

Taylor Wimpey - Former Wisley Airfield

Community Liaison Group 17 – Meeting Minutes

Date – Wednesday 12th February 2025

Time – 6:00pm – 8:00pm

Venue – The Talbot Inn, Ripley

1. Introductions and apologies
2. Planning Timeline and General Update
3. Drainage strategy overview
4. Stewardship body / Community Trust – *It may be helpful to review the schedule 13 within the agreed S106*
5. Q&A
6. Next CLG

Date: 12th February 2025

Time: 6pm

Venue: The Talbot Inn, Ripley

Project Team:

- Antonis Pazourou (AP) – Taylor Wimpey
- Ben Connor (BC) – Taylor Wimpey
- Jenny Cooper (JC) – Cratus Group
- Cian Ward (CW) - Cratus Group
- Rebecca Taylor (RT) – JTP
- Florence Van Vaerenbergh (FVV) – GTA Civils
- Mark Patchet (MP) – Community Stewardship Solutions

Group Members:

- FP – Ockham and Hatchford RA
- JR – East Horsley Parish Council
- DB – Surrey County Council
- PO – Surrey County Council
- MA – Ockham Parish Council
- IJ – Ockham Parish Council
- RA – Ripley Parish Council
- TR – East Horsley
- CC – Villages Against Wisley New Town (VAWNT)
- EH – Resident

Apologies:

- DA – RHS Wisley
- HY – Guildford Borough Council
- JM – West Horsely Parish Council
- CUB – Guildford Borough Council
- CY – Guildford Borough Council

1. Introductions

- JC welcomed the meeting members and introduced the agreed topics requested by the CLG reps from CLG 16 for the meeting: Neighbourhood 1 Masterplan updates for comment, Drainage and Stewardship.
- The project team members and community representatives introduced themselves and apologies were noted from absent members (DA, HY, JM).

2. Planning Timeline and General Update

- AP thanked everyone for attending and confirmed the agenda. He noted that previous items had been agreed, highlighted that wind assessments have now commenced (as requested by MA from OPC), and acknowledged receipt of drawings on Ripley interventions, now with WSP and Surrey County Council. AP then indicated that the meeting would provide a brief update on Neighbourhood 1 (from RT), a focus on drainage (led by FVV), and conclude with an update from

MP. He also confirmed that minutes from the last meeting are available in hard copy.

Neighbourhood 1 Masterplan

RT presented the evolving masterplan for Neighbourhood One with the group for comment and feedback, detailing:

- RT provided an update on the evolving masterplan for Neighbourhood 1 (Stratford View) at the western end of the new neighbourhood. She presented a conceptual drawing highlighting key features: a central active travel corridor, a village green, and a neighbourhood square, all within the permitted outline approval.
- RT explained that refinements have focused on apartment design, building massing, and sensitive edge treatments (e.g., capturing views from the Surrey Hills). The Neighbourhood 1 Design Code has been submitted to safeguard the layout, including garden squares and five green spaces that define the neighbourhood's character.
- FP asked if apartments were always planned around the green.
Response: RT confirmed they were, as per the design parameters.
- IJ requested clarification on height parameters.
Response: RT stated that while the parameter plans allow up to 20% of buildings to be four stories in the designated areas, however overall, most structures are two to three storeys in areas - with southern elements deliberately capped at two storeys.
- AP added that the design emphasises an approach of cascading growth in height, this enhances natural surveillance through strategic balcony placement regarding apartments on green spaces.
- CC questioned the rationale for positioning slightly taller buildings next to open spaces.
Response: RT explained that proper proportions activate the space with windows and balconies, ensuring the taller buildings complement rather than overwhelm the surroundings.
- JR raised concerns that this approach might affect natural surveillance.
Response: RT noted that input from crime prevention experts for Surrey Police are being incorporated to ensure safety through passive surveillance.
- EH queried the pending works on the Wisley Lane Diversion (WLD)
- AP noted that due to planning delays have necessitated a realignment of the access road (approximately a 300m) and the works will include additional street lighting on WLD.
- IJ stated that the delays were not due to the local objections, but the ability for TW and GBC to determine the planning conditions.
- AP refuted this and confirmed that once the application was allowed at appeal, GBC expedited feedback from the statutory consultees and discharged all the prior to commencement conditions as required. Despite these endeavours, AP confirmed National Highways (NH) and their contractors Balfour Beatty Atkins were no longer able to incorporate these works into the WLD, due to the delays for securing planning by appeal. AP further recapped on the statement made at the planning committee highlighting what the impact would be should a permission not be granted despite an officer's recommendation to approve the application, which has now evidently occurred.
- Note the meeting returned to feedback on the evolving masterplan for Neighbourhood 1.

