

**MINUTES OF OCKHAM PARISH COUNCIL MEETING  
TUESDAY 10<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2020  
held remotely on Zoom due to Covid-19 restrictions  
Commenced at 8pm**

<p><b>PRESENT:</b> Dr Aish (Chair) Mrs Jamieson (Vice Chair) Miss Lofthouse Mr Waldman Mr Walton Mrs Walton</p>	<p>In attendance remotely: Mrs Blackwell (Parish Clerk) SCC Cllr Iles 5 Local Residents Mr Davies Project Director Taylor Wimpey Ms Soor Planning Manager Taylor Wimpey Mr Pazourou Community &amp; Green Infrastructure Project Manager Taylor Wimpey</p>
---	--

**20/113 Discussion with Taylor Wimpey (TW)**

Meeting opened with a discussion with Mr Davies, Ms Soor and Mr Pazourou from Taylor Wimpey. Second online consultation events planned Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> November 6pm - 8pm and Saturday 21<sup>st</sup> November 10am – 12pm to update on the Master Plan. Next Design Review Panel in December 2020. Members Briefing 18<sup>th</sup> November 2020.

Q&A session followed:

Q1: Why are the Neighbourhood Discussion Meetings held via Webinar rather than Zoom? It gives the feeling that questions are being filtered? Question time limited to ½ hour and issues linked by Communications. Request to try via a Zoom link, more open style?

A: Response +228 on Webinar in July needs to be formal and structured. Concern about it becoming a free for all. Seeking to be open and transparent, every question is covered on the portal. Chat box available to type questions during the meeting. Supplemented by informal meetings: Community Liaison Group, 1:1 with Neighbours and emails. Ms Soor agreed to discuss with Cratus if a Zoom is possible.

Q2: Are you aware of the widespread dissatisfaction of the Residents of Ockham and the neighbouring villages with the project and the TW handling of communications for what is regarded as a tumultuous imposition on the hamlets of Ockham, all with no apparent benefit to the current Residents?

A: Response empathise a change in the adopted plan, release from the Green Belt. TW have bought the FWA and want to make it as best as possible, benefits for the Community and natural green spaces to make a strong legacy. Need for housing in UK and Guildford Area, decision been challenged in High Court as been restrained by Green Belt. GBC under-delivered on housing, identified problem and included FWA as a Strategic Site.

Q3: How many land banks does TW have?

A: In business of building homes and intend to do so.

Q4: What criteria need to be fulfilled to buy the Airfield?

A: TW have bought the Airfield with a Strategic Site allocation, own 100%. Not able to declare price as commercially sensitive. Will do due diligence for all sites in UK. Not speculative as it is an allocation in the Local Plan as decided by the Local Authority.

Q5: Do TW have to fulfil maximum number of properties for the Site?

A: Local Authority established circa 2,000; if TW asked for a lower number GBC would argue that the site is under-developed. Supplementary question asked do you have latitude to vary? Response GBC have set the numbers. Impact of future Government White Paper unknown.

Q6: Cllr raised concern re: density correlation between the Village and the Site and if cultural difference can be taken on board to make it easier?

A: TW will go through rules set by GBC, Local Planning guidance covers density, transport design etc. polices exist to abide by for planning permission, not set by TW.

Document with density information - framework plan will be loaded on the TW website. Varying density where closest to existing settlement to respect heritage, noted feedback on topography, high point on site. Looking at mix with affordable homes.

Q7: Have TW considered a smaller project, 10 year plan maybe more acceptable to start with a smaller project and develop over time? Supplementary question asked about why do the infrastructure first and destroy areas if not required for properties.

A: TW can only build a finite number of properties per year. Believe in getting infrastructure in place before getting into homes, cited examples at Prince Philip Park built bypass road, skate park before building homes. Interested in new community, graphic of hamlets, sports facilities.

Q8: Major issue includes transport for example, cycle route presented not feasible?

