



***FEEDBACK
FROM VILLAGE MEETING ABOUT
DUNSFOLD'S
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
ON
26th February 2019***

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
RESULTS.....	3
FIGURE 1: SELECTION OF SITES.....	5
ANNEX A: FEEDBACK FORM.....	6
ANNEX B: DRAFT VISION STATEMENT.....	7
ANNEX C: SUMMARY OF SITE SELECTION POLICIES.....	8
ANNEX D: COMMENTS.....	11

INTRODUCTION

A village meeting was held in the Winn Hall on 26th February 2019.

Display boards showed information about possible sites, results from the Village Survey conducted in 2018 and other information. A presentation was also made and is available here: <https://dunsfoldvillage.uk/neighbourhood-plan/>.

Over 100 people attended and were asked to complete a feedback form and return it to the Parish Council office by 31st March. The form was also available on the Neighbourhood Plan webpage. The form is reproduced at Annex A.

RESULTS

103 forms were returned, although not all responded to every question. This overall response rate represents about 13% of the adult population of the Parish.

- 87% (of 89 respondents) agreed with the Vision Statement – reproduced at Annex B.
- 69% (of 80 respondents) agreed with the Site Selection Policies – summarised at Annex C.
- 77% (of 81 respondents) agreed that the houses should be spread around the Parish.

Six of the 19 sites were supported by 63% or more of the respondents: in order of preference:

- DNP/18/1: Alehouse Field
- DNP/18/18: Binhams Lea
- DNP/18/8: The Orchard
- DNP/18/17: Millhanger Farm
- DNP/18/3: Wetwood Farm
- DNP/18/19: Old Croft

This selection coincided with the sites considered to be possibilities for development by the Steering Group.

However, these six include one site that AECOM¹ rejected (DNP/18/19 Old Croft); and exclude four sites that AECOM had considered possible:

- DNP/18/20: Springfield
- DNP/18/11: Wetwood Cottage
- DNP/18/2: Coombe Bury
- DNP/18/9: New Pound Farm

Details are shown in Figure 1.

¹AECOM: Dunsfold Neighbourhood Plan: Site Assessment Report, November 2018
<https://dunsfoldvillage.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/AECOM-Dunsfold-Site-Assessment-Report-Nov-18.pdf>

Forty four people responded to the question about whether other sites should be considered. One suggested “two sites next to Shoppe Hill Cottages” and one other said other sites should be considered but did not make any suggestions.

Respondents were invited to comment. Thirty-six did so and all these comments are reproduced as submitted at Annex D, except in three cases:

- Two were omitted. In one case the comment permitted identification of the respondent and the other was from a developer.
- A third has been edited to remove a personal comment.

FIGURE 1: SELECTION OF SITES

Ref no	No. of houses	Respondents voting			Total	check	% Yes	AECOM (1)	SG (2)	Notes on Steering Group selection with reference to Site Selection policies - see Annex C.
		Yes	No							
DNP/18/1	ALEHOUSE FIELD	11	79	17	96	0	82.3%	A	P	
DNP/18/18	BINHAMS LEA	2	72	16	88	0	81.8%	G	P	
DNP/18/8	THE ORCHARD	4	67	23	90	0	74%	A	P	
DNP/18/17	MILLHANGER FARM (Self-build)	1	59	23	82	0	72%	A	P	
DNP/18/3	WETWOOD FARM	12	56	28	84	0	67%	A	P	
DNP/18/19	OLD CROFT (Self build)	1	57	34	91	0	63%	R	P	Scored well on all criteria
DNP/18/15	HATCHLANDS	3	47	44	91	0	52%	R	P	Scored well on all criteria except S4 Natural Environment. Suggested as self-build.
DNP/18/7	RAMS NEST	7	28	50	78	0	36%	R	O	
DNP/18/20	SPRINGFIELD	32	28	51	79	0	35%	G	O	Scored poorly on S1 Scale, S2 Land Use, S3 Location/coalescence
DNP/18/11	WETWOOD COTTAGE	25	26	56	82	0	32%	A	O	Scored poorly on S1 Scale, S2 Land Use, S3 Location/coalescence, S4 Natural Environment, S8 Access & Traffic
DNP/18/4&5	WROTHAM HILL	8	22	58	80	0	28%	R	O	
DNP/18/12	DUNSFOLD COMMON ROAD	5	21	60	81	0	26%	R	O	
DNP/18/13&14	HIGH BILLINGHURST FARM	204	21	62	83	0	25%	R	O	
DNP/18/10	MILL LANE	5	22	65	87	0	25%	R	O	
DNP/18/2	COOMBE BURY	19	21	63	84	0	25%	A	O	Scored poorly on S1 Scale, S2 Land Use, S3 Location/coalescence, S4 Natural Environment
DNP/18/9	NEW POUND FARM	50	13	67	80	0	16%	A	O	Scored poorly on S1 Scale, S2 Land Use, S3 Location/coalescence, S4 Natural Environment, S8 Access & Traffic
DNP/18/16	SHOPPE HILL	12	7	83	90	0	8%	R	O	
(1) AECOM classification:										
Red indicates the site is not appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan.										
Amber indicates the site is less sustainable, or may be appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan if certain issues can be resolved or constraints mitigated.										
Green indicates the site is appropriate for allocation through the Neighbourhood Plan.										
(2) SG classification										
Green: possibilities for development										
Red: Other										

