

Surrey schools not out for so long in summer?



Surrey County Council is looking at possible changes to school holidays.

A consultation has been launched on whether the county council should switch to a two-week half term break in the autumn – and is asking for families to give their feedback before making a decision.

About one in ten state-funded schools have already made the switch, including some in Surrey.

It has led some families facing added challenges when term times at different schools are not aligned.

If the switch to a two-week autumn half term break goes ahead, the added five days would be clawed back from the summer break, although the council said it would look to minimise this reduction “where there are opportunities to recover days through the natural positioning of bank holidays during the Christmas and Easter breaks”.

The consultation letter sent to parents read: “We are seeking to understand the views of all stakeholders in determining our future approach to term dates and if there is any appetite for change.

“This will enable the council, schools and multi-academy trusts to work in partnership to set term dates with an aim for more consistency for schools, school staff, and families.

“We acknowledge that there may be strong views on either side of this question, but we feel it is right and responsible to seek those opinions at a time when we are seeing movement towards a longer October half term by some schools.

“The combined responses from education settings, families and partners will help inform our approach to term dates for the 2026/27 academic year onwards.

“If it is determined that there is significant appetite for change, the council will adopt a two-week autumn half term break from the 2026/2027 academic year at the earliest.”

The survey runs until the end of the year, and closes at 5pm on Tuesday December 31 2024.

The school year would still be 195 days, including the five inset training days for staff.

Local Plan lessons from our neighbour?



“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.”

Ewell village set to improve



Earlier this month Epsom and Ewell Borough councillors met to agree their contribution of £1.25m Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding toward the Ewell Village improvement project. This funding will match the £1.35m that Surrey County Council have committed to the project.

This is an important milestone for the Ewell Village project and will ensure the improvements go ahead as planned in 2026. The improvements, which include the introduction of new pedestrian crossings, greenery, improvements to footways and the public realm and a 20mph speed limit in the village, aim to improve safety along the High Street and make Ewell a great place to live, work and visit.

The plans were finalised earlier this year, following several public exhibitions and an online engagement, in which over 1400 responses were received from local people. The results of the engagement helped decide the way forward and plans were approved by Surrey County Council’s Infrastructure Board and Capital Programme Panel in August.

Matt Furniss, Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth, Surrey County Council said, “It’s great news that Epsom and Ewell Borough Council have agreed their funding contribution to this important project. Now that all necessary funding is in place, we are in a good position to deliver this work as planned in 2026. Delivering these improvements to Ewell Village will bring about much needed safety enhancements to the High Street, whilst still allowing vehicle access. We know this was important for many local people and believe the plans deliver necessary change, whilst reflecting what the community want in their village.”

Councillor Clive Woodbridge, Chair of the Community and Wellbeing Committee, Epsom & Ewell Borough Council, said: “I’m very pleased that we can support this substantial infrastructure project which will hugely benefit residents, businesses, and visitors to Ewell Village.

This project shows partnership working at its best. I would like to thank Surrey County Council for working so diligently with our residents and businesses to ensure that the planned improvements are tailored to their needs, and that Ewell Village maintains its unique, and historical, characteristics for many years to come, whilst improving accessibility and safety throughout the village.”

What cuts to Surrey County Council services are you prepared for?



Surrey County Council has unveiled its draft budget for the upcoming financial year and is calling on residents to share their views through a public consultation.

As councils nationwide grapple with severe financial pressures, Surrey remains confident in its ability to set a balanced budget. However, making difficult decisions will be essential to ensure long-term sustainability of vital services.

The proposed budget outlines crucial investments in areas such as specialist care services, special education provision, road maintenance, and transport improvements. Public feedback will help shape these priorities.

Tim Oliver, Leader of Surrey County Council, stated:

“Councils across the UK are facing unprecedented financial challenges, and while Surrey benefits from a stable budget position, we are not immune to these pressures. “Our key services – including social care, children’s services, and highways maintenance – are experiencing rising demand, escalating costs, and reduced funding. The demand on services in Surrey is particularly high, and it’s critical that the government addresses this by providing sufficient funding in the upcoming finance settlement.

