



Surrey leading the shout: “Keep the noise down will you!”

An interdisciplinary network of engineers, policymakers, industry stakeholders and social scientists, led by the University of Surrey, will take on one of the UK’s most overlooked environmental challenges: noise pollution.

From the constant hum of road traffic to the thousands of flights in and out of UK airports, noise awareness in our modern world often fades into the background – but it carries significant consequences for both human health and wildlife. Noise Network Plus will focus on promoting conscious design processes to create quieter products, buildings and transportation systems – with the aim of reducing noise pollution and building a healthier environment over the next 10-15 years.

Professor Mark Plumbley, project lead and Professor of Signal Processing at the University of Surrey’s Centre for Vision, Speech and Signal Processing (CVSSP), said:

“Noise is a frequently neglected pollutant, but it has a big impact on health, society and the environment. For example, road noise can lead to sleep disturbance and heart disease, costing £7-10 billion each year in England alone. Once noise is out there, it is really hard to remove. We need to re-think how we design noise from the start.”

Awarded more than £1.8 million in funding, Noise Network Plus is one of six research projects to receive a share of £10 million from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC). Together they form part of its wider community engagement initiative to address ‘Tomorrow’s Engineering Research Challenges’ (TERC), launched today (11th February), which focuses on tackling the most pressing issues facing the engineering sector.

Professor Abigail Bristow from the University of Surrey, said:

“We’re at a pivotal moment in time where our environment is under threat, but we have the technology and expertise to make meaningful changes. Our mission-oriented research and innovation network will look to adopt a systems-thinking approach, addressing the root causes of noise and understanding its far-reaching impacts.”

A collaboration between the University of Surrey, City St George’s University of London, the University of Bath, and the University of Salford, Noise Network Plus aims to build unprecedented research capabilities to tackle the complex challenge of reducing noise and its impacts on people, the environment and the economy. Bringing together diverse teams and stakeholders, the initiative will promote inclusive dialogue and co-design innovative solutions.

Alan Hunter, Professor in Autonomous Systems based in the University of Bath’s Department of Mechanical Engineering, will lead the network’s efforts on underwater noise and artificial intelligence. This will include research into the effects of noise created by human activities at sea and improving the resilience of uncrewed underwater vehicles to noise. Professor Hunter said:

“The ocean is a noisy place, and a lot of the tools and technologies we rely on to deliver services either increase noise levels or are affected by noise. Taking oceanographic measurements, measuring marine wildlife populations, or inspecting underwater infrastructure, are all examples of activities affected by noise and of which we need to build a better understanding.”

Professor Antonio Torija Martinez and Dr Simone Graetzer are co-leads on the project at the University of Salford’s Acoustic Research Centre. Professor Martinez said:

“As the UK moves toward Net Zero, the adoption of sustainable energy and emerging technologies – such as wind turbines and drones – will introduce new sources of noise, fundamentally reshaping our soundscapes. This offers us a unique opportunity for a fresh start and through our initiative, we aim to transform the way noise is managed, embedding innovative solutions into engineering design and policy.”

Professor Charlotte Clark, Professor of Environmental Epidemiology in the Population Health Research Institute at City St George’s, University of London, said:

“This is a rare and timely opportunity to form multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary teams to develop engineering solutions addressing the problem of noise effects on health. We know that noise affects health, but we know little about how to mitigate the problem. The missions developed in the Noise Network Plus have the potential to step up mitigation efforts that will translate into major, long-term public health gains.”

The launch of Noise Network Plus will take place on 18th March at Prince Philip House, the home of the Royal Academy of Engineering, in London. The event will bring together a cross-section of people from engineering and other disciplines including researchers, industry, professional institutions, policymakers, charities, and other stakeholders, to identify the challenges that



need to be addressed, and plan how the Network can work to address these challenges.

Professor Adrian Hilton, Director of the Surrey Institute for People-Centred AI and CVSSP, added:

“Noise Network Plus represents a significant step towards addressing an often-overlooked pollutant and its detrimental impact on people. This interdisciplinary people-centred approach aims to tackle the complex challenges of noise in our modern world and develop innovative solutions for quieter and healthier communities.”

Epsom & Ewell Council not much in the red but too much in the pink!

