Epsom and Ewell appeal to owners of empty homes

To mark National Empty Property Week, Epsom & Ewell Borough Council (EEBC) is getting in touch with owners of properties that have been empty for more than two years, to try to bring them back into use.

Empty properties are considered a wasted housing resource, can attract anti-social activity, and can even create environmental problems.

There are currently more than 250 families from Epsom & Ewell in temporary accommodation, with a further 1,336 people on the council's housing needs register, and many others looking for a property to rent or buy. Bringing empty properties back into use will help households facing homelessness find accommodation within the borough, closer to their schools, jobs and local support networks.

There are currently 64 properties that have been empty for more than two years in Epsom & Ewell. Homeowners still pay council tax on empty properties council tax on a property that has been empty for more than two years increases to 200%, while those empty for more than five years increases to 300%.

There are several options available for empty homeowners:

- Leasing a property to the council via EEBC's Private Sector Lease (PSL) scheme for a period of 3-5 years. The homeowner receives a guaranteed rental income, and the council manages the property on their behalf. Where the property requires renovation before it can be leased, the council may even be able to assist with the cost of works.
- Letting the property privately.
- Selling the property to provide residential accommodation within the borough. In some instances, the council may even be interested in purchasing the property.

Councillor Clive Woodbridge, Chair of the Community and Wellbeing Committee, said:

"Across the country, the lack of affordable housing has put massive pressure on local authorities, and Epsom & Ewell is no different. The council's housing team work extremely hard to house people in need but supply continually outstrips demand.

"I would implore anyone with a long-term empty property in the borough to consider getting in touch with the council or letting it out privately. Not only would you be providing much needed accommodation but, by bringing your property back into use, you can avoid an additional council tax burden."

Anyone interested in contacting the council with a property to let can fill in the form on the council's website - Do you have a property to let? | Epsom and Ewell Borough Council

Epsom & Ewell Borough Council operates a private sector leasing scheme which allows us to assist local families in housing need whilst reducing the risks and hassle of letting for landlords. We offer:

- to manage your property
- guaranteed rent
- a lease of three to five years.

Find out more at Private sector leasing scheme | Epsom and Ewell Borough Council

Photo by Jonathan Cooper

Local Labour view on Epsom and Ewell Council's future

Epsom and Ewell Times has invited representatives of The Residents Association, Liberal Democrats, Labour and Conservative Party to share their policies on local government reorganisation. Here is the first from Cllr Kate Chinn (Court Ward) of the Labour Party.

The government has directed a total reorganisation for two-tier local authority areas across the whole country. This was planned by the previous government and outlined in the Labour manifesto. Surrey County Council will cease to exist and will be divided up into, what Surrey Labour Party hopes, will be three unitary authorities.

Labour in Surrey has long argued that twelve councils, twelve civic centres or town halls, with twelve chief executives and a top-heavy administration is not the most economical way to deliver essential services. Small boroughs all with their own legal teams, revenue teams, housing teams, procurement staff—all duplicating roles unnecessarily. On completing the process, unitary authorities will soon start making efficiency savings.

Surrey Labour has been discussing for years how unitary authorities could be most effectively organised to best serve the residents of Surrey. Unlike the Liberal Democrats, who are hardly engaging, or the independents, burying their heads in the sand and calling for elections to be held in 2025, as did some council ruling groups. How they can claim good financial management whilst wanting an unnecessary election to go ahead makes no sense. Wasting taxpayers' money on a soon-to-be irrelevance would be unforgivable.

Surrey Labour has embraced the process, made a case for three unitary authorities, and carefully examined how they could be organised, taking into account the guidance from the white paper:

- Sensible economic geographies
- Travel to work areas
- The ability for local residents to engage and hold their devolved institutions to account

The Case for Three Unitary Authorities

We believe that there is an overwhelming case for three councils based on existing geography, taking into account expected population growth and recognising the political, economic, and social challenges faced by the county.