- RT outlined the evolving material palette—including local red bricks, tile hanging, weather boarding, varied roof tiles, and fenestration colours—and mentioned plans to install on-site mock-up panels for community feedback.
- AP summarised the evolving street scenes, noting groups of homes with gable forms and varied apartment block heights (2–4 storeys) that maintain a traditional, Arts and Crafts style character.
- IJ asked about the number of apartment blocks;
Response: AP confirmed there are 10 blocks, each with approx. between 11 and 18 apartments (none currently exceeding 20 units).
- EH inquired about parking arrangements;
Response: AP confirmed that all parking provisions meet current guidance and standards.
- JR questioned whether a pub was planned;
Response: AP stated no pub is currently included, as the development is intended to complement existing facilities in Ockham.
- AP concluded by emphasising ongoing design refinements to ensure a coherent, locally contextual, and high-quality development.
- No further feedback was given

Post Meeting Update

- IJ emailed AP with concerns relating to the consultation process and whether this was part of process or a genuine feedback opportunity.
- AP emphasised the importance of providing feedback at the CLG meetings, consultation events or directly. A short summary overview of all the opportunities since 2020 was made including the parameters and considerations now secured by the Hybrid consent coupled with policy requirements. In respect of initial ideas for Neighbourhood 1 this dated back to April 2022 – Vignette studies at the community consultation event (Chapter 4 and available online). Examples of changes made through the consultation and how they have been incorporated were given in the response.

3. Drainage strategy overview

- FVV provided a high-level overview of the drainage strategy, explaining that the design mimics natural, pre-development (greenfield) drainage and improves upon the existing airfield system.
- She detailed that natural catchments are maintained—using permeable paving and filter strips to slow runoff at source—and then guided via swales to strategic SuDS ponds where water is attenuated and released at a 1-in-2-year greenfield rate (QBAR).
- FVV noted that the design has been validated through detailed hydraulic modelling and that the SuDS design code governs future detailed submissions.
- She outlined how the local flooding issues have been taken into consideration within the overall design by:
 - Diverting runoff from catchment 10 (previously draining toward Ockham/Bridge End) to join Stratford Brook downstream.
 - Protecting Elm Lane by routing runoff away from Elm Corner; and
 - Attenuating flows from catchment 1 on Old Lane via a surveyed ditch network and culverts.
- FP welcomed the acknowledgment of local flooding issues;
Response: AP emphasised the importance of addressing community concerns. These concerns had impacted the drainage proposals and highlighted to Surrey County Council (SCC) and NH were they were outside of TW control.

