Government Casts Doubt on Surrey's Mayoral Devolution Promise

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

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 quided 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 "behemouth" of a "black hole"

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

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 guestion in local government reorganisation

Local Government Reorganisation in Surrey: Key Proposals

and others: search "reorganisation".

Surrey home extension charges aired in Parliament

"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

Historic Surrey Hills mansion saved from falling into "rack and ruin"

An additional 27 homes will be built at an abandoned Surrey Hills mansion and stables to stop the heritage buildings falling into "rack and ruin". In February 2023, Mole Valley District Council approved the creation of Audley Headley Court, a 112-home retirement community at the historic site. Now, following the October 1 meeting of the council's development committee, the extra units will be added to the green belt land to make the project financially viable to the developers.

The plans were passed without objection from councillors who were echoing residents' desire to see the old site returned to use and for its much-loved garden spaces to be opened to the public. David Preedy of Headley Parish Council said: "Headley Court is critical to our community both in terms of its history and the impact on the village." He admitted the extra homes were not without controversy but that the parish backed the plans to put an end to the "years of disruption and significant decay to the heritage of our village and the gardens and the heritage buildings".

The mansion house has been vacant since the departure of the Ministry of Defence, with the Jubilee Complex gardens used by the NHS and Surrey County Council during the pandemic. The estate has also been used to support Help for Heroes, those who fought in the Afghanistan war and more recently the NHS throughout the pandemic.

Developers said the refurbishment and reuse of listed mansion houses and stables, alongside sensitive reinstatement of the extensive grounds, will make much of the land publicly accessible for the first time. It would also help meet the need for specialist housing for older people as well as bring social and community benefits, the meeting heard.

The applicant's agent said: "It has received no objections from the local community with whom we have engaged extensively since our first involvement with the site back in early 2022. We will continue to ingratiate ourselves into the local community as we have done elsewhere and bring the site back to its former glory."

Councillor Roger Adams (Liberal Democrat, Bookham West) said: "This is a historic site and it would be a great shame to see it fall into rack and ruin." He added: "It was a pity that green belt land must be taken but on the other hand if it must be taken to preserve the whole site and improve the whole site, then so be it."

Chris Caulfield LDRS

Headley Court. Credit Angle Property.

Related report:

14 against 59 = 70? Dilemma for Headley

Poll points to further Conservative decline in Surrey

Reform UK is in line to win its first Surrey seat, according to a major YouGov poll. The survey of 13,000 people's voting intentions suggests three Surrey MPs would lose their jobs with the Liberal Democrats being the largest beneficiaries in the county - if a General Election was called today.

Nationally, the polls say the United Kingdom is headed for another hung parliament with Reform, the Nigel Farage led party that succeeded UKIP after Brexit, emerging as the largest party. In Surrey voters are leaning a different way.

The three Surrey seats that would switch allegiance would be Spelthorne, Farnham and Bordon, and Godalming and Ash. All three seats are currently held by the Conservatives with Lincoln Jopp, Greg Stafford and Jeremy Hunt projected to lose their jobs as the Tories crumple to just 45 MPs.

Projected to take their places would be two Liberal Democrats and Surrey's first Reform MP. If the voting patterns held true Dorking and Horley, Woking, Guildford, Esher and Walton, Godalming and Ash, Epsom and Ewell, Surrey Heath, and Farnham and Bordon, would all go to the Liberal Democrats to give them eight MPs.

The Conservatives would hold East Surrey, Reigate, Runnymede and Weybridge, and Windsor, to give them four MPs. While Reform UK with 27 per cent is expected to edge out the Conservatives on 25 per cent and the Liberal Democrats on 20 per cent to win Spelthorne.

Nationally YouGov's seat-by-seat analysis indicates Reform UK would secure 311 seats in the Commons, short of the 326 required to demand a majority but far and away the largest party – and 306 MPs more than it currently has. The poll has Labour dropping from its 411 landslide victory in 2024 to 144 with the Lib Dems on 78 and the Conservatives which had been in Government for 14 years prior before losing last year would slip to 45 seats.

