



Surrey's do-re-me for solar to do

Surrey residents can boost local renewable energy generation, cut carbon emissions and save on their energy bills with a new community led initiative to install solar panels for less.

As part of a group-buying scheme, residents are now able to come together to invest in renewables for solar panels and battery storage, confident in the knowledge that they are paying the right price for a high-quality installation from pre-approved installers.

This innovative scheme builds on six years of a highly successful Solar Together programme run across the UK. To date Solar Together has delivered over 17,000 installations and over 350,000 tonnes of avoided lifetime carbon emissions.

Surrey residents can join the group-buying scheme which offers solar panels with optional battery storage and EV charge points, as well as retrofit battery storage for residents who have already invested in solar panels and are looking to get more from the renewable energy they generate as well as increase their independence from the grid.

It is free to register and there is no obligation to go ahead with an installation. Surrey County Council is working in partnership with all district and boroughs, independent experts iChoosr, to make the transition to clean energy as cost effective and hassle-free as possible.

Marisa Heath, Surrey County Council Cabinet Member for Environment said: *"Our target is to be carbon net zero as a county by 2050, and to achieve this we all need to make changes and play our part. There is lots that residents and the county council can do and are already doing, but installing solar panels will make a huge difference."*

"I am pleased we are working with iChoosr on the Solar Together scheme to support our residents to install solar panels, by giving them the reassurance they are doing so in a cost effective way. We know that the cost of living plays a huge part in this, but I would urge those who are able to invest in solar panels, to really consider getting involved in the scheme."

How does it work?

- Householders can register online to become part of the group for free and without obligation.
- Pre-approved UK solar PV suppliers participate in a reverse auction. They are able to offer competitive pricing as the volume and geographic concentration makes it possible for them to realise greater efficiencies, which they pass on with lower prices for installations.
- After the auction, registered households will be emailed a personal recommendation which is specific to the details they submitted in their registration.
- If they choose to accept their recommendation, the specifics of their installation will be confirmed with a technical survey after which a date can be set for the installation of their solar PV system.
- Telephone and email helpdesks are on-hand throughout the whole process which, together with information sessions, will allow households to make an informed decision in a safe and hassle-free environment.

Marie-Louise Abretti, iChoosr UK Solar Manager added: *"With energy prices continuing to increase, residents of Surrey are looking for opportunities to reduce their carbon emissions, save on energy bills and increase their independence from the grid. The Solar Together group-buying scheme offers a straightforward way to make an informed decision and to access a competitive offer from a trusted, vetted provider."*

iChoosr has a strong track record of delivering group purchase schemes for local authorities. It has worked with 210 UK local authorities on its collective energy switching schemes. Furthermore, in 2018 UK councils, in collaboration with iChoosr, initiated their collective purchase schemes for solar PV systems. iChoosr's schemes have been delivered in partnership with local authorities in five countries. Over 116 schemes led to 157,000 residents installing solar PV systems.

Find out more and register your interest at solartogether.co.uk/surrey.



Surrey Youth Arts and Culture Festival

This summer, Surrey based cultural organisations, creative industries and education providers will come together to deliver the Surrey Youth Arts and Culture Festivals 2023.

The festivals have been developed by Surrey County Council Libraries, Arts Services and Community Engagement team, in partnership with local and regional stakeholders, including Spelthorne Borough Council, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, Visit Staines BID, the Elmsleigh Shopping Centre Staines-upon-Thames, Harlequin Theatre Redhill, Spelthorne Youth Hub, YMCA and a wide range of cultural and community organisations.

Image: A youth consultation evening with young people

The two festivals will take place on Saturday 1st July in Staines-upon-Thames and Saturday 8th of July in Redhill, providing exciting interactive activities for young people aged 11 – 16 to learn about the creative sectors.

The events will feature performances by local arts groups; talks and panel discussions from creative industry experts; and workshops and activities, with support from organisations such as, University of Creative Arts, University of Surrey, Royal Holloway University London, Amazon Film Studios, Pinewood Group, CCSkills and many more.