“We are committed to supporting the residents who need us most and delivering essential services that people rely on every day. Achieving this requires cost reduction where feasible, alongside transforming how we operate and exploring innovative ways to deliver services effectively. “We need your input to guide these decisions. Please participate in this consultation – understanding your priorities is essential.”

The draft budget, approved at a recent Cabinet meeting, aligns with the four priority objectives set out in the council’s **Organisation Strategy 2023-2028**. To balance the books while delivering essential services, the council has identified **£57 million in efficiencies**. Public feedback will help refine how these savings are implemented.

Residents are encouraged to share their thoughts through the consultation survey, which takes no more than 10 minutes to complete and can be submitted anonymously.

The survey is open until **11:59 PM on Tuesday, 31 December 2024**. Feedback from this phase will contribute to the final budget report, which is set to be published in January 2025.

To participate, visit Surrey County Council’s website.

HOW YOUR COUNCIL TAX IS SPENT:

In **Epsom and Ewell**, Council Tax contributions are distributed among three authorities: Surrey County Council, Surrey Police, and Epsom & Ewell Borough Council. For every £1 of Council Tax paid:

Surrey County Council receives 76p.

Surrey Police receives 14p.

Epsom & Ewell Borough Council receives 10p.

For the fiscal year 2024/25, the total Council Tax for a Band D property in **Epsom and Ewell** is £2,308.34, allocated as follows:

Surrey County Council: £1,758.60

Surrey Police: £323.57

Epsom & Ewell Borough Council: £226.17

Allocation of Funds:

Surrey County Council utilizes its share to fund services such as:

Education
Social services
Highways and transportation
Libraries
Public health
Waste disposal

Surrey Police allocates its portion to:

Maintain law and order
Crime prevention
Community policing
Emergency response services

Epsom & Ewell Borough Council uses its share to provide services including:

Waste and recycling collection
Maintenance of parks and open spaces
Housing services
Planning and development control
Environmental health
Leisure and cultural services, such as the Epsom Playhouse and Bourne Hall

Epsom SEND case highlights a national problem



A shocking case of systemic failure by Surrey County Council (SCC) has brought renewed attention to the challenges faced by families of children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). After nearly two years of delays and inadequate support, the Mayle family from **Epsom** has finally secured a suitable school placement for their 7-year-old son, Joshua. However, the damage caused by SCC’s inaction is undeniable—and emblematic of a national crisis.

A National Struggle for SEND Support

Joshua’s case, while devastating, is far from unique. Across England, families are grappling with a SEND system under unprecedented strain. The number of children with EHCPs has surged by 77% since 2015, a rise that local authorities nationwide are struggling to accommodate. Against this backdrop, funding for SEND services has not kept pace, creating a perfect storm of unmet needs, prolonged delays, and rising parental frustration.

The Local Government Association (LGA) reported earlier this year that councils are grappling with a national SEND funding gap of over £1.9 billion. Without urgent intervention, local authorities warn that they will be unable to meet their statutory duties under the Children and Families Act 2014.

Surrey’s Struggles in Context

Surrey County Council has seen a sharp rise in demand, with the number of children requiring EHCPs rising from 10,000 in 2017 to around 15,000 today. In response, the council has committed £240 million to SEND provision, promising 6,000 new specialist school places and additional support within mainstream schools. Yet, progress has been slow, and communication failures continue to erode parental trust.

Helen Maguire, MP for Epsom and Ewell, who intervened in Joshua’s case, said:

“It is a sad day when a family in such dire straits has to approach their MP on an issue that should have been addressed much earlier by the local County Council. No family should have to escalate matters this far, especially when their child’s needs are at stake. The voice of parents MUST be listened to, and while I am relieved that Joshua has finally received the education and support he deserves, it is deeply troubling that it took this long for the Council to act.”

“This case highlights systemic failures within Surrey County Council’s SEND services. Urgent reform is needed to prevent other children from suffering in the same way.”

Surrey’s challenges are reflected across the country. In some areas, families report waiting months—sometimes years—for EHCPs to be approved, with many forced to take local authorities to tribunal to secure adequate support. Nationally, tribunals have increased by 80% since 2016, with parents overwhelmingly winning cases against councils, further highlighting systemic issues.

