

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

14 January 2026



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Why is the council paying?

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

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

Opposition fury

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Council response

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

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

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

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

Places Leisure

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

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

Additional reporting from Epsom and Ewell Times:

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

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

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

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

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

Sam Jones – Reporter



Related reports:

Epsom’s Rainbow Leisure Centre Places new operators

Gold star at the end of the Rainbow

Pot of gold for Rainbow?

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

14 January 2026



Dear Editor,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If Cllr Kingston truly believes, as he claims, that residents should decide how council tax is spent and how their communities are governed, then let us see a

credible alternative framework— with transparent proposals, budget implications, and democratic accountability — ahead of March. Otherwise, the debate will continue to swirl around consultancy-driven options that neither trust nor empower the people they purport to serve.

Yours faithfully,
Trevor Burt

- Related letters and reports:
- Long serving Epsom Councillor blasts LGR and NACs
 - Parish power, democratic ideals — and the Residents’ Association dilemma
 - Have your say on the future of local representation in Epsom and Ewell
 - Epsom and Ewell’s Local Democracy Debate: What’s at Stake as Consultation Enters Phase Two
 - Letters from local Councillors on Epsom and Ewell parishes

Surrey tops Man v FAT contest

14 January 2026



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

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

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

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

H5 How the programme supports players

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

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

H5 Success in Guildford and Woking

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

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

H5 Find out more

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

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

Surrey County Council



.
.
.
.
.
.

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

14 January 2026



Surrey’s self-assessment - and what sits behind it

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

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

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

How independent national data stacks up

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

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

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

Where Epsom and Ewell sits in the Surrey league

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

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

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

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

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

Surrey district and borough waste league table, 2023-24

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

Rank (recycling)	District / Borough	Rubbish per household (kg)	Proportion recycled / reused / composted (%)	Proportion of recycling processed in UK (%)
1	Surrey Heath	341.2	58.9	76.8
2	Guildford	347.5	57.9	84.6
3	Tandridge	361.5	57.8	84.2
4	Waverley	350.0	57.0	75.3
5	Mole Valley	362.1	56.4	72.2
6	Woking	348.1	56.4	73.1
7	Elmbridge	407.5	54.2	72.6
8	Reigate and Banstead	381.2	54.2	96.2
9	Epsom and Ewell	402.3	52.1	63.7
10	Runnymede	386.4	46.8	71.5
11	Spelthorne	439.3	44.5	70.7

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

Who owns the Surrey Environment Partnership?

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

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

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

Sam Jones – Reporter



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

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

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

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

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

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

Long serving Epsom Councillor blasts LGR and NACs

14 January 2026



Dear Editor

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours faithfully,

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

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

Related letters and editorial

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

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

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

Letters from local Councillors on Epsom and Ewell parishes

Problem Pavement Parking Powers Promised

14 January 2026



The Government has announced plans to give councils across England new legal powers to tackle pavement parking, following years of concern from disability groups, parents, and local campaigners about blocked pavements forcing people into the road.

In a statement issued on 8 January, the Department for Transport said the changes are intended to make it easier for local authorities to restrict pavement parking across wider areas, rather than relying on street-by-street restrictions that can be slow and complex to introduce.

The Department said blocked pavements create serious barriers for wheelchair users, parents with pushchairs, blind or partially sighted people, and older residents, limiting independence and making everyday journeys less safe. Ministers say the new approach will allow councils to act where pavement parking causes the greatest local problems, while retaining flexibility where limited pavement parking may still be considered acceptable.

Local Transport Minister Lilian Greenwood said clear pavements are essential for people to move around safely and independently, and that councils will be given the power to “crack down on problem pavement parking” while taking account of local conditions. National organisations including Guide Dogs and the RAC welcomed the announcement, calling for consistent enforcement and proportionate use of the new powers.

