

# Leatherhead ruined recycling road repair

29 November 2025



A crumbling, pothole-ridden road that has been the source of countless insurance claims could be given a new lease of life. The North Leatherhead Access Road leading into the Surrey County Council recycling centre off Randalls Road has been slowly destroyed by years of heavy goods vehicles entering and leaving the site. Now, Mole Valley District Council has agreed to spend £60,000 to begin the process of repairing the heavily rutted road. The task is made more complicated as the road is co-owned by Surrey County Council and Thames Water, and it is hoped the initial work, from an overall £300,000 budget, will determine not just what needs to be done, but who pays for it.

Presenting the item to the November meeting of Mole Valley District's cabinet was **Councillor Keira Vyvyan-Robinson**. She said: "Anybody who uses the recycling centre on a regular basis will be very familiar with the problems that road has. Obviously, it is heavily used by very heavy vehicles and over a period of time that heavy use has resulted in a lot of problems with the carriageway, with rutting in the verges and the channel blocks. That has resulted in increased insurance claims and also increased complaints. In February 2024, it was agreed that we would allocate just over £300,000 in order to improve that road. It is a complicated project because Mole Valley District Council owns about half of the road, the majority of the balance of it is the responsibility of Surrey County Council and Thames Water, so it's necessary to liaise with them and reach agreements with them over the work that needs to be carried out. This budget is to start the full design and to get the proper costing, because at the moment it's a provisional figure of about 300,000. The drawdown will enable us to finalise that, submit the planning application and reach the legal agreement with Thames Water and Surrey County Council over how much they will contribute towards the costs. For anybody who uses it, it's quite plain that we can't do nothing, as it's such a detrimental situation at the moment and it will only get worse if we don't."

**Cllr Gerry Sevenoaks**, Independent member for Ashted Park and chair of the council's scrutiny committee, said: "As a user of that road I know it very well. It's dangerous, especially if you are going down there and two refuse carts are coming the other way. I say 'let's get on with it'."

**Cllr Caroline Joseph** (Liberal Democrat, Fetcham) added: "There is a huge strength of feeling locally. It's such a small thing but it makes such a huge difference to people. If we can get this moving it will be a very positive thing to Leatherhead, Fetcham, Bookham, Ashted, everyone locally."


Chris Caulfield LDRS

Image: North Leatherhead Access Road (image Google)

---

# Surrey Hills expansion

29 November 2025



The Surrey Hills could be expanded for the first time since it was first designated as an area of outstanding natural beauty almost 70 years ago.

The Surrey Hills National Landscape boundary has remained the same since it was first introduced in 1958 but throughout that time there have been calls locally to reconsider increasing the beauty spot's borders.

Some of the land that lies next to the Surrey Hills is currently classed as Areas of Great Landscape Value by councils to recognise its value at a county level.

Now, Natural England is exploring whether to formally include 129 square kilometres of these areas into the Surrey Hills National Landscape following a series of consultations on the proposed extensions.

The first took place in 2023 with 1,518 people taking part, a second held in 2024 received over 375 responses. Natural England's report read: "The evidence provided through the first consultation process presented strong arguments to include additional land in the Surrey Hills.

"Following the decision to add further land to the proposal a second round of consultation was required in accordance with our duties under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.

"The second consultation was launched with stakeholders invited to provide a response on the changes to our proposals, including further additions, minor deletions and new land in East Hampshire. We received over 375 responses to the second consultation, the vast majority of which were supportive of the proposals."

The final review period, which the public can take part in, runs until January 14, 2026. The prime purpose of the designation is to conserve and enhance the natural and scenic beauty although it understands that the Surrey Hills is not a museum, and development may need to take place.

"A fundamental role of the local planning authorities is to ensure that the very features that make the Surrey Hills special and worthy of its designation are protected. This is achieved by strict development plan policies and through the vigilant exercise of development management powers.

"The Surrey Hills Management Plan seeks to ensure that both are applied in a consistent manner across the National Landscape. Development proposals should take into account any Landscape Character Assessments for the locality and the Surrey Hills publication", the Surrey Hills National Landscape website reads.

