Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020–2039

Riverbank Surgery, Westcott Street, Westcott RH4 3PA — Policy WNDP7 and Proposed Modification PM6
A chronology of contact between the Westcott Village Forum and the owner, with the underlying documents

To	The Examiner, Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan Examination, care of Intelligent Plans and Examinations Ltd — submitted through Mr Duncan Clarke, Planning Policy Manager, Mole Valley District Council
From	Dr Thomas Guilder, owner of Riverbank Surgery, assisted by Ewan Guilder and Neil Guilder
Date	August 2026
Read with	Representation 68 (21 July 2026) and the letter of 12 May 2026, both submitted on Dr Guilder's behalf

Why this document has been prepared

The Westcott Village Forum has placed before the Examiner a statement dated 31 July 2026 describing three occasions on which it says it tried to engage with Dr Guilder about the safeguarding of Riverbank Surgery. We understand the Examiner has granted the Forum a right to respond to representations. This document is submitted so that those three occasions can be seen alongside the dates of the consultations themselves, and alongside the documents they come from.

Dr Guilder does not dispute that the three events took place, and makes no criticism of any individual. He accepts that members of the Forum and of the Westcott Village Association have for years taken a genuine interest in securing modern premises for the village practice. He was the village general practitioner for over thirty years, converted the building from a house himself, and supports the continued provision of general medical services in Westcott. The point he makes is narrow, and it is about dates.

> ***What is and is not in this document.*** *Every quotation is reproduced word for word from its source and the appendix gives the source for each one. No valuation figure appears anywhere, nor anything concerning Dr Guilder's health or the tenancy of the building; those matters are not relevant to the question here and have been left out deliberately. Personal telephone numbers and email addresses have been removed. Where words have been omitted from a quoted document, that is marked and the reason given, and the unedited document can be provided on request.*

The chronology

■ REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION OPENS — 13 October 2025 (run by the Village Forum)	
11 Oct 2025	A general “Dear Neighbour” letter is sent to 27 landowners and businesses. It names no policy and no property. Dr Guilder is not on the list, and neither is the registered proprietor of the surgery.
21 Nov 2025	**Matplan writes to the Forum on behalf of Dorking Medical Practice (the surgery's occupier) and Rushmon Homes (the adjoining landowner), asking that Riverbank Surgery be moved out of Policy 6 (shops and commercial premises) and into Policy 7 (community assets).** This is the request that begins everything that follows. *(Appendix A)*

■ REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION CLOSES — 24 November 2025
NO CONTACT WITH DR GUILDER

Nov–Dec 2025	The Forum agrees to the request. The tracked-changes version of the Plan shows Riverbank Surgery struck out of the Policy 6 list and added to the Policy 7 list. Dr Guilder is not told.

■ REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION OPENS — 8 December 2025 (run by Mole Valley District Council)	
8 Dec 2025	Copies of the Plan are placed at six locations for the public to read — one of them is Riverbank Surgery itself.
Dec 2025 / Jan 2026	Matplan makes a further representation supporting Policy 7, again on behalf of both the practice and Rushmon Homes.

■ REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION CLOSES — 2 February 2026
NO CONTACT WITH DR GUILDER

The examination begins

9 Feb 2026	The Examiner decides the examination will proceed on written representations, and finds the proposed changes are material and change the nature of the existing Plan.
16 Feb 2026	The Examiner puts 15 questions to the Forum and the Council. None of them concerns Policy 6, Policy 7 or Riverbank Surgery.

■ THE EXAMINER'S FOCUSED CONSULTATION OPENS — 1 April 2026	
15 Apr 2026	Dr Guilder's adviser files a representation with the Council and, as a courtesy, sends a copy directly to the Forum. It records “the absence of any direct engagement with him or his family to date”. **This is the first contact between the two sides, and it is made by Dr Guilder's side, nearly five months after the request of 21 November 2025.**
22 Apr 2026	**Attempt 1.** The Forum replies proposing a meeting with the adviser, adding: “We didn't envisage involving the Guilder family directly in that discussion.” *(Appendix B)*
22–23 Apr 2026	The adviser replies that the family is taking advice and will revert, and that any meeting would need their knowledge and agreement. The Forum does not follow up.
5 May 2026	The Forum writes to the Examiner opposing the deletion of the surgery from Policy 7. The same email records that Forum members “have worked closely with TG, Rushmon and DMP for a number of years”. *(Appendix C)*
12 May 2026	A letter is filed for Dr Guilder by his planning consultants. It arrives after the fact-check stage and is not accepted by the Examiner.

