



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

Open consultation

Proposals for local government reorganisation in Surrey

Published 17 June 2025

Applies to England

Contents

Scope of the consultation

Background

How to respond

Introduction

Government's invitation to councils

Guidance from the Secretary of State for proposals for unitary local government

The councils' proposals

This Consultation

What happens next?

Consultation questions

About this consultation

Annex A: personal data

Annex B: named consultees



© Crown copyright 2025

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/local-government-reorganisation-in-surrey/proposals-for-local-government-reorganisation-in-surrey>

Scope of the consultation

This statutory consultation seeks views on the proposals that the Minister of State for Local Government and English Devolution, Jim McMahon MP OBE, has received following the Secretary of State's invitation to councils in Surrey to submit proposals for unitary local government.

The 2 proposals in this consultation were made by the following councils on 9 May 2025.

Elmbridge Borough Council, Mole Valley District Council and Surrey County Council proposed 2 unitary councils:

- East Surrey (Elmbridge, Epsom and Ewell, Mole Valley, Reigate and Banstead, Tandridge)
- West Surrey (Guildford, Runnymede, Spelthorne, Surrey Heath, Waverley, Woking)

The Borough Councils of Epsom and Ewell, Guildford, Reigate and Banstead, Runnymede, Spelthorne, Surrey Heath, Waverley and Woking, and Tandridge District Council proposed 3 unitary councils:

- East Surrey (Epsom and Ewell, Mole Valley, Reigate and Banstead, and Tandridge)
- North Surrey (Elmbridge, Runnymede, and Spelthorne)
- West Surrey (Guildford, Surrey Heath, Waverley, and Woking)

This consultation asks a number of questions about each proposal to help inform the assessment of the proposals.

This consultation relates to the structure of local government in Surrey. These proposals relate to England only.

Impact assessment

An Impact assessment has not been prepared for this consultation as it will only affect local government in Surrey and so there will be no direct regulatory, economic or social impacts.

Background

Before implementing a proposal, there is a statutory requirement to consult any local authority that is affected by the proposal (but which has

not submitted it) and any such other persons as considered appropriate.

The Minister of State for Local Government and English Devolution has decided to consult:

- the councils which made the proposals
- other councils affected by the proposals
- the councils in neighbouring areas which may be affected by the proposals
- public service providers, including health providers and the police
- certain other business, voluntary and community sector and educational bodies

A full list of named consultees is in [Annex B](#).

We also welcome the views of any other persons or bodies interested in these proposals, including local residents, town and parish councils, businesses and the voluntary and community sector.

The Minister of State for Local Government and English Devolution will carefully consider all views expressed, including from local residents, as well as from named consultees.

Body responsible for the consultation

This consultation is conducted by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.

Duration

This consultation will last for 7 weeks from 17 June 2025 to 5 August 2025.

Enquiries

For any enquiries about the consultation email:
lgreorganisation@communities.gov.uk

How to respond

You can respond by completing the [online survey](https://consult.communities.gov.uk/local-government-reorganisation/surrey/) (<https://consult.communities.gov.uk/local-government-reorganisation/surrey/>), via email or in writing.

If you are responding in writing, please make it clear which proposal you are responding to. You can email your response to the questions in this consultation to lgreorganisation@communities.gov.uk

Alternatively, written responses should be sent to:

LGR Consultation
Fry Building 2NE
Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

When replying, please include your name and email address.

We would also like you to confirm whether you are replying as an individual or submitting an official response on behalf of an organisation. Please indicate this using one of the following categories:

- resident living in area affected
- resident not living in area affected
- business organisation
- education organisation
- local government organisation - principal council
- local government organisation - parish/town council
- local government organisation - other
- police organisation
- fire organisation
- health organisation
- other

Please include your position in the organisation and the organisation's name (if applicable).

Introduction

Residents and businesses in Surrey are currently served by a 2-tier system of local government. The County Council is responsible for services such as adults' and children's social care, maintaining roads, libraries and waste disposal, and the 11 District and Borough Councils are responsible for

services such as rubbish collection, housing and planning and environmental health.