A: No confirmed proposals, currently undertaking a survey to establish feasible routes. Will share design proposals in January/ February 2021. Currently doing a data survey and modelling exercise to be completed by end January 2021, asked for HE model and SCC data but too old. Doing own model to get a true reflection of the highways network, any model will need to be validated by SCC. Cllrs commented traffic not representative at present with the lockdown due to Covid. Cllr also expressed concern about the map produced to show cycling across Public Footpaths. TW response future consultation event to cover transport, in next stage of development.

Q9: Issue of sewage, drainage and local flooding. The sewage works in Ripley is over capacity, so will need a new one somewhere?

A: Mr Davies raised current drainage issues in Ockham with SCC Highways. Infrastructure for foul water will need an upgrade, in discussion with Thames Water. As part of the Local Plan have to deliver an infrastructure delivery plan to set out upgrades required. Plan to reduce surface water run off to create ponds and biodiversity on Site for ecological reasons.

Supplementary questions asked, who is going to pay for infrastructure upgrades i.e. Ripley sewage plant. Response TW responsible, Section 106 funds.

Q10: Asked about the presence of asbestos and concerned about the impact as dangerous for the Community?

A: Identified some asbestos, around Elm Corner source identified from the tiles on the hanger area. Required to submit a plan to show how the asbestos will safely be removed off site. Have a specialist adviser to provide advice on treating it and protecting the Public to ensure safe.

Q11: Have the archaeologists found anything?

A: Reporting takes 4 weeks; found some pottery and old hedgerow revealing historical aspect of the land, looking at incorporating in next phase of plan.

Q12: Planning application for Stub Road, why can't TW wait until outcome known on Junction 10 M23/A3?

A: Ms Soor advised know the Planning Application will not be decided until January 2021 when HE outcome known. Supplementary question, why submitted the planning application if outcome deferred why now? Response want to fit in with the HE build plan, otherwise if delayed and submitted as part of the wider application, and if the DCO works started, would then need to dig up the road. Looked at delivery, if HE approved can construct the roundabout at the same time, subject to planning approval. HE major gas main, as part of the DCO works has to be relocated as extending the A3. TW believe the gas main is going under the road and not over the bridge as HE has reported to WAG.

The Q&A session concluded at 9pm. The Chair thanked TW on behalf of Cllrs and Residents for their time and open manner in accepting questions. TW replied understand it is a Site of concern to the Community, want to do the right thing as going to be here a long time and respect differences.

## **20/114 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies received from GBC Cllr Cross at a GBC meeting.

### **20/115 Disclosure of Interest**

No disclosures of interest.

### **20/116 Questions from Members of the Public**

1.) Ockham Parish Rooms - Dr Lachelin said that she could not understand why the Trustees' statement had been made and then sent out to a large number of people. She said that none of the three people mentioned in the statement had ever been advised about the three points in the statement and that the lawyers had confirmed this. She said that it was not pleasant to have had such an erroneous statement emailed to a large number of people. She requested that the statement from Moore Barlow be circulated in the same manner as the Trustees' statement had been and that the Trustees' statement should be removed from the Parish noticeboard and website. She said that for over a year she and others had been trying to see if a way could be found to restore the much loved iconic Parish Rooms so that they can be once again used as intended by Mary Countess of Lovelace who built them and gifted them to the Parishioners of Ockham. She said that a very generous Ockham resident has offered to pay for the restoration.

The statement from Moore Barlow was read out at the meeting. Agreed to circulate the letter to the Cllrs, OHRA to circulate to Residents, OPC website and noticeboard.

PC

Miss Lofthouse replied in her capacity as a Trustee of the Ockham Parish Rooms that the Trustees made the statement on the advice from the Trusts Lawyers. The Solicitor at Moore Barlow has changed. The previous Solicitor at Moore Barlow agreed with the Trust Lawyers. Letters should have exchanged between Solicitors rather than via a third party the Parish Council. Suggested that the new Solicitor writes to the Trusts Solicitor. Concluded this is not Parish Council business and agreed to note the statement received to record in the Minutes:

“Statement from Moore Barlow – Future of Ockham Parish Room (‘OPR’)

We act on behalf of Ms Pargeter, Mrs Marshall and Dr Lachelin. Our clients, along with several other Ockham residents, refer to themselves collectively as Historic Ockham (“HO”). Our clients have been engaging with the trustees of OPR over their plans for the future use of the rooms. This has included the preparation of a business plan and liaising with the Charity Commission.

