

# Worrying about voter ID law

2 April 2023



Voter disenfranchisement and how to overcome it was discussed at **Reigate and Banstead Borough Council** Thursday 30th March as the authority wound up its business ahead of the May 4 elections.

The country goes to the polls in a little over a month amid the “biggest change to the electoral process in decades” as people will be required to present valid photo identification before casting their ballot.

Councillor **Ruth Ritter**, during questions from members at the March 30 full council meeting, asked what measures were in place to feed back on its impact on turnout.

She said: “At a time when voter turnout for local elections in Reigate and Banstead Borough Council was as low as 29 per cent in one ward last year and voters need to be encouraged to partake in democracy. Voter ID is the biggest change to the electoral process in decades, and it will affect voters in polling stations at the upcoming elections on May 4. It is therefore important that we have assurances that voters aren’t being disenfranchised by this significant change.

“With that in mind, will the returning officer be gathering data on how many people are unable to vote at polling stations due to not having appropriate ID so that this data can be fed back to national government?”

Last time the average turnout for the borough was 35 percent two power cent higher than the national leverage last year.

Responding was **Mari Roberts-Wood**, managing director at Reigate Borough Council whose responsibilities include increasing participation in elections.

She spoke of the “extensive communications about the massive changes to electoral law” and how the council had been targeting hard-to-reach groups such as younger voters and the elderly.

Ms Roberts-Wood said: “We can always do more and should do more and with the introduction of voter ID we need to do more than ever.”

Councils, she said, would also be collecting data from polling stations about the impact of the legislation and sending that to the electoral commission – who will be collecting the data centrally.

A report on its impact is expected to be published in November this year.

She said: “This data will include the number of voters who are essentially refused a ballot paper due to suspected forgery or impersonation, or they failed to answer the statutory required questions, they showed the wrong ID – there are 23 different types of ID that you can show on May 4. For those who don’t have one of those or don’t have any ID at all we will be collecting that data. Also recording those asked to show their ID in private and those who are refused a ballot paper but returned with a valid ID. We’re trying to capture as much as possible.”

She added that it was an “opportunity to collect a lot of data to understand the impact of these changes and hopefully increase our reach coming forward”.

Reigate and Banstead Council has a voter ID section on its website that people can use to ensure they can vote on May 4.

Related reports:

No photo – no vote!

Image credit: Crown Copyright fair use and DVLA CC BY-SA 3.0

# Jail for prolific Epsom burglar who preyed on vulnerable women

2 April 2023

Thanks to the determination of Surrey officers, a prolific burglar from Epsom has found himself sentenced to over three years behind bars.

Frank Smith, 27, from Rutland Close was sentenced at Guildford Crown Court on Friday (17 March), after he pleaded guilty to 19 offences over the last year making the lives of many in the borough of Epsom and Ewell a misery.

Victims spoke about being left “traumatised and anxious” after being targeted by Smith, with one saying: “I should feel safe in my home and not have to worry about things like I do, because of him”.

Another victim described how she had been “manipulated” by Smith and said it was “hard to trust people after what he

did”.

A woman whose house was burgled by Smith said: “It is very difficult to put across in words how devastating it has been for me, and my family, to suffer such a violation of our home, peace of mind and family life.

“Home should be a safe and comforting place, but since the burglary, both of my children are deeply afraid to be in the house. Our home was utterly ransacked. My children’s belongings were strewn on the floor, my daughter’s toys and horse figures were left broken and they had even broken into her money box.”

In this series of offences, which started in May 2022, Smith pleaded guilty to a burglary at Buildbase in Epsom, where he stole tools totalling £4,400.

That same month he stole a black Peugeot 3008 from outside a takeaway while the owner was inside the restaurant. This was followed by the theft of a VW van from the forecourt of a petrol station while its owner was in the garage paying for fuel. He later burgled the Co-Op store on Chessington Road, Epsom managing to get into the safe in the staff room and taking several hundred pounds.

In June 2022, whilst on bail under investigation for these offences, Smith saw a woman taking out cash from a Sainsbury’s in Epsom. He then followed her outside and back to her car. She described how Smith ran past her and snatched her bag out of her trolley whilst she was unloading shopping into the boot. The cost to the victim was estimated to be around £1,000 as she had to change the locks to her home, order replacement car keys and get a new phone. Her bank cards were then used shortly after to make two purchases totalling just under £60. Smith was caught on CCTV getting lottery scratch cards and making contactless payments, while holding the cash he had taken from her.

Smith then moved on to targeting private homes. After going out for the day, an elderly woman returned home to find a whole drawer missing from her dresser which had contained jewellery including a gold watch, two bracelets and several pairs of earrings with a total value of around £4,000. Smith was caught on CCTV carrying the drawer with its contents partly visible.

In July 2022, Smith approached an 83-year-old woman as she was being dropped home, telling her that she had a leaking gutter and offering to fix it. The victim described how he initially quoted £15 but after a brief amount of work, claimed he’d had to replace the rubber seals and the cost would now be £135. When the victim’s son later checked the guttering, he found that no work had been done. Smith later returned to the property via a side gate before climbing in her front bedroom window and taking her purse.

In September 2022, Smith knocked on the door of a property in Epsom and told the 90-year-old occupant she had a rat problem in her back garden. The victim went through the house to the garden followed by Smith. Later she checked her handbag and found that her wallet and purse were missing. She later said Smith had been constantly pestering her to do guttering or other jobs around her home. Following this burglary, Smith used the victim’s card on six occasions making contactless payments.

A further nine offences committed by Smith were also taken into consideration, including four burglaries, three thefts of motor vehicles, one offence of fraud by false representation and one theft of a pedal cycle.

Detective Constable Sam Wightman, who led the investigation, said: “Smith is a serial offender and over time, escalated from opportunistic acquisitive crime, to targeted burglaries and fraud – targeting primarily elderly women. He has caused untold distress to his victims leaving them feeling unsafe in their own homes and costing them thousands because of the way he preyed on their vulnerabilities. This case has involved a lot of hard work and tenacity from officers across several units to track down the evidence needed to link these offences to one person and, because of this work, Smith is now where he deserves to be – behind bars.”


---

The above is reprinted from Surrey Police website with permission. It is not a court reporter’s report.

---

## A different kind of cutting in Surrey’s NHS?

2 April 2023



Robots will be performing more operations, including general surgery and gynaecology at a Surrey NHS hospital trust seeking to introduce “significant savings”, a board meeting heard.

The **Surrey and Sussex NHS trust** held its much delayed annual general meeting on Thursday, March 30, where attendees heard from its chairperson, chief executive, and head of finance.