On 5 February 2025, the Minister of State for Local Government and English Devolution wrote to all councils in Surrey, enclosing the Secretary of State's invitation to submit a proposal for unitary local government. The invitation explained that a proposal could be submitted by a council individually or jointly with other councils receiving the invitation and included guidance on what a proposal should seek to achieve and matters to be taken into account, to which the councils were required to have regard.

These invitations started the legislative process for restructuring local government in Surrey, which is set out in the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (the 2007 Act). In response to the Secretary of State's invitation the Minister of State for Local Government and English Devolution received 2 proposals from Surrey Councils and a further submission from Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, jointly with Crawley Borough Council, by the specified deadline of 9 May 2025.

The 2007 Act requires that, before a proposal for establishing unitary local government can be implemented, there must first be a consultation with any local authority that is affected by a proposal (but which has not submitted it) and any such other persons as considered appropriate.

In deciding which proposal, if any, to implement in an area, subject to Parliamentary approval, the Secretary of State will make a judgement in the round assessing the proposals against the criteria set out in the statutory guidance accompanying the invitation, as well as having regard to all representations received, including responses to this consultation, and to all other relevant information available. [These criteria are set out below.](#)

Government's invitation to councils

On 5 February 2025, an invitation to develop a proposal for the creation of new single-tier (unitary) authorities was issued to all local authorities in 2-tier areas and small neighbouring unitary authorities.

In Surrey, the invitation was sent to:

- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
- Guildford Borough Council
- Mole Valley District Council
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

- Runnymede Borough Council
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Surrey County Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Tandridge District Council
- Waverley Borough Council
- Woking Borough Council

The invitation was issued under Part 1 of the 2007 Act. It invited the councils to submit a proposal for a single tier of local government, which could take the form of any of the types of proposal permissible under the 2007 Act:

- Type A – a single tier of local authority covering the whole of the county concerned
- Type B – a single tier of local authority covering an area that is currently a district, or 2 or more districts
- Type C – a single tier of local authority covering the whole of the county concerned, or one or more districts in the county; and one or more relevant adjoining areas
- Combined proposal – a proposal that consists of 2 or more Type B proposals, 2 or more Type C proposals, or one or more Type B proposals and one or more Type C proposals

Guidance from the Secretary of State for proposals for unitary local government

The invitation specified that any councils responding must have regard to the guidance appended to the invitation. This guidance is as follows:

Criteria for unitary local government

1) A proposal should seek to achieve for the whole of the area concerned the establishment of a single tier of local government.

a) Proposals should be for sensible economic areas, with an appropriate tax base which does not create an undue advantage or disadvantage for one part of the area.

b) Proposals should be for a sensible geography which will help to increase housing supply and meet local needs.

c) Proposals should be supported by robust evidence and analysis and include an explanation of the outcomes it is expected to achieve, including evidence of estimated costs/benefits and local engagement.

d) Proposals should describe clearly the single tier local government structures it is putting forward for the whole of the area, and explain how, if implemented, these are expected to achieve the outcomes described.

2) Unitary local government must be the right size to achieve efficiencies, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks.

a) As a guiding principle, new councils should aim for a population of 500,000 or more.

b) There may be certain scenarios in which this 500,000 figure does not make sense for an area, including on devolution, and this rationale should be set out in a proposal.

c) Efficiencies should be identified to help improve councils' finances and make sure that council taxpayers are getting the best possible value for their money.

d) Proposals should set out how an area will seek to manage transition costs, including planning for future service transformation opportunities from existing budgets, including from the flexible use of capital receipts that can support authorities in taking forward transformation and invest-to-save projects.

e) For areas covering councils that are in Best Value intervention and/or in receipt of Exceptional Financial Support, proposals must additionally demonstrate how reorganisation may contribute to putting local government in the area as a whole on a firmer footing and what area-specific arrangements may be necessary to make new structures viable.

f) In general, as with previous restructures, there is no proposal for council debt to be addressed centrally or written off as part of reorganisation. For areas where there are exceptional circumstances where there has been failure linked to capital practices, proposals should reflect the extent to which the implications of this can be managed locally, including as part of efficiencies possible through reorganisation.

