Council minority vote Local Plan to next stage with Green Belt in

On 10th December 2024, the **Full Council of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council** convened to debate the proposed Local Plan, a pivotal document that will shape the borough's future planning, housing, and Green Belt policies until 2040 and beyond. Central to the debate were contentious issues regarding housing targets, the timetable for the Local Plan submission, and the potential release of Green Belt land for development. The controversial Local Plan, including some Green Belt development, was voted through by 16 votes from a Council that consists of 35 Councillors.

Presentation of the Petition

The meeting began with the presentation of a petition organized by **Yvonne Grunwald**, titled "Remove Green Belt from the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Local Plan." Mrs. Greenwald argued the case against developing on Green Belt land:

"Over the last few years, residents have repeatedly told the Council that they do not want building on the Green Belt. They have held rallies, protests, they have spoken at council meetings. This includes secondary school children. They've sent emails to councillors and their MP... The results showed that 87% of respondents were opposed to building on the Green Belt."

She criticized the council's perceived disregard for public opinion:

"Why consult with the residents if you are going to ignore the result and actively undermine them?"

Mrs. Greenwald also pointed to an alternative plan that relied solely on brownfield sites:

"In November, opposition parties and the Green Party, together with residents, submitted an alternative plan, which showed that enough houses can be built on brownfield sites already identified by the Council."

Concluding her speech, she urged the Council to act quickly to amend the plan:

"You must make sure that the Local Plan doesn't include Green Belt... This should happen as quickly as possible so that it can be submitted to examination before the new NPPF rules come into force."

Council Debate

Councilor **Peter O'Donovan**, (RA Ewell Court) Chair of the Licensing and Planning Policy Committee, responded to the petition. He acknowledged the concerns raised but defended the inclusion of Green Belt land in the Local Plan as a necessary compromise:

"The proposed submission plan... aims to strike the right balance of meeting development needs, including much-needed affordable housing, against protecting the borough's Green Belt and character of the urban area, both of which are important to our residents."

He warned of the risks of removing Green Belt sites from the plan:

"Officers consider that removing sites from the Local Plan would significantly increase the risk of the plan being found unsound at the examination stage. If our Local Plan is found to be unsound, we will have to restart the process again, meaning we will be without an up-to-date Local Plan for longer."

Councillor Julie Morris (Lib Dem College) expressed her sympathy for the petition's intentions but highlighted the challenges of

late-stage changes:

"The problem with this petition is that it's quite late in the day. Whilst I have every sympathy with its intentions and what it says, it's actually quite difficult to implement that right now. You know, 12 months, 18 months ago, it would have been a different scenario."

Councilor **Bernie Muir** (Conservative Horton) strongly opposed the inclusion of Green Belt land in the Local Plan, emphasizing the importance of protecting such spaces:

"Releasing high-quality Green Belt should be avoided at any time... Without this housing, our homeless levels will grow, not reduce. Releasing high-quality Green Belt without achieving a very significant benefit by doing so would be contrary to the NPPF and totally unacceptable."

Councilor **Clive Woodbridge** (RA Ewell Village) cautioned against removing Green Belt sites, citing the experience of Elmbridge Council:

"Elmbridge... submitted a Local Plan with no Green Belt and a multiplicity of smaller brownfield sites. They are now faced with the option of either withdrawing it or having it found unsound. The inspector argued that the brownfield-only approach adopted would fail to deliver anything near the level of need for the planned period."

Final Debate on the Draft Local Plan

When the draft Local Plan was introduced, Councillor **Neil Dallen** (RA Town) summarized the difficult position faced by the Council:

"Nobody wants to build on Green Belt, but there is not enough brownfield land. The risk is that this won't be accepted, and we'll be in even bigger trouble."

Councillor Jan Mason (RA Ruxley) criticized the concentration of development in certain areas:

"You're talking about the most densely populated part of this borough. This isn't well thought out... There will only be harm."

Councillor Chris Ames, (Labour Court) condemned the lack of affordable housing:

"This plan... will only deliver just over 1,000 affordable homes... fewer than 400 social rented homes by 2040. This is not sound."

Clive Woodbridge defended the plan as a balanced approach:

"It delivers badly needed homes while protecting most of the Green Belt and maintaining the character of our borough."

