EPSOM & EWELL TIMES
For the community, by the community. A not-for-profit service

ISSN 2753-2771

More erudition on local government reorganisation in Epsom and Ewell

16 January 2026

Dear Editor,

In his letter of 13 January Trevor Burt makes a number of good points, including rightly calling out the determination of the ruling Residents Association (RA) clique to impose parish councils on the residents they claim to represent without giving them the opportunity to express support for an alternative “community governance” model.

He is also correct that Epsom and Ewell residents will have proportionately more influence in the smaller council of East Surrey than in the bigger pond of Surrey County Council.

But the RA’s determination to force through the creation of parish councils that have little support in the borough is explained by a simpler mathematical calculation. Even in the unlikely event that the political party that claims not to be a political party were to win all the seats available in our current borough, it would still be in a minority on the new council.

As I and others have said, parish councils are about preserving the relevance of a clique that is used to seeing Epsom and Ewell as its fiefdom.

In the meantime, the RA will continue to mismanage the council, as the latest fiasco over the Rainbow Leisure Centre shows, as it wastes the valuable time of council tax payer-funded officers on the pursuit of the RA councillors’ vanity project.

The Rainbow Centre fiasco also shows how determined the RA are to keep the truth of their incompetence from residents. It may interest your readers to know that I have written to the administration to seek confirmation that the decision to keep the huge repairs bill secret included an assessment of what the public interest required.

Yours faithfully,

Cllr Chris Ames (Labour – Court Ward)

Dear Editor,

Sadly, in his support and criticism of my stance on both SCC’s Neighbourhood Councils and the Town Council alternative, Trevor Burt (Letters to the Editor 13/01/26) seems to miss my point.

As I state in my penultimate paragraph, the engagement of residents in determining the outcomes of policies and spending in their area does not necessarily require replacement frameworks, large expenditure and more elections. It can be undertaken by devolving funds to Unitary Authority Councillors individually or jointly to spend on local priorities, more local consultations, the co-designing of local services with residents, regular pulse surveys, as well as transferring local assets to communities. These opportunities provide for real localism and for all residents, if they choose, to have their say.

Yours faithfully,

Eber Kington

Residents Association County Councillor

Ewell Court, Auriol and Cuddington

.

.

.

Related letters:

Is Epsom and Ewell getting “proportional representation” under Council shake-up?

Long serving Epsom Councillor blasts LGR and NACs

© 2021-2026. No content may be copied without the permission of Epsom and Ewell Times Ltd.
Registered office: Upper Chambers, 7 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY

ISSN 2753-2771

Ewell's "UFO" shaped Bourne Hall to take off anew

16 January 2026

A Surrey museum is set to get a long-awaited boost to make the tired building come to life again. Epsom and Ewell Borough council unanimously backed plans to invest in improving the Bourne Hall Museum rather than close it down or let it stay as it is.

The decision means the museum will get more funding and support it needs to become more engaging, relevant and sustainable for the local community. If the funding is not approved by the council's Strategy & Resources Committee in March, the museum will continue as it is for now, costing the council around £236k a year. Up to £396k could be thrown at regenerating the museum. But it could be cheaper to run in the long-term, according to the report.

Councillors at agreed the museum needs a fresh identity and a clear vision for the future at a Community and Wellbeing Committee meeting on January 13. Cllr Clive Woodbridge said the museum "needs to reflect and be relevant to local communities now and the future" . He said the council needs to be more forward-thinking in this area.

Plans for the investment include:

- Updating displays to make them shorter and easier to read
- Creating interactive exhibits and themed trails connecting the museum with the library and other parts of Bourne Hall.
- Reaching out to local schools, community groups and universities with workshops, tours and loan boxes.
- Launching a modern marketing push, including social media, better signage to raise awareness of what the museum has to offer.

The investment is also seen as a chance to future-proof the museum ahead of local government changes in 2027, ensuring it can continue to serve the community under whichever new governance model comes into place.

Councillors highlighted the museum's untapped potential, from local history and famous residents to unique collections that could inspire events and projects for all ages.

The council emphasised that closing the museum would be costly (approximately £280k), slow, and damaging to the community, while doing nothing would let the museum slowly lose its relevance. Instead, the investment approach is designed to make the museum vibrant, interactive, and a real community hub.

Emily Dalton LDRS

View of Bourne Hall and Museum, Spring Street, Ewell. (Credit: Google Street View)

Related reports:

Surrey company wins award for solar installation at Ewell's Bourne Hall

Bourne Hall's Christmas Supremacy

Ewell History Day returns to Bourne Hall

Surrey businesses benefit from County grants

16 January 2026

© 2021-2026. No content may be copied without the permission of Epsom and Ewell Times Ltd.
Registered office: Upper Chambers, 7 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY

ISSN 2753-2771

Greentech innovators and gourmet food producers are among businesses benefiting from a further £1 million investment into the county's economy by Surrey County Council.

Nearly 30 companies and entrepreneurs are receiving individual grants of up to £75,000 in the latest round of funding.

