Local Plan costs eat into Council reserves

An officers' report to the Council advised a further £629,000 is required to progress the Local Plan 2022-2040. The matter was considered by Epsom and Ewell Borough Council's Strategy and Resources Committee Tuesday 13th December.

The report provided an update on the financial position on advancing the Local Plan toward submission and subsequent adoption, aligning with the timelines outlined in the recently published Local Development Scheme (November 2023). Following a public consultation on the draft plan earlier this year, an extraordinary Council meeting in March 2023 decided to temporarily halt the Local Plan. It was subsequently resumed in October 2023, accompanied by an updated timetable.

The financial crunch, estimated at £629,000, revolves around progressing the plan to Regulation 19 and concluding the Local Plan Examination. To address this, the Licensing and Planning Policy Committee recommended allocating £629,000 from the Corporate Projects Reserve. However, this move comes with significant financial implications, as it would reduce the reserve balance from £2.98 million to £2.35 million. If an additional request to use this reserve, hinted at in reference to a matter concerning the Council's commercial property – which was excluded from public and press scrutiny, is approved, the balance would further decrease to £1.85 million.

The item from which the press and public was excluded concerned drawing half-million pounds of taxpayers' money from the Council's reserves – we quote from the Local Plan item in public view: "Should the separate request to use this reserve at Agenda item 4 also be approved, the reserve balance will further decrease (from £2.35m) to £1.85m." The ground of exclusion was to protect financial information of third parties. Do you think such interests should out-weigh taxpayers' interests in what might justify £1/2 million being taken from reserves? Write to Epsom and Ewell Times.

The Council is facing a projected revenue budget deficit of £1.1m from 2024/25 (as reported to Strategy & Resources Committee in July 2023) and reserves are likely to come under substantial pressure in future years and may fall below the recommended level of £1 million.

The officers' report underscored the importance of maintaining staffing levels and securing external technical support to ensure a robust and timely Local Plan. Any deviation from the Local Development Scheme could amplify costs and resource implications. Despite the financial challenges, the Council was urged to use existing in-house resources wherever possible, given the projected revenue budget deficit.

Cllr **Alison Kelly** (LibDem Stamford) queried whether it was necessary to extend officers' contracts to 2026 when the Local Plan is to be submitted in 2025. The Council was advised that the opportunities for legal challenges and so forth would extend to 2026 and therefore they needed to budget for extending officer employment contracts by two years.

Cllr **Robert Leach** (RA Nonsuch) vented his frustration thus: "I probably have to support this recommendation, but I should do so with gritted teeth. This local plan just seems to be a bottomless pit. I understand that it has cost one and a half million pounds already, and that's probably only half the amount that we will waste. In my opinion, it is a waste of £3 million when the whole project of coming up with a local plan and planning applications could be done more simply. This filled me with horror.

In a recent RA meeting, I pointed out that this worked out at £50 for every household in the country. I asked the people there to put their hands up if they were happy for £50, which is, in effect, their money, to be spent on producing this rather than having £50 to spend on food and energy bills. The number of hands that went up, in round numbers, was a round number. The residents, I think, share my view that we are just wasting money.

I realize that we have to meet a legal obligation, and I would certainly never advocate that the council breaks the law. But I think we should point out that this is being imposed on us by central government. They provide us with no grant at all, apart from perhaps a few specific pet projects of their own. While we have to carry on with the local plan, we should make it clear that we do so reluctantly, only because the law forces us to do so, and that we should make clear to our residents that central government is the villain in this pantomime.

The present government is about to announce a new planning policy. If we have a general election next year with a Labour government, they have said that they will just ride roughshod over local authorities. I shall support the motion, and I shall do so

with great reluctance."

Following these two contributions from the Chamber the committee proceeded to unanimously accept the recommendation to draw £629,000 from reserves to fund the ongoing Local Plan process.

The contribution to the prolongation and additional cost of the Local Plan process arising from the unpopularity of the original draft's proposals to develop Green Belt was not mentioned by any Councillor.

