



Taylor Wimpey - Former Wisley Airfield

Community Liaison Group – Meeting Minutes – Thursday 25th
February 2021

Q&A

Date: Thursday 25th February 2021

Time: 5:00pm – 6:30pm

Venue: Zoom

Project Team:

- Antonis Pazourou (AP) – Taylor Wimpey
- Camille Soor (CS) – Taylor Wimpey
- Katy Bennett (KB) – Cratus Communications

Group Members:

- DA – RHS Wisley
- MA – Ockham Parish Council
- Colin Cross (CC) – Guildford Borough Councillor, Lovelace Ward and Ripley Parish Council
- Euan Harkness (EH) – Wisley Action Group
- Basil Minor (BM) – Guildford Ramblers
- MO – West Horsley Parish Council
- FP – Elm Corner Residents
- LP – Surrey Chamber of Commerce
- Robert Taylor (RT) – East Horsley Parish Council
- IW – Ockham Parish Church
- Steven Wood (SW) – Cobham and Downside Residents Association

Apologies:

- Richard Ayears (RA) – Ripley Parish Council
- Alex Beames (AB) – Send Parish Council
- CD – West Clandon Parish Council
- Doug Clare (DC) – Guildford Bike Users Group
- Clare Goodall (CG) – East Clandon Parish Council
- HG – Ockham Parish Church
- AS – Guildford Society
- IS – Effingham Residents Association
- KT – Enterprise M3

1. Introductions

- AP introduced the topic for the meeting: Q&A.
- KB took a roll call of attendees.

2. Q&A

- KB explained the colour coding – green relates to a query answered during the meeting or action taken, orange refers to new updates or outstanding actions to be followed up, and red means an update is still to come.
- MA noted that it is one interpretation of the actions, and some might disagree that the questions have been answered.
- CS agreed, and said it is an illustrative work in progress which can be updated further.
- MA suggested an additional colour is added for an action which has been carried out but resulted in further actions to be followed up.
- EH suggested turning any green items to yellow if further comments are required/requested.
- AP confirmed EH suggestion would be moved forward on further reviews.

3. Q&A

- CS explained that Taylor Wimpey is still in discussion with the Clinical Commissioning Group regarding the potential for a doctor's surgery site. The team has also met with Send Medical Practice, and CS confirmed that Cobham Medical Practice will liaise directly with Elmbridge Borough Council on comments, but our offer of a meeting still stands if they want it. The Clinical Commissioning Group is currently discussing with the three closest medical practices to see what would be the most beneficial if the scheme were to go ahead – a new surgery onsite or a S106 contribution. This information is fed into a demand/capacity analysis.
- EH asked if the team has given up having a surgery on site.
- **Response:** CS said no, that would still be Taylor Wimpey's preference and the preference of Guildford Borough Council. CS noted that the team has a good relationship with Horsley Medical Practice who are also keen to see something onsite.

- RT noted that it seems to be the preference of Taylor Wimpey and everyone else in the area to have one, except the medical authority.
- **Response:** CS explained that the Clinical Commissioning Group understand why it would be helpful, but they have a process to go through and that is why this demand/capacity report is required.
- **Response:** AP noted that a place has been allocated for the surgery within the masterplan as it is Taylor Wimpey's aspiration to have one on site. The decision, however, is up to the Clinical Commissioning Group.
- SW asked who is doing the demand/capacity analysis?
- **Response:** CS said Surrey Heartlands Clinical Commissioning Group is doing the analysis.
- CC noted that the long-term view seems to be to close down police stations and surgeries rather than open new ones.
- **Response:** CS explained that the Clinical Commissioning Group could also decide to request a financial contribution through a S106 Agreement and use that to expand existing facilities instead.
- EH asked if new staff would be required for that option as well.
- **Response:** CS said it is possible the surgeries would need more doctors to staff an expansion of an existing facility.
- SW asked if Elmbridge Borough Council has provided any comments from Cobham Medical Centre.
- **Response:** CS said they have not yet had any comments and understandably the practice is currently busy with its vaccination schedule. CS to check with Elmbridge Borough Council.
- **Response:** AP noted that CLG members have also kindly tried to help make contact with the practice however there has been no response to date.
- CC noted that the surgery would not come in the first part of the build if the site were consented, so the CLG could help to apply pressure at the right time.
- AP explained that further conversations with Surrey County Council are underway regarding bus routes. Further to this, Taylor Wimpey would like to hold a transport CLG to discuss transport and include bus routes within the transport topic in March hopefully.