The draft Order 2026 relates to an area of approximately 129 square kilometres in the counties of Surrey, Hampshire and Greater London in and around:

- Wey Valley, Farnham (in Waverley Borough Council)
- Hog's Back (in Guildford Borough Council)
- Binscombe Hills (in Guildford Borough Council)
- Wey Valley (in Waverley and Guildford Borough Councils)
- Enton Hills (in Waverley Borough Council)
- Cranleigh Waters (in Waverley and Guildford Borough Councils)
- Hatchlands and East Clandon (in Guildford Borough Council)
- Headley Hills (in Mole Valley District Council)
- Chipstead Valleys (in Reigate and Banstead Borough Council)
- Happy Valley (in Tandridge District Council and London Borough of Croydon)
- Caterham Woods (in Tandridge District Council)
- Woldingham Valleys (in Tandridge District Council and London Borough of Bromley)
- Limpsfield (in Tandridge District Council)
- Godstone Hills (in Tandridge District Council)
- Betchworth Hills and Mole Valley (in Reigate and Banstead Borough Council and Mole Valley District Council)
- Ockley Low Weald (in Waverley Borough Council and Mole Valley District Council)
- Dunsfold Low Weald (in Waverley Borough Council)
- Whitemoor Vale (in East Hampshire District Council)
- Ludshott and Bramshott Comms (in East Hampshire District Council)
- Dockenfield Hills (in Waverley Borough Council and East Hampshire District Council)
- Minor boundary refinements (various)

Copies of the draft Orders and maps are also available for download online from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/surrey-hills-area-of-outstanding-natural-beauty-boundary-variation>.

Chris Caulfield LDRS

Graphic: Surrey Hills (image Natural England)

---

## **Tunnel vision for Heathrow's 3rd runway?**

29 November 2025



Heathrow Airport's plan for a third runway - requiring a major re-routing and tunnelling of the M25 - has received Government backing as the preferred option for expansion. A competing proposal for a smaller runway put forward by Arora has been rejected. Heathrow welcomed the decision to proceed with the 3,500m runway, arguing it would deliver economic gains and improved passenger experience. Critics have long criticised the plan, saying it undermines climate targets and that the motorway works risk repeating the chaos seen with the delayed A3/M25 junction upgrade, potentially bringing parts of Surrey to regular standstills. Heathrow insists the M25 realignment would be built on adjacent land, allowing the switch to the new carriageway to take place "in a series of carefully planned overnight operations".

A Heathrow spokesperson said the expansion would mean "more connectivity, increased trade, improved passenger experience and a huge economic boost for the British businesses that will help design and build it", but added that "further clarity" is required on regulation of the next phase. "We need definitive decisions from the CAA and Government by mid-December so that delay to the project can be avoided and we can get on with delivering this vital project for our customers and for the UK." The £33 billion scheme is expected to be entirely privately funded. Around £21bn would cover the runway works, including £1.5bn for the M25 realignment, with £12bn for new terminal infrastructure. Heathrow says it will also invest £15bn to modernise existing facilities, including a new terminal "T5X", an expanded Terminal 2 and three new satellite buildings.

In 2024 the airport handled 83.9 million passengers, operating at 99% of its annual flight cap of 480,000 flights. The expansion would lift these to 756,000 flights and around 150 million passengers. Heathrow's plan will now inform the review of the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS), the framework on which the eventual planning decision will be based. The Government said Heathrow's proposal is the most deliverable and most likely of the options to be approved before the next general election. The Department for Transport stressed this is not a final decision; any changes to the ANPS will be subject to consultation and parliamentary scrutiny next year, with details such as runway length, layout and infrastructure impacts considered throughout the review.

Transport Secretary Heidi Alexander said Heathrow is the UK's only hub airport, supporting "trade, tourism and hundreds of thousands of jobs", adding that the announcement is "another important step to enable a third runway and build on these benefits". She said the Government is acting "swiftly and decisively" to realise the project's potential for passengers, businesses and the wider economy. Ministers also said the scheme must comply with legally binding climate obligations, while balancing economic growth, as well as air quality and noise requirements. The independent Climate Change Committee will be consulted to ensure compatibility with the UK's net-zero framework. A planning application is expected after the ANPS review is complete.

In a promotional video, Heathrow sought to reassure the public about the M25 works: "We understand people may be concerned this could cause congestion or delays. Following previous consultation with National Highways we have developed a smarter solution. We build the future right next to the present. The vast majority of construction happens off-line. A new realigned section of the M25 is built on adjacent land while the current motorway operates as normal and the tunnels and bridges for a new runway are constructed while minimising impact on the airport or the existing motorway. Then in a series of carefully planned overnight operations, we make the switch. Traffic is transferred on to the new alignment with minimal disruption. Our approach also ensures local traffic and access for surrounding communities are kept moving with minimal disruption. This frees up the old route of the M25, creating a safe, traffic-free zone to build the final parts of the runway. The result is an upgraded and expanded M25, with new link roads separating M4 traffic from M25 mainline journeys, easing congestion and improving safety."

