

# A dog’s dinner of a licensing scheme?

8 December 2024



Professional dog walkers have rallied against a new dog licensing scheme in Surrey, claiming the managers have overstepped their mark.

Dog walkers may have to pay £360 a year to roam over the Surrey Hills from April 1, 2025. Banstead Common Conservators (BCC), which manage the four sites, said its main reason for setting up the scheme was for safety. The sites include Banstead Heath, Banstead Downs, Park Downs and Burgh Heath.

But those who rely on the open spaces are less convinced. Dog walkers have accused the BCC of “intimidating” and “abusive” behaviour on the heath. Members of the group have claimed the BCC management team have taken pictures of dog walkers without asking them, and told them to put dogs on the lead when the staff do not have authority to.

Emma, who has been a professional dog walker for seven years, said she now feels “anxiety stricken” going to the heath. She said: “Everytime we get out of the van there is fear that they will be waiting for you in the woods, following you.”

The Local Democracy Reporting Service (LDRS) understands that a handful of dog walkers were “walked off” the Heath last year by the management team for having more than four dogs. Reigate and Banstead Borough Council (RBBC) introduced a scheme to limit dog walkers to only four in August 2024. The walkers say the BCC team acted outside their remit as this was during the grace period, before the rule came into effect, and not done by council enforcement officers.

Now, the dog walkers say the atmosphere on Banstead Heath is “horrible” and “really uncomfortable”. One person said they feel that even though they are insured, professional and sticking to the rules, they are waiting for someone to make a remark.

A spokesperson for BCC said: “All of our engagement with any user of Banstead Commons is done with respect and in accordance with our statutory duties.” The Conservators claim that regulating any commercial activity, like dog walking, is part of its legal duty under the Metropolitan Commons (Banstead) Supplemental Act of 1893.

They added that BCC has received no complaints relating to the behaviour of our staff from professional dog walkers and noted BCC staff will be issued with body worn cameras for their safety in future.

However, a council spokesperson said they have received some complaints about the management of Banstead Commons Conservators in the last 12 months, which are being reviewed.”

Issues relating to controlling dogs have been on the agenda since 2022, with the BCC noting the significant increase in dog owners and commercial walkers. Given the frequency of people walking dogs (commercially or for leisure) over the years, issues of dogs scaring horses, attacking wildlife or littering poo bags have often appeared in the BCC agenda. The Conservators have often noted when a dog has attacked a horse or bitten a person, or tragically killed a woman.

Commercial dog walkers say they have been “kept in the dark” around the licensing scheme which impacts their livelihoods. They say the meeting minutes do not go into detail about what is being discussed, or, on one occasion, is moved to part 2. Although many of the paid dog walkers say they welcome a licensing scheme, they want it run by the council which owns the land.

According to the minutes of a meeting in November, the BCC can regulate for the “prevention of nuisances” on the Common which would include the ability to licence and ban certain activities.

Emma said: “Local dog walkers are simply not prepared to engage in this scheme based on the clandestine approach of how it manifested and the clear lack of respect and utter disdain they have for the profession.”

The BCC has now published the agreement for the scheme which conditions license holders to “not to cause an annoyance or nuisance or interfere” with other people using the commons. The BCC states they are able to take licences away “with immediate effect” with a written notice if the person breaches the agreement, or does not remedy it in 21 days.

Professional dog walkers must walk with identification, issued by the BCC, on them at all times, according to the rules. Commercial walkers must allow any BCC staff member to read a dog’s chip to establish a dog owner’s details.

Emma said the fee is “extortionate” for just four sites, and not the whole of the borough. One of the dog walkers said they did not like the “piecemeal” approach.

Similar schemes are also being trialled in Surrey. Nonsuch Park, in Epsom, is running a pilot commercial dog licensing fee at £200 a year with a limit of six dogs walking at any one time. The licence will be managed by Epsom and Ewell Borough Council as well as the London Borough of Sutton Council.

A joint-statement by the Conservators read: “With the increasing volume of professional dog walkers, including displacement from other areas that have already implemented restrictions, it has become necessary to take the responsible step of licensing this activity.

“This scheme will help regulate the numbers of dogs being walked commercially on our sites and ensure that companies are operating safely and treating Banstead Commons, its users and wildlife with respect and consideration.

