP: Deliveries!

KP: The additional traffic will be cause death with the equestrian users too. We have two existing liveries in the area.

KP: This is rural environment you will be driving out existing business.

KP: How will cyclists exist beside the buses?

DA: The RHS is concerned to see cycle access to Wisley Garden and Village improved too - can we have a separate group to discuss this?

KP: It is a terrifying prospect to think about cyclists on Ockham Lane.

KP: Can you show us what you mean on the plan?

DA: There are good NMU provisions in the Highways England proposals - if they are approved.

AS: TW need to look at the latest JCB kit which is electrical rather than diesel power.

KP: Any retail use increases traffic – what kind of numbers of traffic will this extra retail space create? I think we have established that we need less traffic generated in this area not 10,000 residents and more shoppers generated by this retail space. Your plan is flawed. Please minute this.

KP: The local roads do not support any extra retail space.

DA: Camille, the Wisley Village sports facilities are not routinely in use, so please do not assume so.

KP: Most people in the area are more interested in biodiversity not shopping.

DA: Can I also suggest you include allotments in this review of local facilities?

RT: Can we see the analysis of which medical centres around the area the new residents will be most likely to go to.

CG: Got to leave now, but thank you everyone. When is the next meeting by the way?

KB: Hi Clare, next meeting is 14th Jan I believe.

CG: Thank you, see you then!

Taylor
Wimpey

CS: Thank you Clare

NB: Bye everyone!

AS: Sorry I have to leave - Happy Christmas and keep safe