Related reports:

Local Plan to move forward after passionate debate Local Plan (2022-2040) Un-Pause Recommended Cllr Persand intervenes ahead of Local Plan debate and many many more (search "Local Plan")

Surrey County chief talks to the BBC

Cllr Tim Oliver, Conservative Leader of Surrey County Council was interviewed this morning on BBC Radio 4's Today programme by Amol Rajan. Also Chairman of the County Council Network he welcomed further devolution of financial powers that could lead to a tourist tax and the need for more money to meet burgeoning demands for special educational needs and school transport.

The Epsom and Ewell Times has prepared a tidied up transcript of his interview in full.

Nottingham City Council became the latest local authority to issue what's called a section 114 notice, which means it will halt spending on anything not required by law. Let's talk to Councillor Tim Oliver, who's a Conservative and leader of Surrey County Council. How big a problem are we facing, and what's driving it?

TO: Well, it is a significant problem. We're talking about large councils that deliver social care to our most vulnerable residents. We have seen a huge increase in demand for those services, whether it's for adult social care or for children's services. And we've now got to the point where really well-managed councils are running out of road financially.

And what sort of situation are you in, Surrey County Council?

TO: I'm also chairman of the County Council's Network, so I represent all of those large councils, and the problems are the same. We've seen a decrease in our budgets and our funding from central government. What's different now is that last year, the chancellor gave us a not inconsiderable sum to support adult social care. But we've seen a huge demand for services to children with additional needs. The cost of placing those children in specialist facilities has risen exponentially. And a particular area of concern for us is the rising cost of home-to-school transport. Across the whole system, that currently costs about a billion pounds a year, and that's projected to increase to about 1 and a half billion by 2028. So these are real day-to-day issues. And our plea to the government is to recognize that we're supporting those most vulnerable members in our communities.

Would more fiscal devolution help? Do you need more money from the centre, or do you just need more control of the money you get from the centre?

TO: This government had pledged to pursue a devolution agenda, and indeed they have done that. That has been more about controls and levers rather than about fiscal devolution. But yes, I think many of us would welcome that opportunity. That would give us the flexibility to raise taxes locally if that was appropriate, perhaps around tourist tax and so on.

• The Times reported yesterday that middle-class parents are blamed by some councillors for driving the surge in plans for special needs schooling. Is that a problem where you are?

TO: The County Council's Network, and I am certainly not blaming any individual parents or different groups. We absolutely understand that parents want the best for their children. They're going to push for that. It's really important though that we do make sure that the limited funds that are available, that public pound, is used most effectively.

The County Council Network is the voice of England's counties. Representing the local authorities in county areas, the network is a cross-party organisation which develops policy, commissions research, and presents evidence-based solutions to issues on behalf of the largest grouping of councils in England

Image: Tim Oliver credit LDRS - Surrey Live

Anchored in reason on local housing need?

The Draft Local Plan lacks a proper negotiating position on future house building numbers in the Borough of Epsom and Ewell. So said an unnamed member of the public who addressed last week's Licensing, Planning and Policy Committee.

Let Epsom and Ewell Times know your view. Is he right or wrong? Here is his speech in full:

"Good evening, everyone. The first thing they teach you about negotiations at business school is the power of anchoring. Government has deployed this tactic very successfully. Government's standard method results in a target of 10,368 new dwellings over the Local Plan period. Let's be clear: this target is government's negotiation anchor. It is not our borough's actual housing need; it is simply designed to pressure you into setting a high housing target.

You might not realize that you are in a negotiation, but you are. Although the draft Local Plan recognizes that government's target is unachievable, it has still succeeded in anchoring council's thinking throughout the Local Plan. First, you note that your 3,700 from brownfield sites only meet 36% of government's anchor. Then you use that fact to declare exceptional circumstances. Afterward, you set your own housing target at just over half of government's anchor. That is the classic response of an inexperienced negotiator.

