Illegal dumps dump a dumps in Surrey

Persistent and ongoing fly-tippling problems have forced the permanent closure of a Surrey recycling centre, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council has said.

The Lower Kingswood site in Stubbs Lane has been plagued with illegal dumping despite being plastered with warning posters saying flytipping was a criminal offence – and that continued misuse would result in its closure.

The council has said it will continue to monitor the site after its Monday, May 19 axing in an effort to deter any further tips.

The flytipping, it added, was not only a nuisance but risked contaminating recycling turning it into useless landfill.

Cllr Hannah Avery (Conservative, Horley Central and South), is the executive member for neighbourhood services.

She said: "We're grateful to the many residents who do the right thing when recycling their waste.

"Unfortunately, fly tipping at our recycling sites, which can contaminate this recycling, undermines the efforts of the responsible majority.

"I want it to be easy for residents to recycle as much as they can, so am really pleased that all households in the area local to Stubbs Lane can now use our full collection service and are able to recycle all the materials collected at Stubbs Lane, with the exception of textiles, from home."

The council said its efforts to curb the illegal fly tipping, including fixed penalty notices, failed to prevent large volumes of non-recyclable waste being dumped at the site.

Reigate and Banstead run an alternating waste collection service. Week one – which it calls blue week, collects food as well as paper and cardboard – with a fortnightly garden scheme for members.

The second week, dubbed green week, collects food, paper and cardboard - with a fortnightly mixed recycling and general refuse of anything that can not be recycled.

The council said it has reminded all its residents, businesses, and charities they must dispose waste responsibly and that failure could result in prosecution or a £400 fixed penalty notice.

Stubbs Lane flytipping (image RBBC)

Strip Woking's debt-man of his OBE MP says

The "chief architect" behind the financial collapse of Woking Borough Council should be stripped of his OBE to local government, the town's MP has said. In 2023 the council declared itself effectively bankrupt with debts expected to pass £2.6billion on the back of a failed regeneration scheme. It has led to some communities resembling a 'bomb site', heaped huge tax rises on residents' bills and a gutting of popular public services.

Now, the town's MP has said one of the drivers of Woking's financial decisions should be held accountable. In February 2025, the Financial Reporting Council (FRC) announced it was looking into the "professional standards" of two "individual accountants" – one of whom is Ray Morgan in respect of Woking Borough Council's operations and investment activities. Mr Morgan served as CEO for 14 years before retiring in March 2021 having been made an Officer of the Order of the British Empire in 2007 on the back of green initiatives he oversaw. His efforts even drew praise from King Charles while he was the Prince of Wales who said it was an example of local government "enhancing the wellbeing of its residents — now and in the future." Mr Morgan described being given the award as an honour and that he was disappointed the MP for Woking should seek its removal.

Mr Morgan was identified in November 2024 as being "the principal architect of the council's investment decisions" based on clear "documentary evidence and the information provided by stakeholders". Addressing the Houses of Parliament was the Woking MP Will Forster. He said: "The former chief executive of Woking borough council, Ray Morgan OBE, has been identified in a public interest report as the chief architect in bankrupting my council, leaving it with debts of £2 billion. Does the Leader of the House agree that the very least the Government could do is remove his OBE for services to local government? Will she agree to hold a debate in this House so that we can discuss Government policy on removing honours when wrongdoing has been committed?"

As well as singling out the actions of Mr Morgan, the MP also pushed for a debate on the removal of honours from any individual found to have committed serious failings in public office. Responding, Leader of the House Lucy Powell MP, said she was "really sorry" to hear about the case and urged him to contact the special committee that convenes to look whether individuals should be allowed to hold on to their honours where "there is a strong case for nominations to be removed." She said: "It is absolutely right to say that we need to make sure that people are held accountable for their actions. Where they have received nominations, that is something that we should consider."

Mr Forster said he has now formally submitted a letter to the Honours Secretariat calling Mr Morgan's OBE to be removed. Mr Morgan said: "I was honoured to receive the OBE in 2007 and am disappointed that the MP for Woking should seek its removal."