■ **THE EXAMINER REPORTS — 14 May 2026. He recommends (PM6) that Riverbank Surgery be deleted from Policy 7.**

The gap — no consultation is running

15 May 2026	Dorking Medical Practice writes to the Council supporting safeguarding. The Council later treats this letter as new evidence.
16–18 May 2026	The practice writes to three ward councillors seeking support. One councillor tells the Council he is already in touch with the Guilder family.
26 May 2026	The Council tells the Forum it is waiting to hear from "the planning agents for the Guilder family". A Forum representative replies that "I and others attempted to arrange a private meeting … but were flatly refused". No such approach was ever received by Dr Guilder or his family. *(Appendix E)*
28 May – 1 Jun 2026	**Attempt 2.** At a Village Association committee meeting, a committee member who is Neil Guilder's neighbour offers to speak to relevant parties about revised Policy 7 wording. He then messages Neil informally, neighbour to neighbour. Neil replies that the family had never been consulted and that they would meet on the Friday and come back. Nothing further is pursued for eight weeks. *(Appendices D and G)*
2 Jun 2026	The Council publishes its Decision Statement. It declines to accept PM6 and decides to run a further, focused consultation.

NO DIRECT CONTACT WITH DR GUILDER

■ THE COUNCIL'S FOCUSED CONSULTATION OPENS — 9 June 2026
The question asked: should the Plan safeguard Riverbank Surgery for its existing use under Policy 7?

24 Jun 2026	**The Forum holds a public meeting at Holy Trinity, Westcott. Dorking Medical Practice presents the case for safeguarding the surgery. 67 people attend and a vote is taken by show of hands. Dr Guilder is not invited, not told the meeting is happening, and given no opportunity to reply.** *(Appendix F)*
21 Jul 2026, 5pm	Dr Guilder's representation is filed on the closing day, through his planning consultants.

■ THE COUNCIL'S FOCUSED CONSULTATION CLOSES — 21 July 2026, 5pm

NO CONTACT WITH DR GUILDER BEFORE OR DURING THIS CONSULTATION

After every consultation has closed

29 Jul 2026	**Attempt 3.** The Forum's Chairman sends a text message to Dr Guilder's personal mobile telephone. It reaches him immediately. **This is the first direct communication of any kind from the Forum to Dr Guilder — eight days after the last consultation closed.** *(Appendix H)*
29 Jul 2026	The family replies the same afternoon and asks that Dr Guilder's letter be published on the Forum's website so residents can read his position.
30 Jul 2026	The Forum declines to publish it.
31 Jul 2026	The Forum produces a statement to the Examiner setting out its three attempts to contact Dr Guilder.
3 Aug 2026	The Council tells the family the Examiner has granted the Forum a right to respond to the representations.

Every attempt the Forum made to contact Dr Guilder

Three attempts are relied upon by the Forum. A fourth was claimed to the Council but not to the Examiner. Each is set out below with the date, what actually happened, and whether a consultation was open at the time.

1. 22 April 2026 — a meeting proposed to the adviser, not to the family

- The exchange began five weeks earlier, on 15 April, when **Dr Guilder's own adviser wrote to the Forum**. The Forum was replying, not reaching out.
- The meeting proposed was with the adviser. The email said: “We didn't envisage involving the Guilder family directly in that discussion.”
- The adviser did not refuse. He said the family was taking advice and he would revert, and that any meeting would need their knowledge and agreement.
- The Forum did not follow up.
- **Consultation open at the time:** yes — the Examiner's focused consultation. But only because Dr Guilder's side had made the first move.

2. 28 May – 1 June 2026 — an approach through a third party, to the son

- **This was an informal message between neighbours, not an approach by the Forum.** It was made by Mr [redacted], a member of the Westcott Village Association committee who lives next door to Neil Guilder. It was not made by any officer of the Forum, it was not made to Dr Guilder, and it did not ask for a meeting.
- **The committee minutes of 28 May 2026 do not record any decision to approach Dr Guilder or his family.** What they record is that Mr [redacted] “offered to speak to relevant parties with the revised Policy 7 wording for safeguarding the services as opposed to the building”. That is a conversation about policy wording, not a request for a meeting with the owner. *(Appendix G)*
- **Neil Guilder replied.** He said the family had never been consulted, that their position was set out in the representations already filed by their two named advisers, and that the family were meeting on the Friday and would come back afterwards.
- The intermediary offered to follow up after that Friday.
- Nothing further was pursued — not with the intermediary, not with the son, not with either named adviser, and not through the Council, which had told the Forum two days earlier that it was in contact with the family's planning agents.
- The Forum later described this approach as having received “No response”.
- The Forum's own statement describes this as its “second attempt to arrange meeting with Mr Guilder and his representatives”. On the documents, no meeting was ever requested of Dr Guilder or of his representatives.
- **Consultation open at the time:** no. It fell in the gap between the Examiner's report and the opening of the Council's consultation.

3. 29 July 2026 — the first direct contact

- A text message from the Forum's Chairman to Dr Guilder's personal mobile telephone.
- It reached him immediately, with no intermediary. It was the first attempt to contact him directly, and it worked first time.
- **Consultation open at the time:** no. Every consultation had closed. The last one had closed eight days earlier.

4. A fourth attempt claimed to the Council, but not to the Examiner

- On 26 May 2026 a Forum representative told the Council: “I and others attempted to arrange a private meeting to try to find a way through this but were flatly refused.”
- No such approach was ever made to Dr Guilder or to any member of his family, and nothing was refused by anyone.
- The claim does not appear in the Forum's statement to the Examiner, which lists three attempts and not this one.