Surrey County Council: details awaited

Responding to questions from Epsom and Ewell Times, Surrey County Council said it welcomed the announcement but stressed that it is too early to comment on how it might operate in practice.

A Surrey County Council spokesperson said the authority is “looking forward to finding out more about new powers allowing local authorities to tackle antisocial pavement parking,” but added that further detail is needed on what exactly is proposed and what the powers will entail once introduced. The council said it would be happy to revisit the issue once more information is shared by the Department for Transport.

The Government has said that guidance on how councils should use the new powers will be published later in 2026.

Local MP claims campaign success

The announcement was welcomed by Epsom and Ewell MP **Helen Maguire**, who described it as a significant step forward following sustained local and parliamentary campaigning.

Ms Maguire said she had raised pavement parking repeatedly in Parliament, including through a Westminster Hall debate, an Early Day Motion, written questions to ministers, and local campaigning with residents. She said pavement parking makes streets unsafe and inaccessible, and that no one should be forced into the road when walking to school or the shops.

Following the announcement, the Minister for Local Transport wrote directly to Ms Maguire, thanking her for her advocacy and citing her work in highlighting the challenges caused by pavement parking.

What powers already exist?

At present, pavement parking outside London is not subject to a general nationwide ban. Enforcement relies on a patchwork of existing powers, which can be limited or difficult to apply.

Yellow line parking restrictions, for example, apply from the centre of the carriageway to the highway boundary, which usually includes the pavement. However, these restrictions only apply during the signed controlled hours and do not always prevent vehicles from mounting the pavement if enforcement is not prioritised.

Councils can also act where a vehicle causes an obstruction of the highway, an offence under existing road traffic legislation. In practice, enforcement is often reserved for cases where access is completely blocked, such as preventing wheelchair passage or emergency access. This can leave many partially obstructed pavements unaddressed.

Local authorities may also introduce specific Traffic Regulation Orders banning pavement parking on individual streets or sections of road, but this process can be time-consuming, requires consultation and signage, and is rarely applied borough-wide.

The Government has said the new powers are intended to move away from this piecemeal approach, allowing councils to introduce area-wide pavement parking restrictions more easily, while still permitting exemptions where pavements are wide enough and pedestrian access is not compromised.

What happens next?

The Department for Transport says further guidance will be published later this year, setting out how councils can use the new powers in a proportionate and locally appropriate way. Until then, councils such as Surrey County Council say they are unable to comment on how enforcement might change on the ground.

For residents in Epsom and Ewell, the announcement signals political momentum on an issue that has generated long-standing concern, particularly with food delivery mopeds in the Epsom High Street area, but any practical change to enforcement will depend on the detail of the legislation and how quickly local authorities choose to act once the new framework is in place.

Sam Jones – Reporter



Image: Delivery moped on pavement in Epsom

Related reports:

Pavement Parking: Epsom & Ewell MP Speaks Out

Festival of Friendship -Epsom and Ewell - Ukraine

14 January 2026



From 27 January to 1 February, Epsom and Ewell Borough Council is proud to partner with Epsom and Ewell Refugee Network, Epsom Library, and Epsom Picturehouse to host a borough Festival of Friendship – Ukraine.

This week-long celebration will showcase traditional Ukrainian crafts, music, and cultural heritage, while highlighting the friendships formed between Ukrainian nationals who have settled in the borough and the local community that has welcomed them.

The festival offers a vibrant programme of exhibitions, workshops, films, and live performances, all designed to share Ukrainian culture and foster community connections.

Epsom & Ewell Borough Council has worked with partners to curate and run a week of workshops as part of the Festival of Friendship – Ukraine.

Key Highlights:

- Free Workshops and Exhibitions at Epsom Library, including Ukrainian block printing, paper cutting art, wool crafts, and beading. *Spaces are limited; please arrive early to secure your spot. All materials provided.*
- Film Screenings at Epsom Picturehouse, accompanied by live Ukrainian music performances. *Tickets available via the Epsom Picturehouse website.*
- Children’s Activities, including a treasure hunt, face painting, and a special Paddington Bear appearance, at Epsom Library.

