

**INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE UPDATED WESTCOTT  
NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

EXAMINER: Andrew Mead BSc (Hons) MRTPI MIQ

Examination Ref: 02/AM/WNP

Tim Way  
Chair - Westcott Village Forum

Duncan Clarke  
Mole Valley District Council

16 February 2026

Via email

Dear Mr Way and Mr Clarke

Having carried out my visit to the Westcott Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) Area, I have identified some matters on which clarification from Westcott Village Forum (WVF) and Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) would assist me in my examination of the WNP. May I request the submission of responses to my questions by **2 March 2026**, although an earlier response would be most welcome.

Specific questions of clarification to the Councils are listed below, but I am happy to receive comments from either Council on any of the questions which are not directed at them in the first instance. These questions are posed in the context of establishing whether the WNP meets the Basic Conditions and is legally compliant.

**Questions to Westcott Village Forum (WVF) and Mole Valley District Council (MVDC)**

- 1. Question to MVDC.** What was the date of submission of the WNDP to MVDC from WVF?
- 2. Question to MVDC and WVF.** MVDC comments in the Regulation 16 representation that: "in a number of places, the Plan refers to the 'Ward' when it should be referring to the 'Plan area' because they are not the same". I should be grateful for clarification from both parties of where there is an incorrect description, particularly as Fig 1 of the Plan and the map in the Basic Condition Statement (page 2) shows the Westcott Ward and Neighbourhood Plan Area to be identical.
- 3. Question to MVDC.** In its Regulation 16 representation, MVDC states that "The submission version of the Westcott Neighbourhood Plan has had regard to national policy but some amendments are required to achieve this condition fully". Similarly, MVDC also states that: "The submission version of the Westcott Neighbourhood Plan is largely in conformity with the strategic policies of the Mole Valley District (sic) Plan (adopted 2024) but some amendments are required to achieve this condition fully. Furthermore, there is some conflict with non-strategic policies which require resolution in order for both plans to determine planning applications successfully in tandem".

The representation then goes on to list the policies of the Plan and make comments on each of them. May I assume that the above comments on the policies are those amendments sought in detail further within the representation?

### Policy WNDP1

- 4. Question to WVF.** Has the WVF any comments on the factual corrections suggested to paragraph 5.4.4 of the Plan and the suggested alterations to Clauses ii, iii and iv of Policy WNDP1 by MVDC?

### Policy WNDP2

- 5. Question to WVF.** Has the WVF any comments on the suggested alterations by MVDC to Clauses iv and viii of Policy WNDP2, the latter of which would require a consequent amendment to, or deletion of, paragraphs 2.3.2 and 6.2.9, especially as the Green Belt Review commissioned by the WVF has not yet been published?

### Policy WNDP3

- 6. Question to WVF.** Does the WVF agree with the deletion of the second paragraph of Policy WNDP3?

### Policy WNDP4

- 7. Question to WVF.** Does the WVF have any comments on the suggested amendment to the second paragraph of Policy WNDP4 by MVDC?
- 8. Question to WVF and MVDC.** MVDC suggests the deletion of the third paragraph of Policy WNDP4, citing the reason that the Surrey County Council parking standards are maximum standards. However, Policy INF2 of the Mole Valley Local Plan indicates that parking standards for residential development are minimum standards (Clause 1) and parking standards for non-residential development are maximum standards (Clause 2). Therefore, given that the theme of the policy, as shown by paragraph 6.4.1, is residential parking, rather than deleting the third paragraph, the first phrase of the third paragraph could be amended to *“Proposals for residential development which deliver additional parking above and beyond, etc...”*. I would be grateful for the comments of WVF and MVDC on this suggestion.

### Policy WNDP8

- 9. Question to WVF.** MVDC suggest the inclusion of *“should, where feasible”* in the fourth and seventh paragraphs of Policy WNDP8. Please may I have the comments of WVF on these suggested amendments?
- 10. Question to WVF.** Surrey County Council suggests in a representation dated 29 January 2026 an amendment to the second paragraph of Policy WNDP8 beneath the sub-heading Flood Risk. I would be pleased to have comments from WVF on this suggestion, together with the addition of *“Sustainable Drainage”* as another bullet point to the list in Policy WNDP8 (page 39), to which I might add *“where appropriate”*.

### Policy WNDP9

- 11. Question to WVF and MVDC.** Policy WNDP9 seeks to protect heritage assets. The first paragraph states that: *“Any harm to the significance of a heritage asset will require clear and convincing justification and will only be permitted where the public benefits of the scheme demonstrably outweigh the harm identified.”* However, this paragraph as drafted would also apply to non-designated heritage assets (NDHA) to which, following NPPF guidance and Policy EN6 of the Mole Valley Local Plan, the public benefit test does not apply. It appears to me that NDHA are dealt with adequately in the fourth paragraph of Policy WNDP9. Therefore, the first paragraph of the policy could be amended to: *“Any harm to the*

*significance of a designated heritage asset ..., etc". Please may I have comments from the WVF and MVDC on this suggestion?*

**12. Question to WVF.** In addition, any comments from WVF on the amendments suggested by MVDC on the first and fourth paragraphs of Policy WNDP9 would be welcome.

**Policy WNDP11**

**13. Question to WVF.** Please may I have comments from WVF on the suggested amendments by MVDC to the first and second paragraphs of Policy WNDP11?

**Land at Mill Way House**

**14. Question to WVF and MVDC.** Policy DS63 of the Mole Valley Local Plan allocates 2.3 ha of land at Mill Way House, Bramley House and Heathcrest for residential development with an indicative capacity of 15 dwellings (apartments). A Group Representation seeks the deletion of the site from the Neighbourhood Plan, the main reason being an inadequate and unsafe access from the A25 which cannot be improved sufficiently within the site boundary and hence is undeliverable. Please may I have comments from WVF and MVDC on this representation?

**Land to the rear of Westcott Nursing Home**

**15. Question to WVF and MVDC.** A representation seeks the allocation of a net developable area of 1.4 ha of land to the rear of Westcott Nursing Home for residential development, which the accompanying Landscape and Visual Appraisal and indicative drawings suggest could accommodate 31 houses. Please may I have comments from WVF and MVDC on this representation?

In the interests of transparency, may I prevail upon you to ensure a copy of this letter is placed on the Westcott Village Forum and Mole Valley District Council websites.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Yours sincerely

*Andy Mead*

Examiner