YouGov says its seat projections come with uncertainty and that volatility is now the norm in British electoral politics. They say Reform UK would win at least 82 seats by less than five percentage points and that there was a possibility it could lose them all, leaving the party well short of a parliamentary majority rather than within touching distance.

Chris Caulfield LDRS

From field to fight: Bramley camp faces enforcement questions

An unauthorised traveller camp has been built on land earmarked for inclusion in the Surrey Hills National Landscape – and now plans to make the site permanent have been submitted. Witnesses reported several caravans moving on to Unstead Lane in Bramley last week, sparking frustrations among residents over the lack of enforcement action. Since then a petition has been created calling on immediate action to be taken – with more than 600 people already signing.

It says: "Residents and taxpayers expect and deserve equal protection under planning law. The Surrey Hills National Landscape and Green Belt exist to safeguard our countryside for the benefit of all, not to be eroded by unlawful development. Allowing this encampment to remain would set a dangerous precedent that planning law can be ignored without consequence."

Guildford Borough Council has said it was aware of the work carried out and understood people's concerns. Officers visited the encampment and completed background work to gain a full understanding of the situation.

Councillor Jane Austin, leader of the Conservative opposition group in neighbouring Waverley Borough Council, represents the Bramley and Wonersh ward near the site. She said: "People went to bed on Friday looking out to a field and now they have this. Saturday the road was blocked and they were clearly doing something without planning permission, but nobody could get hold of anyone. That field was due to be national landscape land, deemed to be of that high quality. The land is on floodplain and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, they won't ever be legally built. People around here are reasonable and agree the GTL (Gypsy

Traveller League) community need somewhere to live. Everybody should follow the law of the land without exception, planning is there to build sustainable communities and must be followed."

Councils must provide adequate land for housing – whether fixed homes or traveller pitches. If they cannot demonstrate enough provision, sustainable planning applications are difficult to reject as they are often won on appeal – with the council liable for costs. In 2024 Guildford Borough Council was only able to identify 2.59 years supply for traveller pitches, below the minimum five years. Elsewhere in Surrey, Runnymede Borough Council's decades-long failure to provide the legal minimum number of Gypsy and Traveller pitches has forced families to take matters into their own hands and build their own. Runnymede's planning committee recently felt obligated to approve 12 new pitches in Hardwick Lane, Chertsey, despite concerns the site would be overcrowded and the roads unsafe.

Guildford Borough Council said it could not be expected to predict or prevent this type of incident occurring, but would react and manage it as quickly as possible. A spokesperson said: "If a breach of planning control is confirmed on any site in the borough, we have several enforcement options including negotiation and formal action. However, the enforcement powers available to local authorities do not achieve an instant solution."

A planning application for the site was submitted on Saturday September 13. If it contains the correct paperwork, the council must validate it – with nearby residents contacted and given the opportunity to submit their views before any decision is made.

Surrey County Councillor Matt Furniss said he has been speaking with Guildford's planning team and that Surrey Highways Enforcement has also visited the site to assess the new unauthorised access onto the highway for safety and to determine next steps. He added: "It is always disappointing when some individuals choose to work outside the planning process and I will be pressing both councils for a quick resolution."

MP Jeremy Hunt said: "Residents all express the same sentiment – why is there so little action to address unauthorised encampments like this, which are appearing with increasing frequency. It is absolutely infuriating to see the law being ignored this way – and the people who do it getting away scot-free. This latest case is another rural field, recognised as being of such quality that it is earmarked for inclusion in the Surrey Hills National Landscape. Yet local people now face the prospect of potentially years of planning enforcement action – with no guarantee of success. The point is that such drawn-out processes risk consuming vast amounts of council time and money, while the local community continues to suffer the consequences. Early intervention and decisive action such as prompt issuance of a Stop Notice would help prevent situations like this from worsening."