Speaking of the upcoming festival, Councillor **Clive Woodbridge**, (RA Ewell Village) Chair of the Community and Wellbeing Community said, “The Festival of Friendship – Ukraine is a heartwarming celebration of culture and community spirit, it brings together Ukrainian nationals and local residents through shared traditions, crafts, music and friendship. Events like this remind us that kindness and mutual understanding are at the heart of a thriving borough—thank you to everyone helping to make this festival possible.”

Jo Sherring, Lead from Epsom & Ewell Refugee Network added, “Epsom & Ewell Refugee Network are delighted to partner with Epsom & Ewell Borough Council, Epsom Library and Epsom Picturehouse to create this celebration of our friendship with Ukrainian nationals who live in our community. Since the start of the war in Ukraine in 2022, we have been working with Ukrainian nationals who fled to the UK, helping them access work, housing, schools and community. Their courage, resilience and determination have been an example to us. As we have helped them to navigate life in the UK, we have enjoyed building friendships and learning about their culture and traditions.

The Festival of Friendship is a chance for our Ukrainian friends to share their traditions and culture with the local community with activities happening during the week. We hope you will find time to join us during the week to be part of this celebration.”

Festival Timetable Highlights:

- **Tuesday 27 January:** Opening Celebration at Epsom Library; Ukrainian craft workshops and exhibitions.
- **Thursday 29 January:** Performance by Renaissance Choir and screening of *Rocky Road to Berlin* at Epsom Picturehouse.
- **Sunday 1 February:** Music from Yuliia Komyschan (Ukrainian Bandura) followed by screenings of *Sanatorium* and *Home for Ukraine* at Epsom Picturehouse

Epsom and Ewell Borough Council



Related reports:

From Abramovich’s frozen wealth to Epsom’s Ashley Centre – support for Ukraine continues

From Ukraine to Epsom: How Music and Kindness Struck the Right Note

Music and dance for Ukraine at Epsom Methodist Church

Epsom MP leads cross-party delegation to Ukraine to examine impact of explosive weapons

Epsom Stands in Solidarity with Ukraine on War’s Third Anniversary

“Imagine this house is in Epsom” says our man in Ukraine.

and many more. Search “Ukraine”.

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

14 January 2026



EDITORIAL

For nearly ninety years, since the creation by Charter of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council in 1937, the Residents’ Associations have held political control of the council. Their defining claim — and the claim on which generations of RA councillors have been elected — is that they are not a political party. They describe themselves as pragmatic, non-ideological representatives, motivated only by the practical interests of residents and by efficient, modest and locally accountable government.

That historic self-identity now faces its most searching test in decades.

The decision to promote the creation of two new parish or “community” councils — one for Epsom and one for Ewell — at the very moment when Local Government Reorganisation is removing a tier of local government, raises a question that goes to the heart of the RA project. Is the Residents’ Association movement acting in accordance with its founding principles — or is it, for the first time, beginning to behave like the very kind of political body it has always claimed not to be?

The new community councils, if ultimately approved, would initially be responsible only for allotments and for acting as statutory consultees on planning matters. The projected precept would be around £43-£46 per Band D property — yet council reports make clear that the overwhelming share of the budget relates not to allotments but to administrative costs. The ratio highlighted during the council debate — approximately £1.5 million in administration and around £20,000 in allotment management — leaves opponents arguing that residents would be paying for a structure, not a service.

Supporters reply that this is about local voice, continuity and identity under the new East Surrey unitary authority. They argue that unparished areas risk being left behind elsewhere in the country, and that residents deserve the ability to remain represented at a truly local level.

That argument is a respectable one. But it is also a philosophical one.

It places a principle — more tiers of directly elected democratic representation — above the question of whether those tiers provide proportionate value for money or a clear functional purpose. In short, it places democratic ideology ahead of administrative efficiency.

