Chelsham and Farleigh Parish Council 2026/038

Minutes of a meeting of Chelsham and Farleigh Parish Council held on 5th January 2026 in Farleigh Hall, Farleigh Court Road at 7.00pm

Present: Cllr Jan Moore (in the Chair) Cllr Linda Fullerton-Batten Cllr Jeremy Pursehouse Cllr Chris Deefholts Cllr Neil Chambers Cllr Andrews

In attendance: Samantha Head (Clerk) Cllr Anna Patel (TDC) (arrived at 7.25pm)

And 1 parishioner
The meeting commenced at 7.06pm

1. **Apologies for absence**

0359/0126 Cllr Steer had sent her apologies. These were received and accepted by members. Cllr Chotai (TDC) had sent his apologies.

2. **Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest by Councillors of personal pecuniary interests in matters on the agenda, the nature of any interests, and whether the member regards the interest to be prejudicial under the terms of the new Code of Conduct. Anyone with prejudicial interest must, unless an exemption applies, or a dispensation has been issues, withdraw from the meeting.**

None

3. **Public participation**

None

4. **To approve and sign the minutes of the previous council meeting held on 1st December 2025**

0360/0126 Members resolved that the minutes reflected a true and accurate record of the meeting held on 1st December 2025. They were duly signed by the Chair.

5. **Officer's report**
   - The Clerk reported that she had submitted the Parish Council's 2026-27 Precept request.
   - The Clerk gave a gentle reminder to all councillors of the need to submit any items, via email, for an agenda by the Monday before the meeting date.
6. **Matters arising (for information only)**
   - Cllr Fullerton-Batten reported that St Leonard's Church was grateful to the Parish Council for the information about its grants but that it would not be applying at present.
   - The Clerk noted that a TRO, which she has circulated by email, has been issued for the speed reduction to 40mph along Limpsfield Road.
   - Cllr Moore has followed up with Chris Peters (TDC) regarding a meeting in C&F in February.
   - Cllr Chambers noted that an AONB Variation Order has been published. The deadline was 14th January. He offered to draft a PC comment. He would circulate to all for approval before submission.
7. **Reports:**
   a) **County Councillor**

The Parish Council had received an email from Cllr Becky Rush informing of her resignation from SCC.

   b) **District Councillors i) Jeremy Pursehouse, ii) Anna Patel, iii) Perry Chotai**

   i) No report

ii) Cllr Patel noted that she had attended an Audit and Scrutiny Committee meeting. The focus of the meeting was on the council's audit. She had also attended a Community Services Committee meeting. She commented that perhaps she and Cllr Chotai should swap their rota for attending PC meetings as her committee meetings always seemed to occur the week following the PC meeting and this created a long gap. She would liaise with Cllr Chotai.

iii) Cllr Chotai had sent his apologies. There was no report.

c) Charity in Need meeting

Cllr Moore gave the following report: Cllr Moore attended the Charity's 63rd ordinary meeting on 8th December 2025. Also present were: Michelle Edmondson, Paul Masters (treasurer) and Chris Herron (clerk). No apologies had been received from Cllr Ed Ralph (Warlingham PC). The minutes of the last meeting, held on 19th May, were approved. There were no matters arising but there was an informal discussion about how a representative from Warlingham PC would be useful. The treasurer gave his report and noted that this year they had received a few thank you messages from the recipients of the grants. He also confirmed that he had now been able to set up online banking. The date of the next meeting is TBC, once the allocation of funds is announced.

8. Annual Parish Meeting – date to be agreed

0361/0126 Members agreed to hold the APM on Monday 27th April at 7pm. It was agreed that the PC would ask George Mynehan and Chris Peters from TDC as guest speakers, as well as Claire Coutinho MP. Cllr Anna Patel agreed to represent TDC. Cllr Moore would give the PC's report and Lauren Gates was noted as a possible additional speaker on behalf of SWGB.

9. Land North of Chelsham Road application - update

Cllr Andrews gave the following update: In relation to planning application ref: 2024/1325, the decision due date has now been moved to 9th February 2026. Surrey Flood Risk is not satisfied with the proposal. Ecology advisors have produced a report to support the water basin location and justification for the loss of Skylark habitat (it should be noted that this report was written by a bat specialist not a bird specialist). SWGB has challenged both. Surrey Wildlife Trust has stated that the proposal is not in line with TDC policy DP19. The BBC has written an article about planning in Tandridge. It was suggested that the PC writes to the BBC again.

0362/0126 Members agreed to submit another article to the BBC. Cllr Andrews offered to write the article and circulate to all for agreement.

