



Development Management Plan (Regulation 19)

**Traveller Site Land Availability
Assessment (TSLAA)**

December 2017

Executive Summary

The *Traveller Site Land Availability Assessment* (TSLAA) is part of the Development Management Plan (DMP) evidence base. Its purpose is to assess the availability of suitable and sustainable sites to meet the needs for pitches and plots for Travellers in Reigate & Banstead borough.

The aim of the TSLAA is to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability, and likely economic viability of land to accommodate Traveller sites over the current plan period to 2027. The Government's *Planning Policy for Traveller Sites* (as amended August 2015) (PPTS) seeks to encourage local planning authorities to identify land to accommodate Traveller sites and to plan for sites over a reasonable timescale. In plan-making, the PPTS sets out that local planning authorities should identify a supply of specific deliverable sites to deliver five years' worth of sites, and identify a supply of specific developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15.

This assessment adopts broadly the same process as that used for the *Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment* (SHLAA) – now known as the *Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment* (HELAA) - produced by the Council for 'bricks-and-mortar' housing. The study follows relevant advice set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) and takes account of the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and PPTS 2015, where relevant.

Disclaimer

Reigate & Banstead Borough Council makes the following disclaimer relating to this *Traveller Site Land Availability Assessment (TSLAA)*.

- The identification of land as having potential to accommodate Traveller provision in the TSLAA does not imply that the Council will grant planning permission for sites on this land, or allocate the land for such uses within the Local Plan. All planning applications will continue to be determined against the current development plan and any material planning considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, 2015 (PPTS, 2015).
- The identification of land as being suitable and available for Traveller provision within the TSLAA does not preclude it being allocated or developed for other uses.
- The exclusion of sites from the TSLAA (through assessment) or the omission of sites (perhaps because they were never identified) does not preclude the possibility of planning permission being granted on those sites for Traveller provision. The Council acknowledges that appropriate sites may come forward as planning applications even if they have not been previously identified.
- The TSLAA does not set policy or precedent, but provides background evidence on the potential availability of sites for forward planning purposes including sites which have been put forward by other organisations and individuals for evaluation. Therefore statements would require further confirmation before achieving any status as material planning considerations to support the determination of any planning application.
- The site boundaries in the TSLAA have been informed by the best information available at the time of study. Identification in the TSLAA precludes an expansion or contraction of these boundaries for the purpose of a planning application or future allocation through the Local Plan process.
- The determination of a site's deliverability/developability has been informed by the best information available at the time. Assumptions made in the TSLAA will not prevent planning applications being submitted on any site at any time.
- The estimation of potential pitch capacity has been informed by the best information available at the time and with reference to the PPTS and best practice guidance set out in *Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites (DGTS)* (May 2008). Whilst the DGTS was withdrawn in September 2015, it still forms a material planning consideration. The potential indicated in this report does not preclude the number of pitches on a site being increased or decreased, subject to further information and assessment at such time as a planning application is made.

- The Council does not accept liability for any factual inaccuracies or omissions in the TSLAA. It should be acknowledged that there may be additional constraints on sites that are not included within this document, and that planning applications will continue to be determined on their own merits rather than on the information contained within this document. Issues may arise during the planning application process that were not or could not have been foreseen at the time of publication of the TSLAA. Applicants are advised to carry out their own analysis of site constraints for the purposes of planning applications and should not rely on information contained within this TSLAA.

Contents

1. Introduction	Page 07
2. Policy context.....	Page 07
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	
- Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015 (PPTS)	
- National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)	
- The Development Management Plan (DMP)	
- The Core Strategy	
- The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA)	
3. Identification of sites for assessment.....	Page 12
- Site sources	
4. Site assessments.....	Page 13
- Stage 1: Site size	
- Table 1: Sites smaller than 0.06 ha in size	
- Stage 2: Screening process – absolute constraints	
- Table 2: Sites excluded from further consideration (absolute constraints)	
- Stage 3: Assessing suitability and development potential	
- Table 3: Site suitability conclusions	
- Stage 4: Availability and achievability	
- Table 4: Site availability conclusions	
5. Green Belt Reviews: potential sites.....	Page 67
- Table 5: Suitable and available sites	
- Reviews:	
o G9a: Land at Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords (1)	
o G9b: Land at Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords (2)	
o G13: Land west of Plot 4, Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords	
o BV16: Land south of Woodmansterne Lane, Banstead	
o BV18: Land south of Croydon Lane, Banstead (Parcel Option A)	
o BV18: Land south of Croydon Lane, Banstead (Parcel Option B)	
o G3: Woodlea Stables, Peeks Brook Lane, Horley	
o G4: Treetops/Trentham, Peek Brook Lane, Horley	
o G6: Land at Crossoak Lane/Picketts Lane, Salfords	
o G12: Land at Kents Field, Rectory Lane, Chipstead	
- Need and supply	
6. Assessment: potential of broad locations	Page 88
- Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUE)	
- Table 7: Potential delivery of pitches/plots through Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUE)	
- Potential pitch/plot capacity and estimated need?	

List of Tables

Table 1: Sites smaller than 0.06 ha in size

Table 2: Sites excluded from further consideration (absolute constraints)

Table 3: Site suitability conclusions

Table 4: Site availability conclusions

Table 5: Suitable and available sites

Table 6: Sites suitable for further consideration as Traveller sites

Table 7: Potential delivery of pitches/plots through Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUE)

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This *Traveller Strategic Land Availability Assessment* (TSLAA) sets out an assessment of the suitability, availability, and achievability of sites to address Traveller accommodation needs in Reigate & Banstead borough. It has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF), and *Planning Policy for Traveller Sites* (as amended August 2015) (PPTS, 2015), and takes account of advice within the *National Planning Practice Guidance* (NPPG).
- 1.2 This document forms part of the evidence base for the Development Management Plan (DMP) and informs preferred site allocations for Traveller accommodation. It should be read alongside the Council's *Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment* (HELAA), which assesses sites for 'bricks-and-mortar' housing, which have also been used as a potential source for Travellers sites. It should also be read in conjunction with the Council's *Green Belt Review & Methodology*.
- 1.3 The findings of this assessment are based upon the best available information at the point of its publication. The Council maintains an open 'call for sites' and continues to encourage landowners and other stakeholders to submit sites for future consideration.
- 1.4 In this document the term 'Traveller' includes Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.

2. Policy Context

National policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 2.1 The NPPF sets out overarching national planning policy and guidance for the preparation of Local Plans for England. At the heart of the NPPF is the ethos that planning should contribute to achieving sustainable development. This includes ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places at the right time and providing the supply of land required to meet the needs of present and future generations. In addition, it encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed alongside active management of growth to ensure it is directed to sustainable locations.

2.2 The NPPF is centred around the presumption in favour of sustainable development and, for plan-making, this means seeking to meet objectively assessed needs, unless:

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework; and
- specific policies in the Framework indicate that development should be restricted - including protection of land designated as Green Belt, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, or locations at risk of flooding.

2.3 The NPPF refers to *Planning Policy for Traveller Sites* for specific guidance on the assessment of the land for Traveller provision.

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS, 2015)

2.3 *Planning Policy for Traveller Sites* was updated in August 2015 and sets out the Government's overarching aims in respect of Travellers, to ensure fair and equal treatment for the travelling community that facilitates their traditional and nomadic lifestyles, whilst respecting the interests of the settled community.

2.4 In particular, PPTS seeks to ensure that, in respect of Traveller sites, local planning authorities should:

- Develop fair and effective strategies to meet needs through the identification of sites;
- Increase the number of Traveller sites in appropriate locations to address under provision and maintain an appropriate supply of sites;
- Enable provision of suitable accommodation from which Travellers can access health, education, welfare and employment opportunities; and
- Protect the Green Belt and give due regard to the protection of local amenity and the local environment, whilst reducing tensions between settled and Traveller communities.

2.5 In terms of plan-making, the PPTS sets out that local planning authorities should ensure that Traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally and, in terms of site suitability, should ensure that their policies:

- Promote integrated co-existence between the site and local community;
- Promote access to appropriate health services, and education;
- Provide a settled base that reduces the need for long-distance travelling and environmental damage;
- Provide consideration of the effect of local environmental quality (e.g. noise and air quality) on Travellers and neighbouring occupiers;

- Avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services;
- Do not locate sites in areas at high risk of flooding; and
- Reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles can contribute to sustainability (some travellers live and work from the same location, thereby omitting many travel to work journeys).

2.6 The PPTS also seeks to encourage authorities to maintain a suitable supply of sites by requiring them to:

- Identify a supply of deliverable sites sufficient to meet five years' worth of sites against their locally set targets; and
- Identify a supply of specific developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6-10 and where possible, years 11-15.

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), 2014

2.7 The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) was published in March 2014. The NPPG updates and refreshes all existing planning guidance and provides advice on the implementation of the policies within the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

2.8 The NPPG sets out a five stage methodology¹ for conducting assessments of land availability such as the TSLAA, along with guidance relating to the key inputs and advice on the approach which should be adopted within each stage.

2.9 The following set of standard outputs are also recommended by the NPPG to ensure consistency, accessibility and transparency when undertaking any assessment of land availability:

- A list of all sites and broad locations considered, cross referenced to their locations on maps;
- An assessment of each site or broad location, in terms of its suitability for development, availability and achievability (including whether the site/broad location is viable), to determine whether a site is realistically expected to be developed and when;
- Contain more detail for those sites which are considered to be realistic candidates for development, where others can be discounted for clearly evidenced and justified reasons;
- The potential type and quantity of development that could be delivered on each site/broad location, including how any barriers to delivery could be overcome and when; and
- An indicative trajectory of anticipated development and consideration of associated risks.

¹ Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 3-007-20140306
Reigate & Banstead Borough Council
Traveller SHLAA 2017

- 2.10 The guidance also provides advice as to what could constitute a ‘deliverable’ or ‘developable’ site within the context of the NPPF.

Local policy

- 2.11 Reigate & Banstead Borough Council is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan to replace the Borough Local Plan (BLP) adopted in 2005. The first part of this new Local Plan, the Core Strategy, was adopted in 2014 and sets out broad objectives and scale of required development. The Core Strategy replaced some policies of the BLP and the rest will be replaced by the adoption of the Development Management Plan (DMP).

The Development Management Plan (DMP)

- 2.12 The DMP will set out detailed policies, and will also allocate land to meet the development needs set out in the Core Strategy. Any changes to the boundaries and extent of the Green Belt in the borough will also be progressed through the DMP.
- 2.13 The new Local Plan will also be supported by Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) to provide additional detailed guidance and advice where this is considered necessary and appropriate.

The Core Strategy (2014)

- 2.14 The Core Strategy commits the Council to establish within the DMP a target for pitches/plots and to make provision for an adequate supply of sites. The target for plots and pitches will be informed by the *Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment* (GTAA).
- 2.15 The Core Strategy sets out the overarching sequential approach which the Council will adopt in identifying suitable sites, starting with sites in the urban area, followed by countryside not within the Green Belt and, finally, if necessary, land within the Green Belt. Policy CS16 sets out a series of clear criteria which will be used to assess the suitability of sites for allocation (see 4.4). These criteria are aligned with the guidance and principles in the PPTS and seek to ensure that sites are sustainable both environmentally and socially, whilst also being deliverable and affordable economically.

Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA)

- 2.16 In accordance with the PPTS, the Council has recently completed an updated *Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment* (published July 2017). This

document provides an objective assessment of the accommodation needs of the travelling community in Reigate & Banstead borough, taking account of the needs of the existing population and those seeking to move to Reigate & Banstead. The outputs are derived from a combination of desk based assessment and survey work with Traveller households both on sites and in “bricks and mortar”. This assessment, combined with evidence of constraints and land availability, will ultimately inform the target which will be included in the DMP.

- 2.17 The GTAA 2017 has taken account of the Government’s August 2015 change to the statutory definition of “Traveller”. The Council has taken legal advice which concluded that, under the 2010 Equalities Act, it should consider the accommodation needs of Romany Gypsies, Irish Travellers, and Scottish Travellers, even if they do not fall under the planning definition of Traveller. Information available from planning applications, enforcement cases and household interviews carried out for the GTAA indicate that, in Reigate and Banstead borough, all those included in the needs assessment identify as Irish Travellers or fall under the planning definition. In light of this legal advice the Council is seeking to meet the full identified level of need identified in the GTAA as far as possible. The findings of the GTAA are set out below:

Years	0-5	6-10	11-15	
Status (plan timescale)	2016-21	2021-26	2026-31	Total
Gypsy and Traveller pitches				
Meet Planning Definition	12	2	2	16
Unknown	6	1	1	8
Do not meet Planning Definition	5	1	2	8
TOTAL	23	4	5	32

Years	0-5	6-10	11-15	
Status (plan timescale)	2016-21	2021-26	2026-31	Total
Travelling Showpeople plots				
Meet Planning Definition	3	2	2	7
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Do not meet Planning Definition	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	3	2	2	7

2.18 Given that the Local Plan period only extends until 2027, the total need to be accommodated within this plan period will be 28 pitches for Travellers and 5 plots for Travelling Showpeople.

3. Identification of sites for assessment

Site sources

3.1 In accordance with the requirements of the PPTS for identification of sites, this study is underpinned by a thorough and comprehensive search for sites and review of known sources of land. In particular, the study has considered:

- Existing authorised Traveller sites;
- Land that is used and unauthorised for Traveller accommodation but tolerated;
- Land that is used and unauthorised for Traveller accommodation but not tolerated;
- Land with an extant planning permission for housing or Traveller accommodation which is yet to be implemented or where planning permission has expired (except where permitted under office to residential PD rights);
- Land where planning permission for housing or Traveller accommodation was refused/dismissed at appeal for reasons that have the potential to be overcome;
- Land suggested by members of the Travelling community during the production of the GTAA or as part of the Traveller ‘call for sites’ exercise in 2013;
- Land suggested during a call for sites 2015;
- Land owned by the Council or other public organisations;
- Land submitted to the Council for consideration as part of the *Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)* (including the SHLAA Update 2016);
- Land suggested as part of the *Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA)* (which will replace previous versions of the SHLAA);
- Sites suggested as part of the Regulation 18 DMP consultation; and
- Land or buildings that are empty or derelict or land which is underutilised in its current form.

3.2 All sites were assessed through the process outlined in the following sections.

4. Site Assessment

Stage 1: Site size

- 4.1 All sites identified or suggested were put through an initial filtering process to ensure that they are of a suitable size to accommodate at least one Traveller pitch or Travelling Showperson plot. There is no official definition as to what constitutes the correct size for a single Traveller residential pitch or a showperson's plot, so the following assumptions have been made about pitch and plot sizes.
- 4.2 **Traveller pitch size assumptions:** The Department of Communities and Local Government's (DCLG) *Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide*, 2008 (DGTS, 2008), although revoked, still provides useful guidance on design specifics including size, particularly in the absence of any other Government guidance on design. The document notes that there is no one ideal size of pitches but, as a general guide, an average family pitch must be capable of accommodating a lockable shed, drying space/small garden area, a large trailer, a touring caravan and an amenity building, together with space for two vehicles parking.
- 4.3 As such, a minimum pitch size of 600m² has been determined to allow sufficient space to provide the physical accommodation as well as a site's access/egress, vehicle turning, landscaping, setbacks from site boundaries and roads, and spaces between caravans. The average pitch size from existing Gypsy and Traveller sites in the borough has also been calculated, and supports this figure.
- 4.4 The design guide also notes that the experience of site managers and residents alike suggests that a maximum of 15 pitches is conducive to providing a comfortable environment. As such, a maximum site size of 1 hectare will be used. Where sites of over 1 hectare in size are taken forwards through the assessment process, the optimum part of the site up to 1 hectare in size will be assessed.
- 4.5 **Travelling showpeople:** Travelling Showpeople are likely to require larger areas, as they may need space for the storage of equipment. The average plot size of the existing provision for Travelling Showpeople within the borough has been calculated to inform the minimum requirements for future provision. A minimum area of 1,500 sqm will therefore be assumed.
- 4.6 Sites that were filtered out due to size are listed at Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Sites smaller than 0.06 ha in size

Ref	Site name
BV17	Burghside, Brighton Road, Banstead
EW14	Brethren Meeting Hall, 43 Woodlands Road, Redhill
HC22	Imperial Buildings, Victoria Road, Horley
HC27	T Northeast, 4 Station Road, Horley
MSJ05	Bourne House, Lesbourne Road, Reigate
RC19	Ringley Park House, Reigate Road, Reigate
RC20	4-10 Church Street, Reigate
RE15	The Sea Cadet Association, 2 Hooley Lane, Redhill
RH14	Fileturn House, Reigate Hill, Reigate
SPW12	60 Priory Road, Reigate
SS19	South Lodge Court, Ironsbottom, Sidlow
TAT04	Downs Mower Services, Tattenham Crescent, Epsom
N10	Banstead Downs Reservoir, off Brighton Road
TW12	Former Barclay's Bank, 24 Station Approach, Tadworth
TW15	Bothy Cottage, Buckland Lane, Reigate
SS6	Land at Crossways Cottages, Mason's Bridge Road, Redhill

Stage 2: Screening process – absolute constraints

4.7 The next stage was to filter out sites on “absolute” constraints. These were informed by the PPTS, SHLAA practice guidance, and national policy and have been used to identify sites which are outright inappropriate for Traveller accommodation. Sites affected by the following constraints are therefore not taken further forwards for assessment:

- Land that is a Site for Special Scientific Interest (SSSI);
- Land within the Special Area of Conservation (SAC);
- Land that is within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);
- Land within or directly adjacent to a Conservation Area or within a Residential Area of Special Character (RASC);
- Land within a Historic Park or Garden;
- Land wholly within Flood Zone 2 or 3.

4.8 Table 2 below lists the sites excluded from further consideration due to absolute constraints, and the justification in each case.

