

Minutes of a Meeting of the Executive held on Tuesday 17th December 2013 at Pippbrook, Dorking, from 7.00pm to 9.25pm

Present:

Executive Members: Councillors Chris Townsend (Leader/Chairman), James Friend (Deputy Leader), Simon Ling, Vivienne Michael, John Northcott and Charles Yarwood.

Non-Executive Members: Councillors Stephen Cooksey, Bridget Lewis-Carr, Iain Murdoch and David Preedy.

44. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 26th November 2013 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman/Leader.

45. Disclosure of Interests

Councillor Simon Ling declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 7 – Thomas Flack Trust Fund Applications due to his links to the Ashtead Community Vision Project and his representative role on the Lower Mole Countryside Project, but was not required to leave the meeting during consideration thereof.

Councillor David Preedy declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 6 – Mole Valley District Council Grant Aid Applications as he was Chairman of Headley Parish Council, and explained that the Headley Playground Steering Group was a sub-committee of the Parish Council, but was not required to leave the meeting during consideration thereof.

Councillor Charles Yarwood declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 6 – Mole Valley District Council Grant Aid Applications as he was a member of Charlwood Parish Council, but was not required to leave the meeting during consideration thereof.

Councillor Chris Townsend declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 7 – Thomas Flack Trust Fund Applications as he was a member of the Ashtead Community Vision Forum, but was not required to leave the meeting during consideration thereof.

Councillor James Friend declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 6 – Mole Valley District Council Grant Aid Applications as he had links to various organisations in Westcott and played in the same cricket league as Newdigate Cricket Club, but was not required to leave the meeting during consideration thereof.

46. Councillor Question Time

Councillor David Preedy asked the following question:

‘Bearing in mind the Council’s commitments to openness and transparency, could the Leader provide answers to the questions asked at the Council Meeting on 3rd December, relating to the Ride-London-Surrey cycling events? These were:

When was Mole Valley District Council first aware that these events had been agreed and that the route would come through Mole Valley?

When were Members in wards on the proposed route formally advised of the event?

When was Mole Valley first aware that the event would be staged for more than one year?

What contractual arrangements has Mole Valley entered into relating to these events?’

Councillor Chris Townsend, Leader of the Council, responded as follows:

‘As I stated in my answer to this very question at full Council, we need to look forward and stop dragging up the past. We must and will continue to work with the event organisers and Surrey County Council to ensure robust engagement and communications are planned for all our communities and businesses. As a local Ward member, I know Councillor Preedy has met with the

event organisers and has had many opportunities to challenge and question them. I can not see how this is not being open and transparent. Councillor Preedy is also a member of the Executive Working group, which has been established to develop the Local Cycling plan which aims to consider the health benefits and safety of cycling locally. We also need to look at the benefits of this event and this week we have learnt that a number of local organisations were successful in their applications for funding from the Marathon Charities Trust, bringing significant investment to local communities. So again, I reiterate that we need to focus on the future and I will not be drawn in to a debate about what happened in the past.'

By way of a supplementary, Councillor Preedy asked if Mole Valley had signed the memorandum of understanding with Surrey County Council, and if it was a contractual understanding. Councillor Townsend responded that he was unsure and therefore would ask Officers to check this and let Councillor Preedy know.

47. Report of the Scrutiny and Audit Committees

Audit Committee

Councillor Iain Murdoch, Chairman of the Audit Committee, was in attendance at the meeting to update the Executive on the work of the Committee.

The Audit Committee considered the Annual Risk Management Report at its meeting on 28th November 2013. The purpose of the report was to enable the Committee to meet its responsibilities to provide the Council with independent assurance of the adequacy of the risk management framework and the associated control environment. The Committee considered the report which provided an update on the Council's progress in implementing and embedding risk management arrangements throughout the organisation.

The Committee noted that the Council had increased its risk maturity over the past few years and was now be defined as "Risk Managed". Members of the Committee were pleased to note that risk management was now a formal part of the culture of the organisation and are satisfied with the risk management arrangements that were in place.

However, it was felt that further work could be undertaken in relation to the identification of risks associated with specific projects and the inclusion of these in the corporate implications section of committee reports; work on this was being progressed by officers.

The Committee also felt that it would be useful for all Councillors to be aware of the Council's approach to risk management; a copy of this report had been uploaded onto the Members' extranet site for information.

Scrutiny Committee

The Scrutiny Committee last met on 10th December and at the meeting had considered a number of Executive items. The Committee also received another service update, with Paul Brooks attending to provide an update on the Property Service. The presentation proved to be very informative, a copy of which and a list of assets owned by the Council would be provided to Members for their information.

48. Mole Valley District Council Grant Aid Applications [KEY DECISION]

The Executive were asked to approve the recommendations in relation to the Mole Valley District Council Grant Aid Applications for 2014/15 as detailed in the report (page 5 of the agenda).