What the draft Local Plan did not discuss was our actual need for new dwellings. Strategic plans should always be based on the best available information, and yet the draft Local Plan did not even mention our actual need for new housing. It is very important for the council to prominently and clearly explain within the Local Plan why government's anchor of 10,368 is flawed and why our actual housing need is for just 2,664 new dwellings. By doing this, you will demolish government's anchor and replace it with the council's own anchor. It is absolutely critical to anchor everyone's thinking to the real needs of our borough.

The figure of 2,664 new dwellings is obtained by making just two changes to the standard method: firstly, replacing the outdated 2014 household projections with the more up-to-date 2018 data, and secondly, removing the flawed 40% affordability uplift. The theory behind this uplift is that by flooding the market with new homes, you will drive prices down. This theory is flawed for two reasons: firstly, house builders engage in land banking; they hold back most of their consented land and drip-feed new houses onto the market at a rate that matches demand and maintains prices. Secondly, the affordability uplift assumes that Epsom is a separate market for housing—it is not. If the Competition and Markets Authority were to look at this, the first thing they would do would be to define the relevant markets. They would note the existence of an unbroken chain of substitution across the whole Greater London Commuter Zone and conclude that Epsom just forms a very small part of a very large market. Flooding with new homes will not reduce house prices in the borough due to any supply-demand imbalance. Any reduction in local house prices will be as a result of the borough becoming a less serene and less attractive place to live.

According to paragraph 1.61 of the draft Local Plan, the balance between protecting our environment and enabling development is at the centre of our spatial strategy. At present, the Local Plan is unbalanced. You are planning to build more than twice the number of new dwellings that we actually need by sacrificing some of our best-performing Greenfield Green Belt sites."

Related reports:

Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Unveiled

Housing need or desire?

Can Epsom and Ewell get more dense?

Little plots of Council land for housing?

More affordable housing now. Cllr Kate Chinn

MP's housing solution for Epsom and Ewell

Image credits: Anchor - © Peter Facey licenced under cc-by-sa/2.0. New houses: © David Dixon licenced under cc-by-sa/2.0

Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Unveiled

Wednesday 22nd November the Licensing, Planning and Policy Committee of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council approved a new iteration of a draft master plan for Epsom's town centre to go out for public consultation. The consultation will open tomorrow and end on 22nd December.

Cllr **Clive Woodbridge** (RA Ewell Village) wanted to know what questions would be posed in the online consultation. This was not answered. Nevertheless, the decision of the committee to approve a consultation was unanimous. As County Cllr **Eber Kington** told Epsom and Ewell Times, local government crafted online questionnaires may themselves benefit from a degree of prior consultation. See his opinion piece on the Surrey budget HERE

The Chair of the LPPC Cllr. **Steven McCormick** (RA Woodcote and Langley) clarified that committee members will be sent the questions for comment before the consultation goes live.

A fuller report on the meeting will be published in the coming days.

A public consultation on the draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan is a significant move toward shaping the future of Epsom. The document will be evidence that informs the development of the Borough wide Epsom and Ewell Local Plan.

Background

Commissioned in May 2022, the Epsom Town Centre Masterplan, written by David Lock Associates (DLA), serves a dual purpose: contributing to the local plan and guiding the assessment of pertinent planning applications. A hybrid public consultation in Summer 2022 garnered nearly 2,000 responses.

Addressing Inconsistencies

Responses highlighted both the interests and inconsistencies in residents' views on the town centre. The Masterplan seeks to address these disparities to create an ambitious yet practical framework for managing change in the Local Plan period.

Informing Local Plan

The Masterplan's early work influenced the town centre draft site allocations in the Draft Epsom and Ewell Local Plan (2022-2040), which underwent consultation in early 2023. Further engagement with councillors, landowners, and leaseholders occurred in Summer 2023, providing additional insights.

Key Objectives and Principles

The Draft Town Centre Masterplan lays out comprehensive guiding principles, focusing on key sites like the Ashley Centre/Global House and others including Hook Road car park and Dullshot House. It addresses placemaking objectives, environmental enhancements, travel improvements, and principles for the retention, enhancement, or repair of non-development areas.