The investment, which is largely made up of UK Shared Prosperity Funding from government, will unlock millions of pounds of match funding while creating dozens of local jobs.

Among the recipients are Mantisonix, a University of Surrey spinout in Guildford, which has developed ultrasonic technology to sustainably destroy "forever chemicals". The new facility will reinforce Surrey's position as a leader in environmental innovation.

MS Venison will create a new butchery facility in Oxted while family-run catering business Afromufasa will purchase a new food truck, creating up to eight jobs in Weybridge.

Godalming-based DIY Her Way will look to provide online training for 100 women to become electricians, helping addresses Surrey's shortage of skilled tradespeople.

Councillor Matt Furniss, Surrey County Council's Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Economic Growth, said: "This investment represents another significant step in strengthening and growing Surrey's economy.

"The quality and breadth of the bids within the hundreds of applications that we received is testament to the vibrancy of the business community across the county.

"I'm delighted we have been able to support close to 30 companies with their innovative ideas to grow and look forward to seeing them delivering benefits to our people and places over the months to come."

Surrey County Council launched the Economic Growth Fund in April with a focus on supporting ideas to accelerate growth, boost innovation and create new employment opportunities.

About £2 million was distributed when the first round of grants was announced in September.

With a further £1 million awarded in round two, the total invested locally this year now stands at more than £3 million.

Among those to benefit include Rhevia (formerly known as Streetwise Technology) in Reigate. The firm uses hardware and AI to make highways safer for pedestrians while improving vehicle flow.

Dorian Isaacson, of Rhevia, said: "Being selected for funding by Surrey County Council was a huge vote of confidence for us at a critical stage of our growth.

"The grant has been genuinely transformational, it enabled us to recruit two new team members and significantly advance our technology, making our product more sophisticated and commercially viable.

"That progress has directly helped us win new customers and accelerate our growth. As we scale, we expect this to translate into high-value jobs, continued innovation, and a growing contribution to the Surrey economy."

The Economic Growth Fund is one of several ways the council supports businesses and a growing Surrey economy.

For further details and to register for fully-funded support to start and grow a business visit www.businesssurrey.co.uk.

The businesses to win funding in round two of the Surrey Economic Growth Fund are:

Afromufasa
Aqua Broadcast Limited
Batts Hill Distillers
BecDan Limited (DIY Her Way)
Carpet Ease Limited
Carry on Coffee
Charlie and Ginger LTD
DigiKind Ltd (Kathy Kyle)
Fit with Frank
Hurtwood Events CIC
Kampyro Ltd t/a Emovement
Lesh
MS Venison Ltd
Mantisonix
More Meals Ltd
Morpheus Fluid Ltd
Old School Longcross Ltd (t/a Old School Windscreens)
Parcours Velo Ltd
Porky Whites Ltd
Rawlings Opticians
Rhizo PTX
Shetland Pony Club (registered as Shetland Pony Centre LLP)
Silvermere Gymnastics
Star Player Ltd
Surrey Signs & Display Limited
Systems & Networks Training
The Nourishment Academy (t/a Strength & Bloom LTD)
West Fisher Winery

© 2021-2026. No content may be copied without the permission of Epsom and Ewell Times Ltd.
Registered office: Upper Chambers, 7 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY

ISSN 2753-2771

Surrey County Council

Photo: Dorian Isaacson, of Rhevia, received funding from the Surrey Economic Growth Fund

---

Council’s refusal leaves Esher’s Marquis of Granby derelict

16 January 2026

The owners of the Marquis of Granby in Esher have hit back at Elmbridge Borough Council after it refused to recognise the venue as a restaurant. They said the decision they say is “wrong” and “based on a misunderstanding”.

Greene King, which owns the site on Portsmouth Road, has now submitted a fresh planning application asking for a Certificate of Lawful Existing Use. They want official confirmation that the Marquis of Granby should be classed as a restaurant, not a pub.

They argue the council made a “fundamentally flawed” decision last year when it rejected their original application in November 2023.

According to Greene King, the venue has operated primarily as a restaurant since 1994, with alcohol sales playing a secondary role. In simple terms: most people went there to eat, not just to drink.

Elmbridge council, however, ruled that the premises looked more like a “drinking establishment with expanded food”, a specific planning category used for pubs that also serve meals. The classification puts it outside the normal restaurant category and limits what the building can be used for in future.

Although 77.8 per cent of its sales come from food, officers said in their 2023 report, this is typical for modern pubs, which commonly serve meals, and pointed to industry data showing similar patterns nationwide. They also highlighted pub-style features including a large bar area, self-seating, multiple beer taps, a cellar stocked with kegs, gambling machines, event nights with DJs, and the venue’s own website branding itself as a “local pub”. The council found these characteristics outweighed the presence of a restaurant area and concluded the premises more closely resembles a pub, not a restaurant, leading them to refuse the certificate.

