Updated Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2039

Report on the Supplementary Examination of Policy WNDP7 (Community Assets)

A Supplementary Examination undertaken for Mole Valley District Council, with the support of the Westcott Village Forum, to consider whether the Updated Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan should safeguard the Riverbank Surgery for its existing use.

Independent Examiner: Derek Stebbing BA(Hons) DipEP MRTPI

Date: 30 October 2026

Contents

1. Background and Introduction 3
Examination of the Updated Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan 3
Additional Focused Consultation 4
The Independent Examiner 4
2. Scope of Assessment 5
Legislative Framework 5
Planning Policy Context 6
Submitted Documents 7
Site Visit 7
Written Representations with Public Hearing 7
3. Consultation Process 8
Focused Consultation 8
4. Main Assessment 9
Context of Assessment 9
Issue 1: Are the Riverbank Surgery premises suitable for the future provision of Primary Healthcare services for the residents of Westcott and beyond? 10
Issue 2: What is the current position regarding a possible new Surgery to serve the Westcott area? 11
Issue 3: What is the National Health Service's (NHS) current position on the future provision of Primary Healthcare services for the Westcott community? 11
Issue 4: What is the District Council's position on whether the Riverbank Surgery should be designated as a Community Asset in Policy WNDP7, and be safeguarded for its existing use? 12
Summary 14
5. Conclusion 14
Appendix: Revised Modification 16

Main Finding - Executive Summary

This examination addresses the single question ("issue") of "Should *the Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan safeguard the Riverbank Surgery for its existing use under Policy WNDP7 (Community Assets)?"*

My assessment has centred on whether the Riverbank Surgery satisfies the relevant land-use planning considerations to qualify for safeguarding as a community asset in Policy WDNP7, having taken into account the Basic Conditions and other legal compliance requirements, and the evidence submitted which includes the responses to the focused public consultation and the written and oral contributions to the Public Hearing held on 23 September 2026.

Following the consideration of four principal issues, I have concluded that the Riverbank Surgery should be safeguarded for its existing use as a community asset in Policy WNDP7 in the Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan.

I recommend that the Plan should proceed to referendum subject to Proposed Modification 6 (**PM6**) of the first Examiner's report being replaced by Revised Modification 1 (**RM1**) of this report.

1. Background and Introduction

Examination of the Updated Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan

1.1 An examination of the draft Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan (WNDP/the Plan) was undertaken by independent Examiner Andrew Mead (the first Examiner'), whose report dated 14 May 2026[1] advised that the Plan met both the legal compliance and Basic Conditions requirements, subject to a number of recommended modifications.

1.2 Following consideration of the first Examiner's report, Mole Valley District Council (the District Council) issued the Updated Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan Decision Statement[2] on 2 June 2026. The District Council decided to accept all of the first Examiner's recommended modifications, in agreement with the Westcott Village Forum (the Forum/the Qualifying Body), with the exception of one modification relating to the safeguarding of the Riverbank Surgery for its existing use.

[1] View at: https://molevalleydc.sharepoint.com/:f:/s/MVDCDocumentLibrary/IgB_OQ5H72vOTp8WWpfnrbL3AWo8MQsTv7AhgrWjk4hTkLY?e=OQh35J

[2] View at: https://molevalleydc.sharepoint.com/:f:/s/MVDCDocumentLibrary/IgB_OQ5H72vOTp8WWpfnrbL3AWo8MQsTv7AhgrWjk4hTkLY?e=ZGS8Ly

Additional Focused Consultation

1.3 In respect of the issue of whether it is appropriate to safeguard the Riverbank Surgery, the District Council received information from Dorking Medical Practice (the occupier of the Riverbank Surgery) which it determined to be 'new, germane and material' to modification **PM6** in the first Examiner's report, which recommended the deletion of the Riverbank Surgery from the list of community assets in Policy WNDP7 of the draft Plan.

1.4 In response, and in accordance with the relevant statutory provisions[3], the District Council has undertaken a further Focused Consultation on the following question: *"Should the Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan safeguard the Riverbank Surgery for its existing use under Policy WNDP7 (Community Assets*)?" and has submitted this 'issue' for independent examination. The consultation was undertaken for six weeks between 9 June and 21 July 2026. A total of 76 representations were made to the consultation, including two late responses which were also accepted.