That is — ironically — the kind of approach the Residents’ Associations have historically said they exist to avoid.

A further tension arises when one compares the parish model with the alternative now being piloted elsewhere in Surrey: Neighbourhood Area Committees. These advisory bodies bring together local councillors, police, NHS, voluntary sector leaders and community stakeholders — arguably, the very people most qualified to inform decisions on community priorities. They operate without a precept, at minimal administrative cost, and are designed expressly to improve coordination and engagement under the new unitary structure.

Yet this model does not feature in EEBC’s consultation options.

The consultation preamble instead foregrounds the “potential impact” of losing a local tier of governance, and asks residents to respond within a framework in which the only practical question is whether to establish parish councils — not whether alternative governance models may offer equal or greater benefit at far lower cost.

If the Residents’ Association ethos is one of pragmatism, value for money and minimal bureaucracy, then excluding the lowest-cost participatory model from public consideration is difficult to reconcile with that philosophy.

Some councillors have gone further, suggesting that the drive toward community councils is shaped less by principle than by personal and institutional incentives — that is, by the desire of some existing borough councillors to continue to occupy civic roles in a post-unitary landscape. Whether or not that suspicion is fair, the perception exists, and it has been voiced across party lines during the council debate.

The Residents’ Associations have for generations prided themselves on being the guardians of restrained, businesslike and non-political local government. If they now choose to champion new and potentially expanding administrative bodies — with uncapped taxation powers and initially limited service responsibility — they will need to persuade residents that this is not a departure from that tradition, but a logical extension of it.

That case will need to rest on facts, not sentiment; on function, not symbolism; and on the long-term interests of residents, not on the preservation of municipal office.

As the parish consultation enters its second phase, that is the question at stake: whether the proposals reflect the values the Residents’ Associations have always proclaimed — or whether, in the face of structural change, they risk becoming the very political establishment they were founded to resist.



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

14 January 2026



Epsom & Ewell Borough Council is currently running the second stage of its Community Governance Review (CGR), asking residents whether two new parish-style bodies — Epsom Community Council and Ewell Community Council — should be created to operate beneath the new East Surrey Unitary Authority.

The Epsom & Ewell Times is launching an independent reader survey to invite views not only on Epsom and Ewell Borough Council's proposals, but also on an alternative approach to local consultation and civic participation which is not included in Epsom and Ewell Borough Council's formal consultation. Namely, Neighbour Area Committees.

The Council's consultation

The Borough Council consultation follows its Full Council decision in December to continue exploring the creation of two new parish-style councils. According to the council's press release, the proposed bodies would:

- initially be responsible for allotments
- act as statutory consultees on planning matters
- be funded by a parish precept of around £43-£46 for a Band D property
- hold elections in May 2027 if created

The consultation also asks for views on warding arrangements and councillor numbers for the proposed new bodies.

The Epsom & Ewell Times encourages residents to read the council's consultation material in full and respond to it, whether in favour or opposed, so that the decision ultimately reflects as broad a range of resident opinion as possible.

EEBC CGR Consultation

Why EET is running an additional poll

During the December council debate and in the public correspondence that followed, a number of councillors and residents raised questions about whether the consultation should also invite views on alternative forms of local representation, such as Surrey County Council's pilot Neighbourhood Area Committees, under the new unitary structure. See the Epsom and Ewell Times guide to Neighbour Area Committees [HERE](#)

See letters to the Epsom and Ewell Times from a number of Epsom and Ewell Borough Councillors [HERE](#).

