I would like to comment on the proposed Dorking Divisions within Mole Valley. By proposing to bring the Dorking wards into a single Division, you have made inevitable the creation of huge rural Divisions.

The new **Dorking Hills** gives up the previous urban ward of Dorking North in favour of Holmwoods & Beare Green, an area that has little or no connection with the other areas of the Division to the north and west, despite the inclusion of Coldharbour which is in itself something of an oddity. Holmwoods and Beare Green has transport and other links to the south and east and would be better combined with Capel, Leigh Newdigate and Charlwood.

The proposed **Dorking Rural** Division is thoroughly unsatisfactory from a community of interest point of view. It stretches from Westhumble in the north-west (with links to Dorking) via Givons and Mickleham (with links to Leatherhead) across to Headley and Box Hill (with links east as much as west) and right down to Hookwood on the Sussex border (that looks predominantly to Horley and Gatwick). I do not understand what commonality of community interest exits over that vast area.

I haven’t been able to do the precise calculations but I would imagine there could be a solution along the lines of the proposal above for:

* Holmwoods and Beare Green with Capel, Leigh, Newdigate & Charlwood
* Dorking South with Brockham, Betchworth, Box Hill and Headley, and
* Dorking North with Mickleham, Westcott and Ockley ward.

By linking, where practical, each of the predominantly urban wards with a rural ward, you get more reasonably geographically sized Divisions with more community of interest between the rural villages and the urban area to which they look for services. Many of the villages in your proposed Dorking Hills and Dorking Rural Divisions look to Dorking for shopping, transport and other services. So my proposal would help you meet your community objective. I accept that some tweaking of my broad proposal might be needed for electoral equality reasons but this should be possible, especially as this does not appear to be an over-riding requirement, judging from the proposals for the north of Mole Valley.

I am not sure to what extent this has yet been considered. The very brief description in your report gives very little insight into your reasoning for reaching your published conclusions.