The Independent Examiner

1.5 I have been appointed by the District Council to examine the 'issue', which for the purposes of this examination is the question of whether the Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan should safeguard the Riverbank Surgery for its existing use under Policy WNDP7 (Community Assets)? My appointment has been made with the agreement of the Forum.

1.6 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector with over 50 years of experience in planning. I have worked in both the public and private sectors and have experience of examining both local plans and neighbourhood plans. I have also served on a Government working group considering measures to improve the local plan system and undertaken peer reviews on behalf of the Planning Advisory Service.

1.7 Whilst I share the same employer as the first Examiner, Andrew Mead (i.e. Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd), I have had no previous knowledge of Mr Mead's independent examination other than what is available in the public domain.[4] I have neither a personal nor direct professional relationship with the first Examiner; am located in an entirely different region in England; and am subject to the well-established ethical wall arrangements that are implemented by IPE's Office Team in relation to maintaining the independence of Examiners. I am also independent of the Qualifying Body and the District Council and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the Plan.

[3] See paragraph 2.1 below.
[4] View at: https://www.molevalley.gov.uk/planning-building/neighbourhood-planning/westcott-neighbourhood-plan-examination/

1.8 I therefore consider I have no conflicts of interest and meet the legislative requirement to possess the appropriate qualifications and experience to carry out this supplementary examination as an independent Examiner.

2. Scope of Assessment

Legislative Framework

2.1 The basis on which the District Council has undertaken the Focused Consultation related to Policy WNDP7 is provided in Paragraph 13 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Specifically, Paragraph 13(1) provides that if:

(a) the local planning authority propose to make a decision which differs from that recommended by the examiner, and
(b) the reason for the difference is (wholly or partly) as a result of new evidence or a new fact or a different view taken by the authority as to a particular fact,
the authority must notify prescribed persons of their proposed decision (and the reason for it) and invite representations.

2.2 Paragraph 13(2) of Schedule 4B allows for the exercise of the discretion of the local planning authority, in so far as it provides that if the authority considers it appropriate to do so, they may refer the issue to independent examination. On this basis, the issue i.e. whether the Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan should safeguard the Riverbank Surgery for its existing use under Policy WNDP7 (Community Assets*),* has now been submitted by the District Council for examination.

2.3 In terms of the appropriate statutory examination procedure, whilst Paragraph 13(3) of Schedule 4B provides for the making of regulations about an examination under Paragraph 13, to date, no further provision has been made other than in relation to the decision timetable following the completion of the examination of an issue and the procedure for the Secretary of State's (SOS) intervention.[5] The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) similarly only refers to this process with regard to the local planning authority's decision timetable and Secretary of State intervention.

2.4 Therefore, in the absence of further procedural regulations or guidance governing an examination under Paragraph 13(2), my starting point is Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, which requires the 'Plan' is tested against the Basic Conditions (set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B) and the other legal compliance requirements. For the sake

[5] The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) provide in Regulation 17A(5)(b)(i) that the local planning authority is required to make a decision on recommendations made under a paragraph 13(2) examination within 56 days of receipt of the examiner's report (see also paragraph 13A of Sch.4B). Paragraphs 13B and 13C further deal with Secretary of State intervention.

of brevity, I will not repeat these as the requirements are set out fulsomely in paragraphs 2.7 – 2.10 of the first Examiner's report.

2.5 In practice, given the focused nature of this issue, not all of the requirements in Paragraph 8(1) are directly relevant to this examination. As such I am proposing only to consider the legal compliance and Basic Conditions considerations to the extent that they might be directly relevant to the single issue I am examining. My main assessment in Section 4 of this report below refers to those I consider germane to the land use planning considerations that apply to the safeguarding of community assets, most notably the Basic Condition requirement that a neighbourhood plan must have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State.

2.6 In this regard I would observe that the question is rather more nuanced than that which was subject to public consultation. Inevitably, there was an overwhelming view from those responding in the community that the Riverbank Surgery should be safeguarded. However, the issue more specifically is whether the planning merits are such that the Surgery should be safeguarded: it is the appropriate application of land use planning policies that will determine whether the safeguarding is justified or not. Notwithstanding this, I appreciate that this is a difficult point to communicate and my comment in this regard is neither intended as a criticism nor to suggest any shortcoming in how the community was engaged on the issue, which I consider more fully in Section 3 below.