The BCC said “safety” was one of the “main drivers” for the dog licensing scheme. The group said the scheme will give professional dog walkers “visibility and confidence to operate safely” when using the sites, as well as reassuring other visitors.

The council announced last week that it is reviewing the dog walking limit after a petition calling out the “heavy-handed” nature of the approach. An RBBC spokesperson said: “Only the Council’s enforcement team can enforce our PSPOs. Our enforcement does not extend to the BCC’s own licensing scheme. We will be requesting further information from BCC regarding the operation of their licensing scheme.”

Four dogs in Banstead wood, ahead of the licensing scheme to be introduced. (Credit: Dog walker Emma)

Related reports:

Case for dog-walker regulation after death-mauling

Should Nonsuch Park go to the dogs?

Licensed to walk

---

## Ideas for empty Council premises in Reigate and Redhill

8 December 2024



Calls to make use of empty town centre units could see charities and pop-up shops take over in Surrey towns as councillors ask for short-term leases to be made available on council owned buildings. Over £600k is spent every year on maintaining empty shops and offices in Reigate and Banstead borough, according to council data.

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council (RBBC) own several wholly or partially empty commercial properties which they have to pay expensive business rates, utility bills and insurance for. Half of business rates are absorbed by the council, with the other half sent to the central government.

Councillors found that £619k has been spent on the upkeep of vacant commercial units in the borough this year. Three quarters of this is spent on properties in Redhill, including the new Rise shopping centre and Wheatley Court on Cromwell Road.

Around £174k is spent every year on four completely empty properties, including Beech House in Reigate which has been vacant since 2021. The three-storey office block is now up for sale.

While some prime retail commercial units are sitting empty in Redhill town centre, Cllr Neha Boghani (Green Party) has proposed a “common sense” motion to put the spaces to work. She has suggested using short-term ‘Meanwhile leases’ to save the council from paying extortionate business rates by making the space available to volunteer groups until full rental for these buildings is agreed.

‘Meanwhile’ leases essentially allow for the temporary occupation of a retail unit in a town centre without the lengthy administrative and legal process. It means non-commercial occupiers, who would otherwise not be able to afford the rent, can take advantage of the site as soon as possible.

She said: “Let’s open some of our empty spaces for Christmas on Meanwhile Leases. We could create space for community uses, for entertainment, to serve the most vulnerable and provide a decent size temporary venue until the Harlequin reopens. What’s not to like?”

The Green Party has suggested the multiple empty spaces in The Light shopping centre, Redhill, could be used for Christmas charity appeals or community groups. They also referenced the Harlequin Theatre needing a new temporary venue, which the council could provide in one of the empty shops in the centre.

Although charities and voluntary organisations pay peppercorn rent on a prime location store, it is only for a short period of time while the landlord finds a permanent tenant. Charities are often faced with unpredictable funding streams which can make it difficult for them to operate, so having a short-term let could potentially add further uncertainty.

“This arrangement can create something out of nothing,” the Green Party councillor said. “It could be put to good use to support the charities using the space for the short term.”

The Reigate and Banstead Council executive will consider using temporary leases and its potential economic benefits at a future date.

Cllr Neha Boghani outside an empty retail unit in Redhill. (Credit: Green Party)

## Surrey pharmacies need a better financial prescription

8 December 2024



Pharmacy owners in Surrey say “enough is enough” as they complain working 12-hour days and barely breaking even. One pharmacist said it has to dispense just over 6,000 prescriptions a month to just about balance the books.

Over the last decade or so, the funding community pharmacies received from the government and NHS have been cut by 40 per cent, with 1,500 closing in the last 10 years.

The government announced a £26 billion boost for the NHS and social care in the budget. A Department of Health and Social Care spokesperson said: “We are committed to working with the pharmacy sector and we will set out further details on allocation of funding for next year in due course.”

Asma’a Al-hindawi has worked at her family-owned pharmacy in Horley, after graduating from university in 2010. What used to be a family passion, is now a tough grind. She said: “It’s a lot of hard work. Sometimes me and my sister have to work 12-13 hours a day, six days a week, and still we’re only breaking even.”

Pharmacies are paid on a piecemeal basis for dispensing prescriptions issued by GPs. This makes up most of the community pharmacies’ income. In 2012, the piecework fee was £2.75 per item; but now, despite inflation, the fee stands at £2.18 per prescription dispensed.