- AP said when it comes to car sharing, the previous design CLG should have helped to explain how sustainable modes of transport will be built into the masterplan as explained by the masterplanning architect. Mode sharing/car sharing will be explored by engaging with companies such as Enterprise, to see if that can complement the sustainable transport vision for the proposed site.
- MA said it would be very difficult to be persuasive on this before the event, as it can be set up and people can be encouraged to do it, but the sceptics will not believe it unless it actually happens. MA added that he is unclear how any evidence of this being possible can be provided within the planning application.
- **Response:** AP agreed that it is a change from conventional development, but the team does have professionals in place who can add value and demonstrate how it has worked elsewhere. Hopefully through some examples such as bus services, segregated walking and cycle routes and a car share service, the sustainable vision can be achieved.
- EH said that it is more of a convenient vision that a practical vision, as people have different priorities and schedules. EH asked for examples of other sites where this has worked.
- **Response:** AP agreed that these examples will be shared at the transport CLG and added that within the marketing literature for the site, should it go ahead, there will be a focus on ensuring that potential residents buy into the whole vision for the site including their options for alternative modes of transport beyond their car.
- **Response:** CS added that when it comes to seeing if it works, the team would ensure that there is a monitor and manage system within the S106 for Taylor Wimpey and Guildford Borough Council to gather data and assess the success. The build period could be between 10-12 years, so this will allow the team to adapt to what is working and adjust plans accordingly to meet demand.
- **Response:** AP added that the community trust will also be involved in monitoring and managing how the residents live on the site and keep sustainability central within that.
- MA said that in the first year, 150 homes could be built. Bikes and car shares may not be used within that year. Does that mean that if those things are not used, you will stop building houses?
- **Response:** AP explained that within the first parcel, the parameters for the modes of transport will be set – such as the segregation of the main spine road. The S106 and Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set timescales for sustainable transport methods to come forward and be monitored.
- CC added that it comes across as if onsite and offsite traffic is being mixed – some things onsite can be done as you set out, but the offsite options are very different.

It is impractical to do the things you mention offsite, as the roads are narrow and dangerous for cycling.

- **Response:** AP said that this is why the transport CLG is so important, hopefully in the middle of March. AP added that Taylor Wimpey has not been in a position to share the design proposals to date and recognises how important it is to discuss the offsite cycle strategy with the CLG, along with the bus routes, amongst other elements of the proposals.
- EH said what it comes down to is that the proposals for the area are just too big for the existing area.
- **Response:** CS said EH's comment is noted, but that is where the Infrastructure Delivery Plan comes in – to provide the correct mitigation of impact at the right time. Hopefully the transport CLG will provide more information about that offsite mitigation for the Group, and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will then be discussed in more detail closer to the application submission date.
- SW asked if the information provided to Surrey County Council included bus routes, and whether those routes were specific.
- **Response:** AP said yes, the routes are with Surrey County Council for consideration based on feedback from consultation events and the policy requirements set out by Guildford Borough Council.
- SW asked what the rationale is for the route to the site from Cobham?
- **Response:** AP explained that when examining the surrounding communities' offer, such as shops and amenities, Cobham came top of the list in terms of this in the local area. Additionally, in the first consultation, residents asked for the bus route to include Cobham.
- EH asked for DA's view on Junction 10 and the A3.
- DA explained that everything is yet to be decided as the decision has been deferred. It will affect the RHS, the proposed development and the current stub road and enabling works applications. DA asked Taylor Wimpey what will happen to those live applications now?
- **Response:** CS explained that the two applications are the enabling works for the SANG, and the stub road application. The enabling works application is separate from the stub road and the DCO decision, and the team would like a decision as soon as possible to allow them to carry out the work with Natural England. Discussion with Guildford Borough Council about the best time to hear the Stub Road application is ongoing and whether it should be before or after the DCO decision. CS noted that either way, the consent would still have a Grampian condition – which means that consent could not be implemented until the DCO is