The festivals run from 12 – 5pm on each day and feature a wide range of drop in and bookable sessions. To see more information and to book sessions please visit: www.surreycc.gov.uk/youthartsfestival.

The project aims to advocate cultural engagement for wellbeing and creative skills development; de-mystify the creative industries and creative careers; signpost young people to local cultural engagement initiatives and consult young people on what they would like to see more of in their area.

An extensive outreach programme is planned for both locations in the run up to the festivals throughout June, including assemblies in local secondary schools, activities in the local libraries and workshops to create an art installation at each festival and youth co-design sessions, to shape the creative industry panellists and questions.

Denise Turner-Stewart, Surrey County Council Cabinet Member for Communities and Community Safety said: *"The Surrey Youth Arts and Culture festivals provide a much-needed opportunity for young people to explore the diverse world of arts and culture in their local area. Through these festivals, we aim to inspire, empower, and support the young people of Surrey, ensuring that their voices are heard, and their artistic talents are celebrated. Together with our borough council colleagues and local organisations we are really trying to champion young people to come together in a space designed just for them, where they can develop their creative skills together. If your child or anyone you know is aged 11 to 16 I would encourage you to get them involved and sign them up for these exciting free and local events in Staines-upon-Thames and Redhill."*

Cllr Susan Doran, Chair of the Community Wellbeing and Housing Committee at Spelthorne Borough Council, said: *"During my Mayoral year in 2022/23, I witnessed young Spelthorne residents display amazing creativity and I believe this festival is something that can inspire them further. The council are delighted to host such a variety of activities at the Elmsleigh Centre in Staines-upon-Thames and believe it is a fantastic opportunity for our residents. There is a real range of free workshops and performances to enjoy, ranging from dance and theatre to craft and animation. My thanks to all the partners and industry experts involved for bringing this wonderful initiative forward which I know will be a great success".*

Not insulated against prosecution

47 activists who caused chaos on the Surrey stretch of the M25 in the autumn of 2021 have been convicted of a variety of offences following a lengthy and complex investigation.

Officers have worked tirelessly to bring those responsible to justice following the direct-action protests, which took place between J6 and 14 of the M25 on Monday 13 September 2021, between J8 and 10 on Wednesday 15 September 2021, at J9 on Friday 17 September 2021 and between J9 and 10 on Tuesday 21 September 2021.

Numerous arrests were made at each of the protests, including 35 arrests on 13 September, 35 on 15 September, 33 arrests on 17 September and 24 arrests on 21 September.

Of these, 54 people were charged with 133 offences, with 47 subsequently found guilty following a series of hearings and trials which have taken place over the last few months.



The activists were convicted of a variety of offences, including wilful obstruction of a highway and criminal damage.

Chief Superintendent Jerry Westerman, who was in charge of policing the activity, said: "Not only did the action taken by the Insulate Britain activists over the four days cause significant delays and disruption to our road network, it also endangered the lives of our officers and staff and other motorway users, as well as the activists themselves.

"The tactics used by these activists, which included running out in front of oncoming traffic and lying down in the carriageway, escalated rapidly and was unprecedented in any of the protest activity we had seen previously.

"We will always seek to facilitate peaceful protest but committing criminal offences and taking part in activity which puts lives at risk cannot be condoned. That is why we took swift and robust action to ensure that these activists were removed from the road and detained as quickly as possible to enable us to reopen the affected sections of motorway as soon as we could."

Ch Sup Westerman continued: "We have continued to see this type of direct action in Surrey, with the motorway protests last year and more recently, the activity at the **Epsom Derby Festival** last weekend and these investigations remain ongoing.

"More recently we have seen the introduction of new legislation under the Public Order Act 2023 which gives us a wider range of options to deal with these activists. The protests in 2021 were carried out before this legislation was enforced but we did everything possible to ensure that the offenders were dealt with robustly and brought before the courts."

Ch Supt Westerman added: "I would like to thank those motorists affected by the disruption for their patience and understanding, as well as our colleagues in other forces and partner agencies for their support.