But Greene King strongly disagrees. They say the council has misunderstood the planning rules and how they apply to the site. Their planning consultants argue:

- The Marquis of Granby has never been a drinking-led pub, so it cannot suddenly be classed as one.
- Planning rules do not allow a restaurant to automatically change into a “drinking establishment with expanded food” without permission.
- The business was still food-led even after its carvery deck was removed in 2020.
- Features like a bar, beer taps and a garden do not automatically make somewhere a pub and many restaurants have these too.

They also say the council relied too heavily on a trade magazine article about pub food and drink sales, which they describe as “meaningless” evidence.

Greene King points out that it successfully secured the same certificate for six similar venues elsewhere, with no objections from councils. The Marquis of Granby is the only one that has been refused.

Since closing, the building has become run down, with heavy graffiti, vandalism and anti-social behaviour. Greene King says the lack of a certificate is “sterilising” the site and stopping it from being reused and that it is now a potential fire risk.

A spokesperson said the evidence clearly shows the venue was laid out for dining, with large kitchen facilities, menus focused on meals, tables set with cutlery and condiments and most of the space is dedicated to seated customers. They

© 2021-2026. No content may be copied without the permission of Epsom and Ewell Times Ltd.
Registered office: Upper Chambers, 7 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY

ISSN 2753-2771

argued this proves food was the main attraction.

Greene King is now asking the council to reconsider and approve the certificate without delay. If granted, it would officially confirm the Marquis of Granby as a restaurant, making it easier to bring the site back into use.

The council has not yet commented on the new application.

.

.

Emily Dalton LDRS

.

.

Marquis of Granby pub on Portsmouth Road, Esher. (Credit: Google Street View)

.

What to do with an old Town Hall – lessons for Epsom?

16 January 2026

Hundreds of thousands of pounds have been spent on consultants – yet Elmbridge Borough Council still does not know what to do with its offices, say opposition councillors.

They have now criticised the council claiming it has “little to show for it after years of delay”.

Changing ideas, multiple funding injections, fresh consultant commissions and repeated delays have left people uncertain about what will actually happen to the council’s headquarters and the wider town centre vision.

Around £402,000 has been paid to external consultants across four years as the local authority pursued what it described as a “flagship” regeneration project in Esher town centre. The scheme includes council offices, a library, car parking, a bowling club, tennis courts and temporary accommodation units.

But the council has accepted that earlier business cases are no longer valid due to Local Government Reorganisation (LGR), which will see Surrey split into two mega unitary authorities. Under the plans, Elmbridge will be absorbed into East Surrey.

Two consultancy firms received payments, of around £200k each, linked to the Civic Centre project between 2022 and 2025, according to a Freedom Of Information (FOI) request:

Urban Vision

- 2022: £97,200
- 2023: £116,400

31ten Consulting Limited

- 2023: £28,587.60
- 2024: £143,886
- 2025: £16,200

These figures do not include a further £50,000 approved by Cabinet and Council in November and December 2025 for additional consultancy work. FOI officers confirmed that this allocation has not yet been spent.

Despite the scale of consultancy spending, the council confirmed it has not carried out any surveys, tests or marketing of the Civic Centre building as part of the scheme. In its FOI response, the authority said it does not hold any information on costs for such work “as no such surveys, tests or marketing have been undertaken”.

Cllr John Cope, Leader of the Conservatives and Opposition, Elmbridge Borough Council: “Spending over

© 2021-2026. No content may be copied without the permission of Epsom and Ewell Times Ltd.
Registered office: Upper Chambers, 7 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY

ISSN 2753-2771

£400,000 of residents' money on consultants, with little to show for it after years of delay, sums up how the Liberal Democrat-led council has operated in Elmbridge for the past eight years.

"This comes on top of millions wasted on a failed Local Plan that was rejected by the planning inspector, and £50,000 spent on a climate change citizens' panel PR stunt that has delivered no clear benefit for local taxpayers.

"At a time when Elmbridge has one of the highest council tax bills in the country, residents are right to expect far better. The council should be cutting waste, especially at a time it is ending support for things that residents value, like Meals on Wheels and the local community centres. Their approach is wrong, and local Conservative councillors will continue to fight for residents' interests."

Before the government announced devolution in Surrey, the council had prepared a full 40-year business case. This work recommended entering into a joint venture with a developer to deliver housing on the Civic Centre site, while relocating council offices by purchasing an existing office building in Esher.

Consultancy firm 31ten was appointed in August 2023 to develop a detailed financial model setting out the implications of redevelopment over a 40-year lifespan.

But, as a result of LGR, the entire business case is now defunct, making it necessary to seek new advice on a potential disposal of the site. Despite this, the council has said that redevelopment remains "integral" to Esher placemaking ambitions and could still "significantly enhance the vitality of the town centre".

Cllr Simon Waugh, Leisure, Portfolio Holder for Culture & Commercial Strategy

"Our Esher vision, supported by local businesses and residents, as well as Councillors, sets out aspirations for Esher to be a vibrant town centre, providing residents and visitors with the opportunity to come together and take part in shared activities.