The Leader explained that Mole Valley District Council recognised the significant contribution made by the voluntary, community and faith sector (VCFS) in providing projects and services that improve the social, environmental and economic well-being of the District. Mole Valley operated a grants process which provided funding to organisations that help the Council to meet its priorities and build capacity within communities.

The deadline for submission of applications to the Council's Grant Aid programme for 2014/15 was 30th September 2013, and there were 14 revenue and 8 capital applications made. The report set out the headlines of those applications and recommended the awards to be made.

In total the capital and revenue expenditure allocated to community and voluntary groups for 2014/15 was £312,170, which compared with a total of £307,229 in 2013/14. In the current economic climate this reflected a significant ongoing investment in the community by the Council.

Members noted that given the ongoing financial pressures, the revenue element of the scheme for 2014/15 was effectively closed except to the organisations listed in Appendix E and agreed in the grants report for 2013/14. It was proposed that this approach continue for 2015/16.

The Scrutiny Committee received a report from the Standing Budget Panel who had scrutinised the Grant Aid report at its last meeting. The Panel made a number of comments including a request that a more appropriate name be given to the Parish Council Support Grant, which reflected its purpose. They also suggested that more be done by the Council to promote the tri-partite scheme.

The Panel's other comments were also reflected in the concerns of the Committee and related to the proposal to continue restricting applications for revenue grants to those groups set out in Appendix E of the report. The Committee felt that this recommendation needed to be clarified to make it clear that this restriction would affect grants allocated in 2015/2016. However, both the Panel and the Committee's main concern was the proposal itself; the Committee recommended to the Executive that all organisations that qualify for grant aid under the criteria agreed by the Council should be permitted to bid for grants and that the list set out in Appendix E be reviewed on an annual basis accordingly.

The other main area of concern related to the proposed grant for the CAB. It was accepted that by provisionally allocating the CAB a three year grant it would provide them with a secure source of funding, but in not granting them the full amount they had requested there were concerns that the CAB's ability to continue operating at its current level would be affected, particularly in light of the Government's welfare reforms. It was clear from the discussions held when CAB reported to Scrutiny Committee that welfare reform would place increasing pressures on the service in the coming years and this seemed not to have been taken into account when the three year proposal was developed. The Committee also recommended that either a Working Group or a Scrutiny Panel be established to review the Council's funding of the CAB, and its ability to gain additional funding from external sources.

Lastly, there were also concerns about the consistency of the approach to different organisations particularly when no explanation was given about why grants to different organisations were given varying percentage increases.

The Executive gave further consideration to the renaming of the Parish Council grants, and to the criteria of organisations (similar to those set out at Appendix E) permitted to bid for grants. It was proposed that recommendations 4 and 5, as set out in the report, be amended to delegate authority to the Leader and Portfolio Holder, in conjunction with Officers, to agree the wording for the renaming of the Parish Council grants and organisations eligible to apply for the revenue element of the scheme in 2014/15.

The Leader also made Members aware of two further minor amendments:

- Page 9, Table 3: the grant to St Nicholas, Great Bookham would increase from £4000 to £4400 based on revised costs; and

- Page 9 Table 2: Parish Council Concurrent Service Grants – Officers had received revised costs from Buckland totalling £2500, which meant that the grant would now read £1,875 (75%). This changed the total expenditure from £311,770 to £312,220.

The Executive went on to consider the three options as set out in the report and supported Option One. It was accordingly

RESOLVED: That

1. the one and three year revenue grants and capital grants outlined in the tables below be agreed for 2014/15 subject to the necessary budget being committed;

ORGANISATION	LAST GRANT MADE £	GRANT REQUEST 2014/15 £	GRANT RECOMMENDED £	TOTAL RECOM'D £
3 Year Grant Applications				
<i>Christmas Promotional Activities:</i>		(Maximum Claim Amounts)		
	1,100	1,200	1,200	
Ashted Traders	700	1,900	1,200	
Bookham Residents	5,500	8,000	6,500	
Dorking Christmas Lights	700	100	100	
Fetcham	<u>5,500</u>	<u>6,500</u>	<u>6,500</u>	
Leatherhead Christmas Festival	13,500	17,700	15,500	15,500
<i>Closed Church Yards:</i>	2013/14Yr			
St Nicholas, Great Bookham	3	5,300	4,400	
Holy Trinity Church, Westcott	3,500	4,200	3,650	
Ockley and Okewood	3,150	750	750	
St John's Chapel, Westcott	560	1,000	1,000	
St. Martin's Church, Dorking	1,000	<u>2,150</u>	<u>2,150</u>	
	<u>2,100</u>	13,400	11,950	11,950
	10,310			
Leatherhead and Dorking CAB	125,500	152,500	14/15 131,000 15/16 133,000 16/17 135,000	131,000
1 Year Grant Applications				
East Surrey Rural Transport Partnership	2013/14 10,800	13,500	13,500	31,000