"The work to investigate and bring these offenders to justice is a lengthy and complex process and I would like to thank the team involved for their diligence and determination in seeing this through to its successful conclusion."

Related reports:

Police maintain order at Epsom Derby Festival

Image: BBC

Epsom less flat after more flats approved

Two new blocks of flats will be built next to **Epsom Railway Station** after planners gave the go-ahead.

Planning applications for 16 new homes on the corner of East Street and Kiln Lane and for 20 flats where West Street and Station Approach meet were approved by councillors on Thursday (June 8).

With just two affordable homes over the two developments, both will be subject to a review before completion, to determine if the schemes could provide more than are currently proposed.

Councillors at the **Epsom and Ewell Borough Council** planning committee meeting raised concerns about the "dreadful design" and "ruined" entrances to the town regarding the West Street development. But an attempt to refuse the application failed, when a motion put forward by Councillor **Neil Dallen** (Residents' Association, Town) was lost and the application was approved with six votes in favour and three against.

The development of 20 homes, over five and six storeys, is planned for the former corn and coal merchants which was previously the home of Gillespies Bakery.

The 1905 building will be demolished for a development that was put forward by the developer as a sustainable location for homes that would benefit businesses in the town centre as well as creating jobs during construction.

Councillor **Bernie Muir** (Conservative, Horton Ward), who has spoken out about previous plans for the site, said the site was within the town centre conservation area and within view of multiple listed buildings. She said she wasn't against something going on the site but worried the conservation area was "meaningless" with no reference to the surrounding buildings in the plans.

Had the designs had "some nod" to the look of that part of the town, Cllr Muir said she would be saying something different. She added: "If we don't embrace our conservation areas and what that actually means, then we're just another urban sprawl. And if we want to be another destination high street, this is the beginning of it. This is the one entrance to the town that hasn't been ruined so far, and that matters to the economic life of the town."

She and other councillors recognised the need for more housing in the borough, with the council in March having put a pause on



the process to develop its plan for homes in the area.

Councillor **Clive Woodbridge** (Residents' Association, Ewell Village Ward) pointed out that developers had responded to comments and designed a smaller building than plans that had been previously refused on the site. He said you "couldn't get more sustainable" than a block of flats built next door to the train station and within walking distance of the town centre.

The East Street application, like the one on West Street, had also had previous applications refused and been amended before being approved at Thursday's meeting.

The development of 16 flats, none of which will be affordable because the scheme would otherwise be deemed non-viable, will be allowed to go ahead after changes to previous plans.

Government inspectors had dismissed an appeal on a previous application because of concerns about pedestrians crossing the access road to the block, off Kiln Lane towards Sainsbury's.

But after four year's work on the proposal, which now includes pitched roofs and is of a lower height, plans had been changed and a new footpath had been added to give direct access to the site, avoiding blind corners that had been a concern.

With 18 parking spaces, a suggested condition put forward by Councillor **Jan Mason** (Residents' Association, Ruxley Ward) was agreed by the committee, to allocate the spaces per flat. Cllr Mason said she wanted to avoid "fisticuffs" as there were at similar developments in her area when residents did not have allocated spaces.

She questioned the "viability" claims of developers, saying houses in Epsom sold "at a premium", while Cllr **Kate Chin** (Labour, Court) called for a briefing for councillors on affordable housing and what the council could do to ensure more was built.

The scheme of eight one-bed, five two-bed and three three-bed flats was unanimously approved by the committee.

With a decision yet to be made on plans to turn the former Epsom police station into a 96-bed care home, which was due to come to a cancelled committee meeting in April, the committee's next meeting is due to be on July 20.

Image: Before and after - West Street.

Related reports:

West Street developers climbing down enough?

Two Epsom brownfield developments?

Hospitals heatwave warning

Summer looks like it's here at last - but with a surge in temperatures also meaning a surge in people visiting emergency departments, members of the public are urged to stay safe in the sun.