The afternoon meeting, which board members suggested may have led to its lower than usual attendance, was broken into three sections: a review of the year, a run through of its financial health, and questions from the floor.

Chairperson Richard Shaw led off proceedings explaining the AGM should have taken place in autumn last year but was delayed because of the late filing of its 2021/22 audited accounts.

Chief executive **Angela Stevenson** told the meeting that the 2021/22 year was heavily influenced by the “significant impact” of covid with “very tired” staff “having to work under pressure”. This created a backlog the trust was only beginning to get back under control.

She said: “Staff were working with a disease that we didn’t know how to treat. We had high staff absences due to covid or due to family members having covid. Since then we’ve really got to grips with the backlog. We started to work through but at the start of 2022 these numbers were at their peak.”

Post pandemic, she said, there was a huge increase in patients seeking primary care compounded by the increase in “baseline complexity” as cases were left untreated during the pandemic.”

Ms Stevenson praised the trust for **delivering robotic surgery** for the first time and that it would be rolled out further to include general surgery and gynaecology services. They will also be investing in services with a new MRI department on the horizon – including new CT scanners at East Surrey and Crawley hospitals.

The trust also plans to work in partnership with other groups to better manage the health of the population rather than solely focus on its role as an acute hospital.

On finances, the meeting heard how its deficit continues to grow – even not including the covid years. It expects to run at a £26.5m deficit for 2022/23. This will be the first time the trust has run at a deficit since at least 2013/14 as spending pushes towards £400m a year.

Chief finance officer **Paul Simpson** said this could be partly attributed to an increase in staff costs. The hospital expects to take on an extra 130 new nurses. He said: “Now we have to recover the growth in costs that has happened and now we are (looking at) a significant savings plan.”

They were, however, quick to say “there should be no reason why we accept any reductions in quality of (care) for patients and that before any cuts were made there would be full impact assessments on cost improvement plans.”

Image: Nimur at the English-language Wikipedia CC BY-SA 3.0

## Surrey’s leader’s life pledge for brain tumour research

2 April 2023



Surrey County Council’s leader said his focus “for the rest of his life” will be fulfilling a promise made to his daughter before she died to fundraise for brain tumour research.

**Emily Oliver** was 21 when she died, 18 months after being diagnosed with a diffuse midline glioma, and after seeking medical advice “from across the world”.

Her father, county council leader Councillor **Tim Oliver**, said the fund the family set up for her 21st birthday was now nearing £150,000 but vowed to continue to raise awareness and money.

He told the LDRS: “We promised Emily that we would do all that we could. We promised her that we would fundraise for what she wanted, specific research into her type of high grade glioblastoma. Hers was a very, very rare form.

“That is our focus and that will be our focus for the rest of our lives, to raise as much as we can and to find a research team that will look at predominantly her type [of brain tumour].”

Cllr Oliver said brain tumours didn’t get the level of attention or funding as other types of cancer, because the number of cases was not as high, but said they were the biggest cause of cancer death for under 40s.

He said he and his wife, Debi, hoped to find a specific research project in the near future to give the money to. “It’s really

important to us that we continue to keep that alive and deliver on that promise to her,” he added.

The council leader also has his sights set on creating a Surrey-wide bereavement service and has been having conversations about it with the chief executive at Surrey Heartlands and Surrey hospices.

He said “pulling together” the different organisations that offer support for both before and after death would help people know where to turn.

Cllr Oliver added: “I think that would be a great thing for people to be able to know where to go.” He also praised the work of the **Brain Tumour Charity** and the support they give to families on what their journey may look like and understanding what their diagnosis actually meant.

He will take part in the **Princess Alice Hospice’s** “Talk the Walk” event in April which aims to get men, in particular, to talk about bereavement.

Debi said: “The pain of her loss is with us every minute of every day, but Emily was passionate about fundraising to find a cure for brain tumours, and I absolutely know she would be really pleased that what she had started is being continued.”

Cllr Oliver also called on the government to deliver on its promise of delivering £40million for research into brain tumours.

An inquiry by the **All-Party Parliamentary Group on Brain Tumours** was launched in 2021, and said that as of January 25 2023, just £15 million had been awarded since June 2018.

For advice and support from the Brain Tumour Charity, you can call its Support and Info Line on 0808 800 0004 or go to the website at: <https://www.thebraintumourcharity.org/>

Image Tim Oliver credit Surrey Live

## Goalless draw a relief from 4 goal defeats for both sides.

2 April 2023



Mile Oak 0-0 Epsom & Ewell. Southern Combination League – Division One. Wednesday 29th March.

On Wednesday evening two teams came together, both low on confidence and nursing 5-1 defeats from the previous Saturday, and they battled each other to a standstill with a competitive, but goalless draw.

I asked in my Arundel report just exactly who is in charge and we got our answer a couple of hours before the match as it was advised that our newly appointed Director of Football Anthony Jupp had left the club. In addition, Assistant Manager Matt Chapman was no longer in charge, but was still in the dugout while Vice-Chairman Barry Gartell took over again as Manager. Some may recall him having a successful stint following the dismissal of Sam Morgan in August of 2021, although these were different circumstances, as last time we were sitting near the foot of the table. The club finally advised that it was “still looking for a new long-term Manager” which tells me that they are not looking to advertise the position, or you would think they’d have said so!

On a heavy pitch we finally managed to get the match underway at the fourth time of asking, following three previous postponements, and as usual we had changes to our line up. Gartell decided that the midfield needed changing up, so club Captain Ryan Smith and Nick Wilson started on the bench, having been replaced by Rory Edwards who made his first start for the club, while Jaan Stanley came back in on the left wing in what appeared to be a slightly different formation with Athan Smith-Joseph still absent. At the back Chris Boulter and Alex Penfold came back into the line up in place of the absent Kevin Moreno-Gomez and Oliver Thompson, both of whom had failed to complete the match at Arundel.

We started brightly enough and had the majority of the possession in the first half. An early Penfold cross was met by a Jamie Byatt header, but it was a tough chance and he was unable to get the ball on target. The ball stayed mainly in the Mile Oak half as the predicted heavy rain began to come down, sheeting across the ground and the home side then had a couple of chances, firstly when a free kick was headed over from close range, but then in the 25th minute when a right wing cross was met by the head of Zak Kladis who directed his header back across goal. Tom Theobald made a great diving save to divert the ball on to the post and then as it bounced back towards him, he clawed the ball away before it crossed the line. It was a fantastic save and one that ultimately would earn us a point.

Gavin Quintyne saw his shot deflected wide for a corner and Jaevon Dyer produced a low shot that was well saved by the foot of Aaron Stenning in the Oak goal before he had to be alert to parry a Stanley free kick to safety. Stenning also had a slice of luck as the pitch bobbled on him and he produced an air shot, just getting back in time to save a corner. As the half ended Quintyne was only just over the bar from twenty yards, so you could argue that it was a fairly respectable first half from an Epsom perspective as the teams went for their half time break.

