

Taylor Wimpey - Former Wisley Airfield

Community Liaison Group 15 – Meeting Minutes – Thursday 21  
July 2022

Planning and Transport Update

Date: 21<sup>st</sup> July 2022

Time: 6pm

Venue: Zoom

Project Team:

- Antonis Pazourou – Taylor Wimpey
- Colin McKay – WSP
- Gemma Gallant – Cratus Communications
- Ashleigh Mclellan Cratus Communications

Group Members:

- Richard Ayears – Ripley Parish Council
- MO – West Horsley Parish Council
- TR – West Horsley Parish Council
- IS - Effingham Residents Association
- Robert Taylor – East Horsley Parish Council
- PBD – East Horsley Parish Council
- DT – Cobham Heritage
- JD – Guildford Bike Users Group
- CD – West Clandon Parish Council
- Euan Harkness – Wisley Action Group
- Steven Wood – Cobham and Downside Residents Association
- MA – Ockham Parish Council
- LP – Surrey Chamber of Commerce
- Alex Beames – Send Parish Council
- FP – Elm Corner Residents
- CB – Guildford Borough Councillor, Clandon & Horsley

Apologies:

- GG – East Clandon Parish Council
- AS – Guildford Society
- DA – RHS Wisley
- Doug Clare – Guildford Bike Users Group
- AW – Cobham Conservation & Heritage Trust
- IJ – Ockham Parish Council
- NB – Guildford Bike Users Group
- Clare Goodall – East Clandon Parish Council
- Basil Minor – Guildford Ramblers
- Colin Cross – Guildford Borough Councillor, Lovelace Ward, Surrey County Councillor and Ripley Parish Council
- KT – Enterprise M3
- MH – RHS Transport Consultant
- GT – RHS Transport Consultant

## 1. Introductions

- AP welcomed the meeting members and introduced the agreed topic for the meeting: a modelling and transport update.

- The CLG requested a specific meeting on the transport matters in advance of The Former Wisley Airfield application being validated.
- AP and AM confirmed that all of those who had confirmed were in attendance.
- AP gave a brief overview of how feedback from previous CLG meetings had informed the plans and proposals.
- AP noted that to assist the CLG members with finding further information, references have been added to the presentation to point members to the key documents in the planning application pack

## 2. Transport Overview

- CM provided an overview of the traffic modelling, the process that underlies its creation and its scope.
- He then moved onto specifics, first touching on data collection methods and key data inputs.
- CM noted that the model had been agreed upon with Surrey County Council and National Highways.
- CM mentioned projected population growth for Elmbridge, Guildford, Mole Valley and Woking: 30,000 additional residential households by 2038. CM then moved on to FWA's impact on traffic in the area: an increase of 1.5% of journeys.
- MA sought clarification on the data.
- **Response:** CM and AP noted that the map was highlighting major destinations of travel only.
- CM moved on to year 2038 traffic projections and noted the minimal effect of FWA's future projected traffic increases on most surrounding roads with increased traffic on Plough Lane and the A3 in the morning and Old Lane in the evening. While most roads saw nominal increases in traffic, some saw reductions.
- CM noted it was important to look at these increases in the context of the existing traffic – some with limited traffic movements.
- RA asked about the methodology and reasoning and questioned if Guileshill Lane could handle the increased projected traffic.
- **Response:** AP noted that intervention measures would be put into place to mitigate the impact.
- CM proceeded onto specific road analysis. Projections for Old Lane showed a slight increase in average annual daily traffic measures while Ockham Road North showed a decrease resulting from the speed reduction measures. Cycle safety on Ockham Road North was emphasised.