"At the December 2025 Elmbridge Council meeting it was agreed that limited funding was needed for a property consultant to assess the Civic Centre site for housing development within the context of the Esher vision."

Portfolio holder said the civic centre is "no longer suitable as a modern workplace" as it is costly to maintain and environmentally unsustainable. He said Elmbridge council has continued to review options to ensure value for money, act in the best interest of residents and deliver a smooth as well as effective transition to the new unitary authority.

The council has cited several reasons for continuing work on the site, including government housing targets requiring councils to help deliver 1.5m new homes nationally.

Cllr Waugh said: "The demand for new homes remains strong across the country, including in Elmbridge. The government continues to set ambitious targets to address the housing crisis and Elmbridge Borough Council is firmly committed to supporting the delivery of housing within the borough.

"The Civic Centre site presents this Council with an opportunity to provide extra homes in Esher and to deliver on improved connectivity to the town – providing a community meeting point for markets and events currently lacking in the town. For residents and businesses, we foresee economic benefits for the high street, and improved connectivity around Esher town centre, as well as much needed housing. We will bring an update to Elmbridge Cabinet and Council in the coming months."

The council is now seeking fresh advice on disposal options, even as responsibility for the site is expected to transfer to the new East Surrey authority by April 2027.

Emily Dalton LDRS

Elmbridge Civic Centre, where Elmbridge Borough Council is based. Photo credit Emily Coady-Stemp, LDR.

Related reports:

The Epsom and Ewell Town Hall plan

A new Town Hall for Epsom and Ewell?

Cllr Dallen accused of £1/2 m Epsom & Ewell Council cover-up

16 January 2026

© 2021-2026. No content may be copied without the permission of Epsom and Ewell Times Ltd.
Registered office: Upper Chambers, 7 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY

ISSN 2753-2771

BBC LDRS reports: A Surrey council [Epsom and Ewell] must pay out up to £500,000 after failing to properly check the condition of a major leisure centre before handing it over to a new operator. Poor ventilation, damp and 'possible roof cracks' were cited as some of the problems related to the "fabric" of the building.

Epsom and Ewell Borough Council has agreed to cover the costs of urgent repairs at Rainbow Leisure Centre after the new contractors took over the site and uncovered a long list of issues, some relating to the structure and fabric of the building. Places Leisure took over the contract on October 1, 2025, but has not yet signed on the dotted line, the LDRS understands.

The pay out was approved via a confidential urgent decision, seen by the Local Democracy Reporting Service (LDRS), after Places Leisure said it should not be responsible for fixing the issues.

An urgent decision is when a council cannot wait until the usual decision-making committee process as it could harm the public or council interests.

Some of the problems relate to the fabric of the building, for which the council is responsible, the LDRS understands. This is despite the council previously insisting it had carried out such checks.

In a public report dated June 2025, Epsom and Ewell Borough Council said it had commissioned a stock condition report to make sure the building was handed over in good nick.

As the LDRS understands, council officers believed the centre would be handed back in good condition. An external consultant was used, but their inspection was not invasive, meaning hidden problems may not have been picked up. But just six months later, the authority is now facing a bill of up to £500k to fix problems that either were missed or not properly dealt with because the council did not know about them.

When Places took over, it found issues it believed the previous operator should have fixed. Some of the problems raised include:

- Fire alarm faults
- Lift issues
- Broken seating
- Damaged glazing
- Faulty toilets
- Poor ventilation
- Damp
- Possible roof cracks
- Machinery at "end of life"

Some were flagged as health and safety risks, meaning urgent action was needed to keep the centre safe and open.

The council has now agreed to let Places carry out the repairs and reclaim the costs by reducing the management fee it pays back to the council. Officers said this is the "most cost-effective" option, but it effectively means residents are picking up the tab.

Why is the council paying?
Under the contract, some repairs fall to the council as landlord responsibilities. Others may be recoverable from former operator GLL, but legal experts warn the council is unlikely to claw back the full amount. GLL has been contacted for comment. [See below for additional reporting.]

The authority plans to dip into its 'dilapidation' reserve, a pot of money set aside for building repairs, to cover the shortfall. Officers admit the final cost is still being worked out, but estimate it could reach up to £500,000.

Opposition fury
Councillors have slammed the council for not knowing the state of its own properties.

Cllr **Alex Coley**, member of the Independent group (Ruxley), said: "I'd have hoped that the council as landlord would understand the condition of the leisure centre to establish its potential liability."

Labour group leader, Cllr **Kate Chinn**, (Court) hit out at the ruling Residents' Association (RA), calling the situation a "shocking scandal".

She said: "This secrecy wasn't about keeping the costs involved from the parties to the negotiations as they already know them. It was about preventing the public from learning how incompetent the RA are."

She added: "Cllr **Neil Dallen** (RA Town) has rightly owned this fiasco, but without realising that his 'nothing to see' attitude that council tax payers should expect to be routinely stuck with bills on this scale shows how complacent he is with their money."

She accused the ruling group of being distracted: "The RA have clearly taken their eye off the ball as they focus on a self-serving attempt to create new parish councils and new roles for themselves."

