### **Mole Valley Solar farm decision**

The biggest possible solar farm was before Mole Valley District Council last week with councillors voting to reject the eco energy project – despite warnings they could lose taxpayers hundreds of thousands of pounds on appeal.

Plans for a 55 hectare solar farm in Cobham Road in Fetcham, large enough to power about one third of all the homes in the borough, came before the council's development management committee on April 23.

Councillors narrowly voted seven to five with one abstention to refuse the 49.5 megawatts plant arguing it was an inappropriate use of green belt land and too close to ancient woodland.

The decision went against the advice of officers who said Mole Valley's decision would likely be overturned on appeal – and the council charged costs

Cllr Abhiram Magesh (Liberal Democrat; Mickleham, Westcott & Okewood) said: "It will end up costing the council hundreds of thousands of pounds.

"It will affect the council's balance budget."

He said decisions like this were "not defensible by the legal material planning consideration" and that councillors needed to use vote with their brains, "not with your heart "

"What we can be considering, is the economic impact and the financial impact to not only the wider council but the area."

The developers, Ethical Power, had argued there was an "overriding" case that delivering renewable energy outweighed the "modest impacts" and that they were "proud to bring forward the project".

Their spokesperson added that it represented a "unique opportunity" to "tackle climate change in Mole Valley" by contributing to energy independence and clean power.

Had the power plant been any larger it would have been classified as a nationally significant project requiring government sign off, the meeting heard.

Others challenged the environmental benefits of green energy at the expensive of locally grown food and argued that the 40 year proposed life span of the site was anything but temporary.

Cllr Simon Budd (Conservative; Brockham, Betchworth, Buckland Box Hill & Headley) said: "The land that you are covering up, It's good quality land that grows food.

"At the moment the food is grown in Fetcham and its sold in Fetcham in a farmers shop in Fetcham, you've got zero miles, you've got grain that goes off to make bread, fantastic zero miles on it.

"If you cover up land in Fetcham people have still got to eat so you've got to import grain.

He added: "I feel very strongly about turning what is good agricultural land into what is basically you are ruining the countryside you really are ruining it.

"The gain of a little bit of electric is not worth the loss of this land."

### Waverley not waiving planning fees spark protests

Angry homeowners hit with hefty planning bills and court threats gathered outside Waverley Borough Council to protest against levies that have left some at risk of losing their homes, or going to jail.

About 20 people have so far come forward with what they say are huge and unexpected infrastructure levies for work done to their homes.

They have been shocked by the short notice to come up with, in some cases, £70,000 for work they would have been expected to be exempt from - and would have been if they'd filled out a form.

Instead they have been pursued and threatened with court action if they do not pay.

On Tuesday April 1, those affected protested outside the council's executive meeting and challenged the authority on whether it

had any "genuine intent" to review its Community Infrastructure Levy process.

Community Infrastructure Levies are payable on developments of more than 100 square metres, unless homeowners actively apply for an exemption. Large developers expect there to be an infrastructure charge, which can often take the form of community buildings such as a doctor's surgery or hall. Where these are not suitable money can be paid.

The levy is used to offset the impact development has on an area and can be bid for by public bodies or community groups for projects.

The problem has been some people feel they are being wrongly hit with the fees - and the heavy handed approach the council has taken in chasing the money.

In most cases the council says it has been correct in issuing the bills -despite anger from those who feel wronged.

The exception, it said, was the highest profile case so far, of Steve and Caroline Dally who were stung with a £70,000 bill for a home extension and given no opportunity to argue their case.

The rest, the council argues are not as straightforward - with any long-term solutions not expected until at least May,

Councillor Liz Townsend, portfolio holder for planning said: "I can assure members here and residents that the council is committed to carrying out a discretionary review where householders previously subject to CIL liability can request a discretionary review."

She added: "There have been a number of extremely speculative and scaremongering comments about the nature of this review by some councillors which is very concerning.

"However I would like to assure residents again that we are committed to investigating and assessing each individual case that is submitted to the council and the process for undertaking this will be fully disclosed in the report coming to the executive at the beginning of May."

However, asked if the council had powers to withdraw liability notices for "whatever reasons it sees appropriate" the leader, Cllr Paul Follows, responded: "I think we are comfortable to acknowledge that's what the regulation says. Yes. I don't think there is anything else I can add to that but I am sure what the regulation says."

Asked "For whatever reason you deem fit?"