2.7 The first Examiner's recommendations in his Report of 14 May 2026 have been accepted in full by the District Council, aside from where it relates to the single issue I have been appointed to examine. Therefore, it is not within my remit to revisit any other aspects of the Plan or the merits or otherwise of the first Examiner's recommendations and conclusions.[6]

2.8 Furthermore, in undertaking this independent examination, I am not bound by any previous work of the first Examiner in relation to Policy WNDP7, and specifically, his assessment of the safeguarding of the Riverbank Surgery for its specific use. In any event, new evidence and representations have come forward which were not available to the first Examiner.

Planning Policy Context

2.9 The national and local planning policy context remains the same as that which was applicable when the Updated Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan was examined earlier in 2026. These are principally the Mole Valley Local Plan 2020–2039 (MVLP); the 2024 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the accompanying PPG. A revised NPPF was

[6] Notwithstanding that it is conceivable there might be interrelated, or minor consequential amendments required to the other parts of the Plan as a result of any recommendation(s) I make.

published during the examination on 17 August 2026. Whilst there was, inevitably, some discussion of the 2026 NPPF at the Public Hearing session held on 23 September 2026 (see paragraphs 2.12 and 4.11 and below) on the basis of it being, ostensibly, a material consideration, the transitional arrangements in Paragraph 6, Annex A of the 2026 NPPF are very clear that the revised NPPF does not apply for the purposes of this examination.[7] Accordingly, unless otherwise stated, all references in the report are to the December 2024 NPPF and the accompanying Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

Submitted Documents

2.10 The following documents have been submitted by the District Council for my consideration of the issue[8]:

- Focused Consultation: Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy WNDP7 (Community Assets); and
- Statement of Consultation, August 2026 (including all the representation submitted in response to the Focused Consultation).

Site Visit

2.11 I made a site visit to the Riverbank Surgery on the morning of 23 September 2026, when I was able to view the Surgery building, its site and its surroundings. I also took note of the general level of activity at the Surgery during the period that I was there.

Written Representations with Public Hearing

2.12 As part of my initial assessment of the issue which is the subject of this examination and the representations that had been submitted during the course of the Focused Consultation, I considered that it would be necessary to hold a Public Hearing in order to consider a number of matters that had been raised in representations together with other matters that I had identified from my own assessment. Accordingly, with the assistance of the District Council, a Public Hearing was held in the Council Chamber of the District Council's offices during the afternoon of 23 September 2026. This examination has therefore been conducted on the basis of my assessment of the written representations together with the written and oral submissions that were made at the Public Hearing. This has enabled me to reach a conclusion on the single issue concerned, and my detailed assessment is set out in Section 4 of this report.

---

[7] *"Neighbourhood plans that have been submitted to the local planning authority under Regulation 15, on or before, the date of publication of this Framework should be prepared in accordance with the Framework published in December 2024."* View at: National Planning Policy Framework - GOV.UK

[8] View all the documents listed below at: https://www.molevalley.gov.uk/planning-building/neighbourhood-planning/westcott-neighbourhood-plan-examination/

3. Consultation Process

Focused Consultation

3.1 The full context for the additional consultation, including the letter from the Dorking Medical Practice, is set out in the document, "Focused Consultation: Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy WNDP7 Community Assets)".[9] In summary, the document sets out the chronology of the first Examiner's consideration of the issue, between 4 February 2026 and the publication of his report on 14 May 2026. On 15 May 2026, the four partners of the Dorking Medical Practice wrote to the District Council, setting out their concerns regarding a late representation submitted by Nova Latchmere Ltd., on behalf of the freehold owner of the Riverbank Surgery. The late representation had been accepted by the first Examiner, but the letter from the Dorking Medical Practice post-dated the publication of his report. On 2 June 2026, the District Council considered that the letter from the Dorking Medical Practice contained new and relevant information, which had not been available to the first Examiner, and decided to undertake the Focused Consultation.

3.2 The Statement of Consultation (dated August 2026)[10] sets out the consultation process that was undertaken. All of the 76 representations (Ref. Nos. R1-R76), including two late representations (Ref. Nos. R75 and R76), received in response to the consultation are set out and fully summarised in this document.