- MA noted a concern that the change of priority at Old Lane and how this would create a queue at the Old Lane Junction.
- **Response:** CM noted that they have specifically looked at this junction in the submitted material and are discussing this and other matters with SCC and will provide any further relevant information in due course.
- JD enquired about how speed reduction measures could reduce traffic in principle given that Ockham Road North was the only viable road option for some.
- **Response:** CM explained that a reduction in permitted speed would encourage drivers to find an alternative route given that this road may not then be the quickest route.
- JD brought up concerns regarding the cycle routes with Ockham Road North, and the proposal to use Long Reach and taking into account the comments made by G-bug that it is a concern due to the large developments nearby.
- **Response:** CM and AP noted that they are prioritising creating a cycling network for average cyclists in the area, which will be through Old Reach, with more experienced cyclists still using Ockham road north. CM also notes that the modelling takes into account the large developments nearby, and does not predict traffic increase on old lane. AP and CM further note that the speed reduction measures will encourage motorised users to use alternative routes and roads.
- EH raised a concern that diverted traffic would then just create congestion on Guileshill Lane.
- CB asked what alternatives were available to people to avoid driving on Ockham Road North and noted that there wasn't adequate explanation on the plans as to where the cars would go.
- JD highlighted that students commuting to their secondary school were a primary concern and questions how the students would travel to school.
- AP noted that the secondary school provision is for a 4 form entry school where only 2 forms will be generated by The Former Wisley Airfield. Consideration for both eventualities had therefore been given to children commuting to or from the airfield in advance of a decision from Surrey County Council on the secondary school provision.
- **Response:** AP made note of the fact that increased traffic on the area would proceed regardless of the FWAs impact as a result of Local Plan growth. The interventions proposed by TW would help to reduce these planned traffic growth in many of the areas.

- RA stated that the DCO asked for consultation with SCC and Ripley Parish Council. RA asked to ensure that TW, National Highways, SCC and Ripley Parish Council put these proposals to the group so that everyone is on the same page and are not working against each other.
- **Response:** CM confirmed it had and AP agreed. AP agreed to discuss with National Highways and welcomed the opportunity to join a liaison group.
- CM noted that the cycle route interventions had been agreed upon in principle with SCC and provided an overview of TW's cycling proposals, including the measures which could introduce cobblestone strips on the road to promote safe passing of cyclists. CM moved on to an overview of bus transport proposals, noting that the materials had been seen at previous meetings before reiterating that TW is committed to contributing to the provision of Burntcommon Slips via s106.
- EH noted that there is an intensive traffic flow counting exercise happening through Ripley at the moment and asked if TW were responsible.
- **Response:** AP confirmed this was not TW. RA added that National Highways are responsible.
- JD asked when the bus service improvements would proceed.
- **Response:** AP noted that this level of detail would be tied to the delivery of housing and secured through the s106.
- JD asked whether there would be an extensive management fee.
- **Response:** AP stated that TW are delivering a diverse and inclusive community including 40% affordable homes. As such TW want to ensure estate costs paid by the homeowners are affordable and controlled. Furthermore, TW will be endowing specific assets to the Community Trust at TW cost which will generate their own revenue and offset these from the future residents. These revenues could include car parking and non-residential assets and revenues from sports pitches and hiring of the community hall etc.
- CM and AP finished the transport overview by providing a quick recap of what had been discussed thus far.

### 3. AOB and Q&A

- SW asked for it to be noted that Cobham wasn't mentioned much and asked what engagement TW had conducted with Cobham and Eldridge Cllrs.
- **Response:** AP made note of meetings that had occurred and requested that, if members thought TW could be doing more, they should please reach out to let the TW project team know.

- JD discussed interventions on Old Lane and asked if these included only pedestrian interventions or if they also included cycle interventions.
- **Response:** AP answered that while cycle specific interventions were not included on this road, the interventions would carry wider benefits to wider road users ..
- PBD asked if once Burntcommon Slips go ahead the traffic models would have to be redone.
- **Response:** CM answered that the FWA development was not dependent on the Burntcommon Slips, FWA impact on Ripley in particular is not severe.
- FP asked for it to be acknowledged that there were no roads in the area that were wide enough to accommodate a cycle lane, noting Guileshill Road and Long Reach as specific worries. FP also noted concern for Ockham Lane as an unsighted road.
- **Response:** CM stated this was not the case and gave the example of the proposed interventions on Portsmouth Road which is wide enough to do so. CM noted that it is not a requirement to have segregated cycle lanes to deliver appropriate interventions for the average cyclists.
- EH said that the Office of National Statistics (ONS) had forecast a drop in population in the area and mentioned that it was nearly impossible to forecast future traffic accurately.
- **Response:** AP agreed that it would be difficult to do so and added that that was one of the reasons that TW's projections tended to air on the side of pessimism. In addition any drop in population would have a positive outcome in regard to the proposals currently put forward by TW.

#### **4. Next meeting**

- AP thanked everyone for attending this and previous meetings.
- AP requested that Cratus provide the application number to the CLG members once available.

**AP closed the meeting.**