Earlier this week the UK Health Security Agency and Met Office issued their first heat-health alert of the year in six regions, including London and the South East, which comes into effect tomorrow (Friday) at 9am.



With the mercury set to peak at about 30 degrees Celsius, they are warning people to stay safe and well – and St George’s, **Epsom and St Helier University Hospitals** and Health Group is echoing that plea.

Dr **Richard Jennings**, Group Chief Medical Officer, said: “When temperatures start to soar, more people, especially those in high-risk groups, can suffer from illnesses like heat exhaustion, dehydration, and of course sunburn.

“It often means our hospitals are busier as a result. As always, we are there for those who need us, but please do take steps to stay safe and well, and avoid a trip to our emergency departments.”

High-risk groups include elderly people, babies, young children, and those with heart, respiratory and serious health problems. But everyone should stay safe and well in the hotter weather – and take the following steps:

- Looking out for people who may struggle to keep cool and hydrated, such as elderly relatives or neighbours
- Keeping windows closed when the room is cooler than outside, but opening them at night when the temperatures has dropped, and closing curtains on rooms that face the sun to keep indoor spaces cooler
- Drinking plenty of fluids and avoiding excess alcohol. Taking water with you, if travelling
- Trying to keep out of the sun between 11am and 3pm, and staying in the shade
- Applying suncream regularly, and wearing a hat
- Not exercising during the hottest parts of the day

Staying in the sun for too long increases the risk of becoming unwell. Heat exhaustion is not serious and usually gets better when someone cools down, but if this turns into heatstroke it needs to be treated as an emergency. You may have heat exhaustion if you are experiencing headaches, dizziness, loss of appetite, and feeling sick or confused.

If you are affected by any of these symptoms, it’s important to cool down as quickly as possible. There is more information on the NHS website on how to do this – and also what to do if your condition worsens.

The hospitals group is also reminding people that its emergency departments are there for serious and life-threatening emergencies – particular with a third wave of junior doctors’ strikes coming up next week, which will also have a big impact on services. Hundreds of doctors from St George’s, Epsom and St Helier could walk out over the 72 hours.

Dr Jennings added: “We often find we’re as busy in the days following a heatwave. The hot-weather alert is in place until Monday morning – less than 48 hours before many of our junior doctors will be taking industrial action.



“That’s why it’s even more important for the public to take steps to help us, help our staff, and of course, help themselves.”

If you need urgent medical help you should use NHS 111 online first, which can direct you to where you need to go.

Pharmacies, meanwhile, can offer advice and over-the-counter medicines for a range of minor illnesses, such as coughs, colds, sore throats, and aches and pains.

To find out more about staying safe during hot weather, visit the NHS’s website.

Anonymity for Surrey policeman

A serving **Surrey Police officer** accused of a “series of acts of harassment” against three female officers will not be named by the force throughout his gross misconduct hearing. A five-day hearing will take place at the force’s Guildford headquarters, but the chair of proceedings will not disclose the name of the serving officer for his welfare.

[Image is illustration only – it is not the officer in question.]

The BBC’s LDRS (Epsom and Ewell Times’ news partner – Local Democracy Reporting Service) asked the legally qualified chair, **Eileen Herlihy**, why the officer was not being named, particularly in light of nationwide public concerns about misogyny across multiple police forces, in the wake of Sarah Everard’s murder, the actions of David Carrick and more.

Sarah Everard was murdered by serving Metropolitan Police Officer Wayne Couzens in 2021, when he kidnapped her from the streets of south London, having identified himself as a police officer. He was jailed for life after pleading guilty to her murder. Carrick pleaded guilty to 85 serious offences including 48 rapes over a 17-year period as a Met Police Officer.

But despite the public interest in identifying the Surrey officer accused of harassment, the chair said not naming him “outweighed the public interest in identifying the officer”. The LDRS put to Ms Herlihy that the officer should be named, and asked for the documents relating to the decision to keep his name out of proceedings.