The Role of Central Government

Local authorities are not solely to blame. Reductions in central government funding have left councils stretched thin, with many struggling to recruit and retain qualified staff to meet rising demand. The LGA has called for an urgent review of SEND funding, warning that councils are increasingly using general education budgets to plug the gaps, putting additional strain on mainstream schools.

The Department for Education (DfE) recently announced a SEND and Alternative Provision Improvement Plan, promising £2.6 billion in capital funding to create new school places and improve existing facilities. However, critics argue that the funding is insufficient to address the scale of the problem.

Paul Whiteman, General Secretary of the National Association of Head Teachers, warned earlier this year:

“The government’s SEND review is a missed opportunity to address the systemic underfunding of support for children with additional needs. Families and schools need real solutions, not sticking plasters.”

The Human Cost of Delays

For families like the Mayles, the impact of these systemic failings is profound. Joshua, once a bright and independent child, has regressed significantly due to delays in accessing the support outlined in his EHCP. His father, Alex, said:

“Surrey County Council’s failure to meet its statutory obligations is shocking. All children are entitled to an education, and they are being failed by a broken

system that is underfunded and under-resourced.”

The strain on families is echoed across the country, with parents often feeling forced to navigate a labyrinthine system to secure their children’s rights. A recent survey by the charity Contact found that 65% of families with disabled children believe the SEND system is “not fit for purpose,” and 48% say their child’s mental health has suffered due to delays in accessing support.

A Call for Urgent Reform

Joshua’s story underscores the urgent need for reform—not just in Surrey, but across England. While councils like SCC grapple with rising demand, the root cause lies in a system underfunded at every level. Families should not have to fight this hard for their children’s education and wellbeing.

As the government prepares to roll out its SEND improvement plan, experts warn that without significant investment and a more collaborative approach between councils, schools, and families, the crisis will only deepen. For Joshua and thousands like him, the question remains: how many more children will be failed before meaningful change is delivered?

Is a Isa the answer to Epsom’s high house prices?



With the five-year anniversary of the Help to Buy ISA closure approaching, a fresh analysis has revealed how Epsom and Ewell compares to other Surrey boroughs in benefiting from this government initiative. Launched in 2015, the Help to Buy ISA offered first-time buyers a 25% bonus on their savings, helping them onto the property ladder before its closure to new applicants in November 2019.

According to research by UK conveyancing specialists Bird & Co, only 0.15% of property sales in Epsom and Ewell since 2015 involved the Help to Buy ISA. This ranks our borough 10th among Surrey’s local authorities. However, a significant spike occurred in late 2021, with ISA-backed property purchases rising to 0.73% of sales in Epsom and Ewell during the final quarter of the year.

Experts attribute this spike to several factors: delays caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, which pushed completions into 2021, a rush to secure mortgage rates amid fears of rising interest rates, and confusion over the scheme’s eligibility deadline. Across Surrey, such spikes were common, reflecting national trends.

Daniel Chard, a partner at Bird & Co, commented:

“The Help to Buy ISA has undoubtedly provided vital support for first-time buyers, particularly in areas with lower house prices or greater awareness of the scheme. Epsom and Ewell’s figures highlight the role of regional affordability and access to information in shaping how these schemes are utilised.”

How Does Epsom and Ewell Compare?

While our borough’s 0.15% average use of the scheme lags behind Surrey’s leader, Reigate and Banstead (0.47%), the data tells a broader story of affordability challenges. House prices in Epsom and Ewell may exceed the limits of the Help to Buy ISA, reducing its appeal for local buyers.

The borough also saw a notable drop in ISA usage following the 2019 deadline for new accounts, with property sales using the scheme falling from 0.19% before the cut-off to 0.12% after—a 0.07% decline. This trend is consistent with other Surrey boroughs, where the closure of the scheme saw reductions in usage.

What Are the Alternatives?

For first-time buyers who missed the Help to Buy ISA window, the Lifetime ISA offers similar support, with a 25% government bonus on savings and higher annual limits. However, it’s worth noting that eligibility criteria differ.

Bird & Co, who conducted the analysis, specialise in conveyancing law and offer guidance to buyers navigating government schemes. They highlight the value of understanding regional differences and tailoring advice to individual needs.