ANNEX A: FEEDBACK FORM



VILLAGE MEETING 26TH FEBRUARY 2019 FEED-BACK

Are you a resident of Dunsfold YES NO

Please give your postcode

Do you agree with the Neighbourhood Plan VISION STATEMENT? YES NO

Do you agree with the draft Plan SITE SELECTION POLICIES? YES NO

Waverley's Local Plan requires that Dunsfold provides space for 30 to 40 new homes.

Do you agree that this new housing should be spread around the Parish? YES NO

Please indicate which sites you think should be developed to meet this target

Binhams Lea, 2 houses	YES	NO
The Orchard, Chiddingfold Road, 4 houses	YES	NO
Alehouse Field, 11 houses (retirement homes)	YES	NO
Wetwood Farm, Chiddingfold Road, 12 houses	YES	NO
Millhanger Farm, Chiddingfold Road, 1 house	YES	NO
Old Croft, Shoppe Hill, 1 house	YES	NO
Hatchlands, Chiddingfold Road, 3 houses	YES	NO
Dunsfold Common Road, 5 houses	YES	NO
Coombe Bury, adjoining Gratton Chase, 19 houses	YES	NO
Springfield, Alfold Road, 32 houses	YES	NO
Wrotham Hill (two sites), 8 houses	YES	NO
Mill Lane, 5 houses	YES	NO
New Pound Farm, 50 houses	YES	NO
Wetwood Cottage, Chiddingfold Road, 25 houses	YES	NO
Shoppe Hill, 12 houses	YES	NO
Rams Nest, Knightons Lane, 7 houses	YES	NO
High Billingham Farm (two sites), 204 houses	YES	NO
Any other sites?	YES	NO

PLEASE WRITE ON THE BACK OF THIS SHEET IF YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS

PLEASE LEAVE THIS SHEET IN THE BOX BY THE EXIT AT THE END OF THE MEETING

or post it to: Unit 3, The Orchard, Chiddingfold Road, Dunsfold GU8 4PB by 31st March 2019

IF YOU CAN HELP WITH WRITING THE PLAN OR UPDATING THE VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT PLEASE LET US KNOW

EVERYONE CAN HAVE THEIR SAY – IT'S OUR VILLAGE, OUR PLAN

ANNEX B: DRAFT VISION STATEMENT

Dunsfold's Vision is to maintain its quintessential English country village character whilst embracing and integrating the changing nature of modern life. The aim of the neighbourhood plan is to ensure that changes to housing, employment, communications, transport and community services are complementary to village life and enhance the beautiful settlement, common and surrounding countryside.

ANNEX C: SUMMARY OF SITE SELECTION POLICIES

The criteria for assessing sites for future housing and business development in Dunsfold are set out below. (Development criteria, covering what it is proposed to build on the site, covering both housing or business premises, will be dealt with in a separate document.)

Sites will be considered acceptable providing these criteria are met in addition to meeting the requirements of national policy and local policies, including the Dunsfold Design Statement, and reflecting recent local planning decisions and appeals. The Appendix sets out key policies from the NPPF, WBC's Local Plan Part 1 and draft Local Plan Part 2 together with various background notes.