10. Planning – to determine the Parish Council's position on Appendix A:
TA/2025/1294 Beech Farm Road, Warlingham CR6 9QJ
Change of use of land to a private gypsy and traveller caravan site for 4 pitches, including parking. Relocation of vehicular access to improve highway safety.

0363/0126 Comment: **Objection by Chelsham and Farleigh Parish Council**
Unlawful Development

This plot is part of a larger agricultural grade 3 field, that has been used for cattle grazing and agricultural purposes by Church Farm Services for over 55 years. It is in the 'Area of Great Landscape Value', in the Green Belt and has an article 4 directive (ENF/2012/107) which was put in place due to the sale of land in plots.

On 21st November 2025, members of Chelsham and Farleigh Parish Council witnessed a breach of planning control as the applicant removed ancient hedgerow, destroyed the verge bank, erected substantial gates and imported hardcore to create the 'proposed' new vehicular access. This posed a risk for the cattle and has since required reinforcement measures as the gate/fencing was not stock proof.

While the applicant, Mr Smith carried out the unlawful works, he is not the owner of the land; it was purchased by a Mr Tamplin in September 2024. Mr Tamplin was served an injunction to stop any further works since the intension was to change the land use to a

gypsy and traveller caravan site and apply for planning permission retrospectively. The owner, Mr Tamplin will not be residing on the site.

Not Previously Developed Land

This blatant flouting of planning law is also evidenced in that the submitted planning application form states that biodiversity net gain does not apply as the application is 'retrospective' and listing the land as a 'brownfield paddock'. Had an injunction not been promptly implemented, another unauthorised site would likely have been established. The applicant sought to designate the plot as previously developed land (PDL). While the Design and Access Statement is hard to follow, we assume the planning consultant refers to the in use agricultural barns at 'Broom Bank' as PDL which were erected on a WW2 gun emplacement, these are currently used by Church Farm Services to store hay with the rest of the field for cattle grazing.

Since the land has historically and still been in agricultural use it therefore cannot be considered as Previously Developed Land as set out in the NPPF. The change of use to residential and all associated paraphernalia together with the introduction of hardstanding, mobile homes and touring caravans would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would also be harmful to openness and conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances are identified that would clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and other identified harm and, as such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy CSP9 of the Core Strategy, Policies DP10 and DP13 of the Tandridge District Local Plan: Part 2 – Detailed Policies 2014 and the NPPF 2024.

It is important to support our farmers as the proposed development would lead to the loss of a significant area of best and most versatile agricultural land contrary to the provisions of NPPF paragraph 187 b).

Area of Great Landscape Value and National Landscape

This plot and wider area in the 'Area of Great Landscape Value' has been identified for many years in successive local plans as having significant landscape value that should be protected. Given its identified landscape sensitivity and contribution to the character of the area, AGLVs perform an important role in ensuring development is sustainable in terms of meeting environmental objectives. AGLV, therefore, retains significant status and any proposals to develop on them are deemed to represent unsustainable development.

On 21st November 2025, Natural England launched the notice period for the Surrey Hills National Landscape Boundary Variation. It has been confirmed that the adjacent fields on Beech Farm Road/Chelsham Court Farm Road will be included in the extended Surrey Hills National Landscape 'Woldingham Valleys'. Therefore, this plot is in the 'setting' of the National Landscape, which is a material consideration in the determination of this application. The proposed development would adversely impact upon the character and distinctiveness of the landscape and countryside of the site and wider area and significantly detract from the overall character and appearance of the area and thereby the sensitive setting of the National Landscape. As such, the proposed development is contrary to the provisions of NPPF paragraph 189 and Core Strategy Policies CSP20 and CSP21 and Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014) policy DP7.

Ancient Hedgerow and Highways

The site lies outside the settlement boundary of Warlingham and is in the rural Parish of Chelsham. This undeveloped parcel of land is bordered by ancient hedgerow and since a section was removed without planning permission, we believe the 1997 Hedgerow Act has been breached. The new access has already been implemented and had further works continued, it would significantly harm the visual amenities and character of the area. Unauthorised development is a material consideration. The change of use has already been partially carried out but clearly with the knowledge that planning permission is required. The applicant stated to members of Chelsham and Farleigh PC that according to

their planning consultant they were entitled to create a new access without planning permission.