The Forum has had Dr Guilder's contact details throughout

The Forum has explained the absence of any notification to Dr Guilder by reference to the Land Registry. On 20 April 2026 it told the Council: “The freehold owner of the surgery is Standard Life … No contact details are provided by Standard Life on Land Registry so all consultation documents were hand delivered by the Forum direct to the property.” The Chairman repeated the point on 5 May 2026: “We were unable to send a specific letter to the registered owner of Riverbank Surgery — Standard Life — as no address is provided on the Land Registry record.”

That explanation concerns the registered proprietor. It does not explain the absence of any contact with Dr Guilder himself. **Dr Guilder has been in direct contact with the Forum and with its members over a period of years on matters concerning the surgery, and the Forum has held his contact details throughout.** He is able to produce that correspondence should the point be disputed, and will do so on request from the Examiner or the Council.

The documents already before the examination establish the same thing from the Forum's own words and its own files. At every stage of this process there was a route to Dr Guilder, and each route was known to the Forum at the time it existed.

The routes to Dr Guilder, and the date each is shown by the documents to have existed

Before 2025	**Personal knowledge of Dr Guilder, over a period of years.** The Forum's own letter to the Examiner of 5 May 2026: “Members of the WVF have worked closely with TG, Rushmon and DMP for a number of years to help realise the re-location of DMP … which would enable TG to 'unlock' his property.”	Appendix C
Oct 2025 onwards	**The building itself.** The Forum told the Council that all consultation documents were “hand delivered by the Forum direct to the property”. Members of the Forum therefore attended the surgery during the consultation. Nothing was addressed to its owner.	Forum to the Council, 20 April 2026
By May 2026	**Detailed personal knowledge of Dr Guilder's circumstances.** The Chairman, writing on 28 May 2026: “no-one in the village is ganging up against Tom and actively stopping him realising the asset which sits in his pension plan … he was badly advised in the actions he took when South Street took over the practice … He is a victim of circumstance not of deliberate obstruction.”	Appendix D
15 April 2026	**His retained adviser**, who wrote to the Forum on that date and with whom the Forum then corresponded directly.	Appendix B
By 28 May 2026	**His son, who lives in the village.** The Forum's own statement records that he “had made approaches to a member of the WVA committee on the subject of the WNDP and Riverbank Surgery” — so this route existed before the Forum used it.	Appendix D
26 May 2026	**His planning agents, through the Council.** The Council told the Forum: “I am waiting for the planning agents for the Guilder family to come back to me.”	Appendix E
1 June 2026	**His two named professional advisers**, identified to the Forum by name in the reply it received: “Our representations by Ryan Snow and Mark Eshelby fully reflect the family's views and beliefs.”	Appendix D
1 June 2026	**A willing intermediary.** “I'll take your lead but happy to follow up with him after Friday.”	Appendix D
29 July 2026	**His personal mobile telephone.** The Chairman's text message reached him immediately, with no intermediary and with no need to establish whose number it was. The first attempt to contact him directly succeeded at once.	Appendix H

The position, shortly stated. *The Forum has had Dr Guilder's contact details throughout, and that correspondence can be produced if the point is disputed. Quite apart from it, the Forum's own documents show that from before this process began it knew who he was, knew what his position was, and knew where his property was and attended it; and that from April, May and June 2026 it held at least four further routes to him — his adviser, his son, his planning agents, and a willing intermediary who had offered to follow up. Not one of those routes was used to tell him that a consultation about his building was open, or that a public meeting about it was to be held.*

It is right to record that the Forum's account of the second approach is that Dr Guilder's son had himself made approaches to a member of the Village Association committee. If that is so, it confirms rather than answers the point: a line of communication with the family existed, was known to the Forum, and was available to be used at any time.

In summary

Regulation 14	13 Oct – 24 Nov 2025	No contact with Dr Guilder
Regulation 16	8 Dec 2025 – 2 Feb 2026	No contact with Dr Guilder
Examiner's focused consultation	1 Apr – 14 May 2026	Contact begun by Dr Guilder's side. The Forum's reply excluded the family.
The gap	15 May – 8 Jun 2026	One approach, through a third party, reaching his son. A reply was given and not followed up.
Council's focused consultation	9 Jun – 21 Jul 2026	No contact with Dr Guilder. A public meeting on his property was held without telling him.
After everything closed	29 Jul 2026	First direct contact — a text message

Dr Guilder was the village general practitioner for over thirty years and converted the building from a house himself. He supports the continued provision of medical services in Westcott. The point made here is only about dates: from the request of 21 November 2025 that began this process, to the text message of 29 July 2026 that ended it, no one approached him at a time when it could have made any difference.

What Dr Guilder asks

- That this chronology be placed before the Examiner alongside the Forum's statement of 31 July 2026, the Forum having been afforded a right of response.
- That his representation of 21 July 2026 and his letter of 12 May 2026 be read together and given full weight.
- That his own letter be published alongside the Forum's statement, so that residents of Westcott are able to read his position in his own words.
- That the underlying documents at Appendices A to I be treated as part of this submission. Unedited copies of any of them, and of the earlier correspondence between Dr Guilder and the Forum and its members referred to above, can be supplied on request.