Outcome of the Vote

The Council ultimately voted on the draft Local Plan without amendments. The majority supported the plan, although several councillors abstained or voted against it. Councillor **Peter O'Donovan**'s remarks highlighted the Council's predicament:

"This is the plan we have in front of us, and this is what we need to vote on today."

Those opposing the plan, like Councillor Jan Mason, stood firm in their dissent:

"I'm personally against this plan... This isn't something that will suit Ruxley and West Ewell."

Conclusion

The Full Council's debate underscored deep divisions over the Local Plan. While the plan's supporters argued it represented a necessary compromise to meet government targets and protect the borough's future, its critics condemned the perceived sacrifice of Green Belt land and insufficient affordable housing. The council's approval of the draft plan marked a critical step forward, but the contention surrounding it suggests continued challenges as the plan progresses to examination.

The Voting: 16 FOR, 8 Against and 7 Abstentions.

Councillors Who Voted FOR:

- Arthur Abdulin, Residents' Association, Town Ward
- Steve Bridger, Residents' Association, Stamford Ward
- Neil Dallen, Residents' Association, Town Ward
- Liz Frost, Residents' Association, Woodcote and Langley Vale Ward
- Shanice Goldman, Residents' Association, Nonsuch Ward
- Rachel King, Residents' Association, Town Ward
- Robert Leach, Residents' Association, Nonsuch Ward
- Steven McCormick, Residents' Association, Woodcote and Langley Vale Ward
- Phil Neale, Residents' Association, Cuddington Ward
- Peter O'Donovan, Residents' Association, Ewell Court Ward
- Humphrey Reynolds, Residents' Association, West Ewell Ward
- Alan Williamson, Residents' Association, West Ewell Ward
- Clive Woodbridge, Residents' Association, Ewell Village Ward
- John Beckett, Residents' Association, Auriol Ward
- Hannah Dalton, Residents' Association, Stoneleigh Ward
- Chris Watson, Residents' Association, Ewell Court Ward

Councillors Who Voted AGAINST:

- Rob Geleit, Labour, Court Ward
- Christine Howells, Residents' Association, Nonsuch Ward
- Alison Kelly, Liberal Democrat, Stamford Ward
- James Lawrence, Liberal Democrat, College Ward
- Bernie Muir, Conservative, Horton Ward
- Kieran Persand, Conservative, Horton Ward
- Julie Morris, Liberal Democrat, College Ward
- Jan Mason, Residents Association, Ruxley Ward

Councillors Who ABSTAINED:

- Chris Ames, Labour, Court Ward
- Kate Chinn, Labour, Court Ward
- Christine Cleveland, Residents' Association, Ewell Village Ward
- Bernice Froud, Residents' Association, Woodcote and Langley Vale Ward
- Tony Froud, Residents' Association, Stoneleigh Ward
- Darren Talbot, Residents' Association, Auriol Ward
- Graham Jones, Residents' Association, Cuddington Ward

Procedural criticisms and more:

The **Epsom Green Belt Group** has raised significant concerns regarding the procedural handling of the Local Plan by the Residents Association-led council. They argue that the process lacked transparency and adequate opportunities for scrutiny.

In their press release, the Group stated:

"For almost two years, since the regulation 18 consultation in early 2023, the public has been waiting to see what would be included in the Local Plan, whilst lobbying for the protection of the Green Belt, submitting a 10,000-member petition, holding rallies and writing to councillors. Requests were made to discuss the Local Plan and the treatment of Green Belt in the fourth quarter of 2023, in July 2024, and in September 2024. Nothing was shared, and nothing debated until November 2024."

This lack of earlier discussion and public involvement was also echoed during the Full Council meeting. Councillor **James Lawrence** (LibDem College) highlighted the limited opportunities for councillors to engage in substantive discussions:

"There have been cases where we could have been involved, such as after the briefings. There's nothing wrong with having briefings, but those were never brought into the public domain until a few weeks ago."

The Group also pointed to restrictions on questioning during the December 2024 Full Council meeting, which they argued severely limited proper scrutiny of the Local Plan. They noted that only five questions were permitted in total, with some councillors, such as Councillor Mason, restricted from raising further queries, and others, like Councillor Lawrence, unable to pose any additional questions. Councillor Mason's frustration was evident:

"I had more to ask about the Green Belt allocations and the housing numbers, but I was told I had used up my chance. How is this adequate scrutiny for a plan that decides the future of this borough for 16 years?"