Cllr **James Lawrence**, leader of the Liberal Democrat group (College), said the situation shows "the importance of maintaining key properties so they are in good working condition and ensuring the status of our properties is communicated to both councillors and residents in good time."

© 2021-2026. No content may be copied without the permission of Epsom and Ewell Times Ltd.
Registered office: Upper Chambers, 7 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY

ISSN 2753-2771

Council response
Council leaders defended the decision, saying negotiations are normal during handovers. Councillors Neil Dallen and **Clive Woodbridge** (RA Ewell Village) said: “Rainbow Leisure Centre transferred to a new operator, Places Leisure, on 1 October 2025. Since then, we’ve been pleased to see a number of improvements at the centre.

“This marks the beginning of an exciting new chapter for the leisure centre… including significant investment to upgrade the gym, studios, swimming changing rooms and more, which are already underway.”

They added: “With any handover, it is normal practice for there to be negotiations around works to be carried out which form part of the contract finalisation.”

However, they refused to release further information, saying: “Details relating to terms and financial arrangements are commercially sensitive and therefore not in the public domain.”

Places Leisure
A spokesperson said: “Places Leisure took over the operation and management of Rainbow Leisure Centre in partnership with Epsom and Ewell Borough Council on 1st October 2025. We are excited to work closely with the Council to implement changes and significant investment at the centre to make a positive impact for the local community.”

Emily Dalton LDRS – the BBC’s Local Democracy Reporting Service

---

Additional reporting from Epsom and Ewell Times:

In a further twist GLL has supplied Epsom and Ewell Times a response to the issues: “*“GLL was proud to partner with Epsom and Ewell Council on the design and opening of Rainbow Leisure Centre over 20 years ago. This innovative and award-winning centre has been extremely successful over the 20 years of GLL’s tenure, engaging millions of local residents in activity, improving their health and wellbeing.*

“GLL is unaware of any legal claim that the Council is looking to bring in relation to the standard of the building on handover, especially as there are set protocols to deal with building handovers prior to any instigation of legal action. As background, the Council undertook, via specialist contractors, a full survey of the building prior to GLL exiting. As is normal in all leisure transfers, items that were identified for [repair or rectification] in that survey for GLL were all completed prior to handover and signed off by the specialist contractors on behalf of the Council. GLL handed the building over to the standard required by the Council and under the contract.”

It is normal practice for Councils as landlords to have rights of periodic entry and inspection of premises it engages contractors to manage. Either the Council was negligent in failing to insert such rights in the contract with GLL or the Council has been negligent over an extended period of years in failing to carry out inspections or to carry out inspections properly.

The Council has made fully public announcements that Places commenced its contract on 1st October 2025. See Epsom and Ewell Times report: Epsom’s Rainbow Leisure Centre Places new operators. The Information Commissioner has made plain that Council’s cannot evade accountability by claims of ongoing contractual negotiations. The tender process having ended for both GLL and Places means there is little if any financially sensitive information to protect justifying a confidential label on information that exposes probable Council incompetence.

Epsom and Ewell Times asked Epsom and Ewell Borough Council a series of questions about these issues and received the same “nothing to see here” response from Cllr Dallen as obtained by the BBC’s Local Democracy Reporting Service (LDRS) reporter Emily Dalton, as above. The Epsom and Ewell Times has thus submitted to Epsom and Ewell Borough Council formal Freedom of Information Act demands for relevant information.

Sam Jones – Reporter

Related reports:

Epsom’s Rainbow Leisure Centre Places new operators

Gold star at the end of the Rainbow

Pot of gold for Rainbow?

Is Epsom and Ewell getting “proportional representation” under Council shake-up?

16 January 2026

© 2021-2026. No content may be copied without the permission of Epsom and Ewell Times Ltd.
Registered office: Upper Chambers, 7 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY

ISSN 2753-2771

Dear Editor,

I was heartened to read Cllr Eber Kington's letter of 9th January. For once, a Resident Association councillor has broken ranks with the ruling Residents' Association line by publicly disavowing the party's own sponsored option of creating two community councils to replace Epsom and Ewell Borough Council following Local Government Reorganisation. That departure is to be applauded.

However, I must respectfully challenge the assertion that the current options before us truly trust residents — "the people most qualified to decide what is best for the borough," as Cllr Kington rightly characterises them — with a meaningful say. In reality, EEBC hasn't offered residents any choice beyond:

* Two community councils (effectively parish/town councils with a precept), or
* No community councils at all.

If Cllr Kington has alternative proposals for how local democratic accountability and community decision-making can supplement ten councillors representing East Surrey on the new unitary authority, he has left it far too late for such alternatives to be prepared, costed, and properly considered before EEBC's much-awaited March 2026 meeting.

It is worth putting the democratic and financial context in sharper focus. At present, EEBC has 36 councillors servicing a modest borough budget of around £10.27 million for 2025/26. In contrast, Surrey County Council's budget of £1.2641 billion including responsibilities, covering education, highways, social care and more, account for roughly 76 % of the total council tax bill paid by residents, with EEBC receiving only about 10 %.

