

# Did Epsom and Ewell councillors approve more Green Belt release?

20 May 2026



Epsom and Ewell Borough Council's special Licensing and Planning Policy Committee ("LPPC") meeting on 19 May — convened after a motion by Cllrs **Kieran Persand** (Conservative - Horton), Rob Geleit (Labour - Court) and **Julian Freeman** (LibDem - College) — produced one clear answer to the question troubling many residents: LPPC did not itself vote to approve additional Green Belt land for development.

In summary the effect of the lengthy five-part motion was to ensure Council officers should not be sending revised Local Plan evidence and potentially significant Green Belt-related material to the Inspector without renewed political scrutiny and approval by LPPC / Full Council. All parts of the motion were defeated.

But the two-and-a-half-hour meeting revealed a deeper and increasingly bitter dispute over whether officers have already steered the Local Plan examination towards further Green Belt release without fresh political approval.

The meeting unfolded against the backdrop of continuing examination of EEBC's Local Plan by the Planning Inspectorate and followed recent publication of officer work identifying additional sites "potentially suitable for allocation", including five Green Belt sites, as part of the Inspector's request for further work.

At the centre of the argument lay a constitutional question: once the Local Plan entered examination, did political control of substantive Green Belt decisions remain with councillors — or had delegated authority lawfully passed practical control to officers working under the Inspector's direction?

The atmosphere in the chamber suggested members were debating much more than planning procedure.

Before debate even began, Cllr **Shanice Goldman** (Conservative Nonsuch) made an unusually direct statement from the public seating area challenging how the council had reached this stage. She said delegated authority granted in November 2024 had been understood to concern "small grammatical errors", but had, in her view, later been exercised more broadly than members intended.

"These are not minor administrative matters," she told the committee. "They are material decisions which properly fall within the remit of elected councillors who are accountable to the public." She added: "This issue is bigger than one site or one submission. It goes to the heart of governance, transparency, constitutional process, and public confidence in decision making."

Head of Planning Policy and Economic Development Ian Mawer then delivered a lengthy procedural update attempting to clarify what officers say has — and has not — happened.

Mawer stressed repeatedly that the Local Plan remains the version submitted in March 2025 and that no modifications have yet been made.

"I wish to emphasize that the Local Plan remains as submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in March 2025 as it stands — no changes have been made to it," he said. "It is the Inspector alone that can make changes known as main modifications to address soundness issues."

He explained that the Inspector had required additional work after October 2025 hearings, including revisiting part of the Green Belt Topic Paper and reassessing urban sites. That work, he said, eventually produced 17 sites considered "potentially suitable for allocation" — 12 urban and five Green Belt — but only as evidence to assist the examination.

He also cautioned against confusion over "Grey Belt", noting EEBC's plan is being examined under a pre-Grey-Belt version of national policy.

The procedural explanation did little to calm critics.

Persand opened by objecting that no legal officer was present, saying he had only been informed late in the day. "I feel that we should push this to another date, and then discuss it with a legal officer present," he said. "This is about the delegation of power that was out of scope by officers in the submission of documents."

His motion to defer was seconded by Freeman but failed.

From there the meeting descended into repeated procedural clashes.

When Persand attempted to play a recording from a previous meeting concerning how delegated authority had been described, Chair **Peter O'Donovan** (RA - Ewell Court) stopped him: "You can't play recording... it's not relevant to the motion." Persand countered that recordings were permissible and argued earlier comments were directly relevant to understanding what members thought they had approved.

Freeman challenged the Chair's ruling: "How is it not relevant? Comments that were made at a previous meeting of this committee... when you said something along the lines of... minor grammatical errors and omissions." O'Donovan replied: "I said there were minor grammatical errors... it is not relevant to the motion in front of us."

The core disagreement, however, concerned substance rather than theatre.

Persand argued that documents identifying additional Green Belt land had gone well beyond anything councillors believed officers were authorised to do.

"Submitting a document that has 40% extra Green Belt sites to be allocated, and you're changing the evidence base, is not minor amendments," he said. "That is major material changes. That is completely out of scope of this delegation of power." He warned: "This will go to JR, this will go to Judicial Review."