DNP Site Selection Policy: Overarching aim

Development must preserve the intrinsic beauty and rural character of Dunsfold in the Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) **recognising the outstanding decision to extend the AONB Surrey Hills area to Dunsfold** and have no significant adverse visual or landscape impact, including protecting views from the adjacent Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

DNP Policy: S1. Scale

S1.1 The scale of the site is appropriate to its rural setting, recognises the local housing needs and does not, in itself, lead to increased urban feel and an adverse impact upon the Parish and serving infrastructure.

S1.2 Small sites are preferred.

S1.3 Sites that are above the threshold for affordable housing should not be preferred over smaller sites that are in keeping with the rural feel, just because larger sites provide affordable housing.

S1.4 Sites for self-build should be sought and encouraged to meet a target of up to five dwellings within the Parish.

DNP Policy: S2. Land Use

S2.1. Sites should make effective use of land: they should minimise the use of greenfield and make best use of infill and proven redundant previously developed land (PDL or "brownfield").

S2.2 Development of the site must benefit, and not be to the detriment or risk the loss of employment space supporting local businesses and offering local employment.

S2.3. Agricultural, equestrian and land based activities which help to shape and maintain the landscape and provide opportunity for leisure use should be retained. Claims for change of use should be fully justified and tested against the market need for existing use.

S2.4 The density of dwellings on sites in or adjacent to the settlement area should not exceed that found in the settlement area i.e.15 per hectare. Outside the settlement the density should be in keeping with its surroundings and any brownfield and not exceed 8 per hectare for detached and 12 for mixed housing.

DNP Policy: S3 Location and Coalescence

S3.1 Sites should not be isolated and be near existing dwellings but without significant loss of neighbouring amenity, loss of hedgerows or trees.

S3.2 Development within the settlement should create a linear form and should protect the balance of housing throughout the village whilst complementing the conservation areas and the Common.

S3.3 The impact of the development of the site individually, or cumulatively, must not result in the further coalescence of Dunsfold village with Dunsfold Park.

DNP Policy: S4. Natural Environment

S4.1 Biodiversity assets, especially Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SCNIs), are protected, conserved and enhanced.

S4.2 Existing natural features, including woodland (in particular ancient and protected woodland), significant trees, hedgerows (especially “important countryside hedgerows”) and watercourses of landscape and visual importance are retained.

S4.3 Public views from Dunsfold and from the adjacent AONB are protected or enhanced.

S4.4 Development of the site must not adversely impact on water quality.

DNP Policy: S5 Flooding

S5.1 Sites should be located outside of areas of flood risk.

S5.2 Development should not aggravate existing flooding issues.

DNP Policy: S6. Heritage Assets

Archaeological sites, ancient monuments, listed and non-listed heritage assets (and their settings), military historical sites and Dunsfold’s two conservation areas should be preserved or enhanced.

DNP Policy: S7. Community Facilities

Development of the site must benefit, and not be to the detriment or put at risk the Common, existing sport/recreational and cultural facilities and any other community assets.

DNP Policy: S8 Access and Traffic

S8.1 Dunsfold enjoys a wide network of public footpaths and bridlepaths whose character should be complemented by new development.

S8.2 Access must not unacceptably impact upon existing residential amenity.

S8.3 All new housing developments must, when appropriate and practical, provide safe pedestrian access to link with existing or proposed footpaths and bridlepaths, ensuring residents can walk safely to bus stops and Parish facilities.

S8.4 Development must contribute to the aims of traffic calming and reduced speeds on roads throughout the Parish.

S8.5 Business development should not add significantly to traffic through the Parish and avoid increased HGV movement through the village. Where development proposals are likely to generate HGV movements a Transport Assessment and/or a Travel Plan will be required to demonstrate that the HGV movements are necessary and would be acceptable in terms of their environmental impact.

DNP Policy: S9 Infrastructure

It is essential that new development can be adequately supplied by water and sewerage infrastructure, allowing for the fact that many properties in Dunsfold do not have main drainage. Capacity must exist off-site without compromising supplies or the amenities of current residents locally and downstream.

DNP Policy: S10 Deliverability

Sufficient evidence must be provided to demonstrate deliverability and that the land is free from legal restrictions or covenants which may prevent development.