- FVV explained that no additional runoff is directed to the existing network and that discussions with (SCC) are ongoing to ensure downstream infrastructures are not adversely affected.
- She added that extensive groundwater monitoring has been undertaken and that design measures (such as pond lining) aim to prevent impacts on raised groundwater levels in lower areas.
- FVV confirmed that the entire drainage network is designed for a 1-in-100-year storm plus 45% climate change—ensuring flows are reduced to greenfield QBAR. Additional sensitivity testing has also been conducted to take into consideration overland flows, and appropriate safety factors and pond freeboards have been provided. The SuDS have been designed for exceedance, with careful considerations of levels and flow patterns in extreme storm events.
- The ongoing maintenance of the SuDS will be guaranteed through the community ownership trust, and there is an ongoing dialogue with Thames Water to ensure the foul sewer network is updated (current capacity is available up to the 600th plot).
- FVV clarified that catchment boundaries are defined by existing topography, ensuring overall runoff patterns remain unchanged.
- FP and IJ noted that during heavy rain, residents observed unprecedented runoff;
Response: FVV confirmed that such behaviour is inherent to the land's natural drainage.
- FVV explained that for catchment 10—previously a flooding contributor—the outflow has been rerouted on-site to connect with Stratford Brook downstream, thereby reducing uncontrolled flows.
- CC inquired whether the design intercepts runoff from surrounding fields;
Response: FVV clarified that all water falling on the airfield is intercepted within the design, while external flows lie beyond its boundary. The airfield sits at the high point.
- MA noted that the slope toward Ockham Lane explains existing flooding;
Response: FVV described how runoff is piped along natural contours via gravity (without additional pumping) and that the outfall is located upstream of the new bridge, with a controlled discharge.
- IJ and FP raised concerns over flooding on Old Lane;
Response: FVV confirmed that the catchment nearest to Old Lane is fully designed (though not yet built) to intercept and convey runoff into a restored, currently overgrown ditch, with ongoing SCC discussions ensuring compliance.
- CC questioned potential wildlife impacts from the restored ditch;
Response: FVV explained that the any work to the ditch within the site boundary are done in close coordination with the ecologists to ensure no impact to wildlife.
- AP summarised that all measures—slowing runoff, maintaining natural flow patterns, and capturing water within the development boundary—are part of a comprehensive earthwork and SuDS strategy, with local authorities being informed of potential asset improvements.
- JR asked whether these measures would reduce flooding on local roads;
Response: AP confirmed, flooding issues are complex, and not all factors are within TW's control to address. Where potential improvements could be implemented in the downstream network, these are being discussed with SCC.
- FVV explained that lower parts of the site experience high groundwater levels during wet periods (due to natural topography and geology), as demonstrated through the groundwater monitoring undertaken across the full site.
- FP asked for confirmation that the area truly suffers from a high-water table;
Response: FVV confirmed that groundwater levels rise significantly in the lower areas, primarily due to natural conditions.

- EH noted that the site geology is divided between London Clay and Bagshot Sands, and FP added that Highways England has acknowledged extreme weather impacts on delivery schedules.
- AP shared local feedback regarding flooding along Ockham Lane, leading Taylor Wimpey to incur significant expenses to ensure discharge was diverted away from Ockham Lane.
- FP asked about filtration before discharge into Stratford Brook;
Response: FVV clarified that the SuDS design includes multiple treatment stages—with shallow, planted swales providing initial filtration and strategic ponds offering secondary and tertiary treatment.
- EH inquired about the exact discharge point to the Stratford Brook;
Response: FVV confirmed the location of the outfall upstream of the bridge, ensuring only reduced, controlled flows enter Stratford Brook.
- FP and IJ expressed concerns that converting fields to built areas (with additional tarmac) might increase runoff;
Response: FVV explained that retention in ponds, ensured via control chambers, will ensure the runoff off-site are attenuated to the pre-development (pre-airfield) rates. The provision of source control measures such as permeable paving, raingardens and swales will also help slow down and intercept the first flush, which will help reduce overall outflow despite limited natural infiltration (especially in clay).
- AP noted that the design incorporates porous pavements and attenuation tanks within the built envelope to capture and slowly release water, breaking up the current continuous impermeable surface. This manages and controls water and runoff.
- JR asked what happens to water in saturated ground during dry periods;
Response: FVV responded that low-intensity events allow water to slowly infiltrate and eventually evaporate, preventing prolonged storage.
- IJ and others voiced scepticism based on local experience with SuDS elsewhere;
Response: AP acknowledged concerns but reiterated that extensive sensitivity testing and adherence to statutory guidance support the design.
- TR and CC raised concerns about London Clay limitations and potential system overwhelm;
Response: FVV replied that the SuDS have been deliberately oversized through sensitivity tests and designed for worst-case scenarios (assuming zero infiltration), with ample capacity built into the master plan.
- FVV confirmed that the drainage system is designed to handle runoff from the development (Former Wisley Airfield) site subject to the approved Hybrid Application without adversely affecting Hallam Land.
- AP added that ongoing discussions with local authorities aim to ensure joint management of asset maintenance and improvements.
- FP requested a comprehensive report detailing drainage calculations and design features;
Response: AP confirmed that detailed reports included in the Hybrid applications can be shared post the meeting.
- TR inquired about the involvement of ecologists;
Response: FVV stated that an ecological report is a standard part of the submission, with ecologists consulted on all proposals.

