



Epsom Civic Society say Local Plan should be agreed on Wednesday

18 November 2024



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

18 November 2024



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. Questionable 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

18 November 2024



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

18 November 2024



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

18 November 2024



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?

18 November 2024



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?

Another Surrey borough's Local Plan agony

18 November 2024



More than 800 homes will be built on Surrey green belt land as part of a 15 year plan for 9,270 new properties in the north of the county.

It comes after **Spelthorne Borough Council** agreed, last week, to reinstate 13 green belt sites it had removed from its local plan in February.

Opponents have said delays to the borough's planning bible, which sets out where and the types of development that can go ahead for the next 15 years, has turned Spelthorne into "clarion" to be picked off by "vultures".

The council said it changed its position in order to get its housing plan approved under lower targets of 618 a year versus potentially the 700 plus that could come in under national changes to planning law.

Councillor Darren Clarke (Conservative, Laleham and Shepperton Green) spoke out against the hold ups saying residents were "sold a pup" and councillors unable to stop unwanted development.

He said: "The lack of a local plan means that we don't have a five year housing supply.

"This tilts decisions in favour of development, and away from not developing so when we are lobbied by residents to oppose builds we are told by officers that we have no reasons to object.

"We can reject it as the committee and do because we know what good looks like, however the planners can and do apply those with the most money know they will win and we need to pay their expensive legal costs as well

"So we not only end up with buildings which we do not want, lived in by people from potentially outside the borough, hindering, not helping the borough but also a legal bill for us and them, and who pays this, yes the residents.

"We are in a time of planning approval by appeal with developer vultures circling looking at us like carrion.

"What this short sighted administration has done is harm the borough make us look like a laughing stock and cost the residents in hard pounds.

'It's been almost fingers in ears and la la la'

His speech was rebutted by borough leader, Cllr Joanne Sexton who said the so called "pathetic excuse" to delay the local plan had been to protect residents from flooding rather than any quarrels over green belt.

She told the meeting that she was proud and delighted with the work that had gone in to ensure "that now have a statement of common ground with the Environment Agency, who is a key stakeholder, and knows exactly what it is that they needed from us, and I am extremely proud today to be here to be able to take this forward."

Officially the council paused the inspector's examination of its local plan in December 2023 "to allow for training of newly elected councillors" and to consider potential changes to national planning policy.

In February 2024, the council asked the inspector to remove all green belt allocations, with the exception of the two sites for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople.



The council has now decided to return the 13 protected green belt sites back into the plan so they can be used for housing – before going back to the planning inspector with any proposed changes.

The saga dates back even further with the Secretary of State ordering the council to not pause its plan in September 2023 after councillors asked for a hiatus in June – just a month after examination hearings had started at the end of May.

In all, there will be 855 new homes built on Spelthorne's green belt, of which 438 will be affordable.

Spelthorne Borough Council offices in Knowle Green, Staines. Credit: Emily Coady-Stemp

Call to Epsom and Ewell Council to speed plan denied

18 November 2024



Nine opposition councillors on Epsom and Ewell Borough Council are calling for an Emergency Full Council Meeting to fast-track the final stages of the borough's Local Plan amid looming concerns over potential new housing targets set by the central government. The councillors—comprising members of the Liberal Democrats, Labour, and Conservative parties—are urging swift action, fearing that delays could lead to increased housing quotas that would place significant pressure on the borough's cherished green spaces.

The councillors' proposal, initially set out in a formal request dated 24th October, has stirred considerable debate across the council. They propose that the emergency meeting be held immediately following the Licensing and Planning Policy Committee (LPPC) meeting on 20th November or, failing that, on the evening of the 21st November. In doing so, they hope to expedite the draft Local Plan's approval, enabling the next public consultation phase to commence before the year's end.

The Case for Urgency: New Housing Targets and Local Development

At the heart of the opposition councillors' concerns are potential changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which could soon enforce a higher housing target of 817 new homes annually—over double the borough's existing requirement. One opposition councillor highlighted the urgency, warning, "If the Local Plan fails or is found unsound, we will be subject to the Labour government's new targets, which are 817 dwellings per annum."

These new targets, if implemented, could lead to development encroaching on the borough's green spaces, a possibility that has mobilised both councillors and local residents. This anxiety is reflected in the recent appeals from local groups, including the Epsom Green Belt Group, which advocates for focusing on brownfield sites rather than encroaching on protected land.