ORGANISATION	LAST GRANT MADE £	GRANT REQUEST 2014/15 £	GRANT RECOMMENDED £	TOTAL RECOM'D £
Friends of Broome Hall Nursing Home	-	6,792	6,792	
Headley Playground Steering Group	-	12,000	12,000	
Newdigate Cricket Club	-	20,000	0	
Leatherhead Youth Project	-	12,587	10,000	
				28,792
Surrey Community Buildings –Tri-Partite				

Buckland Reading Room	-	7,500	7,500
Dorking URC	-	20,000	20,000
Eastwick Road Church	-	40,000	0
Christ Church Community Hall	-	5,861	5,861
TOTAL GRANTS RECOMMENDED			312,220

2. the Parish Council Concurrent Service Grants as set out in the table below be approved for a three year period commencing 2014/15;

ORGANISATION	LAST GRANT MADE £	GRANT REQUEST 2014/15 £	GRANT RECOMMENDED £	TOTAL RECOM'D £
3 Year Payments				
Abinger	4,193	4,193	4,193	
Betchworth	346	2,542	(75%) 1,907	
Buckland	1,200	2,500	(75%) 1,875	
Capel	5,109	9,405	(75%) 7,053	
Charlwood	6,539	12,140	(75%) 9,105	
Headley	73	335	(75%) 251	
Holmwood	1,637	1,637	1,637	
Leigh	1,163	1,163	1,163	
Mickleham	718	1,790	(75%) 1,343	
Ockley	654	1,445	(75%) 1,084	
				29,611

- an inflationary formula be applied to the Parish Council Concurrent Service Grants which tracked Mole Valley Council Tax levels on an annual basis commencing final year 2015/16;
- authority be delegated to the Leader and Portfolio Holder in consultation with Officers to agree the wording for the change of name from the Parish Council Concurrent Service Grant scheme; and
- authority be delegated to the Leader and Portfolio Holder in consultation with Officers to agree the wording relating to organisations eligible to apply for the revenue element of the scheme in 2014/15.

49. Thomas Flack Trust Fund Applications [KEY DECISION]

The Executive was asked to take into account the views of the Thomas Flack Working Group and approve the grants outlined in Section 2, Table 1 (page 46) of the report for the financial year 2014/15.

The Portfolio Holder for Customer Service and Wellbeing, Councillor Vivienne Michael, explained that applications to the Thomas Flack Trust Fund were considered by the Thomas Flack Working Group. The group was made up of elected Members from wards in the North of the District who offered views on all applications. Five applications to the Thomas Flack Trust Fund were received by the deadline of 30th September 2013 for funding in 2014/15. The Working Group assessed these

applications and has considered their views on awards and refusals based on eligibility and projected outcomes.

Councillor Bridget Lewis-Carr was in attendance at the meeting as a member of the Thomas Flack Working Group to answer any queries the Executive had. Councillor Lewis Carr expressed concerns that the accounts for those organisations that had applied had not been made available to Members, and that this should be remedied in the future. It was also pointed out that in Appendix 2 to the report (page 50) Age Concern Mole Valley should be amended to read Age Concern Mole Valley North, as it was quite separate from the work undertaken by Age Concern in the south of the District.

Executive Members noted, in relation to the application from Ashtead Community Vision, that locality monies from CDLG could also be used for the project. The Leader indicated that he had awarded the group a small sum from his Surrey County Council Members' allocation.

The Executive went on to consider the two options as set out in the report, and supported Option One. It was accordingly

RESOLVED: The Executive took into account the views of the Thomas Flack Working Group and approved the grants outlined in the table below for the financial year 2014/15:

ORGANISATION	Grant Application for 2014/15 £	Working Group's Views Award/No Grant	TOTAL 2014/15 £
CAPITAL			
Leatherhead Youth Football Club	100,000	No Grant	
Mole Valley Indoor Bowling Club	10,000	6,000	
SeeAbility	3,000	3,000	9,000
REVENUE			
Ashtead Community Vision	2,900	2,900	
Leatherhead Youth Project	5,150	5,150	8,050
GRAND TOTAL			17,050
Projected Balance Available for 2014/15			85,838

50. Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013 – Fees and Charges

The Executive was asked to approve the Fees and Charges for the licensing of scrap metal dealers as identified in paragraph 1.1 of the report.

It was noted that there was a minor error in Annex A to the report (minutes of the Licensing Committee on 10th October 2013); Councillor Northcott had been present at the meeting but was not listed in as in attendance. It was requested that this be corrected.