As Epsom continues to grow as a desirable place to live, schemes like these underline the importance of affordability in ensuring that first-time buyers can achieve their homeownership dreams.

Fly-tipping bags and BB gun shots close Bagshot recycle centre



Bagshot community recycling centre will close in an effort to protect staff from being threatened with violence, Surrey County Council has said.

The depot has been plagued with issues for years with people “dodging bb bullets”, catapults fired, angle grinders used in break ins, and staff put in danger by those dumping hazardous waste, senior councillors said.

The closure would not save the authority money, they said, as alternate sites will have to their hours extended to deal with the knock on.

Waste contractors Suez has recorded 801 instances of fly tipping across all Surrey recycling sites between January 2019 and August 2024. Of these, 531 (66 per cent) were at Bagshot.

A nuisance report listed examples of flytipping at the site as well as details of break ins such as when an “angle grinder was taken to the office shutter” and “oil thrown around site”.

Other times vandals broke in and left fluorescent tubes “smashed over the site”.

Some of the break ins forced the recycling centre to close, while on June 17 “Someone fired a bb gun towards members of the public” which was later reported to the police.

Campaigners had argued that the centre was valued by the community and rather than give up on Bagshot, money should be spent on modernising and making it safer.

They argued that closing the Bagshot centre would make it harder, longer, and more expensive for many people to recycle their waste.

Councillor Natalie Bramhall, cabinet member for property, waste and infrastructure, told the Tuesday, November 26. meeting at Surrey County Council: “ Suez keeps the site safe, but it has inherent problems which are not present at other community recycling centres.

“For many many years the site has suffered from overnight vandalism and unlawful ingress.

“Containers, particularly those used for electricals, are regularly forced open and plundered and the site office has been vandalised.

“The perimeter fence has been driven into and fly tipping left outside the gates and tipped over the fences.

“Prevention measures, whatever we do, things get broken, they use catapults to knock out all the lights, they used angle grinders to get the fence and into the office and vandalise.

“Suez staff receive threats and have to deal with materials delivered to the site that are hazardous and not allowed on the site but they have to turn a blind eye to this because they are threatened with violence.”

The report described the Swift Lane site as small, unmodernised and not fit for purpose.

It serves around 7,000 people in the Bagshot area who will be redirected to Camberley. Those who came from further afield, such as Windsor and Maidenhead, will be directed to the recycling centre in Lyne, Runnymede.

Subject to Surrey Heath Borough Council approval, it is anticipated that Bagshot tip will close immediately prior to the new tenant moving onto the site. This is likely to take place in December 2024.

Photo: Bagshot Recycling Centre (Image Surrey CC)

Epsom & Ewell’s local history museum to be born again?



Bourne Hall Museum in Ewell, a cherished repository of local history, faces an uncertain future as its esteemed curator, **Jeremy Harte**, prepares for retirement in March 2025 after 35 years of dedicated service. Harte’s tenure has been marked by significant contributions, including the curation of approximately 17,000 artefacts and 45,000 photographs that represent the lives of tens of thousands of people who’ve lived in the area since the Ice Age.

Concerns have arisen within the heritage community regarding the museum’s continuity post-Harte’s departure. **Jon Cotton**, President of the Epsom and Ewell History and Archaeology Society, expressed apprehension over the Council’s succession planning, stating, “We fear that no such planning has been put in hand, and there is a growing belief that the Council intends to wind down its commitment to the Museum, its staff, premises and collections.”

Epsom and Ewell Times asked the Council: “Does EEBC intend to keep the museum open after Jeremy Harte’s retirement and is the Council actively recruiting a new curator?”

In response, Councillor **Clive Woodbridge**, Chair of the Community and Wellbeing Committee (RA Ewell Village), affirmed the council’s commitment to the museum’s future, stating, “We are putting plans in place to determine how we will continue to run the museum into the future. There are currently no plans to close Bourne Hall Museum.”

Bourne Hall Museum has been instrumental in community engagement, recently participating in the national Kids in Museums ‘Takeover Day’ by collaborating with Ewell Grove Primary and Nursery School. This initiative, part of the council’s Arts, Culture and Heritage Strategy, aims to inspire local youth by providing hands-on museum experience.

As the museum approaches this transitional period, many remain hopeful that Bourne Hall Museum will continue to serve as a vital educational and cultural resource for future generations.