Table 2 – Sites excluded from further consideration (absolute constraints)

Ref	Site name	Justification
BV13	Land east of Park Road, Banstead	Site is directly adjacent to a Conservation Area
EW01	Land south of Woodhatch Road, Reigate	Site is wholly within Flood Zone 2
HE07	Farney View Farm, Avenue Gardens, Horley	Site is wholly in Flood Zone 2 and partially in Flood Zone 3

HE09	Land at Newstead Hall, Haroldslea Drive, Horley	Site is wholly in Flood Zone 2
HW18	Brethren Meeting Hall, Whitmore Way, Horley	Site is wholly in Flood Zones 2 and 3
KBH01	Land at Margery Hall Nursery, Margery Lane, Lower Kingswood	Site is located within an AONB
KBH10	Land at Kingswood Knoll, Brighton Road, Lower Kingswood	Site is located within an AONB
KBH12	Land at Kingswood Station, Kingswood	Site is directly adjacent to a Conservation Area
KBH23	Land south of Margery Lane (Kingswood Hall Estate), Lower Kingswood	Site is located within an AONB
KBH24	Land south of M25 (Kingswood Hall Estate), Lower Kingswood	Site is located within an AONB
M01	Land at Rocky Lane, Reigate	Site is located within an AONB
M02	Merstham Baptist Church, Weldon Way, Merstham	Site is wholly within Flood Zone 3
M03	Land at Albury Road, Merstham	Site is wholly within Flood Zone 3
M11	Land north of Rockshaw Road, Merstham	Site is directly adjacent to a Conservation Area
M15	Bellway House, Station Road North, Merstham	Site is directly adjacent to a Conservation Area
RC01	Land rear of Flanchford Road, Reigate Heath	Site is directly adjacent to a Conservation Area
RC02	Land at Old Colley Farm, Colley Lane, Reigate	Site is directly adjacent to a Conservation Area
RC07	50-54 West Street, Reigate	Site is directly adjacent to a Conservation Area
RC11	Chatham Court & Linden Court, Lesbourne Road, Reigate	Site is directly adjacent to a Conservation Area
RC12	Land north of Buckland Road, Reigate	Site is within a Conservation Area
RC13	Reigate Beaumont Care Home, Colley Lane, Reigate	Site is within a Conservation Area
RC15	Former Priory Stables, Park Lane, Reigate	Site is within a Conservation Area and a Historic Park
RC16	The Croft, Buckland Road, Reigate	Site is within a Conservation Area
RE02	Land at Marketfield Way / High Street, Redhill	Site is wholly in Flood Zone 2 and substantially in Flood Zone 3
RE14	Redstone Hall, 10 Redstone Hill, Redhill	Site is within a Conservation Area
RE26	26-28 Station Road, Redhill	Site is wholly within Flood Zone 2
RH09	Trinity House, 51 London Road, Reigate	Site is directly adjacent to a Conservation Area
TW05	Frith Park Mansion and grounds, Sturts Lane, Walton on the Hill	Site is a Historic Garden
US03	Seymour, Haroldslea Drive, Horley	Site is in Flood Zone 2
RH13	Land at Quarry Farm, Gatton Road, Reigate	Site is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV).
RC23	Reigate Library & Pool House, Bancroft Road, Reigate	Site is adjacent to a Conservation Area.
RC33	Old Colley Farm, Reigate	Site is within a Conservation Area
RC34	Land to the R/O retail frontage in Bell Street	Land to the rear is within a Conservation Area or Flood Zones 2 or 3

RW18	Extension to the rear of West Central, 3 London Road, Redhill	Adjacent to a Conservation Area
BV21	The Cutting, Brighton Road, Banstead, Surrey. SM7 1AU	Site is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).
BV23	Rosehill Farm, Park Road, Banstead	Site is adjacent to a Conservation Area
M24	Land at Boars Green Farm	Site is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
M25	Land at Home Farm	Site is adjacent to a Conservation Area
RC25	Land to the R/O 45 West Street, Reigate	Site is adjacent to a Conservation Area and almost entirely within Flood Zones 2 and 3.
RC28	Alma House, 1A Alma Road, Reigate	Site is adjacent to a Conservation Area
RE27	North of Brook Road, Redhill	Site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3

4.9 Each of the identified sites not ruled out due to size or absolute constraints has subsequently been assessed in terms of: suitability, availability and achievability in line with the requirements of [National Planning Practice Guidance](#) (NPPG). This assessment provides the evidence required to come to a reasoned judgement as to whether a site represents a realistic option for allocation as a Traveller pitch/plot, and whether the site could form part of the Council's supply of deliverable/developable sites.

4.10 In the event that one of the constraints to development (either in respect of policy, physical characteristics, availability or viability) is severe and it is not known when - or whether - it might be overcome, the site is recorded as not passing that specific test; for example, it would be classed as "*not suitable*", "*not available*" or "*not achievable*".

Stage 3: Assessing Suitability and Development Potential

4.11 The suitability of sites has been assessed in line with the Planning Practice Guidance on *Housing and economic land availability assessments*; and development potential has been guided by policies in the development plan, including the Core Strategy and the saved policies of the 2005 Borough Local Plan (BLP) (as well as the NPPF and PPTS 2015) and have regard to:

- Policy restrictions (including existing designations, and protected areas);
- Physical problems or limitations (e.g. access, flood risk); and
- Environmental conditions (potentially experienced by prospective residents).

4.12 The assessment of suitability has been guided by the criteria set out in Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy, which are in turn derived from the PPTS and

capture the need for Traveller sites to be sustainable socially and environmentally. These criteria are that:

- The site can be integrated into the local area and co-exist with the local community;
- The site has safe access to the highway and has adequate parking and turning areas;
- The site provides a satisfactory residential environment for its intended occupiers and on-site utility services for the number of pitches proposed, including space for related business activities where applicable;
- The site is not located in an area at high risk of flooding, including functional floodplains (caravans and mobiles homes are highly vulnerable uses for the purposes of flood risk and sequential test and therefore are only appropriate in Zone 1 and potentially in Zone 2 if the exception test can be passed);
- There is adequate local infrastructure and access to appropriate healthcare and local schools. (In relation to this criterion we have considered convenience of travel, and accessibility for sustainable transport modes such as walking and cycling, to facilities, including consideration of factors such as suitability of roads for walking on at night, in addition to distance); and
- The site does not significantly impact upon the visual amenity and character of the area or the amenity of neighbouring land uses.

4.13 All sites have been considered against each of the six criteria of Core Strategy Policy CS16, as well as additional policy considerations, with the overall conclusion on suitability taking account of performance against these.

4.14 The estimation of the potential capacity of each site has been guided by the physical characteristics of the site and any known constraints which could impact upon yield. Capacity has also been guided by advice contained in the *Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Good Practice Guide*, as well as pitch/plot densities achieved on existing Traveller sites in the borough and beyond. Assumptions on average plot size are covered in para 4.2 above.

4.15 The conclusions drawn from the assessment of the sites against the suitability criteria above are summarised at Table 3. This table separates out the sites into different types of location (sites within the urban area; sites in non-Green Belt countryside; and sites within the Green Belt) to clearly reflect the sequential approach to identifying suitable sites, as set out in Policy CS16.

- 4.16 It should be noted that a number of the sites considered to perform well against the criteria, and therefore classified as suitable in the table, are located within Countryside or Green Belt locations and as such would subsequently be subject to the Green Belt Review in the next stage. These classifications recognise that whilst the site could offer a suitable and sustainable location for Traveller provision, further work is required to determine the extent of harm, if any, to the designation the site falls within, in the wider policy context of that designation.
- 4.17 Those sites meeting the suitability criteria are classified as suitable, and are colour coded as green. Sites which are considered suitable but would be subject to further review are shown in amber.
- 4.18 Where there are existing buildings on the site, it is assumed, just for this stage, that the buildings can either be removed or a pitch/plot located within the surrounding land. Testing whether this would be viable would be part of the next stage in the process.
- 4.19 Where it is noted that there would be a loss of employment uses, it is recognised that this may be acceptable subject to demonstration that the employment use is no longer required, in line with national policy, and policy in the DMP.
- 4.20 With regard to sites within country-side beyond the Green Belt (Rural Surrounds of Horley), whilst sites within this designation would be more preferable than Green Belt sites in terms of the Core Strategy hierarchy, and are not subject to requirement for as rigorous justification as the Green Belt, the Green Belt review still assesses the Rural Surrounds of Horley to understand which areas of land play a more important role in maintaining settlement separation and preventing sprawl and/or most demonstrate the intrinsic beauty and character of the countryside in line with NPPF paragraph 17. As such, the findings in the Green Belt review regarding the Rural Surrounds of Horley would be applied to relevant sites.

Table 3: Site Suitability Conclusions

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
Sites within the urban area					
EW08	Hockley Business Centre, Hooley Lane, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Proximity to the railway line generates some concern for amenity of future occupants.	Loss of employment uses Land is potentially	Suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
				contaminated	
EW10	101-105 Horley Road, Earlswood	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Access may need to traverse an area of Common Land and site would need to be carefully laid out to ensure a satisfactory level of amenity for future occupiers.	None	Suitable
EW11	19-23 Woodhatch Road, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Site would need to be carefully laid out to ensure a satisfactory level of amenity for future occupiers. The southern half of the site lies within the surface water flood area.	None	Suitable
HC01	Land at the Grove, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Proximity to the railway line generates would need to be carefully mitigated.	Existing BLP housing allocation	Suitable
HC06	Land at Yattendon School, Oakwood Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Impact upon the street scene and predominantly residential character would need to be carefully considered.	Loss of open space associated with the school	Suitable
HE08	121 Smallfield Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. The site is affected to a very limited extent by Flood Zone 2.	Impact on protected woodland and trees	Suitable
HE20	Laburnum, Haroldslea Drive, Horley	HELAA	The site performs reasonably well against all criteria, but would need very careful design to mitigate against problems in relation to access and neighbouring amenity.	Rural Surrounds of Horley; impacts upon protected trees	Suitable
HW08	Landens Farm Buildings, Meath Green Lane, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Given the presence of listed buildings, site would need to be carefully designed/laid out to ensure no adverse impact upon amenity	Impact on Listed Buildings Impact on nature conservation (Great Crested Newts)	Suitable
HW09	The Croft/Meath Paddock, Meath Green Lane, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Given the presence of listed buildings, site would need to be carefully designed/laid out to ensure no adverse impact upon amenity	Phasing in line with delivery of North West Sector, Horley	Suitable
HW10	59-61, Brighton Road, Horley	HELAA	The site performs reasonably well against all criteria, but would need very careful design to mitigate against problems in relation to neighbouring amenity.	Local listing of nearby building.	Suitable
M12	Merstham Library, Weldon Way,	Public Land – Surrey CC	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Site would need to be designed to avoid any parts of the site at	Impact upon regeneration proposals for Merstham	Suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
	Merstham		risk of flooding.		
MSJ03	Redhill Ambulance Station, Pendleton Road, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Site would need to be designed to minimise and mitigate against amenity impact on neighbouring uses given the tight relationship	None	Suitable
N10	14 Brighton Road, Banstead	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Proximity to residential dwellings generates some concern for impact on neighbouring residential amenity.	None	Suitable
P04	Former DeBurgh School, Chetwode Road, Preston	Public Land – Surrey CC	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Small parts of the site in the southern half are affected by surface water flooding.	Impact on Preston regeneration proposals Existing BLP housing allocation	Suitable
RC18	Reigate Business Mews, Albert Road North, Reigate	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Development of the site would need to be mindful of close proximity of neighbouring commercial and residential development. Much of the site is affected by surface water flooding.	Loss of employment uses	Suitable
RC24	Royal Mail Delivery Office, Rushworth Road, Reigate, RH2 0PR	HELAA	The site performs reasonably well against all criteria, but would need very careful design to mitigate against problems in relation to neighbouring amenity.	None	Suitable
RE04	Colebrook Day Centre, Noke Drive, Redhill	Public Land – Surrey CC	Site would have to be designed sensitively to avoid impacts on townscape character of area. Flooding risk also impacts upon suitability for vulnerable traveller accommodation.	Impact on Redhill regeneration plans Impact on protected trees	Suitable
RE07	Royal Mail Sorting Office, St Anne's Drive, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs adequately or well against all criteria. Proximity to railway line also generates some concern for amenity of future occupants and the tightly relationship to existing residential properties would need to be carefully considered to safeguard amenity.	Impact on Redhill regeneration plans	Suitable
RE10	Gasholder site, Hooley Lane, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Proximity to industrial uses generates some concern for amenity of future occupants.	Land is potentially contaminated De-commissioning of utilities use	Suitable
RE21	Quarryside	SHLAA	Site performs adequately or	Loss of	Suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
	Business Park, Thornton Side, Redhill		well against all criteria. Proximity to railway line generates some concern for amenity of future occupants.	employment use	
RW11	Land at The Frenches, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs reasonably or well against all criteria. Development would need to be carefully designed to avoid impacts on neighbouring residential uses, and access would need to be created from the existing cul-de-sac.	Impact on protected trees. Impact on adjoining Listed Building. Loss of private informal recreation space.	Suitable
RW20	Former Territorial Army Site, Linkfield House, 3 Batts Lane, Redhill	DMP, Reg 19	The site performs reasonably well against all criteria, but would need very careful design to mitigate against problems in relation to neighbouring amenity.	Linkfield House is a locally listed building.	Suitable
RW21	Donyngs Carpark and Indoor Bowls Centre Car Park	DMP, Reg 19	The site performs reasonably well against all criteria, but would need very careful design to mitigate against problems in relation to neighbouring amenity. There would also be concerns about potential conflict of uses with neighbouring uses (leisure centre/bowls).	None	Suitable
TW11	Former Royal Phoenix, Dorking Road, Tadworth	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Concerns over access to local services and site would need to be sensitively screened in this sensitive location.	Impact on protected trees to rear of site	Suitable
BV01	Land at Lambert Road, Banstead	Public Land - RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria b) and f) given its constrained access and very tight siting and potential impact upon predominantly residential neighbouring uses	Loss of allotment space	Not suitable
BV03	Thrieve, Orchard House and Inyoni, De Burgh Park, Banstead	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) and f) given its constrained access and tight siting within a predominantly residential location	None	Not suitable
BV04	Amberley, Bolters Lane, Banstead	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the visual amenity and positive contribution which the open site makes to the character of Bolters Lane	Recommended for retention as Urban Open Space	Not suitable
BV06	The Clinic and Youth Centre, The Horseshoe, Banstead	Public Land – Surrey CC	Site performs poorly against criteria b) and f) owing to the constrained access/sensitivity of the surrounding roads in terms of highway safety (presence of primary schools) and the tight siting within a suburban area	Impact on future regeneration of Banstead Horseshoe	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
BV07	Surrey Ambulance HQ, The Horseshoe, Bolters Lane, Banstead	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) and f) owing to the constrained access/sensitivity of the surrounding roads in terms of highway safety (presence of primary schools) and the tight siting within a suburban area	Impact on future regeneration of Banstead Horseshoe	Not suitable
BV02	Land at Holly Lane, Banstead	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs well against all criteria	Recommended retention of Urban Open Space	Not suitable
BV10	Bentley & The Squirrels, The Horseshoe, Banstead	Public Land – Surrey CC	Site performs poorly against criteria b) and f) owing to the constrained access/sensitivity of the surrounding roads in terms of highway safety (presence of primary schools) and the tight siting within a suburban area	Impact on future regeneration of Banstead Horseshoe	Not suitable
BV11	Banstead Hall Playing Field, Bolters Lane, Banstead	Public Land – Surrey CC	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Potential for privacy issues due to close proximity of residential development, and would need to be sensitively screened to prevent harmful impact on the character of the area.	Designated Urban Open Space Impact on future regeneration of Banstead Horseshoe	Not Suitable
BV14	Land at Wellesford Close, Banstead	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) and f) given its constrained access and tight siting within a predominantly residential location	None	Not suitable
EW02	Land to the rear of 1 - 39 Earlsbrook Road, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) and f) given its constrained access and tight siting to the rear of existing residential properties. Site also performs poorly against criteria c) owing to the potential impact of proximity to the railway line and compromised nature of the site on amenity of future occupiers.	Land is potentially contaminated	Not suitable
EW15	Brethren Meeting Hall, 2 Redstone Road, Redhill, Surrey	HELAA	This site performs reasonably well against several criteria, but the potential impact upon the neighbouring residential/suburban environment, for example through the types of movements/storage to be accommodated, means it performs poorly against criteria F.	None	Not suitable
HC02	High Street Car Park, Horley	Public Land - RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the potential adverse impact upon the town centre environment and townscape in a prominent location. Proximity to the	Loss of public car parking capacity and impact on town centre vitality	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
			railway line generates some concern for amenity of future occupants.		
HC03	Central Car Park, Consort Way East, Horley	Public Land - RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the potential adverse impact upon the town centre environment and townscape.	Loss of public car parking capacity and impact on town centre vitality	Not suitable
HC04	Former Henry's Garage, Victoria Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the potential adverse impact upon the town centre environment and townscape in a prominent location and tight relationship with surrounding residential uses	None	Not suitable
HC05	Balcombe Road Industrial Estate, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. However, proximity to the railway line and industrial uses generates some concern for amenity of future occupants.	Designated Local Employment Site (DMP) Land is potentially contaminated	Not suitable
HW14	Bridge Industrial Estate, Horley	DMP, Reg 18	This site performs poorly against criterion C regarding residential environment, and there would also be concerns about the amount of space available.	Designated as a Local Employment Area; locally listing	Not suitable
HC07	Air Balloon Public House, Brighton Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the prominent location of the site and the potential adverse impact upon the character of the area	Part of the site is a locally listed building	Not suitable
HC10	Horley Library, Kings Road, Horley	Public Land – Surrey CC	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the potential negative townscape impact upon a key gateway to the town centre.	Loss of community facilities	Not suitable
HC15	Mitchells of Horley, 1-9 Station Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria c) and f) given the potential impact of proximity to the railway line and compromised nature of the site on amenity of future occupiers and the tight relationship with adjoining uses	Loss of employment uses Land is potentially contaminated	Not suitable
HC16	Horley Police Station, Massetts Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the potential townscape impact upon a key gateway to the town centre.	None	Not suitable
HC17	Chequers Hotel, Bonehurst Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the prominent location of the site and the potential adverse impact upon the character of the area and the setting of listed buildings currently on the site.	None	Not suitable
HC19	Saxley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against	Impact on	Not