Prepared from the Westcott Village Forum's own statement of 31 July 2026, the Council's and the Examiner's published documents, minutes published by the Westcott Village Association, and correspondence obtained from the Council under the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. The underlying documents are reproduced in the appendix that follows.

Appendix — the documents

Everything relied on above, reproduced word for word from its source. Nothing is paraphrased and no comment is added. Appendix J records where each document came from.

> ***What has deliberately been left out.*** *No valuation figure appears anywhere in this appendix, nor anything about Dr Guilder's health or about the occupier's tenancy. Personal telephone numbers and email addresses have been removed. Where words have been omitted from a quoted document, this is marked and the reason given.*

APPENDIX A — The request that began it

Date	21 November 2025 and December 2025
Who	Matplan, on behalf of Dorking Medical Practice and Rushmon Homes

The letter of 21 November 2025 asked the Forum to move Riverbank Surgery out of Policy WNDP6 and into Policy WNDP7. The Forum agreed. Matplan then made the following representation at the Regulation 16 stage, published by the Council in its Statement of Consultation as comment C21, representor R4 — "Riverbank Surgery and Rushmon Homes (Agent: Matplan)".

Regulation 16 representation, published as comment C21

"Having received the email below from the Westcott Village Association, I write on the joint behalf of the Dorking Medical Practice, which operates the Riverbank Surgery in Westcott, and Rushmon Homes, to make representations in support of Policy WNDP7 … By way of context, I have attached a copy of my letter dated 21 November 2025 to the Westcott Village Forum — this letter sets out my clients' representations to Policies WNDP6 and WNDP7 … relating to the categorisation of the Riverbank Surgery in Westcott as a 'Shop and Commercial Premises' under Policy WNDP6; and requests that the surgery is re-categorised as a 'Community Asset' under Policy WNDP7. Having now read the Reg. 16 Neighbourhood Development Plan, my clients are very pleased to note from page 34 that the Riverbank Surgery has been re-categorised as a safeguarded Community Asset under Policy WNDP7 … my clients and I look forward to engaging further with the Westcott Village Forum, residents and your Authority in the preparation and submission of a planning application for a new, purpose-designed and purpose-built surgery, underpinned by enabling residential development, on land owned by Rushmon Homes between Riverbank and Rokefield House to the north."

The Forum's own record of its decision, in the Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: "The GP surgery has been moved to a community asset rather than commercial." The tracked-changes version of the Plan shows Riverbank Surgery struck out at page 31 and added at page 34. Dr Guilder was not notified.

APPENDIX B — Attempt 1 — the April 2026 exchange

Date	15 April – 5 May 2026
Who	Mark Eshelby (for Dr Guilder), Paul Goddard and Tim Way

15 April 2026, 15:03 — Mark Eshelby to Paul Goddard

"Dear Mr Goddard, I hope you are well. I have today submitted a formal representation to Mole Valley District Council on behalf of Tom Guilder who is the owner of Riverbank Surgery, in respect of the emerging Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan. Given the role of the Village Forum in preparing the Plan, I thought it appropriate to send you a copy directly so that you are aware of the points being raised, particularly in relation to the absence of any direct engagement with him or his family to date and the way in which the surgery has been treated under Policies WNDP6 and WNDP7. Tom, who was the GP for Westcott for over 30 years, is entirely supportive of both the village and the continued provision of local healthcare facilities, but the current policy approach raises a number of matters which we consider would benefit from careful reflection as the Plan progresses. I would of course be very happy to discuss this with you if helpful, and to engage constructively as matters evolve. Regards, Mark"

20 April 2026, 09:30 — Paul Goddard to Mark Eshelby, copied to Ewan Guilder

"Mark, Apologies for not acknowledging your email & attachment earlier. I have already forwarded them to the Chairman of the Village Forum for information, and a response. Please note it is specifically the Forum that is responsible for the current update process not the WVA, though I acknowledge the WVA does have a significant interest. Rgds….Paul"

22 April 2026, 22:24 — Paul Goddard to Mark Eshelby, copied to Tim Way

"Mark Thank you for your email (of 15th April). I called you to try to arrange to meet and discuss the content of the email you sent last week. I had discussed the matter generally this morning with Tim Way, Chairman of the Westcott Village Forum - copied in this email. We concluded that meeting you to discuss the points and comments you make relating to the Draft WNDP and Riverbank Surgery would be the best way forward. ***We didn't envisage involving the Guilder family directly in that discussion.*** *Can we meet please? If so, Tim and I are both free on Friday afternoon this week as a starter. Rgds..Paul Honorary Secretary - Westcott Village Association"*