Council's Response: A Call for Procedural Compliance

In response, council leaders from the Residents' Association majority group have expressed concerns about rushing the Local Plan process, citing the necessity of adhering to legal and procedural requirements. Chair of the LPPC, Councillor **Peter O'Donovan**, (RA Ewell Court) emphasised the importance of a comprehensive review process to ensure that any amendments to the draft Local Plan comply with regulations before it proceeds to public consultation. He stated, "The documents which will form the Regulation 19 consultation must be prepared in accordance with the regulations, including the legally required Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment."

O'Donovan added that should any changes be proposed during the LPPC's 20th November meeting, additional time would be necessary for council officers to update the documentation. Failure to address these requirements, he warned, could result in the plan being deemed "unsound" by government inspectors.

Residents' Association View: Balancing Timeliness and Quality

Residents' Association Leader Councillor **Hannah Dalton** (Stoneleigh), in her response to the opposition's proposal, reiterated the council's commitment to both transparency and quality in the Local Plan's development. Dalton acknowledged the delay caused by a temporary halt in 2023 but argued that accelerating the current schedule could compromise the quality and legal robustness of the plan. "We can't simply 'speed up' to replace six months of lost time," she remarked, noting that the council remains committed to commencing the Regulation 19 public consultation "at the earliest possible opportunity after the November meeting of the LPPC."

In a letter addressing a recent call from the Epsom Green Party, Dalton also noted that bypassing the LPPC's role could undermine the Local Plan's overall integrity. She explained, "Circumventing the LPP meeting... bypasses LPP, which has been tasked with the development of the Local Plan." Any changes agreed upon by Full Council would still require further work to comply with legally mandated procedures, she added.

Epsom Green Party's Intervention: Legal Pathways to Expedite Consultation

Meanwhile, **Janice Baker**, Chair of the Epsom Green Party, recently suggested an alternative approach. In a letter to Dalton, Baker proposed a legally permissible pathway for Full Council to assume the LPPC's role, potentially scheduling a Full Council meeting in place of the LPPC's 20th November session. This approach, she argued, could save several weeks and allow the Regulation 19 consultation to conclude by early January 2025, ahead of the potential NPPF changes.

"Many residents have been frustrated by the lack of open discussion," Baker stated, adding that the proposed approach "provides a chance to avoid this disaster." She further urged that any potential legal impediments to this plan be swiftly addressed by the council's legal team, emphasising that delays could lead to increased housing requirements that would place "extremely significant environmental, financial, and social costs" on the borough.

Residents and Environmental Campaigners Express Growing Concern

The debate has galvanised local community groups and residents who are deeply invested in the borough's planning future. The Epsom Green Belt Group has argued for prioritising brownfield sites to protect greenfield areas and prevent the urban sprawl that they fear could follow under new NPPF guidelines. Their concerns were echoed during the LPPC's October meeting, where residents spoke passionately against any development that could jeopardise the area's green spaces.

Adding further weight to the opposition's argument, local Liberal Democrat leader Councillor **Julie Morris** (College) criticised Mayor **Steven Bridger**'s (RA Stamford) refusal to consider an Emergency Council Meeting (ECM) for 21st November. Bridger had stated that an ECM would not allow sufficient time for officers to finalise the necessary documentation and for councillors to adequately review it. However, Morris rebutted that the ECM was intended "to allow Council as a whole to sign off the draft Local Plan AND any amendments agreed on 20th November," thus expediting the consultation's start before the end of the year.

The opposition councillors are now considering other procedural avenues to press forward with the Local Plan, underscoring their commitment to avoid the looming 817-unit target.

What's Next? A Community on Edge

The path forward for Epsom and Ewell's Local Plan remains uncertain, as councillors and community members await the LPPC's 20th November meeting. The stakes are high for the borough, with questions about housing supply, environmental conservation, and procedural integrity all coming to the fore. The decisions made in the coming weeks will not only determine the scale of future developments but will also shape the borough's character for years to come.

In the words of Councillor Dalton, "Balancing development with the preservation of our borough's character is challenging but essential." With the pressure mounting from opposition members and concerned residents alike, Epsom and Ewell Borough Council faces critical choices as it navigates the complex and often conflicting demands of local governance and sustainable growth.