The old disused farm gate is overgrown with vegetation; with additional wire stock fencing due to the cattle and grassed banked verge onto the highway – it would not be a suitable modern-day access. The proposed highways access however has still not addressed highway safety issues as this is positioned on the straight section of Beech Farm Road, which is 60mph, with high hedgerow, trees and vegetation which would obscure sightlines for vehicles entering/exiting the site onto the public highway.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Paragraph 187(a) of the NPPF 2024 highlights the importance of protecting and enhancing landscapes via statutory status and the development plan. CSP17 states that there should be an enhancement of biodiversity. There has been no demonstration of how 10% BNG would be achieved particularly considering that the removed hedgerow is likely to be a 'Habitat of Principal Importance'. The unauthorised development already undertaken by the applicant and the additional development proposed to be undertaken has and will result in a net loss of biodiversity. Insufficient information has been submitted with the current application to determine what mitigation, or compensation would be required to achieve compliance with policies in the National Planning Policy Framework aimed at protecting biodiversity.

The proposed additional manmade boundary to surround the plot with hedgerow and post rail fencing would be at odds with the character of the historical field boundary. The new entrance has made the site highly visible from the road. It would be unacceptable to develop this plot on what is an expanse open field. While a comparison is made to the nearby traveller site 'Pony Paddock' this is contained within a smaller paddock, which had an existing long-standing hedge and tree boundary. The information provided with this application is insufficient to show that there will not be adverse impacts on biodiversity because of the proposed development contrary to the provisions of paragraphs 187 and 193 of the NPPF and Tandridge Local Plan Core Strategy policy CSP17 and Tandridge Local Plan Part 2: Detailed Policies (2014) policy DP19.

Lighting Impact

We have concerns that since the established gypsy and traveller site at 'Pony Paddock' has already erected several tall flood lights without planning permission that the proposed 'sensor-controlled security lighting' would be equally inappropriate and not supported as there are no streetlights in this area. Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to allow for a proper assessment of the impacts of outdoor lighting relating to the proposed development on the amenity of the area, the natural environment and dark sky character of the setting.

Unsustainable Location

The site is not Grey Belt because the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in NPPF footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development. The site is in the setting of the Surrey Hills National Landscape. The application site is situated in an unsustainable location in the open countryside, physically separate and remote from the nearest settlement and without safe and sustainable access to local services and facilities. Beech Farm Road is a fast 60mph road, unlit, with no pavements which turns into Chelsham Court Road. It is not suitable for walking or cycling. The proposed development would be highly reliant on the use of private motor vehicle to access local services and facilities and does not benefit from any exceptions under either the National Planning Policy Framework or Development Plan that would justify its provision in such an isolated and unsustainable location in the countryside. The development is therefore contrary to government guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites in so far as these aimed at achieving sustainable development.

Due to the unsustainable location, without appropriate access to public transport services or local amenities, with limited active travel opportunities, and where the only realistic means of transport would be the private car. This is contrary to the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, in particular paragraph 115, the Surrey Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) and the Tandridge Local Plan Policy DP5.

Over Concentration of Pitches

Beech Farm Road is in the open countryside in the Metropolitan Green Belt, which turns into Chelsham Court Road. There are only 8 dwellings along these roads, which historically have farm and equestrian use – Beech Farm, Chelsham Heights/Court Farm, Broom Bank, Milberry Cottage and Broom Lodge Farm etc. The land surrounding the site is still farmed today. Currently there are 15 authorised pitches - three at Pony Paddock and twelve pitches at TAN-07 Hillview Manor Park 'Highview', 'Field 2472' and 'land adjacent to Caravan site, Beech Farm Road'. Then there are numerous unauthorised pitches- 5 unauthorised pitches at Pony Paddock (2025/525 now at Appeal), approx. 30+ unauthorised pitches at TAN-07 Hillview Manor Park, 'Field 2472' and 'land adjacent to Caravan site, Beech Farm Road', known to be rented out to those who do not hold gypsy and traveller status and recently another new unauthorised site known as 'Hessiers Hill'. This latest site at Hessiers Hill, has been subject to an injunction to prevent further works as they have removed many trees to access the site. There are great concerns about the impact of accommodating a further 4 pitches proposed in this application, when in total that would make over 54+ (authorised and unauthorised) pitches which would dominate this sensitive rural area.

This over concentration of traveller sites here will have an ''over-domineering effect'' on the nearest settled community, particularly as this is a sparsely populated rural area. If these 4 additional pitches are permitted, the likelihood is there would be further expansion given both the proposed paddocks and that the rest of the large field is vunerable to being sold off in plots. In addition, the proposal taken cumulatively with the existing Gypsy and Traveller development in the rural locality, would result in an over concentration of Traveller pitches within the settled community which is contrary to paragraph 26 of the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.