Image: Woking Borough Council chief executive Ray Morgan. Screengrab from webcast of Woking Borough Council meeting 11.02.21

Spelthorne Borough Council commissioners

PLEASE NOTE FRESH QUOTES FROM SBC HAVE BEEN ADDED. IN BOLD BELOW

Serious concerns over Spelthorne Borough Council's financial failures have led the Government to appoint commissioners, experienced in taking over bankrupt authorities, to run key functions at the heavily indebted authority.

Spelthorne Borough Council has significant debts that stood at £1.096 billion in March 2023 making it the second worst for a district authority in England, after Woking.

Such is the "severity and size of the challenge at Spelthorne", the Government has put in place measures that could last for up to five years to try to bring about some level of value for money and financial sustainably.

This includes taking over the council's operating model and a redesign of services offered to residents.

The commissioners, some of whom have already dealt with crises at Liverpool and Woking, will look to close any budget gaps and reduce Spelthorne's "exceptionally high level of external borrowing".

Since May 2022, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government has monitored several councils with high levels of debt and raised "serious concerns across a number of areas" at Spelthorne.

In particular they highlighted the council's "poor record" of addressing recommendations from external reviews and had "no confidence" in the council's ability to make the changes "without significant external support".

They found an unwarranted "culture of optimism bias" with senior officers lacking "awareness" and being "clouded" to the dangers of its financial situation", according to a slew of documents released by the Government today, Thursday May 8.

They spoke of strained and deteriorating relationships between senior management and political leadership as well as a lack of trust – with a high number of complaints against members.

Inspectors also found "poor, late and incomplete reporting, together with a lack of audit and a reluctance to accept and act on challenge" that "severely undermined informed decision-making".

The debt was amassed despite, or perhaps because of a "lack of long-term planning, risk management" and an "overly-optimistic reliance" on property markets" which created an "unsustainable" financial strategy .

Extracts from the report read: "The council's commercial activities are fragmented and lack a unified strategy, leading to uncoordinated decisions that do not align with broader objectives.

"The council's large-scale property investments, driven by concerns over funding shortfalls, have exposed it to significant financial risks, especially post-covid.

"The decision-making process was short-sighted and overly optimistic, with risks not fully understood or mitigated.

"Investments are disproportionate to the size of the authority, raising concerns about risk and return considerations.

"The authority has not fully adhered to statutory guidance on local authority investments, and decision-making reports have been inadequate, often lacking key elements and clear financial implications.

"The finance function lacks the structure, staffing, and expertise to manage the authority's property portfolios effectively.

"The authority financed its property acquisitions with over £1 billion in loans from the Public Works Loan Board, with terms up to 50 years and fixed rates averaging 2.58 per cent.

"This debt is greater than the authority's core funding equating to over £10,000 per resident.

"While senior officers believe the Authority can service this debt using property revenues, there are significant issues such as property voids, high maintenance costs, and no clear long-term exit strategy.

"Having carefully considered the evidence, together with the representations received, the Secretary of State is confident that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the authority is failing to comply with its Best Value Duty."

The commissioners will take over:

- Governance, scrutiny and transparency of strategic decision making
- Financial governance and scrutiny of strategic financial decision
- Strategic financial management
- Commercial decision-making, regeneration, property management, procurement and the management of commercial
- The council's operating model and redesign of services to achieve value for money and financial sustainability.
- Hiring and firing of senior officers and statutory officers.

Issuing a statement, the council said commissioners will be accountable to the Secretary of State and 'uphold proper standards and due process and recommend action to the authority'.

Cllr Joanne Sexton, Leader of Spelthorne Borough Council, said: "We will tackle these challenges head-on. I am resolute in restoring Spelthorne's financial health and will continue to improve our services and work hand-in-hand with the Commissioners to deliver lasting improvements."

Cllr Chris Bateson, Deputy Leader of Spelthorne Borough Council, added: "We stand united in our commitment to drive value for money, cut borrowing and protect vital services. There is no Plan B - we are all in to secure our Borough's future."