The Executive went on to consider the options as set out in the report and it was accordingly

RESOLVED: That the Fees and Charges for the licensing of Scrap Metal Dealers as identified below be approved:

Grant application (site 3 years)	£400
Renewal (site 3 years)	£400
Variation (site)	£200
Grant application (mobile 3 years)	£200
Renewal (mobile 3 years)	£200
Variation (mobile)	£100

NOTE: At this point the Leader amended the order of business – Item 9 Local Development

Scheme 2014 – 2017 would taken after consideration of Item 11 – Bookham Neighbourhood Development.

51. Mole Valley District Council – Consultation Draft Statement of Community Involvement 2014 [KEY DECISION]

The Executive was asked to agree that the draft Statement of Community Involvement be published for an 8 week period from Friday 10th January 2014 and authority be delegated to the Corporate Head with responsibility for Planning in consultation with the Planning Portfolio Holder and Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group to make any changes necessary to the document prior to its publication.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning, Councillor John Northcott, explained that the purpose of the report was to present an updated version of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The new SCI would supersede the previous document published in 2009. There were two main reasons for updating this document:

1. to meet the requirements of the consultation process, amended in the 2012 Local Plan Regulations; and
2. to reduce the content of the previous SCI in order to encourage greater readership.

It was a key document update that would significantly improve the way in which the Council continued to meet Corporate Priority 1 – improving the way it engaged with Customers, and listening to communities. It was hoped that the new SCI would help people to better understand how Mole Valley District Council would involve people in the decision-making process of planning.

The updated SCI was split into three parts - an outline of the recent changes to the planning system (since 2010), the Planning Policy (Local Plan) process and the Development Management process. The two core chapters were the latter two, explaining who, when and how people would be involved. It also explained the process of preparing and adopting a plan document and how a planning application decision was determined.

With the Government's agenda to devolve powers to local Councils and local people, publishing an update to this document was vital to ensuring communities were well informed as to how they could get involved in the planning process.

An addendum was circulated at the meeting showing subsequent minor amendments to the report and Statement of Community Involvement (attached at Appendix 1 to the minutes).

Members expressed concern regarding the issue of how to determine should be consulted about a planning application;; for example, how many properties in a road would be notified? Members noted there was no 'one size fits all' approach and that a formula may need to be worked on. Contacting an entire road would not work in all cases; some roads were very long and some issues would not be relevant to all properties in a road. It was suggested that following the closure of the consultation on the Statement of Community Involvement (starting on 10th January 2014 for an 8 week period) the matter be referred back to the Planning Peer Review Working Group for consideration.

The Scrutiny Committee had made a number of comments and suggestions about the finer detail of the report, which Officers had agreed to take away for consideration and report back to the Executive (see addendum at Appendix 1). Apart from these minor queries the Committee were happy for the Executive to accept the recommendations as set out.

The Executive went on to consider the two options as set out in the report and supported Option One. It was accordingly

RESOLVED: That, subject to the minor amendments circulated on the addendum at the meeting,

1. the Statement of Community Involvement draft consultation document be published for an 8

week period from Friday 10th January 2014; and

2. authority be delegated to the Corporate Head with responsibility for Planning in consultation with the Planning Portfolio Holder and Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group to make any changes necessary to the document prior to its publication.

52. Bookham Neighbourhood Development Plan

Councillor John Northcott explained to the Executive that since publication of the agenda, there had been some considerable changes to the arrangements in relation to the Bookham Neighbourhood Development Plan, and as such, a revised report had been circulated to Members detailing these changes. The Bookham Neighbourhood Forum has requested that the Council take over responsibility for the review of the Green Belt in Bookham and the appraisal of the sites which land owners and developers had requested should be identified for development. As a consequence it would be the Council rather than the Forum that carried out consultation with the local community as part of the preparation of the Housing and Traveller Site Plan. The report set out the implications of this request and suggested a way forward for the Council.

The Executive were asked to agree that authority be delegated to the Corporate Head of Service (Planning) in consultation with the Planning Portfolio Holder, Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group and the six Bookham Members, to approve the conclusions of a review of the Green Belt boundary around Bookham and the appraisals of the suggested development sites, for the purpose of public consultation, and that consultation on the Green Belt Boundary Review around Bookham and the site appraisals be commenced as soon as possible after the publication of the Housing and Traveller Sites – Consultation Document on 10th January 2014.

The Scrutiny Committee had considered the report at its meeting on 10th December, but this had been a different version to the amended report circulated after publication. The Committee had been broadly happy with the original report.

An addendum was circulated at the meeting showing subsequent minor amendments to the report and supporting documents (attached at Appendix 1 to the minutes).

Non-Executive Members indicated the importance of Mole Valley consulting with Guildford Borough Council and Effingham Parish Council during the process as the Bookham Neighbourhood Forum had planned to do.

