

Former Wisley Airfield

TW response to planning application (15/P/00012)

Taylor Wimpey (TW) has submitted a Hybrid planning application for the former Wisley Airfield an allocated strategic site in the adopted GBLP (2019). TW due diligence includes a review of the planning history specifically planning application (15/P/00012) submitted by the previous landowner.

TW proposals for the former Wisley Airfield has derived through over two years of extensive community consultation. Armed with the community and stakeholder feedback, and an awareness for the planning history, TW application will be assessed on its own merits.

1.0 Overview of Previous Outline Application (15/P/00012)

- 1.1. In December 2014, an outline planning application was submitted to GBC by Wisley Property Investments Ltd (WPL) for the development of a new settlement for up to 2,068 dwellings and associated infrastructure including accesses onto the A3 (Ockham Interchange), Ockham Lane and Old Lane and revised access to Elm Corner, a primary/ secondary school, health facility, employment area, and an area of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (“SANG”) was submitted in December 2014 (GBC Ref: 15/P/00012).
- 1.2. The planning application was refused by GBC on the 8th May 2016, the 14 reasons for refusal are outlined and discussed in further detail below.
- 1.3. An appeal was lodged on 30th September 2016. Through the appeal process GBC withdrew several the reasons for refusal cited on the decision notice. The appeal was subsequently dismissed, with the Secretary of State reducing the number of reasons for dismissal to.
 - 1) Green Belt designation (in the then adopted 2003 Local Plan) and absence of very special circumstances (‘in the round’) to outweigh this.
 - 2) Severe Impact on the Strategic Highways Network, by virtue of the then infancy of any improvements scheme to M25/A3 Junction 10 and the objection of NH; and
 - 3) Perceived over-development/ intensity of the development, notably in the easternmost parcels based on landscape harm, noting that there was not adverse harm on heritage assets, and that the overall approach to landscape could be mitigated via a different set of design parameters.
- 1.4. Substantive technical progress was therefore made during the appeal process.

Reasons for Refusal by GBC (15/P/00012)

- 1.5. The application (15/P/00012) was refused at Planning Committee of the 6th April 2016. Ensuring these are all addressed has been a key consideration for TW in the development of the current application.

Reason for Refusal (15/P/00012)	Response, relevant to this new application
1 – Green Belt	<p>None of the land within the red-line boundary is within the Green Belt. It comprises either land within Allocation A35 or additional ‘white land’ owned by TW.</p> <p>The entirety of the proposed built development is within land allocated in the GBLP, under Policy A35.</p> <p>This reason for refusal therefore no longer stands.</p>

<p>2 – Thames Basins Heath Special Protection Area</p>	<p>A SANGs strategy and management plan was agreed with NE throughout the appeal process. TW have used this as a starting point, which has then been discussed with NE extensively through their DAS (pre-application) service.</p> <p>This reason for refusal therefore no longer stands noting it was withdrawn at Inquiry owing to a satisfactory approach to SANGs.</p>
<p>3 – Strategic Road network (A3/M25)</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment prepared by WSP (ES chapter 11) assess the full impact of the development upon the strategic road network, and WSP have been working closely with National Highways.</p> <p>Highways England (now National Highways) submitted a DCO application relating to the M25 Junction 10 / A3 Wisley Interchange on 19th June 2019 as part of its Road Investment Strategy (RIS). The DCO was granted consent – i.e., allowing it to proceed on the 12th May 2022</p> <p>The DCO works are expected to commence in autumn 2022 and the whole scheme is anticipated to open to traffic in 2025.</p> <p>The DCO scheme proposes to close the Wisley Lane and Elm Lane Junctions onto the A3. The Wisley Lane junction will be replaced with a new road called the Wisley Lane Diversion.</p> <p>Given that the proposed principal Site access would be taken from the Wisley Lane Diversion it is proposed that the development is Grampian conditioned to ensure that the residential element of the development cannot be occupied until the DCO works are open to public traffic.</p> <p>In addition, wider transport mitigation measures are provided in the Transport Assessment and listed in the IDP. This has informed the draft S106 Heads of Terms.</p> <p>This reason for refusal therefore no longer stands.</p>

<p>4 – Sustainable Transport</p>	<p>The Application Proposals includes sustainable transport measures in accordance with Policy A35 of the GBLP and further to PPA discussions with GBC. These include bus stops within 200m of every TW home and a range of frequent bus and cycle links to nearby railway stations and towns. This has informed the draft S106 Heads of Terms.</p> <p>This reason for refusal therefore no longer stands noting it was withdrawn at Inquiry owing to a satisfactory approach to public transport, secured via bus service provision / community trust.</p>
<p>5 – Affordable Housing</p>	<p>During the appeal, a policy compliant level of Affordable Housing was agreed.</p> <p>The Application Proposals remain in compliance with the GBLP, including 40% affordable housing (692 affordable permanent homes plus 8 Gypsy and Traveller pitches).</p> <p>This reason for refusal therefore no longer stands, noting it was withdrawn at Inquiry owing to a policy compliant level of affordable housing.</p>
<p>6 – Retail Impact</p>	<p>The adoption of the GBLP and Policy A35 means that TW need to provide various class E uses within the Application Proposal (see the land use Parameter Plan and illustrative masterplan). The GBLP recognises that WNS will become a local centre, the NPPF impact sequential test is not required.</p> <p>TW are in accordance with allocation requirements and the proposed retail provision will complement not compete with neighbouring local centres.</p> <p>This reason for refusal therefore no longer stands, noting that it was withdrawn at Inquiry owing to a satisfactory approach to retail impact / local centre provision for the site.</p>

