



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2024

by L Perkins BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C3620/C/23/3334085

Land known as Ricketts Wood Farm, Norwood Hill, Charlwood, Horley, Surrey RH6 0ET

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Rose Greenwood against an enforcement notice issued by Mole Valley District Council.
- The enforcement notice was issued on 6 November 2023.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission the material change of use of the Land from redundant cattle yard to Class B8 storage.
- The requirements of the notice are:
 - (1) To cease the use of the land outlined in red for B8 storage.
 - (2) To cease the use of Building 2, as annotated on the attached plan for B8 storage.
 - (3) Remove all the items associated with the storage use, completely from the Land.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is 1 month.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (b) and (f) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.

Summary Decision: The appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed, and planning permission is granted in the terms set out below in the Formal Decision.

Application for Costs

1. An application for costs was made by Mrs Rose Greenwood against Mole Valley District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the enforcement notice was issued, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated. But there are no changes of any significance for the issues in this appeal.
3. The Mole Valley Local Plan 2020 – 2039 (the Local Plan) was adopted on 15 October 2024. As such, the policies cited in the enforcement notice have been superseded. The Council was asked to comment on any implications for this appeal and it has confirmed the relevant policies from this new Local Plan. The appellant was invited to comment on the Council's response and I have taken the comments made by both sides into account in my reasoning.
4. At the time of my site visit, the use alleged in the notice was not occurring anywhere within the red line of the plan attached to the notice. But this makes no difference to the grounds of appeal before me, particularly bearing in mind the wording of ground (b).

Reasons

Ground (b)

5. An appeal on ground (b) is that the matters stated in the notice have not occurred as a matter of fact. In a ground (b) appeal the onus is on the appellant to make out their case to the standard of the balance of probabilities.
6. On 15 September 2023, the Council refused a planning application at Ricketts Wood Farm (Reference MO/2023/0984) for: *"Change of use of redundant cattle yard to class B8 storage, conversion of former milking parlour and isolation boxes to ancillary staff welfare facilities, parking and ancillary works."*
7. The officer's report for that planning application acknowledges that part of that application was retrospective. It states: *"Space in front of Building 2 and the building itself are currently being used for storage purposes by a local supplier of pet bedding products"*.
8. According to the appellant, the breach of planning control in this case concerns only Building 2 and its frontage which is defined by tall sleeper walls which I saw at my site visit. The appellant has submitted a plan to this effect. Yet from the information provided, the plan attached to the enforcement notice, to identify the precise boundaries of the land to which the notice relates, is substantially the same as the site location plan for the above refused planning application. It outlines in red 5 farm buildings and the access road for the farm.
9. In respect of the plan attached to the notice, the Council states:
"The land outlined in red was being used for B8 storage purposes by virtue of vehicles entering, existing [sic] and manoeuvring around the site, parking and storing of items. To only outline Building 2 in red would exclude land connect [sic] with that use and from which access to it is gained and on which vehicles park for the Class B8 use."
10. However, no evidence has been provided that the breach of planning control alleged in the notice has occurred beyond Building 2 or its frontage and so in light of what is clearly stated in the Council's report for the above refused planning application, on the balance of probability, the matters stated in the notice have not occurred beyond Building 2 and its frontage.
11. Building 2 is a discrete building and its frontage is clearly delineated from the rest of the farm complex by the tall sleeper walls which surround it. From all of the information available to me, Building 2 and its frontage has been separately let to a tenant. So it has been physically and functionally separate from the rest of the farm complex, to host the breach of planning control which has occurred. As such, as a matter of fact and degree, it has constituted a planning unit separate to the rest of the farm complex. Nothing has been provided to lead me to a different conclusion in this regard.
12. I appreciate that vehicles associated with the appeal development will have used the access road to reach Building 2 and its frontage. But so would vehicles associated with the rest of the farm complex and Building 7 (aka "Barn 7" on the appellant's plan). The information provided indicates part of Building 7 has a lawful use for B8 storage or distribution.