22 April 2026, 17:47 — Mark Eshelby to Paul Goddard

"Afternoon Paul, Thank you for your email and your message earlier, and apologies for missing your call. I note your comments regarding the Village Forum and the position more generally. As you will appreciate, Tom and his family are now taking advice in relation to the current circumstances and are considering matters more broadly. In those circumstances, it is important that they are given the space to do so and take stock properly. I will revert in due course once I have had an opportunity to discuss matters with them. Regards, Mark"

23 April 2026, 12:21 — Mark Eshelby to Paul Goddard, copied to Tim Way

"Afternoon Paul, Thank you for your email. I note your suggestion of a meeting with yourself and Tim. I am currently helping Tom and his family as they consider the position and take matters forward, and given further advice is being sought, I think it is sensible to allow that process to run its course before arranging any meeting. Any meeting would need to take place with their knowledge and agreement, and once they have had the opportunity to consider that advice. Once I have had an opportunity to revert to them and take a steer, I will come back to you. Regards, Mark"

5 May 2026 — Tim Way to Mark Eshelby, copied to the Forum (extract)

"Dear Mr Eshelby, Given that you have ***felt unable to meet*** *me (representing Westcott Village Forum) and Paul Goddard (representing the WVA), to discuss the points and comments you have raised in your response to MVDC about the emerging WNDP -* ***for which you have confirmed your reasons*** *- I have decided to address these points and comments in writing for clarity, and for the record… We were unable to send a specific letter to the registered owner of Riverbank Surgery — Standard Life — as no address is provided on the Land Registry record… Yours sincerely, T E Way, Chairman, Westcott Village Forum"*

Note added by the Forum at the end of this section of its own statement: "NOTE: No further response was received from Mr Eshelby regarding a face to face meeting."

APPENDIX C — The Forum writes to the Examiner

Date	5 May 2026, 15:37
Who	James Leaver, for the Westcott Village Forum, to Intelligent Plans, copied to the Council

5 May 2026, 15:37 — James Leaver to Steve Carnby, copied to Tim Way, Duncan Clarke, Jo Astor and Paul Goddard

"…PM6 - we are concerned by the Examiner's proposal to delete Riverbank Surgery from the list of community assets… ***Members of the WVF have worked closely with TG, Rushmon and DMP for a number of years to help realise the re-location of DMP into more appropriate new premises within Westcott which would enable TG to 'unlock' his property and all parties to achieve their objectives****… We would therefore like to propose keeping Riverbank Surgery in the list of community assets and the following additions…* ***'With the exception of Riverbank Surgery which should revert to its original residential use****, the property has been marketed….' Best wishes, James Leaver for Westcott Village Forum"*

APPENDIX D — Attempt 2 — the May–June 2026 exchange

Date	28 May – 1 June 2026
Who	Tim Way, [redacted] and Neil Guilder

The Forum's own description of this approach, from its statement: "Following a WVA meeting (28th May 2026 minutes available on the WVA website) at which Tim Way … was asked to attend, it was agreed that notwithstanding the first offer to meet having been declined, we would make an approach to Tom Guilder's son who lives in the village and had made approaches to a member of the WVA committee on the subject of the WNDP and Riverbank Surgery." Those minutes are at

Appendix G.

28 May 2026, 20:28 — Tim Way to [redacted]

'[redacted] As promised I attach the section of correspondence dealing with Riverbank evidencing where we are coming from together with the proposed rewording of the Westcott NDP which we put to the Examiner as an alternative to removing any mention of the Riverbank Surgery as a Community Asset, but which he rejected… Let me know if anything is not clear before you talk to Tom's son. As I said tonight, no-one in the village is ganging up against Tom and actively stopping him realising the asset which sits in his pension plan. Sadly we have all concluded that he was badly advised in the actions he took when South Street took over the practice. It was never going to be easy to simply release the property from the pension fund or find an alternative provision for the service in the village. He is a victim of circumstance not of deliberate obstruction. Regards, Tim"

30 May 2026, 11:15 — [redacted] to Tim Way

"Thanks Tim. I'm hoping to speak to him shortly. If I remove your email address, are you otherwise ok for me to forward your email to him? Regards, [redacted]"

30 May 2026 — [redacted] to Neil Guilder, attaching the practice's letter to the Council

"Hi Neil, Please see email below re. Riverbank and the attached letter. Happy to discuss but there are people who are much better informed than me, so happy to put you in touch with Tim if that helps. Thanks, [redacted]"

1 June 2026, 10:54 — Tim Way to [redacted]

"James, Have you had the discussion and any reaction? Tim"

1 June 2026, 18:21 — [redacted] to Tim Way

*"Hi Tim, I've had a busy weekend with friends over so I didn't get to speak to him in person unfortunately. I sent him your email and we've been chatting via WhatsApp. He says, **'Our family have never been consulted about this, except an attempt to reach out to Mark Eshelby after our representation. So that is very odd. I have nothing to say on DMPs representation. Our representations by Ryan Snow and Mark Eshelby fully reflect the family's views and beliefs. We are meeting together on Friday and we can get back to them (Tim) after that as to whether to meet up or not.' I'll take your lead but happy to follow up with him after Friday.** Best regards, [redacted]"*

Note added by the Forum at the end of this section of its own statement, reproduced exactly including its typing error: "NOTE: Noting further was received as a result of this approach."