Ms Herlihy said she had weighed up guidance from the Home Office and from police conduct regulations, which said there may be circumstances in which an officer should not be named. Stating that the Home Office Guidance, police conduct regulations and case law all identified that the “default position is one of open justice”, Ms Herlihy said the presumption was that the hearing “must be held in public open to both the public and media to attend”.

She would not provide the evidence on which she based her decision to keep Officer X anonymous, including a written statement and medical evidence from him, and written submissions on behalf of the police force.

Ms Herlihy said she could not provide the documents because they contained “sensitive and confidential information relating to Officer X’s medical condition”.

What’s more, not only does Ms Herlihy’s response mean that the LDRS cannot name the officer, we also cannot detail the reasons the name cannot be revealed. The LDRS put it to the chair that a police officer should not be given a greater standard of anonymity than would be given to a member of the public, and that in order to do this there should be significant evidence to justify the departure from the open justice principle.

She said looking at the documents provided, it was “necessary and proportionate, having weighed up the need for open justice and transparency as against the officer’s welfare, to anonymise the officer”.

The hearing, due to take place between June 12 and 16, will hear allegations that the officer, “carried out a series of acts of harassment against three female police officers”.

If proven, the allegations could amount to gross misconduct because they would be a breach of the authority, respect and courtesy and equality and diversity standards of the Police’s Standards of Professional Behaviour, according to the Surrey Police site.

A Surrey Police spokesperson says: “We expect the highest personal and professional standards of our officers and any allegations of behaviour which does not meet these standards are rigorously investigated in accordance with Police Conduct Regulations and procedures, set nationally by the Government.

“For cases of gross misconduct, these are chaired by a Legally Qualified Chair (LQC) appointed by the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner. “LQCs are selected from a list of independent, legally qualified persons to conduct police misconduct hearings, and are governed by Police Conduct Regulations. “It is their responsibility alone to determine whether a hearing is held



in public or in private, and whether any participant should be anonymised.

"In the case of Officer X, legal representations in relation to anonymity were made to the LQC before the hearing and this was granted. Where an LQC directs that anonymity is granted, Surrey Police must abide by this decision and therefore, as per regulations, we are unable to confirm details relating to the individuals involved without the explicit direction of the LQC."

The hearing will take place at Surrey Police's Mount Browne headquarters from 10am from Monday 12 to Friday 16 June.

Woking bankruptcy, far or near to us?

Woking maybe a town distant on the horizon of **Epsom** but its debts may yet ripple onto Epsom and Ewell taxpayers' shoulders. Chris Caulfield reports.

Woking Borough Council has gone bust under the weight of its £2billion debt and banned from any new spending after effectively being declared bankrupt.

The dire situation means the council will cut all spending for non-essential services after a section 114 notice was issued. The authority's debt is forecasted to rise to £2.6bn. The only exceptions are in cases where it must legally protect vulnerable people and for services it must cover by law.

The full impact on residents is not yet clear. Croydon Council, which issued its third 114 notice last year, had to increase council tax by 15 per cent and its till negotiating a bail out for about half a billion pounds.

Woking Borough Council's notice comes three weeks after Government appointed commissioners were sent in by, the Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLHUC) over the "serious concerns" over the "exceptional level of financial and commercial risk" the authority exposed itself to, "as well as its approach to strategic financial decision making and debt management".

Julie Fisher, Woking Borough Council's chief executive, said: "The issuing of a Section 114 Notice is a very serious matter that rightly reflects the scale and breadth of the acute financial situation facing the Council. Through the commissioning of an independent financial review of the Council's borrowing and loans to its companies, we have a comprehensive understanding of our severe financial position which informed the Section 151 Officer's decision to issue a Section 114 Notice.

"The Council is required to meet within 21 days to consider the notice. I am preparing a response to this notice for an Extraordinary Meeting of Full Council that is being arranged for Tuesday June 20 to meet this requirement. Following the Secretary of State's appointment of a Commissioning Team, I will be seeking their expertise and using their critical insight to help the council deliver an Improvement and Recovery Plan at pace to ensure we take actions that are in the interests of the public purse.