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
	Court, Victoria Road, Horley		criteria f) due to the prominent location and potential adverse impact on the town centre retail frontage and overall townscape.	Shopping area Impact on protected trees on frontage	suitable
HC24	100 Victoria Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) due to the prominent location and potential adverse impact on the town centre retail frontage and overall townscape.	Loss of employment uses	Not suitable
HC25	Oakfield Court, Consort Way, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) due to the prominent location and potential adverse impact on the town centre frontage and overall townscape.	Loss of offices	Not suitable
HC29	Brethren Meeting Hall, The Grove Meeting Hall, The Grove, Horley	HELAA	There would be concerns regarding the potential impact upon the neighbouring residential/suburban environment, for example through the types of movements/storage to be accommodated (criteria F) and the small size of the site and additional consideration of protected trees covering part of the site.	Adjacent protected trees	Not suitable
HE02	Gas holder site, Balcombe Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Proximity to industrial uses generates some concern for amenity of future occupants.	Land is potentially contaminated Designated Local Employment Site (DMP)	Not suitable
HE03	75 Smallfield Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) and would be out of character in the predominantly suburban residential environment. Access and movements within the site, as well as potential business storage, would be likely to adversely impact on the amenity of surrounding residential properties, given the tight relationship.	None	Not suitable
HE12	Land at Langshott/Orchard Drive, Horley North East	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against d) as the majority of the site lies in Flood Zone 2.	Impact on protected trees on southern boundary	Not Suitable
HW17	Albert Brewery (part of Bridge Industrial Estate)	DMP, Reg 18	This site performs poorly against criteria A and C – it would be very close to other uses with potential for amenity issues for neighbouring uses and a poor residential environment. Access may also be a problem.	Identified in Reg 18 as a Local Employment Area; locally listing	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
M04	Former Iron Horse Public House, Bletchingley Road, Merstham	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the prominent location and potential impact upon the character and townscape of Merstham	Impact upon regeneration proposals for Merstham	Not suitable
M05	Land north of Wells Place, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) given the only access is via an industrial estate road which is unsuited to a residential use. Proximity to industrial uses and the railway line also generates some concern for amenity of future occupants.	This has been designated as an Employment Site in the DMP. Impact upon Ancient Woodland	Not suitable
M06	Moat House Surgery, Worsted Green, Merstham	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the prominent location and potential impact upon the character and townscape of Merstham and very tight siting/potential impact upon predominantly residential neighbouring uses	Impact upon regeneration proposals for Merstham	Not suitable
M07	Land at Bletchingley Road (“The Triangle Site”), Merstham	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the prominent location and potential impact upon the character and townscape of Merstham	Impact upon regeneration proposals for Merstham	Not suitable
M13	The Oakley Centre, Radstock Way, Merstham	Public Land – Surrey CC	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the tight siting/potential impact upon predominantly residential neighbouring uses and potential adverse impact upon listed buildings on the site (including setting)	Impact upon regeneration proposals for Merstham	Not suitable
M16	Telephone Exchange & Depot Site, Station Road North, Merstham	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria d) owing to the fact that a large proportion of the central part of the site is within Flood Zone 3	Land is potentially contaminated	Not suitable
M19	Land at Portland Drive	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) and would be out of character in the predominantly suburban residential environment. Access and movements within the site, as well as potential business storage, would be likely to adversely impact on the amenity of surrounding residential properties, given the tight relationship.	Alternative provision for shopping facilities	Not suitable
M22	Church of Epiphany, Mansfield Drive, Merstham	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) and would be out of character in the predominantly suburban residential environment. Access and movements within the site, as	Impact upon regeneration proposals for Merstham	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
			well as potential business storage, would be likely to adversely impact on the amenity of surrounding residential properties, given the tight relationship.		
N01	Land at Bridgefield Close, Nork	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria b) and f) given its constrained access and very tight siting and potential impact upon predominantly residential neighbouring uses	Loss of allotment space	Not suitable
N02	Land at Parsonsfield Road, Nork	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria b) and f) given its constrained access and very tight siting and potential impact upon predominantly residential neighbouring uses	Loss of allotment space	Not suitable
N07	Land at The Drive, Banstead	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria b) and f) given its constrained access and prominent siting within an area of public open space.	Loss of open space	Not suitable
N08	268-288 Fir Tee Road, Banstead	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) and would be out of character in the predominantly suburban residential environment. Access and movements within the site, as well as potential business storage, would be likely to adversely impact on the amenity of surrounding residential properties, given the tight relationship.	None	Not suitable
N09	125-129 Nork Way, Banstead	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) and would be out of character in the predominantly suburban residential environment. Access and movements within the site, as well as potential business storage, would be likely to adversely impact on the amenity of surrounding residential properties, given the tight relationship.	None	Not suitable
P01	Unit 4, Pitwood Park, Waterfield, Tadworth	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs adequately or well against all criteria. Proximity to industrial uses and the railway line generates some concern for amenity of future occupants.	Designated Local Employment Site (DMP)	Not suitable
P02	Laboratory site, Pitwood Park Industrial Estate, Waterfield, Tadworth	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs adequately or well against all criteria. Proximity to industrial uses and the railway line generates some concern for amenity of future occupants.	Designated Local Employment Site (DMP)	Not suitable
P03	Land at Merland	Public Land –	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. A	Recommended for retention as	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
	Rise, Preston	RBBC	small part of the site is affected by surface water flood area.	Urban Open Space Impact on Preston regeneration proposals	
RC03	Land at 50-52, Unit 54 and 61, Albert Road North, Reigate	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) given the only access is via an industrial estate road which is unsuited to this use.	Land is potentially contaminated	Not suitable
RC05	Land at Rushworth Road, Reigate	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria c) given the potential adverse impact of proximity to the railway line on future occupants as well as the topography which may be unsuited to traveller provision. Site also performs poorly against criteria f) given the visual amenity and positive contribution which the densely wooded site makes to the character of the area	None	Not suitable
RC06	Police Headquarters, Reigate Road, Reigate	Public Land – Surrey Police	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the prominent location of the site and the potential adverse impact upon the character of the area as well as its tight relationship with surrounding residential uses	None	Not suitable
RC32	Reigate Station car park - DMP suggestion was section adjacent to Homebase as well as the station car parking	DMP, Reg 18	The site performs reasonably well against some criteria, but when considered against criteria C and F it is clear that residential amenity – for travellers and surrounding uses – would not be satisfactory. Also some portions of the suggested site would be unlikely to be available.	Protected trees	Not suitable
RE01	Land at Redhill Station, Princess Way, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) due to the prominent location and potential impact on the character and townscape environment.	Impact on Redhill regeneration plans	Not suitable
RE03	Warwick Quadrant North, London Road, Redhill	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria f) due to the prominent location and potential adverse impact on the town centre frontage and overall townscape.	Impact on Redhill regeneration plans Loss of employment uses Site situated within the Redhill Air Quality Management Area	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
RE05	Land at Reading Arch Road, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria d) due to the site being largely within Flood Zone 3a/3b and parts in Flood Zone 2. Site also performs poorly against criteria c) due to access to the site only being available through the adjoining industrial area	Designated employment site Impact on Redhill regeneration plans	Not suitable
RE06	Former Liquid & Envy Nightclub, Marketfield Way, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) due to the prominent location and potential impact on the character and townscape environment.	Impact on Redhill regeneration plans	Not suitable
RE09	Land south of Wiggie Lane, Redhill	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs adequately or well against all criteria. Proximity to railway line also generates some concern for amenity of future occupants.	Recommended for retention as Urban Open Space	Not suitable
RE11	Land between Trowers Way and Holmethorpe Avenue, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria c) owing to the site being “sandwiched” between general industrial uses which would give rise to poor amenity for future occupiers.	Land is potentially contaminated	Not suitable
RE12	Redstone Tennis Club, Redstone Park, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) and f) given there is no existing road access to the site (and no obvious prospect of achieving one) and the very tight relationship to existing residential uses.	None	Not suitable
RE13	Land near Wordsworth Mead, Redhill	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the very tight siting in relation to existing residential uses and the potential adverse impact upon neighbour amenity the reduction in visual amenity arising from loss of the open space. Access via the existing residential cul-de-sacs may also be a concern given the movements likely to occur.	Loss of public open space	Not suitable
RE23	Victoria House, Brighton Road, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the prominent location and potential impact upon the character and townscape of a main gateway to Redhill. Flooding risk and proximity to the industrial uses also raise some concerns.	Impact on Redhill regeneration plans	Not suitable
RE30	Former Mercedes Garage, Brighton Road, Redhill	DMP, Reg 18	The site performs poorly against criteria C, D, and F – it would provide a substandard residential environment, be constrained through flood zones, and potentially impede access to neighbouring uses.	Designated Retail Warehouse Area for Redhill	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
RE31	Land between southbound railway and eastbound railway (south of Redhill railway station)	DMP, Reg18	This site performs well for some criteria, but should be ruled out against criteria B as it would require the creation of a railway crossing. The residential environment may also be poor (criteria C).	None	Not suitable
RH02	Madeira Sandpit, off Madeira Walk/ Highlands Road, Reigate	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria b) and f) given there is no existing access to the site (and no obvious prospect of achieving one safely), the very tight relationship to existing residential use which given topographical changes may create amenity issues. Use of the site for traveller provision would also result in the loss of part of a landscape scale green chain.	Recommended for retention as Urban Open Space	Not suitable
RH08	Land south of Dorchester Court, Wray Common Road, Reigate	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) given the very constrained access to the site via a sloping private road and tight junction which would be unsuited to the type of movements and vehicles resulting from traveller provision.	None	Not Suitable
RH12	Acacia House, Reigate Hill, Reigate	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the prominent location within the town centre and the likely adverse impact upon town centre environment. Tight relationship with residential uses adds to the poor performance.	None	Not suitable
RH15	Former Madeira Quarry Depot, Wray Common Road, Reigate	DMP, Reg 18	The site performs well against all of the criteria, with the proviso that design would be careful to mitigate against negative impacts upon the surrounding areas (criteria F).	Former depot building is locally listed (and Traveller surrounding use may preclude it's re-use); protected trees	Not suitable
RW01	Land at Cromwell Road, Redhill	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the prominent location within the town centre frontage and the likely adverse impact upon town centre environment. Tight relationship with residential uses to the rear also adds to the poor performance.	Impact on Redhill regeneration plans	Not suitable
RW02	Land at Gloucester Road, Redhill	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria d) owing to the fact that the site is substantially affected by Flood Zone 2 and large areas in the north and east of the site are within	Impact on Redhill regeneration plans	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
			Flood Zone 3a/3b.		
RW03	Former Longmead Adult Education Centre, Redhill	Call for sites	This site performs adequately against most of the criteria, but its proximity to housing and town centre uses raises concerns regarding visual impacts and character/amenity of the surrounding area as per criteria f.	The site is Locally Listed.	Not suitable
RW04	Land at Colesmead Road, Redhill	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria f) owing to the potential adverse impact on visual amenity arising from the loss of open space which is integral to the character of the locality	Recommended for retention as Urban Open Space	Not suitable
RW05	Land south of Gatton Park Road, Redhill	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs well against all criteria. Site would need to be designed to maintain amenity of surrounding residential uses.	Recommended for retention as Urban Open Space	Not suitable
RW06	Land at Green Way, Redhill	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria f) owing to the prominent location of the site within the street scene and the very tight relationship with existing residential properties and potential adverse impacts upon amenity	Loss of recreation/play space	Not suitable
RW08	Land rear of 42-46 Carlton Road, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) and f) given there is currently no direct access to the site from the road and the very tight siting to the rear of existing residential properties which would likely give rise to an adverse impact on amenity.	None	Not suitable
RW10	Former Crown Buildings, London Road, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the prominent location of the site on a main gateway to Redhill and the potential negative impact upon character and street scene.	Loss of employment uses	Not suitable
RW12	The Bridge Family Centre, Station Road, Redhill	Public Land – Surrey CC	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the prominent location of the site on a main gateway to Redhill and the potential negative impact upon character and street scene.	None	Not suitable
RW14	21 Clarendon Road, Redhill	SHLAA	The site performs poorly against criteria b) due to difficulties in creating highway access, criteria c) due to constraints of site and proximity to neighbouring development which could harm the amenity of future occupiers, and criteria f) as this is a prominent site and development would have a harmful impact on the town centre frontage and townscape character. Use of the site	Loss of Listed Building. Loss of economic use (restaurant)	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
			would also necessitate loss of Listed Building.		
RW15	Land adj. to former Crown Buildings, Nash Drive, Redhill	SHLAA	The site performs poorly against criteria c) due to constraints of site and proximity to neighbouring development which could harm the amenity of future occupiers and make provision of facilities difficult, and criteria f) as this is a prominent site and development would have a harmful impact on the town centre frontage and townscape character.	Impact on the town centre business area	Not suitable
RW16	Knowles House, Cromwell Road, High Street, Redhill	SHLAA	The site performs poorly against criteria c) due to constraints of site and proximity to neighbouring development which could harm the amenity of future occupiers and make provision of facilities difficult, and criteria f) as this is a prominent site and development would have a harmful impact on the town centre frontage and townscape character.	Impact on Redhill regeneration plans	Not suitable
RW17	Berkeley House, High Street, Redhill	SHLAA	The site performs poorly against criteria b) due to difficulties in creating highway access, criteria c) due to constraints of site and proximity to neighbouring development which could harm the amenity of future occupiers, and criteria f) as this is a prominent site and development would have a harmful impact on the town centre frontage and townscape character.	Loss of ground floor retail units and offices above	Not suitable
RW19	Linkfield Lane Car Park, Redhill	DMP, Reg 18	This site performs poorly against criteria C and F – it is on the middle of a roundabout, adjacent to another busy roundabout and would therefore be likely to provide a poor residential environment; it would also be likely to impact upon the visual amenity of the area.	The site is proposed for the DMP as part of a Local Centre (which could lead to issues regarding vitality).	Not suitable
RW20	Grosvenor House, Redhill	HELAA	This site would present issues regarding co-existence with neighbouring uses (criterion A and F).	Town Centre location (inappropriate)	Not suitable
RW22	Belfry Redhill [Suggested residential over retail/car park]	DMP, Reg 18	This site presents concerns regarding achieving a suitable residential environment, flooding, and affects upon adjacent uses (shoppers) (criteria C, D, and F). However the main concern	Within Local Employment Area, Primary Frontages, and Principle Employment Area (DMP)	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
			would be access to the rooftop via existing shoppers' car parking (criteria B).		
SPW06	Land at Lavender Sandpit, Cockshot Hill, Reigate	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) and f) given the very constrained access to the site (via a private cul-de-sac), the tight siting in relation to existing residential uses and potential adverse impact on the visual amenity.	Impact upon geological and nature conservation value of the site	Not suitable
SPW17	Garage Block, Kingsley Grove, Reigate	HELAA	The site performs poorly against criteria A-C, providing a small and constrained site, but would be particularly unsuitable regarding impacts upon the character of the local suburban environment (criteria F).	Tree protection	Not suitable
SS09	Former Matrix site, Perrywood Business Park, Salfords	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria. Suitable access via the existing track which runs to the west of the site would need to be considered carefully. Proximity to other traveller sites in the Salfords/East Salfords area would need to be taken into account to ensure further provision does not give rise to dominance.	Designated Principal Employment Site (DMP)	Not suitable
SS13	Land to the north of Salfords aggregates depot (west of Salfords Station) Salbrook Road, Salfords	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria c) given the close proximity to the railway line, industrial uses and the proposed aggregates facility and significant impact this would have on amenity of future occupants.	Loss of employment land Designated Industrial Estate	Not suitable
SS16	Astra and Heath Business Centre, Perrywood Business Park, Salfords	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria. Proximity to the railway line and industrial uses gives rise to some concerns about the amenity of future occupiers.	Designated Principal Employment Site (DMP)	Not suitable
SS24	Axeland Park, Axes Lane, Salfords (including land between Axes Lane and New House Lane)	DMP, Reg 18	This site is fairly remote and could reduce potential for integration and access to infrastructure and facilities (criteria A and E).	The land between Axeland Park and Newhouse Lane is covered by a TPO group blanket.	Not suitable
SS25	Salfords Industrial Estate,	DMP, Reg 18	The site would require careful design and layout t and would be dependent on the scale of	Principle Employment Area (DMP)	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
	Bonehurst Road, Salfords		available land in regard to criteria A – C, and F.	Tree protection	
TW03	Land at Tadworth Street, Tadworth	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria b) owing to the highly constrained access to the site via an existing cul-de-sac. Site also performs poorly against criteria c) owing to the extreme proximity to the railway line and the compromised nature of the site in terms of its size and siting. Site performs poorly against criteria f) as it would result in the loss of an area of woodland which makes a contribution to the character and visual amenity of the area.	Recommended retention as Urban Open Space	Not suitable
TW09	Traffic Garages, 41 Walton Street, Walton on the Hill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the potential adverse impact upon the character of a predominantly residential/suburban area and the very tight relationship with adjoining residential properties.	Impact on setting of adjoining Locally Listed Building	Not suitable
TW13	Former City Gate Mini, 90, The Aveue, Tadworth	DMP, Reg 18	It would be unsuitable (out of character) in the transition area between residential and Local Centre uses (re criteria F).	Adjacent to a listed building	Not suitable
SW19	Lime Tree School, Alexander Road, Reigate	DMP, Reg 18	This site performs reasonably well against several criteria, but the potential impact upon the neighbouring residential/suburban environment, for example through the types of movements/storage to be accommodated, means it performs poorly against criteria F.	None	Not suitable
Sites in non-Green Belt countryside					
HE17	Land on the south side of Smallfield Road, Horley	HELAA	This site performs reasonably well against all criteria, with some concerns regarding access, and provisos around the need to mitigate against impacts upon neighbouring uses and character.		Suitable
HW03	Land at Bonehurst Road, Horley	SHLAA	This site performs adequately well against all criteria, although there would be concerns regarding access.	None	Suitable
HC11	Bayhorne Farm, Apperlie Drive, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Site has somewhat constrained access via a cul-de-sac. Site is partially in Flood Zone 2 (north part).	Could compromise the Strategic Employment Site	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
HC12	Fishers Farm, Limes Avenue, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Concerns over proximity of site to traveller sites in East Horley which could give rise to dominance in local community. Site has somewhat constrained access via a cul-de-sac. Site is partially in Flood Zone 2 (north part).	Could compromise the Strategic Employment Site	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt
HC18	Meadowcroft 182 Balcombe Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Site is within noise contour for Gatwick Airport which may impact on amenity of future occupiers. Northern part of site affected by surface water flooding.	Impact on dense woodland character Site is within 57dB noise contour for Gatwick Airport Could compromise the Strategic Employment Site	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt
HC28	Land at Meadowcroft House, Balcombe Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Site is within noise contour for Gatwick Airport which may impact on amenity of future occupiers. Northern part of site affected by surface water flooding.	Impact on dense woodland character Site is within 57dB noise contour for Gatwick Airport	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt
HE06	Land at Inholms, Haroldslea Drive, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Site has somewhat constrained access. Site is affected by Flood Zones 2 and 3 as well as surface water flooding in some parts.	Impact on adjoining Listed Building Impact on protected trees	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt
HE11	Land adjoining 61 Silverlea Gardens, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Concerns over potentially constrained access. Eastern half of site falls within Flood Zone 2 and some of the western part is affected by surface water flooding.	Impact on ditches and watercourses to the south of the site Impact and potential loss of Grade 3 agricultural land	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt
HW06	Land north of Meath Green Lane ("The Cottage"), Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. The site is partially in Flood Zone 3 and these areas would need to be avoided in allocation in order to pass the sequential test. Site would be reliant on facilities/road links provided as part of the NWS sector and would need to be phased accordingly.	Phasing in line with delivery of North West Sector, Horley	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt
HW07	Land at	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or	Phasing in line	Suitability