The council's consultation asks residents only whether they wish to establish parish-style community councils and, if so, how they should be constituted. It does not ask whether residents would prefer any alternative approach or different mechanisms for an additional local voice to the 10 Epsom and Ewell elected Councillors to the East Surrey Unitary Authority

The Epsom & Ewell Times believes that the wider discussion about local democracy after 2027 may benefit from hearing resident views on more than one potential model. Our independent survey therefore allows participants to express:

- support for or opposition to the creation of community councils
- support, if any, for the alternative form of additional local consultation of Neighbour Area Committees
- views on cost, value for money and accountability
- opinions on how civic traditions, such as the mayoralty, might continue

The results will not form part of the official consultation process, but may provide an additional picture of community sentiment to inform public debate and future reporting.

Click [HERE](#) to access the Epsom and Ewell Times reader survey

Two platforms, one community conversation

Residents are invited to complete both the council consultation and the Epsom & Ewell Times survey. The two exercises serve different purposes:

- the council consultation forms part of the statutory Community Governance Review
- the EET poll provides a space for residents to express views on a wider range of possibilities and priorities

Both, however, share a common aim — helping to ensure that local voices are heard at a time of significant change in how Epsom and Ewell will be governed in future.

The Epsom & Ewell Times will continue to report on developments in the Community Governance Review, the consultation outcomes and the wider debate about the future of local representation as the borough approaches the transition to the East Surrey Unitary Authority in 2027.

Sam Jones – Reporter



Related reports and articles:

[Parish power, democratic ideals — and the Residents' Association dilemma](#)

[Epsom and Ewell's Local Democracy Debate: What's at Stake as Consultation Enters Phase Two](#)

[Letters from local Councillors on Epsom and Ewell parishes](#)

[Epsom and Ewell Council leader message for 2026](#)

[Long serving Epsom Councillor blasts LGR and NACs](#)

[Neighbour Area Committees \[HERE\]\(#\)](#)

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

14 January 2026



Epsom and Ewell Borough Council has launched the second stage of its Community Governance Review (CGR), inviting residents to give their views on whether two new parish-style bodies — Epsom Community Council and Ewell Community Council — should be created when the borough is abolished in 2027 under Surrey's Local Government Reorganisation.

The consultation runs from 16 December 2025 to 1 February 2026. It proposes that the two new bodies would:

- cover the same geographic area as the present borough
- retain the existing 14 ward structure
- have two elected community councillors per ward
- levy a parish precept of around £43-£46 for a Band D household

If established, the new councils would initially be responsible for allotments and would act as statutory consultees on planning applications. Elections would be expected in May 2027.

The consultation takes place against the backdrop of the transition to the new East Surrey unitary authority, which from April 2027 will replace both borough and county councils across Epsom and Ewell, Tandridge, Reigate and Banstead, Mole Valley and Elmbridge.

The council states that while reorganisation “may open a number of opportunities”, it is also “mindful of the potential impact that losing a more local tier of governance may have for local residents in relation to local representation, resource allocation and priority of services.”

The consultation documents do not present alternative engagement models — such as Surrey County Council's pilot Neighbourhood Area Committees (NACs) — as response options, a point that several opposition councillors have since raised in correspondence with the Epsom and Ewell Times.

Support for Community Councils: Dalton argues democratic voice must be protected

In a detailed response to the Epsom and Ewell Times, Cllr **Hannah Dalton** (RA leader - Stoneleigh Ward) set out the Residents' Association case for progressing the consultation and exploring the creation of community councils.

She notes that Epsom and Ewell “is not alone” in carrying out such reviews, with similar work also under way in a number of other Surrey boroughs and districts. She states that 67% of respondents to the first consultation supported the proposal to investigate community councils further, and argues that residents should not be denied the opportunity to take part in this second and final consultation.

Cllr Dalton links the case for community councils to the scale of democratic change under the new East Surrey authority, writing that the reduction from 35 borough councillors and 5 county councillors to 10 unitary councillors represents “a 75% decrease in democratic representation,” which she describes as “a compelling reason to explore introducing a local Community Council.”

She describes the current proposal as a pragmatic starting point, with a modest precept that would fund administrative capacity and statutory planning consultation functions, while future roles could be agreed with the new unitary authority if appropriate.