The Executive went on to consider the three options as set out in the report and supported Option two. It was accordingly

RESOLVED: That

- 1) authority be delegated to the Corporate Head of Service (Planning) in consultation with the Planning Portfolio Holder, Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group and the six Bookham Members, to approve the conclusions of a review of the Green Belt boundary around Bookham and the appraisals of the suggested development sites, for the purpose of public consultation; and
- (2) consultation on the Green Belt Boundary Review around Bookham and the site appraisals be commenced as soon as possible after the publication of the Housing and Traveller Sites – Consultation Document on 10th January 2014.

53. Local Development Scheme 2014 – 2017 [KEY DECISION]

The Executive were asked to approve the proposed Local Development Scheme 2014 – 2017 to guide the Council's programme of local plan preparation up to 2017.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning, Councillor John Northcott, explained that the Council was required to prepare a Local Development Scheme (LDS) which established the Council's timetable and process for preparing local development documents. These were also known as local plans. The Council was required to inform the Planning Inspectorate of its adoption of a LDS.

The current LDS was adopted in March 2012. It was now timely to update it in the light of the preparation of the Housing and Traveller Sites Plan and the intention to carry out initial work on the preparation of a new Local Plan in parallel. In summary, it outlined the existing local development documents that the Council had adopted and set out the timetable for the preparation of the Housing and Traveller Sites Plan. It indicated the intention to adopt the Plan by the end of 2015. An outline of the schedule for the preparation of the new Local Plan was also explained. It also outlined the milestones for the preparation of the Community Infrastructure Levy.

An addendum was circulated at the meeting showing subsequent amendments to the report and supporting documents (attached at Appendix 1 to the minutes).

The Scrutiny Committee had considered the report and were happy for the Executive to accept the recommendation as set out in the report.

Members noted the large volume of work going into the Local Development Scheme and Housing and Traveller Sites Plan, and how important it was that Officers had sufficient time in the schedule to undertake all the appropriate work; it was confirmed that any issues for the timescales had already been identified as a risk, and that so far, there had been no slippage in the programme.

The Executive went on to consider the report in full and it was accordingly

RESOLVED: That, subject to the minor amendments circulated on the addendum at the meeting, the proposed Local Development Scheme 2014 – 2017 to guide the Council's programme of local plan preparation up to 2017 be approved.

54. Mole Valley Local Plan: Housing and Traveller Sites Plan Consultation Document [KEY DECISION]

The Executive were asked to accept the recommendations of the Council and agree the publication of the Housing and Traveller Sites Plan Consultation Document, plus supporting background evidence, for an 8 week period from Friday 10th January 2014 to 7th March 2014, and that authority be delegated to the Corporate Head with responsibility for Planning in consultation with the Planning Portfolio Holder and Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group to make minor editorial and other changes to the documents prior to their publication.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning, Councillor John Northcott, informed Members that the Council was required to prepare a Local Plan for Mole Valley. The Local Plan was a suite of Local Development Documents (LDDs) which set out a framework of policies for the use of land in the District. The Local Plan was previously known as the Local Development Framework (LDF). A number of LDDs have already been prepared for the Local Plan including the Core Strategy and the Dorking Town Area Action Plan (AAP).

The Core Strategy set out the overarching approach to future development in the district up to 2026 and was adopted in 2009. The Core Strategy did not identify specific areas of land for particular forms of development. This was achieved through the preparation of other documents in the Local Plan, such as the Dorking Town AAP and the Housing and Traveller Sites Plan. The Council consulted on the Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR) at the beginning of 2013. This document identified broad locations in the Green Belt and assessed them against the contribution they made to the purposes of the Green Belt (as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework). At this stage the Council also invited developers and landowners to submit sites for consideration as part of the preparation of the Housing and Traveller Sites Plan.

All of the proposed sites had been considered, and detailed Site Appraisals completed for each; a summary of each site was set out in the Housing and Traveller Sites Plan - Consultation Document. The public consultation formed an important part of the preparation of the plan and the findings would be used to inform which sites were proposed for development.

The consultation document sought the views of local communities on the sites put forward and their suitability for future development, the proposals for identifying Traveller sites and potential minor

changes to the Green Belt boundary. The report explained the relationship between the preparation of the Housing and Traveller Sites Plan and the Neighbourhood Development Plans. The development of the consultation document had been overseen by the Local Plan Working Group and was supported by a substantial evidence base.

The draft Consultation Document was considered by Council on 3rd December when it was agreed to recommend the Executive agrees to the publication of the Housing and Traveller Sites Plan – Consultation Document. The addenda tabled at the Council meeting had been incorporated into the documents appended to the Executive report.

An addendum was circulated at the meeting showing subsequent amendments to the report and supporting documents (attached at Appendix 1 to the minutes). A revised version of the introduction for Appendix 1, and a new version of Appendix 5 which incorporated the points in the addendum, were also tabled.