The council has gone through many changes in the past five years, having previously been under continuous Conservative control since its inception in 1974. In 2020 the council had its first independent leader when former Tory Ian Harvey crossed the floor. He was replaced that year by the Conservative Cllr John Boughtflower in 2020, the Liberal Democrat Cllr Lawrence Nichols in 2021, Cllr Boughtflower again in 2022. The current leader, the Independent Cllr Joanne Sexton has been in the position since 2023.

She said: "We are determined to address the challenges facing the authority and look forward to working collaboratively with the commissioners to ensure long-term improvement in the areas highlighted."

Residents Association group on two unitaries

The county council's plan to split Surrey in two is "flawed, inconsistent, incomplete and will doom the west to fail", say opposition members.

Surrey as we know it will come to an end as sweeping changes to local government come into effect over the next two years.

The Government wants to get rid of the half-century-old system of 11 boroughs, districts, together with a county council, and replace them with a single mayor sitting atop either two or three large unitary authorities.

How that is achieved is still to be determined but the Residents Association group at Surrey has challenged the county's plan saying that "in almost all" cases the county council's own evidence goes against what it is trying to push through.

The county council wants to split Surrey in two in such a way that the most heavily indebted boroughs, Woking, Spelthorne, Runnymede and Surrey Heath, would all be merged together – creating a massive financial imbalance from the get go.

The residents group says that "worse still" the council's impact assessment flip flopped between where to stick Spelthorne.

Leader of the Residents' Association and Independents Group, Councillor Catherine Powell, said papers published ahead of Surrey's decision showed that a budget imbalance between the two new councils would be created with those living in the west facing higher costs.

Tax collection, she added, was another serious issue, because a new East Surrey would have two councils with the highest number of Band G and H properties while West Surrey would have, in Spelthorne, and Woking, two with the greatest percentage of lower tax band homes.

Cllr Powell said: "Surrey County Council says the proposals are robust and evidence based, and that (having Spelthorne in the west) creates authorities that are best placed to deliver high quality services. But the "data" on which (that) has been selected, except it doesn't.

"It very clearly shows in almost all categories that Spelthorne in the east is more equitable than with Spelthorne in the west."

Tim Oliver, Leader of Surrey County Council: "The recommended geography for a two unitary split of Surrey is based on evidence, with a huge number of factors taken into account. It is also important to note local support and feedback from partners agencies – including other councils – in the final proposal."

He said that detailed evidence showed very similar benefits and challenges between both options but that, when wider factors were considered, putting Spelthorne into West Surrey was considered the preferred option.

He added: "The harmonisation of council tax is a very real and practical challenge within any reorganisation, with different councils in Surrey currently charging different rates.

"Decisions about how to harmonise council tax band D rates will be for the new unitaries to make, but modelling has been undertaken as part of preparing the County Council's LGR Final Plan, and will continue to be progressed to help inform future decision-making so that it is fair and balanced across all Surrey residents, while ensuring any new councils would be in the best possible financial position to provide high quality, sustainable services."

Three Unitary Authorities Proposal for Surrey

Final devolution and merger plans that promise to be one of the biggest political shake ups in Surrey will be formally put forward this week ahead of the Government set May 9 deadline.

While the county council and a few boroughs and districts, notably Elmbridge, favour splitting Surrey in two - arguing it delivers the best combination of cost savings and devolved powers - the majority are set to back reorganising into three unitary authorities.

The three-council plan would put Epsom & Ewell, Mole Valley, Reigate & Banstead and Tandridge into East Surrey.

Elmbridge, Runnymede and Spelthorne would become North Surrey, and Guildford, Surrey Heath, Waverley and Woking in West Surrey.

Sitting atop all three would be a directly elected mayor.

Those in favour of three councils argue it "delivers the best outcome for the people and businesses of Surrey" by looking beyond what saves the most money to focus on natural geographic divisions within the county.