3) Unitary structures must prioritise the delivery of high quality and sustainable public services to citizens.

a) Proposals should show how new structures will improve local government and service delivery, and should avoid unnecessary fragmentation of services.

b) Opportunities to deliver public service reform should be identified, including where they will lead to better value for money.

c) Consideration should be given to the impacts for crucial services such as social care, children's services, SEND and homelessness, and for wider public services including for public safety.

4) Proposals should show how councils in the area have sought to work together in coming to a view that meets local needs and is informed by local views.

a) It is for councils to decide how best to engage locally in a meaningful and constructive way and this engagement activity should be evidenced in your proposal.

b) Proposals should consider issues of local identity and cultural and historic importance.

c) Proposals should include evidence of local engagement, an explanation of the views that have been put forward and how concerns will be addressed.

5) New unitary structures must support devolution arrangements.

a) Proposals will need to consider and set out for areas where there is already a Combined Authority (CA) or a Combined County Authority (CCA) established or a decision has been taken by government to work with the area to establish one, how that institution and its governance arrangements will need to change to continue to function effectively; and set out clearly (where applicable) whether this proposal is supported by the CA/CCA /Mayor.

b) Where no CA or CCA is already established or agreed then the proposal should set out how it will help unlock devolution.

c) Proposals should ensure there are sensible population size ratios between local authorities and any strategic authority, with timelines that work for both priorities.

6) New unitary structures should enable stronger community engagement and deliver genuine opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment.

a) Proposals will need to explain plans to make sure that communities are engaged.

b) Where there are already arrangements in place it should be explained how these will enable strong community engagement.

Developing proposals for unitary local government

The following matters should be taken into account in formulating a proposal:

Boundary Changes

- a) Existing district areas should be considered the building blocks for your proposals, but where there is a strong justification more complex boundary changes will be considered.
- b) There will need to be a strong public services and financial sustainability related justification for any proposals that involve boundary changes, or that affect wider public services, such as fire and rescue authorities, due to the likely additional costs and complexities of implementation.

Engagement and consultation on reorganisation

- a) We expect local leaders to work collaboratively and proactively, including by sharing information, to develop robust and sustainable unitary proposals that are in the best interests of the whole area to which this invitation is issued, rather than developing competing proposals.
- b) For those areas where Commissioners have been appointed by the Secretary of State as part of the Best Value Intervention, their input will be important in the development of robust unitary proposals.
- c) We also expect local leaders to engage their Members of Parliament, and to ensure there is wide engagement with local partners and stakeholders, residents, workforce and their representatives, and businesses on a proposal.
- d) The engagement that is undertaken should both inform the development of robust proposals and should also build a shared understanding of the improvements you expect to deliver through reorganisation.
- e) The views of other public sector providers will be crucial to understanding the best way to structure local government in your area. This will include the relevant Mayor (if you already have one), Integrated Care Board, Police (Fire) and Crime Commissioner, Fire and Rescue Authority, local Higher Education and Further Education providers, National Park Authorities, and the voluntary and third sector.
- f) Once a proposal has been submitted it will be for the government to decide on taking a proposal forward and to consult as required by

statute. This will be a completely separate process to any consultation undertaken on mayoral devolution in an area, which will be undertaken in some areas early this year, in parallel with this invitation.

