

# SALFORDS AND SIDLOW PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING LIST WEEK ENDING 29 AUGUST 2025



Ref	Date	R&BBC Officer	Address	Proposal	Parish Council Decision
25/01356/H HOLD	05/08/25	Helen Love	53 Copsleigh Avenue Salfords Surrey RH1 5BQ	Erection of two storey side extension	No observation
25/01041/H HOLD	08/08/25	Matthew Roberts	14 Nutley Dean Mews Smalls Hill Road Horley Surrey RH6 0HR	Proposed single storey rear extension and alterations.	No observation
25/01342/H HOLD As amended	15/08/25		24 Llaemdos Reigate Road Hookwood, Surrey RH6 0HJ	Erection of single storey orangery style rear extension. 1 No ground floor window added to the north elevation. 1 No first floor window added to the south elevation. First floor windows changed to French doors on the west elevation.	No observation
25/01335/F	18/8/25	Jake Hardman	Premier Inn At Mill House Brighton Road Salfords Surrey	Extension to existing hotel to provide additional bedrooms, together with alterations to the car park and all associated works.	No observation
25/01354/PI P	21/8/25	Michael Parker	Land Parcel Formerly Fairthorn Nursery Lonesome Lane Reigate Surrey	Demolition of two existing barns, erection of 3 new build dwellings retention and enhancement of locally Listed barn together with setting back front boundary hedge to enhance visibility.	Object – see below
25/01451/H HOLD	26/08/25	Matthew Roberts	2 Bagley Cottages Ironsbottom Sidlow Surrey RH2 8PT	Partial demolition of existing rear extension and construction of a single-storey rear extension with a flat roof and roof lantern	No observation subject to neighbours
OK2064914R	HGV Licence	SCC	Honeycrock Farm	Increase at existing operating centre licence to 2 vehicles	Echo conditions for existing licence – see below

## 25/01354/PI P – Land Formerly Fairthorn

The Parish Council believes the reasons for refusing application 25/00533/PI P have not been overcome and therefore still apply.

Reason 1 says: *‘The proposal, by reason of the proposed land use and amount and spread of development across the site, does not meet any of the exceptions set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and constitutes inappropriate development in the Metropolitan Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated to clearly outweigh the harm caused by reason of inappropriateness and the other identified harm. such, the proposal is contrary to Policy CS3 of the Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy, Policy NHE5 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan and the provisions of the NPPF.’*

The Design Statement says *‘There is no longer any ambiguity that the proposed development would be appropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposal complies with NPPF para 154 g etc ’*

The officer report for 25/00533/PI P says *‘In terms of g) the land and buildings were last occupied for agricultural purposes and in any case the proposed site area and proposed dwellings extend beyond the established curtilage of the farmyard complex and existing buildings on the site by extending both to the north-west and south-east of the buildings and previously established farmyard area in to the neighbouring fields. Therefore the development site is excluded from the definition of previously developed land under the NPPF. Therefore the proposal does not meet any of the exceptions under paragraph 154 of the NPPF.’*

## SALFORDS AND SIDLOW PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING LIST WEEK ENDING 29 AUGUST 2025



The officer report for 25/00533 says *'The applicant makes a claim for the site to be grey belt. The site has never been used for anything other than agricultural purposes. It is not and has never been Grey belt. There has been zero industrial lawful development on this site.'*

Despite several references to Grey belt in the Design Statement there is nothing in it to say the site is Grey belt.

### **The Parish Council believe Reason 1 has not been overcome and therefore still applies**

Reason 2 says. *'The proposed development, by reason of the amount of residential development and its location, which goes beyond the existing established curtilage of the farm yard buildings on the site and in to the neighbouring fields, the proposal would result in an unsympathetic development which fails to promote and reinforce local distinctiveness or respect the rural and agricultural character of the site and surrounding area and would therefore fail to comply with Policy DES1 of the Development Management Plan 2019 and guidance within the Council's Local Character and Distinctiveness Design Guide SPD 2021 and the NPPF.'*

The Design Statement says *'The spread of development has been consolidated and redesigned in accordance with the Council's Local Distinctiveness SPD 2021 where countryside redevelopments are required to follow a farm yard typology and avoid suburban subdivision of plot and the Council's Barns and Farm Conversions SPD 2020. The revised proposal now remains within the existing established curtilage of the farm yard buildings on the site'*

The Parish Council notes the area of the revised site boundary, given on page 10 of the Design Statement, is 0.24Ha, is less than the 0.39Ha in the previous application. However the northern boundary of the revised site is north of the curtilage of the farm yard buildings, it is clearly further away from barns A and B which are very close to the established boundary. The revised proposal goes beyond the existing established curtilage of the farm yard buildings on the site.

The proposed footprint of the buildings is now shown to be 448m<sup>2</sup> which is an increase of 49% over 300m<sup>2</sup> in the previous application.

### **The Parish Council believe Reason 2 has not been overcome and therefore still applies.**

Reason 3. says *'The proposed development is in a location that has no street lighting, no footways, and no public transport within 400 metres of the site along roads with street lighting and footways meaning users of the site would be reliant on private motorised transport for movement contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 and Policy TAP1 Parking, access, and Servicing of the Reigate and Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan September 2019 and Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy 2014 Policy CS17 (Travel Options and Accessibility).'*

The Design Statement references developments at Land to the Rear Of 63 & 65 Lonesome Lane Reigate Surrey RH2 7QT and Wrays Farm, Horse Hill, Horley, Surrey RH6 0HN. The Parish Council believes each location must be assessed on its own merits. The above sites are not directly comparable and cannot be judged to overcome this reason for refusal.

### **The Parish Council believe Reason 3 has not been overcome and therefore still applies**

#### **If the planning department is minded to approve this application the following conditions should be applied.**

1. The developed area must not extend outside the boundary of the Reduced compressed site of 0.24Ha shown on page 10 of the Design Statement
2. The land between Lonesome Lane and the area outlined on page 10 of the Design Statement must continue to be green belt, must be kept as open grass land and must be kept free of any building, hardstanding and other development.

3. There must be no intrusive lighting. Any lighting must be within the 0.24Ha area shown on page 10 of the Design Statement, directed downwards and away from Lonesome Lane. Any lighting must be designed and directed in a manner which does not disturb the well-established bats which are registered to be in the vicinity.

**OK2064914R**

The vehicular access to Axes Lane shall be provided with visibility zones of 2.4 metres by the maximum achievable in each direction, all to be permanently maintained and the visibility zones shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction. Attached to Operating Centre: HONEYCROCK LANE, AXES LANE, REDHILL, RH1 5QL New Undertaking: The authorised vehicle will exit the operating centre by turning right into Axes Lane and enter the site by turning left from Axes Lane Attached to Operating Centre: HONEYCROCK FARM, AXES LANE, REDHILL, RH1 5QL.