<p>7 – Loss of waste</p>	<p>The site was removed as a safeguarded waste site within the updated Surrey Waste Plan (December 2020 (covering 2019-2033)) and replacing the 2008 version.</p> <p>This reason for refusal therefore no longer stands, noting it was withdrawn at Inquiry as it was then demonstrated (as is the case now) that the site is no longer within SCC’s Waste Plan intentions.</p>
<p>8 – Indicative Quantum and Scale</p>	<p>TW have complied with the requirements of Policy D1 in the GBLP, with the guidance of the SDF SPD and they have re-master planned the site over a broader area (the whole of Policy A35, alongside SANG provided on additional white land owned by TW). Over the same amount of land proposed under WPIL TW are proposing fewer units. This is all agreed with the other landowners in allocation A35 (see Position Statement).</p> <p>This reason for refusal therefore no longer stands. It was partly addressed at Inquiry owing to a restriction on the development parameters. The design restriction has informed the Illustrative Masterplan and A35 Plans now submitted.</p>
<p>9 – Heritage Impact</p>	<p>In proximity to Yarne, additional landscaping has been proposed, the density of development proposed is also lower and the setting of Yarne has been fully considered.</p> <p>The Inspector Clive Hughes identified less than significant harm to nearby heritage assets including Yarne, it was concluded “...<i>Since the harm would be less than substantial it needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal in accordance with advice in paragraph 134 of the Framework. The public benefits arising from the proposals, including the provision of market and affordable housing, in a Borough where there is substantial shortfall in provision, would be sufficient to outweigh this harm</i>” (Inspector’s Report, 2018, 22.6). The Secretary of State agreed with this conclusion (paragraph 28 of the decision letter).</p> <p>Cotswold Archaeology have prepared a detailed Heritage</p>

	<p>Assessment providing more detail on this. ES Part 10.</p> <p>This reason for refusal therefore no longer stands. It was partly addressed at Inquiry owing to a restriction on the development parameters. The design restriction has informed the Illustrative Masterplan and A35 Plans now submitted.</p>
<p>10 – Air Quality Impact</p>	<p>It is noted that this reason for refusal was not defended by GBC at the inquiry, and that NE raised no objection on Air Quality grounds.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that based upon the evidence before him there is no evidence to suggest that the proposals would harm air quality in Ripley (Inspector’s Report, 2018, 20.132) nor that the changes in air quality, either individually or in combination with other developments, are likely to have significant effects or undermine the conservation objectives for the TBH SPA (Hughes, 2018, 20.143).</p> <p>The Air Quality Impact Assessment undertaken by WSP (<i>ES: Chapter 12</i>) assess the impact in terms of residual and cumulative effects for both the construction phase and the completed development of the Application scheme.</p> <p>In respect of residual effects during the construction phase WSP conclude that with mitigation the proposed, WNS is expected to have no more than a minor adverse impact on amenity and a negligible impact on human health and ecology.</p> <p>In terms of residual effects for the completed development WSP conclude that following Institute for Air Quality Management Guidance, the effects of the Proposed WNS will be negligible.</p> <p>This reason for refusal therefore no longer stands, noting it was withdrawn at Inquiry owing to the evidence base at the time, which remains consistent now.</p>

<p>11 – Education Impact</p>	<p>The previous S106 agreed nursery and primary school provision with SCC and nursery, primary and secondary school provision with GBC.</p> <p>TW have been liaising with SCC who have provided a response in pre-application. Based on this response (see <i>IDP</i>), a policy compliant nursey and primary school are proposed as part of the application scheme, and a policy compliant secondary school has been included as a flexible parameter (<i>Refer to IDP for further detail</i>).</p> <p>This reason for refusal therefore no longer stands, noting it was withdrawn at Inquiry owing to the provision in the S106.</p>
<p>12 – Policing Provision</p>	<p>This is a matter for the S106. This was agreed as part of the previous S106, and thus it can be agreed again. TW is content to include a contribution and have included this in the draft S106 Heads of Terms.</p> <p>This reason for refusal therefore no longer stands, noting it was withdrawn at Inquiry owing to the provision in the S106.</p>
<p>13 – Health Provision</p>	<p>TW has been liaising with CCG and local GP surgeries for an on-site facility and Health centre of 500sqm is proposed (<i>Refer to IDP for further detail</i>). Health infrastructure is included in the draft S106 Heads of Terms.</p> <p>This reason for refusal therefore no longer stands, noting it was withdrawn at Inquiry owing to the provision in the S106.</p>
<p>14 – Library Provision</p>	<p>This is a matter for the S106. This was agreed in previous S106, and thus it can be agreed again. TW is content to have mobile library on site, a facility within the community centre or to provide a contribution. See draft S106 Heads of Terms.</p> <p>This reason for refusal therefore no longer stands, noting it was withdrawn at Inquiry owing to the provision in the S106.</p>

- 1.6. The application submission documents comprehensively address all 14 previous reasons for refusal and critically, since the appeal dismissal, the Site has been released from the Green Belt and formally allocated by GBC as a strategic site in the adopted GBLP (2019).