Additionally, the Group criticized the Residents Association for missing the opportunity to submit the Local Plan under the existing National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) guidelines, which would have allowed for greater flexibility in protecting the Green Belt. They claim that the refusal to expedite the Local Plan's preparation has exposed the borough to heightened housing targets under new rules.

Councillor **Hannah Dalton** (RA Stoneleigh) expressed the challenge of navigating a rapidly changing regulatory landscape but stopped short of endorsing the Group's criticism of delays:

"We've got numbers that have changed. We've got new government ambitions. We want to build affordable and social housing. Whatever we do, it's not going to satisfy everybody. That is the nature of Local Plans."

The Group also accused the council of opening the floodgates for further Green Belt development by including high-quality Green Belt sites in the Local Plan. Councilor O'Donovan, however, defended the approach as a necessary trade-off:

"By including a small portion of Green Belt in the plan, we ensure protections for the rest. Without a Local Plan in place, developers will have greater freedom to target any Green Belt site."

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."

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.

Conflict on Epsom's Green Belt plans of another kind?

On the eve of an important meeting of the Licensing, Planning and Policy Committee on the future of the Borough's Local Plan, housing and Green Belt development, Epsom & Ewell Borough Council (EEBC) is under fire following allegations of inadequate handling of a perceived conflict of interest involving its planning consultant, Mr. **Derek Stebbing**, and his employer, **Strutt & Parker** (S&P). The controversy centres on Mr. Stebbings' advice to permit housing development on Green Belt land in the borough while S&P maintains a business relationship with the Church Commissioners (CC), significant landowners of Green Belt land in the area.

EEBC has also been accused of silencing public concerns. Campaigner **Sam Bentall** was barred from addressing a key council meeting after being accused of making defamatory claims about the alleged conflict. Emails exchanged between Ms. Bentall and the council reveal a contentious and somewhat opaque process.

Ms. Bentall attempted to raise her concerns at a meeting of the council's Licensing, Planning, and Policy Committee (LPPC). However, she was refused the opportunity to speak. The council justified its decision by claiming her assertions of a conflict of interest were defamatory. In an email exchange seen by the Epsom and Ewell Times, Ms. Bentall expressed frustration, stating, "I am being silenced for highlighting genuine concerns about transparency in the planning process."

The crux of the controversy lies in Mr. Stebbing's dual roles:

As a consultant to EEBC, Mr. Stebbing has advised on the Local Plan, including housing developments on Green Belt land such as Horton Farm. Strutt & Parker's website states it "has appointed Derek Stebbing as planning policy consultant to advise its national development and planning team in assisting clients in navigating the planning process."

S&P have the Church Commissioners, owners of Horton Farm, as one of its clients. During a telephone interview with Epsom and Ewell Times, Mr. Stebbings denied any direct advisory role to CC, stating: "I do not advise the Church Commissioners at all, whether in Epsom & Ewell or elsewhere." He acknowledged, however, that CC is a major client of S&P and asserted that "Chinese walls" within the company prevented any conflict of interest.

One Councillor, who asked not to be named, confirmed that the consultant advised Councillors of the need to allow Horton Farm to be developed for housing. "I accept that he may not have known the owner of the land was a client of his employer but the perception of a risk of a conflict of interest cannot be ignored."

The Council was invited to comment and replied it had no comment.

Some local groups have sharply criticized the council's draft Local Plan, which includes proposals to develop nearly 60 hectares of Green Belt land. In a letter to the Epsom and Ewell Times, the Epsom Green Belt Group challenged the council's justification for building on high-quality Green Belt areas like Horton Farm.

"The draft plan proposes the loss of almost 60 hectares of Green Belt land, of which 87% is ranked as High Quality. Horton Farm is one of the highest-ranked areas and unsuitable for development due to flooding risks, traffic impacts, and lack of infrastructure," the group wrote. They argue that the plan unnecessarily sacrifices pristine Green Belt land when alternative solutions exist.