The multiple proposed caravans, by their very nature, do not respect the local distinctiveness of the area, being of a standardised, modern, utilitarian and non-vernacular design. The development does not physically or visually enhance or complement its surroundings.

Breaching of planning law should not be rewarded, Beech Farm Road/Chelsham Court Road is a target for unlawful development.

If approved the land proposed as paddocks and due to the land being sold in plots, we request there is a condition that no further caravans are permitted, no further development on paddock land and occupiers must be of gypsy travellers only or planning permission is revoked particularly since the owner is not going to reside here.

Flood Risk

The land here is clay and chalk which is not free draining, to be replaced with impermeable hardcore material. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development can be feasibly and sustainably drained in a manner that addresses flood risk and particularly surface water concerns. With the impermeable nature of the underlying geology, the natural fall of the land to the highway and the absence of any water course or public sewer in proximity to the site. There is a likelihood that the highway will be flooded which needs proper consideration.

Lack of Utilities

There are no details on how the site is to be connected to water, electricity, sewerage, drainage and refuse disposal which must be provided on all sites. This is a rural location it

is not that easy to connect to these utilities, nor is any evidence provided to support that it can be served.

For example, it has not been confirmed how foul sewage is to be disposed. Therefore, if planning permission is granted, we recommend a condition that no development shall commence until details of the foul drainage scheme to serve the development have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. That the agreed scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development.

Conclusion

Chelsham and Farleigh Parish Council strongly opposes this development due to the adverse impacts of the development in terms of the character of the landscape; the intrinsic value of the countryside; the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area in the AGLV and setting of National Landscape. The unsustainable location of the site; highways safety issue; the net loss of biodiversity; the lack of information regarding sustainable surface and foul water drainage; connection to utilities and the deliberate unauthorised nature of the development already undertaken. Furthermore, the proposed development would not positively enhance the environment and increase its openness. Rather, it has been designed in a manner that encloses the site in a way that gives the impression that the site and its occupants are deliberately isolated from the rest of the community. The proposed development is therefore contrary to government guidance contained in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites aimed at achieving the suitable and sustainable location of gypsy/traveller sites; and the suitable design and assimilation of gypsy and traveller sites into their surroundings. The proposed material change of use of the land and related operations have an urban character and appearance that sits uncomfortably in the existing rural landscape and countryside setting. The development is harmful to the landscape and the intrinsic character, beauty and tranquillity of the countryside. The over concentration of sites in this rural area is unacceptable, and we respectfully request the application is refused.

If the planning officer wishes to approve this planning application, we request that it goes to the Planning Committee.

Cllr Pursehouse noted that he had already submitted a call in request for this application.

11. Finance

i) Receive monthly bank reconciliations – to be signed by two councillors

The Clerk had circulated the bank reconciliations to all councillors prior to the meeting.

0364/0126 Members received and accepted the bank reconciliations. These were signed and dated by two councillors.

ii) Receive monthly budget v actual Year to Date report

The Clerk had circulated the Budget v. Actual YTD reports prior to the meeting.

0365/0126 Members received the Budget v. YTD spend report.

iii) Payment of invoices:

Samantha Head	Salary- December	£ 532.00
HMRC	PAYE / NI	£ 417.50
Lloyds Bank	Fees – November	£ 4.25*
Anthony Norris	Pond plants planting	£ 50.00**
Nick Dance	Various work on TDC land	£ 1260.00**
Vision ICT	Host email accounts 2026-27	£ 48.00**

*already paid by DD

**to be ratified

0366/0126 Members approved the payments.

12. Meetings and Correspondence

- The PC had received a report of fly tipping on Mill Common (near Mill House). The PC needs to seek quotes to clear this substantial amount of fly tipped waste. It was suggested that the PC looks into quotes for a gate across this track.
- It has been reported to the PC that the grit bin on Chelsham Common is being used as a dog waste bin. PC to get a sign for the grit bin and obtain quotes for a dog waste bin and a dual waste bin. Cllr Pursehouse to put a notice on FB.

13. Matters for reporting or inclusion in a Future Agenda or Reports for Facebook or press

- Rubbish on Mill Common (fly tipping)
- Dog waste bins
- PC land and easements
- AONB comment (to be ratified)

The meeting closed at 8.04pm

The next Planning Working Group meeting would be held on 26th January 2025 at 5.30pm.
The next Parish Council meeting would be held on 2nd February 2026 at 7pm.