Despite her family business making a loss, Asma’a said: “I feel I have a moral obligation to work this hard to keep the pharmacy running and to help the community with their healthcare.” She explained the pharmacy is a “community service” which he has stuck by despite often getting verbal abuse.

She said the NHS “doesn’t catch up with the prices of the market” when the market cost of medicine increases. Sometimes items are out of stock so the pharmacy has to buy more expensive branded products, but the pharmacy still only receives the £2.18 fee.

“It’s an ethical dilemma,” said Asma’a, “because you can’t tell a patient you cannot sell the medicine otherwise you will make a loss.” Speaking to the Local Democracy Reporting Service in a bustling pharmacy, with shelves high of medicine, Asma’a said: “If the pharmacy is this busy, it should be making a profit.”

Dorking & Horley MP Chris Coghlan (Liberal Democrat) said: “We really need to make sure our pharmacies are paid properly for the work they’re doing so they can survive and keep helping the community.”

John Bell, who runs South Street Pharmacy in Dorking, started his own mini campaign in protest against the funding situation. He turned off the lights of the pharmacy and posted a note on the window stating: “Why are the lights out in pharmacies? Find out more inside.”

He started the campaign to raise awareness that 500 community pharmacies have closed across the country over the last year. “There comes a point when enough is enough,” said John, explaining pharmacies can’t afford to keep pouring money into a business just to keep it afloat.

The Dorking pharmacist said he makes “zero money” from the main pharmacy business and has to subsidise it with selling the extra hair accessories, sun cream and glasses on the shop floor. Already running at a “skeleton staff”, John said he is dreading the increase in employers’ National Insurance contributions. He said



staffing costs have gone up by 50 per cent in 10 years.

Mr Coghlan has written to Wes Streeting, Secretary of State for Health and Social Care , to “stop the decimation of independent pharmacies”. He wrote: “It’s unacceptable that pharmacies are subsidising NHS work out of their own pockets while being expected to take on more responsibilities.”

In his letter, the Lib Dem MP has urged Mr Streeting to review and increase NHS reimbursement rates to reflect the “true cost” of dispensing and running a pharmacy. Mr Coghlan also asked for employers’ national insurance rise to be “halted” to prevent a “further financial blow” on pharmacies and health providers.

A Department of Health and Social Care spokesperson said: “Community pharmacy has been neglected for years, but it has a vital role to play in the shift of care from hospital to the community as we reform the health service through our 10 Year Health Plan.

“We commend the hard-working pharmacists working to support their communities across England and there is never a justification for threatening behaviour.”

Image: MP Chris Coghlan (left) visiting Asma’a (right) at her family-run pharmacy in Horley. (Credit: Emily Dalton/LDRS)

Local Plan lessons from our neighbour?

8 December 2024



“Four more years?” is the resounding cry after a Surrey council has been moved back to square one with its plan for 8,000 new homes, potentially at a cost of £1m.

Local plans are a crucial framework for councils as they set out where and what type of development is allowed in the borough. Without one, developers effectively have a free-for-all to build where they wish and the council could struggle to defend it.

A planning inspector told Elmbridge Borough Council (EBC) in September to reconsider its local plan, especially to increase the number of affordable housing. Despite asking for a 12-15 month extension to straighten out its plan, after six years working on the proposals, the council was given a firm ‘no’ by the inspector.

Christa Masters, the independent planning inspector, judged that Elmbridge could not prove it had five years’ worth of housing for residents. The inspector has also labelled the borough – which includes Cobham, St George’s Hill and Weybridge – as one of the “least affordable in the country”.

The two choices in front of the council are to withdraw the plan and start again, or accept the inspector’s findings of the report being ‘unsound’ and leave the borough open to speculative development. A report will be presented to the council in February 2025 for the council to decide.

“It is clear to us that building new homes is not this government’s priority,” a statement read from three senior councillors. They said: “Instead, it seems intent on forcing Elmbridge Borough Council and our residents to restart the lengthy 3-4 year process of developing a new Local Plan, with the significant additional costs (potentially £1million) this will bring to the council.”

Council leader Mike Rollings, deputy leader Simon Waugh, and leader of Hinchley Wood Residents’ Association Janet Turner, who wrote the statement, said they have been left with no choice by the government than to start again.

A Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government spokesperson said the decision was up to an independent inspector who found the council’s plan ‘unsound’. They said:“We are in a housing crisis and all areas of the country need to play their part in building more and delivering the homes that communities need. We want to see every council have a local plan as soon as possible, but it is for an independent Inspector to examine a local plan to ensure it is sound and legally compliant.”

But not everyone has been so forgiving of the update on the Local Plan. Cllr John Cope, leader of the Conservative opposition on the council, said: “It’s now clear years of work and millions of pounds of local people’s money have gone down the drain – and an acute shortage of affordable housing allowed in Elmbridge.”

He added that the borough will “have to accept the Labour government’s 121% increase in top-down development targets meaning a huge loss of green belt and loss of local democratic control of planning – but with no new roads, GPs, or schools to support the development.”

Dr Ben Spencer MP (Runnymede and Weybridge) and Cllr Cope have also written a joint letter to Planning Minister Matthew Pennycook MP, urging him to review the situation. The pair ask him to grant the council an extension “so this can be resolved with minimal further financial drain on the council’s resources”.

In the letter, Dr Spencer and Cllr Cope also requested for Elmbridge residents to “not pay the consequences” of the failed Local Plan through “higher council tax and reduced local services”.

“As a Council, we have done everything right,” said Cllr Rollings, speaking to the Local Democracy Reporting Service (LDRS). He said the council has worked to prepare a Local Plan “that meets its responsibilities” but the government has “have constantly changed and shifted the goalposts”. He explained that mandatory housing targets have kept replacing each other and national planning policy is constantly being tweaked.

Cllr Rollings said: “As a Council leadership we will continue to work for the best outcomes for our residents. And we will do everything we can to protect the green spaces we all love.”

Surrey Taxpayers Face Policing Squeeze Amid Funding ‘Postcode Lottery’

8 December 2024



The “post-code lottery” of police funding could force residents to shoulder more of the burden, according to Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) **Lisa Townsend**. The PCC said she fears it will be inevitable taxpayers will have to contribute more to policing.

Home Secretary **Yvette Cooper** announced she will end the “postcode lottery in policing”, in a speech to local PCCs and police chiefs on November 19. She

confirmed that central government funding for police will go up next year by around £500m, with a detailed breakdown of funding allocations for each force will be published mid-December. Until then, many police forces are left in uncertainty about what the changes might be.

But Surrey’s Commissioner said she fears money will be distributed unfairly in Surrey, from the government’s “not fit for purpose” police funding formula. Ms Townsend said if there is a postcode lottery of policing it is financial. She said: “There’s an idea that Surrey is wealthy, but Surrey Police isn’t.”

The way money is divided up for police forces means that some areas receive a significantly larger share than others. For instance, money allocated to Surrey covers just 45% of the total budget whereas other areas such as Northumbria get 80%.

Surrey Police have to save, or cut, £23.4m over the next four years to maintain its current service, according to the LDRS. Inflation, government-agreed pay increases have also contributed to the force’s position.

The Conservative PCC wrote to the Home Secretary on November 13, urging her to review the police funding. She asked the Home Secretary to not use the police funding formula when granting additional money to combat the increase in employers’ National Insurance (NI) as this would “penalise” some counties and benefit others.

Earlier this year, the government provided an additional grant to cover the police pay increase of over 2.5 per cent. Because this money was distributed by the funding formula, Surrey Police had to make up for a shortfall of around £1m, according to the PCC.

In the letter, Commissioner Townsend said she is “prepared to ask local taxpayers to shoulder more of the burden of the cost of policing”. But she added it “cannot be fair” that residents have to pay for an “imposed” increase.

The letter read: “Here in Surrey, 80% of our costs relate to people and so we have calculated that the proposed increase in NI would add approximately £4.5m to our costs. To put this into context, this would be equivalent to an additional £9 on Band D Council Tax or around 100 Police officers.”

Ms Townsend said she did not want to alter Surrey Police’s service to make residents suffer. “What we’re not clear on is what else the government wants us to cut,” she said.

The PCC said she is “not optimistic” about Surrey achieving more money from the new government, despite the county getting an additional £17.3m last year. “We’ve got nobody making the case for us,” Ms Townsend told the LDRS, “we’ve got no Labour MPs or Labour councils.”

A Home Office spokesperson said: “The Government will fully compensate police forces for the impact of the changes to National Insurance Employer contributions.” They added: “Details on the allocation of this funding will be confirmed at the provisional police settlement in mid-December.”