The council has faced widespread criticism for delays in finalizing the Local Plan, now eight years overdue. While the Epsom Civic Society has urged swift adoption to prevent speculative development, other voices, including the Green Belt Group, caution against rushing a flawed plan.

"Submitting a bad plan, unnecessarily and inappropriately destroying huge areas of Green Belt, would be unforgivable," the Green Belt Group warned. They advocate revising the plan to remove high-quality Green Belt sites like Horton Farm before submission.

Related reports:

Epsom Civic Society say Local Plan should be agreed on Wednesday

Epsom and Ewell Green Belt battle lines drawing near

Call to Epsom and Ewell Council to speed plan denied

Epsom Local Plan controversy heats up

Time to press the gas on Epsom's Local Plan?

Epsom and Ewell Brace for Government Housing Targets

Epsom Civic Society say Local Plan should be agreed on Wednesday

The **Epsom Civic Society** (ECS) (motto being "Shaping the future, safeguarding the past") has urged councillors to support the borough's draft Local Plan, warning of the risks associated with further delays. In a press release issued yesterday, ECS Chair **Margaret Hollins** emphasised the importance of progressing the Plan to protect Epsom from speculative and inappropriate development.

"For the past eight years, our newsletters have chronicled the ongoing saga of Epsom's efforts to adopt a new Local Plan," Ms Hollins stated. "Without an up-to-date Plan, the Borough remains vulnerable to developments that may not align with the character and needs of our community."

The Society acknowledges the challenges posed by central government planning reforms, which have increased housing targets and tightened timescales for Local Plan updates. While the draft Plan falls short of fully meeting housing targets, ECS believes it represents the borough's best chance of success in the face of these constraints.

In a letter to members of the council's Licensing and Planning Policy Committee, ECS highlighted the consequences of rejecting the draft. "Having no meaningful Plan to take forward to the next stage is significantly more threatening," the letter warns. "Without an up-to-date Plan, the Borough faces prolonged vulnerability to speculative development, which could lead to inappropriate urban projects and greater threats to the Green Belt."

The letter acknowledges the difficult compromises required in the draft Plan, including limited encroachments on less strategically important Green Belt land. However, ECS views this as a necessary trade-off to protect higher-value areas and secure much-needed housing. The Society is urging councillors to act swiftly, particularly given anticipated changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which may increase housing pressures further in the new year.

"Some compromise now is the best way to defend the rest [of the Green Belt]," the press release concluded. ECS is advocating for the adoption of the Plan as recommended in the council's report, emphasising the risks and costs of restarting the process.

The Licensing and Planning Policy Committee will meet tomorrow to consider the draft Local Plan. The decision could shape the future of development in Epsom for years to come.

Councillors now face the challenging task of balancing housing needs with the preservation of the borough's character and natural assets, while navigating increasingly stringent national planning policies. All eyes are on Wednesday's meeting to see how they respond to the Civic Society's call for decisive action.

Related reports:

Numerous. Search "Local Plan"

Proposed Battery Energy Storage System Near Ashtead Common Faces Objections

Plans to install a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) near Ashtead Common have sparked significant opposition from local conservation groups and residents. The proposed facility, intended to support renewable energy integration and grid stability, has raised environmental and safety concerns, particularly given its proximity to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Ashtead Common National Nature Reserve.

The Proposal

Bluestone Energy Ltd has submitted plans to Mole Valley District Council for the installation of a BESS facility near Barnett Wood Lane, Ashtead. The project includes underground cabling, access roads, security fencing, and biodiversity enhancements. Proponents argue that the facility is vital for managing energy supply fluctuations, particularly with the increasing reliance on

renewable energy sources.

Benefits of BESS Technology

Battery Energy Storage Systems play a crucial role in modern energy infrastructure:

- **Renewable Energy Support:** BESS allows for the storage of solar and wind energy for use during periods of low generation, helping to stabilise energy supply.
- **Grid Stability:** These systems can manage fluctuations in electricity demand, reducing the strain on power grids.
- **Emergency Power:** They provide backup electricity during outages, making them indispensable for critical infrastructure.
- **Environmental Gains:** By reducing reliance on fossil fuel-powered plants, BESS supports the UK's transition to a low-carbon energy system.