Chris Caulfield LDRS

Image of site in Unstead Lane, Bramley

Dorking Halls to shut again for restoration?

One of Surrey's "largest and most comprehensive arts and performance" spaces could shut its doors again if the next phase of its near £10m revamp is approved. Dorking Halls closed last year as Mole Valley District Council agreed to fund £6.1m in "sorely needed" repairs and refurbishments to avoid safety risks and any unscheduled problems. It later became clear the original scope and scale of the issues had been underestimated and that work would take longer and cost more than first forecast. This has been made worse by rises in material prices and market rates over the past year, the council said. Hoped-for grant funding through the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme has also stopped being available.

Mole Valley District Council is now seeking an extra £3.34m of upgrade works to replace outdated air handling units and chillers, cut annual carbon emissions by 75 tonnes with solar panels and heat recovery systems, as well as upgrading the Grand Hall to modern safety and performance standards. Councillor Nick Wright, cabinet member for leisure and tourism, said: "Dorking Halls is arguably the largest and most comprehensive arts and performance venue in eastern Surrey. It is central to our community and is key to the local economy. Dorking Halls plays a vital cultural role in the district, with a busy programme of shows, concerts and films, as well as hosting youth theatre, school productions, live screenings, and community events. It also provides employment opportunities, particularly for young people entering the hospitality sector. This investment will ensure the Halls continue to serve residents and visitors with high-quality cultural experiences for many years to come, while also helping MVDC to meet its carbon reduction goals."

The Mole Valley's cabinet is expected to agree to the additional funding when it meets on September 23 ahead of formal sign off at the following month's full council. The proposed works will be scheduled to minimise disruption, with the venue expected to

close temporarily in 2026 from mid-April to early December. The halls last closed over the summer last year as the council addressed making its ceiling safe after a critical failure risk was identified. Had no work been done there was the potential the Grand Hall's fibrous plaster could become unstable – forcing its closure at short or no notice. Any collapse, regardless of whether the public were in attendance, would likely have led to a fine.

Chris Caulfield LDRS

Dorking Halls Grand Hall (Image MVDC)

Related reports:

Dorking Halls to reopen after upgrade

Dorking Halls to get refit

Dorking refurb: "it's behind you"!

Dorking to slow down?

Plans to cut speed limits in Dorking town centre to 20mph are being considered. Surrey County Council is looking at cutting speeds along the A25 Reigate Road, West Street, South Street, Vincent Lane and surrounding roads – and carrying out a resident survey until October 13 to gather views.

It comes after the county council introduced limits across Surrey in 2024. This proposal is being funded through Surrey's Integrated Transport Schemes – with a countywide budget of £2.8 million.

Before the council can introduce changes it advertises its intentions to give people the opportunity to tell us what they think about them. The council is then obliged to consider any feedback before making a final decision whether to still go ahead, with or without any changes. If there is enough support for the scheme it is anticipated to come into force early next year.

Surrey County Councillor Hazel Watson (Liberal Democrat: Dorking Hills) said lower speed limits give drivers more time to react, reduce the severity of any collisions, and makes the roads safer for vulnerable users. She said: "There will be some additional 20mph signs, but mostly the existing 30mph signs will be replaced."

She added: "She added, "Road safety is a very high priority for Surrey residents and this lower, appropriate, speed limit proposal for Dorking Town has been requested by many residents for a long time. It builds on the very successful introduction of lower, appropriate, 20mph or 30mph speed limits which have been introduced on many of the rural lanes and through the village centres across the Dorking Hills over the last few years."

"It is important that every resident who has an opinion on this proposal registers their comments at https://dorking-20mph-scheme.commonplace.is/ so that their views can be taken into account."

Chris Caulfield LDRS

Dorking Town Centre Streets (image MVDC)