Surrey is to be divided into unitary authorities (UAs), with the government suggesting a **population of 500,000 or more** as ideal but recognising that there *may be exceptions to ensure new structures make sense for an area*. The population of Surrey is **1.25 million**, which implies **two or three authorities**.

Dividing Surrey into two UAs would mean both would be oversized and geographically challenged in an area of anticipated population growth, whereas three would be initially undersized. The likely divisions would be:

- **Two UAs** (East/West) as proposed by the Conservatives
- Three UAs (North/South-West/South-East) as proposed by Labour and supported by all the boroughs and districts

Proposed Unitary Authorities

With service delivery to residents being the most important issue, we suggest the following councils:

Middlesex-Surrey Borders

■ Elmbridge, Spelthorne & Runnymede

■ **Population:** 334,000

Surrey Hills

Guildford, Surrey Heath, Woking & Waverley

■ Population: 478,000

North Downs

- Epsom & Ewell, Mole Valley, Reigate & Banstead, and Tandridge
- **Population:** 416,000

These names and details are provisional and will be decided later. However, they best fit geographically and population-wise.

All these areas would have much stronger geographical links and community ties than the larger, two-unitary authority model. While all three are under the government's ideal **500,000 population** threshold, Surrey Hills is closer to that figure, and all are areas of **population growth**.

These three UAs could provide a more **local and focused** delivery of key services, ensuring better support for **adult social care and SEND needs**, both priorities for Surrey. It would give greater clarity for residents, with one authority being responsible for all local services. Service delivery would be **more efficient, more accountable**, and **free from disputes** over which council has responsibility in an area.

Local Voices Must Be Heard

It is essential to establish a close relationship between Surrey County and district councillors in shaping their new unitary authorities as they are formulated. The reorganisation process must not descend into factional disagreements but remain **focused on communities and democratic engagement** at a local level.

Other unitary councils, such as London boroughs, often have **local committees** to represent community views. Boroughs and districts in Surrey should now begin **engaging residents**, examining the options, and organising forums to ensure local voices are represented in the new UAs.

Conclusion

The devolution offer in the white paper suggests a **Surrey Mayor**, offering **priorities for funding that suit their areas** and providing **strategic leadership**. This could positively impact key Surrey priorities, including:

- Skills and employment
- More housing
- Increased local investment
- Making Britain a clean energy superpower

Surrey's approaches to neighbouring areas for a joint strategic mayor have not been successful.

A Surrey Mayor would automatically represent an area that aligns with the current police and crime commissioner and the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service boundaries, as envisaged by the white paper's goal of "reforming and joining up public services".

Overall, we believe that our three-unitary authority model will best serve the needs of Surrey residents going forward.

Much of this is based on previous contributions by Robert Evans & Arran Neathey (2019), Cllr Catherine Powell (2025), Tony Rooth & Michael Moriarty, with additional input from Cllr Robert King, but it does not necessarily represent all of their individual views.

Cllr Kate Chinn Leader of the Labour Group February 2025

Another Surrey Borough under financial strain

"Hard" times are coming to Surrey Heath Borough Council residents as millions of pounds are being cut from services, with many reduced to minimum standards, as its bleak financial situation became clear. The borough is saddled with high debt repayments to cover the cost of loans it borrowed to finance and purchase Camberley Square and the House of Fraser. The costs of servicing the debt are said to be almost as much as the council brings in through tax.

Plans to sell the town hall for housing and move into the House of Fraser building have also been put on ice due to the imminent restructuring of local government and the likely abolition of borough and district councils. It leaves the council having to rely on rapidly depleting reserves while it guts services to residents – or face going bust.

At the February 19 full meeting of Surrey Heath Borough Council, members agreed to make cuts of £2.143 million in 'transformation savings' while drawing down £21.67 million from earmarked reserves. This comes after years of uncertainty over the council's finances – which have finally been audited for the first time since 2019.

