

Consultation on the Stoneleigh and Auriol Neighbourhood Development Plan (Regulation 16 Consultation)

Representation Form

Ref:

(For official use only)

Please complete	By email: neighbourhoodplan@epsom-ewell.gov.uk
online or return this form to:	By post: Neighbourhood Plan Consultation, Planning Policy Team, Epsom and Ewell Borough Council, Town Hall, The Parade, Epsom, Surrey, KT18 5BY
Return by:	11:59pm on Friday 1 st August 2025

This form has three parts:

- Part A Your details: need only be completed once
- Part B Your representation(s): please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make
- Part C Notification of progress of the Stoneleigh and Auriol Neighbourhood Development Plan

PART A: Your Details

Please note the following:

- We cannot register your representation without your details.
- Representations cannot be kept confidential and will be available for public scrutiny, however, your contact details will not be published.
- All personal data will be handled in line with the Council's Privacy Policy on the Development Plan. You can view the Council's privacy notices at https://epsom-ewell.gov.uk/council/about-council/data-protection/privacy-and-cookies

	Your details	Agent's details (if applicable)
Title:	Mr	
First Name:*	Jason	
Last Name:*	Linford	
Job title (where relevant):		
Organisation (where relevant):		
Address* Please include postcode:		
Email address:*		
Telephone number:		

^{*}Mandatory field

Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Your name or organisation (and client if you are an agent):	Jason Linford Resident)
---	-------------------------

Please indicate which part of the consultation documents that this representation relates to:

Policy:	n/a
Section/paragraph:	n/a
Appendix:	Appendix 5 – Transport Survey Results (May 22nd 2023)

Comments

It is unclear why the plan document itself includes transport survey results from May 22nd 2023 giving them more prominence than other feedback gathered across multiple events and reported in the consultation statement. In some areas this portrays one sided view of feedback on topics where opposing views at other events.

Propose this appendix be removed, particularly opinion comments and these be contained to the consultation statement artefact.

[Oppose]

Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Your name or organisation (and client if you are an agent):	Jason Linford	Reside	ent)	
---	---------------	--------	------	--

Please indicate which	part of the consultation documents that this representation relates to:
	Policy SA-P-H-01 – Consistency of Building Lines
	Policy SA-P-H-02 – New Development Height and Character
	Policy SA-P-H-03 – Permitted Backland Development
	Community Recommendation SA-CR-H-01 – Support for sympathetic
	higher density development
	Policy SA-P-R-01 – Safeguarding of Retail and Service Facilities
	Policy SA-P-R-02 – Safeguarding of Public Houses
	Policy SA-P-R-03 – Parking at Retail, Commercial, Hospitality & Community/Cultural Facilities
Policy:	
	Policy SA-P-G-01 – Protection of Local Green Spaces
	Policy SA-P-G-02 – Protection of Notable Green Spaces
	Policy SA-P-G-03 – Managing the Impact on Biodiversity.
	SA-P-S-01 Certainty of Water Supply and Foul Water Drainage
	SA-P-S-02 Minimising Flood Risks
	SA-P-S-03 Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency
	SA-CR-S-01 Drainage Improvement
	SA-P-T-01 Assessment of Transport Impact
Section/paragraph:	All
Appendix:	All

Comments

As a Stoneleigh resident I support the above sections as currently presented.
[Support]

Please use a separate sheet for each representation

organisation (and client if you are an agent):
--

Please indicate which part of the consultation documents that this representation relates to:

Policy:	SA-P-T-02 – Residential Parking and Cycle Storage SA-P-T-02 - Motor Vehicle and Cycle Storage
Section/paragraph:	1)
Appendix:	n/a

Comments

I note this policy does not have consistent naming throughout the document.

This policy appears to conflict with SA-P-T-01 as provided the development has presented a clear plan on how to mitigate transport and parking (e.g. by being next to the station and excluding occupiers from any residents parking scheme) they should not also need to provide parking spaces on site.

Suggest adding "Other than where a clear mitigation proposal has been accepted" at the start of paragraph 1.

[Support if amended]

Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Your name or organisation (and client if you are an agent): Resident) Resident)	
---	--

Please indicate which part of the consultation documents that this representation relates to:

Policy:	SA-CR-R-01 – Support for retail diversity
Section/paragraph:	General
Appendix:	n/a

Comments

Recommendation as written might discourage competition as a single retail outlet could monopolise local demand and distort pricing. Two outlets of a type would promote competition and hopefully see good value stimulated or service quality benefits.

Propose at least watering down from:

Any plans that diminish the diversity of retail outlets in the area will not be supported.

Propose Change to:

Any plans that significantly diminish the diversity of retail outlets in the area will not be supported, particularly where two similar outlets already exist locally.

[Support if amended]

Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Your name or organisation (and client if you are an agent):	Jason Linford Resident)
---	-------------------------

Please indicate which part of the consultation documents that this representation relates to:

Policy:	SA-CR-T-01 Improvements to Transport Infrastructure	
Section/paragraph:	n/a	
Appendix:	n/a	

Comments

Very happy to see the removal of the 20mph suggestion present in earlier drafts. This is a highly divisive local issue which no clean attempt to determine support has been made without bundling the issue up with distractions.

The vote at the October 2024 community consultation allowed it's separate feedback and I believe came out against the measure overall. Local accident statistics on crashmap.co.uk indicate negligible local fatalities or serious accidents in nearly 20 years (suggesting current measures are adequate and resources are likely better spent elsewhere)

[Support removal of previous drafts 20mph measure and current residual wording]

Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Your name or organisation (and client if you are an agent):	Jason Linford Resident)
Please indicate which	part of the consultation documents that this representation relates to:
Policy:	Policy SA-P-G-04 – Protection of Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows.
Section/paragraph:	
Appendix:	
Comments	
,	ven on retention of perimeter greenery to prevent erosion of privacy & ntly enjoying such protection.
All applications for deve	elopment should minimise the destruction of trees, woodlands and hedgerows nificantly to the character of the area.
Propose change to:	
which contribute so sign	elopment should minimise the destruction of trees, woodlands and hedgerows nificantly to the character of the area, particularly where they form part of a penefiting adjoining plot character
Or similar	
[Support but policy show	uld go further]

PART C - Notification of progress of the Stoneleigh and Auriol NDP

Do you wish to be notified of any of the following?

Please tick all that apply

Publication of the Examiners report / Decision to progress to referendum	Yes	
Decision to adopt the Stoneleigh and Auriol NDP	Yes	

Signature	Date	29-Jul-2025
-----------	------	-------------

Your completed representations must be received by the Council by 11:59pm on 1st August 2025.

Please note: submitted responses will be shared with the Neighbourhood Plan Examiner and published on our website.