Under the new arrangements for two unitary authorities— as confirmed by government decision — the Epsom and Ewell area will be represented by 10 councillors on the East Surrey Council, dealing with the vast majority of public services currently under County control. Crude though it is, this means that for the major service budgets now handled at county level, Epsom and Ewell will have significantly greater relative influence than before. Currently, just five county councillors represent the borough's interests on a much larger Surrey budget; in future, ten unitary councillors will cover roughly half of the former Surrey population's budget responsibilities.

Yes, it is true that we lose some of the micro-representation previously afforded by a larger cohort of borough councillors on planning and routine community matters — though even now many planning decisions are subject to Government inspectors overruling local decisions on appeal. But on the biggest pots of public spending — education, adult social care, highways, children's services — residents will likely be better represented proportionately than under the old two-tier county/district system.

So when debating the merits of Neighbourhood Area Committees versus community councils, let us be clear about the alternatives on the table. Both NACs and community councils have limitations and cost implications, and both are artificially constrained by the narrow set of options EEBC has chosen to present. The real democratic choice for residents should be wider than simply more or fewer tiers of parish councils.

If Cllr Kington truly believes, as he claims, that residents should decide how council tax is spent and how their communities are governed, then let us see a credible alternative framework— with transparent proposals, budget implications, and democratic accountability — ahead of March. Otherwise, the debate will continue to swirl around consultancy-driven options that neither trust nor empower the people they purport to serve.

Yours faithfully,

Trevor Burt

Related letters and reports:

Long serving Epsom Councillor blasts LGR and NACs

Parish power, democratic ideals — and the Residents' Association dilemma

Have your say on the future of local representation in Epsom and Ewell

Epsom and Ewell's Local Democracy Debate: What's at Stake as Consultation Enters Phase Two

Letters from local Councillors on Epsom and Ewell parishes

Surrey tops Man v FAT contest

16 January 2026

© 2021-2026. No content may be copied without the permission of Epsom and Ewell Times Ltd.
Registered office: Upper Chambers, 7 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY

ISSN 2753-2771

Guildford's MAN v FAT Football Club has been crowned Community Club of the Year 2025 at the nationwide MAN v FAT Football Awards, recognising its outstanding contribution to improving men's health and wellbeing.

In Surrey, the MAN v FAT weight loss programme is commissioned by Surrey County Council through the free healthy lifestyle service One You Surrey. The FA-accredited scheme, which also runs in Woking, combines football with structured weight-loss support and is aimed at overweight and obese men with a BMI of 27.5 or above, helping participants lose weight, gain confidence and build friendships.

At each session, players weigh in before taking part in a 30-minute six-a-side football match. Teams receive extra goal bonuses based on their combined weight loss. A team's match scores and weekly weight-loss totals then contribute to its standing in the club's league table.

Mark Smithies from the Guildford club said joining had been transformative for him: he has lost weight, improved his fitness and made lasting friendships. He added that the positive, supportive environment has boosted his confidence and mindset, describing the club as "more than just football… a proper community".

H5 How the programme supports players

Alongside weekly football sessions, MAN v FAT players receive additional support off the pitch, including healthy meal ideas, general fitness tips and access to a bespoke mental health platform through partners JAAQ.

Across the UK, MAN v FAT players have collectively lost more than 800,000 pounds in weight.

H5 Success in Guildford and Woking

The Guildford club meets on Friday evenings at Kings College – Community Sports Hub on Southway and currently has 68 members regularly achieving their weight-loss goals. Over the past twelve months, players at the club have shed more than 34 stone of excess weight, with progress continuing week on week.

The Woking club meets on Monday evenings at the Woking Sportsbox and has supported 40 players to lose a combined 365kg during 2025.

H5 Find out more

Funded places are available for Surrey residents at the Guildford and Woking clubs through Surrey County Council and One You Surrey.

To register, visit manvfat.com/football and search for Guildford or Woking to apply and begin your journey to a healthier 2026.

Surrey County Council

SURREY
COUNTY COUNCIL

.

.

.

.

.

Epsom and Ewell lags Surrey's recycling front-runners, new tracker shows

16 January 2026

© 2021-2026. No content may be copied without the permission of Epsom and Ewell Times Ltd.
Registered office: Upper Chambers, 7 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY

ISSN 2753-2771

Surrey's self-assessment – and what sits behind it

A new "Surrey Waste Tracker" published by the Surrey Environment Partnership (SEP) claims Surrey is one of the best performing areas in England for recycling and low landfill. The tracker uses data for the 2023–24 year and compares Surrey County Council with 28 "similar" waste authorities across England.

SEP reports that 54.5% of Surrey's total household waste is recycled, reused or composted, placing Surrey joint second out of 29 comparable authorities. Surrey households produced around 445kg of rubbish per home, said to be eighth out of 29 and better than an England average of around 511kg. Just 0.2% of Surrey's household waste went to landfill, compared with an England average of 5.5%, and 85% of Surrey's waste is processed in the UK rather than exported.