Cllr Follows replied:"Yes - but at the same time I do think you have to recognise we can't in ourselves act unlawfully in the withdrawal of the CIL liability - there are things we have to do here.

"This is not a straightforward process. If anybody has been advising you that it is a straightforward process I would consider widening your advice.

"One of the problems here - we've effectively got three categories of individuals in this process.

"Individuals who may have had some fault of the council, and although we're still checking the details, for example would be Mr Dally who we've looked at – and most of us have concluded he was told something in error and I think there will probably be some remediation that takes place there.

"There are individuals who have been advised poorly...as part of their building project. Yes I can understand their frustration with the council but actually their issue is with the private advice which has been inaccurate and their first course of resolution would be through the liability insurance of the private advisor.

"And thirdly there are individuals that disagree with the concept of homeowner CIL but have been charged legally for it at this point of time and that's subject to a different discussion of whether we should charge homeowners or not.

"It broadly falls into those three camps."

The council said it would be taking this final group into consideration in May when it is due to discuss potential changes to CIL.

A longer term solution is not likely to be finalised until the council's local plan – effectively the planning rules it must abide by – is signed off in 2027.

Image: Waverley CIL protests (image Waverley Conservative Council Group)

# A towering decision by Epsom and Ewell Borough Council

Epsom and Ewell Borough Council has approved plans for hundreds of new homes. The former SGN Gasworks site on East Street in Epsom will see all of its buildings and infrastructure demolished to make way for new homes. The town's "biggest planning application in years" has been approved. Members of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council planning committee agreed to the outline scheme for 456 homes by a majority vote on April 24. The development will see five high rise blocks, ranging from eight to twelve storeys tall. A performing arts centre, educational buildings and an open public garden are also included in the plans. Of the proposed 456 homes, according to planning documents, 210 will be one-bedroom, 180 will be two-bedroom, and 66 will be three-bedroom units. A further 46 of the 456 homes will be social rent units and 21 wheelchair accessible, according to planning documents.

"You cannot build a nine-storey building behind someone's back door," said Richard Coles, an Epsom resident speaking against the scheme. He explained it would be "60 metres from my back door to someone's balcony, for some hundred or so properties". Mr Coles argued the new builds will make life significantly worse for those living immediately around the blocks. "We're not delivering for Epsom if we're not delivering for all our residents," Cllr Kim Spickett said. "We're not talking about overlooking buildings, we're talking about human beings." Responding to concerns, council planners said fears of overlooking is not such an issue in practice because neither resident can really make out the features or activities of a person that far away. Officers accepted sunlight would be reduced for six neighbouring homes and 23 student rooms but said the benefits of the scheme would outweigh the impact.

Wrestling with the application, Cllr Julian Freeman appreciated the residents' concerns but said "fear is often much worse than the reality". He added the borough is in a "housing crisis" and "for the greater good" the development will provide new homes for 600 or more people. Cllr Kate Chinn slammed the council for not building enough homes or social housing over the last five years. "We're now asking residents to pay the price for the failures of the past," she said. With only 68 car parking spaces for 456 homes, councillors urged for something to be done. Members worried about tradesmen needing to use cars for work or families driving to school. Around 21 spaces would be designated for wheelchair users which Cllr Freeman challenged as "excessive". Cllr Jan Mason said: "People living there actually will be defranchised." She claimed future residents might not be able to have people visiting the house or getting the work men round.

Officers said fewer parking bays would help "champion a change in attitude" to using cars and support the council's "ambitious target" of becoming carbon neutral by 2035. But some councillors said it was "unrealistic" to demand people to change their motor habits by restricting parking spaces. Just a 10 minute walk from Epsom train station, the applicants argued the development would be an immensely sustainable location. People can get to London Waterloo station in around 35 minutes. Members agreed conditions to the car management plan so it could come back to committee for further approval if needed.

Also included in the scheme, Laine Theatre Arts College will be replaced by a modern building. The development will be further detailed in separate planning applications, the report said. The site has been used as gas works for more than 150 years, according to documents, while a separate application for the same site has stated the storage facility for natural gas "has been permanently decommissioned and purged".

Image: Site Masterplan (Aerial) Formation Architects

#### McDonalds run out of Loch Fyne, Cobham

Plans for a McDonald's in Cobham have been thrown out.

McDonald's had hoped to find a new home on the former Loch Fyne Restaurant in Portsmouth Road on the outskirts of Cobham. Members of Elmbridge Borough Council's planning committee rejected the application by majority vote on April 24, against officer's recommendations to approve.