My first report on these actions will be to the Thursday 13 July meeting of the Council's Executive."

The council's debt soared into the billions on the back of an investment strategy that saw it borrow hundreds of millions of pounds for regeneration projects.

The most high profile, the Victoria Square development in Woking town centre, was based on £750million in borrowing, with reports now showing the project to be worth just £200m.

The council said its Section 151 officer and interim director of finance issued the notice "in response to the unprecedented financial challenges facing the Council." It said "the expenditure of the council is set to exceed the financial resources available, and therefore it can no longer balance its budget for the current financial year nor subsequent years.

"Against the core funding of £16million available in the 2023/24 financial year, the Council faces a deficit of £1.2billion."

The council has been on DLUHC's radar for sometime, given the scale of its commercial activity and financial situation, noting that, relative to its size is became the "the most indebted local authority" in the UK.

As of December 2022 it had amassed £1.9bn of debt compared to a core spending power of £14m. The section 114 notice means it is no longer possible for the council to balance its budget but as yet the government has not committed to a bail out - the scale of which could have national implications.

The amount of money needed to get the council on to an even keel is beyond the remit of DLUHC and needs formal government approval. However leaked documents from an unpublished report suggested this could impact government borrowing ability.



Two main private companies run by the council, Wey Group and Victoria Square Woking Ltd, generated the majority of its debt through housing and regeneration schemes between 2016 and 2019.

Cllr **Ann-Marie Barker**, leader of Woking Borough Council, said: "My administration has been very clear about the huge financial challenges facing the council due to the legacy of inherited debt.

"The Notice makes clear the true scale of these challenges which are so significant that the Council cannot simply deal with them on its own. We must work in partnership with the whole of government and its agencies to support us in delivering a robust Improvement and Recovery Plan.

"I understand the concerns and questions this will raise, and I am committed to maintaining transparency with residents and partners as we progress through this unsettling time. Difficult decisions will lie ahead as we seek to balance the Council's budget and address the unaffordable debt."

WOKING'S DEBT CRISIS EXPLAINED

Related reports:

Woking Council has the worst debt in Britain!

Woking £490m write down sparks 'worst fears'

Woking to Woking's woeful debt

Would you want to live in Woking?

Woking up to a very big debt problem

Verging on the ridiculous

Opinion by County Councillor **Eber Kingston**: The decision by the Conservative ruling group at **Surrey County Council** to take back from April the cutting of highway verges from **Epsom and Ewell Borough Council** was heralded as means of securing consistency across the County. Whether that was meant to be a consistent levelling down of the service (but not the height of the grass!) I am not so sure. But so far it has been a very public display of how not to launch a new service to the public.

It's nine weeks into the new regime and still many verges in Epsom and Ewell have not been cut, and the latest website information shows that many roads in Epsom and Woodcote will have to wait another week before the mowers move in.

There is grass so high that street name plates, bollards and signs cannot be seen, and sight lines that are dangerously obscured, making driving hazardous. Clovers, trefoils and daisies in verges that are of most nectar value and will best cater for our wildlife, are swamped by tall growing grass and weeds. And a policy of blowing back grass cuttings on to the verge, whilst sensible and manageable when the grass is cut at a reasonable level, is not workable when the grass has been left to grow so high. The blow back just spreads the grass on to the footpaths and has the potential to block the drains.

And when the machines have actually done their work, residents in our urban streets are far too often looking out at poorly mown verges peppered with clumps grass, as though our verges were experiencing a bad hair day!

SCC puts it down to "operational issues at the start of the new contract and the wet weather we had in April and at the start of May". Is that politicians way of saying a failure to plan effectively and ensure sufficient resources were deployed from the start. And if a period of rain delays the schedule by nine weeks, that does not augur well for the future given our unpredictable climate.

Sadly, the problem has been compounded by poor communication from SCC. A website page with the scheduled dates for cuts regularly missed and not updated, and just general locations listed (Epsom, Ewell, Stoneleigh) so that residents of Cuddington and Langley Vale, for example, have no idea when their verges will meet up with a SCC grass mower.