APPENDIX E — The Council and the Forum — the 'private meeting' claim

Date	26 May 2026
Who	Duncan Clarke (Mole Valley District Council) and a Forum representative

26 May 2026, 14:26 — Duncan Clarke to the Forum

*"I cannot give you definitive dates about the consultation as I am waiting for **the planning agents for the Guilder family** to come back to me… [words omitted: they concern the family's private financial position and are not relevant] … the late, late representation by Bell-Cornwell **that was not permitted by the Examiner.**"*

26 May 2026, 14:58 — a Forum representative, in reply

*"Whilst I can understand the Guilder family having some concerns about what has now become public knowledge, **I and others attempted to arrange a private meeting to try to find a way through this but were flatly refused.**"*

The unedited email can be provided on request. No approach of the kind described was received by Dr Guilder or by any member of his family, and this claim does not appear in the Forum's statement to the Examiner.

APPENDIX F — The village meeting

Date	24 June 2026, 8.15pm, Holy Trinity, Westcott
Who	Westcott Village Forum; presentation by Dr Vishal Sagar, Dorking Medical Practice

Held immediately after the Village Association's Annual General Meeting at the same venue (7–8pm), on the fifteenth day of the Council's focused consultation. The published agenda: introduction by the Forum Chairman; presentation by Dr Sagar;

questions and answers; next steps in the consultation.

The case presented, as published by the Forum

- Over 2,200 registered NHS patients; two care homes served; 2,000–2,500 prescriptions dispensed each month; the only dispensary in Westcott.
- Top ten per cent of Surrey practices for management of long-term conditions; 90 per cent patient satisfaction.
- **"Eight years of effort" to relocate:** a site pursued 2017–2019 and found unviable; a second scheme pursued 2019–2022 and found unviable; a 2021 NHS District Valuer assessment concluding relocation would represent good value; and **active engagement with Rushmon Homes from 2024 to the present on a new-build surgery as part of any redevelopment.**

The vote, word for word from the published record

> *"67 people in attendance, including 14 online via zoom. Those answering YES – the majority by far (incl. 3 on zoom). Those answering NO – 1". The one person who voted no is recorded as considering that the question should have asked about safeguarding "the provision of medical services", not "the Riverbank Surgery premises".*

The attendance figure of 67 is confirmed independently by the Village Association's AGM minutes for the same evening. Dr Guilder was not invited, not told the meeting was taking place, and given no opportunity to be heard at it.

APPENDIX G — Village Association committee minutes

Date	Thursday 28 May 2026, 7pm
Who	Westcott Village Association committee — published on its website

These are the minutes the Forum cites as the authority for its second approach. The relevant parts are reproduced below word for word.

Attending: Jo Astor, Jane Betterton, [redacted], Paul Goddard, Magesh Ramakrishnan. **Apologies:** Nick Lund. **Guest:** Tim Way, Chairman of the Westcott Village Forum.

Agenda Item 2 — reproduced in full

Minutes of 28 May 2026, Agenda Item 2

> *"• TW gave an update on the WNDP status and the ongoing discussions relating to the status of Riverbank Surgery*
> *• **JC offered to speak to relevant parties with the revised Policy 7 wording for safeguarding the services as opposed to the building.** TW to send him that wording and anything else of relevance. Action TW/JC*
> *• **Committee agreed to a Westcott Village Forum meeting being held immediately after the conclusion of the WVA AGM on 24th June.***
> *• AGM start date to be 7pm aiming to conclude by 8.15pm for the WVF meeting to start shortly thereafter*
> *• **TW/JA to collate meeting notifications for the WVF** to include the information on the likely revised / delayed schedule prior to a Village Referendum Action: TW/JA"*

Three points arise from that text

- **There is no decision to approach Dr Guilder or his family.** The Forum's statement says that at this meeting "it was agreed … we would make an approach to Tom Guilder's son". The minutes record no such agreement. What they record is an offer by Mr [redacted] to speak to relevant parties about revised policy wording.
- **The committee's own wording was to safeguard the services, not the building.** The revised Policy 7 wording Mr [redacted] offered to discuss was "for safeguarding the services as opposed to the building". That is the distinction Dr Guilder has asked for throughout, and it was the Village Association committee's own formulation on 28 May 2026 — a month before the public meeting, and eight weeks before the consultation closed.
- **The public meeting of 24 June was agreed at this meeting, and notifications for it were to be collated.** The meeting was therefore planned nearly four weeks in advance, and a list of people to notify was drawn up. Dr Guilder was not notified.

Nowhere in these minutes do the words Guilder, Tom, Neil, son, or approach appear. The document is complete and legible and is published on the Association's own website. Other agenda items concern the setting up of a parish council, planning applications, resident queries and preparation of the Association's annual report and accounts, and are not reproduced because they have no bearing on the matters before the Examiner.