Governance Failing Exposed by External Audit Findings

The Audit and Scrutiny Committee of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council convened on 6th February 2025, where the External Audit Report by Grant Thornton ignited a heated debate over transparency, governance, and the Council’s use of confidential “pink papers”. Against the background of relative positive news on the accounts and budgets the meeting focussed on the culture of secrecy over decision-making.

The external auditors highlighted a culture of secrecy, citing too many decisions being taken in private and a lack of openness in decision-making. Opposition Councillors Kate Chinn, Chris Ames and James Lawrence strongly criticised the Council’s handling of transparency, while the Council’s leadership attempted to downplay the concerns, insisting that governance processes were robust.

The External Audit Report: A Damning Verdict on Transparency

The Grant Thornton audit report drew heavily on a Local Government Association (LGA) Peer Review, which criticised the Council’s decision-making culture. The report highlighted that:

- “Too many decisions are being made under part two as a media management strategy.”
- There is a “lack of transparency” in governance structures.
- The Council needed to demonstrate clearer and more open decision-making.

These findings were met with stark reactions from opposition councillors, who argued that the Council was withholding information from elected members and the public.

Councillor Kate Chinn: “Stop the Navel-Gazing”

Before the committee formally discussed Item 4: External Audit, Councillor **Kate Chinn** (Labour, Court Ward) made a strong opening statement, focusing on the governance failures exposed by the auditors. She highlighted:

“Throughout their report, Grant Thornton noted the LGA report stating a culture of secrecy, noting a lack of transparency, stating a culture of secrecy described by members and that too many decisions are being held behind closed doors.”

Chinn criticised the ruling administration for focusing on internal restructuring, particularly the proposal to separate audit and scrutiny functions, rather than addressing substantive transparency issues. She stated:

“The ruling group has chosen to focus as a priority on the LGA recommendation to decouple audit and scrutiny. This is a decision that was already planted in council by the political leadership as a direction of travel, and I’m quite sure this is not a priority for



the residents of Epsom and Ewell facing so many cost-of-living challenges.”

She urged the Council to move beyond constitutional tinkering and focus on supporting frontline services:

“In view of the move to a unitary authority, the Council should stop spending so much time on internal matters—no more tweaking the constitution or fiddling about with the functions of a soon-to-be different committee. It’s just become navel-gazing.”

Councillor Chris Ames Challenges “Pink Paper” Secrecy

The overuse of confidential “pink papers” (private reports) became a central point of contention, with Councillor **Chris Ames** (Labour Court) raising concerns over the council’s reliance on closed-door discussions.

He directly challenged the administration on whether they were deliberately using “part two” rules to restrict public access:

“Are you using part two to be a euphemism for going into a closed session? Because that’s not my understanding of what part two means..... There is a withheld report here. It’s Appendix Two. It’s quite clear. It says on both the public pack and in item 13.”

Chair **Steve McCormick** Chair of the Committee (RA Woodcote and Langley) defended the Council’s approach, arguing that some reports contained sensitive financial details:

“If you start to ask questions on that, then we will have to go into part two. We will have to basically stop the feed. And once we go into part two, we can’t come out.”

However, Ames remained sceptical, pressing for clear definitions of what was truly confidential and what was being unnecessarily withheld. He questioned whether decisions should be debated in secret unless absolutely necessary: “My question is, are we using the word Part Two consistently and accurately? Because it says item 13 and it says it’s on the public pack.”

Adding to this transparency row, Councillor **Alex Coley** (RA Ruxley) reported that he was unable to access the part two documents on the Council’s internal system, ModGov:

“I’m not actually able to access the part two items in ModGov. So that’s perhaps why there’s been some confusion. I can’t get to them.”

Councillor James Lawrence: “A Transparency Crisis”

In one of the most scathing criticisms of the evening, Councillor **James Lawrence** (LibDem College Ward) said that his own experiences confirmed that the Council had a serious transparency problem. He declared:

“Quite frankly, my own experience of transparency at the Council is not great.”

He pointed to several key examples where he felt information was deliberately restricted:

1. The Local Plan Process: “I’ve struggled to be involved at all in the local plan process. The entire time I’ve been elected as a councillor, it has not come to a public committee until right before it went to full council.....If I’m struggling as a councillor, my goodness, what do we think residents are struggling to see?”
2. The Town Hall Move (£7m Project): “Still don’t really know why that was in part two.....Then of course we had the well-prepared, very slick PR statement to go out after, to give the impression to residents that there were no problems, that it’s all clean sailing.”
3. The Hook Road Arena Plan: “I remember I saw that appear in the Local Plan documents, and I emailed in questions about that. Nothing. Nothing back.”
4. Access to Audit Reports: “Having my own struggles to get hold of an audit report as a member of audit and scrutiny—it’s not a very good sign.....Of all the people to be struggling to get hold of an audit report, it shouldn’t be someone on the Audit and Scrutiny Committee.”



Council's Response: A Dismissive Attitude?

The Council's official response to the audit findings did not acknowledge any fundamental governance failures. Instead, the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) issued a brief statement, saying: "SLT believes the Council is transparent in its reporting and through Committees."

Lawrence ridiculed the response, stating: "My impression of the management response is essentially: Don't care. It's already transparent enough."

A pragmatic attitude from Councillor Alan Williamson

Cllr **Alan Williamson** (RA West Ewell) struck a pragmatic tone, questioning whether the Council should devote energy to internal reforms when local government reorganisation was imminent. He remarked:

"Obviously, the one area where there is an element of concern from the external auditors is governance and transparency. Now, this is, in my mind, an issue of culture rather than performance..... The whole focus of this Council is going to be the impending local government reorganisation, and to expect it to change its culture in the next year or two is somewhat implausible."

He suggested that the Council's priorities should shift towards ensuring stability during the transition rather than engaging in lengthy internal governance debates.

A Governance Crisis?

The Audit and Scrutiny Committee meeting exposed deep divisions within the Council. While external auditors and opposition councillors raised legitimate concerns about secrecy and accountability, the administration remained largely dismissive of these criticisms.

As Councillor Lawrence bluntly put it: "If I'm struggling as a councillor to access this information, what hope do our residents have?"

With local government reorganisation looming, the Council faces mounting pressure to reform its decision-making processes—but the meeting made clear that no immediate action is planned.

Whether transparency will improve or whether secrecy will remain embedded in the Council's culture remains to be seen.

Related reports:

Seeing through transparency in Council Chamber

"Audit and Scrutiny" under scrutiny

Annual audit of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council

Surrey's new rail link to Heathrow?

Plans for a new railway connecting Surrey to Heathrow and beyond have resurfaced as the track's backers welcomed government support for a third runway at the airport. The line, called the Heathrow Southern Railway (HSR), is a privately financed proposal to link towns in Surrey to one of the world's busiest airports.

If built, it would operate between Heathrow and London Waterloo via Staines. There would also be direct trains from the airport to Woking and Guildford, before carrying on to the south coast. Heathrow Southern Railway said it also would provide for an extension of the Elizabeth Line to Staines.

Baroness Jo Valentine, the group's chairperson, said: "The UK Government has set a bold agenda for growth with its support for a third runway at Heathrow Airport. Our railway enhances that growth by increasing connectivity and reducing surface emissions. These benefits accrue with a two runway airport but will be enhanced with an additional runway. We look forward to working



with all partners to make this a reality.”

Mark Livock, chief executive, added: “The new Government has expressed interest in finding ways to harness private sector finance in making the delivery of major infrastructure schemes more affordable. Heathrow Southern Railway has a depth of experience in creating opportunities for private investment that could deliver tangible benefits to the UK, and southern rail access to Heathrow would positively transform public transport connectivity to Europe’s busiest airport.”

The group estimates that the new route would cut about millions of road journeys – with many of those from the M25. They added: “Our construction plans minimise the impact on neighbouring communities by providing a route mainly in tunnel and using only electric trains. Unlike the previous “Airtrack” proposals, HSR avoids level crossings in the Egham area.”

An HSR spokesperson said: “Our proposed route starts at Heathrow’s Terminal 5 station and is intended to run mainly in tunnel and be electrified to minimise environmental impact. It rises to the surface to connect to the existing railway near Staines and Virginia Water.”

Related reports:

Heathrow expansion reaction

“Blocks away” from airport expansions

Hsr Proposed Route (Image Heathrow Southern Rail)

Guildford Borough Council keeps its lights on

A Surrey council may have “kept the lights on” and balanced the budget this year but trouble could be looming. The pessimistic warning came during the budget meeting as councillors were told they will have to make tough decisions in the future.

Members of Guildford Borough Council signed off a balanced 2025/26 budget this week despite an ‘unkind’ settlement from the government leaving levels of funding largely unchanged from the previous year. Councillors from all parties praised officers and finance bosses for turning Guildford’s accounts around in the last two years. The Surrey borough was nearing bankruptcy in 2023 with the strain from rising historical debts.

But all is not as rosy as it seems. Each year Guildford Borough Council must find £2m worth of savings just to keep afloat and cover borrowing costs for its “ambitious” capital programme. The projected budget gap is expected to grow from 0 in 2025 to potentially £5.9 million in four years (2028/29) with at least an £1.6 million increase every year. Service costs from the council are projected to rise from £16.4 million in 2025/26 to potentially £20.3m in 2028/29.

Over the next five years, Cllr Richard Lucas (Lead for Finance and Property) explained the requirement for Guildford to pay back its escalating debt represents a “major financial challenge”. He said: “Each year we will have to find another £2m worth of savings just to stay still and cover our borrowing costs increasing.”

However, the council’s plan for paying back debts for building projects does not include the Weyside Urban Village scheme. A hugely ambitious undertaking, the Weyside Urban Village project is the council’s regeneration scheme aiming to build 1,500 homes. The borrowing costs, or interest, for the project are due after 2029 and so are not incorporated into the medium term financial plan.

Despite work being underway, the council still has not quite figured out how it’s going to foot the bill. Although it may seem a ‘future problem’, councillors will decide how they are going to finance the project in March.

“If anything is going to put the council back in the financial mire it is that,” said Cllr Patrick Oven. He said although he was very “committed” to the scheme, he “wondered whether we can afford it”.

Cllr Richard Lucas told the council the budget was balanced by “finding some savings within the services, increasing some fees and charges”. The Lead Councillor for Finance and Property added the main source of potential savings going forwards is from opportunities of collaboration with Waverley. The councils had recently claimed £600k has been saved in the local authority partnership between Guildford and Waverley.

National insurance increases took the biggest chunk of the council’s finances, hitting Guildford with around £1,000 per full time employee. Wage rises and inflation is also squeezing the council’s budget, demanding the increase in council tax by the maximum 2.99 per cent. Charges for council services are projected to increase by at least 3.75 per cent.



Non-ringfenced reserves for a rainy day sit at around £17.7m, well above the minimum 5% of general fund expenditure recommended.

Cllr Patrick Oven described the accounts as “an austerity budget”. Expenditure is reduced in 2025/26 but for the next four years spending “effectively falls off a cliff” with money dropping to about a third of the £111k promised this year. “But we can’t spend money we haven’t got,” he added.

Opponents still criticised the Liberal Democrat administration for a “lack of ambition” with the budget as no ‘rabbit out of the hat’ or exciting projects were revealed. Cllr Joss Bigmore said: “It’s really sad that we’re at this stage now where we’re going budget to budget trying to keep the lights on and that leaves so little discretion for any political ambition or choices.”

Guildford council has also agreed to undergo a ‘zero budgeting basis’ by looking at everything it does, covering its statutory duties and long-term priorities. Cllr Lucas said: “It inevitably means we will stop doing some things. There will be pain involved but we have £2m a year, each year, to find extra savings.”

Outside Guildford Borough Council’s HQ, Millmead House. (Credit: Guildford Borough Council)

Surrey’s flood defences and energy efficiency funding

Funding for Surrey’s climate change programme has been reinstated after the county council received £1.5m more in government grants than it was expecting.

Surrey’s Greener Future’s programme is a climate change strategy that aims to reduce carbon emissions and make the county net-zero by 2050. Budget details had initially proposed to slash £0.5m from the Greener Future’s spreadsheet, as part of Surrey County Council’s identified £66.4m cuts it needs to make in 2025/26.

But the cuts will now be reversed after an amendment put forward by the Residents’ Association/Independents and the Green Party. Members unanimously agreed to the proposed changes to the budget at a full council meeting on February 4.

Cllr Catherine Powell said in the meeting: “Younger residents want a long-term focus which I don’t believe this budget fully supports.” The Independent member for Farnham Residents said the funds will safeguard the “vital work on developing and embedding climate adaptation”.

Money reinvested back into the Greener Futures team can be used to develop and integrate climate adaptation policies such as flood defences, heat avoidance, and programmes to improve household energy efficiency. It also includes developing finance opportunities like natural capital and organising health initiatives.

Cllr Jonathan Essex (Green Party/ Redhill East), who initiated the amendment, said: “Now is the time to strengthen and extend, not water down, climate action across Surrey, so I am delighted that we have taken this step to continue tackling the climate emergency.

“Leadership by local councils, including here in Surrey, is vital to ensure that the health of the economy is defined by community well-being and sustainable living, not by growth at all costs.”

Cllr Powell added: “I firmly believe that climate change is not only real, but impacting Surrey and our residents and our businesses today.” She cited the multiple instances of flooding across Surrey last year which the Environmental Agency said would only happen once every 30 years in normal condition.

The agreed change was just one of five amendments the Green Party put forward to change the council’s budget, the rest were rejected. The others included creating a voluntary contribution fund for early intervention children services, closing the Your Fund Surrey programme, putting a transport scheme on hold and committing to a cross-party working group for SEND needs.

View from Little Misley, one of the fields set to have solar panels. (Credit: Guildford Borough Council planning documents)



Mole Valley setting a green belt development trend?

Up to 200 new homes will be built on former green belt land despite fears they could overwhelm the already strained sewage system. Mole Valley District Council's planning committee approved developer Thakeham's vision for the 27-hectare site off Little Bookham Street on Wednesday, February 5. As well as the 200 homes, the plans will feature a community building, Gypsy and Traveller pitches, and public open space that the developers said would also open access to nearby ponds. Forty per cent of the homes would be affordable.

The site has been identified for development by the council's local plan, but the application had drawn more than 300 objections. Residents speaking at the meeting raised concerns about raw sewage, as well as the impact on local children being pushed out of their school's catchment area. Thames Water, however, raised no objections. Christine Milstead said: "Our green belt is definitely not Angela Rayner's gray belt. We think this development will cause harm to the green belt and protected habitats. All residents have objected to surface water flooding, and there are springs all over this site. For years, residents have been pumping water off their patios to prevent their houses from flooding. When you get a lot of rain, water does not drain through permeable surfaces. Will the proposed infrastructure capture water from the rear of new properties, or will it just run down to Little Bookham Street?"

Speaking on behalf of the plans, Tristan Robinson, Thakeham's director of external affairs, said Mole Valley was the fourth least affordable place to live in the country. He highlighted young couples struggling to afford housing and the 680 households on the waiting list. Despite the plans being voted through—by eight in favour, three against, and one abstention—Councillor Joanna Slater (Conservative; Leatherhead South) cautioned against setting a precedent for developing beyond what was laid out in the council's local plan for green belt. Cllr Paul Kennedy (Liberal Democrats: Bookham East and Eastwick Park) also urged the committee to heed residents and environmental groups calling for the protection of the "precious unspoiled countryside."

The new homes will be net carbon zero and feature a mix of one to four-bedroom properties. The developers aim to create 45 acres of open space and a new country park accessible to the wider community. Mr Robinson said: "After undertaking a comprehensive public consultation process for Land North West of Preston Farm, we are pleased to receive backing from Mole Valley District Council. The scheme includes 40 per cent affordable housing—something urgently needed locally—and significant new public open spaces for everyone to enjoy."

Plans for 200 homes in Little Bookham (image Thakeham)

Surrey Uni leads research to replace plastic with paper for liquids

A multimillion-pound research project, called SustaPack, aims to overcome manufacturing challenges for the next generation of sustainable, paper-based packaging for liquids. Backed by a £1 million grant from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) as part of UKRI's co-investing programme, packaging technology company Pulpex Ltd has joined forces with the University of Surrey to refine its manufacturing processes to provide a viable solution to plastic pollution.

Contributing matching support towards the project, Pulpex has already made significant strides in the development of its patented technology, which produces degradable bottles made from natural wood fibres. The packaging offers a sustainable alternative to traditional plastic materials and can be recycled in existing paper waste streams.

However, designing the next generation of production technology and materials requires novel and fundamental research to address current limitations, including new analytical techniques to improve product quality, optimising performance and reducing in-process imperfections.

Scott Winston, CEO at Pulpex, said:

"We're excited to strengthen our existing collaboration with the University of Surrey to enhance our technologies and processes. Our SustaPack partnership will help us advance safe, sustainable packaging solutions, enabling brand owners to meet Net-Zero targets. It gives consumers sustainable choices, delivers answers for brand owners, and enables supply chains and retailers to deliver their carbon footprint reduction goals – a priority for all."

A key feature of the packaging is its multi-layered barrier coating, which prevents contained liquid from leaking, as well as inward oxygen permeation, maintaining high-quality products for consumers. To create a step-change in the energy usage in methods



used to apply these coatings, the researchers plan to develop innovative processes that consume less energy and water while increasing the shelf life of packaged goods.

Professor Joseph Keddie, from the University of Surrey's School of Mathematics and Physics, and Fellow of the Institute for Sustainability, said:

"Over the past couple of years, I have forged a close relationship with Pulpex as a Royal Society Industry Fellow, and I am enthusiastic about strengthening our ties through our SustaPack Partnership.

"Our aim here is to combine novel coating processes, mechanistic modelling, computer vision and artificial intelligence (AI) to establish a 'dry' spray coating process that deposits food-safe, degradable coatings. This technology, which isn't yet commercially available, will not only drive the next generation of packaging technology but will also contribute to a significant reduction in plastic pollution and lower carbon emissions from manufacturing."

A multi-disciplinary team of researchers will explore the feasibility of using thermal imaging to detect defects in wet coatings as they occur, enabling immediate corrections using AI. Multi-scale mechanistic models of the coating process will be employed to identify the sources of imperfections and non-uniformities and then eliminate them to ensure optimal packaging performance.

By applying innovative computer vision techniques powered by AI, the project aims to identify production defects in real-time, optimise materials and processes, and achieve 100% reliability in the manufactured products.

The outcomes of the project could set new standards for environmentally friendly packaging, helping brand owners reduce their environmental impact amidst ever-increasing environmental regulations - while offering consumers eco-friendly options to help fight against plastic pollution.

From left to right: Dr Hui Luo and Professor Robert Dorey (University of Surrey's School of Engineering); Professor Joseph Keddie (University of Surrey's School of Mathematics and Physics); Scott Winston, CEO at Pulpex; Barrie Harvey, COO at Pulpex; Dr Simon Hadfield (University of Surrey's Centre for Vision, Speech and Signal Processing); Professor Charley Wu (University of Surrey's School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering).

Elections Delayed as Surrey Faces Uncertain Future of Local Government Shake-Up

Surrey residents will have to wait an extra year to vote in the county elections following the government's decision to postpone the polls from May 2025 to May 2026. The delay comes as part of a sweeping local government reorganisation that will see the biggest structural shake-up in fifty years. However, concerns are mounting over the rushed timetable, the fate of council debts, and the financial burden that could fall on responsible local authorities.

Reorganisation at Speed

The government's drive for local government reform is progressing at an accelerated pace, with councils required to submit interim proposals by 21 March 2025 and finalised plans by 9 May 2025. The reform aims to replace Surrey's current two-tier system - where Surrey County Council oversees borough and district councils - with unitary authorities that will consolidate power at a higher level.

Under plans being considered, a directly elected mayor could manage strategic services such as policing, fire and rescue, health, and education. However, uncertainty remains over whether the new unitary system will feature a single authority covering all of Surrey's 1.2 million residents or two to three smaller councils.

Who Pays the Price?

A key source of controversy is the issue of existing council debts, particularly in boroughs such as Woking, Spelthorne, and Runnymede, which have amassed a combined debt exceeding £3 billion. Woking has already declared effective bankruptcy, with Spelthorne and Runnymede under government scrutiny.

Local leaders across Surrey are voicing their objections to any attempt to spread the financial burden of these debts across councils that have maintained responsible fiscal management.

Councillor Richard Biggs, leader of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, said: "Our view remains that plans should not support



any restructuring of local government boundaries based on ‘redistributing’ the debt of other authorities.” His council, along with others, has worked to maintain financial stability while continuing to provide additional services beyond statutory requirements.

The Residents’ Association and Independents Group at Surrey County Council has strongly criticised the government’s approach, arguing that it is forcing through change with “zero funding” while suggesting that costs could be covered by selling off council-owned assets. Group leader Councillor Catherine Powell raised concerns that the government expects local authorities to fund reorganisation through “capital receipts,” which could mean selling buildings currently used to deliver essential services.

Opposition to Election Postponement

The Surrey Leaders Group, a forum representing the county’s borough and district councils, has already voiced opposition to the decision to delay elections. Chair of the group, Councillor **Hannah Dalton**, (RA Epsom and Ewell for Stoneleigh ward), warned that the proposed reorganisation could remove decision-making from local communities and lacks clarity on how existing debts will be handled.

“There is a real risk that new authorities will be set up to fail,” said Cllr Dalton, highlighting the potential for new unitary councils to inherit substantial financial liabilities without sufficient funding or support from the government.

A Distracted Local Government

Critics argue that the rapid timeline for reorganisation is an unwelcome distraction at a time when councils are struggling with increased demand for statutory services, including social care and housing. Concerns have also been raised about the practicalities of implementing a new financial IT system for the newly formed authorities, given that Surrey County Council’s recent system overhaul has been plagued with problems.

With just weeks to prepare draft proposals and a final deadline in early May, councils across Surrey are left scrambling to determine the best way forward. The government’s insistence on a rapid restructuring without clear funding commitments has left many questioning whether the changes will deliver better services—or simply create further financial and administrative chaos.

For now, Surrey residents must wait for further clarity on how their local government will be reshaped, and more crucially, who will bear the cost of these sweeping changes.

Related reports:

[Political furies over Surrey election postponement](#)

[Surrey County Council election delay stirring up a storm](#)

[What might local government reorganisation mean for Epsom and Ewell?](#)

[All change! Epsom and Ewell Borough Council approaching its final stop?](#)

[Surrey’s Conservative leader wants to postpone May’s poll reckoning](#)

[Tiers to be shed if Epsom and Ewell loses its Borough Council?](#)

Surrey mansion tax debated at County Council

Plans for ‘those with the broadest shoulders’ to voluntarily pay more council tax to help those in need have been labelled ‘morally corrupt’ in a heated debate. The idea is based on a scheme introduced by Westminster Council in 2018, dubbed a “mansion tax”.

Council Tax is based on the property value of a house if it was sold in April 1991 in England. For instance, Band H is for properties valued at over £320,000. But with the average house price in Surrey today at just over £600k, according to Rightmove, councillors agreed the council tax system needs reform.

Paul Follows, Liberal Democrat group leader, put forward an idea to ask residents in Band H if they would be willing to pay more money to support essential services and those in need. He asked the county council to “explore the creation of a voluntary contribution scheme” for those in the highest bracket of council tax.

But the Lib Dem’s amendment to the budget was lambasted by councillors at a full council meeting on February 4. Members voted against proposal 43 against, 25 in favour and six abstentions.



Brandishing the proposal as “morally corrupt”, Cllr Ernest Mallett MBE (Residents’ Association and Independents/ West Molesey) argued many people, like himself, support charities which try to combat poverty. He said that for Cllr Follows to suggest a council with a £2bn turnover should attempt to “levy funds from residents” is “totally immoral” and “unjustified”.

The suggestion was tabled as an amendment to Surrey’s budget for 2025/26 at a full council meeting on February 4. Residents living in a Band H property will be facing a council tax bill of over £3,690 this year as the council’s budget was approved.

Not a concrete plan, Cllr Follows proposed a cross-party working group would be created to flesh out the scheme’s scope and structure. Then the designs would be brought back to council for consideration for the next financial year. He said: “It does not cost us a lot of money to try, and we may help a lot of people if we do.”

Cllr Mark Nuti (Conservative/ Chertsey) said it was “an affront” to the people of Surrey who are generous with their time and money in the voluntary sector and philanthropic investors in the community.

Council leader Tim Oliver agreed and said Surrey “already has one of the highest council tax bills in the country”. Cllr Oliver said members should focus more on local government reform rather than getting residents to pay extra.

Worried about the “unintended consequences” of the scheme, Cllr Denise Turner Steward (Conservative/ Staines South and Ashford West) said putting “moral pressure” on residents to pay more council tax to help others could “divert” funds away from much-needed charities in Surrey.

But not everyone shared the same view. “There is nothing iniquitous of asking those with more to consider voluntarily giving a little extra,” said Cllr George Potter (Lib Dem/Burpham). “If that bastion of socialism in Westminster can manage it, then surely middle of the road Surrey can certainly manage it.”

Other members took a more hard-line approach. “If you can afford a £3m or £4m house, you ain’t poor,” said Cllr Jan Mason (Residents’ Association/ West Ewell). “They know they are buying housing in an affluent area, they are able to pay.” She told the council many of the residents in her ward and it would be an “insult to my residents who are on really low income” if bigger council tax bands were not brought in.

Cllr Lance Spencer (Goldsworth East and Horsell Village), seconding the motion, said he understood not everyone in a Band H property would be able to contribute. However, the voluntary contribution could provide “an opportunity to make a significant impact to the county’s future” with the “further degradation of services realistically inevitable”.

Waverley Borough Council, where Cllr Follows is leader, has also sent a letter to residents asking for their thoughts on a proposal to introduce voluntary tax contributions to support projects and vulnerable residents across the borough.

Paul Follows speaking at full council meeting 4/02. (Credit: Surrey County Council live stream)

Citizens Advice Epsom & Ewell Delivers Crucial Support Amid Rising Cost-of-Living Pressures

Citizens Advice Epsom & Ewell (CAEE) has revealed the scale of its impact over the past year, with thousands of local residents receiving support on a range of pressing financial and social issues. From benefits and debt advice to housing support, the charity continues to be a lifeline for many struggling to make ends meet.

A Year of Helping the Community

Figures released by CAEE highlight just how vital their work has been. In 2024 alone, the organisation:

- Assisted **3,394 people** with **10,233 issues**
- Made **12,406 client and third-party contacts**
- Secured **£1,022,934** in additional income for clients

For January 2025, the demand for support has surged even further:

- **560 people** received help in just one month



- **1,036 issues** were handled
- **£159,670** in extra income was secured for struggling households

The most common concerns among residents remain **benefits, tax credits, housing, and debt**, reflecting the ongoing financial pressures facing families in Epsom & Ewell.

Expanding Outreach in 2025

With the rising cost of living continuing to bite, CAEE is set to expand its **energy outreach programme** to better reach underrepresented communities. The initiative aims to provide guidance on **energy bills, debt support, benefit checks, and energy-saving advice**, ensuring that vulnerable individuals can access the help they need.

The charity is also distributing funds from the **Household Support Fund** until March 2025, offering financial aid to those on low incomes. Residents struggling with essential costs are urged to get in touch before the deadline.

Making a Real Difference

Beyond statistics, the impact of Citizens Advice is best illustrated through the experiences of those they have helped. One such case involved a **vulnerable client** living in unsuitable accommodation, battling rent arrears and struggling with multiple health concerns.

With extensive support from CAEE, she was able to:

- Repay her rent arrears
- Secure a move to a more suitable **ground-floor flat**
- Receive **medical and financial assistance**
- Successfully challenge a dispute through the **Energy Ombudsman**

This intervention not only improved her living conditions but also stabilised her finances, demonstrating the charity's commitment to holistic, long-term support.

Financial and Social Impact

CAEE's work delivers significant savings to public services, including:

- **£186,802** in NHS savings by reducing demand on mental health and GP services
- **£550,131** in savings for the **Department for Work and Pensions** by helping people stay in work
- **£326,078** saved for **housing providers** by preventing evictions

In total, their advice and interventions generated a staggering **£3.85 million** in value for the local economy.

Looking Ahead: Advocacy and Research in 2025

Beyond direct support, CAEE also plays a key role in influencing policy and addressing systemic issues. In 2025, they will continue to campaign on critical concerns such as:

- **The cost-of-living crisis**
- **Housing shortages and homelessness prevention**
- **Debt, including rising council tax arrears**
- **Access to health and disability benefits**

A key event on the horizon is **Citizens Advice Data Insights**, taking place on 25th February 2025, where experts will discuss how accumulated debt is preventing people from rebuilding their lives.



Support Your Local Citizens Advice

With demand for services higher than ever, Citizens Advice Epsom & Ewell is calling for public support. Running the service costs over **£100 per client per year**, and donations play a crucial role in ensuring free advice remains available.

Residents can contribute by donating as little as **£10 a month**, helping to sustain a vital service that continues to transform lives across the borough.

For **free, confidential advice**, visit CAEE at The Old Town Hall, The Parade, Epsom, or call **0808 278 7963**.