At least the Leader of SCC has acknowledged this is not his finest hour and set up Task and Finish Groups to find what went wrong and how it can be fixed. Residents' Association and Independent County Councillors have put in a joint submission highlighting the failings and offering solutions. Those solutions include a commitment to return to the 6 to 8 cuts previously provided by Epsom and Ewell Borough Council - the verges in residential roads are too narrow to support the meadow look.

It is going to take some time for our verges (and residents) to recover from this. Sadly there may be more to come.....from April SCC has also taken back responsibility for weeds, alleyway clearance and highway roundabouts!



County Councillor Eber Kington (RA Ewell Court, Auriol & Cuddington)

Related reports:

Verging on reason?

A Greener Future in Partial Sight As Verges To Be Left Unmown

Birds dropping trees?

The fate of trees which a **Surrey golf club** wanted to cut down because of bird poo falling on its clubhouse patio is still unclear. The beech trees outside Guildford Golf Club's clubhouse, in Merrow, were scheduled to be cut down in May, before a last-minute tree preservation order (TPO) was put in place. Guildford Borough Council's officers put the TPO in place on Friday (May 12) just days before the trees were due to be felled, on the following Monday.

Residents and councillors had spoken out against the plans to fell the trees, which are within the **Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty**, and officers will decide in the next six months if they should be permanently protected.

People can write to the council to give their views on protecting the trees, though the council's former leader made clear this was not a subjective exercise, but one based on the expert opinions of the council's tree officers.

Councillor **Joss Bigmore** (Residents for Guildford and Villages, Merrow) said he thought they were "beautiful" trees, but there had to be expert analysis rather than people saying: "I just like the tree."

He told the LDRS: "They should be assessed. If they're dangerous, then something needs to be done with them. If they're not, then they should be protected because they're stunning trees. But we should let the experts opine as to whether there is any real danger from them or whether they should be protected."

The golf club set out reasons for wanting to fell the trees in a newsletter to members, seen by the LDRS, which outlined "key reasons" for wanting to fell the trees, including regarding insurance and after storms in January 2022 had brought down one tree at the club.

The newsletter also outlined the "unacceptable" problem of bird droppings falling from the trees and landing on patio seating and tables.

Residents have until June 8 to write to the council to outline their views on if the TPO should be made permanent.

Katherine Atkinson, the independent chair of the Board of the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), said cutting down the trees "would have a significant negative impact on the local environment and the public's enjoyment of it". She wrote to the borough council regarding the TPO, pointing out the trees' location in the nationally protected AONB and that they provided a "natural screen" for the clubhouse buildings, conserving and enhancing the "scenic beauty of the landscape".

She added: "The trees provide shade for those using the public footpath (especially in the areas with benches) and because they are mature trees they provide important habitat for a wide range of species. The trees stand as a highly visible and highly valued feature within this part of the AONB, from a distance forming a natural green skyline around the clubhouse and contributing to the sweep of landscape up from the bottom of Merrow Downs."

She said the response to the initial plans to fell the trees was "immediate and clear" and that the "amenity value" of the trees to the public was clear.



Councillor **George Potter**, (Lib Dem, Burpham), who sits on the district and the borough council, said the door was “always open” for the golf club to have a discussion about the plans for the trees. He added: “The borough council will make a decision based on the merits of the case, and considering comments made by any and all parties, but public support for making the TPOs permanent would certainly be welcome.”

Maggie Mamen lives in Canada, but regularly visits Guildford, and wrote to the council to call for the TPO to be made permanent. She said: “It is one of the major joys of these visits to walk up to Merrow Downs and admire the beautiful beech trees outside the club house in all the seasons. It is appalling that they are under any kind of threat.”

A **Guildford Borough Council** spokesperson said: “A Provisional Tree Preservation Order was served on Guildford Golf Club on 11 May 2023. Interested parties have at least 28 days to comment on, object to, or support the Order. The Provisional Order will remain in force for up to six months. During this time, but only after the first 28 days, we will consider the responses and decide whether the order will be confirmed.”