Councillors were unhappy that the new McDonald's would be within walking distance of schools and near an area of high social and economic deprivation. "McDonald's isn't a proper choice," Cllr Lawrence Wells said, "most of it is ultra-processed food."

The Liberal Democrat councillor for Cobham and Downside argued: "To young people and families who have very little access to

healthy food or treats, a McDonald's will be like the witch's candy house to Hansel and Gretel."

North of the potential McDonald's site, argued Cllr Wells, there is a socially and economically deprived area between River View Gardens and Northfield Road. He claimed the 650-odd houses come in the fifth most underprivileged sub-ward in the whole of Surrey.

But Cllr Ashley Tilling accused groups of "middle class snobbery" in opposing the scheme. He said it was unlikely there would be such opposition if a Gail's or a Megan's decided to open there.

Councillors debated whether it was appropriate for a fast food restaurant and take away should be in walking distance from schools, parks and a children's home. Surrey County Council had also raised concerns about the potential health impacts the new burger branch could have, being so close to areas where children congregate.

"You have a duty to protect the most vulnerable, you have the duty to protect the health and wellbeing of your constituents," Mr Sabi said, speaking for residents against the scheme at the meeting. He argued the council was using a London yardstick for walking distance to fast food places for a Surrey borough.

Fearing the chicken nugget chain would exacerbate issues of obesity and not promote healthy living, planning members refused the scheme. Officers said it was a matter of judgement and there was no evidence to suggest the American burger branch would make people less healthy.

Other councillors warned "we don't live in a totalitarian state where people are told what they must and mustn't eat" or that it is even their role on the planning committee to "combat obesity".

Ward councillor Katerina Lusk acknowledged the old Loch Fyne Restaurant is in "disrepair" and no other use has been found. Cllr Tilling also supported bringing the locally listed building "back to life" and re-using it in the community.

Despite the concerns, many people flagged the multi-million dollar company would bring huge financial benefits to the village, increasing visitors and supporting local business.

But Cllr Lusk highlighted the limited indoor dining options (60 covers) and proposed opening hours until midnight, which could mean it would be primarily used for takeaway. "More noise, more traffic and constant delivery movements- all spilling into an area already burdened with congestion and frequent flooding," Cllr Lusk said.

Submitted last year, the application has been hugely contentious. Hundreds of objections flooded in from residents, including an online petition reaching over 34,000 signatures. A similar strength of feeling was also boosted from those who want to see a closer Happy Meal in Cobham.

McDonald's has been approached for comment.

Related report:

Global fast-food giant targets Surrey village

### How did Aldi arrive at this Epsom junction?

Plans for an Aldi store near an Epsom junction described as being "fraught with danger" have been green-lit after an appeal—but with conditions attached. For years, the budget superstore has been trying to get planning permission on the Former Dairy Crest Site on Alexandra Road in Epsom. The planning inspector recognised the road is "far from easy to navigate and potentially dangerous" but said mitigations to encourage people to walk to the store would help.

Members of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council had thrown out the German company's second application in July 2024 due to fears that increased traffic would have a severe impact on road safety. A previous application was rejected in 2015 over concerns about the site's location, car parking capacity, traffic levels, and the potential effect on the neighbourhood's character. The new £5 million development includes parking and some landscaping, but earlier plans for residential units have been dropped.

Residents and councillors had previously criticised the scheme for exacerbating an already 'challenging junction', often described as a "rat run" and "fraught with danger". Despite these objections, Surrey Highways raised no formal objection and concluded the development would not create unacceptable risks.

Although the planning inspector agreed that the Aldi store would "undoubtedly increase the potential for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians", they concluded that "additional measures to encourage drivers to slow down and take extra care would

help to mitigate these increased risks." The decision statement noted: "At the end of the day, nearly all collisions are the result of human error. In this case, the lack of an obvious pattern of collisions suggests that there are not significant problems with the layout which could easily be addressed by engineering interventions."

The conditions imposed on Aldi's approved scheme include improving pedestrian access to the site, implementing slow-down measures, installing new junction signage, and laying anti-skid surfacing—all subject to full agreement by the Surrey Highways Authority. The inspector highlighted the Former Dairy Crest Site as a location with "good opportunities to encourage more customers to choose to walk to the store".