13. As such, as it currently stands, the notice would prevent the use of the access road by vehicles serving Building 7. This would interfere with what the evidence indicates is a lawful use within Building 7 and so the access road should be removed from the notice.
14. I have a duty to get the notice in order, where I can, drawing on my powers under section 176(1) of the 1990 Act. So in this regard, to ensure the notice is directed at the relevant planning unit, I shall correct the notice by deleting the plan attached to the notice and substituting it with the site identification plan (drawing no. 01S rev A) provided by the appellant for the purposes of this ground of appeal. This amended plan outlines in red only "Barn 2" (aka Building 2) and its frontage.
15. This correction reduces the geographic scope of the notice. So I am satisfied it will not cause injustice to the appellant. I also note from the Council's written submissions, that the Council recognises that the area of the enforcement notice "could be reduced". No objection has been raised by the Council to this reduction and so I am satisfied correcting the notice in this way will not cause injustice to the Council either.
16. I conclude the appeal on ground (b) succeeds to the extent that I shall correct the notice in respect of its geographic scope.

Ground (a)

17. An appeal on ground (a) is that planning permission ought to be granted for the matters stated in the notice. In considering whether planning permission ought to be granted, the main issues are:
 - whether the appeal development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having regard to the Framework and any relevant development plan policies;
 - the effect of the appeal development on the character of the area;
 - the effect of the appeal development on highway safety;
 - the effect of the appeal development on the Council's strategy for the location of development; and
 - the effect of the appeal development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to noise and disturbance.

Whether Inappropriate Development

18. The appeal site is in the Green Belt. As is set out in the Framework, the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
19. The Green Belt serves five purposes: (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; (c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

20. Paragraph 155 of the Framework lists forms of development which are not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it (noted above). Paragraph 155 (d) refers to 'the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction' and paragraph 155 (e) refers to 'material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds)'. There is no dispute that these paragraphs of the Framework are relevant to Building 2 and its frontage, respectively.
21. Policy EN1 of the Local Plan states that land which is designated as Metropolitan Green Belt will be protected against inappropriate development. Paragraph 3 of Policy EN1 specifies forms of development which are exceptions to the definition of inappropriate development, which will be permitted where they comply with other relevant policies in the Local Plan.
22. Of relevance to this appeal, the forms of development in paragraph 3 of Policy EN1 are 'e.' and 'j.', set out below.
 - e. The re-use of existing buildings which are of permanent and substantial construction, provided the physical changes and associated uses and activity would preserve the openness of the Green Belt and not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
 - j. Other forms of development specifically identified through national policy as exceptions to the definition of inappropriate development, including changes of use and engineering operations which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
23. In light of the above, I am satisfied Policy EN1 is consistent with the Framework, for the purposes of this appeal.
24. Tall sleeper walls run along the northwest and northeast side of the frontage of Building 2. Further to the northwest and northeast, substantial hedgerows exist, on the wider farm site. Building 2 abuts the southeast side of its frontage and Buildings 1, 3 and 4 are sited to the west/southwest of the frontage of Building 2. So the appeal development (ie the use) is either contained within Building 2 or, in respect of its frontage, is shielded from views outside of the appeal site by the structures which surround it, or the hedgerows.
25. As such, I am satisfied that there would not be any views of the use occurring on the appeal site or in the appeal building. Nothing has been provided to lead me to a different conclusion. Moreover, given the containment of the use within the existing structures which surround it, I am satisfied there would be no spatial impact of the use either, such that the appeal development preserves the openness of the Green Belt.
26. I have taken into account the Council's concern about the parking, turning, loading and unloading of vehicles on the site. But no evidence has been provided that these would be (or have been) seen from outside of the appeal site. As a matter of my planning judgement, they would not be, due to the structures which surround the open part of the land (following correction of the notice) and/or the aforementioned hedgerows.