Photo: Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey Lisa Townsend. Credit: Surrey Live photographer Darren Pepe.

## Surrey’s focus on independent lives is “good”.

8 December 2024



Surrey County Council’s adult social care services have been rated as ‘good’ by a health watchdog – despite some inconsistencies. In the local authority’s first ever overall rating, the Care Quality Commission found SCC ‘good’ at keeping people independent for longer in communities.

The new report, published November 20, comes from the CQC’s new responsibilities to assess how local authorities meet their duties under the Care Act. The watchdog assessed SCC in nine areas, including how the local authority works with people, safeguarding and leadership.

The CQC’s report found one of the county council’s strengths was that a “variety of measures were in place to prevent, reduce and delay people’s needs”. People could access information and advice where needed but improvements could be made to streamline this further.

CQC assessment teams reported 70 per cent of the service’s provision should be rated “good”. The report did highlight some areas that needed improvement, which the council said it would be working on.

Sinead Mooney, Surrey County Council’s Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, said: “The dedication of our staff shines through the report and I’d like to thank them publicly for their hard work making a positive difference to the lives of thousands of people in communities across Surrey.

“Our ultimate goal is to deliver the best possible services for Surrey residents and this ‘good’ outcome will help instil confidence in the services and support we are providing and that we are on the right path to making further improvements.”

Partners with SCC gave positive feedback about how the authority worked with them to support people’s independence, according to the report. Data for Surrey showed 86% of people who have received short term support didn’t need ongoing longer-term support which is positive compared to the England and regional average of 78%.

Inspectors praised Surrey for their “ambitious” plans to increase supported living by at least 500 spaces to help encourage people’s independence, choice and control. The council is also working to keep people in their homes for longer and avoid unnecessary hospital admissions, reducing pressure on A&E departments.

## Good, but inconsistent

However, the CQC found there was room for improvement. Although a lot of the feedback seemed positive in the report, inspectors noted experiences of receiving care and support in Surrey varied.

The report said: “One person was assessed and felt listened to, achieving the outcome they wanted, which was to return to live at home. Other people had similar good experiences with staff focusing on what people wanted plus their future wishes, people described staff as being empathic and showing them respect.”

Safeguarding was judged to be effective, slightly above the national average, but has some shortcomings. Staff and partners raised concerns about some new safeguarding processes that were not yet fully embedded with knowledge and understanding of some staff.

Staffing challenges were also flagged as an issue, leading to some reviews not carried out in a timely way and leading to a backlog. Partners working with SCC told inspectors the cost of living crisis had affected people on low incomes, and Surrey was an expensive place to live, making it hard to recruit and retain staff and then impact on care services, the report said.

But the report noted SCC has long-term plans to address recruitment challenges which had been created with staff. The local authority stated they were making improvements to manage risks until staffing levels had improved, by making better use of existing resources.

James Bullion, CQC’s chief inspector of adult social care and integrated care, said the county council “should be proud of this assessment and the foundation they’ve created on which to build improvements and further innovation”.

He added: “The local authority was very aware that although Surrey is an affluent county, there are pockets of deprivation where residents have high levels of need and disadvantage. The authority knew of these very differing needs of its population and were doing some creative work to meet those needs and help people keep their independence.”

Commenting on the report’s feedback for improvement, Mrs Mooney said: “As we celebrate this achievement, we also recognise that there are areas where we need to learn and develop and we are actively working to address all feedback from the CQC through comprehensive improvement plans. Our new director of adult social services recently started with us, so we’re well-placed to build on this result to further raise the bar for our residents.”

Photo: Sinead Mooney, Surrey County Council’s Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care (*second from right*), pictured with people who draw and care and support



alongside staff from the provider Dramatize, which supports adults with learning disabilities after they leave education, offering a wide range of activities including day provisions and employment and life skills programmes.

---

## Party divide on Surrey solar farm?

8 December 2024



Plans for a Surrey solar farm have been questioned as an MP has called for the government to look again at the “nationally significant” decision. Jeremy Hunt, MP for Godalming and Ash, has supported the request of Compton Parish Council to call in the application.

The University of Surrey was granted permission to build solar panels on a 43-hectare site west of Blackwell Farm, Hog’s Back near Guildford on November 6. In partnership with SEE Energy, the solar farm is said to provide 34% of the University’s current electricity needs. On its own, the facility will increase total renewable energy generation in Surrey by 13%.