Related reports:

Bourne Hall’s Christmas Supremacy

Kids takeover Ewell’s Bourne Hall

Ewell History Day returns to Bourne Hall

Dorking Halls to reopen after upgrade



The official reopening date for Dorking Halls is days away and a special ceremony has been announced to mark the occasion.

Mole Valley District Council was forced to close its veritable old venue in June so it could undergo a £11million facelift, to take place over two phases, to replace the 1930s plaster ceiling in the grand hall together with much needed mechanical and electrical work to its stage and internal workings.

Now, the first stage of that work, which has so far cost £4m, is done and Dorking Halls will reopen its doors on Monday, December 9 with screenings of Paddington in Peru, Wicked and Gladiator 2.

Then, from December 20 the big winter panto Sleeping Beauty takes to the stage, complete with 3D laser projections.

Ahead of the big day the council is also hosting a special reopening celebration the Friday before to show off the upgraded site, which will also feature newly enlarged toilet provision, and a draft lobby.

Speaking about the soon to be reopened Dorking Halls, leader of the council, Councillor Stephen Cooksey said: “I wanted to update you of an ‘early Christmas present’.

“The work to replace the Grand Hall ceiling at Dorking Halls has gone brilliantly well and our entertainment venue will be re-opening as planned on Monday December 9, with the panto, ‘Sleeping Beauty’ beginning not long after on the 20 December and running until the end of the month.

“Whilst Dorking Halls has been closed, the opportunity has been taken to upgrade our film projectors meaning that they will not only present even better-quality visuals, but also run in a greener, more energy efficient, manner.

“So, be prepared for an invigorated cinema experience when the Halls reopens with a comprehensive events screening and film listing.”

The second phase of the project’s £11m refurbishment will take place in 2025 and will focus on replacing “critical mechanical and electrical systems” – said to be its heating and cooling plant – that are near the end of their useful lives.

Related reports:

Dorking refurb: “it’s behind you”!

Dorking Halls to get refit

Epsom and Ewell’s Draft Local Plan goes to Full Council



The Licensing and Planning Policy Committee (LPPC) of **Epsom and Ewell Borough Council** met on 20th November 2024 to consider the draft Regulation 19 Local Plan amid a storm of public opposition and internal division. The meeting, attended by residents and a significant complement of councillors, highlighted the deep tensions over the inclusion of Green Belt sites for development.

After nearly seven years of delays, the draft Local Plan was endorsed by the LPPC, sending it to the Full Council for final approval in December. However, the debate exposed significant disagreement among councillors about the cost of achieving housing targets and the risk of sacrificing valued green spaces.

Public Pleas to Save the Green Belt

Three public speakers opened the meeting, delivering impassioned critiques of the draft Local Plan. **Janice Baker** accused councillors of abdicating their responsibility by deferring to officers’ recommendations. Quoting directly from the meeting papers, she said, “Paragraph 3.46 states that removing Green Belt sites would significantly increase the risk of the plan being found unsound. In other words, you’re being told not to think about changes. But I ask: where is democracy in this process? Stand up for residents, stand up for your duties.”

Tim Murphy, a member of the Council for the Protection of Rural England, highlighted Horton Farm’s ecological and strategic importance, labelling it “one of the highest-performing Green Belt sites in the borough.” He challenged the committee directly: “The decision lies with you, not officers, not inspectors. You will be held responsible by residents for either protecting or destroying our Green Belt.”

Finally, **Yvonne Grunwald** reminded councillors of the 11,000-signature petition submitted during the Regulation 18 consultation. “Eighty-seven percent of residents opposed building on the Green Belt,” she said. “What happened to their voices? This plan will forever change the borough’s character.”

Councillor Perspectives: Frustration, Reluctance, and Division

The councillors’ deliberations revealed starkly contrasting views, with many expressing unease about the Local Plan but accepting its necessity. Chair Cllr **Peter O’Donovan** (RA Ewell Court) opened by praising the officers’ efforts, describing the plan as a delicate balance. “Our task,” he said, “is to tread carefully between safeguarding the borough’s unique character and ensuring future generations can thrive.”