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
	Meath Green Lane (Cinderfield), Horley		well against all criteria. The site lies partially in Flood Zone 3 (north part). The site would have acceptable access to health and education facilities but would be reliant on facility provision at North West Sector, Horley.	with delivery of North West Sector, Horley	subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt
HW15	Land north of Meath Green Lane (The Coach House), Horley	SHLAA	This site performs reasonably well against criteria A – C, and E, given potential proximity to forthcoming or potential development areas (although services would be via vehicle initially). There would be need for sensitive design and screening regarding criteria F. Some of the site could be affected by flooding criteria D).	Area of Archaeological Potential in the north of the site; site is part of a reserve sustainable extension in the DMP (NWH1) – which means this could only be developed as part of a longer-term master plan option	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt
US05	Woodside Bungalow, Horley	Call for Sites 2015	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. There is potential for privacy issues given neighbouring residential and commercial development.	Loss of employments uses	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt
US07	Sandra's Riding School, The Close, Horley	Call for Sites 2015	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. There is potential for privacy issues given neighbouring residential and commercial development.	Loss of employments uses Impact on Gatwick Open Setting	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt
HE04	Land at Wilgers Farm, Smallfield Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria d) as substantially in Flood Zone 2, and partially in Flood Zone 3 (centre of site).	Conflict with Town Park open space allocation	Not suitable
HE05	Land at Harrowsley Green Farm, Smallfield Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria d) as substantially in Flood Zone 2, and partially in Flood Zone 3 (north part of site).	None	Not suitable
HE10	Land rear of 17 The Close, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) due to constrained access which would be unsuited to types of vehicle movement likely to occur. Donor residential property would be required to create access, however, an application refused at the site in 2015 did not propose the demolition of any dwelling.	Impact on Gatwick Open Setting Site is within 57dB noise contour for Gatwick Airport	Not suitable
Sites within the Green Belt					
BV24	The Old Rectory,	RBBC Develop	This site performs reasonably well against all of the criteria,	None	Suitability subject to

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
	Rectory Lane, Woodmansterne	ment Mangt	though access for pedestrians is limited, and good design would be required in what is a countryside/transition location, and to avoid negative impacts upon neighbouring residential areas (Criteria E and F).		review of Green Belt
BV09	Hengest Farm, Woodmansterne Lane, Banstead	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Proximity to traveller sites in Rectory Lane would need to be taken into account for cumulative impacts.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
BV12	Land at Banstead Estate, Banstead	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Access to the site from the A217 would need to be carefully designed. Site would need to be carefully screened given the transition location of the site within the Area of Great Landscape Value.	Impact on adjoining SNCI and SSSI Impact on Area of Great Landscape Value Potential loss of Grade 2 agricultural land	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
BV16	Land south of Woodmansterne Lane, Banstead	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Proximity to other traveller sites in the Chipstead/Woodmansterne area would need to be taken into account to ensure further provision does not give rise to dominance.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
BV18	Land south of Croydon Lane, Banstead	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Access would need to be created into the site from Croydon Lane. Site would need to be sensitively screened as it forms narrow landscape gap between Banstead and Woodmansterne.	Impact on adjoining potential SNCI Public Right of Way would need to be safeguarded	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
BV19	Land at Kingscroft Road, Woodmansterne	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Ability of residential road providing access to carry additional traffic would need consideration. Site would need to be sensitively screened given proximity of some residential dwellings.	Impact on nearby SNCI Impact on nearby Ancient Woodland Public Right of Way would need to be safeguarded Some loss of informal public amenity use	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
CHW01	Land at Woodplace Lane, Coulsdon	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Provision	Impact on AGLV Duty to Cooperate (site adjoins neighbouring borough)	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
			in this location would be somewhat reliant on education provision in the adjoining Borough.		
CHW02	Land at Outwood Lane, Chipstead	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Proximity to the railway line gives rise to some concerns about the amenity of future occupiers.	Impact on AGLV	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
CHW06	Land at Rectory Lane (Drakes Field), Chipstead	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Proximity to traveller sites in Rectory Lane raises some concern in terms of cumulative impacts. Constrained access via Rectory Lane. Access to health and education facilities may be reliant to some extent on services in adjoining borough.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
EW03	Land at Princes Road, Earlswood	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. The site is partially in Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3 and these areas would need to be avoided in allocation in order to pass the sequential test.	Loss of public open space/allotment space	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
EW07	Royal National Institute for the Blind, Philanthropic Road, Redhill	SHLAA	The site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Localised areas of the site are affected by surface water flooding.	Impact on Listed Buildings Duty to Cooperate (site crosses borough boundary)	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
EW13	Burnt Oak Farm, 26 Woodhatch Road, Redhill	HELAA	This site performs well against most criteria, although there could be concerns with regard to access (criteria B) and access to services (criteria E).	SNCI; pockets of ancient woodland; a locally listed building – would need to take account of these	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
G3	Woodlea Stables, Peeks Brook Lane, Horley	Existing Unauthorised Site	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Existing site already integrated into and established within the community. The site is partially affected by Flood Zone 2 and these areas should be avoided in any allocation.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
G4	Treetops/Tretham,	Existing Unauthor	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria but	None	Suitability subject to

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
	Peeks Brook Lane, Horley	ised Site	would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Existing site already integrated into and established within the community. The site is partially affected by Flood Zone 2 and these areas should be avoided in any allocation. Proximity to the motorway gives rise to some concern about the amenity of future occupants however adequate mitigation has been demonstrated through recent applications/appeals.		review of Green Belt
G6	Land at Crossoak Lane/Pickett s Lane, Salfords	Traveller Call for Sites	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Proximity to other traveller sites in the Salfords/East Salfords area would need to be taken into account to ensure further does not give rise to dominance.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
G9a	Land at Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords (1)	Existing site	This site performs well against most of the criteria	There are tree preservation orders on existing tree belts.	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
G9b	Land at Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords (3)	Existing site	This site performs well against most of the criteria	There are tree preservation orders on existing tree belts.	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
G13	Land west of Plot 4, Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords	Existing Site extension	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Careful consideration would need to be given to access arrangements to ensure highway safety is maintained and impact on countryside is minimised.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
G12	Land at Kents Field, Rectory Lane, Chipstead	Existing Site extension	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Site would need to be laid out to avoid any potential adverse amenity impact upon neighbouring residential uses to the south.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
G14	Land at Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords (2)	Existing site	This site performs well against most of the criteria	There are tree preservation orders on existing tree	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
				belts.	
KBH03	Rookery Farm, Mogador Road, Lower Kingswood	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Access to facilities is restricted, which impacts upon sustainability. Need to consider size of site ensure existing community was not dominated.	Land is potentially contaminated	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
KBH04	Land at Holly Lane, Banstead	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Access onto Holly Lane would need to be carefully considered to ensure highway safety is maintained.	Proximity to SNCI/SSSI and potential impact upon nature conservation	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
KBH11	Land at Shrimps Field, Chipstead Lane, Kingswood	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. The site has a somewhat constrained access via a narrow track. The change in land levels may make it unsuited to traveller provision.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
KBH18	Land north of Bonsor Drive, Kingswood	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Site would have acceptable access to health and education facilities.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
KBH19	Land east of Smithy Lane, Lower Kingswood	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Site has somewhat constrained access via private residential lanes with no clear access point. Site would need to be sensitively designed and well screened given the location in the AGLV	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
KBH25	Land north of Chipstead Lane, Kingswood	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Potential for privacy issues given close proximity of residential development. Site is affected by surface water flood risk, particularly in western parts. Site has limited access to public transport services with exception of infrequent bus service along A217.	Impact on historic earthworks. Impact on settlement gap between Kingswood and Lower Kingswood	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
KBH26	Land at Beechen Lane	DMP, Reg 18	The site performs quite well in terms of the criteria, although there is a question over access to the site (criteria B), and access to facilities could be limited (criteria E). There would also need to be careful	Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV); close to an area of archaeological potential and	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
			design to mitigate against potential impacts on neighbouring amenity and character.	ancient woodlands/protected trees – would therefore require very sensitive design	
KBH28	Legal & General, Kingswood, Land parcel 1	DMP, Reg 18	The site performs well against the criteria, although proximity to local services and impacts upon neighbouring uses are considerations (criteria E and F).	Adjacent to Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV); protected trees; footpaths; a locally listed building	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
KBH29	Legal & General, Kingswood, Land parcel 2	DMP, Reg 18	The site performs well against the criteria, although proximity to local services and impacts upon neighbouring uses are considerations (criteria E and F).	Within an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV); protected trees; footpaths	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
M14	Oakley Farm, 143 Bletchingley Road, Merstham	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. The site is partially within the AONB and as such landscape impact is a key consideration. There may also be impact on the setting of nearby Listed Buildings.	Impact on setting of nearby Listed Buildings	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
M17	Darby House, Bletchingley Road, Merstham	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Access would need to be secured from Bletchingley Road. Part of the frontage is affected by surface water flooding.	Impact on adjoining SNCI	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
M18	164 Bletchingley Road, Merstham	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. May have some impact on Listed Buildings within the site.	Impact on Listed Buildings	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
M20	Land south of Darby House, Merstham	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria. There is also screening to the south from the wider countryside.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
M21	Land north of Radstock Way, Merstham	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria. Site would need to be sensitively laid out to avoid impact on the Radstock Way frontage and access via the residential roads would need to be carefully considered.	Loss of open formal recreation provision	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
M26	Merstham Manor Estate,	HELAA	The suggested site is large and sprawling and therefore difficult to assess, but it is	Other policy considerations, aside from	Suitability subject to review of

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
	Merstham		considered that some parts of the site would perform reasonably well against all of the criteria. Very careful design would be needed in some areas, including parts of the site within the AGLV (for criteria F). Some of the suggested site is inappropriate as located within the AONB.	AONB and AGLV, include Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) and ancient woodland. Some parts adjoin areas of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).	Green Belt
RE19	Nutfield Lodge, Nutfield Road, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Topography of the site may mean that parts are unsuited to traveller provision.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
RE20	Former Copyhold Works, Nutfield Road, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
RE22	Land at Hillsbrow, Nutfield Road, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs well against all of the criteria.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
RE24	Land north of Nutfield Road (The Paddock), Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
RE25	Land south of Nutfield Road, Redhill	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location.	Loss of allotment space	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
SPW01	Land at Lonesome Lane, Reigate	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location.	Loss of public open space Impact on adjoining SNCI	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
SPW03	New Pond Farm, Woodhatch Road, Reigate	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Access is slightly constrained but unlikely to be prohibitive.	Land is potentially contaminated	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
SPW04	Land at Sandcross Lane, Reigate	SHLAA	Site performs well against all of the criteria.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
SPW05	Land at Dovers Farm, Dovers Green Road, Reigate	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria. The areas in the central and southern part of the site are affected by surface water flooding.	Impact on neighbouring Listed Buildings	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
SPW07	Land at Castle Drive, Woodhatch	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside edge/transition location. Site would need to be designed and laid out to mitigate against amenity impact on any adjoining residential uses	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
SPW08	Hartswood Nursery, 146 Doversgreen Road, Reigate	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Potential impact on adjoining listed buildings would also need to be mitigated.	Impact on adjoining Listed Buildings	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
SPW10	Land at Hartswood Farm / Flanchford Farm, Reigate	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria. Site is partially affected by Flood Zone 2 (southern part).	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
SPW11	Garage Block/Atherfield Barn, Woodhatch Road, Reigate	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria. The site would need to be designed and screened sensitively to ensure that the predominantly open residential character of the locality was not conflicted and the visual amenity offered by the surrounding open area was not eroded.	Site is partially previously developed.	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
SPW16	ASD on the Green, Lonesome Lane, Reigate	HELAA	This site performs reasonably well across most of the criteria, albeit with a need for sensitive design in a countryside area (criteria F), but there would be concerns about access to the site via Lonesome Lane and accessibility via this location to services and facilities (criteria B and E). Additionally, some of the site could be affected by flooding (criteria D).	With a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI)	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
SPW18	Paddock 19, Dovers Green Road	HELAA	This site performs well against criteria A to C, but would require sensitive design in a countryside transitional location and on a site with potential for flooding on the eastern end (Criteria F/D), and consideration of accessibility	Adjacent statutory listed buildings	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
			for pedestrians via Lonesome Lane (Criteria E).		
SS02	Land to the west of Bonehurst Road, Salfords	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria. Access from Bonehurst Road would need to be carefully considered from a highway safety perspective. Some concern that the site would not have ideally close access to health and education facilities.	Land is potentially contaminated.	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
SS06	Land at Rosemary Farm, Ironsbottom Road, Sidlow	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. Scale of site would need to be small to ensure traveller provision would not dominate the small village community of Sidlow. The site is also partially affected by flood risk (Zones 2 and 3) which would need to be avoided in any allocation for traveller accommodation.	Land is potentially contaminated.	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
SS12	Land between Mason's Bridge Road/Pickett's Land and the railway, Salfords (Land east of Salfords)	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria. Proximity to existing traveller sites in East Salfords and cumulative impacts could give rise to dominance in the local community. Proximity to railway line could affect amenity of future occupiers of the site. The site is affected by Flood Zones 2 and 3 – these areas would need to be avoided for traveller provision. Whilst on the outer edge from the existing urban area, the site would have acceptable access to health and education facilities.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
SS15	Horley Place, Bonehurst Road, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria but would need to be sensitively designed and screened given the countryside location. The site is affected to a limited extent by flooding and any site would need to be laid out to avoid these areas.	Site is partially previously developed. Impact on settlement gap.	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
SS17	Land south of Copsleigh Avenue, Salfords	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria. Access on to the A23 may present some highway safety issues, and the only other option is between existing residential properties. Proximity to the railway line and adjoining industrial uses	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
			could have an adverse impact on the amenity of future occupiers of the site. The site is partially affected by Flood Zone 2.		
SS22	Land at Bonehurst Farm, Salfords	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria. Access to the A23 would be reliant on completion of the eastern link road of the North West sector. Parts of the site are affected by Flood Zones 2 and 3 (the site is bounded to the south by the River Mole/Burstow Stream) which would need to be avoided for traveller provision, and parts of the site are affected by surface water flooding. Accessibility to many local services and facilities is currently poor, although some improvement will result once the services/facilities at the North West Sector are complete.	Impact on landscape gap between Salfords and Horley. Impact on areas of archaeological potential.	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
SS27 (part of SS22)	Field on Bonehurst Road between Cambridge Hotel and Lawson's Timber Yard, Bonehurst Road, Horley	DMP, Reg 18	This site performs reasonably well against the criteria although there could be concerns regarding access and accessibility. There would also be a need for careful design avoiding impacts on the green nature of the area (Criteria F).	There are protected trees and woodlands in the area.	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
TW11	Land at the Priory, Sturts Lane, Walton on the Hill	HELAA	This site performs well against all criteria, except that public transport could be limited and walking difficult due to lack of footways.	None	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
US02	Land at Downs Way, 81 Kingswood Road, Tadworth	Call for Sites 2015	Site performs acceptably or well against all of the criteria. There may be potential of amenity impact on adjoining residential properties, given close proximity. Currently no access to the site; would need to be formed from the east and improved to provide adequate access, as access via the rear of 81 Kingswood Road is constrained. Site would need to be sensitively designed given that this is a countryside/transition location, and taking the Area of Great Landscape value into account.	Impact on AGLV. Impact on adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument. Impact on unprotected trees within the site. Retention of public footpath.	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
US06	145 Sandcross Lane, Reigate	Call for Sites 2015	Site performs acceptably or well against all criteria. Site would need to be sensitively designed in this countryside/transition location.	Impact on area and individual Tree Preservation Orders.	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt
HE21	Acres	Planning	The site performs reasonably	None	Not