Regrettably the second half was nowhere near as interesting from an Epsom point of view. Mile Oak had a header at goal

in the early stages which was deflected over and Theobald then had to make a low save on the hour mark. He had a lucky escape in the 66th minute when he came out to clear a ball near the edge of the penalty area but missed it. Fortunately we had defensive cover.

For our part, we seemed to be restricted to sending long balls up to Byatt, who tried his best with the limited service he had. In the 68th minute a nice one-two with Lewis Pearch gave him a shooting opportunity, but he dragged his shot beyond the far post from twelve yards and our best chance of the night had gone.

As so often happens with tight encounters, a little bit of niggles started to enter the contest and after Kladis had been fouled, he then clattered into Gideon Acheampong who reacted; both players earning yellow cards for their trouble, following the obligatory player scuffle. However, the game was beginning to deteriorate by this stage and our threats were becoming less and less. Dyer and Stanley became non-factors on the wings, although Dyer nearly pulled a moment of magic out in the 86th minute with a good run and powerful strike that missed the far post by inches.

In truth though we were beginning to lose the game in midfield as the home side kept pushing us back and it did seem odd that on such a heavy surface we waited until the 88th minute before making a substitution. We appeared to be crying out for fresh legs in the middle of the park, yet with two players that could do just that job on the bench, Wilson would only get on in the fifth minute of injury time, while Smith wouldn't take the field at all. We did nearly pinch a winner when a long throw bounced up, but I don't think Byatt expected the ball to reach him and he only managed to get the faintest of glances to the ball literally two yards out, which Stenning still caught anyway.

In reality the longer this game went on, the more it looked like Mile Oak would pinch the win, but ultimately neither team really did enough to deserve all three points and we had to settle for the goalless draw.

These dropped points mean that the opportunity to finish in second place is now no longer exclusively in our hands, with both Wick and Godalming Town now three points behind us and holding a game in hand. Godalming also now have a better goal difference than us and are clearly in a better run of form, although they have a tough finishing schedule so there is still hope if we can win our final four fixtures. Who do we face this Saturday? It's Mile Oak again!!

Epsom & Ewell: Tom Theobald, Gideon Acheampong, Alex Penfold, Rory Edwards, Chris Boulter, Dylan Merchant, Jaevon Dyer, Gavin Quintyne, Jamie Byatt, Lewis Pearch, Jaan Stanley

Subs: Musa Beegun for Pearch (88), George Owusu for Stanley (91), Nick Wilson for Edwards (95)

## Pothole payouts and repairs penalise Councillor projects?

2 April 2023



Surrey County Council has spent more than £800,000 in pothole compensation payouts in the last five years but it hopes front-loading the road maintenance budget will help end the broken-road scourge.

In that time it repaired about 221,456 potholes along its rundown road network, at an average of 121 per day. It was also announced that the Government was to give the county £3million to tackle the problem but some say this is "just a drop in the ocean" compared with how much the road budget falls in future years.

County hall's finances this year include a capital fund of £69.8million for highways maintenance as part of a front-loaded £188m that was announced in February.

That is set to fall back to £29.5m a year - for the next four years - much more in line with the spending under its previous highways strategy which has led to the roads we have today.

It was also announced that individual councillor allowances of £100,000 to spend in their divisions would go, meaning any individual projects earmarked by members can not go ahead.

If highway's can not be maintained, the opposition leader at Surrey County Council warned, then the roads will fall into further disrepair and the number of potholes, and motorists insurance claims, will rocket.

Councillor **Will Forster** said: "The cut to is to the road maintenance budget, this will mean the road surfaces will get worse. The cut is notable in the next financial year 24/25 and makes the £3m to repair the potholes from the Government look like a drop in the ocean."

In 2018, Surrey County Council paid out £399,189 in compensation payments for claims relating to potholes - on both carriage and footway.

This declined to £135,949 in 2019 and was followed by two years where people were off the roads during the pandemic £83,415 and £79,364 in 2020 and 2021 – before climbing again as roads got busier in 2022 to £118,553.

These figures, the council said, relate to both property damage and personal injury with the “best endeavours” made to only include compensation payouts, however, “some figures may also include elements of legal costs and disbursements.”

A spokesperson for Surrey County Council said the road maintenance, capital, budget agreed by council in February totalled £188m for the next five years.

They added that the budget was front loaded, because work had been accelerated in order to realise the benefits sooner.

Image: Potholes in Surrey (Surrey Ad)

Related reports:

On the Hunt for pothole repairs

Don't blame us for potholes say Surrey's highway authority.

Going potty about pot-holes?

## The Hills Are Alive With the Sound of Drilling... ?

2 April 2023



The owners of a Surrey oil field have signed an agreement to “deliver increased production and revenues” that will allow it to focus on its Dunsfold site.

Environmental campaigners, however, are still holding out hope the Supreme Court stops the drilling.

**Uk Oil & Gas** (UKOG) announced to shareholders that it was to “farm out” production at **Horse Hill** to the US-based **Pennpetro Energy**.

The Texas firm is to takeover 12 kilometres at the site, just north of Gatwick Airport, at a maximum cost of £4.6m.

Announcing the tie up **Stephen Sanderson** UKOG's chief executive said: “This mutually advantageous transaction will inject new activity into Horse Hill, aiming squarely to deliver increased production and revenues from the oil field.

“The farmout enables UKOG to move this asset forwards without the need to raise capital, enabling our resources to be firmly focussed upon the appraisal and development of the Loxley gas discovery, our most material petroleum asset. We look forward to a close working relationship with Pennpetro and a mutually successful future at Horse Hill.”

UKOG refers to its holdings at Dunsfold as its Loxley site and hopes to drill for £123 million of oil near the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty – pending its own High Court review.

Environmental campaigners who have been fighting against oil drilling at Horse Hill are still confident that the new company's involvement will not change things materially.

In June the **Supreme Court** will sit for a legal challenge against **Surrey County Council's** 2019 decision to grant planning for the four extra wells at Horse Hill. The same year the county also declared a climate emergency.

The application will go before the UK's highest court after three judges were split in their findings – that the county council's decision to grant permission for 25 years of oil drilling and production was lawful.

According to UKOG the Horse Hill site has so far produced about 185,000 barrels of with approximately 1.362 million barrels still available.



Redhill climate campaigner Sarah Finch at Horse Hill rally 5 Nov 2021. Credit Denise Laura Baker.