The councils' proposals

Proposals for reorganisation of local government were received from the following councils by 9 May 2025:

Elmbridge Borough Council, Mole Valley District Council and Surrey County Council proposed 2 unitary councils:

- East Surrey (Elmbridge, Epsom and Ewell, Mole Valley, Reigate and Banstead, Tandridge)
- West Surrey (Guildford, Runnymede, Spelthorne, Surrey Heath, Waverley, Woking)

The Borough Councils of Epsom and Ewell, Guildford, Reigate and Banstead, Runnymede, Spelthorne, Surrey Heath, Waverley and Woking, and Tandridge District Council proposed 3 unitary councils:

- East Surrey (Epsom and Ewell, Mole Valley, Reigate and Banstead, and Tandridge)
- North Surrey (Elmbridge, Runnymede, and Spelthorne)
- West Surrey (Guildford, Surrey Heath, Waverley, and Woking)

In addition to being a signatory to the latter proposal, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council with Crawley Borough Council, submitted a supplementary submission, asking the government to consider a cross-boundary option and, if government sees merit in it, to allow for further discussion for its incorporation into the wider proposals.

This Consultation

The 2007 Act requires that before a proposal for local government reorganisation can be implemented, there must first be a consultation with any council affected that has not submitted the proposal, as well as any other persons considered appropriate. A [full list of named bodies being consulted on each proposal is in Annex B](#) and we also welcome views from any interested persons, including residents.

The Minister of State for Local Government and English Devolution has decided that there will be a consultation on all proposals received that are compliant with the invitation terms (i.e. the proposals seek to achieve the criteria specified in the guidance that accompanied the invitation and all the information specified in the guidance has been provided). As such, this consultation is on the 2 proposals received – the 2 unitary council proposal and the 3 unitary council proposal.

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government will also seek further clarification from Surrey Councils in respect of their financial assessments.

The detailed information and supporting analysis within the 2 proposals can be found by clicking the links below:

- [Elmbridge Borough Council, Mole Valley District Council and Surrey County Council proposal for 2 unitary councils](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/lgr/plans/final)
(<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/lgr/plans/final>)
- [The Borough Councils of Epsom and Ewell, Guildford, Reigate and Banstead, Runnymede, Spelthorne, Surrey Heath, Waverley and Woking, and Tandridge District Council proposal for 3 unitary councils](https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/surrey-district-and-borough-councils-final-proposal)
(<https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/surrey-district-and-borough-councils-final-proposal>)

The Minister of State for Local Government and English Devolution has also considered the joint supplementary submission from the borough councils of Reigate and Banstead and Crawley and their view that this was a formal proposal that the Secretary of State should consult upon.

The Minister of State for Local Government and English Devolution has decided that he will not consult upon this submission. This is for a number of reasons.

First, the Minister of State for Local Government and English Devolution considers that the submission does not meet the statutory requirements. This is because Reigate and Banstead Borough Council is already a signatory to the 3 unitary proposal, and the 2007 Act only permits principal authorities to make one proposal. Furthermore, the 2007 Act requires that a proposal either be ‘for the area which is the county concerned’ (in this case Surrey) or specify the area that it covers. The submission does neither, instead setting out a range of options which cover different areas.

Second, separately from the statutory requirements, the Minister of State for Local Government and English Devolution considers that the submission does not seek to achieve the criteria specified in the guidance. The invitation letter and feedback on interim plans was clear that councils should submit one proposal which covered the whole of the invitation area and provided a single geography. The submission does not achieve this.

Third, there is no financial assessment nor transitional costs and savings for what could be proposed, and in requesting flexibility for future devolution geographies, there is limited detail of the impact on the proposed Sussex and Brighton Combined County Authority and potential future devolution to Surrey. To include this option within the consultation it would need to be resubmitted with considerable work to meet the terms of the invitation.

The Minister of State for Local Government and English Devolution acknowledges that Reigate and Banstead Borough Council and Crawley Borough Council were seeking a way in which their submission could be considered as part of this consultation. However, the guidance provided by the Secretary of State was clear and it was open to Reigate and Banstead Borough Council to submit a proposal which included Crawley Borough Council (rather than being a joint signatory to the 3 unitary council proposal) and which accorded with the guidance. The councils that submitted their proposals which accorded with the statutory process and guidance by the deadline of 9 May 2025 have a reasonable expectation that their proposals should be taken forward in a way that supports the ambitious timetable established, whereby the government expects new authorities to be elected in May 2026 to allow new authorities to go live in May 2027.