APPENDIX H — Attempt 3 — the July 2026 exchange

Date	29 – 30 July 2026
Who	Tim Way, Dr Thomas Guilder and Ewan Guilder

29 July 2026, 15:06 — text message, Tim Way to Dr Thomas Guilder

"Tom, Are you aware that we offered Mark Eshelby the opportunity to sit down and talk to you both. ***He rejected that offer.*** *I again in June offered to talk to your son via* [redacted]. ***No response.*** *Your assertion that no attempt has been made to talk to you is not true. It would help everyone if you could explain what you want and how the NDP prevents you from achieving this. I fear that all the paperwork is now with a new examiner who will make the decision on the NDP without reference to any further representation. Tim"*

29 July 2026, 16:30 — Ewan Guilder to Tim Way, copied to Neil Guilder

"Hi Tim, Thank you for reaching out to Dad. Neil and I are supporting him with this matter because of the considerable stress it has caused him. Dad has no wish to fall out with anyone in the village and has tried to explain his position as openly and honestly as possible. You mentioned that attempts had previously been made to speak with Dad and the family. However, I have attached the email sent to Mark in April, which expressly stated that you and Paul did not envisage involving Dad or the family directly in the proposed discussion. It is therefore difficult to regard that as an offer to sit down and talk with us. I understand that a further approach was made indirectly through [redacted] *in June. However, Dad did not receive any direct communication from you until your message today. More importantly, neither Dad nor his family was contacted during the original Neighbourhood Plan consultation about the proposal to safeguard Riverbank Surgery, despite the obvious potential implications for his property.* ***Nor, when the subsequent focused consultation took place, was Dad approached by the Village Association, invited to explain his position at the village meeting, or otherwise given the opportunity to discuss directly the proposals affecting his property and pension.*** *The approaches you refer to therefore came only after Dad had discovered what had happened and raised his concerns. That distinction is important. In answer to your question about what Dad wants, this is set out clearly in the personal letter and representations submitted to the Council. In summary, he wants to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan does not unnecessarily restrict the reasonable future use or value of his property, particularly given the uncertainty surrounding its long term occupation as a surgery. As you say, the representations are now before the new Examiner. At this stage, we think it is appropriate to allow the formal process to take its course rather than attempt to revisit these matters through an informal discussion. We would, however, respectfully ask that Dad's letter is published on the Westcott Village Forum website so that residents are able to read his position directly. I have attached a suitably redacted version for publication. Regards, Ewan"*

30 July 2026, 11:27 — Tim Way to Ewan Guilder and Neil Guilder

"Ewan, Thank you for your email, the contents of which are noted. The Westcott Village Association website (Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan – Westcott Village Association) contains the notification from MVDC that all representations on the subject of the WNDP have been sent to the Examiner and this includes your father's letter. We will await the Examiner's decision. Regards, Tim Way, Chairman, Westcott Village Forum"

APPENDIX I — The Examiner's office explains the 12 May letter

Date	14 May 2026, 13:09
Who	Intelligent Plans and Examinations Ltd to Duncan Clarke, Mole Valley District Council

On the fact-check responses

"The Examiner has now had an opportunity to consider the very helpful fact check responses from Mole Valley District Council (MVDC) and the Westcott Village Forum (WVF), and has accepted the relevant updates and minor amendments, where appropriate in his final report… This includes paragraph 4.12 where the Examiner has corrected the factual error

referencing the representation being on behalf of Dorking Medical Practice."

On the late representations

"MVDC has brought to the IPe office's attention that a late representation was submitted to the authority on 12 May 2026 by an agent representing Standard Life. However, the Examiner has not accepted this late representation since it postdates the issue of the fact check version of the report."

On the fact-check stage generally

"This is a very narrow exercise to identify factual inaccuracies, typographical errors and similar. It does not envisage the making of substantive amendments."

APPENDIX J — Where each document came from

A	Regulation 16 Statement of Consultation, comment C21; Regulation 14 Consultation Statement; tracked-changes version of the Plan	Published by Mole Valley District Council
B	Reproduced in the Forum's own statement to the Examiner of 31 July 2026; originals also on the family's email file	Circulated by the Council, 3 August 2026
C	Reproduced in the Forum's own statement; corroborated by disclosure from the Council	Forum statement; environmental information request of 16 June 2026
D	Reproduced in the Forum's own statement; the 30 May email to Neil Guilder from the family's own file	Forum statement; family file
E	Email chain between the Council and the Forum, 26 May 2026	Environmental information request of 16 June 2026
F	"FINAL Westcott Forum Meeting 24 June 2026 – Riverbank Surgery"; Village Association AGM minutes of the same evening	westcottvillage.com, published July 2026
G	WVA-Committee-Meet-280526-Agenda-Minutes.pdf — committee minutes of 28 May 2026, signed off PRG 30 May 2026	westcottvillage.com
H	Text message of 29 July 2026 and the email exchange that followed	Forum statement; family file
I	Intelligent Plans and Examinations Ltd to the Council, 14 May 2026	Environmental information request of 16 June 2026

Two documents are referred to in the chronology but not reproduced here: the letter filed for Dr Guilder on 12 May 2026, and his representation of 21 July 2026. Both are already before the examination. The Council has also confirmed that it holds, but has not yet released, further correspondence between itself, the Forum, councillors and the Examiner's office; that request remains open.