Cllr Dalton also expresses scepticism about Surrey's pilot Neighbourhood Area Committees, stating that evidence from other reorganised areas suggests that such bodies “do not have the requisite powers or representation to deliver for the residents they represent.”

Opposition concerns: cost, mandate and scope of responsibilities

Opposition councillors from the Independent, Liberal Democrat and Conservative groups have written separately to the Epsom and Ewell Times to set out their concerns.

Cllr **Alex Coley** (Independent Ruxley) warns that while the consultation presents an initial Band D precept of around £45, costs could rise significantly if community buildings and major assets were later transferred to the new bodies. He argues that residents risk facing an “uncapped” additional tax burden if responsibility for high-maintenance assets is devolved in future years.

Cllr **James Lawrence** (LibDem College) questions the proportionality of the financial model at this stage, highlighting that the only defined operational responsibility is allotment management, while the bulk of projected expenditure relates to administration rather than service delivery. He argues that residents are being asked to approve a structure whose long-term role and cost profile are not yet clear.

Cllr **Bernie Muir** (Conservative Horton) argues that the proposals recreate an additional layer of local government at a time when reorganisation is intended to simplify structures. She questions the value for money of establishing elected community councils when Surrey's Neighbourhood Area Committees are being piloted as a lower-cost forum for local voice and partnership working.

A number of opposition members also point to the relatively small number of responses to the first-stage consultation and argue that this does not amount to a clear mandate for creating new precept-raising bodies.

The letters from Councillors — published in full [HERE](#) on the Epsom and Ewell Times website — set out contrasting views on democratic representation, accountability, taxation and local identity in the new unitary era.

Neighbourhood Area Committees: an alternative model not included in the consultation

Surrey County Council's pilot Neighbourhood Area Committees are currently being evaluated after operating across four areas during 2025.

Surrey describes NACs as advisory partnership forums bringing together councillors, public services, voluntary and community organisations and residents to discuss local priorities. They do not have statutory powers or the ability to levy a precept, and have so far been delivered largely using existing staff resources and modest meeting costs.

Supporters of NACs argue that they provide a mechanism for local influence without creating a new tax-raising organisation. Supporters of community councils counter that advisory bodies cannot substitute for an elected local tier with formal status and statutory consultation rights.

The current CGR consultation does not invite residents to express a preference between these models.

See the Epsom and Ewell Times short guide to Neighbour Area Committees (NAC) [HERE](#).

Participation, turnout and cost-benefit questions

The most recent full borough elections in May 2023 recorded an overall turnout of around 34% across Epsom and Ewell. Some opponents of the community council proposals question whether introducing an additional elected body represents good value where participation in local elections is already comparatively low.

Supporters respond that the reduction in democratic representation under the new unitary structure makes it more important, not less, to retain an additional tier through which residents can engage directly with locally-focused representatives.

The debate therefore continues to centre on differing conceptions of democratic voice, accountability and financial prudence during a period of structural change.

What happens next

The CGR consultation materials and questionnaire are available online and in hard copy at Epsom Town Hall, Bourne Hall, local libraries and the Community & Wellbeing Centre.

Public engagement events are scheduled for January, after which councillors will consider the consultation responses at a special meeting on or before 20 March 2026. At that meeting, the council will decide whether to make a Reorganisation Order to create the two new community councils.

Whatever the outcome, the decision will help shape how local representation, identity and civic life in Epsom and Ewell evolve as the borough approaches its transition into the new East Surrey authority in 2027.

Sam Jones – Reporter



Related reports:

[Councillor letters to the Editor](#)

[Local government reform or just more layers?](#)

[Where do we stand on local government reorganisation in Epsom and Ewell and the County?](#)

[Parishing Epsom and Ewell is unholy?](#)

[Debate Opens on the Future Shape of Surrey's Local Government](#)

[and many more.....](#)