The budget papers read: "The council now has a greater understanding of its level of reserves, the figures contained within its base budget and the overall size of the deficit. This is not a palatable situation and requires some significant transformational savings, efficiencies and additional income generation just to remain solvent over the period covered by this Medium-Term Financial Strategy (the next four years). Over the previous budgets, the council has applied some of its reserve balances to support regeneration and continued delivery of services to the local residents and businesses; however...this is not sustainable in perpetuity. Previous years have seen an annual base budget review exercise which generated £2.1 million overall savings to the council. These have not been sufficient to bridge the budget gap and have only succeeded in 'buying more time' on reserve usage; the council is now embarking on a council-wide transformation programme."

This includes a full review of all discretionary services and a restructuring of what it provides to residents. The report read: "The desired outcome of reducing the cost of delivery through reduction in the non-statutory element level of service, ensuring compliance with only the minimum statutory requirement and ensuring appropriate cost recovery in the discretionary chargeable services offered." There will also be a full review of the staffing structure as this makes up the majority of controllable costs of services.

The council has also said it would look to sell off assets and has identified some that could be disposed of. However, its two largest assets, and the ones that are primarily the root cause of much of the council's financial problems, are now worth significantly less than what Surrey Heath paid. Selling these would result in huge losses.

Councillor Shaun Macdonald, leader of Surrey Heath Borough Council, said: "As expected, the view is not pretty. We are now clear that the numbers we inherited were fundamentally misstated, with the reserves being confirmed as £16m lower. That's about a third of a haircut versus the total. Therefore, our ability to provide the same services to residents that they've been used to is nonexistent."

He told the meeting: "Putting the properties to one side, our core income is about £13m and our core cost of services is roughly £15.8m. It does not take an accountant to understand that's a difference of £2.8m a year – and that is before net indirect costs of roughly £5.3m, which is predominantly made of interest and debt repayments – less property income – to pay for the reckless purchases made in 2016 and which will remain a significant number for future generations. So what are our choices to address this longer term? Well, there are only two options: reduce costs and increase income further.

"Our ability to increase income is extremely limited, therefore the budget increases council tax by the permitted maximum of 2.99 per cent." He said the maximum contribution must come through cost-cutting, through efficiencies, and through transformational change.

He added: "This is easier said than done. Not least with the cost of change to factor in. We simply have to stop doing things that we do today if it can't pay its way or it's not a statutory service, and that is hard. It's hard for us collectively in this chamber, it's hard for the officers who work very hard to provide our services, to provide our residents with the best services they can. It's hard for our residents who are used to having what they've had as a service or the support that they've been given through grants."

Related reports:

Guildford Borough Council keeps its lights on

Will Epsom and Ewell be bailing out Woking?

Will Epsom and Ewell be bailing out Guildford?

Will Epsom and Ewell be bailing out Spelthorne?

Surrey to get new recycling centre?

Newspapers, cardboard, plastic bottles and tins of tuna could have a new home to go to in Surrey. Plans for a new recycling centre are on the cards on farmland in Chertsey as the existing infrastructure is "under strain", a new report says.

Surrey County Council is proposing to build a dry material recycling centre on Trumps Farm, just off the M3. An outline planning application has been submitted and an outline business case has been developed, with a decision hopefully being made in May 2025.

Waste like metal, cardboard and plastic would be collected at the kerbside and then separated from mixed items like paper, card, plastic, metal and glass into single material streams. These streams are then sent on to reprocessors to turn into new products.

Trumps Farm, owned by the county council, was identified as the most suitable location for a recycling facility as it is North West Surrey, closest to where the highest levels of waste are produced, according to the council report. The size of the proposed facility will provide capacity for Surrey's dry recycling now and into the future, the document said.

The county's ability to recycle and get rid of waste is under "significant strain", according to a council report. A report in 2023 highlighted a strain on the current recycling infrastructure and a lack of dry mixed recycling centres in the county.

"If we're going to build and invest in a recycling centre, we need to up our recycling rates," said the Leader of the council, Tim Oliver at a cabinet meeting on February 25. He urged members to "renew their energy" for recycling around the districts and boroughs.