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
	Stables	application	well against some of the criteria, though it would be quite remote, providing reduced scope for integration and less access to public transport services (Criteria A and E). It would nonetheless provide a discreet and shielded location (Criteria F). However access to the site would be very constrained (Criteria B).		suitable
BV15	Land south of Holly Hill Park, Banstead	SHLAA	Site performs acceptably or well against criteria a) to f). Concerns over potential constrained access from cul-de-sac. Site would need to be sensitively screened, given the countryside/transition location. The site may impact on the setting of nearby Listed Buildings and Historic Park & Garden. However, site performs poorly against other policy considerations; site is almost wholly covered by woodland, some of which is ancient woodland and parts are protected by TPOs. Development would result in the loss of significant woodland and could impact on nature conservation.	Impact on ancient woodland and protected trees Potential impact upon adjoining Historic Park and Garden and nearby Listed Buildings	Not suitable
CHW07	Land off Harden Farm Close, Coulsdon	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria e) given poor accessibility to facilities and is very remote from the nearest main service centre. Site also performs poorly against criteria b) given the highly constrained road access and likely impact of internal movements on neighbouring properties. Site size would also need to be small to ensure existing village community was not dominated.	None	Not suitable
EW12	Redhill Aerodrome	HELAA	The site performs well against several of the criteria (A – D) and could be adequate in terms of access to facilities if built as part of a wider development (criteria E). Sensitive design would be required (criteria F).	Within a Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA) and potential SNCI; tree protection - but the site is large enough to potentially avoid these However, this site is also included within the Regulation	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
				19 DMP as a Safeguarded Site (for post-plan period) and, as such, no development of Traveller sites could happen until after the current plan-period (2026). Further Traveller need would then also need to be assessed.	
KBH02	Land at Brighton Road, Burgh Heath	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) as no direct access from highway; access from A217 would be unacceptable, therefore alternative access arrangements would need to be found.	None	Not suitable
KBH09	Land at Sandy Lane, Kingswood	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) as constrained access to main highway relying on residential lanes which raises concerns of highway safety and disturbance issues.	None	Not suitable
KBH15	Land off Copt Hill Lane, Kingswood	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) given highly constrained access to the main highway via residential lanes and narrow private track. Location is also sensitive given siting within the AGLV.	None	Not suitable
KBH16	Land west of Holly Lodge Lane, Kingswood	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against category a) as the site would be remote from the urban area. Potential that traveller provision in this location may dominate existing small community at Holly Lodge.	None	Not suitable
KBH20	Land at Kingswood House, Kingswood	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) as it has a highly constrained access via a narrow track unsuited to the types of vehicle movements likely to occur.	None	Not suitable
KBH21	Land north of Copt Hill Lane, Kingswood	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) as it has a highly constrained access to the highway and only via two narrow roads – Copt Hill Lane or Canons Lane, which would likely be unsuited to the types of vehicle movements likely to occur.	Impact on AGLV Impact on protected trees Impact on open landscape gap between Banstead/Burgh Heath and Kingswood	No suitable
RE08	Battlebridge Recreation Ground, New	Public Land – RBBC	Site performs poorly against criteria b) given the constrained access to the site via a narrow access road and	Loss of open formal recreation/sport provision	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
	Battlebridge Lane, Merstham		possible highway safety conflict with the school proposed on the adjoining site. Access directly onto the A23 would also conflict with highway safety.		
RH01	Land at Clifton's Lane, Reigate	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) given the highly constrained access to the main highway via a single track lane which passes under a narrow rail bridge – unsuited to the types of movements which would occur. Location is also sensitive given siting within the AGLV.	Land is potentially contaminated	Not suitable
SPW09	Land at Shepherd's Lodge Farm, Park Lane East, Reigate	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) given the only access to the site is via a private residential road which would likely be unsuited to serve the movements associated with a traveller site. Topography of the site also affects suitability for traveller provision and worsens the potential adverse landscape impact.	Impact on Historic Park and adjoining SNCI	Not suitable
SS01	Land at Rushmeads, Horse Hill, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria e) given poor accessibility to facilities. The site is also very remote from the nearest main service centre.	Duty to Cooperate given potential impact on adjoining borough. Land is potentially contaminated.	Not suitable
SS04	Fontigarry Farm, Reigate Road, Sidlow	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against category e) and would have more limited access to, and would not be served well by, health and education facilities.	Land is potentially contaminated.	Not suitable
SS05	Land south of Horse Hill, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria e) given poor accessibility to facilities. The site is also very remote from the nearest main service centre.	Land is potentially contaminated.	Not suitable
SS07	Land south of Duxhurst Lane, Sidlow	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against category e) and would have more limited access to, and would not be served well by, health and education facilities.	Impact on adjoining nature conservation site.	Not suitable
SS10	Millstream Farm, Brighton Road, Salfords	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria d) as the site is substantially affected by Flood Zone 2 and the northern half of the site is within Flood Zone 3. Proximity to other traveller sites in the Salfords/East Salfords area would need to be taken into account to ensure further provision does	Land is potentially contaminated.	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
			not give rise to dominance.		
SS11	High Trees Nursing Home, Horsehill, Norwood Hill, Horley	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria e) as accessibility to many local services and facilities is poor given the level of detachment from the urban area. The site has relatively poor access to public transport services.	None	Not suitable
SS14	Land north of Axes Lane, Salfords	SHLAA	The site performs poorly against category e) as access to many local services is poor given the level of detachment from the existing urban area. The site has relatively poor access to public transport services.	Impact on protected trees. Impact on setting of adjoining Listed Buildings.	Not suitable
SS18	Land at Oakfield, Axes Lane, Salfords	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) given the visual amenity and positive contribution which the densely wooded site makes to the countryside character. Proximity to other traveller sites in the Salfords/East Salfords area would need to be taken into account to ensure further site does not give rise to dominance.	Loss of protected woodland/trees	Not suitable
SS21	Land at Duxhurst and Sidlow Farms, Sidlow	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria e) as accessibility to local services and facilities is limited given the level of detachment from the existing urban area. The site is poorly served by public transport services.	Impact on ancient woodland. Impact on setting of Listed Buildings. Impact on adjoining SNCI	Not suitable
TW01	Land at Dorking Road, Walton on the Hill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) as there is no access point except for a private driveway serving two residential properties. Access from Dorking Road would need to be very carefully considered in respect of highway safety and may constrain development.	Land is potentially contaminated. Loss of common land.	Not suitable
TW02	Land to the east of Ebbisham Lane, Walton on the Hill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) given the highly constrained access to the site via a residential cul-de-sac and narrow track which would be unsuitable to support the types of movements generated by such a site.	Land is potentially contaminated.	Not suitable
TW04	British Transport Police Training Centre, Sandlands Grove,	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria f) as development would be out of character in this predominantly suburban environment. Access and movements within the site would likely have an adverse	None	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
	Tadworth		impact on adjoining residential properties.		
TW06	Land at Sandlands Road, Walton on the Hill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria b) given the highly constrained access to the site via a residential cul-de-sac which would be unsuitable to support the types of movements generate by such a site.	None	Not suitable
TW08	Land at Frith Park, Walton on the Hill	SHLAA	Site performs poorly against criteria e) as the site would be on the outer edge of the existing urban area, and would have more limited access to, and would not be particularly well served by, health and education facilities.	None	Not suitable
US01	Clayhall Farm, Reigate	Call for Sites 2015	Site performs poorly against criteria b) as access is via a series of narrow lanes, and thus constrained to the highway, and would be unsuitable for the types of vehicle movements likely to occur.	Impact on adjoining SNCIs. Impact on adjoining RIGS. Impact on adjoining ancient woodland areas. Impact on setting of Listed Buildings within site. Impact on AGLV.	Not suitable
US04	Plot 18, Soloms Court Road, Banstead	Call for Sites 2015	Site performs poorly against criteria b) as the site access is constrained via the private road, and would unlikely be suited to the types of vehicle movements likely to occur. The size of the site would also constrain internal vehicle manoeuvring. Site would need to be sensitively designed due to being a countryside/transition location.	Impact on adjoining AGLV. Impact on adjoining Potential SNCI. Impact on adjoining ancient woodland. Impact on unprotected trees within the site.	Not suitable
US08	Plot 10, Axeland Park, Axes Lane, Salfords	Housing SHLAA Update 2016	Site performs poorly against criteria b) given that there is no access into the site, and as it is not known what the ownership status is of neighbouring plots/land into which the field has been subdivided for disposal, it is not known if access would be achievable or adequate to provide for the types of vehicular movement likely to occur.	None	Not suitable
G1	Crosswinds, Collendean Lane, Horley	Traveller Call for Sites	Site performs poorly against criteria e) given poor accessibility to facilities. The site is also very remote from the nearest main service	None	Not suitable

Ref	Site name	Site source	Performance against Traveller site criteria (Policy CS16/PPTS)	Additional Policy/ Suitability Considerations	Overall Suitability
			centre.		
G2	Land at Collendean Lane, Norwood Hill, Horley	Traveller Call for Sites	Site performs poorly against criteria e) given poor accessibility to facilities. The site is also very remote from the nearest main service centre.	None	Not suitable
G5	Summers Place, Perrylands Lane, Horley	Existing Unauthorised Site	Site performs poorly against criteria c) given the extreme proximity to the motorway and no known prospect for mitigation. Access to the site is also constrained via a narrow private track.	None	Not suitable
G11	Highlands, Blackhorse Lane, Lower Kingswood	Traveller Call for Sites	This site performs poorly against criteria f) given the countryside location in the AGLV, proximity to the AONB and impacts upon views into and out of the AONB (confirmed by previous planning appeals) which is very close to the east and west.	The site is within the AGLV and very close to the AONB	Not suitable

Stage 4: Assessing Availability and Achievability

- 4.21 For all sites considered to be suitable or potentially suitable for Traveller provision, landowners or those promoting the site have been contacted to confirm whether they would be willing to make the site (either in part or in whole) available for delivery of Traveller accommodation.
- 4.22 Where the landowner would be willing to release the site for Traveller provision, this correspondence also sought confirmation of whether there are any constraints (such as occupational leases, operational or relocation requirements, unresolved multiple landownerships or legal issues such as covenants) which could prevent availability.
- 4.23 In the event that the Council has been unable to ascertain landownership or has not received confirmation of the intentions or willingness of the landowner to release the land for traveller provision, the site is considered to be unavailable.
- 4.24 A key provision of PPTS is that sites for Traveller accommodation should be sustainable socially and environmentally, but also economically. In addition, viability remains a prime consideration in whether sites can be considered “deliverable” in the context of the NPPF and PPTS. The Core Strategy also makes clear that “any site considered for allocation must be deliverable (including affordable to its intended occupiers) to ensure that needs are met”.
- 4.25 Whilst it is difficult to assess mathematically the viability of a site for Traveller provision given their unique nature, there are a number of relevant considerations. Firstly, achievability is inextricably linked to landowner intentions and, as such, a lack of willingness to release the site for traveller provision is indicative that a site is not achievable.
- 4.26 In addition, the presence of existing high-value uses (such as residential or commercial uses), or the real prospect of such uses being achieved on site, may also have implications for the affordability for such uses without any funding or financial subsidy.
- 4.27 In addition to testing economic viability, the assessment of achievability also considers, based on market evidence, the likely appetite and demand for the type of units which the site would provide, potential rates of delivery and identifies, based on the assessment of site constraints, any possible ‘abnormal’ factors which could impact upon viability.
- 4.28 For each site, an assessment is also made of the actions, if any, which are required to bring the site forward or overcome constraints to development, the

likely complexity of such actions and how these actions may impact upon delivery timescales.

- 4.29 All sites concluded as being suitable or potentially suitable against the relevant criteria, and in light of other policy considerations, have been subjected to an assessment of their availability and potential achievability for traveller provision, in accordance with the process set out above, which has included contacting site owners/agents to ascertain availability.
- 4.30 The conclusions of these assessments are set out in Table 4 below which includes a brief commentary on landowner intentions/willingness to release the site for traveller provision, any known legal or ownership constraints, and an assessment of the likely viability/affordability of traveller provision, taking into account existing/potential alternative uses for the site (as well as landowner expectations).
- 4.31 It should be noted that all sites considered to be suitable, available, and achievable, as set out in the table below, fall within the Green Belt, and are still subject to review of the Green Belt classification. This classification recognises that whilst the site could offer a suitable and sustainable location for traveller provision and there is a reasonable prospect that it would be deliverable, further work is required prior to allocation to determine whether the site could be removed from the Green Belt, with little or no harm to its openness and integrity. A Green Belt review of the relevant sites is undertaken in section 5 further below.

Table 4: Site Availability Conclusions

Ref	Site name	Suitability Conclusion	Commentary	Overall conclusion on Availability/Achievability	Estimated Capacity
Sites within the urban area					
EW08	Hockley Business Centre, Hooley Lane, Redhill	Suitable	The site is owned by a house builder and the site was granted planning permission for residential development in 2017. The landowner would therefore be unwilling to make the site available for traveller provision. There is also a reasonably high existing use value given the existing uses and therefore it would be unlikely to be affordable or viable for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
EW10	101-105 Horley Road, Earlswood	Suitable	The site owned by multiple residential landowners. The site comprises three residential plots of detached houses. The site was granted outline consent in 2011 for 8 semi-detached houses, however, there has been no progress since then to enable development. Subsequently two of the dwellings (Nos. 101 and 103) have been subject to further planning applications in 2013 and 2015 for replacement residential schemes, whilst No. 105 was granted permission for residential extensions in 2014. The landowners would therefore be unwilling to make the site available for traveller provision. There is also a reasonably high existing use value given the existing residential uses and therefore it would be unlikely to be affordable or viable for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
EW11	19-23 Woodhatch Road, Redhill	Suitable	The site is owned by a local registered housing provider. The site comprises warehousing/commercial and informal open space. The site benefits from planning consent for an affordable residential scheme, and the landowner is bringing forward the site in accordance with the existing consent. The landowner would therefore be unwilling to make the site available for traveller provision. There is also a reasonably high existing use value given the existing uses and therefore it would be unlikely to be affordable or viable for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
HC01	Land at the Grove, Horley	Suitable	The site is owned by a private organisation and is actively in use for airport car-parking. The landowner has previously confirmed that availability of the site is contingent upon relocation of the existing uses for which at this point there is no known prospect; the landowner was contacted in December 2015, however, no response was received to ascertain availability of the site. Therefore, it is likely that the situation at the	Not available/achievable	N/A

Ref	Site name	Suitability Conclusion	Commentary	Overall conclusion on Availability/Achievability	Estimated Capacity
			site remains the same, and the site is not available for traveller provision. The landowner's expectation of land values, given the existing Local Plan housing allocation, means that traveller provision is unlikely to be viable.		
HC06	Land at Yattendon School, Oakwood Road, Horley	Suitable	The site is owned by Surrey CC and forms part of Yattendon School. The site benefits from a recent existing planning consent (2015) to deliver 7 new homes. Capital receipt from sale of the site is intended to fund school improvements; given the existing consent and the need to maximise value, the site is unlikely to be affordable or viable for traveller provision, and is not available.	Not available/achievable	N/A
HE08	121 Smallfield Road, Horley	Suitable	The site is owned by a national house builder. The site comprises a single residential dwelling in large grounds. The site benefits from outline planning consent for up to 36 dwellings and pre-commencement conditions have been discharged (in 2015), therefore, the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
HE20	Laburnum, Haroldslea Drive, Horley	Suitable	This site is being promoted for residential (market and affordable) housing and self-build plots, as part of the SHLAA/HELAA – the respondent did not tick the option for Traveller provision on the form.	Not available/achievable	N/A
HW03	Land at Bonehurst Road, Horley	Suitable	The site is owned by a single landowner. The landowners agent was contacted who confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision	Not available/achievable	
HW08	Landens Farm Buildings, Meath Green Lane, Horley	Suitable	The site is owned by a regional house builder. The site comprises agricultural buildings and derelict residential properties. The site benefits from planning consent for 9 new dwellings, and pre-commencement conditions are currently being discharged. The site is therefore not available for traveller provision. Given the existing residential consent on the site, and the potential for further residential development, the value of the site is likely to be such that traveller use would not be viable or affordable.	Not available/achievable	N/A
HW09	The Croft/Meath Paddock, Meath Green Lane, Horley	Suitable	The site is owned by a private individual and has been promoted for housing development. The site comprises a residential property with paddock. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
HW10	59-61, Brighton Road, Horley	Suitable	This site is being promoted for residential (market) housing, as part of the SHLAA/HELAA – the respondent did not tick the option for Traveller provision on the form.	Not available/achievable	N/A