Improved pedestrian access was seen as an acceptable compromise, rather than simply accepting that peak times would bring queues and delays due to limited parking. Based on average data, the risk of excessive pressure on the Five Ways junction was considered small, though the inspector acknowledged that at exceptional times—such as Christmas—some delays would be inevitable. However, they concluded that seasonal stress is not sufficient justification for additional parking, "when the priority should be to promote increased numbers of visits to the store on foot."

Aldi now has three years to begin construction of their new bargain grocery store on Alexandra Road before planning permission expires.

Image: CGI visualisation of Aldi store on the Former Dairy Crest Site, on Alexandra Road, Epsom. (Credit: Aldi/ Epsom and Ewell Borough Council)

## Global fast-food giant targets Surrey village

A global fast food giant could be coming to a Surrey village as a new McDonald's restaurant and takeaway might get the go ahead. Despite being famed for its 'Happy Meal', some residents fear the American icon will be 'detrimental to the health of Cobham".

The popular burger and nugget chain is hoping to find a new home in the former Loch Fyne Restaurant on Portsmouth Road, Cobham. The fate of the application will be decided by Elmbridge Borough Council members at a planning meeting on April 24.

Planning officers have recommended McDonald's gets the green light to transform the disused fish restaurant. Residents have railed against the scheme, with nearly 500 letters of objection sent to the council.

The village of Cobham was named as one of the most affluent communities in the county but the Northfield Estate, where the restaurant is proposed, is among Surrey's poorest socio-economic areas.

Significant concern has been raised about the proposed distance (or lack of) to local schools and playgrounds nearby. Opponents have claimed the new branch will "encourage children to form unhealthy habits", "exploit young people" who will eat at McDonald's and add to the country's obesity crisis.

People have said the new outlet will be "detrimental to the health of Cobham" and the impact "cannot be underestimated". Lots of residents pointed out there is already an outlet at the M25 services, so they do not need another one closer to the village.

Wyndham Avenue park and Hamilton Ave play area, both managed by PA Housing, are just a four-minute walk away (321m) from the potential McDonald's site. Felton Fleet Prep School, Cobham Free School and Cobham recreation ground are only a seven minute walk (482m) away from the fast food chain.

But planning officers said the nearest schools are not within a 400m radius walking distance to the site. The intervening A3 would be a "man-made barrier" to the fast food chain, officers reported, and the proposed restaurant is not on the main school route to Cobham Free School so children would be walking the opposite way.

Although the neighbouring petrol station has a Greggs, the proposed restaurant will not create a 'cluster' of takeaways. The nearest other takeaways are in Cobham's centre some 700m away, according to the report.

Despite recognising local public health concern, officers found there is no evidence the multi-million fast food chain will have a detrimental impact on health in the neighbouring areas. National planning guidance says local authorities should refuse plans for takeaways near schools and where young people hang out. Surrey County Council's public health team did not object to the new McDonald's in principle.

Cobham residents launched a petition in May 2024 against the plans to open a new restaurant and takeaway. The petition, which has garnered over 34,000 signatures, calls for the site to be turned into a community hub instead. Concerns raised include

increased traffic, litter, and potential impacts on the area's health and well-being.

Despite the concerns, many people flagged the multi-million dollar company would bring huge financial benefits to the village, increasing visitors and supporting local business. Others said the new 'Happy Meal' site could provide up to £60k a year in business rates for the council.

Supporters of the proposed McDonald's slammed the listed building as an "eyesore" and in need of "restoration". The new fast food outlet would employ around 120 people, which the company hopes to recruit from the local area, as well as offering training and career development.

People said comments about the quality and 'wholesomeness' of the food is "irrelevant" as no one has to eat there. Those looking forward to the new branch said it would be a good place for young people to meet and socialise as well as providing more takeaway options.

According to the chain, the new restaurant would include both indoor and outdoor seating with space for 60 diners, 30 cars parking bays, two of which would be accessible and three with EV charging spaces. The American fast food branch is hoping to be open every day from 6am to 11pm.

McDonald's has been approached for further comment.

# **Shock as Surrey Council Puts Protected Woodland Up** for Auction

A surprise decision by Surrey County Council (SCC) to auction off a cherished woodland in the heart of Cuddington has sparked uproar among residents and elected councillors, who are now rallying to save the green space from the threat of large-scale development.

The 13-acre site, situated between Grafton Road and Old Malden Lane and bordering Linden Bridge Special Needs School, was discreetly marketed for potential development of up to 40 homes by commercial estate auctioneers. The move came without prior consultation with Epsom & Ewell Borough Council or even the local Surrey County councillors representing the area.