Potential Hazards

Despite their advantages, BESS technology carries significant risks:

- **Fire Hazards:** Lithium-ion batteries, commonly used in these systems, are susceptible to thermal runaway, leading to fires that are difficult to extinguish and can reignite.
- **Environmental Impacts:** Manufacturing and disposal of batteries contribute to pollution if not carefully managed. Additionally, construction can disrupt local ecosystems.
- Noise and Light Pollution: Ongoing operations may disturb nearby wildlife and residents.
- Land Use Concerns: Large-scale facilities can lead to habitat fragmentation and loss of natural landscapes.

Objections Raised

1. Environmental Concerns

The City of London Corporation, which manages Ashtead Common, highlights the potential harm to local wildlife, including bat species protected under national and international law. Their letter of objection emphasises the detrimental impact of light, noise, and habitat fragmentation on these species. Ashtead Common is home to ancient oak pollards and biodiversity of national significance, further underscoring the ecological risks.

2. Fire Risks

Ashtead Common has a history of significant biodiversity loss due to wildfires. Objectors express concerns over the fire hazards posed by lithium-ion batteries, particularly given the facility's location and prevailing winds. The proposed water tank is deemed insufficient to address thermal runaway events effectively.

3. Green Belt and Landscape Impact

Councillor Andy Smith notes the intrusion on Green Belt land, citing concerns about coalescence, encroachment, and loss of openness. He argues that such developments undermine the distinct landscape qualities of the countryside and suggests that the facility's location does not align with local conservation goals.

4. Ouestionable Site Selection

Critics question the necessity of placing the facility adjacent to Ashtead Common when closer alternatives to the Chessington substation could reduce environmental impact and energy loss. They argue that the benefits outlined by the developer are generic to any BESS project and fail to justify the chosen location.

5. Opportunity Cost

The City of London Corporation suggests that the land, currently transitioning to a natural habitat, offers better long-term biodiversity potential if left undisturbed. They challenge the proposed biodiversity net gain enhancements, arguing that natural succession would achieve similar, if not superior, outcomes without artificial intervention.

Public Sentiment

While there is broad acknowledgment of the need for renewable energy infrastructure, local stakeholders believe this project's costs outweigh its benefits. "We need to modernise our energy systems, but not at the expense of our precious natural habitats," commented one resident.

Next Steps

The planning application is under review by Mole Valley District Council. Public and expert feedback will weigh heavily on the decision, particularly given the sensitive location and environmental stakes.

Balancing Progress and Preservation

The debate over the proposed BESS facility near Ashtead Common encapsulates a broader challenge: balancing the urgent need for renewable energy infrastructure with the equally critical imperative to protect natural ecosystems. As local authorities deliberate, the outcome may set a precedent for future developments in similar areas.

Epsom and Ewell Green Belt battle lines drawing near

The latest draft of the Local Plan has just been revealed. The headline news is that the housing target has been significantly reduced by omitting the Ewell East Station Green Belt site but the Horton Farm and Hook Road Arena Green Belt sites have been retained.

Decision time is coming with the key Council committee meeting to deliberate on the Local Plan on 20th November and Full Council due to meet on 10th December.

The campaigning group Epsom Green Belt has sent to the Epsom and Ewell Times a detailed analysis criticising delays, costs, and lack of transparency in the ongoing development of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council's Local Plan. The findings highlight that a six-month "pause" in 2023, frequently cited by the ruling Residents' Association councillors as the reason for the current tight schedule, didn't halt progress entirely. During this period, some work continued, including transport assessments, suggesting that time lost was minimal and that the pause alone doesn't fully explain the prolonged delays in the Local Plan's timeline.

The study notes that, after work resumed in December 2023, the Council extended the Local Plan timetable by 11 months, meaning there was effectively a five-month gain rather than a loss. Statements made by Councillors Peter O'Donovan (Chair of the Licensing Planning and Policy Committee) and Hannah Dalton (Leader of the RA Group) that the pause led to delays which prevent the Council from accelerating the current timetable to avoid higher housing targets are challenged.

The review shows that delays have, in fact, compounded over years: since 2017, the Local Plan timeline has stretched by an additional seven and a half years, while budget overruns now exceed £1.7 million. A portion of this funding, nearly £742,000, was reallocated from the New Homes Bonus Grant—intended to reflect community priorities—without consulting residents.

