

EMAIL ONLY

Planning Inspectorate

Our Ref: 015892/3/PS/
Parminder Sanghera

**Your
Ref:**

7 August 2026

Dear Sirs

Re: APP/R3650/C/25/3366481, 3366493, 3366387, 3366483, 3367392 & 3367393
Plots at Stovolds Hill, Cranleigh

We write further to your email of 5 August 2026 @ 15.26.

The Inspector's response has led to further queries having to be raised in order to seek clarification on what the Inspector is allowing as evidence in these appeals. Unfortunately, some of the queries we raised in our letter of 31 July 2026 have not been addressed and we seek urgent clarification on the following matters:

1. There may still be an outstanding determination in relation to the evidence of Dr Murdoch. Having received confirmation from PINS that the flooding, ecology and landscape evidence would be allowed, Dr Murdoch then drafted his planning proof of evidence and submitted that on 24 July 2026. Dr Murdoch's proof deliberately only considered the evidence submitted at Statement of Case level, except the GTAA and PDA as these were submitted ahead of the exchange of proofs. **Is the Inspector allowing the general planning sections of Dr Murdoch's proof of evidence?**
2. If the answer to the above is yes, then Dr Murdoch will amend and resubmit his proof 4 weeks prior to the Inquiry. **Is this acceptable?**
3. If the answer to (1) is no, then please confirm that a Rebuttal proof from Dr Murdoch will be allowed so that he can address the issues raised in the LPA's evidence submitted in February 2026, not the LPA's rebuttal evidence (which we are yet to receive). **Will Dr Murdoch be allowed to submit this 3 weeks prior to the Inquiry?**

To prevent the Appellant from advancing any argument in respect of the planning balance, which is fundamentally dependent upon the need/supply position, given the unfortunate timing of the provision of LPA evidence on these matters, would be to visit a significant procedural unfairness upon the Appellant. It would not be in the interests of any party to this appeal if the Inquiry was further delayed in the event that judicial review proceedings become necessary in order to challenge the current procedural unfairness and denial of the legitimate expectation of the Appellant that he should be afforded the opportunity of



addressing the need/supply position, and thus the planning balance, an opportunity that he has thus far not been afforded.

We apologise for the number of emails being sent to PINS but the responses being received have not adequately addressed the issues we have raised in and this further letter has been drafted so that matters can be clarified. It would be appreciated if the Inspector could consider the 3 questions raised above and respond as soon as possible.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of the letters 'CP' in a cursive, stylized font.

The Community Law Partnership Limited