The Executive discussed the mix of measures that would be undertaken to ensure the public were engaged in the consultation, such as drop in sessions, use of social media and a letter to every household in the District. Executive Members agreed it was essential that the Executive, Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group and Group Leaders all had sight of the drafted letter before it was sent, and proposed that this be added as an additional resolution to the recommendations.

The Executive went on to consider the two options as set out in the report and supported Option One. It was accordingly

RESOLVED: The Executive accepted the recommendations of the Council and agreed, subject to the amendments circulated at the meeting,

1. the publication of the Housing and Traveller Sites Plan – Consultation Document, plus supporting background evidence, for an 8 week period from Friday 10th January 2014 to 7th March 2014;
2. that authority be delegated to the Corporate Head with responsibility for Planning in consultation with the Planning Portfolio Holder and Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group to make minor editorial and other changes to the documents prior to their publication; and
3. that the letter to be sent to all households and businesses in the District alerting the public to the consultation be drafted by Officers and shared with the Executive, the Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group and Group Leaders before distribution.

APPENDIX 1 – Addendum to Agenda Items 9, 10, 11 and 12

Agenda Item 9 – Local Development Scheme 2014 – 2017

Agenda page 67

Amend paragraphs 3.4 and 3.5 as follows -

Neighbourhood Development Plans the Council has invited the three Neighbourhood Forums preparing the NDPs in the Green Belt to carry out the review in their areas using a similar methodology to the Council. The Forums are well advanced with their assessments. The Ashtead and Westcott Forums have taken up this invitation and are advancing with their assessments and will be consulting locally on their conclusions in early 2014. The Bookham Forum, having published its initial Green Belt Review has requested the Council should take over responsibility in its entirety for this part of their NDP. The Council has agreed and will be consulting on its conclusions as part of the wider consultation on the Housing and Traveller Sites Plan – Consultation Document

The findings of the Ashtead and Westcott Forums and the responses they receive will be passed.....

Agenda Item 10 Mole Valley District Council – Consultation Draft Statement of Community Involvement.

Agenda page 99

Add Town Centre Forums to the list of bodies that will be consulted about the preparation of Local Plans.

Agenda page 102

Amend item 4 of paragraph 3.20 as follows:

Choose consultation processes which balance appropriately cost and time constraints, community impact and available resources that will best inform the community having regard to the likely impact of the proposal, while also taking account of costs, time constraints and resources.

Agenda page 106

Add new bullet point after the diagram as follows;

In the countryside, each planning application will be considered on its merits and neighbour notifications carried out as appropriate, taking into account the likely impact of the proposed development on residential or business neighbours.

Agenda page 107

Add new paragraph after paragraph 4.10 as follows:

Applications for work on trees (protected with a Tree Preservation Order or in a Conservation Area) will be added to the weekly list as usual and will be determined without consultation. Public input will be sought on applications to fell significant protected trees, but only where the request is not urgent e.g. the tree is not considered to pose a risk or the tree is not dead or dying.

Agenda Item 11 – Bookham Neighbourhood Development Plan

Agenda page 119

See addendum report which updates this agenda item

Agenda Item 12 – Mole Valley Local Plan: Housing and Traveller Sites Plan – Consultation Document.

Note.

The documents in the Appendices contain a number of typographical/formatting/grammar errors. These will be corrected in the publication version of the Consultation Document.

Appendix 1 –Consultation Document

New text is underlined

Deleted text is ~~struck through~~

(1) Overview – replace with text attached at Appendix 1 to this addendum

(2) Chapter 1 – Background. Add new section on brownfield land after paragraph 1.14 as follows:

Why can't brownfield land be used for new homes?

The Council has scoured the District to identify brownfield sites that are available for development. But it has to be recognised that Mole Valley is not a district with an available supply of redundant and derelict buildings or significant areas of brownfield land available for development.

The Council has asked for suggestions from the community on many occasions. This has not revealed a significant number of sites and those which have been mentioned are either small (one to two dwellings), premises in active use by businesses or suggestions which are hypothetical/aspirational rather than practicably deliverable.

This is not to say that new homes will not continue to be built on brownfield sites. It's just that they cannot be identified, but rather will happen under particular circumstances, for example when a property or site changes hand and a new owner wishes to build new homes on it an existing use ceases and it frees up a redevelopment opportunity or because of market conditions residential development of a site becomes viable when it previously had not been.

To capture these circumstances, the Council has included an estimate of 120 dwellings for these brownfield windfall housing sites in the estimated deliverable supply of housing sites in the above table. The Council is taking a cautious approach having regard to the provisions of the national Planning Policy Framework (para.48).

(3) Start of Chapters 2 – 10 text added to say: Before commenting on any particular site, please read the introductory section at the start of the document called 'What is this consultation about?' which explains the context for the consultation and includes information about what your comments should cover.

(4) **LH26:** Developer's estimated capacity: None given. For the purposes of this consultation, it is estimated the site has capacity for ~~30~~ 10 dwellings. (page 32)

(5) **Givons Grove Area:** Sites named. (Page 34).