DNP Policy: S11. Independent Assessment

Assessment scoring by independent consultants AECOM in 2018 will be taken into account:

The full paper is available on the Dunsfold Village website:

<https://dunsfoldvillage.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Site-Selection-Principles-Oct-18.pdf>

ANNEX D: COMMENTS

TOTAL NUMBER INCLUDING GRATTONS CHASE MUST NOT EXCEED 100
IF WE ARE TO HAVE 2000 NEW DWELLINGS IN THE OLD AIRBASE WHY SHOULD WE FILL IN MORE GREEN FIELDS WITH MORE HOUSES? SURELY DUNSFOLD HAS ENOUGH? AIRFIELD + FRACKING. STOP MORE DEVELOPMENT NOW PLEASE
WE HAVE TOO MANY ALREADY PROPOSED, NO MORE ARE NECESSARY. THE INFRASTRUCTURE CANNOT COPE
HATCHLANDS HOUSE SITE IS ALONGSIDE OUR SHARED DRIVE. NO FACILITIES. OVERLOOKS & SPOILS THE ONLY BIT OF GREEN & RUINS & OVERLOOKS OTHER PEOPLES GARDENS & THINK IT HAS HAD PLANNING PERMISSION TURNED DOWN TWICE. IT HAS A COVENANT & IS USED FOR ANIMALS I BELIEVE
SITE SELECTION POLICIES: YES BUT MORE FOCUS ON BROWNFIELD DEVELOPMENT. DUNSFOLD COMMON ROAD & COOMBEBURY: EFFECT ON LISTED BUILDINGS - SEE INSPECTORS REPORT REFUSED FROM 2013. ENTRANCE TO VILLAGE. OVERDEVELOPMENT NEXT TO GRATTONS CHASE IN THAT AREA - AVOID CONCENTRATION WHICH IS ONE OF THE POLICIES. HIGH BILLINGHURST YES BUT LESS HOUSES
WETWOOD FARM - NOT APPROPRIATE TO DEVELOP AS IT HAS ACCESS TO A DIFFICULT BEND ON THE CHIDDINGFOLD ROAD WITH LACK OF SIGHT LINES
NO NO NO TO BILLINGHURST FARM
BUT THE NUMBER OVERALL SHOULD NOT EXCEED 80 INCLUDING GRATTONS CHASE
NOT RESIDENT 'JUST BEHAVE LIKE ONE' HIGH BILLINGHURST FARM 'COALESCE'
RETIREMENT HOMES - 'WE NEED THIS!' HIGH BILLINGHURST - TOO MANY
SELECTION POLICIES: S1.1 "IN ITSELF" SHOULD READ "IN AGGREGATE" OR "IN TOTAL" S2 - HATCHLANDS PROPOSAL IS GREENFIELD, AGRICULTURAL LAND USED FOR GRAZING. FOR A VILLAGE FACING THE DEVELOPMENT OF WELL OVER 1,000 NEW HOUSES ON ITS BORDER, THIS FEELS LIKE A SLAP IN THE FACE, A DISRESPECTFUL WAY TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF A RURAL COMMUNITY. PLEASE DELAY ANY <u>BINDING</u> PLAN UNTIL APPEAL PROCESS COMPLETE
THERE IS NOT THE INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT ALL THIS NEW BUILDING. ROADS ARE APPALLING & CANNOT COPE WITH MORE TRAFFIC. EACH HOUSE = 2 MORE VEHICLES. SHOPS? SCHOOLS? MEDICAL? VILLAGE BECOMES TOWN? No.1 - 50 NEW HOUSES IN NEW POND FARM? HOW ARE THEY GONG TO GET IN AND OUT. DISRUPTION TO LOCAL RESIDENTS
EMPHATIC 'NO' FOR COOMBEBURY
1800 HOUSES ARE PLANNED AT DUNSFOLD PARK WHY ARE YOU PLANNING FOR MORE? WHY DO YOU REFUSE TO REDUCE THE HOUSING REQUIREMENT GIVEN THE OVERSPILL FROM WOKING IS NOT NOW NEEDED? PLEASE ANSWER
GO FOR SITES NOT OVERLOOKED BY NEIGHBOURS
OTHER SITES: TWO SITES NEXT TO SHOPPE HILL COTTAGES
YES - OUT OF VILLAGE AND ALL IN ONE PLACE!
88% OF ANSWERS TO 'NO MORE BUILDING FOR FIVE YEARS' SAID NO. THIS SHOULD BE RESPECTED
WHY ONLY 5 HOUSES IN DUNSFOLD COMMON ROAD?
5 HOUSES AT DUNSFOLD COMMON [Personal comment deleted]. THIS APPLICATION SHOULD NOT EVEN OR EVER BE CONSIDERED
SITE SELECTION POLICIES: DON'T KNOW - HAVE NOT READ