27. Even if vehicles were seen, which would most likely be only in glimpses, it seems to me that this would be comparable to vehicles which would have been seen on the frontage of Building 2 anyway, as part of the site's previous use for agriculture.
28. A planning condition can prevent storage on the open land exceeding the height of the sleeper walls. Nothing has been provided to lead me to a different conclusion in this regard and the appellant identifies these walls as being 2.3m high, a dimension which has not been disputed by the Council.
29. I appreciate that the appeal development generates vehicular movements to and from the site, utilising the access from Norwood Hill. But so did its previous agricultural use and so did its use for the parking of motor vehicles. The evidence indicates the previous agricultural use included articulated lorries, a point which has not been disputed by the Council. The parking of motor vehicles use has been supported by a Lawful Development Certificate (LDC, Ref APP/C3620/X/00/1042079, dated 20 March 2001). It is clear that LDC concerns a substantial number of vehicles and the land for that use includes the appeal site, as corrected.
30. The appellant has provided a Traffic Statement which includes a trip generation assessment. This indicates a daily level of trips for the appeal development of 14 per day (of which 5 would be ordinary goods vehicles), compared with between 0 and 4 trips per day for the agricultural use. However, it is stated that the closed dairy cattle operation will have had a higher level of trips than this and trips for the appeal development are likely to be less than stated. This is because the example sites the assessment is based on are purpose-built, modern, fully weatherproof/climate-controlled units with tall storage capacity. Their efficiency (and hence traffic generation) is likely to be greater than that from a converted ex-dairy cattle shed, as is the case in this appeal. I see no reason to disagree with this assessment.
31. The access road to the site is already used by vehicles accessing the lawful storage use within Building 7 (including Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs)) and the rest of the wider farm complex, including its use for the parking of motor vehicles. In the context of the above, particularly the history of the site, I am satisfied that vehicle movements associated with the appeal development preserve the openness of the Green Belt. This is particularly the case given that any re-use of a building in the Green Belt, pursuant to paragraph 155 (d) of the Framework and/or paragraph 3 e. of Policy EN1, would be likely to result in some vehicular movements.
32. The Council has indicated that the appeal development conflicts with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, without identifying which Green Belt purposes are served by the appeal site. From all of the information available to me, there is no evidence that the appeal site (as corrected) serves any of the five Green Belt purposes, set out above, and the use would be contained within Building 2 and the structures which surround its frontage, rather than encroaching into the countryside. So I am satisfied that the appeal development does not conflict with the purposes of including the land within the Green Belt either, meaning that paragraphs 155 (d) and (e) of the Framework are satisfied, as is paragraph 3 j. of Policy EN1 in this regard.

33. I conclude on this main issue that the appeal development is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having regard to the Framework and relevant development plan policies. In this regard, I find no conflict with Policy EN1 of the Local Plan or the Green Belt Policies of the Framework.
34. As I have found that the appeal development is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, there is no need for me to go on to consider 'other considerations' for the purposes of Green Belt policy, or whether 'very special circumstances' exist, to justify the appeal development.

Character

35. The appeal site is in the countryside and so the area around the appeal site is rural in character. According to the Council, the appeal development results in intensification of the site to the detriment of the rural character of the area visually and by reason of additional activities. These include the type of vehicular movements likely to be generated and parking for varying vehicle sizes in the outdoor space, ie the frontage of Building 2.
36. These arguments are essentially the same as those raised in respect of the effect of the appeal development on openness in the Green Belt that I have addressed above, the detail of which I shall not repeat here. I am satisfied that the enclosed nature of the site (as corrected and subject to a condition controlling the height of storage) means any such intensification, parking, turning, loading and unloading will not be perceptible, because of the screening effect of the surrounding structures and hedgerows.
37. Moreover, there is no evidence to lead me to believe that the volume or type of vehicles associated with the use is materially different from what has gone on before, to such an extent that the rural character of the area is harmed. I say this, taking into account the vehicles (including articulated lorries) associated with the previous agricultural use, the LDC for the parking of motor vehicles and the use of the access road by vehicles associated with the lawful use of the other parts of the wider farm complex, including Building 7.
38. I conclude on this main issue that the appeal development does not harm the character of the area. In this regard, I find no conflict with Policy EN4 of the Local Plan or the Framework.