4. Stewardship body / Community Trust – *It may be helpful to review the schedule 13 within the agreed S106*

- MP introduced himself, his credentials and gave some background on similar stewardship schemes he has worked on.
- MP stated that every scheme is bespoke and emphasised that, unlike other developments where responsibilities are fragmented, this scheme will be managed under one integrated structure.
- FP inquired about how many different parties typically share management responsibilities.
Response: MP explained that while in other schemes components are managed by different entities, in this scheme management will be consolidated—handled by himself, Iona, and a dedicated team—to ensure consistency and long-term stewardship.
- MP outlined that a Community Trust will be established as a charitable organisation to manage all assets—not just for new residents but also for the existing surrounding communities. He highlighted that the structure of a Trust ensures that residents benefit over the long term, drawing on examples like Letchworth, the first garden city.
- MP emphasised two key objectives: (1) developing, owning, and maintaining community assets and (2) fostering a vibrant community with proper oversight of public spaces, sports facilities, and cultural activities.
- EH commented that this is a sensitive issue,
Response: MP responded that integrated management from the outset helps avoid inconsistent standards often seen when developers control projects until the end.
- IJ asked if Taylor Wimpey (TW) would be involved until the end;
Response: AP stated that TW will be involved until their responsibilities are met and approved by the authorities. Responsibility will then transfer to the Trust.
- FP questioned the recruitment of trustees.
Response: MP explained that trustees will be carefully selected—preferably from local groups, councils, and experienced stakeholders—to ensure public benefit. He noted that while some residents may volunteer, the trust will be professionally staffed rather than relying solely on volunteers.
- MP described the operational model, noting that a small specialist team (approximately three to four people) will manage community assets such as caretaking, cleaning, and maintenance of public areas, with additional roles for managing service charges and other finances.
- EH raised concerns about limited parking spaces per property;
Response: MP acknowledged the issue, citing a cultural shift in car ownership and the increasing role of car clubs and sustainable transport options.
- AP added that a Community Trust officer will be in place from first occupation to help set expectations and foster community engagement from the start.
- MP outlined the principles of the funding model, explaining that revenue will be derived from service charges, grants, commercial income (including from community facilities), and an endowment fund as described in the In Perpetuity Funding Framework (IPFF) designed to secure long-term financial stability.
- FP expressed concerns regarding fairness in charges;
Response: MP clarified that any service charges will be proportionate (e.g., scaled according to property size) and that the funding model has been designed to be equitable for all residents of all tenures.
- MP further explained that clear covenants will be established to maintain consistent standards across the development, ensuring that all properties adhere to the same conditions.

- CC inquired about the involvement of external experts such as Surrey Wildlife Trust;
Response: MP and AP confirmed that they have been in discussion with them and will invite their participation in future governance meetings.
- MP concluded by reiterating the importance of robust governance, integrated management, and long-term community benefits, thanking everyone for their contributions and support, and confirming that the stewardship arrangements will be in place from the very beginning.

Next CLG

- AP noted that future CLG meetings will be scheduled in a few months once feedback from the consultation on Neighbourhood 1 is received and encouraged residents to reach out with any questions or to arrange further discussions.

End of Meeting

AP closed the meeting.

- JC to distribute the draft minutes.