The Conservative leader said recycling rates around Surrey had stagnated at around 50 per cent and perhaps residents were not sure what can and cannot be recycled. He added: "I have persuaded my wife to look at a package before she puts it in the bin because it does tell you whether it's recyclable or not."

Responsible for around 90,000 tonnes of recycling in Surrey, the council is hoping to find an operator to process all this material without changing the current district and borough collection regimes. These authorities are Epsom & Ewell, Elmbridge, Guildford, Runnymede, Spelthorne, Surrey Heath, Tandridge, Waverley and Woking.

Use of third-party sites to manage recyclable materials collected by the District and Boroughs on the county's behalf has been increasingly expensive and the service has no control over costs or the separation processes. "Surrey County Council will need greater control over its supply chain and associated infrastructure," according to a new report.

Imminent waste legislative changes could put the county council at risk of not meeting its duty as the Waste Disposal Authority. The new legal rules include: collection packaging reforms and extended producer responsibility (meaning the need to collect and recycle a broader range of materials) and a new levy on fossil fuel waste which could cost the council up to £10m a year.

The report said: "The delivery of a Surrey material recycling facility will work to mitigate these financial pressures by increasing recycling, particularly with regard to plastics and provide revenue savings which can offset these costs."

In the event that Surrey was split into a number of unitary authorities that were responsible for waste disposal, the county council said the continued use of strategic waste management facilities would be managed through agreements between local authorities.

Image: Surrey Recycling Centre. Credit Surrey County Council

An Epsom 17th century pub to become supermarket?

A 17th century pub could be transformed into a Sainsbury's Local. Plans have been submitted to refurbish the Grade II-listed drinking establishment, on Dorking Road in Epsom, to a convenience store.

If approved, a Sainsbury's convenience store would take over the ground floor of the historic building and install an ATM machine outside. Plans also include resurfacing and reducing the car park to just 13 spaces, four of which will be reserved for delivery vehicles.

The former White Horse Public House was converted into Lava Lounge, a restaurant and cocktail bar, in 2020. Lava Lounge closed in January 2024, having been on the market for at least two years according to planning documents.

Used for centuries for drinking, the former purpose of the pub is no longer viable according to Sainsbury's. "Given the wealth of drinking establishments in Epsom, not just in the town centre, it is unlikely that the loss of a facility which has already been closed for a year could be considered a detriment," the application said.

Serving a specific catchment area, the proposed Sainsbury's is said to be conveniently located for nearby residents, visitors and employees at Epsom hospital as well as passing trade. The development will also create around 20 new jobs, a mixture of full and part-time.

"Very little appears to have survived" from the 17th-18th century on the ground floor, planning documents state, perhaps only the thick walls around the chimney breasts. The timber framed structure at first floor level appears to be correctly placed for a historic building but, the report says, the timbers appear to be modern.

Sainsbury's heritage statement states the proposals would have a "neutral effect" on the special interest of a listed building. The report says the vast majority of the building's internal heritage value has been lost from modern adaptations.

Planning documents read: "The core of the building has a hipped slate roof and is of timber framed construction, some of which is evidently modern, but which may form the altered remains of the 17th or 18th century building referred to in the Listing description. The pub has a parapeted brick frontage which likely dates from the middle of the 19th century."

The scheme proposes removing the replacement of the Victorian-style sash window, as well as reconfiguring and refurbishing the insides of the former pub. Demolishing the covered yard at the back of the site, Sainsbury's plans to build an extension to form a 'back of house' for the convenience store.

Minor modifications to the historic part of the building are needed to use the original pub building for the back office part of the shop. The application clarifies the historic part of the building is not being used for a sales area.

Neighbours can comment on the application on Epsom and Ewell Borough Council's website. No decision date has been listed yet.

View outside the Lava Lounge, and former White Horse Pub, in Epsom. (Credit: Sainsbury\'s/ Epsom and Ewell Planning Documents)

What Epsom could do with Woking's £75 million bail out?