It has come to our clients' attention that a statement was made at the Council meeting of 13 October. This is stated to have been made at the request of the trustees of OPR. We understand that it was agreed at the OPC meeting that the statement would be circulated by email to the Ockham and Hatchford Residents Association. This was emailed on 16 October to its members and also posted on the OPC website and noticeboard. We have recently seen a copy of the minutes of the meeting, which are enclosed with this letter, and the email circulating the statement. The statement refers to advice given to HO by this firm. The statement is not consistent with the advice we have given. Please note the following:

- Our clients have put forward a business plan and we have not advised that it is not viable. Charities are required to act in accordance with their charitable objects but are able to carry out ancillary commercial activities to provide funds to meet those objects. We have submitted the business plan to the Charity Commission and have been in contact about it.
  
- We have not advised that any trustee is unacceptable due to a conflict of interest.

The trustees of a charity are those with the legal duties to further the charity's objects, but the Charity Commission in its guidance encourages the involvement of beneficiaries as a way of helping a charity achieve its aims more effectively.

We would respectfully request on behalf of our clients that the Council have this letter read aloud at the next Council meeting, circulates it in the same manner as the original statement, notes it in the minutes of the meeting and displays it on the OPC website and noticeboard. “

#### **20/117 Approve Minutes of the Meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> October 2020**

The Minutes of the Meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> October 2020 were approved and will be signed by the Chair.

#### **20/118 Matters Arising not on agenda:**

**20/105a.) Item 3 Clarification from GBC** – Feedback received from Cllr Cross.

**20/96c.) SCC request to identify new wet spot areas** – Feedback report sent to Cllrs.

**20/104 Point 7 – White Paper on Planning for the Future** – SCC responded on areas of concern. Local MPs responding on further changes. Cllr Cross circulated information via OHRA.

**20/105b.) Communication from Surrey Wildlife Trust** – Noted ragwort has died back.

**20/108b.) Members Community Grant Allowance** - Cllrs to submit suggestions before the deadline.

ALL

#### **20/119 Coronavirus Measures**

Top line briefings received from SCC. During lockdown trying to keep Schools running, Libraries offering a digital service and appointment based access to computers.

Financial hardship Community helpline number on SCC website for advice.

#### **20/120 Planning Matters**

**a.) Planning Applications as at 6.11.20:** Updated report circulated to Cllrs:

**1. Reference: 20/P/01830 Location: Red Balloon Ockham Ltd, Pound Farm, Old Lane, Cobham, KT11 1NH** Proposal: Variation of condition 3 of planning permission 11/P/01496, approved on 28/09/2011, to allow 81 pupils and 21 staff per day (instead of the approved number of users - 54 pupils and 16 staff). Application is being made anticipating development of FWA and an increase in demand for nursery places. The building will not need to be extended to allow for the additional numbers as extra space is facilitated through the conversion of a corridor and a storeroom into classroom space. GBC imposed a limit on the number of pupils in previous applications (condition 3 of approval 11/P/01496) based on the level of anticipated increased traffic movement. OPC agreed to object, as the roads are already extremely busy with traffic movement and there is no planning consent for TW on FWA.

**2. Reference: 20/P/01868 Location: The Lodge, Stumps Grove Farm, Whitehill Lane, Ockham, Woking, GU23 6PJ** Proposal: Removal of condition 2 (occupancy of dwelling) of planning application 92/P/1016 approved on 06/10/1992. Application is to remove the Lodge from the restricted covenant imposed on it in 1992 stating that someone can only inhabit it solely or mainly employed in agriculture. Another one of the conditions from 1992 was that the property should be no larger than 73sqm gross floor area. The applicant has stated that they are willing to 'swap' the occupation condition from the Lodge to Stumps Grove Farmhouse. OPC agreed to object as would remove a tied property from the farm so that it could be sold on the open market. As a small community with strong ties to farmland important to retain dwellings to enable workers to live close to the land as this supports the environment and traditional skills as well as creating local employment. This was the intention of the covenant and should remain in force. The report state that the Lodge is approx. 156 sqm of floor space has already been significantly developed; of concern further potential development creep.