Local County Councillor **Eber Kington** (RA), alongside RA Cuddington ward councillors **Kim Spickett**, **Graham Jones** and **Phil Neale**, and the Cuddington Residents' Association, have launched a campaign urging SCC to reconsider its course of action.

"This woodland isn't just a patch of land – it's a vital green refuge in our urban landscape, a space of peace, biodiversity, and community value," said Cllr Neale. "We're asking residents to stand with us and help protect it for future generations."

The woodland, known locally for its mature trees and diverse wildlife, lies adjacent to the Grafton Park Road estate and has long been considered a buffer zone preserving local environmental quality and character.

The auction concluded in late January, but SCC is yet to announce a winning bidder. The auctioneers stated that the highest bid would not necessarily be accepted, leaving room for alternative proposals to be considered.

One such alternative comes from a joint venture involving the Cuddington Residents' Association, the Wandgas Sports & Social Club, and a local developer. Their bid proposes a modest housing scheme to fund the creation of a community-led sports and recreational space, including public woodland access for walkers and cyclists. The vision includes safeguarding the majority of the natural landscape and establishing long-term protections for its use.

Campaigners argue that SCC's recent adoption of a **Community Asset Transfer** (CAT) scheme—championed by Epsom & Ewell's own county councillor Eber Kington—should provide the framework to enable this type of locally-driven project.

"Transparency and local accountability are vital when it comes to decisions that affect our shared spaces," Cllr Webb added. "We're calling on the County Council to respect the CAT process, consider our community proposal seriously, and honour the values of environmental stewardship and public trust."

Residents are now being asked to sign a petition backing the community bid and urging SCC to reject blanket housing development in favour of a sustainable, locally-beneficial plan.

The petition can be signed online and will be submitted to Surrey County Council ahead of a final decision.

For more information or to add your name to the petition, visit: Change.org

### Paintball plans to entertain Epsom's youth

Plans for a new paintball and laser tag centre have been put forward in a former farm building. The new play shooting centre could be launched at The Paddock on Langley Vale Road, Epsom.

The proposed play shooting range already has a name-dubbed 'PandaWarz'-and will offer Lasertag to the under 16's and Tactical Paintball to those 16 and over.

Developers claimed Epsom is a "thriving town with much to offer" but is "limited in leisure". Planning documents sent to the council read there are "minimal opportunities for young children and young adults" particularly when it comes to their "special annual celebrations", or birthdays.

Details of the scheme include changing the existing agricultural building into an indoor children's Lastertag arena. Two containers could also be installed, making closed arenas, along with a temporary roof covering for the indoor Tactical Paintball.

Planning documents said that "PandaWarz's objective is to modernise the game" by using military skills and techniques from close range to build up obstacles.

The equipment will be modernised and operating with magazines, according to the applicant. Planning documents read: "The games are tactical, not simply spraying paintballs and hoping to hit."

The two purpose play area will be made up of shipping containers, internal rooms, mazes and obstacles. Fine mesh is proposed to cover the arenas so no paintballs can be fired beyond the confines of the play area. A gantry has been designed over and around the arena with a temporary roof covering to protect both spectator and player from any weather.

Planning details read: "Twenty minutes running around a dark room filled with obstacles and UV reactive artwork shooting each other in teams. A successful way of both entertaining [children] and wearing them out!"

Noise will be reduced by containing the games within the existing building and as well as using the constructed containers and temporary roofing, the application states.

Car parking for up to 15 vehicles is included, with additional parking directed to the open, free roadside parking a short walk away on the Downs.

Locals can comment on the proposals until April 30 on the council's website. Epsom and Ewell Borough Council will decide the future of The Paddock site at a later date.

Proposed site layout. Epsom and Ewell planning documents.

## **Pedestrian visions of Mole Valley**

Masterplans for Dorking and Bookham are set to be signed off by Mole Valley District Council's executive committee on April 16. These set out a bank of projects the council would like to "bring to life" in order to make "a lasting positive impact" on the towns. Among the works being considered are improvements to Dorking town centre, as well as connections to the three train stations. The council said it wants to improve streets and public spaces, get more people walking and cycling, and find uses for its vacant buildings.