Critical front-line services will be spared after a huge government 'bail out' was agreed, bankrupt Woking Borough Council has said. Officially referred to as Exceptional Financial Support for local authorities, Woking Borough Council has been given £74.9 million for the 2025/26 financial year on top of the £96.5million agreed for 24/25.

Woking declared itself effectively bust in 2023 with debts of about £2 billion. It forced the council to cut new spending, axe non-statuary services and increase tax by 10 per cent.

It used the money to build up what it hoped would be a significant investment portfolio but instead saddled itself with huge debt repayments costing tens of millions of pounds every year that it simply can not afford.

It has left the council relying on the Government to cover the cost of its heavy borrowing, known as minimum debt repayment. And this week came the news that it would receive all the money it has asked for – including a further £ 2.8million to cover the cost of providing services this year.

Had the Government refused completely the council would have ground to a halt. Councils also have to, by law, balance their books each year, and the £2.8m above and beyond debt repayment was agreed as it was viewed that Woking Borough Council has been doing what it can to reduce its spending.

This has included mass layoffs, the sale of assets, and finding partners to take over the running of others. Had any further cuts been made in such a short period of time, the results would have been 'catastrophic' to both the council and residents it had been said.

The government cash comes as part of 30 councils overall that have been given support to manage financial pressures – such is the widespread problem of local government finance.

Cllr Ann-Marie Barker, Leader of Woking Borough Council, said: "I welcome the Government's decision to provide exceptional

financial support. Critically, this will ensure that the council can meet its financial obligations relating to its £2.1 billion legacy debt without impacting front-line services and will allow us to set a balanced budget at a meeting of Council on Monday 3 March.

"We continue to urgently address the council's legacy debt through work being undertaken as part of our Improvement and Recovery Plan on asset rationalisation, debt reduction and improved commercial governance.

"We remain committed to working alongside Commissions and Government to find a lasting resolution to our complex and challenging financial situation."

In January 2023, an external assurance review covering Woking Borough Council's governance, finance and commercial issues was carried out. It provided an external assessment of Woking Borough Council's governance arrangements, financial situation, commercial investments and its capacity and capability to manage these.

The Secretary of State was not satisfied that the pace or scale of the council's response was proportionate to the issues it faced and decided immediate urgent government action was required, – and On May 25, 2023, he decided to intervene and appointed the review team as commissioners.

By June that year the council declared itself bankrupt and by October, the Commissioners spoke of the gravity of the situation in Woking and the scale of the challenge the council faced.

Related reports:

Will Epsom and Ewell be bailing out Woking?

Ex-Council Officers under investigation for Woking's £2 billion debt

No wonder Woking went bankrupt. Scandal of private school loans

Poundland saving itself pennies in Elmbridge

Poundland has been told to "show some local pride" and repair its broken shop front window and remove the graffiti from its East Molesey store.

The low-price chain, which serves up to seven million customers every week natonwide, has been issued with a community protection warning by Elmbridge Borough Council after ignoring multiple requests to address the eyesores.

Elmbridge Borough Council says it works with business groups and community volunteers to keep its high streets, villages and parades thriving and to bring that sense of civic pride.

One group, from Manor Road, takes care of the planters along Walton Road to "lift up the high street".

Initiatives in the last year have been designed to make a positive impact on the community, such as new bins, flower planters, deep cleans and pavement works.

It's part of a move to get businesses, volunteers and the council working together in support of the borough's high streets.

That work has been undermined for "almost a year" as Poundland left temporary wooden panelling and unsightly graffiti, in place.

A spokesman for Elmbridge Borough Council said: "Despite multiple requests to address the graffiti and damage at Poundland in East Molesey, sufficient action has not been taken.

"The store has tried to clean the windows professionally but could not get the graffiti removed.

"In support of local residents, we have issued this Community Protection Warning hoping that Poundland will now undertake the necessary repairs and support our high streets."