We understand this will be disappointing to those who supported the joint submission. However, this consultation process allows for consultees to comment on whether the Secretary of State should implement one or other of the 2 proposals and to argue that she should not implement either of the proposals, including by reference to the joint submission. Furthermore, if, in the future, there remains an interest in changing the boundary between Surrey and West Sussex, there are other mechanisms for doing so.

What happens next?

The consultation will close at 5.00pm on 5 August 2025.

The consultation on these proposals will inform an assessment of the merits of the proposals. All of the proposals will be considered carefully, alongside the responses received to this consultation, all representations and all other relevant information, in assessing the proposals against the criteria before reaching a judgement in the round on which proposals, if any, to implement.

The Secretary of State may decide, subject to Parliamentary approval, to implement a proposal with or without modification, or to not implement any proposal for an area, and also seek advice from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

If any proposals are to be implemented, we would expect new unitary councils to take on full council roles from April 2027, with the transitional arrangements in place as soon as the secondary legislation comes into force to support a smooth implementation.

The final decisions will be communicated to the councils as soon as practicable.

Consultation questions

This consultation seeks views on the 2 proposals being taken forward for consultation, posing the following questions in relation to each proposal:

1) Does the proposal suggest sensible economic areas and geographies which will achieve a single tier of local government for the whole of Surrey?

Please explain your answer, including any comments on whether this proposal suggests sensible economic areas (for example reflect economic geography/travel to work areas/functioning economies) for councils with an appropriate tax base that does not create an undue advantage or disadvantage for one part of the area, and a sensible geography that will help to increase housing supply and meet local needs?

2) Will the local government structures being put forward, if implemented, achieve the outcomes described?

Please explain your answer, including any specific comments on the evidence and analysis to support the proposals.

3) Is the councils' proposal for unitary local government of the right size to achieve efficiencies, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks and is this supported by a rationale for the population size proposed?

Please explain your answer, including any specific comments on the efficiencies identified to help improve the councils' finances, how it will manage transition costs and any future service transformation opportunities identified.

4) As an area covering councils in Best Value intervention and in receipt of Exceptional Financial Support, do you agree the proposal will put local government in the area as a whole on a firmer footing?

As of 17 June 2025, councils in Surrey in [Best Value intervention](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statutory-best-value-inspections-and-)
(<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statutory-best-value-inspections-and->

[interventions-in-england#current-statutory-interventions](#)) are Spelthorne Borough Council and Woking Borough Council.

As of 17 June 2025, the council in Surrey in receipt of [Exceptional Financial Support in 2025/26 \(https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/exceptional-financial-support-for-local-authorities\)](#) is Woking Borough Council.

Please explain your answer, including any specific comments on the area-specific arrangements necessary to make new structures viable.

5) Will the proposal prioritise the delivery of high quality and sustainable public services to citizens, improve local government and service delivery, avoid unnecessary fragmentation of services and lead to better value for money in the delivery of these services?

Please explain your answer, including any comments on the public service reform opportunities within the proposal, including social care, children's services, SEND and homelessness, and wider public services, including public safety.

6) Has the proposal been informed by local views, and does it consider issues of local identity and cultural and historic importance?

Please explain your answer, including any comments on the local engagement activity undertaken on the proposal and how it is proposed that any local concerns will be addressed.

7) Does the councils' proposal support devolution arrangements?

Do you have any comments on the proposed devolution arrangements?

8) Will the councils' proposal enable stronger community engagement and deliver genuine opportunity for neighbourhood empowerment?

Do you have any comments on the proposed approach to community engagement?

9) Do you have any other comments with regards to the proposed local government reorganisation in Surrey?