Guildford Golf Club was contacted for comment.

Council to pay £15,000 to families over failings

A “senior level” review into **Surrey County Council**’s educational shortcomings must be carried out and £15,000 paid out to the families it has failed, a local government watchdog ordered.

The county council must also demonstrate what it is doing to increase educational psychology capacity, and cut waiting times – as well as show how it will increase capacity for specialist school places.

The ruling came in three damning reports published by the **Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman** against Surrey County Council that found it has again failed young people.

In the first ruling, the county council was found to have caused someone to miss three quarters of their education over a two year period. According to the published report, a county council ‘fault’ caused an eight-month delay in their education and evidence showed the person’s father had “concerns” his son was “academically behind as a result”. The report read: “He has not received the education he was by law entitled to receive.

“This had a serious impact on [his] educational development and caused him distress by reason of being isolated at home. Our remedies guidance outlines that where no education is provided at all, we would normally recommend £600 per month to remedy a loss of education. There are 10 academic months in each school year. In this case, there was lack of the required provision over two academic years. This equates to a remedy of £12,000.

“However, the council provided 27 per cent of the provision [he] was entitled to receive and so this should be accounted for. This informs a financial remedy of £8,760 to put right [the] loss of education and his associated distress.”

The county council was also ordered to apologise to the family for each area of fault and injustice cause, and to pay a further £200 as an acknowledgement of the uncertainty and distress suffered.

As a result, the ombudsman said the county council must conduct a senior-level detailed written review into its failings. It should focus on “delays in implementing timely alternative provision and the effective monitoring and recording of decisions relating to what provision is suitable in the circumstances”.

The review will then inform “service improvements and policy changes, as well as specific feedback and areas of needed training to those involved in the case”.

The second ruling, issued at the same time in April and published six-weeks later, found council maladministration caused a mother, who said she had to leave work to look after her two out-of-school children, distress. The council blamed staffing changes and shortages but there appears, the ombudsman said, to have been a lack of monitoring or oversight during one of her children’s processes.

Documents seen by the ombudsman showed the council “delayed consulting with schools and finding suitable a school place”.

The watchdog found Surrey County Council to be at fault and that it failed to provide education and SEN provision to the children. As a result the council was told to apologise and pay £100 for time and trouble, £1,000 for distress, and £3,300 for missed provision.



The third ruling the ombudsman issued, found the council to be at fault for a two-month delay in issuing an Education, Health and Care Plan, and then failing to provide what it recommended. The council agreed to apologise and make a payment in recognition of the injustice caused. It must now apologise and pay £200 for the frustration caused by its faults.

The council was also ordered to pay £600 for the loss of provision caused by its delay, and a further £300 every month from the date of the plan until a special school place or suitable alternative provision can be arranged.

Within three months the council must also provide evidence of what it is doing to increase educational psychology capacity and reduce waiting times, as well as evidence of how it will increase capacity for specialist school places.

Clare Curran, Surrey County Council cabinet member for education and learning said “We take the findings from the Ombudsman very seriously and we apologise for the distress these families experienced.

We are not able to comment on any individual children specifically, however we are constantly reviewing how we support young people who are unable to attend school, and are implementing our £180million capital programme that is increasing the availability of, and access to specialist provision. We also recognise the significant issues that confront the SEND system nationally.

“We have seen a 64 per cent increase in education, health and care needs assessment requests across Surrey since 2020, at a time of a national shortage of educational psychologists.”

She added that the council was doing its “utmost” to recruit more but hoped to see the shortage in trained education psychologists and other issues addressed soon through the government’s improvement plan.

Cllr Curran said: “We remain committed to improving outcomes for children with additional needs so that they are happy, healthy, safe and confident about their future.”

Related reports:

Education assessment delays making parents sick

Council pays £3,900 to mother of SEND child

Surrey County failed SEND boy