WITH THE DEVELOPMENT ON DUNSFOLD PARK THAT INCLUDES WOKING QUOTA HOUSES I FIND IT DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND WHY MORE HOUSES NEED TO BE BUILT IN DUNSFOLD. I WOULD BE VERY CONCERNED ABOUT ROAD SAFETY IF THE SITE ON WROTHAM HILL IS USED AS THE ENTRANCE WILL BE ON THE BROW OF THE HILL AT A HOTSPOT SITE FOR CAR ACCIDENTS

DUNS COMMON ROAD - PROXIMITY TO LISTED BUILDING. COOMBE BURY, SPRINGFIELD, NEW POUND FARM, WETWOOD COTT, SHOPPE HILL, HIGH BILLINGHURST - TOO LARGE. MILL LANE - PREVIOUS APPLICATION HAD INSUFFICIENT PARKING - TWO SPACES FOR A 3 BEDROOM HOUSE IS INADEQUATE. PARKING IS AN ISSUE FOR ALL DEVELOPMENTS. PUTTING HOUSING IN VILLAGES WITH LITTLE PUBLIC TRANSPORT RESULTS IN TOTAL CAR DEPENDENCE FOR ALL RESIDENTS. THANKS FOR ALL YOUR HARD WORK ON OUR BEHALF

A CONSERVATION AREA SHOULD NOT BE DEVELOPED

I FEEL THAT BOTH THE SCHOOL SITE AND THE FIRE STATION SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE VILLAGE PLANS

THE FIRE STATION SITE & THE FORMER SCHOOL SITE SHOULD BOTH BE INCLUDED WITHIN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AS THEY ARE BOTH IMPORTANT SITES IN CENTRAL LOCATIONS. THE SCHOOL SITE CANNOT BE ALLOWED TO STAND UNUSED FOR MUCH LONGER (LISTED IN A CONSERVATION AREA). THE 2 SITES NEED TO BE CONSIDERED DESPITE SPECIFIC 'CALL FOR SITES' NOT BEING FORTHCOMING FOR THESE SITES. AECOM ALSO ADVISE THAT CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE SCHOOL SITE.

BINHAMS LEA - SHOULD BE 6 OR MORE. THE SITE IS LARGE. WETWOOD FM - LESS HOUSES WITH DEEP BUFFER FROM ROAD IE., ON SITE OF EXISTING BUILDINGS. HATCHLANDS - PERHAPS IF COMPELLED. COOMBE BURY - PERHAPS POST 2032 IF COMPELLED. MILL LANE - PERHAPS IF WOODED. GIVEN THE HUGE CONTRIBUTION TO HOUSING STOCK BEING MADE BY OUR COMMUNITY VIA DUNSFOLD PARK, WE SHOULD NOT EASILY ACCEPT MORE HOUSES IN THE VILLAGE. A MUCH MORE ROBUST STAND SHOULD BE TAKEN AGAINST WAVERLEY - NEW HOUSING JUST TO SATISFY A 'NEED' FOR NUMBERS SHOULD NOT BE FORCED INTO SMALL VILLAGES SUCH AS OURS. THE 'VISION STATEMENT' RECOGNISES THE QUALITIES OF OUR VILLAGE. IT FOLLOWS THAT ANY NEW DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE DISCRETE, SET BACK FROM PATHS AND ROADS & WELL SCREENED IN ORDER TO REDUCE THE 'URBANISING' EFFECT. THE STRENGTH OF FEELING & CONCERN OF VILLAGE RESIDENTS OVER THE 'SPOILING' OF OUR VILLAGE BY OVER DEVELOPMENT - NOT TO SATISFY LOCAL NEED BUT PURELY TO SATISFY A WAVERLEY NUMBERS REQUIREMENT - MAY BE JUDGED BY THE NUMBER OF RESIDENTS AT THIS VILLAGE MEETING. THE PARISH PLAINLY HAS THE RESIDENTS MANDATE ON THIS ISSUE.