Campaigner **Sarah Finch** of Redhill argues that the permission is out of touch amid the global climate crisis, Sarah Finch said: “We are taking legal action that is going through the Supreme Court in June.

“Currently the planning is subject to a legal challenge. There is still a possibility that the Supreme Court will not give it the go ahead. There has been low level production for a while there even though they got permission for expansion in 2019. I don’t think this new company’s involvement will change anything.”

Sarah started the campaign against the drill site on climate impact grounds -not just from the impact the drilling would have in the immediate area but the wider overall effect from burning the collected oil.

She added: “It will take us away from keeping climate change within limits. Horse Hill will just make hitting those targets more difficult. I’ve been concerned about climate change for a very long time and when a new oil well was proposed near my home I was horrified and we really needed to stop it going ahead. And it’s not just me, lots of residents have been involved. There have been a series of planning applications for the site but these four new wells were agreed in 2019, such a huge ramp up. That is why I decided it needed a legal campaign.”

The Supreme Court is due to sit on June 21 after the Court of Appeal reached a split decision.

## Surrey County’s Cathedral citadel conserved...

2 April 2023



The “fundamental specialness” of Guildford and its cathedral have been preserved after plans to build 124 homes next to the historic site were refused.

Guildford Borough Council’s planning committee met on Wednesday, March 29, and heard a “really definitive” 25 minute officer’s report that outlined the scheme.

The cathedral, along with developer Vivid Homes, wanted to demolish the existing staff housing and create 124 homes in a mix of flats and housing – 54 of which would be affordable properties – on undeveloped woodland.

The cathedral said it was selling land surrounding its Grade II listed site to create an endowment fund to pay for maintenance costs but during the presentation, the public heard that cash from this sale would only last five years. When combined with a separate sale, planners said, this would only raise 23 per cent of the budgeted maintenance costs.

Top image: The 124 new homes would be built in the area surrounding the cathedral (Image: Grahame Larter)

Officers at the council recommended refusing the plans of a host of reasons including its harm to the the setting of heritage assets, “visual prominence of the apartment blocks” and the impact on the “green collar” forming part of the “landmark silhouette”.

The plans attracted 286 letters of objection raising issues such as over development, a lack of details on a wider masterplan, and harm to the heritage assets.



Indicative CGI of Planning Application For Homes Near Guildford Cathedral. (Image: VIVID Homes)

Councillor **Will Salmon** said: “We’ve been looking at it this for a number of years and there’s definitely been some improvements made in the application over those years particularly on issues like sustainability. The percentage of affordable housing is also admirable here. My overall feeling is it would have to be somewhere else.

Fundamentally this is not the location for this scheme. My concern is the scale, the whole setting, it’s the openness and semi-wild spaces that you can really appreciate as part of the community, that’s the green collar that we see from all sorts of distances. That is the sense that I can certainly feel coming from the many representations.

“The parkland provides very special setting with different short and long views of the cathedral and it provides a sense of proportion which is really essential for a building as big as the cathedral and I think a lot of that would be lost with the high density scheme. Overall my feeling is very much that this is a heritage asset that must be protected. I do worry that the over development here would actually risk the fundamental specialness of the cathedral.”

His concerns were echoed by both Cllrs **Chris Blow** and **Angela Gunning** among others as the chamber united almost unanimously in its opposition to the plans.

The only exception was Cllr **Marsha Moseley** who did not speak on the application but abstained from voting.

A spokesperson for the **Friends of Stag Hill** group which has been campaigning against the application, said: “We would like to thank the **Guildford Borough Council** planning officer for her care and attention to what must at times have been a difficult task, and the committee for looking out for the interests of Guildford.

“Friends of Stag Hill will wait to see the cathedral’s reaction to this second refusal, but would hope that the cathedral now pauses and realises the damaging nature of their proposals, both for the cathedral and the community. The community has now been fighting with the cathedral over the development plans for over seven years, and it is time to accept that developing the land is not an appropriate way to raise funds for the cathedral.

“They have put the local community through significant distress over the last 7.5 years.”

The Grade II-listed cathedral was designed by **Sir Edward Maufe** and work began at the site 1936. This was interrupted by the Second World War and eventually finished through a fund-raising campaign.

The cathedral was consecrated on May 17, 1961.

Related reports:

[Will Cathedral repairs threaten Canadian WW1 memorial?](#)

## County resists nimbies against children’s home

2 April 2023



Resident objections to a new children’s home and apartments for care leavers have been labelled “petty” as councillors approved the plans.

The former Adult Education Centre in Dene Street, Dorking can now be converted to provide accommodation for young people in the home and in “trainer flats” which bridge the gap before young people move into independent housing.



Plans for new children's home in Dene Street, Dorking. From Design and Access Statement. Credit: SCC

A meeting of Surrey County Council’s planning and regulatory committee on Wednesday (March 29) unanimously approved the plans, which will include the construction of a new two-storey building on part of the site. But the meeting also heard that of 48 letters received at the time of the meeting, 24 were objecting to the plans.

Three were in support, citing reasons such as the need for suitable accommodation in Surrey and being glad to see a vacant site used, while 21 letters were commenting on the application.

Councillor **Ernest Mallett** MBE (Residents’ Association and Independent, West Molesey) described residents’ objections as “petty” when he spoke on the application. He said: “I don’t quite know what the population are thinking. They seem to be objecting as if this was some sort of prison for about 100 people. I can’t really understand the objections.”

Cllr Mallett added that on a site visit he thought the plans were “an excellent use of the building”.

The development, which will be owned and run by Surrey County Council, raised concern among residents about rats being displaced and the need for pest control in neighbouring properties, and the authority being “poor at managing children’s home”.

These, along with concerns about the consultation carried out and the protection of the “well-being and mental health of existing residents” were put under the heading “other” by officers, stating in the report they were not material planning considerations for the application.

An officers’ report said: “The majority of objections were concerning the need to protect and enhance the site’s nesting swifts.”

Officers confirmed ten “swift bricks”, which allow birds to nest in them, would be added to the design, while the birds’ current access to the roof of the building would be maintained during building work.

Along with the concerns about swifts, residents raised issues including the design being out of keeping with the residential area, worries about anti-social behaviour, noise and disturbance, and smells from “industrialist catering”.

Cllr **Catherine Powell** (Farnham Residents, Farnham North), who sits on the council’s corporate parenting board, said the new facilities were “absolutely necessary” and that she “100 per cent” supported the application.

She told the meeting: “Clearly the building is in a state of decay and it puts it back into a useful purpose.”

Officers confirmed the work would be done in two phases, with the children’s home and “no wrong door” facility being built first, followed by changes to the existing building to develop the trainer flats.