(6) **DK14:** Estimated capacity: ~~420~~ 100.(Page 45)

(7) **Chapter 11:** Title amended to "Minor Green Belt and Village Boundary Changes" (Page 119).

Para 11.2 – After sentence 1, add: Different issues apply, depending whether the settlement in question is a Built Up Area or Larger Rural Village which is "inset" (excluded) from the Green Belt, or a Small Rural Village which is "washed over" by the Green Belt. This chapter explains the approach which has been followed in each area. The supporting document "Green Belt Boundary Review: Minor Boundary Changes" identifies the locations where a boundary change is being considered.

(Page 119)

Insert heading after para 11.2: Minor Green Belt Boundary Changes: Built Up Areas and Larger Rural Villages (Page 112)

11.3 – Add: The Built Up Areas and Larger Rural Villages are "inset" from the Green Belt (i.e. The land inside the boundary is not covered by Green Belt policy). (Page 113)

Box after paragraph 11.4, point 2: Add: This is on the assumption that the property boundary will, in most cases, have some physical definition on the ground. (Page 120)

Appendix 2 – Site Assessments

LH06 & LH24: Land off The Fairway

Page number	Paragraph, sentence	Heading	Changes
21	1 st paragraph, 3 rd sentence	Description	The site is flanked-bound to the west by housing along Clare Crescent; Clarewood; Sandes Place; and Woodbridge Grove.
24	2 nd paragraph, only sentence	Availability	It is understood from the promoter that the site that there are no legal / ownership constraints on the site that might prohibit or delay any development.
24	1 st paragraph, 4 th sentence	Final comments provided by the site promoter (not covered elsewhere in the assessment)	Impacts from the nearby motorway and railway could be overcome through careful planning and design. of the proposed development with Mitigation measures <u>could be</u> put in place in order to reduce the noise and air pollution, along with improvements to the bund surrounding the north and west of the site.

LH07: Land west of Oxshott Road

Page number	Paragraph, sentence	Heading	Changes
28	3 rd paragraph, 2 nd sentence	Access and Travel	Surrey County Council identify a need to provide a surfaced right of way from Dorin Court (a handicapped-disability centre) to Tesco through and alongside Teazle Wood on Footpath 159, Leatherhead.
28	1 st paragraph, 2 nd sentence	Key services and community facilities	The site is next-door <u>adjacent</u> to a supermarket and adjacent to that is an industrial estate.
28	paragraph after bullet points, 2 nd sentence	Nature Conservation and Biodiversity	Any development would have to demonstrate how the biodiversity of Teazle Wood would be safeguarded. <u>This would be</u> to ensure that it is not damaged either through the physical development or increased use and resultant issues such as litter and trampling that might arise from more people living next to it <u>nearby</u> .

LH09: Leatherhead Police Station, Kingston Road

Page number	Paragraph, sentence	Heading	Changes
32	1 st paragraph, 1 st sentence	Description	<u>This site contains the former</u> Leatherhead Police Station on Kingston Road in Leatherhead

LH10: Leatherhead Sorting Office, Station Road

Page number	Paragraph, sentence	Heading	Changes
36	1 st paragraph, 1 st sentence	Description	<u>This site contains the Royal Mail Sorting Office and vehicle depot on the junction of Station Road (one way) and Waterway Road.</u>
36	1 st paragraph, only sentence	Proposed Development	Housing or housing-led mixed use. Number not specified by promoters but based on a typical town centre scheme between 10 and 20 units might be expected <u>The site has been promoted for housing or housing-led mixed use. The number of dwellings has not been specified by the site promoter but based on a typical town centre scheme, between 10 and 20 units might be expected.</u>
36	2 nd paragraph, 1 st sentence	Access and travel	The site is very close to Leatherhead Railway Station and many bus stops, there is therefore <u>demonstrating</u> excellent access to public transport

LH14: Leatherhead By-Pass (including Barnett Wood Lane)

Page number	Paragraph, sentence	Heading	Changes
40	5 th paragraph, last sentence	Description	The site itself is flat. <u>The topography of the site can be described as flat.</u>

LH20: Land South of Windmill Drive

Page number	Paragraph, sentence	Heading	Changes
40	5 th paragraph, last sentence	Description	The promoter is promoting both this site and Land South of Windmill Drive, in combination, they estimate around 200-250 homes with improved pedestrian links between the site and the surrounding areas and open space. The promoter is promoting both this site and Land South of <u>Yarm Way (LH19)</u> . <u>Combined</u> , they estimate to <u>deliver</u> around 200-250 homes with improved pedestrian links between the site, the surrounding areas and open space.