SURELY THE BEST APPROACH WOULD BE TO LOCATE ALL THE ADDITIONAL HOUSING ON THE HIGH BILLINGHURST FARM SITE WHICH WOULD NOT UNDULY IMPACT THE VILLAGE & WOULD ALSO REFLECT THE NEW DUNSFOLD PARK HOUSING. I ALSO SEE LITTLE BEING GAINED FROM ADOPTING A 'LINEAR' APPROACH TO THE NEW HOUSING (I.E., SPREADING THE NEW HOUSING ALONG CHIDDINGFOLD ROAD/DUNSFOLD COMMON ROAD). LINEAR SETTLEMENTS ARE USUALLY A RESULT OF AN UNAVOIDABLE RESTRICTION ON A MORE DISPERSED SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT (E.G., COASTLINE, OTHER GEOGRAPHICAL RESTRICTION) WHICH CLEARLY DO NOT APPLY AT DUNSFOLD.

NO TO SHOPPE HILL 12 HOUSES - VERY NARROW ACCESS - INADEQUATE SEWAGE STRUCTURE - AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY - DIRECT IMPACT ON 10+ HOUSES SURROUNDING THE FIELD - CREATE TRAFFIC & PARKING PROBLEMS ON SHOPPE GHILL WHICH IS A SINGLE LANE ROAD - PARISH COUNCIL HAS ALWAYS STATED THAT THIS FIELD IS UNSUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT - WILDLIFE ISSUES, DISRUPTION AND ANIHILATION OF HABITATS FOR HEDGEHOGS, NEWTS, TOADS ETC. OWLS FORAGE, DEER, FOX - WOULD HAVE TO CUT DOWN TREES IN ORDER TO ACCESS THE FIELD,

SPREAD - I OBJECT TO THIS NUMBER BUT AGREE WITH THE PRINCIPLE THAT DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE SPREAD AROUND THE PARISH. QUERY WHY WETWOOD FARM AND WETWOOD COTTAGE ARE SO FAR APART IN THE RANKINGS. VISION STATEMENT IS TOO 'WORDY'. IT IS NOT CLEAR WHAT IS MEANT BY 'QUINTESSENTIAL ENGLISH COUNTRY VILLAGE CHARACTER', 'CHANGING NATURE OF MODERN LIFE'. THIS IS SUBJECT TO DEBATE AND DOESN'T PROVIDE A 'VISUAL' DESCRIPTION OF DUNSFOLD OF THE FUTURE. SECOND PART REFERS TO THE N.P'S OBJECTIVES, RATHER THAN A VILLAGE 'VISION'. THE OBJECTIVES SHOULD BE KEPT SEPARATE (ALTHOUGH SHOULD FLOW FROM THE VISION). AS A RESULT I HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT HOW EFFECTIVE THE VISION STATEMENT IS IN GUIDING POLICY CHOICES/PLANNING POLICIES IN THE DOCUMENT. I HAD HOPED THE VISION STATEMENT WOULD BE A POSITIVE, AMBITIOUS AND INSPIRATIONAL MESSAGE TO THE PUBLIC (& WAVERLEY BC) ABOUT THE DUNSFOLD OF TOMORROW AS A PLACE TO LIVE, WORK AND VISIT FOR RECREATION. LANGUAGE IS VERY IMPORTANT IN HELPING TO ACHIEVE THIS CONNECTION WITH THE AUDIENCE. WHY NOT START WITH 'DUNSFOLD WILL BE' OR 'PEOPLE WILL VALUE LIVING & WORKING IN DUNSFOLD AND VISITING HERE BECAUSE' A VISION 'TO MAINTAIN' SEEMS TOTALLY UNDERWHELMING BY COMPARISON, AND SUGGESTS THE VILLAGE IS PASSIVE (CHANGE HAPPENING TO IT RATHER THAN IT TAKING (OR INTERESTED PARTIES) ARTICULATING AN ACTIVE LEAD IN DIRECTION).

I THINK IT IS IMPORTANT TO BEWARE OF THE RIDICULOUS TACTICAL VOTING WHICH APPEARS TO BE TAKING PLACE ('YOU VOTE AGAINST THE DEVELOPMENT NEAR ME AND I'LL VOTE AGAINST THE ONE NEAR YOU'). AS ADVISED AT THE VILLAGE MEETING I AM ONLY VOTING FOR THE DEVELOPMENTS ABOVE THE LINE AS I BELIEVE WE SHOULD ALL BE TRYING TO KEEP THE DEVELOPMENT TO A MINIMUM,

SUPPORT FOR SPRINGFIELD IS BASED ON AN ASSUMPTION THIS IS THE SAME SITE AS THE 8 AFFORDABLE HOUSES THAT ALREADY HAS PLANNING PERMISSION. THAT THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD UTILISE THE SAME ACCESS TO ALFOLD ROAD.