Highway Safety

39. Policy INF1 of the Local Plan states that development should be located so as to eliminate any unacceptable impact on highway safety and severe adverse impact on the highway network. This is consistent with paragraph 115 of the Framework which states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
40. The Council has indicated that HGVs and articulated lorries have overrun grass verges, made manoeuvres on the public highway to access the site and queued to gain entry to the site, leading to highway safety issues. However, the Council has not explained what these issues are or, for the purposes of Policy INF1 and paragraph 115 of the Framework, how they are unacceptable. Nor has the Council provided evidence to substantiate its case in this regard.

41. I realise that the County Highway Authority may have recommended refusal of the aforementioned 2023 planning application. But that was for a significantly greater scale of development and there is no evidence that the highway authority object to the appeal development which is before me (or that it has provided any comment on it at all).
42. It is not necessarily right to apply comments that authority made on the 2023 planning application to this appeal and a copy of its comments have not been put in evidence for this appeal for me to consider, in any event.
43. I appreciate that an increase in vehicles accessing the appeal site may be attributed to the appeal development, compared with the situation prior to the breach of planning control occurring. But from the evidence provided, I am not satisfied that the appeal development which is before me results in any appreciable harmful effect on highway safety, compared with what has lawfully gone on before, for the following reasons.
44. This is an appeal site which forms part of a wider farm complex which the evidence indicates has historically been accessed on a daily basis by articulated lorries. There is no evidence of road traffic accidents at the farm access involving a car or lorry since 1965. Whilst the access is not particularly wide, it does allow cars to pass each other, it has a passing place for HGVs and a good standard of visibility in each direction being on a long straight section of road which is subject to a 40mph speed limit. Overrunning a grass verge does not necessarily mean there is an unacceptable impact on highway safety, bearing in mind this is a rural area with very limited pedestrian activity.
45. In its statement, the Council has suggested that the change of use of Building 2 to B8 storage would have a significant impact on the highway network. But it has not substantiated its case further in this regard and the relevant threshold set out above, from paragraph 115 of the Framework and Policy INF1 is 'severe'.
46. I have had regard to the various other highway concerns raised by interested parties. But for the appeal development before me, these concerns are not supported by evidence, particularly from the highway authority. So I am not satisfied these concerns constitute a reason to refuse planning permission in this case, whether considered separately or cumulatively. I take the same view in respect of the condition of the road, ie Norwood Hill. This is a matter for the authority responsible for its repair, rather than a reason to refuse planning permission for the appeal development.
47. I conclude on this main issue, based on the evidence provided, that the appeal development does not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. So in this regard, I find no conflict with Policy INF1 of the Local Plan, the Framework or the Surrey Local Transport Plan 4 (2022) as material considerations.
48. My attention has been drawn to Policy INF2 of the Local Plan which concerns parking. But aside from the Green Belt openness and character issues which have already been addressed above, no specific parking harm has been identified by the Council. In light of the reasons for issuing the enforcement notice, it has not been explained how Policy INF2 is relevant. I therefore consider this policy weighs neither in favour of, nor against the appeal development.