BG01: Breakspear Farm

Page number	Paragraph, sentence	Heading	Changes
174	1 st paragraph	Green Bely Analysis	Land within this part of the Green Belt on the whole makes a minimal contribution to the various purposes of the Green Belt. It does not preventing the merging of towns or villages or <u>and</u> , due to the self-contained nature of the land and the clearly defined boundaries, <u>it plays a minimal role in safeguarding</u> the countryside from encroachment. Due to Its position at the entrance to the village and the range of predominantly rural buildings, <u>means</u> the site plays a moderate role in preserving the setting and character of Beare Green.

BR01: Land at Kiln Lane

Page number	Paragraph, sentence	Heading	Changes
189	2 nd paragraph	Relevant Planning History	A revised application (MO/2013/0806), for a reduced number of houses, concentrated on the eastern half of the site <u>was refused in September 2013.</u> <u>This decision has now been appealed.</u> is currently under consideration. (MO/2013/0806).

BR14: Land east of Wheelers Lane

Page number	Paragraph, sentence	Heading	Changes
237	1 st paragraph	Green Belt Analysis	It also plays a minimal <u>moderate</u> role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment <u>and</u> It plays a moderate role in preserving the setting and character of the villages.

CP02: Capel House Farm, The Street

Page number	Paragraph, sentence	Heading	Changes
242	1 st paragraph	Access and Travel	The Highways Authority have advised that if the full frontage of no.39 was available it is likely that the required visibility could be achieved if <u>and</u> the access point was relocated towards the centre of the plot then it is likely that the required visibility could be achieved.

CP10: Old Kiln Farm, Coles Lane

Page number	Paragraph, sentence	Heading	Changes
256	1 st paragraph	Green Belt Analysis	The land within GB-CHBA makes a minimal contribution to the Green Belt's purpose of preventing the merging of communities but a moderate contribution to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and preserving the setting of historic settlements.

DK24 – Land Adjoining Marley Mead

Page number	Paragraph, sentence	Heading	Changes
117	Sustainability Appraisal point 12.	To conserve and enhance biodiversity and networks of natural habitat.	Minor <u>Major</u> negative. <u>The site includes an area of Ancient Woodland.</u>
117	Sustainability Appraisal point 13.	To conserve and enhance landscape character and features, the historic environment and cultural assets and their setting.	Neutral/negligible <u>Minor negative.</u> The site has similar characteristics to area DJ but is more exposed in the landscape than the broad area as a whole, as a result of the upwards slope.

DK29 – Land adjacent to Betchworth Golf Club, Punchbowl Lane

Page number	Paragraph, sentence	Heading	Changes
135	1 st paragraph	Key services and community facilities	The nearest services, including a convenience store, Health centre and leisure facilities (including a swimming pool and the Dorking Halls), are around 1.2km 800m away. A Tesco Express opened at the end of September 2013 close to the site. The railway stations are around 1.5km 4km away, but there are bus services along Reigate Road, with a stop within 400m of the site. The nearest supermarket is just over 1km away and The nearest primary school is over 2km about 1.5km away. Overall, access to services is considered to be fair good but there are no footpaths linking the site to the surrounding roads and therefore the local facilities.
136	Sustainability appraisal point 5		Minor positive <u>Neutral / negligible</u> <u>Services and facilities are generally over 1km away and access is hampered by lack of footpaths. However, a wide range of facilities are available in Dorking which is the nearest town.</u>
137	Sustainability appraisal point 14		Although the site is physically close to a good range of services and facilities, The lack of footpath along Punchbowl Lane reduces the likelihood that occupiers would walk to such facilities.

Appendix 4 - Green Belt Boundary Review Update & Sustainability Appraisal

Add a Table of Contents and number pages in Appendix A

Appendix 5 - Green Belt Boundary Review: Minor Boundary Changes

The Minor Boundary Changes supporting document has been re-structured to assist with the consultation process, as follows:

- Explanatory text from Chapter 11 of HTSP Consultation Document has also been included in the supporting document, in a new Chapter 1: Background. This will assist those who have only the supporting document to hand.
- Chapter 1 includes additional paragraphs 1.6 to 1.14: Answers to questions likely to be asked by consultees.
- Chapter 1 includes new box after paragraph 1.14: How to comment.
- New paragraphs have been added at the beginning of each settlement chapter, linking readers to explanatory text and maps. The links will be electronic in the online version and will assist those who may access the supporting document direct, without downloading the introductory chapters.
- In order to distinguish more clearly between Green Belt and village boundary changes, the original introductory and background material has been split into two chapters:
 - New Chapter 2 covers the Green Belt boundary around Built Up Areas and Larger Rural Villages.
 - New Chapter 11 covers the village boundary around Small Rural Villages washed over by the Green belt, where different criteria apply.
- Text has been updated where necessary to identify locations where both a minor boundary change and a proposed site allocation are under consideration.
- Underlined text is new. Minor textual amendments have also been made elsewhere to correct typographical errors and for clarity.