Chris Caulfield LDRS

Heathrow shown with a third runway over the M25 (image Heathrow)

Related reports:

[Conditional nod to southern rail link to Heathrow](#)

[Environment News Transport](#)

[Heathrow expansion - what it may mean for Epsom](#)

[Heathrow expansion reaction](#)

---

## Epsom and Ewell 5th least obese 10 year olds in the

# UK

29 November 2025



Year six schoolchildren in Surrey have some of the lowest obesity rates in the country, with Mole Valley leading the way. The figures were published as part of the Government's National Child Measurement Programme, which covers mainstream state-maintained schools. Children in Year 6 are aged 10 to 11 and the data is based on the address of the child rather than their school.

Mole Valley, at 9.7 per cent, was the only borough in the country where fewer than one in 10 children were classed as obese. Three boroughs, Sandwell and Wolverhampton in the West Midlands and Knowlsey in the North West had rates above 30 per cent.

**The complete top ten was:**

- Mole Valley - 9.7 per cent
- St Albans - 12.0 per cent
- Richmond upon Thames - 12.1 per cent
- Cambridge - 12.7 per cent
- Epsom & Ewell - 12.8 per cent
- Elmbridge - 13.1 per cent
- Waverley - 13.1 per cent
- South Hams - 13.1 per cent
- Uttlesford - 13.2 per cent
- Guildford - 13.6 per cent

**The remaining Surrey boroughs had the following obesity rates among year six children:**

- Surrey Heath - 14.5 per cent
- Woking - 15.2 per cent
- Reigate & Banstead - 15.7 per cent
- Tandridge - 16.7 per cent
- Runnymede - 16.9 per cent
- Spelthorne - 18.2 per cent

Councillor Nick Wright, Mole Valley District Council cabinet member for leisure and community assets, said one of their priorities was to support residents to live healthy and fulfilling lives. He said: "These childhood obesity figures, which shine such a positive light on Mole Valley, are very encouraging for parents, carers and young people who live in our district. For our part in contributing towards these low obesity rates, we are proud of the work we do and the initiatives we provide which can only help participating children be healthier and more active. Examples include our popular free summer holiday activities programme, most recently run this past summer, and the wide range of indoor activities - such as the kids swim for a pound offer - available at Dorking Sports Centre and Leatherhead Leisure Centre, both run on our behalf by Better."

"Our sports club access scheme also provides up to £250 per eligible young person to cover all, or part, of a sports club membership and free taster session at that specific club. "The Mole Valley parkrun and junior parkrun initiatives that we helped to establish also continue to go from strength to strength, most recently highlighted by the junior park celebrating its sixth anniversary. "The funding opportunities we provide, for example our neighbourhood fund, are available for sports clubs or other youth projects to apply for money to help improve existing and build new facilities which young people can benefit from."

"Our commitment to improving our already impressive range of play facilities, including playgrounds and skate parks, across Mole Valley will always be a high priority for us, and a decision due to be taken by cabinet later this month could see several million pounds of Community Infrastructure Levy funding become available for a major parks and recreation ground enhancement programme."

Chris Caulfield LDRS

---

## Leatherhead to be home to 500 Surrey Police Officers

29 November 2025



Surrey Police will get its new East Surrey headquarters after huge plans including hundreds of homes was approved. The force has been on the lookout for a new hub after its Reigate base was forced to close suddenly when dangerous crumbly RAAC concrete that can collapse without warning was found through the old site in 2023. The plans, on the former ERA site in Cleeve Road, Leatherhead, will be built in phases after being approved by Mole Valley District Council's development committee on Wednesday, November 5.

The first work at the site will be to build a new strategic divisional police headquarters for Surrey Police with 500 officers and staff moving into the building. Stage two will see the existing redundant buildings demolished to make way for a residential block accommodating 40 affordable residential homes that the police said would ideally be for its own staff. Stage three would build out 185 new homes.

Despite being voted through without any formal objections, concerns were raised over the lack of affordable housing in the project and that the council's affordability targets had been made a mockery. It was admitted that, in the current market, it was practically impossible for new developments to have 40 per cent of the new homes be affordable, and the project be financially viable.

Speaking on behalf of the force, a spokesperson said: "We needed to move out of our Reigate Headquarters in 2023 due to the discovery of RAAC. We are lucky enough to have secured temporary accommodation, but very much a temporary solution in the knowledge that we needed a long-term divisional headquarters." He said Surrey Police settled on Leatherhead because its gave their teams "good access to the local area and the major road links so officers can fight crime and protect people in the area."

Better facilities would allow the force to attract and retain staff. He added that while there will be serving officers operating from the base it would not act as a fire type response meaning that, while they could not guarantee there would never be sirens going off, it would be "highly unlikely."