Under Community Protection Warnings, £100 fines can be issued in the first instance. If no action is taken, prosecutions can begin. If convicted the maximum penalty is a fine up to £20,000.

Councillor Steve Bax (Conservative: Molesey East) said: "Almost a year has gone by without action and they are giving the impression they are not bothered as long as the money continues to roll in.

"When we have got Manor Road residents caring for the planters so brilliantly and doing their best to lift up the high street, we need this retailer to show some local pride too.

"The council has issued a community protection warning against Poundland which gives the company 28 days to fix the shop front or face a fine.

"Hopefully this formal action will now mean the company move forward and deal with shopfront issues."

Poundland was approached for comment.

Councillor thinks new Ewell homes refusal is batty

Plans for four new homes in Ewell have been refused over bats potentially living in the two bungalows. Although one survey was done, councillors could not rule out there were definitely no bats in the buildings.

The scheme involved demolishing two semi-detached bungalows on Kirby Close, and erecting four, 3-bedroom homes in a residential Ewell suburb. The two-storey houses would have two car parking spaces per house with associated landscaping, according to the report.

However, the applicant had not carried out a phase 2 survey establishing if there were any bats in the bungalow. Officers "could not be satisfied" the demolition of the building did not pose a risk to protected species and its habitat. Members rejected the application at an Epsom and Ewell Borough Planning Committee meeting on February 13.

Cllr **Julian Freeman** (LibDem College) said: "This smacks of desperation to find some reason for turning down an application for housing that we desperately need in this borough." An increasingly frustrated Cllr Freeman reminded the committee that the borough has a "housing crisis".

The Liberal Democrat member argued that you would know if bats are on the site as "you would be sweeping up the mess on a fairly regular basis". He said: "If [the council] is going to refuse an application because there *might* be bats then, surely you need some evidence of that."

But Cllr **Steven McCormick**, (RA Woodcote and Langley) chairing the meeting, explained the plans have to be turned down because there is no evidence that bats are *not* in the two bungalows. Councils have a legal requirement for bat surveys to ensure the mammals are not harmed in the demolition or construction of buildings.

The potential harm to protected species is the only reason why the risks would outweigh the benefits of delivering two houses, planning officers told the committee as they recommended the application for refusal.

If the applicant was to appeal the decision, members asked whether the council would be "laughed at" for refusing on the grounds there was no evidence that bats are non-existent on the site. However, officers told the committee that an application on Reigate Road, which was refused for a lack of satisfactory bat survey, was dismissed at appeal by the Planning Inspector.

Councillors questioned whether they could approve the application with the condition of a further bat survey, but officers said National England guidance is it has to be known early on if bats are in the building before approval could go ahead. The bungalows cannot be demolished until the council knows whether or not bats are there.

Cllr **Clive Woodbridge** (RA Ewell Village) said he was happy to approve it once the second bat survey is done as he couldn't see "any significant or demonstrable harm that outweighs the benefit of two additional dwellings".

A previous similar application for the 'principle of development' was rejected in July 2024 on the basis the housing proposal was too dense to match the character of the street. This is currently at appeal.

Image: 9-10 Kirby Close in Ewell, where the proposed development would be built. (Credit: Google Street View)

Epsom & Ewell Borough Council: Financial Crisis or Manageable Deficit?

Epsom & Ewell Borough Council is under increasing scrutiny following the resignation of Councillor **Alex Coley** (Independent Ruxley Ward) from the ruling Residents' Association (RA) group. His resignation letter cites a failure to address the "unhappy

truths" about the borough's finances and warns that 2026 could be the year the Council "runs out of money". But is this a political exaggeration, or do the financial documents substantiate these concerns? A recent 78-page financial report prepared for councillors at the end of January 2025 sheds light on the borough's economic standing.

Cllr Coley, who has served in various leadership capacities—including Vice Chair of Audit & Scrutiny and Chair of Community & Wellbeing—states that despite his efforts to get clarity on the financial trajectory of the Council, he has been left without clear answers. His conclusion? The Council is heading for a financial crunch by 2026 with no viable plan in place to prevent it.