The tracker does not spell out which 28 other authorities Surrey is being measured against, nor does it cite the exact national datasets used for those comparisons.

How independent national data stacks up

Provisional government waste statistics for 2023–24 show that, across England as a whole, the household recycling rate is around 44%. The same official release reports that 5.5% of local authority-collected waste in England was sent to landfill.

Taken together, these independent figures broadly support SEP's central message: Surrey's recycling rate is around ten percentage points higher than the England average, Surrey sends a much smaller share of its waste to landfill than the country as a whole, and Surrey households appear to be producing less residual rubbish than the average English household.

However, the 42.3% "England average" recycling figure quoted on the Surrey Waste Tracker is slightly lower than the 44% national rate reported by government, suggesting SEP may be using a different measure or earlier cut of the same data.

Where Epsom and Ewell sits in the Surrey league

The tracker also breaks down performance by each of Surrey's 11 district and borough councils, including Epsom and Ewell. For each area it publishes annual rubbish per household (in kg), the proportion of household waste recycled, reused or composted, and the proportion of recycling processed within the UK.

On those measures, **Epsom and Ewell** is a low performer within Surrey, but well behind the best-performing districts.

Recycling rate: Epsom and Ewell recycles, reuses or composts 52.1% of its household waste. This places it ninth out of the 11 Surrey districts and boroughs on the recycling measure, while Surrey Heath leads the county on 58.9%, with Guildford and Tandridge close behind.

Rubbish per household: Epsom and Ewell households produce 402.3kg of rubbish per year. That is better than Elmbridge and Spelthorne, but still ninth out of 11 when ranked from lowest to highest residual waste. Surrey Heath again tops this table with 341.2kg per household.

How much recycling stays in the UK: Only 63.7% of Epsom and Ewell's collected recycling is processed within the UK, the lowest share in Surrey. Several councils send a much higher proportion of recyclables to UK facilities, including Reigate and Banstead, Guildford and Tandridge.

Surrey district and borough waste league table, 2023–24

Based on the Surrey Waste Tracker's published data, the picture across the 11 local areas is as follows, ranked by recycling rate from highest to lowest:

Rank (recycling)	District / Borough	Rubbish per household (kg)	Proportion recycled / reused / composted (%)	Proportion of recycling processed in UK (%)
1	Surrey Heath	341.2	58.9	76.8
2	Guildford	347.5	57.9	84.6
3	Tandridge	361.5	57.8	84.2
4	Waverley	350.0	57.0	75.3

© 2021-2026. No content may be copied without the permission of Epsom and Ewell Times Ltd.
Registered office: Upper Chambers, 7 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY

ISSN 2753-2771

Rank (recycling)	District / Borough	Rubbish per household (kg)	Proportion recycled / reused / composted (%)	Proportion of recycling processed in UK (%)
5	Mole Valley	362.1	56.4	72.2
6	Woking	348.1	56.4	73.1
7	Elmbridge	407.5	54.2	72.6
8	Reigate and Banstead	381.2	54.2	96.2
9	Epsom and Ewell	402.3	52.1	63.7
10	Runnymede	386.4	46.8	71.5
11	Spelthorne	439.3	44.5	70.7

On this reading, Epsom and Ewell recycles a larger share of its waste than the national average, but less than eight of its ten Surrey neighbours, produces more rubbish per household than most Surrey areas, and sends the smallest proportion of its recycling to UK plants.

Who owns the Surrey Environment Partnership?

The Surrey Waste Tracker is published by the Surrey Environment Partnership, which is a partnership between Surrey County Council and the 11 district and borough councils. SEP is therefore not an external watchdog but a joint project of the councils whose performance it reports on.

The tracker draws on data that councils are legally required to report to central government through the WasteDataFlow system, which the government then uses to produce national statistics. However, it does not identify the 28 “similar areas” Surrey is compared with, nor the criteria for including them, and it does not explicitly reference the government publications from which national averages appear to be taken.

For residents in Epsom and Ewell, the Surrey Waste Tracker offers a useful snapshot of local performance within a strong-performing county, while also raising questions of transparency and comparability. The extent to which the borough can close the gap with Surrey’s recycling leaders, and keep more of its recycling treatment within the UK, is likely to remain a live policy issue for years ahead.

Sam Jones – Reporter

Image: Landfill site in UK by M J Richardson CC BY-SA 2.0

Since publication of the above report the Surrey Environmental Partnership has issued the following helpful clarification:

Unfortunately, there was an error in the number of authorities that we compared Surrey with. The report originally listed that there were 29 similar authorities, when in fact it was 27. This has now been amended on our website – Surrey Environment Partnership – Surrey Waste Tracker. The authorities that Surrey compares to are the other waste disposal authorities in England.

The article also mentions a discrepancy between the figure of 42.3% that we used for England’s recycling rate compared to the figure of 44.0%. Just to clarify that 44.0% is England’s recycling rate for the calendar year of 2023 whereas 42.3% is England’s recycling rate for 2023-24, which is the period that our report covers.