The Children’s Home would be for a maximum of four residents and 2 staff, while the “no wrong door” facility, also in the new building, would accommodate two emergency residents and one member of staff.

Top image: Dorking Children's home approved in Dene Street, Dorking. Current view from Google Street View

## Middling rate for Epsom and Ewell Council Tax

2 April 2023



Epsom and Ewell Borough Council is slap in the middle of the 11 Surrey boroughs table of band D council tax charges for 2023/2024. The difference between the highest and lowest is £78.20 per annum. As reported by The Epsom and Ewell Times it should be no surprise to find debt ridden Woking having the highest. Emily Coady-Stemp LDRS reports on the full

Surrey County wide picture and Epsom and Ewell Times produces the table.

|    | Borough                                | D band Tax       |
|----|--|------------------|
| 1  | Runnymede Borough Council              | £2,170.57        |
| 2  | Guildford Borough Council              | £2,178.06        |
| 3  | Mole Valley District Council           | £2,184.84        |
| 4  | Waverley Borough Council               | £2,187.29        |
| 5  | Spelthorne Borough Council             | £2,201.79        |
| 6  | <b>Epsom and Ewell Borough Council</b> | <b>£2,205.25</b> |
| 7  | Tandridge District Council             | £2,223.53        |
| 8  | Surrey Heath Borough Council           | £2,226.30        |
| 9  | Elmbridge                              | £2,229.00        |
| 10 | Reigate and Banstead                   | £2,235.36        |
| 11 | Woking Borough Council                 | £2,248.77.       |

Related reports:

Budget Report: More council tax for Epsom and Ewell

Epsom and Ewell Council raises tax 2.99%

2023/2024: average of £50 more to pay Surrey County Council

Council tax bills for Surrey residents will go up from April 1 after authorities confirmed their budgets for the coming financial year. Surrey County Council, the Police and Crime Commissioner, and each of the county's 11 districts and boroughs, confirmed their increases separately last month, with council tax bills and collection being the responsibility of the districts and boroughs.

The Police and Crime Commissioner, Lisa Townsend, confirmed a rise of £15 per year for residents amid an increase in Surrey Police's fuel bills of more than £500,000.

While Surrey County Council, which is responsible for adult social care as well as services including road repairs and schools, increased its share by £50 per year on Band D homes.

See below for a breakdown of the council tax bands in your area.

Elmbridge Borough Council

The average Band D property in Elmbridge will pay £2,229.00, except in the Claygate parish, where the bill for a Band D home will be £2,243.15.

Band A: £1,486.00

Band B: £1,733.66

Band C: £1,981.33

Band D: £2,229.00

Band E: £2,724.34

Band F: £3,219.67

Band G: £3,715.00

Band H: £4,458.00

Epsom and Ewell Borough Council

Residents in Surrey's smallest borough will see council tax bills of £2205.25 from April, for the average Band D property.

Band A: £1,470.17

Band B: £1,715.19

Band C: £1,960.22

Band D: £2,205.25

Band E: £2,695.31

Band F: £3,185.36

Band G: £3,675.42

Band H: £4,410.50

Guildford Borough Council

The bill for Band D households in Guildford will be £2178.06, excluding parish and town councils. For Band D the parish share ranges from no extra charge in Wisley to £2291.71 for a Band D property in Normandy.

Band A: £1,452.04  
Band B: £1,694.04  
Band C: £1,936.05  
Band D: £2,178.06  
Band E: £2,662.07  
Band F: £3,146.08  
Band G: £3,630.1  
Band H: £4,356.11

#### Mole Valley District Council

In Mole Valley, the average Band D property will pay £2,184.84, except where there are parish councils. In Charlwood, with the highest parish council precept, residents in a Band D property will pay £2,259.09.

Band A: £1456.56  
Band B: £1699.32  
Band C: £1,942.08  
Band D: £2,184.84  
Band E: £2,670.36  
Band F: £3,155.88  
Band G: £3,641.4  
Band H: £4,369.68

#### Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

A Band D home in Reigate and Banstead will pay £2,235.36 from April, while residents in the Horley Town Council Area will pay £2,283.12 and in Salfords and Sidlow will pay £2,265.08.

Band A: £1,490.24  
Band B: £1,738.61  
Band C: £1,986.98  
Band D: £2,235.36  
Band E: £2,732.11  
Band F: £3,228.85  
Band G: £3,725.60  
Band H: £4,470.72

#### Runnymede Borough Council

Runnymede residents in Band D property will pay £2,170.57.

Band A: £1,447.05  
Band B: £1,688.22  
Band C: £1,929.39  
Band D: £2,170.57  
Band E: £2,652.92  
Band F: £3,135.27  
Band G: £3,617.62  
Band H: £4,341.14

#### Spelthorne Borough Council

Residents in a Band D property will pay £2,201.79 for their council tax in Spelthorne.

Band A: £1,467.86  
Band B: £1,712.50  
Band C: £1,957.14  
Band D: £2,201.79  
Band E: £2,691.08  
Band F: £3,180.36  
Band G: £3,669.65  
Band H: £4,403.58

#### Surrey Heath Borough Council

Surrey Heath's amount for a Band D property is £2226.30, plus the amounts paid to parish councils throughout the borough. Bands listed below are for the most expensive parish, in Bisley.

Band A: £1,523.45  
Band B: £1,777.35  
Band C: £2,031.26  
Band D: £2,285.17  
Band E: £2,792.99  
Band F: £3,300.8  
Band G: £3,808.62  
Band H: £4,570.6

#### Tandridge District Council

In Tandridge, a Band D property's council tax will be £2,223.53 2023/24. Parishes in the district range from no additional charge, to £2,311.97 in the most expensive, Crowhurst.

Band A: £1,482.36

Band B: £1,729.41  
Band C: £1,976.47  
Band D: £2,223.53  
Band E: £2,717.65  
Band F: £3,211.76  
Band G: £3,705.89  
Band H: £4,447.06

Waverley Borough Council

A Band D home, excluding parish council charges, is set at £2,187.29 in Waverley. The most expensive parish bills are in Godalming, and shown below.

Band A: £1,530.45  
Band B: £1,785.52  
Band C: £2,040.60  
Band D: £2,295.67  
Band E: £2,805.82  
Band F: £3,315.97  
Band G: £3,826.12  
Band H: £4,591.34

Woking Borough Council

In Woking, residents in a Band D home will pay £2,248.77.

Band A: £1,499.18  
Band B: £1,749.04  
Band C: £1,998.90  
Band D: £2,248.77  
Band E: £2,748.50  
Band F: £3,248.22  
Band G: £3,747.95  
Band H: £4,497.54

---

## How to cut the County's cake?

2 April 2023



A Surrey MP challenges the cuts the County makes to supporting children with special educational and disability needs (SEND), in a classic how to cut the County Council's cake dilemma. Chris Caulfield LDRS reports.