Mr Hunt, whose constituency covers the southern and western part of the site, has written to the Minister of Housing, Communities and Local Government Angela Rayner to express his concern on the facility’s impact on the countryside. The southern parts of the site are assessed as meeting National Landscape criteria and recommended for inclusion within the revised part of the Surrey Hills boundary.

In his letter to Mrs Rayner, who is also the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Hunt said he was worried the development “may set a precedent for emerging policy relating to National Landscape land”. He wrote: “Rather than selecting brownfield, this site selected is high value farmland in a geographically significant and nationally important landscape.”

He added: “Given the national importance of this decision, I support the view of Compton Parish Council and CPRE that the application should be called in and determined by a Planning Inspector.”

The secretary of state decides whether to review a planning decision based on government policies after a request to call in has been made. If approved, the Planning Inspectorate will hold a public inquiry into the proposal and produce a recommendation.

Surrey Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) charity also wrote to the deputy PM in November, arguing the decision for the solar farm on green belt land be overturned. John Goodridge, Surrey CPRE chair, raised concerns on the impact of “agricultural land, encroachment on the green belt, harm to ancient woodland, the land’s legal status as candidate for inclusion in the Surrey Hills National Landscape”.

However, Guildford’s MP Zöe Franklin has defended the solar farm plans and she support’s the university’s aims through the investment.

The new Liberal Democrat MP said she “recognise[s] that solar farms can be contentious “important part of providing renewable energy for a sustainable, low-carbon future”. Mrs Franklin said: “This solar farm proposal is a move towards clean, affordable, local energy production and supports our local grid capacity in Guildford and our villages.”

She expressed her confidence in Guildford Borough Council’s planning committee having made the decision in line with planning regulations. But, the Guildford MP added she would also like to see the university include solar installations of their existing buildings and car parks.

A spokesperson for the University of Surrey said: “We are proud to play our part in reducing emissions – not just through this facility, but also through adding solar to the large roof on the Surrey Sports Park, progressing feasibility studies to maximise other on-campus generation – for example on our car parks – and a comprehensive energy efficiency programme.

“We hope others will follow our lead, as there is no time to waste in increasing renewable generation to reduce emissions and increase Surrey and UK energy security. This project is firmly in line with local and national planning policy priorities, and we look forward to bringing it on stream in the near future.”

Related report:

Surrey University to get a third of its power from the Sun

---

## Pods off in bricks grant for Epsom homeless

8 December 2024



Epsom and Ewell Borough Council (EEBC) will receive £1,493,250 in one-off funding from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to help tackle its spending on homeless families. The Council will use it to buy five properties and one to be used for helping Afghan families resettle.

The grant was initially hoped to be spent on Epsom and Ewell council’s recently approved temporary housing pods but it was refused by the government. Cllr Hannah Dalton told the committee on November 12: “They turned us down because they want us to invest in bricks and mortar.”

Council documents state the programme will reduce local housing pressures by providing better quality housing, reduce emergency accommodation costs and reduce the impact on those waiting for social housing. It adds that the initiative will also provide sustainable housing for Afghan citizens on the resettlement scheme so they can “build new lives in the UK, find employment and integrate into communities.”

Following the unanimous approval of the scheme, EEBC will receive the first payment in January 2025, with three instalments spread out over two years.

EEBC is also contributing £75,000 from Section 106 contributions, contributions from developers, to pay for the scheme. Section 106 is put towards community and social infrastructure projects, this can include social housing.

The new scheme will still cost the taxpayer £35,000 a year for the maintenance of the properties. However, it is a smaller sum than the £115,000 the Council was spending on the equivalent accommodation costs. Saving an estimated £80,000 in total, it would take just over nine years for the council to be paid back from buying the properties.

Around £2.34m was forked out on temporary accommodation by the council last year alone. EEBC said the new funding to purchase houses will help it reduce the annual cost of expensive nightly accommodation with permanent homes.

The two-three bedroom houses would be owned by the council and located within the borough of Epsom and Ewell. Officers told the committee they had already identified a couple houses suitable for the scheme before they have been put on the market. Conditions set by the ministry mean that the properties have to be

either freehold, or minimum leasehold of 125 years.