Papers presented to councils this week read: "These new councils, East Surrey, West Surrey and North Surrey, are more than just lines on a map.

"They reflect the county's real economic and human geography. They reflect the lived reality of our residents, and the practical considerations of our businesses."

It added: "When we examined the evidence, we found that two unitary authorities would be remote from the communities they serve, disconnected from residents and partners, reactive in service delivery, and reliant on outdated means of engagement to overcome a significant democratic deficit."

"But the impact is greater than just identity.

"There are no two unitary options for Surrey that would not divide and fragment the county's recognised three functional economic areas, baking in strategic inconsistency and economic incoherence from the start, and so significantly hindering

economic growth."

Councils will begin voting on their formal plans to create new authorities this week with Elmbridge, Spelthorne, Epsom and Ewell, Waverley, Surrey Heath, Mole Valley, and Tandridge all set to vote through their final submissions to the Government on Tuesday night (May 6).

They will be followed by Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council, Reigate and Banstead, and Runnymede on Wednesday while Woking will wait until Thursday May 8.

Any proposed reorganisation is still extremely reliant of Government assistance in dealing with the £5.5billion of debt Surrey's councils have amassed.

"To be clear, the decision between two or three unitary authorities is far more than one of mere administrative convenience or numbers on a spreadsheet – it represents a choice between a system of local government that actively fosters and encourages community empowerment, local decision making and strong place leadership, and one that while certainly aspiring to it, will lack the institutional and strategic clarity to drive growth and embrace truly local decision making.

"A two unitary authority model, lacking alignment with Surrey's functional economic areas, places and identities will embed economic incoherence and conflicting growth incentives, and cannot meaningfully empower local people due to its democratic distance and disconnection of residents from the levers of power.

"We have considered whether systems like community boards would help, and concluded that, as demonstrated by the experience of Wiltshire, that these will not resolve the fundamental issues," the report added.

County elections were cancelled this year to allow council staff the time to focus on devolution If everything goes smoothly the Government expects elections for the newly formed councils to go ahead in 2026 and in 2027 for a mayor.

Nork By-election Results

The only vote held in Surrey saw the Residents Association hold the Nork and Tattenhams by-election, while Reform UK moved up to second place after securing more votes than the Conservatives, Labour and Lib Dems combined.

The May 1 poll took despite elections being cancelled across the county so council staff could work on devolution plans to merge Surrey and its boroughs and districts – making this the only meaningful snapshot of the electorate to take place.

The seat became available after the former leader of the residents association, Nick Harrison, decided to call time on the council.

He had represented the area for 20 years having first been elected to represent Nork and Tattenhams in 2005.

Taking his place will be fellow residents association member Peter Harp who secured a resounding majority of 54 per cent after receiving 2,084 votes when ballots were counted on Friday May 2.

Cllr Harp was already a serving member for Reigate and Banstead Council on a platform of believing in the importance of the environment as well as, preserving and enhancing Nork.

Reform UK's Elizabeth Cooper was the runner up after 902 people put a cross next to her name – enough for a 23 per cent share of the vote.

Rounding out the rest of the results were Pamela Freeman of the Conservatives with 515.

Esme Wright of Labour on 167, Mike Robinson, Liberal Democrats, 106, and Alistair Morten, The Green Party, 93.

In all there were 3,867 votes cast for a 32 per cent turnout.

The result does not change the political balance of Surrey County Council which remains under Conservative control with 44 councillors. The Liberal Democrats, and Resident Associations each have 16 councillors, with two Labour, two Green, and one non-aligned independent making up the opposition.

Results in full

- Peter Harp Nork and Tattenhams Residents' Association 2084 54% Elected
- Elizabeth Cooper Reform UK 902 23% Not elected

- Pamela Freeman Conservative 515 13% Not elected
- Esme Wright Labour 167 4% Not elected
- Mike Robinson Liberal Democrats 106 3% Not elected
- Alistair Morten The Green Party 93 2% Not elected

ENDS

Devolution plans for Surrey

Surrey County Council has set out how and why it wants merge with the 11 boroughs and districts to create two mega authorities as the deadline to submit local government reorganisation plans approaches.