implemented. This could mean, for example, the application could be consented but no work could be done until the DCO decision is made. This protects everybody, making sure there is not a roundabout in the middle of nowhere. The stub road work would always come after the DCO. CS added that the Environmental Statement for the enabling works is with Guildford Borough Council's environmental consultant, and comments are due back in the next week.

- **Response:** AP added that the application was only submitted because of Highways England's build programme – to ensure that Taylor Wimpey was proactive should the DCO works be approved. These applications provide an opportunity to coordinate works.
- CC said the correspondence from RHS Wisley, Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council is troubling as it says that this decision is outside the local authorities. Therefore, unless Highways England makes the right decision about the A3 and Wisley connection, it could affect everyone in the local area, including this proposed development. We must get some leverage on Highways England to come to a sensible decision and stop talking about the Burnt Common slips which are largely irrelevant.
- **Response:** AP said that there is a separate discussion to have around the Burnt Common slips. For now, the DCO is with the Secretary of State and only once that decision is reached will we know what work is or is not going ahead.
- DA said that this is true, but RHS Wisley has made the point that if the DCO is approved, and the stub road and SANG works go ahead, the increase in construction traffic from that – bar the flood scheme – around the RHS Wisley is horrifying. Materials being moved out of the site and transported on the highway network could throttle the local traffic. The applications therefore cause some concern, as there is a strong element of prematurity regardless of the fact that it has to tie into the DCO decision. The RHS would have preferred to have seen one complete application in the summer, with those two applications forming part of the overall planning application.
- **Response:** AP explained that the reason for submitting the application now is to ensure that Highways England do not complete the diversion route and then Taylor Wimpey come to the site next and start digging up the completed road.
- DA said the RHS would like the Secretary of State to go back and consider the alternative route.
- **Response:** AP said Taylor Wimpey understands that position, but the DCO is out of our hands – part of the land with the DCO works is being compulsory purchased.

- DA said the Lovelace ward should be concerned about the impact of the construction traffic, and the transport model has been delayed. DA said he would like to see a construction traffic management plan as well.
- **Response:** AP confirmed that the Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted with both applications.
- DA said that the plan cannot anticipate the DCO, and therefore supports the view that the application is premature.
- **Response:** AP suggested that DA reviews the plans and speaks to AP and CS with any comments or concerns, as it is important to keep that line of communication open.
- DA agreed that it is important and noted that the RHS has had good meetings with the team regarding Wisley Lane and landscaping which are very constructive – but at these forums, it is important to express the stance.
- FP added that with regard to the enabling works application, a lot of residents feel that it is premature, and you could lose any small amounts of trust you have gained so far.
- **Response:** CS explained that this application has been submitted now to work towards the land forming works to assist with the timing of SANG being open upon first occupation – and that the SANG will be for all locals to use, not just new residents. CS added that it is very important that the site is set up with community assets early on, and that requires early enabling works.
- FP said she understands the point, but as there is no planning permission, you could start the SANG work, ruining that area for the residents who live here at the moment, and then not get permission.
- **Response:** CS said she can understand the point but hopes the benefit will be clear if and when the site has permission and the SANG is ready early on.
- AP continued to review the actions, and noted that there would be a consultation on the cycle proposals in March.
- AP said that the concept of a deeper buffer zone on Ockham Lane has been introduced following feedback from the Group, but the majority of the interface with Ockham Lane sits with a third-party landowner.
- AP mentioned the comments regarding opening up parts of the site to take advantage of the topography and existing views have also been taken on board, with one example including the western neighbourhood/settlement from the Village Green.