WETWOOD FARM/WETWOOD COTTAGE - APPEARS SILLY TO 'ENLARGE' THE 'CENTRE' OF THE VILLAGE WHEN MORE REMOTE AREAS AVAILABLE.

ALEHOUSE: SITE DEVELOPABLE AREA IS APPROXIMATELY 5,000M² IN SIZE, AS MEASURED ON ORDNANCE SURVEY MASTERMAP. THEREFORE THE CAPACITY SHOULD BE CLOSER TO 7 DWELLINGS AT 15 DWELLINGS PER HECTARE RATHER THAN THE STATED 11, AS PER DNP POLICY S2 - SE.4. ACCESS ISSUES? VERY RESTRICTED FROM DUNSFOLD COMMON ROAD, AND WOULD INVOLVE REASONABLE AMOUNT OF TREE LOSS DOWN LANE, UNLESS THROUGH EXISTING PROPERTY. WETWOOD FARM: GOOD TO BE REUSING BROWNFIELD LAND, HOWEVER - LARGE AMOUNT OF TREE COVER IN AND AROUND THIS SITE. TAKING INTO ACCOUNT GUIDANCE FROM BS 5837:2012 TREES IN RELATION TO CONSTRUCTION, THE REMAINING DEVELOPABLE AREA IS LIKELY TO COME TO APPROXIMATELY 6,000M². THIS COMES TO 5 DWELLINGS AT THE 8 DWELLINGS PER HECTARE SET IN DNP POLICY S2 - S2.4, OR 7 MIXED USE, RATHER THAN THE 12 STATED. NOT VERY SUSTAINABLE LOCATION IN TERMS OF WALKING TO THE VILLAGE - 1.2 MILES ALONG THE ROAD WHICH HAS NO PATH SO IS NOT PARTICULARLY SAFE FOR CHILDREN/PRAMS ETC. THE ORCHARD: APPROPRIATE INFILL SITE FOR 4 DWELLINGS. BINHAMS LEA: GOOD INFILL SITE. MATURE TREE BEHIND RESTRICTS DEVELOPMENT AND GARDEN TO 18M X 18M - MORE LIKE 1 DWELLING? IT IS NOT CLEAR FROM THE PRESENTATION ON THE WEBSITE WHERE THE OTHER *PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND - 2 SITES IN THE CENTRE OF THE VILLAGE* ARE FOR 10 DWELLINGS. SELF-BUILD PLOTS: ALL 5 DWELLINGS APPEAR LOGICAL. NOTE: THE ABOVE TOTAL COMES TO 32 DWELLINGS AND DOES NOT MEET THE PROPOSED ALLOCATION TARGET OF 44 HOMES. BASED ON THE ABOVE REDUCED NUMBERS, I CONSIDER SITE 20 EAST OF DUNSFOLD (SPRINGFIELD) SHOULD HAVE CONSIDERATION TO MEET THE SHORTFALL FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS: THIS SITE ALONG WITH BINHAMS LEA ARE THE ONLY ONES IN THE AECOM SITE ASSESSMENT TO BE CLASSED AS SUITABLE: IT IS PROVEN TO BE DEVELOPABLE - A SMALL SITE IS CURRENTLY UNDER CONSTRUCTION, WITH THE ACCESS PROVEN TO BE ACCEPTABLE; IT IS CLOSE TO THE CENTRE OF THE VILLAGE, BUT WOULD NOT IMPACT ON VIEWS FROM THE PUBLIC AREAS OF THE VILLAGE AND; THE QUOTED NUMBER OF 32 HOMES IS FOR THE WHOLE SITE - THIS SITE CAN BE FLEXIBLE IN ITS SIZE TO FIT THE NEED OF THE VILLAGE AND COULD BE RE-SIZED, FOR EXAMPLE, TO 0.8 HECTARE TO FIT THE 12 DWELLINGS REQUIRED AT 15 DWELLINGS PER HECTARE.