Strategy for the Location of Development

49. I have identified this main issue from the fifth paragraph of section 4 of the enforcement notice and a review of the planning policies referred to by both main parties in their submissions.
50. In its statement, the Council has said that the appeal development is not physically well-related to existing settlements or where the Council would direct development of this nature to.
51. In respect of this main issue, the Council has referred to the Framework and the Surrey Local Transport Plan 4 (2022). But in respect of this main issue, it has not been explained how these support the Council's case for resisting the appeal development.
52. I have had regard to Policy EC4 of the Local Plan, which is directly relevant to the appeal development. Paragraph 1a of Policy EC4 states that to maintain a successful, sustainable and diverse rural economy, outside the Built-Up Area as shown on the Policies Map, the Council will support the diversification of rural businesses by encouraging the re-use and adaptation of rural buildings for appropriate alternative employment uses, where this complies with other policies of the Plan.
53. This is consistent with paragraph 88 of the Framework. This states that planning decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of businesses in rural areas, including through conversion of existing buildings.
54. In light of the above, in respect of this main issue, I am not satisfied that the appeal development is contrary to Policy EC4 or the Framework. I accept that the appeal development is not physically well-related to existing settlements. But I do not see that this is a basis to resist the appeal development in this case, in light of the encouragement given to the re-use of rural buildings by the Local Plan and the Framework. Moreover, I have not found conflict with other policies of the Local Plan.
55. The Council states that the site is located in an unsustainable location where the only realistic means of access is by private car. But from a review of all of the information provided, this criticism of the appeal development has been taken directly from the County Highway Authority's recommendation on the aforementioned 2023 planning application.
56. As previously stated, that planning application was for a significantly greater scale of development, there is no evidence that the highway authority object to the appeal development which is before me and it is not necessarily right to apply that authority's comments on the 2023 planning application to this appeal.
57. I acknowledge that Policy INF1 of the Local Plan states that development should be located so as to maximise the use of sustainable modes of transport. But this must be seen within the context of Policy EC4, from the same plan, adopted at the same time and its explicit encouragement of the re-use of rural buildings.

58. Such encouragement also comes from the Framework. Paragraph 89 is clear that planning decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. That is relevant here.
59. So whilst Policy INF1 may appear to pull in a different direction from Policy EC4 and the Framework, it seems to me that the appeal development is located to maximise the use of sustainable modes of transport as far as may be expected in a rural area like this. I say this particularly bearing in mind that representations made on this appeal reveal that Norwood Hill is part of the Surrey Cycleway and is said to be 'used by many cyclists at most times of the day'. As such, I consider the site to be accessible by cycling to at least some extent, and this is a sustainable mode of transport. So Policy INF1 supports the appeal development to this extent.
60. Taking all of the above into account, based on the cases put to me, on this main issue I conclude that the appeal development does not conflict with the Council's strategy for the location of development. As such, in this regard, I find no conflict with Policies EC4 or INF1 of the Local Plan or the Framework or the Surrey Local Transport Plan 4 (2022) cited in the notice.

Living Conditions

61. The nearest neighbouring properties to the appeal site are 1 and 2 Woodside Cottages and Longfield House. The Council states that other properties are considered sufficiently removed to not be adversely impacted and I have no reason to disagree.
62. In respect of this main issue, the notice refers to noise, disturbance and overpowering effects by reason of the increase in vehicle types and movements generated by the appeal development.
63. I addressed vehicular movements and trip generation earlier in this decision and so I shall not repeat the details here. But in summary, the evidence indicates the previous agricultural use of the appeal site generated vehicle movements including articulated lorries and the appeal site played a part in the lawful use of the wider site for the parking of a substantial number of motor vehicles, all of which will have used the access road.
64. In addition, No 1 is separated from the access road by No 2, No 2 is separated from the access road by its own side garden and a tall hedgerow and Longfield House is set back from Building 2 and the access Road to such an extent that vehicles accessing the appeal site do not run close to it. The space in front of Building 2, where vehicles associated with the appeal development may load and unload, is surrounded by tall sleeper walls and separated from Longfield House by a significant distance.
65. In the context of all of the above, as a matter of my planning judgement, I am satisfied that the vehicular types and movements associated with the appeal development are not so close to these neighbouring properties and are not so different from what has gone on before, to such an extent that the living conditions of the occupants of these properties is harmed or that the effects of the vehicles is 'overpowering'. Nothing has been provided to lead me to a different conclusion.