- AP noted that community land trusts and similar models will be discussed with Mark Patchett, as he is now working on the business plan. The team will be looking to see if they can improve the offsite broadband access as they move into the detail of the applications.
- CS explained that Mark Patchett and the team have discussed the Ripley Good Neighbour Scheme and will explore if a similar model can be part of the community trust.
- CS explained that air pollution will be assessed under the Environmental Assessment for the main outline application – once the transport model is available, that will be fed into the air quality surveys and noise surveys, and the result will be analysed and any required mitigation will be discussed within the Environmental Statement.
- CC said that tests involving pollution levels or noise need to be done when not in lockdown to ensure that the data is representative of the regular situation.
- **Response:** CS explained that when doing the transport model, data from pre-Covid was used and validated by Surrey County Council to inform that. CS to ensure appropriate data is also used for the air and noise assessments.
- MA added that air quality was a major issue in the previous application, and the data used to arrive at the final result was a source of debate. The way this Environmental Statement is prepared is vital.
- **Response:** AP said MA's feedback was very helpful, and would be shared with the air and noise consultants.
- CC agreed with MA, adding that there were serious shortcomings with the previous data.
- AP continued to review the actions, noting that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Sustainability Strategy will be discussed with the CLG before submission. The March CLG will be on transport, with the Sustainability Strategy to be discussed in April's CLG providing the council feedback has been received. Guildford Borough Council is currently reviewing this with their consultant, and the team met with Guildford Environmental Forum recently to get their views on the proposals.
- MA asked if the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will not be completed until the submission of the application.
- **Response:** CS explained the team would like to get comments from Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council on the Plan, and will be presenting a summary of the Plan to the CLG before submission. The Plan sets the groundwork for the S106 agreement, as even through determination it is likely to be amended based on the S106.

- **Response:** AP noted that Taylor Wimpey will continue to break down the topics for discussion with the Group, such as flooding and drainage. The final CLG before submission will also be about the key documents, so the Plan will form part of that meeting.
- AP confirmed that the team has met with Woking Cycle Users and will be liaising with Guildford Bike Users Group as well.
- AP showed the flood map from the Environment Agency showing Church End with no records of historical flooding, noting that the evidence from residents shows flooding around Church End. AP confirmed that this had been provided by the drainage consultant.
- MA said it may be that the road drain at Church End needs to be cleared, but after any heavy shower, the road floods.
- **Response:** AP added that it has been discussed with Surrey County Council as part of the offsite infrastructure conversations.
- AP explained that since the CLG, Taylor Wimpey has met with the British Horse Society and hopes to have a follow up meeting in due course. AP noted that the invite for a meeting following that will be extended to the CLG members who have previously expressed an interest.
- CS informed the group that the existing community infrastructure analysis has been expanded to include Effingham and Bookham. This is being reviewed internally and then will be issued to the CLG. CS noted that it has been a desktop exercise due to the current situation, so feedback would be welcome.
- AP discussed the question about whether Hatch Lane would be the main access for all traffic except cars, explaining that it will provide cycle and pedestrian access to the Neighbourhood Centre but there will not be vehicle access to the Centre north of Bridge End Farm.
- CS explained that the car parking ratio query is still awaiting further guidance from Guildford Borough Council.
- AP described how the team is proposing a Design Framework for the scheme, which will be followed by a Design Code should the scheme be consented, and this will be used in Reserved Matters application. The Framework will provide a robust structure, and then each parcel and Reserved Matters application will need to comply with that. Taylor Wimpey is committed to ensuring this can become an exemplar development should it be consented.
- MO asked how much material will be taken off the site during construction.