Related reports:

Opposition Calls for Emergency Council Meeting Over Epsom and Ewell Local Plan

Epsom Local Plan controversy heats up

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

Epsom and Ewell Brace for Government Housing Targets

Opposition Calls for Emergency Council Meeting Over Epsom and Ewell Local Plan

18 November 2024



In a move that underscores growing concerns over the future of development in Epsom and Ewell, nine opposition councillors from the borough council have requested an Emergency Full Council Meeting to accelerate the adoption of the Local Plan. The councillors—comprising four Liberal Democrats, three Labour members, and two Conservatives—are calling for the meeting to take place immediately after the Licensing and Planning Policy Committee (LPPC) on 20th November, or alternatively, on the evening of 21st November.

The opposition's objective is clear: to expedite the council's voting on the draft Local Plan to ensure that the next round of public consultation can proceed swiftly. Councillors are particularly concerned that any delays in finalising the plan could subject Epsom and Ewell to new government-imposed housing targets. These targets, outlined by the current Labour government, could increase the borough's required new dwellings to 817 per year, a significant rise from the existing figure.

One opposition councillor stated, "We all know that if the Local Plan fails or is found unsound or non-compliant, we will be subject to the Labour government's new targets, which are 817 dwellings per annum." The councillors are urging the council leadership to act now to avoid this outcome.

Council's Position: Balancing Housing Needs and Green Space

In response, the leadership of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council, led by the Residents' Association, has emphasised the importance of balancing development with the preservation of the borough's character. Councillor Hannah Dalton, Chair of the Residents' Association, spoke recently about the challenge of providing much-needed housing—particularly affordable housing—while safeguarding the borough's treasured green spaces.

Councillor Peter O'Donovan, Chair of the Licensing and Planning Policy Committee, has reiterated that the council is adhering to a clear timetable. The LPPC is expected to review the Pre-Submission Local Plan at its November meeting, following which the next public consultation phase will commence. O'Donovan stressed the need for a robust evidence base to ensure the Local Plan withstands scrutiny and avoids challenges that could delay or derail the process.

The council is also grappling with an increase in homelessness, which has risen by 95% over the past year, further highlighting the need for new housing, particularly for families. Councillor Clive Woodbridge, Chair of the Community & Wellbeing Committee, outlined the council's efforts to mitigate homelessness, including working with private landlords and providing support to those at risk.

The Stakes: Higher Housing Targets and Green Belt at Risk

The backdrop to this debate is the government's proposed revision to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which includes higher housing targets and reduced protections for Green Belt land. If the Local Plan is not submitted for approval before these changes come into effect, the borough could face the new target of 817 homes per year. For many residents, this raises the spectre of large-scale developments encroaching on green spaces that are integral to the borough's identity.

At a previous LPPC meeting in October, tensions ran high as residents voiced concerns about the potential loss of Green Belt land. The Epsom Green Belt Group, a local campaign organisation, has proposed an alternative plan that focuses on developing brownfield sites instead. They argue that this approach would meet housing targets without sacrificing green spaces.

What Next?

The requested Emergency Full Council Meeting, if granted, would allow all councillors to debate and vote on the draft Local Plan. Whether the meeting will be scheduled remains to be seen, but with growing pressure from both the opposition and the public, the council's next steps will be closely watched.

The stakes are high for Epsom and Ewell. The decisions made in the coming weeks will shape the borough's future, determining how it meets housing demands while preserving the community's much-loved green spaces.

Epsom's neighbour cracks on with its Local Plan

18 November 2024



More than 6,000 new homes will be built in the Surrey borough of Mole Valley, with Leatherhead taking on the largest share after the district council approved its long-term planning bible.

Mole Valley District Council has agreed to build an average of 336 homes a year between 2020 and 2039 with town centre sites in Leatherhead, such as Bull Hill, and Dorking being set aside for large scale housing-led redevelopment.



Office complexes in Ashstead and Dorking have also been earmarked for regeneration, and green belt land in Ashstead, Bookham, Dorking and Leatherhead released so developers can build homes.

The council has also agreed to hand over green belt land for housing within and around Hookwood to "complement" economic growth near Gatwick.

Villages within the green belt, namely Beare Green, Brockham, Capel, Charlwood, and Westcott will have their boundaries amended to allow "appropriate development" after Mole Valley District Council formally adopted its local plan last week (October 15).

In all, Leatherhead is expected to take on 30 per cent of the new homes (1,914), followed by the areas around Dorking 23 per cent (1,467), Hookwood, 15 per cent (957), Ashtead, 11 per cent (701) and Bookham, seven per cent (446).

The remaining 14 per cent (893) will be spread across the rest of the district.