66. A planning condition has been suggested to limit the hours of use of Building 2 to be the same as conditioned for Building 7. I am satisfied that such a condition is necessary, in the interests of the living conditions of the closest neighbouring occupiers.
67. I note concern that this condition may not be adhered to. But enforcement powers exist to control a breach of a planning condition and so the above concern is not a good enough reason to refuse planning permission for the appeal development.
68. I understand that vehicles seeking to access the wider site may have arrived early and parked outside neighbouring properties. But for the appeal development, I am satisfied the likelihood of this continuing would diminish significantly as a result of the above condition being imposed, as drivers accessing the appeal site would get used to a restriction on the hours of use.
69. It has been indicated that vehicles accessing the appeal site would block access to Longfield House. But there is no evidence this is the case and I am satisfied it is set far enough back from the access road that this would not occur.
70. I conclude on this main issue that the appeal development does not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to noise and disturbance. As such, in this regard, I find no conflict with Policy EN4 of the Local Plan or the Framework.

Other Matters

71. I have carefully reviewed the written representations provided by interested parties for this appeal. These appear to comment on the appellant's statement. However, paragraph numbers which have been referenced by these parties do not correlate with the appellant's statement provided for this appeal. So I am not satisfied that all the comments made are necessarily relevant to the appeal development which is before me.
72. I have had regard to a concern that the appeal development would result in a loss of privacy for occupants of Longfield House. But, as a matter of my planning judgement, this property is set far enough back from the access road and the appeal site for there to be no significant loss of privacy.
73. My attention has been drawn to external lighting which may not have benefitted from any planning permission. But this is not attacked by the notice which is before me and so it is not a matter for me to consider in this appeal.
74. An objection has been raised on the basis that no one knows the type of business that will be renting "the buildings". But this is not the case as the use would be confined to the wording of the allegation set out in paragraph 3 of the notice, controlled by any conditions I impose. So I do not accept that the site would become 'out-of-control', as has been suggested. Moreover, it is only Building 2 which is the subject of this appeal in any event, because of my finding on the ground (b) appeal.
75. Whether the appeal site or the wider site has an Operator's Licence and whether drivers transport insecure loads are both matters for separate legislation and are not matters for me to consider in an appeal under section 174.

Conclusion on Ground (a)

76. I have found that the appeal development is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and I have not found harm arising from the effects of the appeal development on the character of the area, highway safety, the Council's strategy for the location of development or on living conditions, with particular regard to noise and disturbance. So subject to the imposition of the planning conditions referred to elsewhere in this decision, based on the cases put to me, the use before me is acceptable in planning terms and so the appeal on ground (a) succeeds.

Conclusion

77. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal succeeds on ground (a). I shall grant planning permission for the material change of use of the Land from a redundant cattle yard to Class B8 storage, as described in the notice as corrected.

78. The appeal on ground (f) does not fall to be considered.

Formal Decision

79. It is directed that the enforcement notice is corrected by:

- the deletion of the plan attached to the notice and its substitution with the plan attached to this decision.

80. Subject to this correction, the appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended for the development already carried out, namely the material change of use of the Land from redundant cattle yard to Class B8 storage, at Land known as Ricketts Wood Farm, Norwood Hill, Charlwood, Horley, Surrey RH6 0ET, as shown on the corrected plan attached to the notice and subject to the following conditions:

- 1) No items or materials shall be stacked or deposited externally above a height of 2.3 metres measured from ground level.
- 2) Machinery shall be operated, processes shall be carried out and deliveries shall be taken at or despatched from the site only between 7:30 am to 6:00 pm on Mondays to Fridays, 8:00 am to 2:00 pm on Saturdays and not at any time on Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.

L Perkins

INSPECTOR



Plan

This is the plan referred to in my decision dated: 11 December 2024

by **L Perkins BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**Land known as Ricketts Wood Farm, Norwood Hill, Charlwood, Horley, Surrey
RH6 0ET**

Reference: APP/C3620/C/23/3334085

Scale: Not to scale