The specific concerns he raises include:

- Budget uncertainty for 2025/26 and beyond.
- Financial instability of Council-owned properties, which could have wider implications for the borough's assets and revenue streams.
- A lack of a clear strategy to prevent the Council from exhausting its financial reserves.

The Financial Report: Does It Confirm the Warnings?

The Financial Strategy Advisory Group's report (31 January 2025) is a key document shaping the Council's budget. Several aspects of this report support Cllr Coley's concerns:

1. A Deficit on the Horizon?

The Council's 2025/26 budget is delicately balanced, but its long-term financial plan suggests a deficit by 2026/27, growing further in 2027/28:

Year	Net Expenditure (£m)	Expected Income (£m)	Funding Shortfall (£m)
2025/26	10.27	10.27	0
2026/27	11.48	10.40	1.08
2027/28	12.24	10.72	1.52
2028/29	12.85	11.06	1.79

The projections indicate a potential funding crisis by 2026/27 unless new revenue streams or savings are identified.

2. Property and Investment Risks

- The Council relies significantly on income from its commercial property portfolio, including investments through Epsom & Ewell Property Investment Company Ltd (EEPIC).
- Rental income from commercial properties contributes £1.35m annually to the Council's budget, but there are concerns over sustainability if market conditions shift.
- In addition, £448,000 of this income is required to fund day-to-day services, raising questions about financial resilience.

3. Shrinking Government Support

- The New Homes Bonus (NHB), which has provided additional income, is set to shrink dramatically from £498,000 in 2024/25 to just £6,000 in 2025/26.
- The Government's Core Spending Power allocation to Epsom & Ewell Borough Council is effectively stagnant at £10.2m, meaning the Council is not receiving inflation-adjusted increases.
- The Fair Funding Review scheduled for 2026/27 could further reduce financial support for district councils like Epsom

& Ewell.

4. Business Rates Volatility

- The Council is highly dependent on business rates, yet its share of retained rates is forecast to fluctuate. In 2025/26, it expects to retain £1.8m, but past years have shown this figure is not guaranteed.
- There is a £282,000 deficit in the business rates collection fund, a concern for future budgets.

Council Tax Increases as a Stopgap?

To address some financial pressures, the Council is proposing a 2.98% increase in Council Tax for 2025/26, which would:

- Raise an extra £228,467.
- Increase the average Band D household bill from £226.17 to £232.92 per year.
- Be just below the government's 3% cap before requiring a referendum.

However, even this increase will not be enough to fully close the funding gap beyond 2025/26.

What This Means for Residents

If Cllr Coley's concerns hold true, services could be at risk in 2026 and beyond. Potential consequences include:

- Cuts to local amenities, including cultural venues and community support.
- Higher fees for Council services, as seen in the proposal to increase charges by 6% in 2025/26.
- Reliance on reserves, which could lead to financial instability in the future.

Local Government Reorganisation: A Game-Changer?

Surrey County Council has been advocating for the creation of a unitary authority, which would absorb district and borough councils like EEBC. This move could:

- Reduce Bureaucratic Costs Eliminating multiple layers of government could generate savings.
- Redistribute Resources EEBC's financial issues might be alleviated if its budget were merged with Surrey's broader funding pool.
- Dilute Local Control While cost efficiencies could be achieved, decision-making might shift away from community-focused governance.

If reorganisation proceeds, EEBC's financial crisis may become a moot point as budget planning is absorbed into the county-wide strategy. However, if the process is delayed or abandoned, the borough must act independently to avoid financial distress.

Conclusion: A Crisis in the Making?

While the Council insists its 2025/26 budget is balanced, the financial report confirms a growing structural deficit, aligning with Cllr Coley's warnings. The reliance on property income, shrinking government support, and an increasing budget gap suggest that by 2026, tough financial choices will be inevitable.