3.3 At the Public Hearing session I sought to assure myself that the issue under consideration had been drawn to the attention of all relevant parties with an interest, particularly in the light of the first Examiner's concerns around the process for engaging with the relevant landowner(s). Paragraph 4.13 of Mr Mead's report of 14 May 2026 records as follows:

"*It is evident that, for whatever reason, the landowner of the Surgery has not been included in the process of preparing the Neighbourhood Plan, despite the relevant information being delivered to the tenants, the Dorking Medical Practice, and that, in this case, the interests of the landowner (whether it be Mr Guilder or Standard Life) may have been prejudiced. In this regard, I understand that the title entry at the Land Registry records the owners as Standard Life Trustee Company Limited and note that its registered address is readily available through an online public search of information at Companies House. Therefore, I shall recommend the deletion of the Riverside [sic] Surgery from the list in Policy WNDP7.*"

3.4 I was told at the Public Hearing session that neither the District Council nor the Forum had made direct contact with Standard Life Trustee Company Limited to draw its attention to the further Focused Consultation exercise. Nonetheless, from the Statement of Consultation I can see that

[9] Consultation Document
[10] Statement of Consultation.

steps were taken to ensure appropriate wider publicity around the Focused Consultation and I heard at the Public Hearing session from representors with interests broadly aligned with those of Standard Life that it is reasonable to assume that the organisation was aware of the discussion around the safeguarding of Riverbank Surgery.

3.5 Therefore, based on the consultative steps that have been taken by the District Council and the additional clarification I was able to elicit at the Public Hearing session, I am generally satisfied that the steps have, on balance, sufficed to highlight the "issue" and invite views on the appropriateness, or otherwise, of the safeguarding of the Riverbank Surgery from those that may have an interest. The Focused Consultation itself has been proportionate, fair and impartial. I read and heard no evidence to suggest that any party has been directly prejudiced, so do not think it would be in the interests of the proper consideration of this issue to take a more zealous approach.

3.6 Additionally, between the date of my appointment and the date of the Public Hearing, I agreed to accept further correspondence from the Forum, Dr. T.F. Guilder and the NHS Surrey & Sussex Integrated Care Board. I have also taken the information provided in this correspondence into account, as part of my assessment.

3.7 All of the representations and the afore-mentioned further correspondence has been uploaded to the District Council's website.[11]

4. Main Assessment

Context of Assessment

4.1 The Basic Conditions require that the Plan (and by implication the 'issue') must have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State. It may also be noted that the Basic Condition which required a neighbourhood plan to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area no longer applies.[12]

4.2 The principal planning objective of safeguarding community assets is to support community well-being by ensuring that citizens have accessible local services, community facilities, and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and sustain long-term residential vitality.

[11] View at https://www.molevalley.gov.uk/planning-building/neighbourhood-planning/westcott-neighbourhood-plan-examination/

[12] By virtue of the *Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (Commencement No. 11 and Saving and Transitional Provisions) Regulations 2026*, which brought into force section 99 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023.

4.3 In this regard, Paragraph 88 d) of the NPPF provides that planning policies and decisions should enable the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship. Paragraph 98 b) further sets out that, to provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community.

4.4 With this context in mind, having studied all of the representations that were submitted during the Focused Consultation, together with the further correspondence that was submitted subsequent to the publication of the first Examiner's report and also during the course of this examination, I identified four matters as part of the agenda for the Public Hearing:

- *Are the Riverbank Surgery premises suitable for the future provision of Primary Healthcare services for the residents of Westcott and beyond?*
- *What is the current position regarding a possible new Surgery to serve the Westcott area?*
- *What is the National Health Service's (NHS) current position on the future provision of Primary Healthcare services for the Westcott community?*
- *What is the District Council's position on whether the Riverbank Surgery should be designated as a Community Asset in Policy WNDP7, and be safeguarded for its existing use?*

On these matters, I considered I needed to hear the views of the District Council, the Forum and representors.

Issue 1: Are the Riverbank Surgery premises suitable for the future provision of Primary Healthcare services for the residents of Westcott and beyond?

4.5 In my consideration, this is an important issue. It is clear to me that the Riverbank Surgery fulfils an important role in providing Primary Healthcare services, including a pharmacy, for the residents of Westcott and beyond. I saw how busy the Surgery is during the course of my site visit, and I heard from the two GP's representing the Dorking Medical Practice how the practice is becoming increasingly busier, in part due to Government and NHS policy initiatives to place more emphasis on patients being treated through the Primary Healthcare system, in order to reduce pressures on the Secondary Healthcare (acute care) facilities at local hospitals. The Riverbank Surgery was rated as 'Good' by the Care Quality Commission at its most recent inspection in 2019. I have also taken into consideration the '*10 Year Capital Plan for Health and Social Care'* published by the Government on 8 July 2026, and provided to me by Bell Cornwell on 24 September 2026 as a post-hearing submission.