About this consultation

This consultation document and consultation process have been planned to adhere to the Consultation Principles issued by the Cabinet Office.

Representative groups are asked to give a summary of the people and organisations they represent, and where relevant who else they have consulted in reaching their conclusions when they respond.

Information provided in response to this consultation may be published or disclosed in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 and UK data protection legislation. In certain circumstances this may therefore include personal data when required by law.

If you want the information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, as a public authority, the Department is bound by the information access regimes and may therefore be obliged to disclose all or some of the information you provide. In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government will at all times process your personal data in accordance with UK data protection legislation and in the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties. A full privacy notice is included below.

Individual responses will not be acknowledged unless specifically requested.

Your opinions are valuable to us. Thank you for taking the time to read this document and respond.

Are you satisfied that this consultation has followed the Consultation Principles? If not or you have any other observations about how we can improve the process please contact us via the [complaints procedure](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ministry-of-housing-communities-local-government/about/complaints-procedure) (<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ministry-of-housing-communities-local-government/about/complaints-procedure>).

Annex A: personal data

The following is to explain your rights and give you the information you are entitled to under UK data protection legislation.

Note that this section only refers to personal data (your name, contact details and any other information that relates to you or another identified or identifiable individual personally) not the content otherwise of your response to the consultation.

The identity of the data controller and contact details of our Data Protection Officer

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) is the data controller. The Data Protection Officer can be contacted at dataprotection@communities.gov.uk or by writing to the following address:

Data Protection Officer
Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 4DF

Why we are collecting your personal data

Your personal data is being collected as an essential part of the consultation process, so that we can contact you to respond to the consultation, and we may also contact you regarding your response and for statistical purposes or use it to contact you about related matters.

We will collect your IP address if you complete a consultation online. We may use this to ensure that each person only completes a survey once. We will not use this data for any other purpose.

For named consultees listed in Annex B, who MHCLG is emailing directly to inform them of the consultation, names and email addresses of relevant persons have either been taken from existing MHCLG systems, provided by other government departments or local authorities, or found on public websites.

Sensitive types of personal data

Please do not share [special category](https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/guide-to-data-protection/guide-to-the-general-data-protection-regulation-gdpr/lawful-basis-for-processing/special-category-data/#scd1) (<https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/guide-to-data-protection/guide-to-the-general-data-protection-regulation-gdpr/lawful-basis-for-processing/special-category-data/#scd1>) personal data or criminal offence data* as we have not asked for this. By 'special category personal data', we mean information about living individual's:

- race
- ethnic origin
- political opinions
- religious or philosophical beliefs
- trade union membership
- genetics
- biometrics
- health (including disability-related information)
- sex life
- sexual orientation.

*By 'criminal offence data', we mean information relating to a living individual's criminal convictions or offences or related security measures.

Our legal basis for processing your personal data

The collection of your personal data is lawful under article 6(1)(e) of the UK General Data Protection Regulation as it is necessary for the performance by MHCLG of a task in the public interest/in the exercise of official authority vested in the data controller. Section 8(d) of the Data Protection Act 2018 states that this will include processing of personal data that is necessary for the exercise of a function of the Crown, a Minister of the Crown or a government department i.e. in this case a consultation.

There is also a statutory duty to consult. The 2007 Act requires that, before a proposal for establishing unitary local government can be implemented, the Secretary of State must first consult any local authority that is affected by a proposal (but which has not submitted it), and any such other persons as she considers appropriate.

With whom we will be sharing your personal data

MHCLG may appoint a 'data processor', acting on behalf of the Department and under our instruction, to help analyse the responses to this consultation. Where we do we will ensure that the processing of your personal data remains in strict accordance with the requirements of the data protection legislation.

For how long we will keep your personal data, or criteria used to determine the retention period.

Your personal data will be held for 2 years from the closure of the consultation, unless we identify that its continued retention is unnecessary before that point.