Riverbank Surgery: chronology of consultation and contact

Every material date and event, with the Westcott Village Forum's three recorded contact attempts shown in context.

Important context: The Forum had Dr Guilder's contact details throughout the whole period shown below.

Consultation open · Examination / gap / after closure · Recorded contact attempt · No direct contact / consultation closed

REGULATION 14

13 Oct - 24 Nov 2025

11 Oct — A general "Dear Neighbour" letter is sent to 27 landowners and businesses. It names no policy and no property. Dr Guilder is not on the list.

21 Nov — Matplan asks the Forum, for Dorking Medical Practice and Rushmon Homes, to move Riverbank Surgery from Policy 6 into Policy 7. This begins the process.

24 Nov — Regulation 14 closes.

Nov-Dec — The Forum agrees to the request. Riverbank Surgery is removed from Policy 6 and added to Policy 7. Dr Guilder is not told.

NO CONTACT WITH DR GUILDER

REGULATION 16

8 Dec 2025 - 2 Feb 2026

8 Dec — Regulation 16 opens. Copies of the Plan are placed at six locations, including Riverbank Surgery itself.

Dec-Jan — Matplan makes a further representation supporting Policy 7 on behalf of the practice and Rushmon Homes.

2 Feb — Regulation 16 closes.

NO CONTACT WITH DR GUILDER

EXAMINATION + FC-1

9 Feb - 14 May 2026

9 Feb — The Examiner decides the examination will proceed on written representations and finds the proposed changes are material.

16 Feb — The Examiner puts 15 questions to the Forum and Council. None concerns Policy 6, Policy 7 or Riverbank Surgery.

1 Apr — The Examiner's focused consultation opens.

15 Apr — Dr Guilder's adviser files a representation and sends a copy to the Forum. This is the first contact between the two sides, initiated by Dr Guilder's side.

1 — 22 Apr 2026

Reply to the owner's adviser

The meeting proposed was with the adviser and expressly excluded the Guilder family. The adviser did not refuse; the Forum did not follow up.

During the Examiner's focused consultation - but initiated by Dr Guilder's side

22-23 Apr — The adviser says the family is taking advice and will revert. The Forum does not follow up.

5 May — The Forum writes to the Examiner opposing deletion of the surgery from Policy 7.

12 May — A letter filed for Dr Guilder arrives after the fact-check stage and is not accepted by the Examiner.

14 May — The Examiner reports and recommends that Riverbank Surgery be deleted from Policy 7.

THE GAP

15 May - 8 Jun 2026

15 May — Dorking Medical Practice writes to the Council supporting safeguarding. The Council later treats this as new evidence.

16-18 May — The practice writes to three ward councillors seeking support. One councillor says he is already in touch with the Guilder family.

26 May — The Council tells the Forum it is waiting for the family's planning agents. A Forum representative says a private meeting had been 'flatly refused'; no such approach was received.

2 — 28 May - 1 Jun 2026

Informal contact via Neil's neighbour

A Village Association committee member who is Neil Guilder's neighbour informally contacts him about revised Policy 7 wording. Neil says the family will discuss it and come back. No further approach is pursued.

Outside any consultation window

2 Jun — The Council publishes its Decision Statement, declines PM6 and decides to run a further focused consultation.

NO DIRECT CONTACT WITH DR GUILDER

COUNCIL FC-2

9 Jun - 21 Jul 2026

9 Jun — The Council's focused consultation opens. The question is whether the Plan should safeguard Riverbank Surgery for its existing use under Policy 7.

24 Jun — **The Forum holds a public meeting at Holy Trinity. Dorking Medical Practice presents the case for safeguarding; 67 people attend and a show-of-hands vote is taken. Dr Guilder is not invited, notified or given a right of reply.**

21 Jul, 5pm — Dr Guilder's representation is filed on the closing day through his planning consultants.

21 Jul, 5pm — The Council's focused consultation closes.

NO CONTACT BEFORE OR DURING FC-2

AFTER CLOSURE

29 Jul - 3 Aug 2026

3 — 29 Jul 2026

First direct contact with Dr Guilder

The Forum Chairman texts Dr Guilder's personal mobile. It reaches him immediately. This is the first direct Forum communication to him.

Eight days after the final consultation closed

29 Jul — The family replies the same afternoon and asks that Dr Guilder's letter be published on the Forum's website.

30 Jul — The Forum declines to publish it.

31 Jul — The Forum submits a statement to the Examiner setting out its three attempts to contact Dr Guilder.

3 Aug — The Council tells the family the Examiner has granted the Forum a right to respond to the representations.

FIRST DIRECT CONTACT - AFTER CLOSURE

Overall timing

From the request of 21 November 2025 to the direct text of 29 July 2026, no one approached Dr Guilder at a time when it could have affected a live consultation. The first direct contact came eight days after the final consultation closed.