Meanwhile, Epsom and Ewell Borough Council has issued a press release reaffirming its commitment to a comprehensive and balanced Local Plan, which will be discussed at the Licensing and Planning Policy Committee (LPPC) meeting on 20 November. At this meeting, the LPPC will make its recommendation to Full Council, which is scheduled to vote in December. Councillor O'Donovan, Chair of the LPPC, described the Local Plan as a "vital and cross-cutting document" that will influence all areas of local development, from supporting the economy and creating affordable housing to protecting the environment and enhancing biodiversity.

Acknowledging that residents may have mixed reactions, Councillor O'Donovan stated, "There is now a full suite of Evidence Base reports to support the Proposed Submission Local Plan, including feedback from last year's Regulation 18 consultation." He encouraged residents to review these reports and attend the LPPC meeting, highlighting the council's aim to create a Local Plan

that secures a "thriving future" for the borough.

The Epsom Green Belt analysis further reveals that reporting on Local Plan progress largely ceased after 2019, raising questions about accountability. A 2018 agreement to regularly update councillors on the Local Plan's status appears to have lapsed, leaving minimal scrutiny over the plan's extended timeline and growing costs. The Group urges the council to enhance transparency and engage more actively with the public, particularly on spending decisions like the New Homes Bonus Grant, which it is contended was reallocated without community input.

With the next public consultation (Regulation 19) anticipated to open following Full Council's approval, residents have another chance to voice their opinions. Councillor O'Donovan encourages those interested to register for updates on the Council's website

The coming weeks will be critical in determining the future development and preservation of Epsom and Ewell.

Related reports:

Call to Epsom and Ewell Council to speed plan denied

Epsom Local Plan controversy heats up

Time to press the gas on Epsom's Local Plan?

Epsom and Ewell Brace for Government Housing Targets

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Image: Solar Power farm unrelated to University

Surrey Police HQ redesign will quieten the dogs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mrs Townsend added: "Mount Browne has been Surrey Police's home for over 70 years, but the buildings here are run down, expensive to maintain and simply no longer meet the requirements of a modern police force."

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

Image - unrelated dog in a kennel

Did a fair view prevail on Epsom's modular homes for the homeless?

The decision by Epsom & Ewell Borough Council 7th November to approve three modular homes for temporary accommodation on Fairview Road has ignited a fierce debate. The council framed this decision as a compassionate and financially prudent response to an acute housing crisis, while residents, local leaders, and some council members aired strong concerns about road safety, infrastructure, and the integrity of the planning process.

A Much-Needed Solution, According to the Council

The council has justified the development as a crucial step in addressing homelessness in the borough, where families are often displaced to temporary accommodations outside Epsom, causing significant disruptions to their lives. With over 160 households in temporary housing and 90 more in costly nightly-paid accommodation outside the borough, the need for local temporary housing solutions is undeniable.

Councillor **Clive Woodbridge**, (RA Ewell Village) Chair of the Community and Wellbeing Committee, remarked in the council's press release, "Epsom & Ewell has proportionately one of the highest numbers of homeless households living in temporary accommodation in England. Increasing temporary accommodation provision for local families will not only be life-changing for those being housed now and in the future but will also have a positive impact on the borough as a whole."

The council also highlighted the economic benefits of the modular homes. According to their press release, the development could reduce the need for expensive nightly-paid accommodation, generating long-term savings. Funding for the project includes £75,000 from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities' Brownfield Land Relief Fund. "This project is a decent thing to do," Councillor **Humphrey Reynolds** (RA West Ewell) noted during the meeting. "We need to find somewhere for families to live."

Road Safety and Infrastructure Concerns Dominate the Meeting

The Planning Committee meeting, was chaired by Councillor **Steven McCormick**, (RA Woodcote and Langley) and the meeting revealed divisions on the issue. Many residents and councillors raised significant concerns about the state of Fairview Road, a narrow, privately maintained road with limited pedestrian pathways, which is already busy with schoolchildren and local traffic.

The Principal Planning Officer, introduced the application, clarifying that the site has existing access from Fairview Road and is currently overgrown, having previously served as a builder's storage yard. She explained that the modular buildings would "meet a significantly higher standard of temporary accommodation" than current options in the borough.