Masterplan Sections

The document is divided into six sections, covering the Introduction and Vision, Masterplan Evolution, Character Areas Frameworks, Public Realm and Sustainable Transport, Opportunity Sites, and Appendices. Each section provides a detailed view of the town's envisioned evolution.

Public Input Crucial

The public is urged to review the options for each opportunity site and the wider Masterplan document, expressing their thoughts before the finalization. The Masterplan, while not a statutory planning document, will be a key consideration in decision-making processes for the Local Plan and the Epsom and Ewell Local Cycling Walking Investment Plan.

Respondents can view the draft Masterplan and give their views via an online questionnaire at https://epsom-ewell.inconsult.uk/ETCMP/. Paper copies of the draft Masterplan are also available on request by emailing localplan@epsom-ewell.gov.uk, or viewable in the borough's libraries for the duration of the consultation. Feedback can also be sent in by email to localplan@epsom-ewell.gov.uk, or by post to Epsom Town Centre Masterplan, Planning Policy, Epsom & Ewell Borough Council, Town Hall, The Parade, Epsom, KT18 5BY.

Future Steps

Following public consultation, feedback will be considered by DLA and council officers, contributing to the finalization of the Masterplan. Once adopted, the document will form an integral part of the evidence base for the Local Plan, carrying substantial weight in decision-making for Epsom Town Centre planning applications.

Related reports:

Mind the Epsom Town Centre Masterplan!
The cost of planning
£225,000 to plan the unplanned

Climate Justice. A generation thing?

With **Epsom Hospital** Doctor and mother of four **Kristine Damberg** in the lead, **Mothers' Rebellion for Climate Justice**, a global grassroots organization, orchestrated coordinated actions across the UK and 30 countries on six continents on Saturday, November 18, to mark **World Children's Day**. In response to the escalating threat posed by the climate crisis to children worldwide, the movement held fifteen impactful "Circles" across the UK, drawing attention to the urgent need for action. Dr Damberg was joined by Epsom mother Lisa Davies and several other Epsom residents, including children.

They joined the action that started at the UN Green for a symbolic march to Parliament Square where they formed a Mothers' Rebellion Circle with speeches, songs and children's activities.

As part of World Children's Day, which falls on November 20 and commemorates the adoption of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, Mothers Rebellion staged non-violent public protests. The focus was on the severe risks children face due to the impacts of global heating, including floods, heatwaves, droughts, storms, ecocide, and violent conflicts. Particularly emphasized was the disproportionate burden borne by children in the Global South due to resource-intensive practices by the Global North.

Operating under the banner of Climate Justice, Mothers' Rebellion called for respect for the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, demanding that those in power take decisive actions to address the escalating climate emergency. The movement condemned structural violence against children and highlighted the exacerbating factors such as poverty, economic and social inequalities, food insecurity, and forced displacement.

A recent Unicef analysis revealed that at least 43 million children were displaced over the past six years due to extreme weather events. Healthcare professionals, including Dr. Camilla Kingdon, president of the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, warned that climate change poses an existential threat to children's health and well-being, with tangible impacts already witnessed, including air pollution and extreme weather effects.

Mothers' Rebellion members, including Dr. Kristine Damberg, stressed the urgency of meaningful climate action. Damberg highlighted the need for cleaner air, more green spaces, healthier food, and reduced strain on healthcare systems, emphasizing the tangible benefits for both current and future generations.

Expressing deep concern for the future, mothers and allies globally urged countries to incorporate children's right to a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment into national legislation. They called for just measures to implement these rights and emphasized the historical role of mothers and caregivers in protecting and nurturing the vulnerable.

Elizabeth Cripps, Senior Lecturer in Political Theory, and Lisa Davies, a mother of three, shared their perspectives on the collective need for change, stressing the importance of a united effort in the face of a climate crisis threatening the overall future of children.