---

## Surrey University to get a third of its power from the Sun

8 December 2024



Permission has been granted for The University of Surrey to build a solar farm on green belt land. The scheme will provide the university with 34 per cent of its electricity, helping reach its net zero carbon emissions targets by 2030.

Working in partnership with SSE Energy Solutions, the university has proposed to place 22,410 solar panels across three fields on the Hogs Back in Guildford. The 12.21 megawatt farm will provide electricity directly to the university by a 50m underground cable link, zig-zagging to a substation on the Stag Hill campus.

After rigorously debating for over an hour, members of Guildford Borough Council’s (GBC) planning committee approved the scheme on November 6. A majority of nine councillors voted in favour, with four against and two abstentions.

Cllr Joss Bigmore said it was an “incredibly difficult decision”, boiling it down to the “substantial benefits” of renewable energy versus “some of the highest landscape protection areas”.

Despite the students’ union supporting the scheme, the application attracted over a hundred objections from residents, and 15 other groups. Speakers at the meeting vocalised their anxiety that the harm to the green belt and Area of Great Landscape Value had been “downplayed” by planning officers and feared approval would open the floodgates.

Cllr Pat Oven raised issues with the solar panels being used on agricultural land, arguing: “You can’t grow crops on any old land but you can graze sheep anywhere; we need to grow food in this country.”

Planning agent Paul Rogers told the committee it is “financially essential” the university decarbonises its energy supply. He added: “A stable university is critical to a thriving Guildford”. Councillors heard that the university’s energy costs have increased significantly, soaring from £4m to £17m per year.

Will Davies, Chief Operating Officer for the University of Surrey, said: “This solar facility is critically important for our University and the wider Guildford community – helping us to deliver on our commitment to achieve net zero by 2030, while also enhancing our financial stability and energy security after the price shocks caused by the energy crisis.

“Our modest scheme will boost the county of Surrey’s renewable energy generation capacity by 13%. It will be delivered alongside wider plans to add solar to University rooftops and car parks, and a package of measures to increase our energy efficiency in general.”

Set to go live in 2025, the solar farm will be in operation for 35 years before being decommissioned back to a field.

Image: Solar Power farm unrelated to University

---

## Surrey Police HQ redesign will quieten the dogs

8 December 2024



Plans to redevelop Surrey Police headquarters, at Mount Browne, have been given the go-ahead. The changes also include a new access road which the Force say will speed up response times from Mount Browne by two minutes.

The significant modifications to the police’s home include demolition and rebuilding of the dog school, accommodation for Police students, and a new Contact and Deployment centre, a multi-storey car park with electrical charging points.

Members of Guildford Borough Council (GBC) planning committee unanimously approved both applications on November 6. Councillors praised the application for the compactness of the development, with no overall height increase and limited harm to the Green Belt.

One of the applications included a new western arm to Artington Roundabout, which the Force says will reduce traffic on neighbouring roads like Sandy Lane and The Ridges.

Straight through the middle of an open field, officers highlighted the new access road would be visible and harm the Green Belt as well as agricultural land. However, they also noted even small improvements in Police response times can have a large positive impact on how emergencies can be handled.

The second application relates to the redevelopment and modernisation of the site, including demolition and construction of operational buildings, as well as internal refurbishment of the old building, corridor wing and sports building.

Mount Browne, on the outskirts of Guildford, has been the headquarters for Surrey Police for over 70 years. The current campus contains a large number of buildings which have been constructed mainly on a piecemeal basis and are judged no longer fit for purpose by the Force.

The benefits of the scheme include high quality facilities to meet the ongoing operational needs of the Police, as well as staff retention and well-being, according to the report. Replacing the dog kennels was also said to provide significant improvements to operations. Officers told the committee that currently all the training dogs can see each other in the kennels, so if one dog barks “they all go off”.

Surrey’s Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) Lisa Townsend has welcomed the decision, calling it a “significant milestone for the Force”. A six-week judicial review period now awaits before Surrey Police can take decisions on the next steps.

Mrs Townsend added: “Mount Browne has been Surrey Police’s home for over 70 years, but the buildings here are run down, expensive to maintain and simply no

longer meet the requirements of a modern police force.”

The PCC and Surrey Police’s Chief Officer decided in 2021 that the Force should remain at Mount Browne, on the edge of Guildford, rather than seek a new location.

Image - unrelated dog in a kennel