

Q. Are you happy for your council to oversee the destruction of this green belt site which has been protected for over 50 years by previous councils?

A. *No, but we have little choice.*

Q. Does the Council actually know who the economic beneficiary behind this trust structure is? If so, what disclosures about their identity and political donations will be made?

A. *This is not an issue for MVDC, it is something to be considered if and when the land is sold.*

Q. How can you justify identifying this land as having a 'moderate' contribution to the green belt and then downgrading it in two categories to 'minimal' on very subjective grounds to allow it to be included in the re-classification?

A. *This is all part and parcel of the process we have to follow to comply with guidelines. If it is considered that this process is flawed then this should be made clear in any response to the document and logged as part of the consultation as an unsound judgement*

Q. How does this plan 'Future Mole Valley' fit with MVDC declaring a Climate Emergency in 2019?

A. *We did everything we could to avoid using green belt land and succeeded in reducing the amount re-designated quite considerably.*

Q. Having already written to the Secretary of State to ask for a reduction in the number of houses MVDC is requested to build, is it not now time to write again? Mole Valley is in the unique position of having responsibility for so much green belt land. It is in a unique position to argue for large reductions in the formulae used to calculate housing provision. With a new Secretary of State now is the time to ask for further considerations.

A. *This is an option and will continue to be part of our ongoing actions.*

Q. Have all other options been examined?

A. *We have worked very hard to try and ensure that we have explored all and every option open to us.*

Q. Has the council explored the possibility of a joint venture with Horsham District Council to create a new village with supporting infrastructure thereby avoiding the necessity to use MVDC's green belt land?

A. *We have written to numerous councils asking for any spare capacity but they all have their own quotas to fill and although a 'joint venture' is an option for us it does not necessarily appeal to other authorities.*

Q. What attempt has been made to involve our long standing local MP Sir Paul Beresford in these discussions with government departments?

A. *Our MP has not been very supportive of MVDC. He has recently written to the PM objecting to the use of green belt land for development.*

Q. MVDC appear to have placed a number of constraints on developers wishing to build houses on this site and yet no consideration has been given to existing local residents whose properties will be affected by any development on this site. There needs to be a dialogue assessing the needs of existing local residents and from this, changes need to be made to the strictures placed on developers considering this as a potential site.

A. *Taking resident's views into account is an integral part of the planning process when any developer applies for planning permission.*

Q. Your documents site two figures for potential capacity, 170 and 128. Once the 170/128 houses have been built. At what point will the council be unable to resist the pressure from developers to add a further 130/172 houses to complete the 300 houses suggested by the Trustees of the land? Once this land is re-categorised then building will become a 'free for all' and the council will not have any powers to stop it.

A. *Once this land is re-categorised then developers can submit planning applications in the normal way. It is at this stage that objections can be raised as to the number and density of the proposed number of houses.*

Q. I would like to ask why it is that the council have not considered alternatives to building on green belt land. There are Over 142 golf courses in Surrey, completely untouched by any development, why haven't the council put pressure on the government to change the status of these recreational facilities and compulsory purchase small parcels of land from them?

A. *We have had offers of small parcels of land from lots of organisations, including a local golf course but as the offers fell within one or other of the 'protected' categories then we would be faced with the same problem of re-classification.*

Q. Why is it only green belt land that has come under the spotlight? As much as it pains me to say there are areas that are totally inaccessible to the public which are left completely untouched, Ancient Woodland being one. What makes these areas more special than the green belt, what useful purpose do they serve in comparison to the green belt which is accessible to all?

A. *This is a point and may be worth pursuing although it may prove difficult if not impossible to challenge.*

Q. The old Friend's Provident site and Chalcraft Nurseries are both sites that could offer land for development but have been exempt from this land grab on the part of the MVDC. Why does the plan not include compulsory purchase of land currently occupied by housing or offices to build social and other housing and increase density rather than current proposals for building on agricultural land?

A. *The old Friend's Provident site is providing some land for development. We have to have a balance in the town between living accommodation and business premises otherwise we will have no economic benefit.*

Q. I believe that MVDC should be assessing the actual house building need for the area and creating a plan for that. That need should be created from evidence which is available to all. This

plan is based on meeting a government figure from an algorithm that has no public evidence for its need in Mole Valley. Who will be housed in these homes? Who is this plan for, certainly not for the residents of Mole Valley? There is obviously a need for social housing. How much? And how will MVDC ensure this is delivered? Is it not reasonable to assume that by 'flooding the market' with new homes in the Mole Valley we will create a glut of empty properties because given the local house prices there is a limit to the number of potential buyers.

*A. This is potentially true. The government requires us to build homes according to a formulae that they have devised it is not based on the 'needs' of an area and so may well lead to a scenario where Dorking has a 'glut' of empty properties.*

Q. Why is The Priory School mentioned in the Future Mole Valley document? It is in the process of downsizing because of rapidly falling numbers and does not need extra car parking, pick-up and drop-off facilities.

*A. This was a 'legacy' provision from developers as a potential benefit to be gained from releasing the land for development when the school planned to expand its numbers. It no longer forms part of the argument to change the status of this land and cannot form part of any argument to support planning permission.*

Q. Any attempt to include these facilities in the Future Mole Valley plan will require even more traffic to enter the one-way system to access this site off the Westcott Road. The number of students from the west of the area attending this school is minimal as identified in the Traffic Plan produced for the school in their attempt to increase capacity by 300 extra pupils.

*A. Surrey County Council are responsible for all of the highways in the MVDC area, they seem to have little interest in trying to resolve the traffic problems in and around Dorking and have gone so far as to say that they do not consider the addition of 200 extra homes on the Westcott Road will have any significant impact on the traffic problems in the area.*