---

Surrey County Council "may be in breach" of statutory duties over its decision to cut respite breaks for parents of children with special educational needs. The county council redesigned its short breaks services and has been able to maintain its provision of overnight care but, with the budget frozen at 2017 levels, cuts had to be made elsewhere.

It wrote to care providers saying it was freezing payments from April this year and issued a statement saying it was only "able to fund two-thirds of the current capacity in community-based play and youth schemes for children with disabilities".

Parents left furious and on the brink as they struggled to find ways to balance full-time care needs and work have been given a glimmer of hope by Runnymede and Weybridge MP Ben Spencer.

Dr Ben Spencer, MP for Runnymede and Weybridge, has written to Surrey County Council. Credit SurreyLive/Grahame Larter.

In a letter to a constituent, he said: "I have now written to Surrey County Council regarding their new policy on short breaks. I share your concerns about the impact the new policy will have on families. I understand the importance of short breaks and am grateful for you taking the time to raise these issues with me.

"Since receiving the response from Surrey CC and doing some research I am concerned that Surrey CC's new policy may be in breach of their statutory duties. "These duties are set out in the Children Act of 1989 include specific references to breaks for carers."

A spokesperson for Surrey County Council said the decision to freeze - rather than cut- funding was an "important

decision” given the “real challenge for public finances” and that the authority understood the importance of these services for children, young people and their families.

They said: “We have a statutory duty to deliver a balanced budget and this means we have not been able to increase the budget for short breaks services at this time, in line with inflation.

“We understand the concern this may cause families and we are pleased to announce that we have been successful in securing £907k of Short Breaks Innovation funding for 2023/24 from the Department for Education.

“This will enable us to deliver some enhanced short breaks services for children and families with more complex needs in 2023/24, which we believe will make a real difference. Whilst there will still be changes to services, we hope this additional funding will be welcome news to families.

“This funding will be allocated to services that meet the highest level of need. In particular, we are committed to maintaining current capacity of overnight respite services for children who have been assessed as needing them, so that we fulfil statutory commitments in children’s care plans.”

## No photo - no vote!

2 April 2023



You need photo ID to vote in person at the upcoming 4th May local elections. In an important announcement from Epsom and Ewell Borough Council the new Government rules are explained.

The UK Government has introduced a requirement for voters to show photo ID when voting at a polling station at elections. If you do not show ID then you will not be issued with a ballot paper. This new requirement will apply for the first time at the local elections on Thursday 4 May 2023.

You may already have a form of photo ID that is acceptable. These are some of the main ones you can use:

- passport
- photo driving licence (full or provisional)
- blue badge
- Older Person’s Bus Pass, Disabled Person’s Bus Pass, Oyster 60+ Card, Freedom Pass
- identity card with PASS hologram (Proof of Age Standards Scheme)
- biometric immigration document
- defence identity card
- national identity cards issued by an EEA state

You can use photo ID if it’s out of date, as long as it looks like you.

The name on your ID should be the same name as you are registered to vote. If it is not then you should take along other proof of name change such as a marriage certificate or deed poll.

There will be more information on your poll card about other acceptable forms of photo ID or you can find out more on the Electoral Commission website <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/i-am-a/voter/voter-id> or call their helpline on 0800 328 0280.

If you don’t already have an accepted form of photo ID you can apply for a free voter ID document, known as a Voter Authority Certificate. You can apply for this online at the Voter Authority Certificate Service <https://www.gov.uk/apply-for-photo-id-voter-authority-certificate> or contact Electoral Services for a paper form.

The deadline to apply for a Voter Authority Certificate for elections on Thursday 4 May 2023 is by no later than 5pm on Tuesday 25 April 2023. You need to be registered to vote before you apply for a Voter Authority Certificate.

You do not need photo ID if you vote by post.

### BOUNDARY CHANGES

The Local Government Boundary Commission completed its review of all Epsom & Ewell electoral wards in 2022 and the

changes they made will apply at the elections on 4 May.

Poll cards for the elections on 4 May will be going out from 27 March and will contain information about which ward you are in and the location of your polling station. You should check your poll card when it arrives to see if you need to go to a different polling station since you last voted.

For more information about the election including all official election notices please visit <https://www.epsom-ewell.gov.uk/council/elections-and-voting>

## Salts give Mullets taste for big victory

2 April 2023

| Team                | P  | W  | D | L | F  | A  | Diff | Pts |
|---------------------|----|----|---|---|----|----|------|-----|
| Shoreham            | 27 | 18 | 7 | 2 | 71 | 24 | 47   | 61  |
| Dorking Wanderers B | 29 | 17 | 5 | 7 | 53 | 28 | 25   | 56  |
| Epsom & Ewell       | 27 | 17 | 3 | 7 | 59 | 36 | 23   | 54  |
| Godalming Town      | 27 | 15 | 7 | 5 | 57 | 29 | 28   | 52  |

Arundel FC 5-1 Epsom & Ewell FC. Saturday 25th March.

Arundel, nicknamed the Mullets, secured their first ever competitive victory over us in comprehensive circumstances at Mill Road on Saturday afternoon with a 5-1 drubbing, and make no mistake, we could have no real complaints here.

Top of Southern Combination League Division One

We made some changes once again from our narrow but comfortable win over Montpelier Villa two weeks previously. Jaan Stanley and Athan Smith-Joseph were not available and originally Jaevon Dyer was listed as a substitute, due to a breakdown on route to the picturesque ground. Fortunately he arrived in time and was then added to the team sheet at the expense of Steve Springett who dropped to the bench. Alex Penfold also joined him there, while Lewis Pearch came in for his first start and we had another new centre back pairing of Dylan Merchant and Oliver Thompson with Kevin Moreno-Gomez also returning to the starting eleven alongside them.

On a blustery day we made an awful start and went behind in the eleventh minute as a harmless enough attack on the left suddenly turned dangerous with a ball across goal that was turned into the net by Carl Brown. Six minutes later Tom Theobald made a decent punch clear of a looping header and appeared to be fouled in the process, yet a corner was awarded and in the 18th minute the inswinging delivery caught Theobald out in the swirling wind and he dropped the ball over the line for Arundel's second goal.

We had created little to this point although Jamie Byatt fashioned a half chance a couple of minutes after the goal, only to see his shot blocked by a defender. Dyer then made decent progress down the right flank but his pull back was behind both Byatt and Pearch.