However, dissenting voices were prominent. Cllr **Christine Howells** (RA Nonsuch) passionately opposed the inclusion of Horton Farm and Hook Road Arena. “This is our Green Belt,” she argued. “Once it’s lost, there’s no going back. Horton Farm is a critical environmental buffer and a floodplain. Its removal would set a precedent for the destruction of every other Green Belt site.”

Cllr **Robert Leach** (RA Nonsuch) expressed broader discontent with the central government’s housing targets. “Epsom has a population density five times the national average,” he said. “Why must all the burden fall on us? We’re being treated as a branch office for Westminster, not as an independent council.”

In contrast, Cllr **Clive Woodbridge** (RA Ewell Village) reluctantly supported the plan, acknowledging the compromises it entailed. “I wrestled with this decision,” he admitted. “Horton Farm is high-performing Green Belt, but without it, the plan will almost certainly be found unsound. If we exclude it, speculative developments could wreak havoc across the borough.”

Motions and Proposals: Protecting the Green Belt

Cllr **Neil Dallen** (RA Town) questioned the land allocated for Gypsy and Traveller sites, suggesting higher densities to reduce the footprint. “If we increase the density from 16.5 to 25 or 30 per hectare, could we not meet the full need on a smaller site?” he asked. Planning Policy Manager Ian Mawer responded, explaining that the lower density reflects cultural and practical requirements for Gypsy and Traveller communities, including space for caravans, vehicles, and utility blocks.

Cllr **Julie Morris** (LibDem College) called for stronger environmental commitments, particularly around climate change and biodiversity. “Why are climate and biodiversity issues always buried at the end?” she asked. “These should be front and centre of the plan.”

Meanwhile, Cllr **Kieran Persand** (Conservative Horton) vehemently opposed the inclusion of Horton Farm. “This is not a balanced plan,” he declared. “Including Horton Farm doesn’t protect other Green Belt sites—it puts them at greater risk. The planning inspector will see this as justification to include more Green Belt land.”

Despite these objections, motions to remove Horton Farm and other Green Belt sites were defeated, with officers warning that such changes would undermine the plan’s soundness. “Without Horton Farm, we simply cannot meet housing needs or provide Gypsy and Traveller pitches, which are legal requirements,” said Ian Mawer.

Difficult Decisions: Reluctant Support for the Plan

As the debate continued, councillors wrestled with the plan’s broader implications. Cllr **Phil Neale** (RA Cuddington), reflecting the prevailing mood, said, “None of us like this plan, but what’s the alternative? Without an up-to-date Local Plan, we’re at the mercy of speculative developments. We cannot afford to start from scratch.”

Cllr Woodbridge echoed this sentiment, emphasizing the risks of delay. “This plan is far from perfect, but it’s the best chance we have to protect the majority of our Green Belt while meeting our obligations. If we fail, the consequences could be far worse.”

However, not all councillors were resigned to compromise. Cllr Persand insisted that rejecting the plan would force the council to find alternative solutions. “We don’t have to accept this bad plan,” he argued. “There is still time to come up with something better.”

Press Release and Public Reaction

Following the vote, EEBC issued a press release reiterating the importance of adopting the Local Plan. “The Proposed Submission Local Plan strikes the optimal balance between development and preservation,” said Cllr O’Donovan. “It will deliver affordable housing, protect biodiversity, and secure infrastructure improvements while safeguarding the majority of the borough’s Green Belt.”

The press release also emphasized the risks of not adopting a plan, including unplanned and speculative developments. Residents were encouraged to participate in the upcoming Regulation 19 consultation, set to begin in early 2025.

Public reaction, however, remains overwhelmingly critical. Campaigners accused the council of ignoring residents’ views and bowing to government pressure. “This is not a balanced plan,” said Janice Baker. “It’s a capitulation.”

Looking Ahead: Full Council Debate

The draft Local Plan now moves to the Full Council for debate on 10th December 2024. With opposition among councillors and residents showing no signs of abating, the future of Epsom’s Green Belt hangs in the balance.

While some see the plan as a necessary compromise, others view it as a betrayal of the borough’s character and environmental heritage. The upcoming Full Council meeting promises to be as contentious as the LPPC debate, as Epsom grapples with the challenge of balancing growth and preservation.