Your rights, for example access, rectification, restriction, objection

The data we are collecting is your personal data, and you have considerable say over what happens to it. You have the right:

- a) to see what data we have about you
- b) to ask us to stop using your data, but keep it on record
- c) to ask to have your data corrected if it is incorrect or incomplete
- d) to object to our use of your personal data in certain circumstances
- e) to lodge a complaint with the independent Information Commissioner (ICO) if you think we are not handling your data fairly or in accordance with the law. You can contact the ICO at <https://ico.org.uk/> (<https://ico.org.uk/>), or telephone 0303 123 1113.

Please contact us at the following address if you wish to exercise the rights listed above, except the right to lodge a complaint with the ICO: dataprotection@communities.gov.uk or Knowledge and Information Access Team, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, Fry Building, 2 Marsham Street, London SW1P 4DF.

Your personal data will not be sent overseas.

Your personal data will not be used for any automated decision making.

Your personal data will be stored in a secure government IT system

We use a third-party system, Citizen Space, to collect consultation responses. In the first instance your personal data will be stored on their secure UK-based server. Your personal data will be transferred to our secure government IT system as soon as possible, and it will be stored there for 2 years before it is deleted.

Annex B: named consultees

We welcome the views of all those interested in the proposals, including local residents, town and parish councils, businesses, and the voluntary sector. In this annex we list for information those who are specifically named consultees.

Before implementing a proposal, there is a statutory requirement to consult any local authority that is affected by the proposal (but which has not submitted it), and any such other persons as considered appropriate. This consultation is specifically inviting comments from the following councils and other named bodies:

Principal councils in the area

Elmbridge Borough Council

Epsom and Ewell Borough Council

Guildford Borough Council

Mole Valley District Council

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

Runnymede Borough Council

Spelthorne Borough Council

Surrey County Council

Surrey Heath Borough Council

Tandridge District Council

Waverley Borough Council

Woking Borough Council

Neighbouring principal councils

Bracknell Forest Council

East Sussex County Council and the district councils within East Sussex County

Greater London Authority

Hampshire County Council and the district councils within Hampshire County

Kent County Council and the district councils within Kent County

London Borough of Bromley

London Borough of Croydon

London Borough of Hillingdon

London Borough of Hounslow

Royal Borough of Kingston-Upon-Thames

London Borough of Richmond-Upon-Thames

London Borough of Sutton

Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead

Slough Borough Council

West Sussex County Council and the district councils within West Sussex County

Health Bodies

Ashford and St Peter's Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

Epsom and St Helier University Hospitals

Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust

Kingston and Richmond NHS Foundation Trust

NHS Frimley Integrated Care Board

NHS Surrey and Borders Partnership Foundation Trust

NHS Surrey Heartlands Integrated Care Board

Royal Surrey NHS Foundation Trust

South Central Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust

South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust

Surrey and Sussex Healthcare NHS Trust

Policing, Fire and Rescue Bodies

Chief Fire Officer of Surrey Fire and Rescue Service

Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner (Lisa Townsend)

Chief Constable of Surrey Police

Other Public Sector Bodies

High Weald National Landscape

Surrey Hills National Landscape

Independent Chair of the Surrey Safeguarding Adults Board

Chair and Independent Scrutineer of the Surrey Safeguarding Children Partnership

Transport for London

Transport for the South East

South Downs National Park

Surrey Association of Local Councils

Business Bodies

Federation of Small Business (South East and South Central)

Surrey Business Leaders Forum

Surrey Chambers

Surrey Institute of Directors

Voluntary Sector Bodies

Surrey VCSE Alliance

Education Bodies

Royal Holloway

University of Surrey

University of Creative Arts

Other Bodies

Lord-Lieutenant of Surrey

Visit Surrey

National Bodies

Environment Agency

Local Government Association

GMB Union

National Association of Local Councils

National Highways

National Housing Federation

UK Health Security Agency

Unison

Unite The Union



All content is available under the [Open Government Licence v3.0](#), except where otherwise stated



[© Crown copyright](#)