Finding on Issue 1

4.6 Taking account of everything that I have seen and heard, my assessment of Issue 1 is that the Riverbank Surgery premises are suitable for the future provision of Primary Healthcare facilities for the Westcott community, albeit that the pressures on the various facilities and services at the premises are growing, through the greater demands being placed upon them, and that a purpose-built new Surgery, or larger alternative premises, will probably be required at a future date if such demands continue to increase.

Issue 2: What is the current position regarding a possible new Surgery to serve the Westcott area?

4.7 There is a current initiative by Rushmon Homes to develop a new Surgery building, with accompanying residential development, on land between Riverbank and Rokefield House to the north of the existing Surgery site. Pre-application discussions have been held with the District Council in May 2025, but a planning application for the proposed development has not yet been submitted. Discussions took place at the Public Hearing regarding the possible timescale for this proposed development, and Rushmon Homes consider that, if planning permission is granted, the new Surgery could be completed in October 2028. However, as the Hearing Statement submitted by the Dorking Medical Practice notes, "*there is currently no planning application, no permission, no NHS capital or revenue approval and no agreed timescale".*

Finding on Issue 2

4.8 For the purposes of this examination, I must therefore place no reliance upon the new Surgery being provided in the immediate future, until such time as the necessary planning and NHS approvals are in place, and construction can commence. Nevertheless, I do consider that the provision of a new Surgery would provide an appropriate longer-term solution to the pressures being faced at the existing Surgery. A future review of the Neighbourhood Plan can take account of the position at that time.

Issue 3: What is the National Health Service's (NHS) current position on the future provision of Primary Healthcare services for the Westcott community?

4.9 The NHS Surrey & Sussex Integrated Care Board (ICB) were not able to be represented at the Public Hearing, and therefore my assessment of this matter is based upon their representation to the Focused Consultation and their subsequent letter dated 26 August 2026. The ICB has confirmed that its representation was provided from a healthcare commissioning perspective, reflecting the importance of maintaining accessible Primary Healthcare services for the population of Westcott, and that its interest is the continuity and accessibility of healthcare services rather than the ownership of, or legal interests in, any particular property. It goes on to

state that, whilst Primary Healthcare services are currently delivered from the Riverbank Surgery, the ICB recognises that healthcare estate solutions may evolve over time and could include reprovision, relocation or alternative service models, where supported through the appropriate commissioning, estates and governance processes.

Finding on Issue 3

4.10 On this matter, I am satisfied that the ICB will continue to maintain accessible Primary Healthcare services for the Westcott community from its commissioning perspective, these being at present provided at the Riverbank Surgery but possibly from a new Surgery or alternative premises at a point in the future. I do not see any prospect that such Primary Healthcare services will be withdrawn.

Issue 4: What is the District Council's position on whether the Riverbank Surgery should be designated as a Community Asset in Policy WNDP7, and be safeguarded for its existing use?

4.11 Again, this is an important issue in my consideration. At the Public Hearing, the District Council provided a schedule of how Policy WDNP7, as drafted (and including the Riverbank Surgery), conforms with Policy HC6 in the NPPF (August 2026) and Policy INF4 in the adopted Mole Valley Local Plan 2020-2039 (adopted October 2024). I agree with the District Council's assessment, although as I set out in paragraph 2.9 above, it is the December 2024 NPPF that applies in this instance. Furthermore, conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the area is no longer a Basic Conditions requirement (see paragraph 4.1 above).

4.12 During the discussions on this matter, the District Council suggested that a number of amendments could be made to the text of Policy WDNP7 in order to improve the clarity of its policy criteria that need to be considered in respect of any future proposals that might lead to the replacement or re-provision of existing community assets. Although such amendments to the policy text fall outside the scope of this examination, I do recognise that, as drafted, the criteria could more clearly address the factors that would need to be taken into consideration.