Finally, with regard to the source of the data, the source is Defra’s publicly available data, which can be found here – Local authority collected waste management – annual results – GOV.UK.

We have made a note to include the above level of detail in Surrey Waste Tracker reports from hereon.

Long serving Epsom Councillor blasts LGR and NACs

16 January 2026

© 2021-2026. No content may be copied without the permission of Epsom and Ewell Times Ltd.
Registered office: Upper Chambers, 7 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY

ISSN 2753-2771

Dear Editor

I am not sure where your Editorial writer of 6th January 2026 gets their information on SCC's pilot project Neighbourhood Area Committees (Parish power, democratic ideals — and the Residents' Association dilemma), but NAC's are certainly not the answer to the proposed LGR centralisation of local government and are far away from the concept of local democracy.

But before I address that, let's just step back a bit and see how we got here. The Government had no electoral mandate to abolish SCC and Surrey's Districts and Boroughs. And even if a vague manifesto reference to the reform of local governments counts as legitimate, the Leader of SCC had no mandate to use his Executive power to drag all of Surrey's local authorities into a rushed and centralising new local government structure.

The Government and Tim Oliver also cancelled the May 2025 local County Council election, denying residents themselves of the chance to express their view on this change, via the ballot box. That said, residents used a different mechanism to say what they thought. The results of the Government's own public consultation on the Unitary Options, published in October, showed that 51% of respondents expressed support for the three Unitary Option and only 19% favoured SCC's two Unitary option, with 56% strongly opposed to it. Yet the Government decided it knows better.

The outcome is that we won't have the devolution of power as promised under LGR but, instead, the centralisation of local government upwards and into two Unitary Authorities covering populations over ½ million. And in my Division, covering Ewell Court, Auriol, and Cuddington, just two Unitary councillors will replace the current eight local councillors with the expectation (I suppose) that this is sufficient to ensure that our residents needs and expectations will still be adequately met.

And this is where the Government's concept of Neighbourhood Area Committees comes into play. How ironic that, having realised Unitary Authorities will have nothing "local" about them, the Government decides (fully supported by the ruling party at SCC) that they will also impose what will fill that void.

Your Editorial seems quite keen on these. They write "*These advisory bodies bring together local councillors, police, NHS, voluntary sector leaders and community stakeholders — arguably, the very people most qualified to inform decisions on community priorities*."

However – and given that I am a Residents' Association councillor you probably won't be surprised at this – I think the people most qualified to determine local priorities and what their council tax should be spent on, are residents and council taxpayers themselves. Not an unelected quango with a small minority of residents working to an agenda determined by the Unitary Authority. Neighbourhood Area Committees therefore do not pass the tests of democratic local government, representation of the people, nor the ability for local people and communities to influence local outcomes.

Your Editorial also states that NACs come "*at minimal administrative cost*." I am not sure that's a given if it's only based on SCC piloting four NACs. If introduced by the East Surrey Unitary there could 36 or more of them. And how long will it take before the Police, NHS, and Fire Service, for example, realise that that simply cannot resource every NAC and every meeting in Surrey.

So, I do not support the NAC option. It is not local, it is not democratic, and it excludes the voice of most residents. But neither do I support the Town Council and precept model which will add a further tax burden on residents alongside any new elected Mayor's annual precept, in order to run allotments and not much else.

We need to look at options such as providing Unitary Councillors, individually or jointly in their localities, with funding to allocate locally. We need more local engagement and consultations on the introduction of school streets, speed limits and no verge parking zones and more. We should increase opportunities for community asset transfers enabling communities take over council assets that are better run by those who will use them. And we should undertake more co-designing with residents and users of local services and facilities, to better reflect their needs and aspirations.

So, going forward, if I get the chance to influence the local arrangements, it won't be to install a quango of unelected public servants and self-selected individuals, but it will be introducing localised structures and financial decision making to ensure that our residents are able to influence the important local choices and funding allocations that affect their lives.

Yours faithfully,

Cllr Eber Kington – (RA Surrey County Councillor Ewell Court, Auriol and Cuddington and former RA Epsom and Ewell Borough Councillor)

Editor's note: Epsom and Ewell Times received its published information about Neighbour Area Committees and the cost of running 16 meetings of pilots direct from Surrey County Council's communications team.

© 2021-2026. No content may be copied without the permission of Epsom and Ewell Times Ltd.
Registered office: Upper Chambers, 7 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY

ISSN 2753-2771

Related letters and editorial

Parish power, democratic ideals — and the Residents' Association dilemma

Have your say on the future of local representation in Epsom and Ewell

Epsom and Ewell's Local Democracy Debate: What's at Stake as Consultation Enters Phase Two

Letters from local Councillors on Epsom and Ewell parishes

© 2021-2026. No content may be copied without the permission of Epsom and Ewell Times Ltd.
Registered office: Upper Chambers, 7 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY