



What might local government reorganisation mean for Epsom and Ewell?

As Surrey faces a significant overhaul of its local government structure, residents of Epsom and Ewell are rightfully concerned about the potential financial repercussions. The proposed reorganisation may lead to two unitary authorities that merge the county's 11 borough and district councils, a move intended to streamline services and reduce administrative costs. However, this consolidation raises pressing questions about fiscal responsibility and the equitable distribution of debt, particularly for boroughs like Epsom and Ewell that have historically maintained prudent financial practices.

The Financial Landscape of Surrey's Boroughs

The Epsom and Ewell Times has just published three reports detailing the financial woes of three councils within Surrey that are grappling with substantial debts resulting from ambitious investment strategies.

- **Woking Borough Council** declared effective bankruptcy in 2023, burdened by debts exceeding £2 billion due to failed investments in large-scale projects. The council has since been compelled to implement severe austerity measures, including significant tax increases, service closures, and asset sales.
- **Spelthorne Borough Council** faces over £1 billion in debt from investments in commercial properties. A recent audit revealed "significant weaknesses" in financial record-keeping, inadequate plans to address looming budget gaps, and concerns over governance and internal culture.
- **Guildford Borough Council** is confronting a challenging financial future, with projected budget gaps escalating to £5.9 million by 2028/29. The council has acknowledged the need for cost reductions and increased income to manage these pressures.

Epsom and Ewell's Prudent Financial Management

In contrast, Epsom and Ewell Borough Council has consistently balanced its budgets or been able to use reserves to meet its obligations, demonstrating fiscal discipline and effective financial stewardship. This prudent management has enabled the council to maintain most services and infrastructure without accruing unsustainable debt levels.

The Justice of Debt Redistribution

The proposed reorganisation raises a critical question: Is it just for residents of financially prudent boroughs like Epsom and Ewell to assume responsibility for the substantial debts incurred by other councils? Merging councils into larger unitary authorities could lead to a pooling of assets *and liabilities*, potentially obliging Epsom and Ewell's residents to contribute to servicing debts they had no part in accumulating.

This scenario not only challenges principles of fiscal fairness but also risks penalising councils that have exercised sound financial management. It is imperative to consider whether it is equitable for residents to bear the financial burdens resulting from the mismanagement of neighbouring authorities.

Calls for Government Intervention

Recognising the potential injustice, Surrey County Council's leader, Councillor Tim Oliver, has advocated for central government to write off the significant debts of councils like Woking before proceeding with devolution plans. This approach aims to mitigate the financial risks associated with high debt levels and prevent the unfair distribution of financial burdens across the county. How likely is it that a Labour Government will write off a debt accumulated by Woking under its previous Conservative led Council?

The Path Forward

As discussions about local government reorganisation progress, it is crucial to ensure that any new structures are underpinned by principles of fiscal responsibility and equity. Potential solutions include:

- **Debt Segregation:** Isolating the debts of heavily indebted councils to prevent them from being transferred to newly formed unitary authorities.
- **Government Debt Relief:** Advocating for central government intervention to alleviate or write off unsustainable debts, ensuring that the financial missteps of certain councils do not adversely impact the entire county.



- **Transparent Financial Assessments:** Conducting comprehensive financial evaluations of all councils involved in the reorganisation to inform fair and equitable decision-making.

The proposed reorganisation of Surrey's local government presents an opportunity to enhance efficiency and service delivery at the cost of Borough based democracy. However, it also necessitates careful consideration of the financial implications for all residents. Epsom and Ewell's community, having benefited from prudent financial management, should not be unduly burdened by the debts of other councils. It is incumbent upon policymakers to design a reorganisation framework that upholds fiscal justice, ensuring that the residents of Epsom and Ewell are not unfairly disadvantaged in the pursuit of broader administrative reforms.

Related reports:

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?

Will Epsom and Ewell be bailing out Woking?

Debt-ridden Woking Borough Council has approved the sale of two more assets as it continues slashing its way to a balanced budget.

The bankrupt authority, with debts of more than £2billion, is undergoing a full review of the buildings it owns as it's forced to sell them off to try to ease the burden on the taxpayer if and when a Government bailout happens.

The two most recent sell offs are the Egley Road Barn Site and Sheerwater Nursery. They are currently being used by the Woking Gymnastics Club and a charity.

Woking Borough Council went effectively bankrupt in 2023 on the back of a failed investment strategy to regenerate parts of the borough and has since had to raise its share of tax by 10 per cent, close a raft of public services including toilets, lose about 60 staff members and stop funding to community groups.

Borough leader Councillor Anne-Marie Barker told the Thursday January 16 executive committee: "It's part of our asset disposal program to help to reduce the debt at Woking Council."

The meeting heard that an earlier bid to sell Egley Road had fallen through but a second offer had since been accepted.

Councillor Dale Roberts said: "The purchaser progressed their offer in good faith but has ultimately withdrawn. The recommendation is to transact with the next highest bidder.

"The recommended purchaser, the new bidder, has submitted the highest financial offer on a conditional basis subject to planning."

Exact details of what this is, and the value of the bids, are still being kept private.

He added: "These decisions aren't purely economic, it's a key factor for this council of course as it's engaged in an asset disposal and debt reduction programme but it's not purely economic" and that the decision "also aligned with the Woking for all strategy".

He said: "It will help deliver a thriving community through partnerships."

Tenants Woking Gymnastics Club has been sent what the council calls a "letter of assurance" outlining what help the authority can provide going forward "in terms of balancing everyone's interest".

Cllr Roberts said: "We are doing everything we can though with Woking Gymnastics Club to facilitate their extension at the new site at Kingfield.

He added: "The disposal will facilitate the regeneration of the site.

"It will complement the existing development of residential land on the adjacent land holding and it will increase the provision of homes within the borough.

"It will also of course generate a capital receipt."

The Sheerwater site, in Blackmore Crescent, has been sold to a "special purchaser because advantages have been found for their



ownership that would not be available to other buyers.”

The two-storey community building, together with parking and a garden, does not currently provide the council with any rental income. It is being let to a charity that leases the entire site for free. The charity licences part of the building to a children’s nursery with the income retained by the charity to support its operation.

The report into the sale read: “The authority recognises that this may require difficult decisions to be made as part of the wider transformation policy and an important priority for the council is to revise its approach to property ownership and to identify opportunities to raise both income and capital receipts from the disposal of surplus properties within the context of supporting current/future council expenditure/debt.

Will Epsom and Ewell be bailing out Guildford?

A Surrey council faces tough decisions in the future after receiving a “very difficult financial settlement from the government”.

Guildford Borough Council has no extra funding to meet inflation and demand pressures, meaning it will have to cut costs and increase income to make ends meet. Cost pressures looming over the council stand at over £3m, with National Insurance increases and developments causing the most strain.

The local authority said it has been told the settlement it would receive from the government for the financial year 2025/26. However, the “significant change” for the next year is Guildford council will not have a cash increase despite an assumed council tax rise of 2.99%.

Even though residents and businesses may face increased council tax and business rates, without extra government funding, the authority’s overall “Core Spending Power” will remain the same,” the council’s report stated.

No additional funding is coming to meet the cost of pay awards from the central government, inflation and demand pressures. Guildford Council is therefore reliant upon cost reduction and increasing income to meet these costs. Richard Bates, Guildford Council’s Chief Financial Officer, said: “In the light of a poor settlement, we’ve done the best we can.”

The projected budget gap is expected to grow from 0 in 2025 to potentially £5.9m in four years (2028/29) with a at least a £1.6m increase every year, Service costs from the council are projected to rise from £16.4m in 2025/26 to potentially £20.3m in 2028/29.

Council officers said they will be looking to attack the gap with a series of measures, including budget reviews across the board, service reviews, and comparing charges (e.g. Car parking) with neighbouring councils.

Cost pressures facing the council currently stand at around £3.18m, with the biggest demands coming from firstly the rise in National Insurance and then capital spending on developments.

National Insurance (NI) increases were announced in the Chancellor’s autumn statement and the combined cost of these changes adds up to around £1,000 per employee, according to council documents. Not only affecting public bodies, the rise in NI costs could impact contractors and suppliers to the council and push up costs further.

The government is providing some support to public sector employees, but the actual amounts were not announced as part of the provisional settlement. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government said it plans to put £69bn into council budgets across England.

Paying for the council’s “ambitious” building programme is a significant part of the financial gap, with large amounts being borrowed for major schemes like the Weyside Urban Village development. However, the cost of borrowing has increased significantly since many of the major schemes in the capital programme were approved, in line with the council’s report.

Although the 10-year-project will require significant borrowing, the council is managing the levels of debt by selling assets. Officers have warned that a borrowing strategy for the next few years will be “critical” to ensure interest costs are minimised and that long term deals are secured at competitive and affordable rates.

However, the Chief Finance Officer said in his report that the “on-going inflation pressure on land values leave a significant projected deficit on [the Weyside Urban Village] scheme”. He added that a “mitigation strategy needs to be agreed in Spring ’25”.

A decision on the council’s medium term budget (2025/2026- 2028/29) will be made at full council on February 5.

Outside Guildford Borough Council (Credit: Google Street View)



Will Epsom and Ewell be bailing out Spelthorne?

“Significant weaknesses” in a council’s financial records have been laid bare in a new report.

External auditors for Spelthorne Borough Council said they could not fully assess or complete the financial statements as there was inadequate record keeping. Many queries remained unanswered, said auditors, who reported they were unable to conclude on the 2023/2024 closing balances.

“Without complete and accurate information, the Council cannot have full confidence in the financial decisions reached,” the report said. “The finance papers are detailed but, in our judgement, can be confusing to follow, contain contradictory information in the same paper and lack a clear narrative by way of explanation.”

Spelthorne Council has not fully addressed the funding gaps and risks within its financial plan, according to the report. The latest outline budget for 2025/26 reported in December 2024 shows the council closing its £0.3m funding gap in 2025/26 but it has larger gaps of £3.5m and £5.4m predicted for the following consecutive financial years 2026/27 and 2027/28. The report said the council does not have agreed plans to address the budget gaps which amount to around 15-20 per cent of net revenue expenditure.

Although the council has a significant amount of investment properties for which it receives commercial rents, auditors found recording keeping for monitoring the key leases was “inadequate”. The council had around £52m in commercial rents in 2023/24 but auditors could not be assured by the amount recognised and the cash received.

The “uncomfortable” report made for “stark reading” by both councillors and officers. Councillor Karen Howkins told members Spelthorne “is a council in crisis” at an Audit Committee council meeting on January 28.

Auditors raised concerns that the minimum revenue position (MRP) – the amount of money the council must put aside in its budget each year to ensure it can repay debt incurred for capital expenditure- is likely to have been played down significantly. But auditors said they did not have enough evidence to conclude this was the case.

Spelthorne Council is currently facing over £1bn debt from investing in shops and offices, including Elmsleigh Retail Centre in Staines. Paying this sum for the next 50 years, auditors stressed the council were not “effectively managing” the risk.

Auditors also highlighted issues around Spelthorne’s accounts for purchasing three commercial properties including Carter Building, Thames Tower and Porter Building- worth £351m. The report reads that Spelthorne council only paid £297.9m for the properties and the total figure was ‘grossed up’ by £53.7m to include tax and added the debt to its balance sheet.

The first audit the council has received since 2017/18, auditors noted auditing requirements and have changes and standards have increased. The report also highlighted issues with council staff not having capacity or capability to carry out or send through the work required for the audit.

Officers said a training session will be provided for council staff and, in future, staff will be separated between those working on the audit and those working on the council’s overall budget setting.

Several issues and weaknesses were identified during the audit and 16 recommendations have been put forward.

The report flagged “significant weaknesses” in governance arrangements and “extremely poor relationships” between some political groups is impacting the council’s financial management. Auditors recommended the council “urgently” address the issue of trust and apparent “toxic culture” between members and officers.

An LGA Peer review in November 2022 concluded: “There is poor behaviour by some councillors towards each other and staff which is widely recognised as damaging the council’s reputation. It is also affecting staff morale and the organisation’s ability to retain and recruit staff.” As of January 2025 there have been 10 complaints outstanding with the monitoring officer regarding councillor behaviour.

Image: Spelthorne Borough Council offices in Knowle Green, Staines. Credit: Emily Coady-Stemp



Surrey County tax increase vote

A council tax hike could be hitting Surrey as members take the first look at the county's budget. Residents could see a maximum increase of 4.99 per cent on council tax, meaning a rise of £1.69 a week for a Band D household.

The proposed increase, which would come into force from April, was agreed by the cabinet on January 28 and will be voted on at Surrey Council's budget meeting next week on 4 February.

"I absolutely recognise the pressure that any increase in council tax will put on households," said Tim Oliver OBE, Surrey County Council leader, at the cabinet meeting. But the leader added increasing council tax was important to "balance our budget and to ensure we can continue to deliver improved and increased services meeting the demand we know we will experience".

Surrey county council said there is a significant pressure on this year's budget due to the rising demand for services, like adult social care and children's home to school transport, combined with inflation and added national insurance contributions- which has resulted in a higher cost of delivery.

Council documents state that for the local authority to balance the books, it has to hike up council tax by the maximum 2.99 per cent, and increase the Adult Social Care Precept by 2 per cent. The final budget for 2025/26 proposes total funding of £1,264.1m, an increase of £55.7m from 2024/25.

Currently a Band D property pays £1,758.60 a year in council tax, but following the maximum increase in tax, residents could see themselves forking out almost £88 extra. This would bring the total up to £1,846.35 a year. People living in Band H properties could have to cough up £3,692.70 a year for the county council.

This does not take into account other charges in a household's council tax bill, such as parish precepts, or the police and crime commissioner's precept. Surrey's Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), Lisa Townsend, has heavily indicated she wants the precept to increase by roughly 4.3 per cent. A decision on the PCC's budget is also due on Monday February 3.

Council reports state the local authority "continues to see exponential increases in demand for services" particularly adult and children's social care as well as Home to School Travel Assistance. It adds that the demand for these services has resulted in a "need for further efficiencies", or cuts, within the services and increasing council tax to balance the books.

Draft proposals show the Adult social care budget has been increased by £18.7m and the Children, Families and Lifelong Learning budget (which includes home to school transport) has gone up by £19.2m. However, the county council is also making 'efficiency savings' or cuts to the departments, £33m and £12.6m respectively.

The increase in council tax comes after the new government announced a rise in both the National Living Wage and in Employer's National Insurance Contributions. Not only will this increase the county council's own wage bill, it may impact its suppliers and potentially lead to increased costs all round. Compensation funding for local councils was not confirmed in the provisional Local Government Financial Settlement, leaving Surrey with some uncertainty.

Speaking to the cabinet, Cllr Oliver said the council has seen "higher levels of inflation than predicted", an increase in national insurance contributions and national living wage, as well as the cost of borrowing for capital investment has continued to rise as interest rates remain high. The council leader also pointed out the increased demand for services, particularly mental health, and pressures on the health system.

"We have achieved financial stability and we are not in the same position as many other authorities across the country," said Cllr Oliver. "We have not asked the government for extra financial support and we are not proposing to seek a referendum on increasing our council tax above the permitted 4.99 per cent."

Heathrow expansion reaction

Heathrow has been given the go ahead to press forward with plans for third runway that will bring in hundreds of thousands of extra flights to the West London airport every year, the Chancellor has announced - but questions remain about how deliverable the project will be.

The airport has long pressed for a third runway. The plans in the past have involved demolishing the mediaeval village of Harmondsworth and its neighbours Sipson and Harlington.



Feasibility studies have also been carried out about re-routing the M25 through a tunnel under the new northern runway and the enormous infrastructure project is supposed to be built while the country meets its environmental targets.

Heathrow has welcomed the Chancellor's announcement today that the Government is backing a third runway – and would be inviting proposals to be brought forward by the summer.

The government has already tightened legal pathways against any plans, cutting the number of appeals allowed from three down to just one.

Opponents, including the London Mayor's office, MPs and campaign groups however, argue a third runway won't bring in hoped-for economic benefits but will raise "serious environmental and health concerns".

The Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, said: "I remain opposed to a new runway at Heathrow Airport because of the severe impact it will have on noise, air pollution and meeting our climate change targets.

"I will scrutinise carefully any new proposals that now come forward from Heathrow, including the impact it will have on people living in the area and the huge knock-on effects for our transport infrastructure.

"Despite the progress that's been made in the aviation sector to make it more sustainable, I'm simply not convinced that you can have hundreds of thousands of additional flights at Heathrow every year without a hugely damaging impact on our environment."

Stanwell Moor is the Surrey village at the end of Heathrow's southern runway.

Residents there have grown used to jet engines flying overhead. So much so, that some regard the noise made from incoming planes a respite compared with the roar when taking off.

The Stanwell Moor Residents' Association, in a statement published on its website, said: "What is different this time is that easterly alternation planning application will go ahead regardless of the airport expansion and would lead to more flights over our village; and secondly, the Government are likely to reform planning to speed up the approval for expansion.

"We will be ready to represent the village with a list of demands that put residents first."

The Government said it would issue a full assessment of any expansion plans through the Airports National Policy Statement.

It said the project must represent value for money and that it, plus any associated service transport costs, will be financed through private funding to "ensure that a third runway is delivered in line with our legal, environmental and climate objectives."

Paul Beckford, policy director at the HACAN clearskies group said: "The announcement today will disappoint the thousands of residents whose communities will be destroyed by a third runway and the millions who will be exposed to increases in noise and air pollution.

"Labour have set four tests that any airport expansion must pass in order to be approved and we believe that Heathrow's current plans are simply not compatible with those tests.

"The Government believes that it can achieve both growth and meet its climate targets but this decision puts both of those ambitions at risk.

"Expanding the UK's largest emitter of carbon in a forlorn hope of increasing GDP at some point in the future without a credible plan to deliver zero emission aviation is a folly of the highest order."

The Liberal Democrats issued a statement from its MPs saying the third runway would jeopardise the UK's climate commitments and will have a significant negative impact on local communities and human health.

The hundreds of thousands of extra flights to-and-from Heathrow, they said, will increase the risk of health conditions including heart disease, strokes and mental health issues.

MP for Esher and Walton Monica Harding said: "A third runway at Heathrow would have a profound impact on our climate, health, and communities. With a lack of clarity on the economic benefits and costs to the taxpayer, along with serious environmental and health concerns, the Government must urgently address these questions."

Others, such as the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport UK were quick to praise the announcement but cautioned the importance of prioritising environmental concerns.

Its chairperson, Paul Le Blond, said "Any expansion strategy must prioritise public transport integration, leveraging existing transport hubs and accommodating new rail links.

"The development should include modernised terminals and new gateway facilities for both the northern and southern perimeters. Crucially, all environmental impacts—including noise, local air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions—must remain



within statutory limits.

"Whilst the expansion would be privately funded through passenger and shipping revenues, government support through policy frameworks and strategic rail investment will be essential to unlock private sector investment."

Related reports:

["Blocks away" from airport expansions](#)

[Surrey village to suffer a lot more Heathrow flights](#)

[Chance for Epsom and Ewell's say on Heathrow flights](#)

Parliament's sting in the tail for Epsom and Ewell WASPIs lamented by local MP

Helen Maguire, the Liberal Democrat MP for Epsom & Ewell, has expressed her disappointment after a parliamentary vote on compensating WASPI (Women Against State Pension Inequality) claimants failed to gain cross-party support. Maguire, who voted in favour of the bill, said she was "proud" to back the proposal, which sought to address what she described as a "gross injustice" affecting thousands of women in the constituency and across the UK.

The bill was introduced following an independent report that concluded that many women born in the 1950s had suffered an injustice due to a failure by successive governments to properly inform them of changes to the state pension age. However, the measure failed to secure enough support in Parliament, with Conservative and Labour MPs voting against it or abstaining.

What is the WASPI Campaign?

The WASPI campaign was formed in 2015 to highlight the plight of women born in the 1950s who were affected by changes to the state pension age. Prior to reforms enacted by the Pensions Acts of 1995 and 2011, women in the UK could retire at 60, while men retired at 65. The government decided to equalise the pension age for men and women, eventually raising it to 66 for both. However, many women argue they were not adequately informed about these changes in time to make necessary financial adjustments.

The Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman (PHSO) found that the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) failed to communicate the pension changes properly, leading to significant hardship for many women who had planned their retirements based on the previous system.

Local Impact and Political Response

According to data from the House of Commons Library, 5,420 women in Epsom & Ewell are believed to have been affected by these pension changes. Many have reported financial distress, as they were forced to continue working or adjust to an unexpected delay in receiving their pensions.

Speaking after the vote, Maguire criticised both Labour and Conservative MPs for failing to back the compensation plan. "For years, senior Labour representatives and even the Prime Minister himself pledged to deliver fair compensation to those impacted by changes these women had no control over. They made a conscious political choice to break that promise and ignore the findings of the independent watchdog," she said.

"For Conservative and Labour MPs to fail to back these women is an immense disappointment. All they are asking for is fairness," Maguire continued. "I, alongside my fellow Liberal Democrat MPs, will continue to stand up for the WASPI women at every turn and keep fighting until they get the justice that they deserve."

The Wider Debate

The issue of state pension reform has been contentious for years, with successive governments arguing that the changes were necessary to ensure the long-term sustainability of the pension system. The government has so far resisted calls for direct compensation, citing fiscal constraints, but campaigners argue that the lack of proper notification has left many women



financially disadvantaged through no fault of their own.

The failure of the bill to progress means that WASPI women and their supporters will need to continue pressing their case in Parliament and beyond. With growing political pressure and the findings of the PHSO still pending further action, the fight for compensation is likely to remain a key issue in the coming months.

For now, Maguire has pledged to keep up the pressure, but with the major parties unwilling to back compensation at this stage, it remains to be seen whether justice will be delivered for the thousands of affected women in Epsom & Ewell and beyond.

Heritage at the heart of Epsom and Ewell

The Licensing and Planning Policy Committee (LPPC) of Epsom & Ewell Borough Council convened on January 23rd, to address several key issues, including the annual Heritage Champion's statement, fees and charges for 2025/26, budget estimates, and an urgent decision regarding the local development scheme. The meeting, held at the Epsom Town Hall and broadcast online, saw a full agenda with a number of significant decisions taken.

Heritage Champion's Report Praised

A highlight of the evening was the presentation of the Heritage Champion's annual statement by Councillor **Kim Spickett** (RA Cuddington). This was the first such statement that Committee Chair, Councillor **Peter O'Donovan** (RA Ewell Court), could recall seeing. Councillor Spickett, unfortunately, was not present at the meeting due to a prior engagement at the Epsom Playhouse (The Band of the Scots Guard: Gala Concert staged by Cllr **Dr Graham Jones** MBE RA Cuddington, for the Mayor's charities), but her report was met with high praise from committee members.

Councillor **Phil Neale** (RA Cuddington) lauded the "enthusiasm and the depth of the research" in her report, adding that "it really does show... that there is such a deep heritage in Epsom". Councillor **Julie Morris** (LibDem College) echoed this sentiment, saying "ditto that" and praised Councillor Spickett for her work in trying to trace the culverts in the area. Councillor O'Donovan also acknowledged the work done, noting "it is a remarkable work and it shows you what I think, really, what a champion should be providing". The committee unanimously resolved to receive and note the annual statement of the Heritage Councillor Champion.

The Heritage Champion's report detailed a number of local heritage projects. Some examples include:

- **St. Martin of Tours Church:** Councillor Spickett detailed a fact-finding mission related to the car park, noting issues of ownership, access permissions, and the involvement of English Heritage and the Church of England. She also highlighted a musket ball lodged in the old wall, masonry around the steps and a red granite edging under the tarmac. Her report also focused on how non-permeable areas in town displace water and cause surface flooding, a problem she has experience of with the South East Rivers' Trust.
- **D-Day 80 Commemoration:** Councillor Spickett was tasked with designing a badge for the Girl Guides and Scouts to commemorate D-Day. She also provided research material for a reading at the ceremony, which was a letter home from Captain Gerald Ritchie.
- **Mysterious Streams and Tunnels:** Councillor Spickett discussed her interest in the borough's hidden history, including the industrial past of the Pound Lane/Kiln Lane area. She made reference to the brickworks that sprang up all over the borough.
- **The Hogsmill River:** Councillor Spickett detailed a project that aimed to raise awareness of the importance of a clean river. This involved the creation of an information lectern at the Hogsmill Tavern, with funds from a Surrey County Council grant.
- **Old Barn in Woodcote Ward:** Councillor Spickett has been investigating an old barn, with the help of local photographer, Richard, noting a need for its sympathetic restoration.
- **Shadbolt Park** Councillor Spickett has worked with officers to develop a heritage and natural history information board.



- **Park Wall to the Durdans** Councillor Spickett has met with Councillor Liz Frost to look at a listed clunch wall which is covered in graffiti.
- **Royal Connections at Durdans** Councillor Spickett has detailed connections to the Royal Family and scientists who have stayed at the Durdans.

Fees and Charges for 2025/26 Approved The committee then moved to discuss and approve the fees and charges for the upcoming financial year. A council officer explained that pre-application advice and planning performance agreement fees would remain at the 2024/25 level. However, planning application fees, which are set nationally, are expected to increase by the Retail Price Index (RPI) from April 2025. Many general licensing fees were set to increase by 6%, whilst taxi licensing fees would mostly remain unchanged due to a rise in operators, except for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire drivers whose fees would increase by 3% and 7%, respectively, and missed appointments without notice rising by 7.7%.

Councillor **Robert Leach** (RA Nonsuch) raised a question about some of the licensing fees, wondering “do we really have all these things going on? I mean, I’m not aware how many zoos do we have”. A council officer clarified that there was one zoo. Councillor Phil Neale also asked about additional charges for retrospective planning applications. A council officer clarified that these are set nationally and not included in local fees. The committee resolved to agree on the fees and charges for 2025/26 as set out in the appendices.

Budget Estimates for 2025/26 The committee also reviewed the budget estimates for licensing and planning policy services for the next financial year. A council officer reported that the second quarter outturn for 2024/25 showed no net variance against the budget. The base net budget for 2025/26 is set at £1.279 million, compared to £1.237 million for 2024/25. An additional £94,000 is expected in revenue, which will be used to fund additional staff and a new software system.

Councillor **Clive Woodbridge** (RA Ewell Village) asked whether expenditures relating to the local plan were included in the budget. A council officer clarified that these costs are funded from reserves and strategy resources, but the costs of staff working on the local plan were included within the planning policy section of the budget. The committee resolved to recommend the 2025/26 service estimates for approval at the full council budget meeting in February.

Urgent Decision on Local Development Scheme

Finally, the committee noted an urgent decision made by the Director of Environment, Housing, and Regeneration regarding the Local Development Scheme. A council officer explained that the scheme needed to be updated to align with a new government timetable. This required moving the consultation period to December and the submission to March, rather than the previously scheduled dates of January and May. The committee resolved to note the urgent decision and the reasons for it.

The meeting concluded with the committee having made important decisions regarding the borough’s planning and licensing policies, demonstrating their commitment to the efficient operation of local governance.

Related report:

Heritage at Risk: Epsom Town Centre Conservation Area Faces Challenges

Image: A spoof Epsom and Ewell Times report contained in Cllr Spickett’s Heritage Report. Click [HERE](#) to see her full report within the “Reports Pack” presented to the LPPC councillors. We are taking no action for the unauthorised breach of copyright of our logo!

Sutton and Epsom rugby away win

SIDCUP 24 SUTTON & EPSOM RFC 34. Saturday 25th January. Crescent Farm has produced a bounteous harvest this season with a maximum crop yield of 35 points from a magnificent seven wins. In addition, last season’s visit by Sutton and Epsom was seen by many levelheaded observers as the nadir of that campaign. Originally planned for January 18th, before the intervention of Jack Frost, this fixture came with the usual proviso of a rescheduled match: Who is available? In a quality encounter, Sutton and Epsom, playing their best rugby of the season, inflicted the first home defeat of the season on Sidcup by 34-24.

The Black & Whites welcomed back Messrs Johnson & Lennie to the front row union but were bereft of the veteran Munford and Number 8 Rob Hegarty who had scored a hat trick against Old Tiffinians the previous Saturday. Job 1:21 springs to mind. The hosts kicked off in glorious sunshine on a windless afternoon. S&E were swiftly into their stride opening their account after a few minutes. Freddy Bunting kicked a penalty to the 22 where Ewan McTaggart obliged with clean lineout ball. A dominant carry by



Josh Glanville set up the backs and slick passing resulted in a Gareth O'Brien dummy and a try. Captain Bunting converted from the flank for 7-0. Sutton now demonstrated vastly improved kicking from hand with the highlight being a sublime 50-22 from Tom Lennard. Sidcup have conceded the least points by any club in the league this season so excellent defence was expected. A second try was denied but they came back for a penalty that Freddy Bunting nonchalantly converted for 10-0.

The home team hit back with multiple phases and great intent. Deep in the Sutton 22 they had a free ball and looked to cross the whitewash. It was the turn of the Surrey men to defend valiantly and the Kent team to have the consolation of a penalty. Josh Twyford obliged to trail by 3-10. It had been a thrilling start but the best was still to come. On the quarter hour Sutton produced their try of the season. The forwards carried with pace and conviction with Sam Lennie and Josh Glanville making gains. The ball was then passed along the backs with pace and precision to exploit an overlap, and winger Finlay Scott ran in untouched from near halfway. Freddy Bunting's conversion extended the advantage to 17-3 at the end of an inspired first quarter.

Sidcup fought hard to get back into the game but not only was S&E tackling first rate but also the coverage of the host's kicking game was most efficient. Another penalty gave Freddy Bunting the chance to put the Crescent Farm team into the corner. The lineout was secured but all momentum appeared to have dissipated, and the drive was halted. Sutton lost yards and were recycling the ball on the 22 when Number 9 Laurence Wise dummied at the ruck and made a clean break. Ben Tame's fine support run was rewarded with his try under the posts. A simple conversion added to the burgeoning Bunting account for the season for 24-3 on the half hour.

There was no easing off from the visitors. Playing with a high tempo combining powerful carrying from the pack and astute kicking from the backs, the hosts were forced to defend in their 22. With normal time nearly complete, winger Matt Symonds picked up a loose ball near touch as Sidcup tried to break out. The ball arrived at the Brobdingnagian lock Ewan McTaggart who strode towards glory only to be denied by courageous cover. Despite two 5-metre penalties under the posts, and Sidcup being reduced to 14 when Ben Ibrahim saw yellow for an additional 10-minute siesta, the visitors failed to extend their lead. S&E had replaced their front row in its entirety as Gibson, Hilton and Howes came off the bench, but despite these fresh legs the first period ended with no further addition to the scoreboard that read 24-3 to Sutton and Epsom.

Winning at home has not only become a habit but it is the norm for Sidcup this term. Sutton may have excelled in the first half with a comfortable lead at the break but all those present were expecting the hosts to raise their game. Still with the numerical advantage, the second half began where the first had left off with the Black & Whites besieging the home line after the Bunting restart was dropped on the 22 gifting S&E a scrum. Sweeping attacks, superb defence and the usual penalty kicked to the corner. However, there was variety as Sutton erred with an accidental offside followed by a Sidcup infringement on their put-in and culminating with S&E giving away a penalty at the ruck when in prime position. Would the visitors rue their failure to secure the fourth try either side of the break?

In the third quarter, Sutton and Epsom were forced into demonstrating their defensive qualities. They were assisted by a lack of discipline by the hosts. After a 5-metre lineout had been neutered, Sidcup had the consolation of a scrum under the posts. Not only did they concede a penalty but in addition a quizzical comment saw them retreat ten metres more a second time. The cacodoxy in rugby is to argue with the referee. The second 10-metre forced march for Sidcup hinted at an outbreak of logorrhoea from a certain quarter and Mr Pedro Diogo would not tolerate the dissentient voices. Finally, the hosts made their possession, territory, and pressure count. The popular combination of a penalty, kick to the corner and the catch & drive try. Replacement Harry Large was the beneficiary of the fine forward effort. The reliable boot of Josh Twyford added the extras and optimism swept through Crescent Farm as their team trailed 10-24.

Sutton reintroduced Lennie and Johnson for Howes and Hilton. The gains from the Sidcup goal were quickly negated by another penalty which gave Freddy Bunting the opportunity to extend the lead to 27-10. From the restart the Rugby Lane men tried to run it out of their 22 but knocked on. From the scrum the hosts took full advantage as the forwards carried deep into the 22 before centre Sam Leek's astute line of running saw him touchdown by the uprights. Josh Twyford made it 27-17 and the comeback was on. Ewan McTaggart then received a yellow card at the restart and suddenly the game took on an entirely new complexion. An emboldened Sidcup threw everything at the visitors and looked favourites to add another quick score. However, credit to the character of this current S&E vintage. They rallied, scrapped for every ball and were defensively dogged.

The decisive blow came with ten minutes to go and the Black & Whites still with 14. A loose ball was picked up by prop Dan Johnson. There is no more popular sight in rugby than a prop forward on the charge. This was a classic with an impressively high knee-lift he set off like a Highland warrior eager to decapitate an Englishman and bearing an expression of deranged ferocity as he covered the 40 metres to score unchallenged under the posts for a memorable first try for Sutton. Freddy Bunting chipped over the easiest of conversions for a 34-17 lead and a bonus point.

Returning to their full complement, the Black & Whites doubled down defensively and looked to control territory. A penalty was kicked to the 22 was followed by a fine grubber by Tom Lennard and the hosts were stuck deep in their own half. The game



entered time added on and the deficit was too great but credit to Sidcup as they kept pressing. The Crescent Farm crowd were rewarded when their team scored their third try of the afternoon. A penalty was kicked into the corner and from the ideal platform of the 5-metre lineout they crossed the whitewash. Josh Twyford being presented with the close-range try after the hard yards from the forwards. He added the conversion for 24-34. There was just time for one more play but there was to be no further addition to the scoreboard and Sutton recorded a notable scalp winning away 34-24.

Without doubt, this was the performance of the season that has included fine wins over the table toppers at Rugby Lane on three separate occasions. It was a wonderful team effort from 1 to 18 with the forwards providing quality ball and the backs playing with a fluency not previously seen. Laurence Wise at 9 had an exceptional game for a man with only a handful of caps. The kicking game was unrecognisable from recent times, the defence was back to its high standards but it was the tempo and continuity that really caught the eye. It needed a performance of this nature to defeat a Sidcup XV that has made Crescent Farm a fortress this season.

Next week, the Sutton charabanc heads to Medway who will be looking to redress the balance. They arrived at Rugby Lane in October in pole position and returned with a 28-24 defeat.

Sutton and Epsom: O'Brien, Symonds, Bibby, Bunting ©, Scott, Lennard, Wise, Johnson, Lennie, Boaden, Glanville, McTaggart, Rea, Jones & Tame. Replacements: Hilton, Gibson & Howes.

Sidcup: Ellison, Sheridan, Leek, McMahon, Keeley, Twyford, Ibrahim, Conlon, Fordham, Carmen, Epps, Evans, Williams, Healey & West. Replacements: Gibbons, Large & Masters.

Epsom and Ewell car parking fees on new levels

Epsom and Ewell Council Approves Changes to Car Parking Fees and Policies for 2025/26

In a meeting of the Environment Committee on 21 January 2025, councillors approved a series of changes to car parking fees and policies across the borough. The measures aim to address financial targets, enhance service provision, and offer new concessions for cultural activities. After detailed discussions, the committee voted to adopt the proposals, with amendments led by Councillor **Julie Morris** (LibDem, College).

Fee and Permit Adjustments

The committee voted (6 for, 1 against, 1 abstaining) to implement proposed changes to car park fees and permit prices for the 2025/26 financial year. Notable adjustments include:

- A 10% increase in parking fees at the Ashley Centre for up to 3 hours, rising from £5.00 to £5.50.
- Revisions to parking permits for residents and businesses.

Councillor Morris expressed concern about the annual increases in parking charges, stating, "We cannot be doing this year on year." She urged the council to explore alternative ways to balance the budget without consistently raising costs for residents. In response, Councillor **Liz Frost** (RA, Woodcote and Langley), Chair of the Committee, emphasized that not all charges were increasing, highlighting the reduction in evening parking fees under the new flat rate structure.

Special Concessions for Performers and Shoppers

Councillor Morris successfully secured amendments to the proposed concessions for Epsom Playhouse performers, crew, and technical teams. The adopted recommendation ensures these concessions align with current practice and take effect immediately. She also pushed for a defined timeframe for the Christmas parking concessions, resulting in the committee's agreement to offer discounted festive parking for the next two years.

The committee unanimously approved:

1. **Concessionary parking rates** for Playhouse-affiliated individuals, effective immediately.
2. The continuation of **discounted Christmas parking offers** for the next two years, aimed at boosting local shopping and economic activity during the festive period.



Simplified Evening Parking

The committee agreed to standardize evening parking charges across the borough. From Monday to Saturday, a flat rate will now apply:

- £5.00 for major car parks like the Ashley Centre.
- £2.50 for smaller facilities such as Dorset House and Stoneleigh Parade.

This change simplifies parking for residents and visitors, with some charges lower than before.

Implementation and Public Engagement

The Head of Housing & Community was authorized to implement the changes and address any public representations. Feedback from residents and businesses will be reviewed by the committee in March 2025.

Decision Breakdown

The resolutions were approved with varying levels of support:

- The fee and permit adjustments passed with six votes in favor, one against, and one abstention.
- Concessionary parking rates for Playhouse performers and Christmas offers were unanimously adopted.
- The Head of Housing & Community's authority to implement the changes was approved with five votes in favor, one against, and two abstentions.

Next Steps

The updated fees and concessions will take effect on 1 April 2025. Residents are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the changes and provide feedback to the council.

Councillors will continue to monitor the impact of the changes, balancing the need for sustainable revenue with affordability and accessibility for the community. The committee will revisit the parking policies in March 2025 to review public input and adjust as needed.