4.13 At the Public Hearing, I suggested that the Forum should consider the proposed amendments and advise the District Council and myself whether they could support the District Council's suggested amendments. On 24 September 2026, the Forum put forward the following revised text for Policy WDNP7, with the District Council's suggested amendments being highlighted in red. I do not make a formal recommendation on this matter, as it is beyond the scope of this examination. However, I consider that the amendments are appropriate, and would serve to enhance the clarity of the policy, and that the District Council might

consider this matter alongside my recommendation on the issue before me.[13]

WNDP7: The following community assets, as shown on the Policies Map (Fig 4 below), are safeguarded for their existing use:

- Holy Trinity Church
- The Village Hall
- Cradhurst Recreation Ground
- The Village Green
- Riverbank Surgery
- St John's Chapel and The Village Hub
- The Sports Club
- Surrey Hills All Saints School
- Faurefold

Proposals for the provision and maintenance of flexible, accessible and modern community assets will be supported, where they would help to maintain and extend the vibrant social, sporting, recreational, and educational activities in the Plan area and where they comply with national and local Green Belt policy. The change of use of existing community assets to other uses will not be supported unless:

- Any partial loss of the site/floorspace will not undermine the viability of the asset;
- The asset is surplus to requirements or there is no reasonable prospect of the existing use continuing;
- That an alternative or replacement asset of equivalent or better quality or scale is available within the Plan Area or will be re-provided within the Plan Area or the use will be provided in a different way serving the same community; and
- Where appropriate, the property has been marketed for a minimum period of twelve months on reasonable market terms with a recognised agent for alternative community uses without success.

Finding on Issue 4

4.14 The District Council was clear at the Public Hearing session that its view was the Riverbank Surgery should be safeguarded as a community asset through the Westcott Neighbourhood Plan. Nonetheless, it is disappointing that prior to the Public Hearing session, I could identify no clear opinion expressed, or evidence of advice provided by the District Council in its earlier written submissions.

4.15 Whilst I appreciate that local planning authorities generally seek, rightly, to provide qualifying bodies with the space to determine what is included in their neighbourhood plans and how they approach those land use

[13] As observed in the first Examiner's report of 14 May 2026 (see paragraph 4.20), minor non-material changes may be made by the Local Planning Authority in agreement with the Forum. See PPG Reference ID: 41-106-20190509.

planning matters that are most important to the local community, the legislation is very clear that *"A local planning authority must give such advice or assistance to qualifying bodies as, in all the circumstances, they consider appropriate for the purpose of, or in connection with, facilitating the making of proposals for neighbourhood development orders in relation to neighbourhood areas within their area."*[14] Similar advice is provided in the PPG.[15] As such, whilst respecting the District Council's desire to provide the Forum with an appropriate degree of autonomy in the production of its Plan, with the benefit of hindsight, the provision of appropriate advice from the District Council at a much earlier stage may well have averted the additional process that has been necessary to resolve this issue.

Summary

4.16 This examination has investigated only whether the Riverbank Surgery should be safeguarded through Policy WNDP7 of the Updated Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan, with reference to the relevant Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I have taken account of all the responses made during the Focused Consultation and the other documents that were submitted prior to and following the Public Hearing that was held on 23 September 2026.

4.17 From everything that I have seen and heard as part of the examination, and with particular reference to my findings on Issues 1-4 above, my assessment is that Riverbank Surgery is a vital asset for the community of Westcott and that it should be safeguarded for its existing use as a community asset through Policy WDNP7 in the Updated Westcott Neighbourhood Development Plan.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Accordingly, it is my recommendation to the District Council that the Riverbank Surgery should be safeguarded as a community asset as part of Policy WNDP7 and I have therefore made a Revised Modification (**RM1**) on this specific issue to that contained in the first Examiner's report (Ref. **PM6**) dated 14 May 2026. This is set out in the Appendix to this report. I trust that this will provide the District Council with a sound basis to make a determination that allows the draft Plan (as proposed to be modified) to proceed to a referendum.

5.2 I would like to thank the officers at Mole Valley District Council for putting in place the necessary arrangements for the Public Hearing session and for the informative and constructive contributions made by those that participated on the day. This was complemented by the fulsome written

[14] See Paragraph 3(1) of Schedule 4B.
[15] PPG Reference ID: 41-067-20140306.

submissions made by those with an interest in the issue who helpfully took the time to submit responses to the Focused Consultation.

Derek Stebbing

Examiner

Appendix: Revised Modification

Revised Modification number (RM)	**Page no./ other reference**	**Modification**
RM1	Pages 34 and 36	Policy WNDP7 – Enhancement of Community Assets Retain 'Riverbank Surgery' in the list of community assets in Policy WNDP7 and retain its designation on Figure 4 (Westcott Community Assets).