The county council believes the best way forward is to split Surrey into eastern and western divisions.

On one side would be Woking, Spelthorne, Runnymede, Surrey Heath, Waverley and Guildford the other with Elmbridge, Mole Valley, Epsom & Ewell, Reigate & Banstead, and Tandridge.

The two new mega councils would have an overarching mayor responsible for, among other things, policing and fire services.

If the plans do go ahead, elections for the new shadow unitary councils would likely be held in May 2026, and a mayoral election most likely in 2027.

The county council argues its plan would "help ensure the future of local government in Surrey" was "cost effective, simplified and strengthened" while "unlocking further devolution for the county".

It would, by their own figures, create the single largest combine authority ranked by gross domestic product per capita. Surrey County Council favours sticking to current boundaries because this would help unify public services, many of which are already shared.

It has rejected the idea of creating a single merged body despite it financially being the most beneficial.

Not only that, but forming a single mega council also comes with the "least amount of risk to vital social care services currently delivered countywide", according to papers published ahead of the May 7 meeting.

The council has dismissed this because it would miss out on any devolved powers from central government given when two or more top tier authorities join forces. Instead, it is looking at what it calls the "two unitary model".

Surrey County Council said this would be "the right size to achieve efficiencies, have better alignment between key areas of service expenditure and funding and therefore better able to withstand financial shocks, as well as better prioritise the delivery of high quality sustainable public services."

Splitting into three, it suggests, "offers less financial resilience when needing to manage key areas of demand, in particular social care."

Smaller authorities are less able to absorb the inherited debt, are likely to spend a greater proportion of revenue on debt servicing costs, and have less agility to redeploy resources in response to growing service demands, the council continued.

There would also be higher costs associated with the need to disaggregate services across three new authorities.

Beyond the financial risks, Surrey's analysis of the three unitary model showed there would be greater disparity between the authorities across population, housing, flood risk, homelessness, and road maintenance backlogs.

Tim Oliver, Leader of Surrey County Council said: "Our analysis shows that two unitary councils would bring the greatest benefit to Surrey's residents.

Two councils, in partnership with a mayor for Surrey, would save money, strengthen and simplify local government and with an east and west arrangement both councils would be in a strong position to continue to deliver high quality services to all Surrey residents

"Of course, consideration must be given to the differing levels of debt that the authorities would potentially inherit, and we're in talks with government about our request that the stranded debt be written off as well as providing financial support to those

borough councils that need it.

"Most importantly, this proposal strengthens local community engagement.

"We know that residents want high quality services that are easy to access, and they want a real say in services and decisions that affect them. That's why we're proposing the creation of community-level boards across Surrey.

"These community boards will be locally determined but we would expect them to include representation from health partners, Surrey Police, voluntary groups, councillors, council staff, local town and parish councils and residents associations. We plan to pilot these boards over the coming months, and residents will have a say in how they are set up and delivered.

"We're in a strong position as a county council, with good quality services and an excellent track record of stable finances after years of successful transformation. And working together with our residents and partners, we are well placed to deliver this important reorganisation.

"Ultimately, this work will unlock further devolution, meaning Surrey can elect a mayor which will bring more power, flexibility and funding closer to communities."

Surrey County Council is expected to vote its plan through on May 7 before formally submitting it for consideration by the May 9 deadline

Government bailout to ease Woking's debt burden

Taxpayers will cover the cost of Woking Borough Council's financial folly after the government agreed to "aid the reduction" of the bankrupt authority's multi-billion pound debt.

The bail out will initially cover debt owed by the borough in 2026-27 but could be extended if needed.

The pledge is an attempt to prevent Woking from immediately destroying any new authority it joins as part of the Government's merger plans for Surrey's councils.

Woking Borough Council declared itself effectively bankrupt in 2023 when its regeneration plans collapsed leaving it with debts expected to £2.6billion and annual repayments far outstripping what it brings in every year through council tax.