Regrettably we then went three nil down in the 33rd minute as a clever pass floated over the top of Moreno-Gomez where Brown was waiting to drill the ball into the net from an angle and it nearly got worse six minutes later when James Crane then hit the bar as we were carved open again. The half ended with the home side having another good chance from a corner but the unmarked Harry Russell headed over the bar.

This was a horrible first half to watch and whilst you always feel that a good start to the second half could spark some sort of comeback, it really looked as though the only win we were likely to celebrate at Arundel was when long-serving supporter John Bonner won a crate of lager in the club raffle!

The other item of note at the half time break was the sight of our entire Management team standing outside the dressing room as the players clearly had some sort of discussion without them. Whatever was said, it seemed to work for a while. We made two substitutions with Rory Edwards and Springett coming on for the limping Smith and Moreno-Gomez respectively and nearly scored straight away as a Springett corner was flicked just over the bar by Nick Wilson. Next up with a decent chance was Gavin Quintyne who tried his luck with his weaker foot and sliced the opportunity wide. However, he made amends in the 50th minute when he weaved his way across the edge of the penalty area before threading a pass through to Byatt, who guided the ball back across Oliver Howley in the Arundel goal from twelve yards which then crept in off the far post to get us back in the game.

Another Springett corner caused trouble as Merchant headed the delivery towards Thompson, whose header was just over the bar, but our only period of superiority in the match was about to end. Thompson limped off with an injured knee and whilst it was good to see Johnny "Sonic" Akoto returning after a few weeks out, his introduction required a defensive reshuffle. Whether this had a bearing on the next Arundel goal in the 63rd minute is hard to say, but a harmless ball in from the right was struck at goal by an unmarked player, and whilst Theobald made a good save from the first shot, Will Breden was also in acres of space and he drove the loose ball home from a few yards out with our defence absolutely nowhere in sight.

In the 72nd minute it got worse still as a low ball in from the right was tapped in at the far post for a fifth goal by Breden once again, and we were lucky not to concede more with Wilson being our latest sin-bin visitor around this time, while Byatt and Quintyne both picked up yellow cards for fouls to go with the first half issue to Smith. Our afternoon was then summed up when Dyer put substitute George Owusu through on goal ten minutes from time, only for him to tread on the ball in the act of shooting!

Now that ten man Shoreham's victory over East Preston has virtually guaranteed them the title, it is imperative we cling

on to second place to guarantee the home playoff matches. The players kept trying in this contest, even at the end and I'm aware that some more new signings are likely as we approach the transfer deadline on 31st March, but if we don't get back to winning ways on Wednesday at Mile Oak, we could slip out of that position. We cannot make any more mistakes now.

This is not just about us though. We didn't play well but full credit should also go to Arundel who played with a lot of energy and just appeared to cover a lot more ground per player than we did and will no doubt chase Selsey all the way for that final playoff spot, in which case we may well see them again before the end of the season. However, this is a massive reality check for us. Are we actually good enough to go up? We'll probably find out the answer to that question on Wednesday as we face a Mile Oak team that have also lost 5-1 this weekend.

Epsom & Ewell: Tom Theobald, Gideon Acheampong, Kevin Moreno-Gomez, Ryan Smith (c), Oliver Thompson, Dylan Merchant, Jaevon Dyer, Nick Wilson, Jamie Byatt, Gavin Quintyne, Lewis Pearch

Subs: Steve Springett for Moreno-Gomez, (HT), Rory Edwards for Smith (HT), Johnny Akoto for Thompson (58), George Owusu for Byatt (76)

Report Source: [www.eefconline.co.uk](http://www.eefconline.co.uk)

## Spelthorne's thorny property problems spelt out

2 April 2023



Following the report on Woking's woes we have Emily Coady-Stemp from LDRS report on another sister Surrey borough's woes over property investments:

Spelthorne's former leader says "hand on heart" he still believes the borough council's commercial property investments were "utterly legal". The councillor said the authority had taken legal advice on the decision to purchase the buildings but raised concerns about other councils with high borrowing costs.

Image: Spelthorne Borough Council audit committee on March 23, 2023. Credit: Emily Coady-Stemp

Councillor Ian Harvey (United Spelthorne Group, Sunbury East), who was leader of Spelthorne Borough Council at the time three commercial properties were bought outside of the borough in 2017/18, was responding to a public interest report carried out by its auditors. He told a meeting of the borough council's audit committee on Thursday (March 23) his first question at the time the possibility of buying properties came up was: "Is it legal?"

He said the advice given at the time by the council's KC was that it was legal, and that the decision had "repeatedly been determined to be legal subsequently".

The report, publicly released in November, claimed the council had "acted unlawfully" in its decision to buy properties outside of the borough, and set out five recommendations for the authority.

At a December meeting of the council, councillors agreed the recommendations set out in the KPMG report, and Thursday's meeting was an update on the action plan to come about from that.

The current council leader, Cllr John Boughtflower (Conservative, Ashford East) said in December the council "should not have any difficulties" accepting the recommendations, because of changes to processes at the council and issues that had been addressed since the purchases.

Cllr Harvey asked auditors at Thursday's meeting, who were presenting their report into the 2017/18 accounts, if they had assessed the council's risks "compared to some other spectacularly investing local authorities for example, Slough, Croydon, Thurrock". He also asked about comparisons to Woking Borough Council, where the current administration has warned an effective bankruptcy may be declared, saying they had "borrowed more than we have without any surety of repayment".

Later in the meeting Cllr Harvey said: "I can say hand on heart that we were assured, and I still believe, it is utterly legal. And if what we did was illegal then what a lot of other councils have done, and spectacularly failed, at was far, far more illegal." He claimed the difference in legal opinions was because KPMG had "relied on a much more junior barrister within the same chambers who came up with a dissenting view".

Cllr Lawrence Nichols (Liberal Democrat, Halliford and Sunbury West) said though the advice was taken from a "very well qualified QC", it amounted to 19 words of legal advice for more than £200million of expenditure in 2017/18. He also questioned the diversity of the council's property portfolio and the advice sought from how to manage commercial

properties. He told the meeting: “I do think we out to be more realistic about diversification. We are in the office business, whether it’s an engineering company or a dental practice, that’s not the issue. It’s the office market we’re in, so that’s our diversification risk.”

In response to an expected £60m of rental income dropping to £46m for next year, which Cllr Nichols said was a “massive change of direction”, the council’s chief accountant Paul Taylor said £7m rent guarantee income had been released and would be going into the council’s revenue budget.

The meeting heard that a new group head of assets had recently started at the council and that a “fully worked up action plan” would come to the committee’s next meeting in July. Spelthorne’s chief executive, Daniel Mouawad, said the nearly half a decade turnaround in the audit report for 2017/18, the last stage of which was the public interest report, was “by any measure” a “remarkably poor turnaround”. But he added that nearly a year’s delay could be “directly attributed to the actions of one individual Spelthorne councillor” which was currently being investigated under the members code of conduct.