However, Fairview Road residents, represented by **Debbie Ransom**, voiced fears about the impact of the development on local traffic and safety. "The road is already hazardous, narrow, and below minimum width standards," Ransom asserted. "With this development, traffic on Fairview Road could increase by 50%, and the road simply cannot sustain that increase. It is already dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists due to insufficient lighting and narrow paths."

This sentiment was echoed by **Jo Garrod**, Headteacher of nearby **Glyn School**. "Fairview Road is extremely narrow, with no dedicated pavement and poor lighting, which makes it difficult for our students to walk safely," Garrod said in a formal objection. "Any increase in traffic will heighten the risk of accidents."

Legal Challenges and Community Impact

The legal right of the council to use Fairview Road as an access point was also questioned. Residents claim that the council lost its legal right to access the site via Fairview Road when it sold an easement to Sainsbury's for access through an adjacent car park. "The council no longer has the right of access through Fairview Road, and we as residents have refused to grant such an easement," Ransom stated on behalf of residents. She argued that any additional wear and tear on the road, already funded by resident contributions, would be unacceptable.

Councillor **Alison Kelly** (Liberal Democrat Stamford) queried whether alternative access routes had been considered, such as Kiln Lane, but the officer responded that the council could only assess the application as submitted. "It's up to the applicant to propose alternative access, not the council," she said, adding that Surrey County Council had raised no objections based on road safety.

The discussion revealed frustrations among councillors who felt limited by what they saw as procedural obstacles. "If this was an adopted road, we'd be looking at solutions like yellow lines or even street lighting to improve safety," Councillor **Jan Mason** (RA Ruxley) said. "But with this private road, we're stymied. Surrey County Council has done nothing to mitigate these issues, and I find it difficult to believe that they wouldn't see a problem here."

Balancing Homelessness Needs and Community Safety

While the safety issues were widely acknowledged, some councillors, including **Kate Chinn** (Labour Court), stressed the need to consider the positive impact of the development on the borough's homeless families. "For many families facing eviction through no fault of their own, the option to stay within the borough is critical," said Chinn. "These modular homes could offer stability and security, allowing children to stay in their schools and families to keep local support systems."

Councillor **Lucy McIntyre** (RA West Ewell) also voiced support, stating, "I understand the residents' objections, but I believe these units represent a positive step for the borough overall, especially with the council's focus on homelessness."

However, other councillors, such as Jan Mason, remained sceptical. "It's all very well to support homelessness initiatives, but this road simply isn't suitable for further development," Mason argued. "Adding three units to this unsuitable road will only make matters worse, and we've got no way to improve the infrastructure to make it safer."

Conditions and Approval Amid Ongoing Concerns

The committee approved the development on a temporary five-year basis, subject to several conditions, including amendments to conditions to reflect a review of the scheme's necessity and to ensure parking spaces were allocated to individual units. The council stipulated that after five years, a review would assess if there remained a need for such temporary accommodation.

During the discussion, Councillor **Phil Neale** (RA Cuddington) queried the proposed red colour of the modular units in the CAD drawings, expressing concerns that it might clash with the neighbourhood's character. Planning officer clarified that the colour was a default setting in the drawings, not the intended final appearance, and that materials and finishes would be selected to harmonise as much as possible with the area.

In the end, the vote carried with seven members supporting the application, zero opposing, and one abstention. Councillor Phil Neale, reflecting on the vote, stated, "We know this is a tough decision, but as councillors, we live in the borough, we know the people, and we understand the difficulties of homelessness. We have to be both compassionate and professional in our decisions, and I believe this project warrants support."

A Divisive Outcome

The approval of these modular homes highlights a difficult balancing act in Epsom & Ewell, where urgent social needs clash with established community concerns and limited local infrastructure. While the council aims to address a pressing homelessness crisis, residents worry that Fairview Road lacks the capacity and infrastructure to absorb additional traffic and maintain safety.

As this project proceeds, the council will need to navigate ongoing concerns about road access, safety improvements, and potential legal challenges from residents. For now, the decision stands as a testament to the challenges councils face in balancing local development with the needs of vulnerable populations.

Related reports:

Epsom's homelessness crisis

What are the solutions to Epsom's homeless crisis?