Chris Caulfield LDRS

ERA Site, Cleeve Road, Leatherhead, Surrey (image Google)

Related reports:

[New Surrey police division HQ plans](#)

[Surrey police to move to Epsom and Ewell constituency](#)

---

## Vital Surrey bus reduced from hourly to three mornings a week

29 November 2025



People who wait for buses are often left disappointed and that only looks set to continue after the company behind an axed service said it was “not likely” to return. Residents in Horley gathered at what they have dubbed a ‘ghost’ stop in protest to the axing of the hourly 424 bus which served their estate and went between the town centre and Gatwick Airport. It has left them with just a single service - but that just runs three mornings a week.

Councillor Neha Boghani, Green Party member for Horley East and Salfords said: “For Surrey County Council, whose strapline is ‘we leave no-one behind’, to cut buses this savagely without even any public consultation is shameful, and a dereliction of their commitment to serve all residents. Our residents deserve better.” One resident at the bus stop protest said the loss of the route had taken away her social life with another adding the impact had been unbelievable. She said: “There are so many elderly people and people with disabilities living around here and we can’t afford to keep taking taxis.”

Metrobus’s commercial director Nick Hill said the two-way loop the 424 used to run along made it unreliable and the decision was made to simplify the route. The detour through Horley Riverside Gardens Estate was then dropped to make scheduling more reliable and because it was so poorly used - it would only pick up passengers on one in five journeys. He said: “It is not likely that a conventional bus service will return to the area on a frequent basis due to such low demand. Residents in the area do also have other alternatives: much of the area is a short walk to access more frequent bus services.”

The dial-a-ride type service Surrey Connect is to be made available in the area and for Gatwick Airport. A spokesperson for Surrey County Council said they understood the disruptions alterations to bus services can make but that no areas have been left unserved by the cuts. They said: “Residents in the Horley Gardens Estate were previously served by Metrobus service 424, however data showed less than one passenger per journey travelled on most of the 424 journeys, which was unsustainable. This area continues to be served by local bus service 26 three days a week, providing links with Horley Town Centre and Hookwood Tesco, as well as the Surrey Connect service, which operates between 7am to 7pm weekdays and 8am to 6pm on Saturdays, with alternative services available for most passengers within a five-minute walk.”

“These changes form part of a wider review, which has seen the off-peak service 100 rerouted from Park 25 in Redhill, where data showed a usage of less than one passenger per journey, to instead serve residents in Westvale Park, Horley. This has enabled in the region of 4,000 otherwise isolated residents to be served, and initial patronage figures from the bus operator indicate that the number of passengers now travelling in the area have since quadrupled. Residents in Park 25 continue to be served by service 100 in the peak hours and on Sundays, and off-peak service 424 provides an hourly service throughout the day. We will continue to work alongside bus operators to create travel opportunities which encourage greater bus use and will keep the prospect of rerouting an alternative service via Park 25 under review.”

Chris Caulfield LDRS

Image: Cllr Neha Boghani (right), Green councillor for Horley East, with residents of the Gardens Estate, south Horley, at the ‘ghost bus stop’ where they used to get on the 424 Metrobus (image Cllr Boghani)

## Surrey resident’s views on County split ignored?

29 November 2025



The Government has been accused of ignoring Surrey residents’ views on how to dissolve and merge the county’s councils after it emerged there was a clear preference for three unitaries rather than the two mega authorities that have been imposed.

A consultation ran from June 17 to August 5 to help the Government understand what residents, businesses, and other

stakeholders thought about the changes in Surrey. The results, we were told, would be used to “inform the final decision on which option is best for Surrey, with a decision expected in October.”

On Tuesday, October 28, it was announced that Surrey County Council and its 11 boroughs and districts would be abolished and replaced with West Surrey Council and East Surrey Council. The decision flies in the face of the 51 per cent of the 5,617 respondents who backed three unitary proposals versus the 19 per cent that favoured East/West.

This, despite a costly PR drive from Surrey County Council that sent leaflets to every household pushing for the two unitaries. The results were published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government as part of its decision - and found that, in addition to the strong resident support for three councils, 56 per cent were also strongly opposed to what has been delivered.

The Ministry said: “Support for the three unitary proposal was based on the view that a three unitary council model resulted in authorities that were a good size and that the groupings of current authority areas made sense. Residents generally believed that the proposal would achieve good economies and efficiencies and be good for local identity, accountability, community engagement and service improvement.

“Negative responses relating to the three unitary proposal highlighted concern that it would not generate significant efficiencies, as well as concerns about how debt would be addressed. Those who supported the two unitary proposal typically did so on the basis of the greater efficiencies presented in the proposal, with the belief that it would create authorities of a good size.

“It added: “There was no single factor as to why residents did not support the two unitary proposal, though the most common theme in responses was that the two unitaries were too large and secondly, that the proposals would be bad for local identity.”

Councillor Paul Follows, leader of the Liberal Democrats on Surrey County Council, was one of the drivers behind the three unitary model in his role as leader of Waverley Borough Council. He said: “They cancelled elections, asked for views, and then did the opposite.”

The Ministry said its decision process carefully considered responses to the consultation as well as all other relevant information. It said the proposals were assessed against set criteria and that, of the choices, the two-council proposal better met that - particularly as it is seen as more likely to be financially sustainable.

A spokesperson said: “Putting Surrey’s local authorities on a more sustainable footing is vital to safeguarding the services its residents rely on, as well as investing in their futures. The government consultation for both proposals, held between July 17 and August 5, treated the proposals equally.”

On the cancelled elections, the ministry said they were postponed for a year to provide additional capacity for speeding up reorganisation - given the urgency of creating sustainable unitary local government for Surrey.

Chris Caulfield LDRS

Related reports:

[Government Casts Doubt on Surrey’s Mayoral Devolution Promise](#)

[Residents sigh of relief if Government bail out bankrupt Woking](#)

[Epsom and Ewell to Go East in Surrey shake-up](#)

[Surrey County Council LGR leaflet misleading claim](#)

[LGR and CGR, what’s the difference for Epsom and Ewell?](#)

[No release from LGR releases](#)

[Where do we stand on local government reorganisation in Epsom and Ewell and the County?](#)

[Many more.... search local government reorganisation](#)

Image: Ministry of Housing, Communities, and Local Government (image Google)

---

## Government Casts Doubt on Surrey’s Mayoral Devolution Promise

29 November 2025



No promises have been made that Surrey will get full devolution and a directly elected mayor - despite it being the "entire purpose" of the lengthy and arduous process of splitting the historic county and its 11 boroughs and districts into two mega councils.

It had been understood that Surrey's councils would be abolished and reformed into either two or three unitary authorities, with two sets of elections - first for the new bodies, and then for an overarching mayor in 2027. Surrey County Council's website outlining the devolution and Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) process mentions the word "Mayor" seven times, and even lists May 2027 as when residents would go to the polls to decide who would be responsible for strategic services such as education, policing, fire and rescue.

However, the Government's own timetable for Surrey only lists a May 2026 election for the two shadow councils, followed by the next round of balloting in May 2031 - and then every four years after that. Furthermore, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government has said that the references to Surrey getting a directly elected mayor were "not quite accurate" as the decision "has not been confirmed" and that they were only "committed to working with partners to establish a strategic authority for the area". They clarified that the announcement that Surrey would be dissolved and reformed into East and West Surrey was "not promising a mayor".

Areas with strategic mayors, such as London and Manchester, are given extra devolved powers from Government, with the argument being it gives local people a greater say in the running of their areas. Writing to the leaders of Surrey's councils, the ministry would only say that simplifying local government ensures "a strong foundation for devolution". It said it was committed to working with partners across Surrey, including the new unitary authorities, to establish a strategic authority to ensure relevant functions held at the county level can continue on that geographic footprint where possible, such as transport and adult skills.

It added that the establishment of a strategic authority would be subject to the relevant statutory tests being met and local consent - but makes no mention of a directly elected mayor. This is important because strategic authorities are different from Mayoral Strategic Authorities. According to the ministry, Foundation Strategic Authorities include non-mayoral combined authorities and combined county authorities, and any local authority designated as a strategic authority without a mayor.

Mayoral Strategic Authorities, such as the Greater London Authority, all Mayoral Combined Authorities and all Mayoral Combined County Authorities, "automatically begin as Mayoral Strategic Authorities" - and only those that meet specified eligibility criteria may be designated as Established Mayoral Strategic Authorities to unlock further devolution.

It has left the county council saying devolution is now an "ambition" rather than a formality. Others have called out the council for rushing into such a seismic shift, and cancelling elections to get devolution done - without any guarantees over whether the county would get a mayor.

Councillor Paul Follows, leader of the Liberal Democrat group at Surrey County Council, said having a mayor "was the entire purpose of the reorganisation". He added: "The county council has gone in on this nonsense without any guarantee over the reason they have it, despite that being the principal reason the county has initiated this process - but they have yet to receive any guarantees. I'm sure the county will reflect their reasons for going for this in the light that the ministry said we may not be getting devolution."

Chris Caulfield LDRS

Image: Tim Oliver (credit Surrey Live) and County graphic (credit SCC).

Related reports:

[Residents sigh of relief if Government bail out bankrupt Woking](#)

[Epsom and Ewell to Go East in Surrey shake-up](#)

[Surrey County Council LGR leaflet misleading claim](#)

[LGR and CGR, what's the difference for Epsom and Ewell?](#)

[No release from LGR releases](#)

[Where do we stand on local government reorganisation in Epsom and Ewell and the County?](#)

[Many more.... search local government reorganisation](#)

---

## Some election detail on the new Surrey Councils

29 November 2025



Election dates in Surrey, and how the seats will be split in the two new mega councils, have been confirmed as more details emerge of how everything will work following the Government's local government reorganisation announcement. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government wrote to council bosses across Surrey laying out the roadmap to how and when the old authorities will be abolished. Councils will be sent a draft structural change order with a November 7 deadline to give their feedback. From there, parliament will scrutinise the plans in early January before the formal creation of East Surrey Council and West Surrey Council - and the abolishment of the existing authorities. Elections for the new councils will take place in May 2026 in order to create shadow bodies that will sit alongside the outgoing system. Those elected will be responsible for budgets and long term planning before formally taking over local government functions and powers on April 1 2027.

The new councils will run under a leader and cabinet model, as is currently the case with Surrey County Council. The outgoing councils will remain responsible for services in their areas until they are abolished on April 1 2027. It is understood wards in the new mega councils will follow the current county boundaries - having only recently undergone an electoral boundary review. The major difference will be that each ward will have two councillors representing their areas rather than the current one. Elections will be overseen by the head of paid service of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council for East Surrey Council, and the head of paid service of Runnymede Borough Council for West Surrey.

The ministry has said it wants the first elections to carry a five-year term and is scheduling the second ballots for 2031. After this it will revert to a standard four-year cycle. Writing to Surrey councils' chief executive, Ruth Miller, deputy director for local government reform and strategy, said: "This is in line with recent reorganisations and brings benefits of stability, with councillors serving most of their first year on the 'shadow' council. From your representations that means the election cycle will align with the majority of elections to parish councils. Where that is not the case, we can, in further legislation, look to align parish elections with the 2031 election, and we will be guided by your views."

Any Parish council elections are expected to take place as normal in 2027. During the shadow year, the new councils will be expected to prepare and submit a devolution proposal or consent to a government plan, to progress the work for a Strategic Authority.

Chris Caulfield LDRS

Related reports:

[Epsom and Ewell to Go East in Surrey shake-up](#)

[Surrey County Council LGR leaflet misleading claim](#)

[LGR and CGR, what's the difference for Epsom and Ewell?](#)

[No release from LGR releases](#)

[Where do we stand on local government reorganisation in Epsom and Ewell and the County?](#)

[New Epsom and Ewell Parish? Cherish or perish the thought?](#)

[Many more.... search local government reorganisation](#)

Image: Scout outside a polling station Molesey (image: Chris Caulfield)

## Dorking's "behemoth" of a "black hole"

29 November 2025



The "behemoth" that is Dorking Halls has been labelled a "black hole" that sucks in all resources around it after an additional £3.34million in maintenance work was approved.

The new money comes on top of the originally agreed £11.2m the refurbishment project was expected to cost after delays and lead paint saw the bills spiral.

The work has been labelled as essential by those who see the building as a Dorking icon that must be preserved for future generations. Critics have accused Mole Valley District Council of treating the public purse like 'Monopoly' money.

The decision was made at the October full council meeting where the second stage of the project was signed off and confirmed Dorking Halls would again close, this time from April 2026 through until early December.

Councillor Nick Wright, cabinet member for leisure and community assets, said: "Dorking Halls is the largest publicly owned performance venue anywhere in east Surrey.

"Dorking Halls typically gets about 180,000 visitors, there are over 60,000 registered customers of which only about half live in Mole Valley.

"Of the Mole Valley residents, approximately one third have postal codes in Dorking itself, 26 per cent from Leatherhead and the north of the district, and about 40 per cent from rural areas. So the Halls really do serve the entire Mole Valley community.

"But it's not just Mole Valley, with its 900 seated grand hall plus two other halls, two cafe bars and a conference room, this is the largest performance venue anywhere in Surrey and it's owned by us, the public. This iconic building should and must be cherished and preserved for future generations.

"It's old, it's built in 1931, but it has national significance as a venue for classical and choral music and now embraces everything from rock pop musicals, theatre pantomime, comedy lectures, to cinema and circus."

The building came into public ownership in 1947 and had its first big upgrade and expansion in the 1990s when much of the current tech was installed.

He added: "But after 30 years of continuous daily use, it was showing its age, breakdowns were occurring and running costs increased." The council had originally approved £11.2million of spending across the two phases; the first was completed late last year in time for the Christmas panto season.

Costs leapt when lead paint was found in the building and needed to be removed - so the council has had to top up the pot with an additional £3.34m this time around. The phase one work concentrated on replacing the ceiling of the grand hall which was failing but the discovery of the toxic paint made the entire project more complex.

This time the council will upgrade the Halls heating cooling, air-conditioning and electrical systems - as well as the technical infrastructure inside the grand hall - bringing it up to modern standards. Council said the extra costs of phase one, together with three years of inflationary pressures has meant a further £3.34 million is needed to finish the job.

The money also includes a one-off "unavoidable growth" of £584,000 to cover the loss of earnings during the Halls' closure. Cllr Wright said: "Without phase two this building would run the risk of falling into disrepair".

Cllr Chris Hunt (Independent: Ashtead Lanes and Common), said was one of the first to speak out against the added costs. He said: "This isn't fair on council tax payers. Nobody is saying it's a bad building. I was arguing that the scheme should be built quicker. The administration said 'no slow it down', they have got to be responsible to this overspend, this monopoly (money) approach to council tax."

Cllr Patricia Wiltshire (Independent: Ashtead Lanes and Common) said: "This is a massive, massive, overspend and there are people in Mole Valley who are desperately resentful of all these resources going into this one building. Every time we ask for something, little things we get told 'there's no money', or 'the budgets are too tight'.

"Yet here we are with this behemoth of a building, like a black hole absorbing the resources going into it. It's a nice venue, it's useful, people enjoy themselves, but don't kid yourself that every single person in Mole Valley enjoys it or uses it. It's a relatively small number in comparison to the whole population.

She added that the burden should fall on those who use Dorking Halls instead and that, if you want to go to the theatre you should pay without expecting everyone else to cover the cost.

Defending the project however was Cllr Stephen Cooksey (Liberal Democrats : Dorking South). He said: "It's a big chunk of money but if we don't spend it we could lose Dorking Halls."

Chris Caulfield LDRS

Image: Dorking Halls - Google.

Related reports:

[Dorking Halls to shut again for restoration?](#)


[Dorking Halls to reopen after upgrade](#)

[Dorking Halls to get refit](#)

[Dorking refurb: "it's behind you"!](#)

# Surrey County Council LGR leaflet misleading claim

29 November 2025



Claims of potential corruptions of due process have been levelled at key figures linked to Surrey County Council's **local government reorganisation** (LGR) plans. The charges were put in a letter to the Minister of State for Local Government and Homelessness by the borough council leader at Surrey Heath. It surrounds a publicity leaflet issued by the county council and sent to householders across Surrey. The advert featured the signatures and logos of leading public bodies and figures in the county including Surrey Police, the fire and rescue service and the police and crime commissioner - and publicly backs Surrey County Council plans to merge with its 11 boroughs and districts to form two mega councils.

They did so, he said, before a final alternative position for three new councils had been finalised - meaning it was impossible to know all the options. Councillor Shaun Macdonald has since asked the ministry whether there were reasonable grounds to test whether public bodies, civil servants and elected officials broke impartiality guidelines and due process. He says senior figures, whose roles should be politically neutral, worked together, and spent public money, to push for Surrey's two mega councils plan.

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government said the statutory consultation set out information about both proposals, and was available on gov.uk. It added that councils are required to have regard to the publicity code and any concerns should be raised with the council concerned. Surrey County Council leader Tim Oliver said they engaged with their Surrey partners about Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) throughout the process of compiling their recommendation "as government, stakeholders and residents would rightly expect". He added that many felt the proposal for two unitary councils was the best possible outcome for the county, "which will simplify the system, save money and strengthen community engagement" and that their partners "followed their own governance processes in formally acknowledging their support for the two unitary proposal." He said: "Importantly, all councils across Surrey have communicated with residents throughout LGR, and will continue to do so, using various channels to ensure people have access to information and given every opportunity to engage with the process."

A decision on whether to create two or three new councils was expected earlier this month but the Local Democracy Reporting Service understands this has been delayed to give further consideration to the three-council model. A formal decision is expected at the end of this month. Delays to the announcement create a tighter window on the opposite side ahead of next May's shadow elections.

Surrey Police said it was consulted by the county council over the two unitary councils and that it backed the move as it reflected structures the force already had in mind "before, and independently of, any plans for LGR within Surrey". A spokesperson for the force said: "Since the proposals reflected the existing ideas of the force as to our likely future structure, it was natural for us to support them. Surrey Police will continue to work closely with our partners to understand how this proposal and any subsequent decisions might affect our own operating model now or in the future."

Police and Crime Commissioner Lisa Townsend said she set out her support for a proposed two-unitary model of local government in a letter to the leader of Surrey County Council in May. She added: "This was subsequently included as part of the submission to Government who are currently considering what option will be implemented here in Surrey. I believe a two unitary model will not only be a simpler and more cost-effective structure for local residents but it would also be better placed to support the efficient policing of Surrey in the future. Nothing outlined in the three-unitary proposal has caused me to change my mind. The two unitary model fits well with Surrey Police's emerging plans for a revised policing operating model - work on which had begun long before the white paper for local government reform was even on the table. My office were not consulted directly by Surrey Heath Borough Council during this process. My Chief Executive was approached by another council Chief Executive who requested feedback to help inform the development of the three-unitary proposal and we were very happy to engage in this discussion. I do not consider my support for the two unitary model to be a political decision. My views on this topic are informed by what aligns best with the future plans for Surrey Police and what I believe is right for the Force and the people it serves."

Part of Cllr Macdonald's letter read: "Objectivity requires 'holders of public office must act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit, using the best evidence and without discrimination or bias'. It is my view that a reasonable person would not accept that writing a letter of support prior to the publication of final proposals and the start of the statutory consultation process meets the Nolan Principle of Objectivity, as due diligence in the assessment of 'best evidence' had not been completed. A safer position for a public body would be strictly balanced, factual information about impacts across all final options as part of the statutory consultation. Police officers, in serving the Crown, are prohibited from engaging in political activity and must remain impartial. Publicly endorsing a specific governance option (e.g. an SCC-led 'two unitary' model) or allowing the force's crest to be used in a marketing campaign risks breaching those duties, even if the issue is 'cross-party'. He added: "I do request that in assessing all statutory responses due note is taken of the potentially corrupted process and biased publicity resulting from the undue influence of Surrey County Council over these public officials and bodies, and their inputs disregarded to avoid the potential risk of judicial review."

Chris Caulfield LDRS

Related reports:

Local government reform or just more layers?

Where do we stand on local government reorganisation in Epsom and Ewell and the County?

Surrey's partner organisations support county council plans for local government reorganisation

Surrey Councils launch Local Government Reorganisation engagement

Surrey's BIG debt question in local government reorganisation

Local Government Reorganisation in Surrey: Key Proposals

and others: search "reorganisation".

---

## Surrey home extension charges aired in Parliament

29 November 2025



"Complex and inflexible" rules that unintentionally and "unfairly penalise" homeowners with six-figure fines "for the apparent crime of building a home extension" will be reexamined, the housing minister has said.

The problem of Community Infrastructure Levy charges being unfairly or disproportionately applied to homeowners has inflicted pain on dozens of Waverley residents with the borough council saying it is tied by Government guidelines on how to enforce the charges.

The charges are supposed to help offset the impact of large scale developments in an area - and help fund the infrastructure to support it.

In Waverley, dozens of homeowners have found themselves inadvertently caught in the tangle of bureaucracy. One resident, Steve Dally was stung with a £70,000 'contribution' with others threatened with imprisonment or having their homes repossessed.

The issue came to a head this week in Parliament with Godalming and Ash MP Sir Jeremy Hunt raising the matter to housing minister Matthew Pennycook.

Sir Jeremy said: "My constituent Steve Dally was charged £70,000 by Liberal Democrat-controlled Waverley borough council for the apparent crime of building a home extension. I met the housing minister earlier this year to talk about abuse of the community infrastructure levy. Could he update the House on his plans to stop it?"

Mr Pennycook told the commons that he agreed there had been a number of "unintended consequences of the 2010 CIL regulations—they have unfairly penalised some homeowners.

"I can only reiterate the commitments I gave him during that meeting. In principle, we are committed to finding a solution to this issue, and I am more than happy to meet him again and update him on the steps we have taken in the interim."

The news has been welcomed by Waverley Borough Council, which has set up its own discretionary review panel to examine cases of wrongdoing - although uptake has been extremely slow with only two cases coming forward so far.

Councillor Liz Townsend, Waverley Borough Council portfolio holder for planning and economic development said: "We welcome the recent comments made in Parliament by the Housing Minister acknowledging the unintended consequences of the current Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations.

"The legislation is overly complex and inflexible, and like many residents we are frustrated by a system that can leave homeowners facing large bills for genuine mistakes. We have been pressing the Government for reform for some time, so it is encouraging to hear a clear commitment to finding a solution.

"While national legislation limits what councils can do, we are doing everything possible to support our residents. She added: "The case of Mr Dally, which was raised in Parliament, was one of the situations that highlighted the need for change.

"Following discussions with him, the council reviewed his case and concluded that his CIL charge should be withdrawn and refunded. His experience helped shape the introduction of our Discretionary Review Scheme, so that other residents would have a clear route to request a review."

The council said it would continue to lobby Government for urgent reform to ensure the CIL system "is clearer, fairer and more proportionate for homeowners" and called for the collaborative work between themselves, Sir Jeremy and ministers

“to help shape a fairer and more compassionate system that still supports local infrastructure.”

Chris Caulfield LDRS

Godalming and Ash MP Sir Jeremy Hunt in parliament raising the issue of CIL injustice (Parliament TV)

Related reports:

Waverley not waiving planning fees spark protests

Planning a house extension in Epsom and Ewell? A hard lesson from Waverley