In Leatherhead the council wants to create what it calls, a Riverside Quarter, at Claire House and James House in Bridge Street. This would go alongside an Urban Quarter at the redevelopment of the Bull Hill.

For Dorking, the Pippbrook House refurbishment remains its flagship development as well as plans to redevelop the Foundry Museum and Church Street workshops.

More locally, housing requirements for neighbourhood areas are as follows:

- Ashtead - 652 net new dwellings
- Bookham - 513 net new dwellings
- Capel Parish - 198 net new dwellings
- Ockley Parish - 135 net new dwellings
- Westcott - 123 net new dwellings

Mole Valley District Council, which passed its local plan by 28 votes to five with one abstention, said that 40 per cent of all new units would be affordable, and all come with at least one EV charging point.

The meeting heard that about 76 per cent of Mole Valley land was designated as Metropolitan Green Belt and protected from most forms of development.

Under its new plan, it said it has been able to deliver sites for housing while relinquishing less than one per cent of that.

Had the local plan not been agreed, developers would have had carte blanche to build without restrictions.

Cllr Margaret Cooksey, portfolio holder for planning on the Liberal Democrat run council, said: "It gives me enormous pleasure to be able to bring the local plan to this council for adoption at last.

"The local plan is about much more than a document about meeting housing need but a good deal of time and effort is taken up by worrying about specific development sites, particularly green belt sites,

"It's worth noting again that only 0.65 per cent of the existing green belt in the district has been identified to be released for future development.

"There are sites in most of our wards that we wish were not there however I did say, that I felt that it was a fair plan in as much as what could be seen as pain was spread as evenly as possible across the district."

Local plans go through long drawn-out processes before they are formally adopted, requiring sign off from planning inspectors.

Councils need to identify land for development and demonstrate it can meet housing targets. Often there is a trade off between town centre intensification or protecting green belt.

As well as the housing, the Mole Valley plan creates 230 new locally listed buildings and grants 27 parks and open spaces extra protection.

Dissenting voices in the chamber felt the council could have gone further to limit the impact on green belt while Cllr Chris Hunt (Independent, Ashtead Lanes and Common) said more could be done to curb building heights to stop town's from becoming the next Woking.

He told the meeting: "This is not a sugar coated pill for us to take, it's got some very good things, affordable housing, the commitment for better health and education facilities, those are very positive things.

"But it's also got some really hard to agree things.

He added: "There is still quite a lot of uncertainty about whether a key site in our key town of Leatherhead can actually be developed or not."

Adding: "It's effectively saying that the plan's foundations are uncertain in that regard and unfortunately it does echo something else, that there are no clearly defined density agreements.

"It has lots of good things but if I was on Strictly [Come Dancing] it would not be 10 out of 10, it would be a seven."

Cllr Cooksey said: "We're not Woking, Mole Valley is not Woking and we don't want to look like Woking but there's the dilemma between do we build in the green belt (or in the towns?)

Cllr Leah Mursaleen-Plank (Liberal Democrat, Mickleham, Westcott and Okewood) said her ward has been hit by uncontrolled development "again and again" and called out at those asking to delay the plan's adoption in order to protect more green belt.

She said: "There is no alternative here.

"We have been in a position in my ward where we haven't had a local plan and we've had uncontrolled developments going through over and over again.

"We're losing green belt by delaying further.

"To say that we need more time just means more development on green belt sites, the opposite of what you would like to achieve."

Summing up Cllr Cooksey said: "I'm disappointed that we can't say that it's the overwhelming view of the whole council, it would have been very much stronger if we could have had support from the whole chamber.

'However we have an excellent plan here, I truly believe it and really think it's probably the best we could probably have come up with under all the circumstances that we've had to deal with over the years.'

Mole Valley covers 25,832 hectares, 16 per cent of Surrey as a whole and is the third largest borough in the county.

Its population of 87,245 accounts for seven per cent of Surrey's total, while the average house price of £505,000 makes it second most expensive district in the county.

The ratio of house prices to residents' salaries was 14:1 in March 2020, the fifth most unaffordable district in Surrey.

Between 2014 and 2019, 1,265 new homes were completed in Mole Valley - 230 of which were affordable.

Related reports:

Mole Valley 'won't bend' to petitioners

Mole Valley Plan Paused

Artistic Impression Of The Arrival Square from North Street, south east corner. (Credit: Mole Valley District Council and Keir Property)