Ref	Site name	Suitability Conclusion	Commentary	Overall conclusion on Availability/Achievability	Estimated Capacity
M12	Merstham Library, Weldon Way, Merstham	Suitable	The site is owned by Surrey County Council. The site is then intended to be redeveloped. Given the landowners intentions, the site would not be made available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
MSJ03	Redhill Ambulance Station, Pendleton Road, Redhill	Suitable	The site is owned by the SE Coast Ambulance Service. The site is in active use as an ambulance station – redevelopment of the site would be dependent upon service needs. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
N10	14 Brighton Road, Banstead	Suitable	The site is owned by a developer. The existing use on the site comprises a detached residential dwelling. The site benefits from planning consent (2013) for a block of 9 flats and pre-commencement conditions have been discharged during 2014-2015. The site is not available for traveller provision. Given the existing residential consent on the site, the value of the site is likely to be such that traveller use would not be viable or affordable.	Not available/achievable	N/A
P04	Former DeBurgh School, Chetwode Road, Preston	Suitable	The site is owned by Surrey County Council. The site benefits from a planning consent for a residential development of 180 homes as part of the regeneration of the Preston Estate. The site has an existing Local Plan allocation for housing and therefore expectations of value reflect this. Furthermore, capital receipts from the sale are required to fund improvements and infrastructure elsewhere on the estate and therefore the site would not be made available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
RC18	Reigate Business Mews, Albert Road North, Reigate	Suitable	The site is owned by a private organisation. The existing uses at the site comprise office and industrial units. The vast majority of commercial units on the site are vacant following lease expiry in 2014. The site benefits from a planning consent (most recent in 2015) for a residential development comprising flats and houses, and would therefore not be made available for traveller provision. Given the consent for housing development, it would not be affordable or viable for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
RC24	Royal Mail Delivery Office, Rushworth Road, Reigate, RH2 0PR	Suitable	This site is being promoted for residential (market) housing, as part of the SHLAA/HELAA – the respondent did not tick the option for Traveller provision on the form.	Not available/achievable	N/A

Ref	Site name	Suitability Conclusion	Commentary	Overall conclusion on Availability/Achievability	Estimated Capacity
RE04	Colebrook Day Centre, Noke Drive, Redhill	Suitable	The site is owned by Surrey County Council. The existing uses on the site comprise community uses and a garden centre. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
RE07	Royal Mail Sorting Office, St Anne's Drive, Redhill	Suitable	The site is owned by Royal Mail and is actively in use as a main Sorting Office for the area. Redevelopment and availability of the site is dependent upon relocation of the existing operations. The landowner has confirmed that the site is not available for redevelopment.	Not available/achievable	N/A
RE10	Gasholder site, Hooley Lane, Redhill	Suitable	There are no known plans at this stage to remove the gasholders, and no contact details were available for the landowner to ascertain availability. Therefore it cannot be considered available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
RE21	Quarryside Business Park, Thorntonside, Redhill	Suitable	The freehold of the site is owned by a single private individual. There are a number of active occupational leasehold interests in the site which would need to expire or be acquired to make the site available for traveller provision. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision. The landowners expectation of land values, given the existing Local Plan housing allocation, means that traveller provision is unlikely to be viable.	Not available/achievable	N/A
RW11	Land at The Frenches, Redhill	Suitable	The site is owned by a utility company. The existing uses on the site comprise a vacant clubhouse and informal open space. The site benefits from a planning consent (2013) for 11 residential units and pre-commencement conditions have been discharged. More recently, a planning application has been submitted (February 2016) for a variation of this previous consent to increase accommodation in the roof space of residential units. Therefore, the site would not be made available for traveller provision. Given the consent for housing development, it would not be affordable or viable for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
RW20	Former Territorial Army Site, Linkfield House, 3 Batts Lane, Redhill	Suitable	This site was on a disposal database by the Ministry of Defence in 2013. It was not possible to confirm availability. No response was received from the landowner.	Not available/achievable	N/A
RW21	Donyngs Carpark and Indoor Bowls Centre Car Park	Suitable	The site is owned by RBBC. The site is currently leased to Donyngs Leisure Centre and the Bowls Centre. The landowner was contacted in August 2017 and has confirmed that the site is not available.	Not available/achievable	N/A

Ref	Site name	Suitability Conclusion	Commentary	Overall conclusion on Availability/Achievability	Estimated Capacity
TW11	Former Royal Phoenix, Dorking Road, Tadworth	Suitable	The site is owned by a private individual. The site comprises a disused restaurant. The site benefits from planning consent (2013) for 11 flats which has been implemented. Therefore the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
Sites in non-Green Belt countryside					
HE17	Land on the south side of Smallfield Road, Horley	Suitable	This site is being promoted for residential (market and affordable) housing and care home/extra-care provision, as part of the SHLAA/HELAA – the respondent did not tick the option for Traveller provision on the form.	Not available/achievable	N/A
HW15	Land north of Meath Green Lane (The Coach House), Horley	Suitable	This site is being promoted for residential (market) housing, as part of the SHLAA/HELAA – the respondent did not tick the option for Traveller provision on the form.	Not available/achievable	N/A
HC11	Bayhorne Farm, Apperlie Drive, Horley	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt	The site is owned by Surrey County Council. The site comprises agricultural land. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
HC12	Fishers Farm, Limes Avenue, Horley	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt	The site is owned by a national housebuilder. The site comprises agricultural land. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
HC18	Meadowcroft, Balcombe Road, Horley	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt	The site is owned by a private organisation. The site benefits from recent consent (reference 15/02215/AP30) for a conversion of the existing offices to form a single residential dwelling. Given this consent, there is a reasonably high alternative use value associated with the site and traveller provision is therefore unlikely to be viable or affordable. Therefore the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
HC28	Land at Meadowcroft House, Balcombe Road, Horley	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt	The site is owned by a private company. The site comprises office accommodation in large grounds. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
HE06	Land at Inholms, Haroldslea Drive, Horley	Suitability subject to review of	The site is owned by a regional house builder. The site comprises agricultural/grazing land. The site benefits from outline planning consent (reference	Not available/achievable	N/A

Ref	Site name	Suitability Conclusion	Commentary	Overall conclusion on Availability/Achievability	Estimated Capacity
		countryside beyond Green Belt	12/01973/OUT) for the erection of 50 dwellings, and all pre-commencement conditions have been recently discharged. Given this consent, there is a reasonably high alternative use value associated with the site and traveller provision is therefore unlikely to be viable or affordable, and is therefore not considered to be available for traveller provision.		
HE11	Land adjoining 61 Silverlea Gardens, Horley	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual. The site comprises agricultural/grazing land. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
HW06	Land north of Meath Green Lane ("The Cottage"), Horley	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual. The site comprises agricultural land. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
HW07	Land at Meath Green Lane (Cinderfield), Horley	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual. The site comprises agricultural land. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
US05	Woodside Bungalow, Horley	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt	The site is owned by a single landowner. The site comprises commercial and residential development, with a paddock. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
US07	Sandra's Riding School, The Close, Horley	Suitability subject to review of countryside beyond Green Belt	The site is owned by a private company. The site comprises residential curtilage and a semi-natural open space. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
Sites within the Green Belt					
BV16	Land south of Woodmansterne Lane, Banstead	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a consortium of private individuals. The site comprises equestrian and grazing land. The landowners' agent was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is available for traveller provision.	Available/Achievable	Up to 15 pitches

Ref	Site name	Suitability Conclusion	Commentary	Overall conclusion on Availability/Achievability	Estimated Capacity
			The site does not benefit from any planning consent that would add alternative use value, and therefore, traveller provision is likely to be viable and affordable.		
BV18	Land south of Croydon Lane, Banstead	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a number of individuals. The site comprises grazing land. The main landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is available for traveller provision. The site does not benefit from any planning consent that would add alternative use value, and therefore, traveller provision is likely to be viable and affordable. The main landowner has also confirmed that subject to the removal of the site from the Green Belt, the required finances are in place to implement housing development at the site, which would be a mix of market and social housing.	Available/Achievable	Up to 15 pitches
G3	Woodlea Stables, Peeks Brook Lane, Horley	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned and occupied by travellers. The site is currently occupied and numerous applications have been made to regularise the use of the site. Given this, the site is considered to be both available and viable/affordable for traveller provision.	Available/Achievable	6 pitches
G4	Treetops/Trentham, Peeks Brook Lane, Horley	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site and adjoining house are owned by travellers. The current landowner has actively pursued traveller provision on the land through planning applications and the plan-making process. Given this, the site is considered to be both available and viable/affordable for traveller provision.	Available/Achievable	1 pitch
G6	Land at Crossoak Lane / Picketts Lane, Salfords	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site was promoted to the Council through the traveller site Call for Sites in 2013, and is owned by travellers. It has been confirmed that there are no legal constraints and the site would be available for traveller provision.	Available/Achievable	10 pitches
G9a	Land at Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords (1)	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	Availability confirmed by the landowner for use of the site as a travelling show-persons plot	Available/Achievable	1 plot
G9b	Land at Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords (3)	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	Availability confirmed by the landowner for use of the site as a travelling show-people's plots	Available/Achievable	4 plot
G13	Land west of Plot 4, Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by travelling showpeople. A planning application for travelling showpeople plots has been pursued on the site. It is therefore considered to be available for traveller provision.	Available/Achievable	3 plots
G12	Land at Kents Field, Rectory Lane, Chipstead	Suitability subject to review of	The site is owned by travellers. The site is currently occupied and the existing residents have promoted expansion of the site onto adjoining land in their ownership	Available/Achievable	2 pitches

Ref	Site name	Suitability Conclusion	Commentary	Overall conclusion on Availability/Achievability	Estimated Capacity
		Green Belt	and reconfiguration of the existing site. Given this, the site is considered to be both available and viable/affordable for traveller provision.		
BV24	The Old Rectory, Rectory Lane, Woodmansterne	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	A letter was sent to the contact details on the land registry report in July 2017 but no response was received. As such the site is not available.	Not available/achievable	N/A
BV09	Hengest Farm, Woodmansterne Lane, Banstead	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual. The site comprises agricultural land and buildings. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
BV12	Land at Banstead Estate, Banstead	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a single landowner, a private company. The site comprises agricultural fields/ grazing land. The landowner was contacted in December 2015, however, no response was received, therefore it cannot be confirmed the site is available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
BV19	Land at Kingscroft Road, Woodmansterne	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a large number of private individuals (in total 94) who own separate plots across the site. Only 19 plot owners have previously submitted information to the Council to promote their plots for development. The site is unlikely to be available for traveller provision given the uncertainty regarding availability of the entire site and its deliverability, given the current ownership issues.	Not available/achievable	N/A
CHW01	Land at Woodplace Lane, Coulsdon	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by RBBC. The site comprises predominantly agricultural use. The landowner has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
CHW02	Land at Outwood Lane, Chipstead	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by RBBC. The site comprises predominantly agricultural use. The landowner has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
CHW06	Land at Rectory Lane (Drakes Field), Chipstead	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual. The site comprises agricultural fields. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
EW03	Land at Princes Road, Earlswood	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by RBBC. Parts of the site are actively used as public open space and parts as allotments. Alternative provision of both uses would be required if the site was released for traveller provision. However, alternative provision is not available at this time, therefore the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
EW07	Royal National Institute	Suitability	The site is owned by the Royal National Institute for the Blind.	Not available/achievable	N/A

Ref	Site name	Suitability Conclusion	Commentary	Overall conclusion on Availability/Achievability	Estimated Capacity
	for the Blind, Philanthropic Road, Redhill	subject to review of Green Belt	The site comprises specialist care facilities and accommodation in large grounds. The site benefits from planning consent (reference 14/02562/F) for the redevelopment of the site to form 102 new dwellings in total, and pre-commencement planning conditions have been recently discharged. Given this consent, there is a reasonably high alternative use value associated with the site and traveller provision is therefore unlikely to be viable or affordable, and the site therefore is not considered to be available for traveller provision.		
EW13	Burnt Oak Farm, 26 Woodhatch Road, Redhill	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	This site is being promoted for residential (market) housing, and affordable housing, as part of the SHLAA/HELAA – the respondent did not tick the option for Traveller provision on the form.	Not available/achievable	N/A
EW12	Redhill Aerodrome	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is being promoted by a house builder. The site has been identified as a potential safeguarded site so would not be available for traveller provision at this current time, as this could compromise the delivery of the site should it be considered necessary for development needs in a subsequent Local Plan review.	Not available/achievable	N/A
G14	Land at Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords (2)	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual. The landowner was contacted in July 2017 but no response was received. As such, the site is not available	Not available/achievable	N/A
KBH03	Rookery Farm, Mogador Road, Lower Kingswood	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by RBBC. The site was previously used as landfill and therefore remediation would be required in order to make the site suitable as a traveller site. Based on discussions with Environmental Health Officers, remediation would be expensive given the comparatively recent landfilling. There is a real possibility that this would make traveller provision unviable. The landowner has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
KBH04	Land at Holly Lane, Banstead	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by RBBC. The site comprises agricultural use. The landowner has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
KBH11	Land at Shrimps Field, Chipstead Lane, Kingswood	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual. The site comprises semi-natural open space. The landowner was contacted in December 2015, however, no response was received, therefore it cannot be confirmed that the site is available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
KBH18	Land north of Bonsor	Suitability	The site is owned by private individuals.	Not available/achievable	N/A

Ref	Site name	Suitability Conclusion	Commentary	Overall conclusion on Availability/Achievability	Estimated Capacity
	Drive, Kingswood	subject to review of Green Belt	The site comprises a paddock with associated buildings. The landowners' agent was contacted in December 2015, and has confirmed the site is not available for traveller provision.		
KBH19	Land east of Smithy Lane, Lower Kingswood	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private trust and two other separate landowners. The site comprises agricultural use. The landowners' agent was contacted in December 2015, and has confirmed the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
KBH25	Land north of Chipstead Lane, Kingswood	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual. The site comprises amenity and grazing land. The landowner was contacted in December 2015, and has confirmed the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
KBH26	Land at Beechen Lane	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	This site is being promoted for residential (market) housing, as part of the SHLAA/HELAA – the respondent did not tick the option for Traveller provision on the form.	Not available/achievable	N/A
KBH28	Legal & General, Kingswood, Land parcel 1	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by Legal & General. The landowner has confirmed that the site is not available for development at the present time.	Not available/achievable	N/A
KBH29	Legal & General, Kingswood, Land parcel 2	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by Legal & General. The landowner has confirmed that the site is not available for development at the present time.	Not available/achievable	N/A
M14	Oakley Farm, 143 Bletchingley Road, Merstham	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by private individuals. The site comprises agricultural and grazing fields. The landowners' agent was contacted in December 2015, and has confirmed the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
M17	Darby House, Bletchingley Road, Merstham	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a house builder – Croudace Homes. There is an extant permission (reference 13/02147/OUT) for a residential development of c.20 homes and the landowner is in the process of implementing this consent. Given this, and the likely value of the site in light of the consent, the site is not considered to be available or viable for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
M18	164 Bletchingley Road, Merstham	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual and has previously been promoted on their behalf by a private development company. The site comprises a residential dwelling in large grounds and former agricultural uses. The landowner's agent was contacted in April 2016 and has confirmed that the site would not be made available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
M20	Land south of Darby	Suitability	The site is owned by a private development company.	Not available/achievable	N/A

Ref	Site name	Suitability Conclusion	Commentary	Overall conclusion on Availability/Achievability	Estimated Capacity
	House, Bletchingley Road, Merstham	subject to review of Green Belt	The site comprises open grounds. The landowner's agent was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site would not be made available for traveller provision.		
M21	Land north of Radstock Way, Merstham	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by RBBC. Parts of the site are actively used as public open space with some parts comprising woodland. Alternative provision of the open space would be required if the site was released for traveller provision. However, alternative provision is not available at this time, therefore the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
M26	Merstham Manor Estate, Merstham	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	This site is being promoted for residential (market) housing, and possibly office and retail, as part of the SHLAA/HELAA – the respondent did not tick the option for Traveller provision on the form.	Not available/achievable	N/A
RE19	Nutfield Lodge, Nutfield Road, Redhill	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a local Masonic organisation and is actively used for community uses. The site comprises a community building in large grounds. The site has been promoted on behalf of the landowner for residential development alongside re-provision of community uses. Given the intentions of the landowner to use part of the site for community provision and the need for residential development as enabling development, traveller provision is not considered to be viable or achievable. Furthermore, the landowner's agent was contacted in December 2015, however, no response was received, therefore it cannot be confirmed that the site is available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
RE20	Former Copyhold Works, Nutfield Road, Redhill	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a strategic land developer. The site comprises derelict industrial buildings and woodland. The landowner was contacted in December 2015, however, no response was received, therefore it cannot be confirmed that the site is available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
RE22	Land at Hillsbrow, Nutfield Road, Redhill	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual. The site comprises semi-natural open space/woodland. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
RE24	Land north of Nutfield Road (The Paddock), Redhill	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a strategic land developer. The site comprises agricultural and grazing land. The landowner was contacted in December 2015, however, no response was received, therefore it cannot be confirmed that the site is available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
RE25	Land south of Nutfield Road, Redhill	Suitability subject to	The site is owned by a strategic house builder and leased to RBBC for use as allotments.	Not available/achievable	N/A

Ref	Site name	Suitability Conclusion	Commentary	Overall conclusion on Availability/Achievability	Estimated Capacity
		review of Green Belt	If the site were to be released for traveller provision, alternative allotment provision would need to be found by the Council, and alternative provision is not available at present. The landowner was contacted in December 2015, however, no response was received, therefore it cannot be confirmed that the site is available for traveller provision.		
SPW01	Land at Lonesome Lane, Reigate	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by RBBC. Parts of the site are actively used as public open space and parts as allotments. Alternative provision of both uses would be required if the site was released for traveller provision. However, alternative provision is not available at this time, therefore the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
SPW03	New Pond Farm, Woodhatch Road, Reigate	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by RBBC. There is an occupational lease to a third party. This lease would need to expire or be acquired if the site was to be made available for traveller provision. The landowner has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
SPW04	Land at Sandcross Lane, Reigate	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by private individuals. The site comprises agricultural use. The landowner was contacted in December 2015, however, is unable to confirm at this stage whether the site would be made available for traveller provision, therefore it cannot be confirmed that the site is available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
SPW05	Land at Dovers Farm, Dovers Green Road, Reigate	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a local developer. The site comprises agricultural use. The landowner has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
SPW07	Land at Castle Drive, Woodhatch	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual and there is third party interest from a local registered affordable housing provider. The site comprises semi-natural open space and grazing land. The landowner's agent was contacted in December 2015, however, no response was received, therefore it cannot be confirmed that the site is available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
SPW08	Hartwood Nursery, 146 Doversgreen Road, Reigate	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual. The site comprises semi-natural land (former nursery) with derelict structures and a residential dwelling. The landowner's agent was contacted in December 2015, however, no response was received, therefore it cannot be confirmed that the site is available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
SPW10	Land at Hartwood Farm / Flanchford Farm,	Suitability subject to	The site is owned by a private trust. The site comprises agricultural fields.	Not available/achievable	N/A