- **Response:** AP explained that the principle is to equalise the site – the team wants to ensure that a ‘cut and fill’ approach is followed to ensure that the development is sustainable and materials are not taken off site which could affect the highways network. This will reduce vehicle movements.
- MO asked if construction traffic would be expected to follow one way in, one way out.
- **Response:** AP said the detail has not been explored yet, but the team is aware of the comments from the residents, particularly those on Old Lane. The main access will be from the Ockham Interchange, and a Construction Environment Management Plan will be used to map out the potential traffic movements. Stakeholders and neighbours will continue to be engaged with.
- MO asked if the Design Review Panel report would be published.
- **Response:** AP explained that there were some clarification points, and the final version was received last week. CS added that the team has asked permission to be able to publish the report.
- MO asked that this is circulated if the permission to publish is given.
- **Response:** AP and CS confirmed they would do so.
- EH said that transport has been classed as the main issue, but sewage and drainage are also very important. EH added that he has asked about measures to protect ground nesting birds from cats and dogs, such as a fence along the border of the development between it and the SSSI with self-closing gates. This should apply to bridleways too.
- **Response:** AP said the point has been noted and shared with the ecologist, and the bridleways point will also be shared.
- SW said that the relationship with Elmbridge Borough Council has been mentioned, so are you formally consulting with them through Guildford Borough Council or are they a statutory consultee as an adjoining borough?
- **Response:** CS explained that the team met the Head of Planning, and now have a point of contact in the Planning team. Taylor Wimpey now meets them every three months to keep both sides updated.
- SW said that due to the proximity of the site to Cobham in particular, Elmbridge Borough Council should have a robust role in the consultation.
- **Response:** CS agreed that the site is close to Elmbridge Borough and that is a good point.

- CC said from a Lovelace perspective, the goal is to get Cobham involved.
- SW said that now Cobham is involved, and will hopefully be increasingly involved going forward.
- **Response:** AP noted that the team has also met with the Cobham Heritage Society.
- MA said that the consultation period of the two current applications has now ended, with a deluge of objections – some very well-argued. MA asked if this is a sign that these meetings are not having the right effect?
- **Response:** AP asked MA if the CLGs are helpful to him.
- MA said this is a large improvement in comparison to the previous applicants, but there are still many more objectors than there are supporters.
- **Response:** AP said that as the site is now allocated in the Local Plan, the delivery of the allocation will change the environment that the neighbours to the site currently live in. Sometimes this will result in objections, regardless of the relationship we might have with the individual. Taylor Wimpey understands that, and the purpose of the CLG, and all of our engagement, is to give us the opportunity to work together should the development go ahead. We would rather have your comments and have the opportunity to adapt to make the best application possible, than have no engagement.
- **Response:** CS added that in general supporters are quieter than objectors in the vast majority of planning application, so Taylor Wimpey's job is to engage with supporters and objectors and take all comments on board.
- CC said the first application was in 2016, and the letters of objection were between 3-4000, with seven in support.
- MA said that the letters of objection to the current application are very detailed, and this will only increase when it comes to the full application.
- **Response:** CS said the team will be responding to the comments and the consultant team is also aware of them.
- AP noted that the archaeology mitigation works will be beginning in the next week or so.
- AP explained that the next meeting would be focused on transport, followed by sustainability, and the CLG before submission will be a review of the key documents.

- CC asked if the transport model would be issued ahead of the transport meeting to allow attendees to review it.
- **Response:** AP explained that the team has not yet received it, but once it is available, an update will be sent through with an agenda of what will be discussed and shared based on the available information.
- MO asked if there will be at least a week's notice with the information before the meeting?
- **Response:** AP said if the information is issued close to the CLG meeting, the meeting will be moved back a week to give everyone a chance to review it.

- Next meeting date – Thursday 25th March 2021
- Topic: Transport

AP closed the meeting at 6:20pm.