**3. Reference: 20/P/01215 The Studio, Blue Ride Lodge, The Drift, East Horsley KT24 6NU** - Retrospective planning application to establish a four bedroom dwelling for what was approved as a studio, OPC agreed to seek further information. IJ

**4. Reference: 20/P/01708 Location: Land at Wisley Airfield, Hatch Lane, Ockham, GU23 6NU** Proposal: Detailed application for engineering operations to form a new roundabout and stub road. OPC agreed to ask GBC for an extension to respond. Cllrs agreed to provide feedback to Mrs Jamieson. IJ  
ALL

**b.) Taylor Wimpey – Former Wisley Airfield Community Liaison Group**

Dr Aish attended the meetings on Zoom last week, discussion took place on potential cycle routes, impacts for Horsley and Effingham also. Cllr Iles noted that any changes to cycle routes would need to be approved by SCC. Advised that the Parish Council would need to be plugged into Section 106 monies and would need to liaise with GBC about requirements.

**20/121 Highways Update**

**a.) Update proposed M25J10/A3 interchange works**

Mrs Jamieson informed received a letter from Department of Transport asking further questions for deadline 11&12. Asked all interested parties to respond regarding replacement land, biodiversity and common land. Mrs Jamieson agreed to draft a response and share with Cllrs for comment. IJ/ALL

**20/122 Ockham Village Green**

Reviewed quotes for removal of stemmed Oak tree and dead pine tree. Approved quote from Gecko Tree Solutions for £750 and agreed for the works to be done as soon as possible. IJ/PC

**20/123 Financial Matters**

a.) Cheques paid out/money received to bank account balance – updated budget and cash book circulated to Cllrs. Community Account as at 10<sup>th</sup> November 2020 - £18,431. Approved payment: Garden Maintenance - £360 for September 2020, Printer cartridges- £87.86.

b.) Draft budget for 2021-22 – Circulated to Cllrs, no comments for final approval at the next meeting.

**20/124 Revised Councillors' Code of Conduct Policy**

Revised Policy approved. Copy to be placed on the OPC website and sent to GBC. Cllrs agreed to attend the GBC training sessions. PC  
All

**20/125 Concurrent Functions Grant Aid (CFGA) Projects**

a.) CFGA 2019-20 Historic Ockham Signs – Agreed to arrange for the signs to be installed at the boundary with Green Lane. Suggestion to do at the same time as installing the posts for the Vehicle Activated Signs.

b.) CFGA 2020-21 Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) – Thanks extended to Mr Assadi, SCC Highways for his visit. Approved the sites to erect the VAS signs. Mr Assadi to seek quotation for installing the 2 posts and to obtain and install a third post.

c.) Discussed traffic calming measures on Church corner, proposal to put a table ramp to slow traffic. Mr Assadi agreed to put it on the running list for consideration by the Committee for next year. A Local Resident asked about weight restrictions on Old Lane. Informed notice served on Brick Kiln.

**20/126 Correspondence**

a.) Consultation on admission arrangements for Surrey's community and voluntary controlled schools for 2022 by deadline 1 December 2020 – Noted, no comments.

b.) Guildford Residents Association – Invite to Membership, agreed not to take up for the

Parish Council.

**20/127 Any item for noting or inclusion on a future agenda**

a.) Agreed to invite TW to the January meeting and to start the meeting earlier at 7.30pm.

MA

**20/128 Date of next remote meeting** – Next meeting 8<sup>th</sup> December 2020 via Zoom at 8pm.

There being no further business the meeting ended at 10.20pm  
*Alyson Blackwell, Clerk to Ockham Parish Council*