Freeman broadly backed that critique while distancing criticism from officers personally.

"With the greatest of respect to Mr Mawer, and I know he's an officer doing his job... this plan is for councillors to review and approve, not for officers," he said. "We are the councillors who have been elected to represent this community... and we should not be putting that on officers. I find that behaviour to be disgraceful and reprehensible."

Mawer firmly rejected the suggestion that officers had independently redirected policy.

"We've prepared the documents... under the advice of the Inspector," he said. "We've done the work that is necessary for the examination to proceed." The documents, he stressed, are now published and subject to consultation. "It will be the Inspector ultimately who decides if any extra sites go into the Local Plan."

Pressed by Persand on whether the Inspector had ever explicitly required more Green Belt allocations, Mawer drew a distinction between the Inspector's concerns about unmet housing need and the work requested in response. The Inspector had asked for reassessment, he said; the resulting correspondence led to officers being asked to identify sites "potentially suitable for allocation".

Vice-Chair **Clive Woodbridge** (RA - Ewell Village) attempted several times to steer discussion toward a pragmatic middle ground.

At one point he suggested the motion had been "overtaken by events" but that the committee might still usefully discuss the submitted material. "I don't really see why this committee shouldn't... have the chance to ask questions about the work they've done on the Green Belt."

Later, seeking a compromise on future meetings, Woodbridge proposed softening one motion element so that further LPPC meetings would "update on the Local Plan examination" rather than purport to re-approve already-submitted documents. He acknowledged limits on councillors' powers once the examination is underway but argued members should not face "a complete gap without the opportunity to ask questions."

Labour councillor Rob Geleit was unconvinced by the dilution. "Surely that amendment really eviscerates the whole point, does it not?" he asked.

Substitute member **Christine Howell** (Independent Nonsuch) repeatedly returned the discussion to democratic legitimacy and Green Belt trust.

"If there is even the slightest doubt in anyone's mind about the integrity of this process, it must be reviewed again thoroughly and transparently," she argued, saying residents had expressed "serious concerns and lack of trust" regarding Green Belt inclusion.

In one of the evening's more striking exchanges, Howell sought clarity about councillors' practical role if the Inspector ultimately proposes extra sites.

"So... some [sites] have been identified, and at any set time the Inspector could put them all in... and then we don't have any ability to question that?" she asked.

O'Donovan's reply was blunt: "Yeah, basically, but you have ability to question it through the consultation." He added that members would later be able to vote on the final modified plan. Howell observed that during consultation councillors would effectively be participating "just as a resident, as a neighbour, and not in any position of power or influence." O'Donovan answered: "That's right."

In procedural terms, the committee rejected all five elements of the motion, including proposals to require LPPC review of documents before submission, tighten delegated authority wording, revisit earlier submissions and mandate additional scrutiny meetings.

So did LPPC approve more Green Belt release?

Not directly. The committee did not vote to allocate new Green Belt sites on 19 May. Officers maintained throughout that the Local Plan remains unchanged and that only the Inspector can propose "main modifications". Critics, however, argue that by submitting revised evidence identifying additional "potentially suitable" Green Belt sites without renewed member approval, the council has already moved materially toward expanded Green Belt release during examination.

The public consultation on the new documents runs until 15 June, with a further Inspector's hearing scheduled for 2 July.

For residents trying to understand the state of play, one point emerged clearly from an evening of procedural warfare: the argument is no longer simply about how much Green Belt land might be released, but about who, in practice, is making the decisions.

Sam Jones - Reporter



Related reports:

Persand parses the Local Plan process in Epsom

Next phase in the journey of the Epsom and Ewell Local Plan announced

Epsom and Ewell Local Plan tensions surface as committee debate curtailed by chair

Fresh Local Plan row as councillor questions Green Belt revisions and governance at Epsom and Ewell

Epsom & Ewell's Council responds to Local Plan concerns

and many more ..... search "Local Plan"

Image: Cllrs Freeman, Persand and Geleit at the LPPC meeting - EEBC YouTube channel.