When asking a question on this individual, Cllr Harvey was cut off by the chair, his wife Cllr Helen Harvey (United Spelthorne Group, Sunbury East), though officers did confirm they would revert with a response on the cost of the delay caused by the councillor concerned.

KPMG representatives confirmed an “adverse conclusion” would be issued in relation to the “value for money arrangements” for the 2017/18 accounts, the same as in the 2016/17 accounts where recommendations and weaknesses raised were “still in place in the 2017/18 period”.

The meeting also heard that a review into the council’s borrowing carried out by the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities should be coming to an end this week

In response to a public question on the review, the chair said the council was not “privy to the terms of reference or have any expectations to receive the final report within any given period”.

It was hoped this report would also come to the next committee meeting in July, though Terry Collier, the council’s deputy chief executive, said it had been hoped there may be a draft report available by Thursday’s meeting.

---

## Waking to Woking’s woeful debt

2 April 2023



Epsom and Ewell Times has followed the finances at this sister Surrey borough. We all should perhaps be concerned and learn lessons from a County borough that can get in such a mess. In contrast Epsom and Ewell Borough Council has been balancing its books for years. At the end of the day where will the money come from to save Woking? Local Democracy Reporter Chris Caulfield reports:

---

The dire financial future of Woking Borough Council was laid bare with senior figures warning of the “significant risk” of it effectively going bankrupt as its cash reserves run dry.

The council’s executive committee met on Thursday March 23 to hear an update on its financial strategy. It was told of the budgeted shortfall of £9.5m for the next financial year and the swingeing cuts coming as it moved to provide only the minimum levels of services – those it must provide by law.

Woking Borough Council’s financial disaster is the product of years of heavy borrowing to pay for a failing investment portfolio. The previous administration had hoped this would generate income but instead it has saddled the local authority with annual interest repayments of more than £60m a year while only generating £38.5m.

Councillor **Dale Roberts** is now the portfolio holder for finance on the council. He said it had gone to the government seeking to lower the minimum amount it can set aside to repay its loans and has been searching for further “restrictions on expenditure necessary to address the budgeted shortfall of £9.5m for 24/25. He added: “Both of which relate to the ongoing and significant risk of issuing a section 114 notice.”

Councils can not go bankrupt. Instead, they enter what is known as being under section 114 notice and means they cannot make new spending commitments.

He also said the council would seek to try to fund “transformational projects” through any capital receipts. Cllr **Ian**

**Johnson** (Lib Dem, Mount Hermon) said: “It shows a stark issue, the deficit next year is £9.5million based on current numbers, and yet our services expenditure is just under £45m. So that’s a 20 per cent difference. So we need either cost savings or revenue generation to be able to cover that gap of 20 per cent. Because the £62million interest payments we are making at the minute could well go up given today’s interest rate rises.

“Its unaffordable at the present level. We know that DLUHC (the Department for Levelling up, Housing and Communities) have been in the office talking to us for the last couple of months. Until we get their report as well we won’t be able to be definitive in where we’re progressing with any of the business we’ve got including talking to the government about our debt levels and how we might be assisted in reducing the interest payments we make.”

DLUHC was not expected to return any decision until the start of the new political year in May. Cllr Dale Roberts said: “The enormity of the task ahead of us for next year, the affordability of the borrowing, the degree that we have to find savings are deeply concerning.”

Cllr **Stephen Dorsett** (Con. Pyrford) asked about the possibility of future savings if council was already operating at “statutory spend only” – that is for services the council is legally obligated to provide. Cllr Roberts said: “Even costs savings cost”.

Leader of the council **Anne Marie Barker** said: “We’re having to put controls on day to day spend and just keep a very tight rein on everything. We’ve got our balanced budget for the year by using reserves but going forward that £9.5m next year, and more than that the following year, we do need to do a fundamental review of what were doing and how were doing it. It’s the only way we can make those budgets balance, the reserves aren’t going to last forever.”

Related reports:

Would you want to live in Woking?

Woking up to a very big debt problem

## Legally Blonde at Epsom Playhouse

2 April 2023



The Epsom Players performance at the Epsom Playhouse on Tuesday 21st March is reviewed by Nigel Dams for Sardines and reprinted with permission. It runs till Saturday. Tickets from Epsom Playhouse box office

Until I spoke with one of the cast members (the leading cast member actually, the glorious Lydia May Whiteside) after the show, I thought this was a professional production.

When the curtain went up, I thought, hang on, amateurs can’t afford a set like this. And then when the dancing began, I thought, hang on, amateurs can’t afford dancers like this. Same with the singing.

So I decided they must be pros, and settled back to be more and more entertained as the evening went on.

Let me get the minor niggles out of the way first. I couldn’t always make out the words the singers were putting across. This was sometimes because the band, especially the horns, were just a shade too loud, sometimes because the lead was not cutting through the chorus, and sometimes because the vocal frequencies blended too much with the band’s. But this was only in the beginning, really, and got better as the show progressed.



Also, when the stage crew flew in various bits of scenery, they sometimes hung suspended and swinging an inch above the boards, which was pretty distracting. It seemed to me that another inch would have grounded them, and eliminated that.

But the rest was great, and kept getting better and better.

Right from the opening number I kept thinking how sharp the choreography was - kudos to Della Bhujoo - and how fit and well-drilled the dancers were. I have great respect for people who can do intense cardio and sing at the same time. They were singing very well too, all of them. Harmonies were crisp and close, high notes and belt notes all well struck, all very impressive. I must make special mention of the eye-popping opening number in Act 2. The entire troupe were skipping (sorry, jumping rope) in time to the music, with great vigour, while singing, led by Millie Shields as Brooke. Max respect. Especially because Ms Shields had to speak shortly afterward and you could barely tell she'd been working out.

It seems unfair to single anyone out from the cast, because they were all excellent, but I must mention Imogen Smart-Steele as Paulette (excellent accent, great singer), Akhil Gowrinath likewise and Ms Whiteside, who led the whole show, playing an enormous part with total confidence, swagger and beguiling blondness. Oh, and the two dogs who were obviously classmates at RADA.

A final special mention to the whole cast for the 'Gay or European?' number, which was .... perfect, and very funny.

I have to say again, I can hardly believe that this show was done by amateurs (am I allowed to use that word any more?) it was so slick, so tight, so well done. My humble and sincere congratulations to Director Chris Malone, Musical Director Dan Francis and the entire cast, band and crew. Superb.

Nigel Dams

Reprinted courtesy of Sardines Magazine