The problem has since spilled into neighbouring councils after the Government selected Surrey and its 11 boroughs and districts to become a newly devolved and reorganised and merged-mayoral authority.

On April 4, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government said liabilities should be locally managed by councils.

Since then, the Government has committed to "supporting any new authorities in Surrey with the rationalisation of Woking's assets, whether through the provision of interim financial support" it said this could be involve "further tranches of financial support for any remaining unsupported debt" until "new authorities are financially sustainable".

The council would still be expected to continue cutting costs and finding "best value" for taxpayers by selling off its assets - even after the Surrey was reorganised, according to papers published this week.

Leader of Woking Borough Council, Councillor Ann-Marie Barker, said: "We welcome the government's statement of intent regarding future financial support. It marks an important step towards addressing our debt position as part of wider discussions on the future structure of local government in Surrey.

"Whilst there is much still to be agreed, this announcement provides a degree of certainty as we continue to work closely with government and other Surrey councils to secure a sustainable financial future for Woking and ensure the best possible outcomes for residents.

"We are doing all we can to put our house in order by setting a balanced budget and having a strategic plan to sell assets. We remain committed to delivering our Improvement and Recovery Plan to the ensure that we enter any future arrangements in the strongest position possible."

ENDS

Will Surrey's Debts Force Us to Have a Unitary Authority?

Billions of pounds in crushing debt could force Surrey and its boroughs and districts to become a single mega council – potentially merged with a neighbour, following government feedback on its devolution and reorganisation plans.

Two plans were submitted in March over how to dissolve local government in the county and create a new streamlined system.

The county council and a handful of the boroughs favoured splitting Surrey into two authorities with Elmbridge worried about being 'punished' if it is grouped with debt-ridden neighbours – while the majority of the districts favoured three. Both would have an overarching and directly elected mayor.

Now, those plans could all be for nothing if they are unable to demonstrate how to deal with the more than £5 billion of debt owed - and in particular £2.6billion from bankrupt Woking Borough Council and £1billion at Spelthorne where government commissioners have recently been appointed to take over.

The letter from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government was sent to all chief executives of Surrey's boroughs, districts and county council, in reply to the councils' plans.

It read: "The county and district co-authored plan shows that greater efficiencies are available where there is less disaggregation, with the single unitary enabling the greatest efficiency that could benefit the management of local debt.

"Given the scale of the financial challenges facing Surrey, we would welcome further detail on how the ability to manage debt compares in each of the different options.

"As the long-term financial sustainability of the three unitary option seems most challenging in this context, we will need more information on how you will manage the risks of disaggregation to meet the financial sustainability criteria as well as the approach to debt management."

"We suggest meeting to discuss in more detail local proposals for managing debt."

The ministry said that if Surrey was to shift towards a single unitary model, unlocking devolution would mean partnering up with neighbouring authorities or joining a neighbouring mayoral authority. "

To achieve this, the area will need to ensure the proposed devolution geography meets the criteria set out in the English Devolution White Paper.

A Surrey-only devolution would only work, it added, under the two or three unitary council proposals "subject to achieving sensible population ratios between unitaries".

The ministry also specifically asked for evidence on how any new merged authority "would enable financially viable councils, including identifying which option best delivers value for money for council tax payers".

It added; "We note the desire for clarity and further discussions around the area's debt position and your preferred option for Government to write off the current estimated debt of £1.5bn."

Woking Borough Council is short £1.5billion - once all its assets are accounted for.

It continues: "The default position is that assets and liabilities remain locally managed by councils, but we acknowledge that there are exceptional circumstances where there has been failure linked to capital practices.

"Where that is the case, proposals should reflect the extent to which the implications of this can be managed locally, including as part of efficiencies possible through reorganisation.

"Commissioners should be engaged in these discussions.

"It would be helpful to see further detail in proposals on the projected financial sustainability of proposed unitaries and how they could manage debt locally."

ENDS

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."