Cllr Coley's warnings are not entirely unfounded, but the financial data suggests that EEBC is not yet on the brink of insolvency. The real risk lies in the structural deficit and growing debt burden, which must be addressed through a combination of revenue generation, cost-cutting, and strategic planning.

The key question remains: What is the Council's plan beyond short-term fixes? Without a comprehensive long-term strategy, the

borough may indeed be heading towards the financial cliff that Cllr Coley has predicted.

Related reports:

Prominent Residents Association Councillor leaves the fold

Epsom & Ewell Full Council Meeting: Budget Approved Amid Debate

Ex-Council Officers under investigation for Woking's £2 billion debt

Two former officers at Woking Borough Council are being investigated over their roles in Woking Borough Council's bankruptcy. The Financial Reporting Council (FRC) has confirmed that it is looking into the "professional standards" of two "individual accountants" in respect of Woking Borough Council's operations and investment activities for the financial years ended 31 March 2017 to 31 March 2023.

While the FRC has not identified the two people involved, former CEO Ray Morgan has confirmed to the Local Democracy Reporting Service he is being investigated. The Guardian has named the other as Leigh Clarke, who was the council's chief financial officer until 2023. Shortly after her departure the council's interim section 151 officer declared Woking bankrupt with debts of more than £2 billion.

Since then the council has had to cut huge numbers of jobs, increased its share of tax by 10 per cent and slashed funding to services and facilities. It is the second time the FRC has investigated council officers. In January 2024 it began an investigation into a former member at Thurrock Council after that authority admitted to a £469m budget black hole.

If that is any indication of timescales, it could easily be more than a year before a decision is reached in Woking. FRC sanctioning powers range from issuing unlimited fines down to a slap on the wrist. It can also strip people of their membership of professional bodies.

Both Ray Morgan and Leigh Clarke were named in the Grant Thornton report published on Tuesday, November 5 that examined the scale of Woking's borrowing. The report found a "long and atypical history of borrowing from the Public Works Loan Board" ran between 1999 and 2020.

Borrowing accelerated rapidly between 2016 and 2019 – primarily to fund regeneration projects such as Victoria Place and Sheerwater but also to cover running costs at its companies as well as loans to a private school. The Grant Thornton report read: "There was a strong message, over a period of many years, from the former CEO, Ray Morgan, that if debt could be serviced it was possible to borrow as much as the council wished, for whatever purposes it chose."

Will Forster said: "As Woking's MP, I've called for those who effectively bankrupted our local council to be held to account. Pleased to see that the Financial Reporting Council, the UK's accounting watchdog, is investigating Ray Morgan and Leigh Clarke, two former senior council figures."

Responding to the news, Cllr Ann-Marie Barker, Leader of Woking Borough Council, said: "Since the council fully accepted the recommendations of the independent Grant Thornton public interest report, Government-appointed commissioners overseeing Woking Borough Council's financial recovery have been liaising with relevant professional bodies.

"As a result, the Financial Reporting Council (FRC) has confirmed investigations into the conduct of two former employees.

"Woking residents deserve complete transparency and for those responsible for the borough's financial issues to be held accountable. We will therefore do whatever we can to assist the FRC in their investigations."

The FRC statement read: "This press notice concerns the opening of an investigation into the relevant individuals. The investigation does not relate to any persons or entities other than the relevant individuals and it would not be fair to treat any part of this announcement as constituting or evidencing an investigation into any other persons or entities.

"The Financial Reporting Council has commenced an investigation under the Accountancy Scheme into the conduct of two individual accountants in relation to their compliance with governance, reporting, regulations and professional standards in respect of Woking Borough Council's operations and investment activities for the financial years ended 31 March 2017 to 31 March 2023.

6th November 2025 weekly



ISSN 2753-2771

"The individuals are no longer employed by the council. The decision was made at a meeting of the FRC's conduct committee on 17 December 2024. The investigation will be conducted by the FRC's executive counsel."