Ref	Site name	Suitability Conclusion	Commentary	Overall conclusion on Availability/Achievability	Estimated Capacity
	Reigate	review of Green Belt	The landowner's agent was contacted in December 2015, and has confirmed that the site is not available for traveller provision.		
SPW11	Garage Block/Atherfield Barn, Woodhatch Road, Reigate	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a local house builder who has promoted the site for residential development. The site comprises a derelict barn and hardstanding. The landowner's agent was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that they would not be willing to release the site for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
SPW16	ASD on the Green, Lonesome Lane, Reigate	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	This site is being promoted for accommodation for people with autism, and enabling development in the form of a hotel, as part of the SHLAA/HELAA – the respondent did not tick the option for Traveller provision on the form.	Not available/achievable	N/A
SPW18	Paddock 19, Dovers Green Road	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	This site is being promoted for residential (market) housing, and self-build and affordable housing, as part of the SHLAA/HELAA – the respondent did not tick the option for Traveller provision on the form.	Not available/achievable	N/A
SS02	Land to the west of Bonehurst Road, Salfords	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual and forms part of Bonehurst Farm. The site comprises agricultural and grazing land. The landowner's agent was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that they would not be willing to release the site for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
SS06	Land at Rosemary Farm, Ironsbottom Road, Sidlow	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual. The site comprises agricultural land. Given the existing predominantly agricultural use, there is a reasonable likelihood that the site would be affordable for traveller provision. It has not been possible to contact the landowner to ascertain if the site would be made available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
SS12	Land between Mason's Bridge Road / Picketts Land and the railway, Salfords (Land east of Salfords)	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a regional developer, Quintain. The site comprises predominantly agricultural land but including areas of open space and woodland. The landowner's agent was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that they would not be willing to release the site for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
SS15	Horley Place, Bonehurst Road, Horley	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual. The site comprises a hotel and grounds. The site benefits from recent planning consent reference 15/00631/F for 2-storey extensions to the hotel, and whilst the site was previously promoted for development, this is no longer being pursued. The site is therefore not considered to be available for traveller	Not available/achievable	N/A

Ref	Site name	Suitability Conclusion	Commentary	Overall conclusion on Availability/Achievability	Estimated Capacity
			provision.		
SS17	Land south of Copsleigh Avenue, Salfords	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private organisation. The site comprises grazing land and natural open space. The landowner's agent was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site would not be available for traveller provision. It is being actively promoted.	Not available/achievable	N/A
SS22	Land at Bonehurst Farm, Salfords	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a private individual. The site comprises agricultural land. The landowner's agent was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site would not be available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
SS27 (part of SS22)	Field on Bonehurst Road between Cambridge Hotel and Lawson's Timber Yard, Bonehurst Road, Horley	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	This site is being promoted for residential (market) housing, as part of the SHLAA/HELAA – the respondent did not tick the option for Traveller provision on the form.	Not available/achievable	N/A
TW11	Land at the Priory, Sturts Lane, Walton on the Hill	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	This site is being promoted for residential (market) housing, as part of the SHLAA/HELAA – the respondent did not tick the option for Traveller provision on the form.	Not available/achievable	N/A
US02	Land at Downs Way, 81 Kingswood Road, Tadworth	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a local property developer. The site comprises woodland, rough scrub, and grassland. The landowner's agent was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site would not be available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A
US06	145 Sandcross Lane, Reigate	Suitability subject to review of Green Belt	The site is owned by a single landowner. The site comprises agricultural land. The landowner was contacted in December 2015 and has confirmed that the site would not be available for traveller provision.	Not available/achievable	N/A

5. Green Belt Reviews: Potential Sites

- 5.1 Of all of the sites that were sourced, assessed for suitability (tables 2 and 3), and found to be available and achievable (table 4); nine sites could potentially be considered for Traveller pitches and plots: three for Travelling Show-people plots, and six for gypsy & Traveller pitches. All of these sites are located in the Green Belt, and are set out in Table 5 below, along with the potential number of pitches or plots that could be accommodated by each site.

Table 5: Suitable and Available sites

Sites (plots)	Potential plots
G9a: Land at Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords (1)	1 plot
G9b: Land at Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords (3)	4 plots
G13: Land west of Plot 4, Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords	3 plots
Sites (pitches)	Potential pitches
BV16: Land south of Woodmansterne Lane, Banstead	Up to 15 pitches
BV18: Land south of Croydon Lane, Banstead	Up to 15 pitches
G3: Woodlea Stables, Peeks Brook Lane, Horley	6 pitches
G4: Treetops/Trentham, Peeks Brook Lane, Horley	1 pitch
G6: Land at Crossoak Lane/Picketts Lane, Salfords	10 pitches
G12: Land at Kents Field, Rectory Lane, Chipstead	2 pitches

- 5.2 All of the potential sites are located within the Green Belt which is the least preferential location in terms of the Council's sequential approach to finding land for development as set out in the Core Strategy. However because all other sites have been ruled out against absolute criteria, unsuitability, and lack of availability and/or achievability, it is necessary to consider these sites and examine the impacts of the sites upon the Green Belt.
- 5.3 This section assesses each of the remaining nine sites in regard to its relative importance to the Green Belt. Development is generally regarded by national policy as inappropriate in the Green Belt, although there are certain exceptions. However, national policy does clarify that exceptional circumstances can allow Green Belt boundaries to be altered. Core Strategy Policy CS16 states that the lack of any suitable, affordable and deliverable sites in the urban area or other countryside not covered by Green Belt could provide the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify alterations to Green Belt boundaries to meet a specific identified need for a Traveller site. Core Strategy CS3 also notes that:
- 'In exceptional circumstances land may be removed from the Green Belt...Exceptional circumstances may exist where...there is no or limited conflict with the purposes and integrity of the Green Belt (clause 3b)'.
- 5.4 The methodology in the *Development Management Plan: Green Belt Review* evidence paper has been used for these Traveller site Green Belt assessments.

A size limit of one hectare only has been applied to these assessments as set out in Stage 1 above. This resulted in site BV18 (land south of Croydon Lane, Banstead) being assessed as two separate sites, the split of the site informed by surrounding context, proximity of neighbouring development and roads, and defined physical boundaries.

- 5.5 Each of the sites set out in Table 5 above is reviewed below, and those that are considered not to have an unacceptable impact upon the purposes of the Green Belt are set out at Table 6.

Green Belt reviews:

Site G9a: Fairacres (1), Axes Lane, Salfords	
	
<small>© Crown Copyright and database right 2018. Ordnance Survey licence number 100019405. Produced by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council. 1:1,250</small>	
<p>Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</p>	
<p>This site is not contiguous to or contained within any settlement (although it is contiguous to existing Traveller accommodation); it is detached from – and poorly related to – the existing settlement areas.</p>	<p>Moderate importance to the Green Belt</p>

<p>The boundary is strong, comprising of a separate residential curtilage to the south, dense tree belt to the east and north and a bund (and built form) to the west.</p> <p>Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of moderate importance to this purpose.</p>	
<p>Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another</p>	
<p>This site lies on a line between the settlements of Nutfield (to the north-east, and Horley, to the south-west). This line is approximately 4.72km from edge to edge of the settlements, and on this line the potential development measures approximately 58m.</p> <p>Removal of the site would still leave a wide gap of more than 2km (including in either direction from the site).</p> <p>The gap would be closed by less than 15%.</p> <p>The site is therefore considered to be lower importance to the Green Belt for this purpose against the criteria.</p>	<p>Lower importance to the Green Belt</p>
<p>Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p>	
<p>There has been encroachment into the Green Belt at this site, and enforcement procedures have required it to be reinstated to its original undeveloped form. As such, it is considered as open Green Belt and can be considered as less than 10% developed and therefore of higher importance to the Green Belt for this purpose.</p> <p>The boundaries of the site are strongly defined as set out above and would assist in preventing development encroachment into longer range views into the countryside.</p> <p>Taken as a whole, the site is considered to be of moderate importance to the Green Belt for this purpose.</p>	<p>Moderate importance to the Green Belt</p>
<p>Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</p>	
<p>There are no conservation areas in the vicinity of the site and as such it plays no role in conserving historic character or setting, against the criteria of the Green Belt Review; therefore this site is regarded as having a lower importance to the Green Belt for this purpose.</p>	<p>Lower importance to the Green Belt</p>
<p>Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</p>	
<p>The “urban areas first” approach set out in Policy CS6 of the adopted Core Strategy ensures that development on greenfield, Green Belt sites should not directly compete with viable and deliverable urban/regeneration opportunities.</p>	<p>Lower importance to the Green Belt</p>
<p>Suitability Conclusion:</p>	
<p>This site is green field and separate from nearby settlements, but it also has good boundaries preventing visual encroachment and contributes little to the prevention of coalescence. As such is can be regarded as moderate in its importance to the Green Belt against the purposes.</p>	<p>Final Rating Across All Purposes: Moderate importance to Green Belt</p>

Site G9b: Fairacres (3), Axes Lane, Salfords



© Crown Copyright and database right 2018. Ordnance Survey licence number 100019405. Produced by reigate & Banstead Borough Council.

1:1,250

Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

This site is not contiguous to or contained within any settlement (although it will be contiguous to Traveller accommodation); it is detached from – and poorly related to – the existing settlement areas.

The boundary is strong; a dense tree belt is located to the east and south (and part of the west side) of the site and to the north and rest of the west side there are other plots currently being built out under a previous planning permission. The boundary contains the development as a whole, preventing sprawl.

Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of moderate importance to this purpose.

Moderate
importance
to the
Green Belt


Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another

This site lies on a line between the settlements of Nutfield (to the north-east, and Horley, to the south-west). This line is approximately 4.63 km from edge to edge of the settlements, and on this line the potential

Lower
importance
to the

<p>development measures approximately 174m.</p> <p>Removal of the site would still leave a wide gap of more than 2km (including more than 2km to the north, and approximately 1.9 to the south).</p> <p>The gap would be closed by less than 15%.</p> <p>The site is therefore considered to be lower importance to the Green Belt for this purpose against the criteria.</p>	Green Belt
Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment	
<p>This site is undeveloped and less than 10% of the area is covered in urbanising features, in terms of the Green Belt Review criteria, meaning that the site is of higher importance to the Green Belt for this purpose.</p> <p>The boundaries of the site are strongly defined as set out above and would assist in preventing development encroachment into longer range views into the countryside.</p> <p>Taking account of the factors above, the site is considered to be of moderate importance to the Green Belt for this purpose.</p>	Moderate importance to the Green Belt
Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns	
<p>There are no conservation areas in the vicinity of the site and as such it plays no role in conserving historic character or setting, against the criteria of the Green Belt Review; therefore this site is regarded as having a lower importance to the Green Belt for this purpose.</p>	Lower importance to the Green Belt
Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land	
<p>The “urban areas first” approach set out in Policy CS6 of the adopted Core Strategy ensures that development on greenfield, Green Belt sites should not directly compete with viable and deliverable urban/regeneration opportunities.</p>	Lower importance to the Green Belt
Suitability Conclusion	
<p>Despite its location away from a settlement, and green field status, this site’s location on lines between settlements, and its strong boundary features point to a lower-moderate contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt overall as assessed against the DMP Green Belt Review criteria. It is considered that it would be suitable to take this site forward for further consideration as a Traveller site within the Green Belt.</p>	Final Rating Across All Purposes: Moderate Importance to Green Belt

G13: Land west of Plot 4, Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords



© Crown Copyright and database right 2017. Ordnance Survey licence number 100019405. Produced by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council. 1:2,500

Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

None of the parcel is contiguous with the existing urban area and is largely detached from, and poorly related to, the existing urban concentration, which makes the site of higher importance to the Green Belt in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.

The boundaries of the parcel are partially formed by strong features such as the tree line on the west and southern side. However, the parcel is mostly open to the countryside on the east boundary.

On balance the site is considered to have a moderate importance to the Green Belt for this purpose.

Moderate
importance
to the
Green Belt

Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another

This site lies on a line between Salfords, which is the nearest settlement, and either Blindley Heath or South Godstone – the nearest settlements on a line from Salfords that crosses the site. This gap is

Lower
importance
to Green
Belt

<p>approximately 6.5km, when taking a line from Salfords to the residential area to the north of and attached to Blindley Heath. Removal of the site would therefore still leave a wide gap (as per the Green Belt Review criteria), and would lead to the existing gap being closed by less than 15%.</p> <p>The site is therefore counted as of lower importance to the Green Belt for this purpose against the criteria in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	
<p>Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p>	
<p>The parcel is largely open space; less than 10% of the land area of the parcel is covered by built form/urban features, which makes this site of higher importance to the Green Belt for this purpose in regard to the DMP review criteria.</p> <p>The boundaries of the site are strongly defined by the tree line to the west; however the parcel is mostly open on the eastern side. The tree line further to the east and continuing to the south would prevent encroachment of development into longer range views into the countryside from the southern and eastern sides, however the parcel may still be relatively visible from the road to the north due to its extensive open eastern boundary.</p> <p>On balance it is therefore considered that this site is of higher importance in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	<p>Higher importance to Green Belt</p>
<p>Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</p>	
<p>There are no conservation areas in the vicinity of the site and as such it plays no role in conserving historic character or setting. The parcel is therefore regarded as having a lower importance to the Green Belt for this purpose in the DMP Green Belt Review.</p>	<p>Lower importance to Green Belt</p>
<p>Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</p>	
<p>The “urban areas first” approach set out in Policy CS6 of the adopted Core Strategy ensures that development on greenfield, Green Belt sites should not directly compete with viable and deliverable urban/regeneration opportunities.</p>	<p>Lower importance to Green Belt</p>
<p>Suitability Conclusion:</p>	
<p>This site is of higher importance to the Green Belt in terms of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, whilst being of moderate and lower importance for other purposes, including reduction of a settlement gap. As such, it is considered to be of higher importance to the purposes of the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Final Rating Across All Purposes: Higher importance to Green Belt</p>

BV16: Land south of Woodmansterne Lane, Banstead



© Crown Copyright and database right 2017. Ordnance Survey licence number 100019405. Produced by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council. 1:1,250

Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

The parcel is partially contained – approximately 50% of the parcel is contiguous with the urban area along the northern and western boundaries of the parcel.

The boundaries of the site abutting neighbouring residential plots are strong and would largely contain sprawl. However, to the south, there is no boundary that would contain potential sprawl from development.

Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of moderate importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.

Moderate
importance
to the
Green Belt

Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another

<p>The parcel lies between Banstead Village and Woodmansterne. The gap is currently approximately 0.22km when taking the approximate distance from residential plots to the east in Woodmansterne Lane/Park Road to residential plots in Chalmers Road to the west. If the parcel did not remain open this would result in a reduced gap of 0.15km, equivalent to a reduction of approximately 32%.</p> <p>Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of higher importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	Higher importance to Green Belt
Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment	
<p>The parcel is predominantly open agricultural land, with some man-made fencing. Less than 10% of the land area of the parcel is covered by built form.</p> <p>Whilst the northern and western boundaries do abut residential plots, the extensive southern boundary of the site is not defined by any physical feature that would prevent physical/visual encroachment into the long range views currently available across the site into the countryside.</p> <p>Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of higher importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	Higher importance to Green Belt
Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns	
<p>The parcel is not directly adjacent to or in proximity of a historic town. The north west corner of the site abuts the Conservation Area but the parcel itself plays little part in the setting or historic character of the neighbouring conservation area.</p> <p>Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of lower importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	Lower importance to Green Belt
Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land	
<p>The “urban areas first” approach set out in Policy CS6 of the adopted Core Strategy ensures that development on greenfield, Green Belt sites should not directly compete with viable and deliverable urban/regeneration opportunities.</p>	Lower importance to Green Belt
Suitability Conclusion:	
<p>Whilst some of the boundary of the site is confined by residential development, the extensive southern boundary of the site is not physically defined, and would not prevent physical sprawl of development into the Green Belt, or prevent visual encroachment into the long range views into the countryside. The site performs poorly against Purposes 2 and 3 (in terms of suitability) and therefore fails the suitability test and is excluded from further consideration for the provision of Traveller accommodation.</p>	Final Rating Across All Purposes: Higher Importance to Green Belt

BV18: Land south of Croydon Lane, Banstead (Parcel Option A)



© Crown Copyright and database right 2017. Ordnance Survey licence number 100019405. Produced by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council. 1:2,500

Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

The parcel is not contained – none of the parcel is contiguous with the existing urban area and is largely detached from, and poorly related to, the existing urban concentration.

The boundaries of the parcel are partially formed by strong features such as residential curtilage and a dense tree line on the western side, but the parcel is open to the south.

Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of higher importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.

Higher
importance
to Green
Belt

Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another

When taking the approximate distance from the eastern edge of Banstead to the northern edge of Chipstead/Woodmansterne (1.46km), removal of the parcel would leave a reduced gap of less than 2km.