UNICEF acknowledged the voices of children and young people, stating, "From climate change, education, and mental health, to ending racism and discrimination, children are raising their voices on the issues that matter to their generation."

Mothers' Rebellion for Climate Justice concluded its global actions with a resolute stance: "In the face of the climate crisis and its impact on children, we refuse to look away."

For more information, visit mothers rebellion.com.

Image: Dr Kristine Damberg, Credit Andrea Domeniconi

Undiluted squash champions of Epsom

Ebbisham Sports Club in Epsom is proud of its junior squash members, in particular several of its girls who regularly play in the Ladies Team competing against other clubs in the Surrey Leagues. **Maja Leese**, who turned 15 in May this year plays at Number 1 for the club's Ladies Team. Recently, Maja and two other Ebbisham girls - **Lara Krnic** and **Imogen Wood** - were all selected to represent Surrey as Numbers 1, 2 and 3 respectively for the 2023/24 Girls Under 17 team.

On the 12th November at Broxbourne Sports Club, Hertfordshire they competed against other counties in Stage 1 of the Junior Inter-County Championships where they emerged as runners-up in their group. All the juniors at Ebbisham have training at the junior club sessions, and are coached by our resident coach **Paul Steward**.

The Club was awarded both Epsom and Ewell and Surrey's "Sports Club of the Year" in 2009 and 2016. Its mission is to provide a sporting pathway for life, for all ages and abilities, from grassroots to elite level. Members can play racket sports at an affordable price and enjoy a sociable, healthy lifestyle, whether at a casual or competitive level – Ebbisham is a Club for life.

It is a friendly purpose-built club, open 362 days a year, with three dedicated courts each for badminton, squash & racketball and tennis. There is also a small warm-up gym area with a treadmill, indoor rower and a stationary bike. The Club has over 400 adult members and over 200 junior members drawn from all over the borough and beyond.

For more details see https://ebbisham.mycourts.co.uk/index.asp

Image: left to right Lara, Maja and Imogen

The Plot in the thick of planning options

At a meeting of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council's Strategy and Resources Committee held on 13th July it was decided that various Council owned "brownfield" sites would not be offered up for development for housing in the long-awaited Local Plan. This followed a note from the Licensing, Planning and Policy Committee of 15th June that "Officers have written to the Council in its capacity as landowner to check the availability of additional sites for promotion through the call for sites process". I.e., promotion in the Local Plan for housing development.

Most of the Council portfolio on the Kiln Lane and Longmead industrial, retail and commercial areas are held on long-leases. Plot 8, in the far north-east corner of Kiln Lane was held by Wilsons, the car sale emporium, on a 10 year lease that expired in 2019. This was one plot, bordered by housing to the east, that could potentially ease pressure on other land, including green-belt, to deliver on new housing targets. Presently, it is an open area used for storing motor vehicles.

It is understood that with the lease having expired the Council could regain possession upon a redevelopment being planned. However, at the meeting of the same committee held on 21st September it was decided to authorise the grant of a new lease. Details of the new lease were excluded from public and press view at the meeting to protect the privacy of financial and commercial information of a third party, presumably Wilsons.

The length of the lease has not been disclosed but will in due course be available to public view at HM Land Registry.

Cllr **Alison Kelly** (LibDem Stamford) told Epsom and Ewell Times "I voted in favour of extending the lease, as the business wished to continue and it provides much needed income for the council. The details of the lease are part of a restricted document as is normal in these cases. However it was a well thought out contract that does not stop the local plan work. It maybe several years before both the local plan is complete and a developer comes forward with an alternative plan for plot 8."

Councillor **Chris Ames** (Labour Court) said: "Labour knows that there is a need to build homes, but also to keep people in jobs. What the council needs is a fully thought through local plan that resolves competing requirements for land. Unfortunately the hopelessly divided Residents Association administration hasn't been able to achieve this. It is also important to maintain the council's income when cash for vital services is stretched."