For Dorking, the council wants to create a greater sense of arrival, improve its cultural offering, and address crash hotspots. A new "more attractive" civic hub would create an "important cluster" of cultural, leisure and civic buildings to encourage more people to spend time there – while pedestrianising access to Dorking Halls could help maximise the experience around the famous site. As a whole, the masterplan focuses on the town centre, public spaces, transport infrastructure, and HGV restrictions to protect the heritage character of the town.

The option to pedestrianise West Street was not taken forward in Dorking, but the idea of cutting cars from High Street in Bookham has been retained. The council is also looking to capture more of the visitors to Polesden Lacy and Box Hill into the historic core of Bookham village by reducing the impact of traffic and its "car dominated environment" and celebrating the town's heritage and cultural links.

At this stage though, all options are concepts and not fully realised designs or planned projects. The intention, the draft masterplan reads, is to "plant seeds of ideas for change; as such they will need to be further developed subsequent to completion of this study."

In a statement issued ahead of the meeting, Councillor Margaret Cooksey, cabinet member for community services, said she was pleased the masterplans had reached the approval stage and that the majority of feedback had been in support of the project. She said: "We listened to our communities and made necessary and appropriate changes based on the feedback received, before presenting the final plans to cabinet.

"Once the masterplans are approved, the commencement of these projects will depend on securing the necessary funding. Mole Valley District Council will explore various funding streams, including government grants, national organisations, and local contributions. We are committed to bringing these projects to life and making a lasting positive impact on Bookham and Dorking. Many of the schemes will require further discussions about their details in the future."

The council said that more than 500 people engaged in the Bookham masterplan consultation and that there were more than 1,000 responses for Dorking.

# Epsom & Ewell's Local Plan under the Green microscope

#### Epsom Green Belt Group Lodges Formal Complaint Against Borough Council Over Local Plan Submission

The Epsom Green Belt Group (EGBG) has submitted a formal complaint to Epsom and Ewell Borough Council (EEBC) regarding the council's Local Plan submission, raising concerns over procedural irregularities and transparency in the consultation process.

In a detailed letter dated 14 March 2025, EGBG congratulated the council for submitting the Local Plan before the 12 March deadline, ensuring it falls under the provisions of the December 2023 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). However, the group identified what it describes as significant flaws in the submission, particularly concerning documents that were not made available for public scrutiny before submission.

#### **Concerns Over Topic Papers**

A key contention in the complaint is the inclusion of seven Topic Papers—covering areas such as the Green Belt, economy, housing, spatial strategy, heritage, and Gypsy and Traveller accommodation—without prior consultation or approval by councillors. EGBG argues that these documents were neither included in the consultation evidence base nor subjected to review by the Local Plan Policy Committee (LPPC) or Full Council before submission. This, they claim, violates the requirements of the *Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012*.

The group asserts that these documents were not made available to the public in accordance with regulatory requirements, including being published on the council's website and made accessible at the Town Hall or local libraries during the consultation period. Furthermore, some Topic Papers were dated after the consultation closed, raising concerns about their legitimacy as submission documents.

EGBG has called on EEBC to take one of three actions: withdraw the Topic Papers from the submission, conduct a retrospective consultation, or submit an explanatory statement to the examiner clarifying the lack of prior consultation.

#### Criticism of the Consultation Statement

EGBG's complaint also highlights alleged shortcomings in the Consultation Statement submitted by EEBC. The group argues that:

- The statement underrepresents the weight of objections by counting consolidated group responses as single representations, despite EEBC's guidance encouraging collective submissions.
- The narrative summary is not impartial, as it includes the council's views rather than an objective summary of objections.
- Several key issues raised by EGBG in its formal response were omitted or misrepresented, particularly concerning

specific development sites such as Hook Road Arena and Horton Farm.

■ The Sustainability Appraisal was described as 'robust' despite extensive criticisms submitted by EGBG, including claims that certain rankings were 'misaligned' and descriptions 'bore little or no relation to supporting evidence.'

EGBG has requested that EEBC revise and republish the Consultation Statement to accurately reflect public concerns.

#### Council's Response

When Epsom and Ewell Times approached for comment, EEBC provided a brief response, stating:

"Any complaint made to Epsom & Ewell Borough Council will be dealt with according to our Complaints Policy, published on our website: Complaint Policy V1.pdf."

#### Related reports:

Epsom and Ewell Local Plan Submitted for Examination The Local Plan plot thickens after revised NPPF Council minority vote Local Plan to next stage with Green Belt in Epsom and Ewell's Draft Local Plan goes to Full Council and many more..... search "Local Pan"