Moderate
importance
to the

<p>Due to its size and positioning removal of the parcel would lead to the existing gap being closed by less than 15% and the overall effect is limited due to other built form in the area.</p> <p>Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of moderate importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	Green Belt
Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment	
<p>The whole parcel is open land with less than 10% of the land area of the parcel covered by built form/urban features.</p> <p>The boundaries of the parcel are partially formed by strong features such as residential curtilage and mature hedging/trees to the north, west and east but open to the south. Although there is no physical boundary to the south, the western tree line and tree line further to the south would prevent encroachment into longer range views into the countryside.</p> <p>Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of higher importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	Higher importance to Green Belt
Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns	
<p>There are no conservation areas in the vicinity of the site and as such it plays no role in conserving historic character or setting. The parcel is therefore regarded as having a lower importance to the Green Belt for this purpose in the DMP Green Belt Review.</p>	Lower importance to Green Belt
Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land	
<p>The “urban areas first” approach set out in Policy CS6 of the adopted Core Strategy ensures that development on greenfield, Green Belt sites should not directly compete with viable and deliverable urban/regeneration opportunities.</p>	Lower importance to Green Belt
Suitability Conclusion:	
<p>This land parcel is important to the Green Belt both to prevent sprawl and to protect against encroachment into the countryside. The site performs poorly against Purposes 1 and 3 (in terms of suitability) and therefore fails the suitability test and is excluded from further consideration for the provision of Traveller accommodation.</p>	Final Rating Across All Purposes: Higher Importance to Green Belt

BV18: Land south of Croydon Lane, Banstead (Parcel Option B)



© Crown Copyright and database right 2017. Ordnance Survey licence number 100019405. Produced by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council. 1:2,500

Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

None of the parcel is contiguous with the existing urban area and is largely detached from, and poorly related to, the existing urban concentration.

The boundaries of the parcel are partially formed by strong features such as the road, and residential plot and tree line on the eastern side, but open on the remaining boundaries.

Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of higher importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.

Higher
importance
to Green
Belt

Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another

When taking the approximate distance from the eastern edge of

Moderate

<p>Banstead to the northern edge of Chipstead/Woodmansterne (1.46km), removal of the parcel would leave a reduced gap of less than 2km.</p> <p>Due to its size and positioning removal of the parcel would lead to the existing gap being closed by less than 15% and the overall effect is limited due to other built form in the area.</p> <p>Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of moderate importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	<p>importance to the Green Belt</p>
<p>Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p>	
<p>The whole parcel is open land with less than 10% of the land area of the parcel covered by built form/urban features.</p> <p>The extensive northern boundary is defined by the road, with a residential plot and tree line on the eastern boundary. However, there are no physical boundaries on the west or southern side. The continuing tree lines on either side towards the south would to a certain extent prevent encroachment into longer range views into the countryside.</p> <p>Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of higher importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	<p>Higher importance to Green Belt</p>
<p>Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</p>	
<p>There are no conservation areas in the vicinity of the site and as such it plays no role in conserving historic character or setting. The parcel is therefore regarded as having a lower importance to the Green Belt for this purpose in the DMP Green Belt Review.</p>	<p>Lower importance to Green Belt</p>
<p>Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</p>	
<p>The “urban areas first” approach set out in Policy CS6 of the adopted Core Strategy ensures that development on greenfield, Green Belt sites should not directly compete with viable and deliverable urban/regeneration opportunities.</p>	<p>Lower importance to Green Belt</p>
<p>Suitability Conclusion:</p>	
<p>This land parcel is important to the Green Belt both to prevent sprawl and to protect against encroachment into the countryside. The site performs poorly against Purposes 1 and 3 (in terms of suitability) and therefore fails the suitability test and is excluded from further consideration for the provision of Traveller accommodation.</p>	<p>Final Rating Across All Purposes: Higher Importance to Green Belt</p>

G3: Woodlea Stables, Peeks Brook Lane, Horley



© Crown Copyright and database right 2017. Ordnance Survey licence number 100019405. Produced by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council. 1:1,250

Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

None of the parcel is contiguous with the existing urban area and is largely detached from, and poorly related to, the existing urban concentration.

The north and south boundaries of the parcel comprise strong features; mature woodland to the north and spread restricted on the southern side due to the presence of Woodlea Kennels. The other boundaries of the site to the west are not as strong, including some younger hedging, fencing and a small area open to the countryside. However, the hedging and fencing is doubled up. Given this, it is considered that the boundaries are average.

Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of moderate importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.

Moderate importance to Green Belt

Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another	
<p>When taking the approximate distance from west to east (edge of Horley to edge of Smallfield) the gap is 1.32km. The removal of the parcel would not reduce the gap due to its size and position and would leave a settlement gap.</p> <p>Removal of the parcel would lead to the existing gap being closed by less than 15%. Due to its size and positioning removal of the parcel would not affect the existing gap, and overall it would have a limited effect due to other built form in the area.</p> <p>Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of lower importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	<p>Lower importance to Green Belt</p>
Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment	
<p>This site is currently an unauthorised Traveller site and the majority is covered in built form. Historic maps show that some form of man-made surface has been existent on this site since 2003, with units present from circa 2006.</p> <p>The boundaries of the site are strongly defined by the road, woodland, and neighbouring kennels. However, the site is open to the countryside to the west, with only an insubstantial hedge around some of the boundary. The woodland further to the north, west, and south would to an extent prevent encroachment into longer range views into the countryside.</p> <p>Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of moderate importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	<p>Moderate importance to Green Belt</p>
Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns	
<p>There are no conservation areas in the vicinity of the site and as such it plays no role in conserving historic character or setting. The parcel is therefore regarded as having a lower importance to the Green Belt for this purpose in the DMP Green Belt Review.</p>	<p>Lower importance to Green Belt</p>
Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land	
<p>The “urban areas first” approach set out in Policy CS6 of the adopted Core Strategy ensures that development on greenfield, Green Belt sites should not directly compete with viable and deliverable urban/regeneration opportunities.</p>	<p>Lower importance to Green Belt</p>
Suitability Conclusion:	
<p>As this site is unauthorised it has been treated as a greenfield site. Whilst the northern boundary of the parcel is undefined/open, the other boundaries are strongly defined by a road, mature hedge line and woodland. Although the northern boundary is open, the hedge line further to the north, as well as the continuing tree line would help in prevention of the visual encroachment of development into the wider countryside. The site performs acceptably against all Green Belt purposes, and therefore passes the suitability test, and can be included for further consideration for the provision of Traveller accommodation.</p>	<p>Final Rating Across All Purposes: Moderate importance to Green Belt</p>

G4: Treetops/Trentham, Peek Brook Lane, Horley



© Crown Copyright and database right 2017. Ordnance Survey, licence number 100019405. Produced by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council. 1:750

Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

None of the parcel is contiguous with the existing urban area and is largely detached from, and poorly related to, the existing urban concentration.

The boundaries of the parcel are formed by strong features: the roads on the east and west side (M23), woodland on the north side, and the residential curtilage on the southern side.

Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of moderate importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.

Moderate
importance
to Green
Belt

Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another

<p>When taking the approximate distance from west to east (edge of Horley to edge of Smallfield) the gap is 1.32km. The removal of the parcel would not reduce the gap due to its size and position and would leave a settlement gap.</p> <p>Removal of the parcel would lead to the existing gap being closed by less than 15%. Due to its size and positioning removal of the parcel would not affect the existing gap, and overall it would have a limited effect due to other built form in the area.</p> <p>Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of lower importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	<p>Lower importance to Green Belt</p>
<p>Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p>	
<p>This site is currently an unauthorised Traveller site and the majority is covered in built form. Historic maps show that some forms of man-made surface and units have been existent on this site since 2003.</p> <p>The boundaries of the site are strongly defined by the road, motorway, woodland, and neighbouring residential curtilage. The boundaries would assist in preventing development encroachment into longer range views into the countryside.</p> <p>Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of moderate importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	<p>Moderate importance to Green Belt</p>
<p>Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</p>	
<p>There are no conservation areas in the vicinity of the site and as such it plays no role in conserving historic character or setting. The parcel is therefore regarded as having a lower importance to the Green Belt for this purpose in the DMP Green Belt Review.</p>	<p>Lower importance to Green Belt</p>
<p>Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</p>	
<p>The “urban areas first” approach set out in Policy CS6 of the adopted Core Strategy ensures that development on greenfield, Green Belt sites should not directly compete with viable and deliverable urban/regeneration opportunities.</p>	<p>Lower importance to Green Belt</p>
<p>Suitability Conclusion:</p>	
<p>As this site is unauthorised it has been treated as a greenfield site. Whilst the northern boundary of the parcel is undefined, the other boundaries are strongly defined by a road, mature hedge line and woodland. Whilst the northern boundary is open, the hedge line further to the north, as well as the continuing tree line would help in prevention of the visual encroachment of development into the wider countryside. The site performs acceptably against all Green Belt purposes, and therefore passes the suitability test, and can be included for further consideration for the provision of traveller accommodation.</p>	<p>Final Rating Across All Purposes: Moderate Importance to Green Belt</p>

G6: Land at Crossoak Lane/Picketts Lane, Salfords



© Crown Copyright and database right 2017. Ordnance Survey licence number 100019405. Produced by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council. 1:1,750

Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

None of the parcel is contiguous with the existing urban area and is largely detached from, and poorly related to, the existing urban concentration.

The boundaries of the parcel are partially formed by strong features such as the road on the east side, woodland on the west side, and hedge on the southern boundary. The parcel is open on the northern boundary.

Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of higher importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.

Higher importance to Green Belt

Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another

When taking the approximate distance from north to south (southern edge of South Earlswood to northern edge of Horley) the gap is more

Lower importance

<p>than 2km. The removal of the parcel would not reduce the gap due to its size and position.</p> <p>Due to its size and positioning removal of the parcel would not affect the existing gap, and overall it would have a limited effect due to other built form in the area.</p> <p>Taking account of the factors above, the parcel is considered to be of lower importance to this purpose, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	to Green Belt
Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment	
<p>This land parcel is largely open. The only development on the site is electricity pylons, and as such there is less than 10% of the land area of the parcel covered by built form/urban features.</p> <p>The boundaries of the site are strongly defined by the road, mature hedge, and woodland. Only the northern boundary is open although the hedge further to the north would to a certain extent prevent encroachment into longer range views into the countryside, as would the continuing tree line and road.</p> <p>It is considered on balance that, due to the lack of development on the site, it is of higher importance to the Green Belt, in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	Higher importance to Green Belt
Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns	
<p>There are no conservation areas in the vicinity of the site and as such it plays no role in conserving historic character or setting. The parcel is therefore regarded as having a lower importance to the Green Belt for this purpose in the DMP Green Belt Review.</p>	Lower importance to Green Belt
Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land	
<p>The “urban areas first” approach set out in Policy CS6 of the adopted Core Strategy ensures that development on greenfield, Green Belt sites should not directly compete with viable and deliverable urban/regeneration opportunities.</p>	Lower importance to Green Belt
Suitability Conclusion:	
<p>Whilst the northern boundary of the parcel is undefined, the other boundaries are strongly defined by a road, mature hedge line and woodland. Whilst the northern boundary is open, the hedge line further to the north, as well as the continuing tree line would help in prevention of the visual encroachment of development into the wider countryside. Nonetheless, this site is of high importance to two purposes of the Green Belt (purposes 1 and 3) regarding checking sprawl and encroachment into the countryside. On balance it is considered that the site is of higher importance to the Green Belt and this site should therefore not be taken forward for consideration as a Traveller site.</p>	Final Rating Across All Purposes: Higher importance to Green Belt

G12: Land at Kents Field, Rectory Lane, Chipstead



© Crown Copyright and database right 2017. Ordnance Survey licence number 100019405. Produced by Reigate & Banstead Borough Council. 1:850

Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

None of the parcel is contiguous with the existing urban area, although the site is relatively close to the existing urban concentration.

The boundaries of the parcel are partially formed by strong features; the tree line and road on the east side, as well as the authorised site on the north side. However, the site is open on the west side and spread may also occur to the south, due to the insubstantial hedge line, hardstanding, and derelict buildings. Given this, it is considered that the boundaries are average.

On balance this site is considered to have moderate importance in regard to this purpose of the Green Belt in regard to the criteria set out

Moderate
importance
to the
Green Belt

in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.	
Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another	
<p>The distance from the settlement to the north (Tonbridge Close, Woodmansterne) and to the south (edge of Chipstead) is less than 1km (0.63km). However, removal of the parcel would have limited impact on the gap due to its size and position, and other built form.</p> <p>On balance this site is considered to have moderate importance in regard to this purpose of the Green Belt in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	Moderate importance to the Green Belt
Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment	
<p>Less than 10% of the land area of the parcel is covered by built form/urban features.</p> <p>The boundaries of the parcel are partially formed by strong features; the tree line and road on the east side, as well as the authorised site on the north side. However, the site is open on the west side and spread may also occur to the south, due to the insubstantial hedge line, hardstanding, and derelict buildings. The tree line further to the west and south screening residential development may prevent encroachment of development into longer range views into the countryside.</p> <p>On balance this site is considered to have moderate importance in regard to this purpose of the Green Belt in regard to the criteria set out in the DMP Green Belt review evidence paper.</p>	Moderate importance to the Green Belt
Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns	
<p>There are no conservation areas in the vicinity of the site and as such it plays no role in conserving historic character or setting. The parcel is therefore regarded as having a lower importance to the Green Belt for this purpose in the DMP Green Belt Review.</p>	Lower importance to Green Belt
Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land	
<p>The “urban areas first” approach set out in Policy CS6 of the adopted Core Strategy ensures that development on greenfield, Green Belt sites should not directly compete with viable and deliverable urban/regeneration opportunities.</p>	Lower importance to Green Belt
Suitability Conclusion:	
<p>The boundary’s tree line would help in prevention of the visual encroachment of development into the wider countryside. The site performs acceptably against all Green Belt purposes, and therefore passes the suitability test, and can be included for further consideration for the provision of traveller accommodation.</p>	Final Rating Across All Purposes: Moderate Importance to Green Belt

Suitable site for further consideration

Table 6: Sites suitable for further consideration as Traveller sites

Site	Estimated Capacity
G9a: Land at Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords (1)	1 plot
G9b: Land at Fairacres, Axes Lane, Salfords (3)	4 plots
G3:Woodlea Stables, Peeks Brook Lane, Horley	Up to 4 pitches
G4:Treetops/Trentham, Peeks Brook Lane, Horley	Up to 2 pitches
G12:Land at Kents Field, Rectory Lane, Chipstead	Up to 2 pitches
	Up to 8 pitches/5 plots

Need and Supply

- 5.6 Table 6 above sets out the sites which are considered to be suitable for consideration as Traveller sites, along with potential plot or pitch numbers.
- 5.7 As set out in paragraph 2.17 above, 23 pitches and 3 plots would be necessary to provide sufficient accommodation to meet five year needs.
- 5.8 5 plots have been identified that could come forward in the next five years which would effectively deliver the whole need until the end of the plan period for Travelling Show-people. However only 8 pitches have been identified for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation, leaving a shortfall of 15 pitches against the five year housing need figure.
- 5.9 The borough of Reigate & Banstead is heavily constrained by features such as flooding, AONB, heritage assets and protected nature sites. Even so, almost 300 sites have been identified and assessed for potential Traveller sites to demonstrate that a thorough approach has been taken to identifying potential sites and a robust assessment has been applied as set out above. Whilst a five year supply cannot currently be demonstrated, the measures taken to address this have been thorough, proportionate and appropriate.
- 5.10 This is reflective of the situation for non-Traveller housing; Reigate & Banstead Borough Council demonstrated at the Core Strategy stage that it was not able to meet its objectively assessed need of 640 homes a year and the target was set at 460 homes a year recognising the level of constraint.

6. Assessment: Potential of Broad Locations

Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs)

- 5.9 PPTS requires that Local Plans should identify a supply of specific developable sites or broad locations for growth for years 6 to 10 and, where possible, broad locations for growth for years 11-15 of the plan period. In accordance with the NPPG² broad locations can include potential urban extensions.
- 5.10 The draft Regulation 19 DMP document includes 12 Urban Extension sites which are potentially suitable for Traveller provision, since national planning policy encourages the delivery of Traveller sites in sustainable locations, along with integration and co-existence with the settled community. By their nature, the urban extension sites are on the edge of settlements, and therefore also have the potential to provide the more rural/semi-rural location often preferred by Travellers.
- 5.11 This approach finds favour with the PPTS and *Designing Traveller Sites Guidance* which both promote the importance of integrating Traveller provision within mixed communities. The latter also specifically encourages Councils to consider opportunities for Traveller provision on major new housing developments.
- 5.12 The housing trajectory prepared to support the draft Regulation 19 DMP document indicates that urban extensions will be required from 2022 onwards. The projected timescales for the commencement of SUEs means that they provide only a longer term opportunity to meet Traveller accommodation needs. Nevertheless, it is considered appropriate to evaluate what potential may exist to provide Traveller accommodation on SUEs over the plan period.
- 5.13 In assessing the potential capacity which might realistically be provided as part of SUEs, there are a number of factors to consider, which include:
- The need to ensure that the ability of the broad areas to provide the requisite amount of conventional housing is not compromised;
 - The need to ensure that provision would not make sites unviable; and
 - The need to ensure that the scale of Traveller provision would not be disproportionate to, or dominate, established settled communities, particularly once any existing sites are taken into account.
- 5.14 In addition, there is evidence that the greatest preference of the Traveller community is that for family sites; limited interest was shown in larger mixed

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

sites. There is also a preference for private sites. Therefore, it is more practical that sites provide no more than 3 to 4 pitches (most appropriate for a single/extended family).

- 5.15 Provision of land for Traveller accommodation within SUEs will reduce the developable area for conventional housing. As stated above there is a need to ensure that, coupled with other policy requirements, this additional burden would not compromise the achievement of viable development on any site. It is therefore considered that a proposed rate of 1 pitch per 70 homes would present a viable rate of delivery (this rate is considered to represent a cost equivalent to approximately 2% of total development costs – including land and profit). This will be rounded up or down to the nearest pitch.
- 5.16 The table below (Table 7) sets out the housing figures considered most appropriate to be deliverable for each site, for all SUE sites identified within the draft Regulation 19 DMP document, along with the number of pitches these would provide, based on the rate above.

Table 7: Potential delivery of pitches/plots through Sustainable Urban Extensions

Broad Location	Site No.	No. of Homes Deliverable	No. of Pitches Achievable
East Redhill	ERM1	100	1
	ERM2/ERM3	210	3
East Merstham	ERM5	95	1
S&SW Reigate	SSW2	260	3
	SSW9	100	1
Horley	NWH1	75	1
	SEH4	70	1
		910 homes	11 pitches