Epsom Civic Society maintains a watchful citizen's eye on planning matters and its Chair, **Margaret Hollins** told Epsom and Ewell Times "Epsom Civic Society supports retention and encouragement of strategic employment sites which are significant drivers of the local economy. No information is publicly available about the terms and duration of the lease so it is difficult to comment further.

"The Society considers that any attempts to cram residential dwellings along with industrial and commercial activities need to be avoided. Mixed residential and employment use could only be achieved through a carefully conceived regeneration strategy which would need to ensure proper separation between any residential areas and noise/disturbance/air pollution issues that can often occur with the type of distribution/warehousing activities prevalent on the existing industrial estates."

A spokesperson for the Council responded: "On 13 July 2023, Strategy & Resources Committee considered the land availability of several Council owned sites including the Longmead and Kiln Lane Industrial Sites. The decision was taken not to include the industrial sites and they remain part of the Council's commercial property portfolio. We are unable to provide any further comment at this time as this relates to confidential commercial matters."

Do you have a view? Feel free to write to Epsom and Ewell Times.

Council staff to get 6% pay increase?

November 14th, Epsom and Ewell Borough Council's Strategy and Resources Committee grappled with the decision of recommending a pay award for staff in the fiscal year 2024/25. The recommendation to the full council came amid challenging financial projections and a backdrop of heightened inflationary pressures.

The annual pay award, previously agreed upon for a four-year period spanning from 2020 to 2024, necessitated a new deal for the fiscal year 2024/25. Over the past four years, the cost of living pay award had been closely tied to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) inflation, with a 3% cap implemented when CPI exceeded 3%. The council had maintained a partnership approach, actively consulting with the Staff Consultative Group (SCG) in accordance with its Employee Pay & Reward Procedure.

However, the past two years had seen staff receive pay awards beneath prevailing inflation rates. As of the latest data, CPI inflation for September was at 6.7%, down from 8.7% in April, with projections suggesting further moderation. Despite this, public sector unrest had been evident, and the government had accepted recommendations for pay awards in the range of 5-7% for millions of public sector workers, including police officers and teachers.

In an effort to gauge staff sentiment, the SCG conducted a survey, receiving 140 responses, representing approximately 40% of all staff. The overwhelming preference was for a single-year deal (82% in favor). Furthermore, 58% expressed support for including provision for recognizing those at the top of their pay grade within the pay deal.

The survey also indicated that 80% of staff believed an increase in the 5-7% range was appropriate, with a leaning towards the higher end. Notably, there was a sentiment that the council should prioritize funding the highest percentage pay award rather than opting for one-off, non-consolidated payments or other perks.

As the council faced a budget deficit of £1.1 million in 2024/25, financial prudence was crucial. Budget planning had assumed a 3% pay increase for the next four years. Any award above 3% would escalate the projected deficit, necessitating additional service income or savings.

Despite financial constraints, staff and wider-public sector settlements, coupled with the persistent high level of inflation, indicated that a 3% offer might not be acceptable to employees. The council also had to consider its position as an employer compared to neighboring authorities with higher starting salaries.

The UK National Living Wage (NLW) was expected to rise to at least £11.00 per hour (a 5.7% increase) from April 1, 2024, posing additional challenges for the council in maintaining pay differentials.

The committee was tasked with considering several pay options, each with financial implications. Option 1 maintained a 3% pay award, aligning with existing financial projections. Options 2 through 4 escalated the pay increase and subsequently increased the council's projected budget deficit. Importantly, all options ensured that staff remained eligible for pay progression, and no employee would be paid below the National Living Wage rate uplift.

Councillor **Robert Leach** (RA Nonsuch) expressed concern that the 3% pay award in recent years was below the rate of inflation, effectively resulting in a pay cut for staff in real terms. He advocated for a higher rate, specifically 6%, considering the impact of inflation

Councillor **Chris Ames** (Labour Court) echoed Councilor Leach's sentiments, emphasizing that staff should not consistently receive pay awards below inflation. He supported the idea of a 6% increase.

Councillor Alison Kelly (LibDem Stamford) highlighted that the borough was among the lower-paying ones and expressed

disappointment in the need to express concern about the living wage. She favored one of the higher rates.

Councilor **Alan Williamson** (Ra West Ewell) acknowledged the importance of considering the budget deficit implications and proposed a 5% increase, citing projections of a downward trend in inflation.

The debate continued, with various councillors expressing their views on the appropriate pay rise percentage. The discussion also touched on the distribution of staff salaries and the potential impact of the pay award on the budget deficit.

Ultimately, Councillor Leach suggested a voting process, starting with the highest figure (6%) and moving down until a majority-supported percentage was reached. A unanimous decision was reached in favor of recommending a 6% pay rise for staff.

The chair Cllr **Neil Dallen** (RA Town) clarified that this recommendation would be presented to the full Council, emphasizing that the percentage discussed did not guarantee approval but would be subject to further debate.

Local Council stalwarts up for local honour

In a proposal put to the Strategy and Resources Committee of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council on 14th November, councillors were urged to consider bestowing the prestigious title of Honorary Alderman upon three distinguished figures: former Councillors **Eber Kington**, **Chris Frost**, and the late **Clive Smitheram** (to be awarded posthumously).

The proposed honours come as a customary practice at the commencement of a new municipal term, wherein the Council contemplates honouring Councillors of longstanding and outstanding service, typically those who have held the position of Mayor of the Borough.

A formal nomination for the former Councillors has been submitted to the Council's Chief Executive, underscoring their significant contributions to the community.

Former Councillor Eber Kington, a stalwart in local governance, dedicated an impressive 36 years of service as an Epsom and Ewell Borough Councillor, presiding as Mayor of the Borough in 1999-2000 and Deputy Mayor in 2000-2001.

Similarly, former Councillor Chris Frost, with 24 years of devoted service from May 1999 to May 2023, held the role of Mayor of the Borough in 2015-2016 and Deputy Mayor in 2014-2015.

Tragically, the late Former Councillor Clive Smitheram, who served for 23 years until April 2022, is being considered for the posthumous title. His term included the role of Mayor of the Borough in 2010-2011 and Deputy Mayor in 2011-2012.

Eber Kington last served Ewell Court Ward until he switched to his new home ward of Horton where he lost out in this year's May election. He still serves as a County Councillor. Chris Frost for many years served his local ward of Woodcote and the late Clive Smitheram was a councillor in Ewell West. All three represented Residents Associations.

Section 249 of the Local Government Act 1972 empowers Local Authorities to appoint both Honorary Freemen and Honorary Aldermen. The criteria for appointment, whether as Freemen or Aldermen, hinge on an individual's distinguished service to the community or the Council.

The Act stipulates that the appointment must take place at a Special Meeting of the Council, convened exclusively for that purpose. The endorsement requires a two-thirds majority of Members in attendance. While Honorary Aldermen do not enjoy legal or social precedence, it is customary for them to be invited to Civic ceremonial events.

The proposal contemplates posthumously awarding the title of Honorary Alderman to the late Clive Smitheram, an unprecedented move prompted by his exceptional service to the council.

Related report:

Long serving Councillor Clive Smitheram dies at 76

Flooding concerns defer Church St care home plan

9th November Epsom and Ewell Borough Council's Planning Committee considered once more the plan to build a care home on the sites of the Church Street police and ambulance stations.

Concerns raised by neighbouring land owners about increased risks posed by the development to ground-water flooding to their properties triggered a deferral of the application.

Cllr Neil Dallen (RA Town) proposed the deferment for the applicants to provide a more detailed assessment of flood risk from a "recognized authority".

Concerns were also expressed about the safety of refuse and re-cycling vehicles entrance and exit from the development.

There was discussion about whether the application could be approved with the imposition of conditions to address these concerns but ultimately no final decision was reached.

Related reports:

Epsom care home plans

Two Epsom brownfield developments?