

Officer Recommendation: Refused

DATE VALID - 7th August 2025
TARGET DATE - 2nd October 2025

APPLICATION NUMBER – 25/01303/F

LOCATION:

Rogers Of Redhill 22 Monson Road Redhill Surrey RH1 2ET

APPLICANT:

St Marks Properties (XIX) Ltd
20-22 Wenlock Rad
London
N1 7GU

AGENT:

PD Planning UK Ltd
2 Fieldend
Horsham
RH12 4GY

PROPOSAL:

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 2 pairs of two-storey, semi-detached (2-bed, 3-person) houses and a detached two-storey (2-bed, 3-person) house, together with associated amenity space, landscaping, car parking, cycle parking and bin storage.

SITE VISIT DATE: 5th September 2025

CONSULTATIONS

County Highway Authority (CHA) - Requested additional information requested

Environment Agency (EA) - Objection raised on the grounds that the development would be built on a culverted river and the submitted information fails to identify the presence of the culverted main river.

Contaminated Land Officer - No objection subject to conditions and informatives.

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours - Objections have been made on the following grounds:

- Drainage/sewage capacity
- Out of character with surrounding area
- Overdevelopment
- Overbearing relationship
- Poor design
- Flooding
- Inadequate parking
- Inconvenience during construction
- Increase in traffic and congestion
- Hazard to highway safety
- Loss of private view
- Noise & disturbance
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Overshadowing
- Property devalue (a non planning matter)

Comments in support:

- Support - Visual amenity benefits

- Support - Benefit to housing need
- Support - Community/regeneration benefit
- Support - Economic growth / jobs

Councillors - No comments made or request for referral to planning committee

POLICY CONTEXT

Urban Area

Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy policies CS1, CS4 and CS10

Reigate & Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 (DMP) Policies DES1 DES2 DES5 TAP1 EMP4 CCF1 CCF2 INF1

Other Relevant Considerations - National Planning Policy Framework, supplementary planning guidance 'Householder Extensions and Alterations', Human Rights Act 1998

SITE AND CHARACTER APPRAISAL

The site comprises a commercial tile showroom premises and builders yard/ warehouse buildings which is now vacated, located on a backland site behind properties in Monson Road, Lyndale Road and London Road. The site is accessed by two points of access one between 20 and 24 Monson Road by an existing track which extends across the width of the site frontage up to the flank elevations and side boundaries of the dwellings either side; the other located between 18 and 22 Lyndale Road.

The site has most recently been a tiling/ bathroom retailer and includes a number of buildings, including a large, pitched roof structure, a two storey flat/shallow pitched roof tight to the rear boundary and a number of other smaller ancillary buildings. The remaining surface of the site is predominantly covered by hard standing and accordingly considered previously developed land.

The topography of the site is generally flat. The site is surrounded by Victorian and interwar housing including detached, semi-detached and short terraces. The area is characterised by consistent building lines, long narrow plots, predominately residential with variations in the housing designs. Surrounding roads are no subject to controls however it is noted that many houses have dropped kerbs therefore on street parking is somewhat limited.

ADDED VALUE

Improvements secured at the pre-application stage:

Pre-application advice was not sought from the local planning authority prior to submission.

Improvements secured during the course of the application:

None as the application is deemed to be unacceptable on a number of grounds and is to be recommended for refusal.

Further improvements to be secured through conditions or legal agreement:

None as the application is to be recommended for refusal.

PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

There is no planning or enforcement history related to the site.

PRINCIPAL ISSUES

The application seeks permission to demolish the existing buildings on site and construct two pairs of two storey semi-detached dwellinghouses and a detached two storey dwelling (2 bed 3 person) with associated amenity space, landscaping, parking and bin storage.

The main issues are:

- o Principle of the development
- o Loss of the existing retail use
- o Design and impact on the character of the area
- o Effect upon neighbour amenity
- o Amenity of future occupants
- o Trees and landscaping
- o BNG
- o Highway matters
- o Flooding and drainage
- o Sustainability, infrastructure and climate change
- o CIL
- o Affordable Housing

PRINCIPLE OF THE DEVELOPMENT

The application site is situated within the urban area where there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and where the principle of such residential development is acceptable in land use terms. Appropriate residential growth is actively encouraged by the Core Strategy, in line with the "urban areas first" approach in Policy CS6. This is reinforced within the Introductory section of the Development Management Plan 2019 (DMP) which states that the Core Strategy is an 'urban areas first' strategy. Where priority is given to the identified regeneration areas and main settlements. Therefore there is no objection to the principle of residential development in this location.

LOSS OF THE EXISTING EMPLOYMENT USE

The development proposes the loss of the existing buildings which are used as former builder's yard and workshop/storage buildings.

Policy EMP4 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 (DMP) states the following:

1. The loss of employment land and premises will only be permitted if:

- a. it can be clearly demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of (or demand for) the retention or redevelopment of the site for employment use (see Annex 3 for information on what will be required to demonstrate this); or
- b. the loss of employment floorspace is necessary to enable a demonstrable improvement in the quality and suitability of employment accommodation; or
- c. the proposal would provide a public benefit which would outweigh the loss of the employment floorspace.

2. Where loss is justified under (1) above, proposals for non-employment uses will only be permitted if they would not adversely affect the efficient operation or economic function of other employment uses or businesses in the locality.

The above policy requires applications for the loss of employment uses to meet a, b or c. The applicant has submitted a marketing report (Seymoures Land and New Homes 27th June 2025). The report advises that interest was shown in the building from commercial and residential parties, however ultimately declined to proceed due to the tucked away location and condition of the building.

Annex 3 of the Councils DMP requires that marketing exercises are required to provide certain information in order to determine whether the site has been appropriately marketed. The site was actively marketed directly to local and regional occupiers and through targeted mailout to developers, showroom operators and small business users. It is not clear from the marketing report or planning statement that the property was marketed more widely. The report is also absent of any detail regarding sale or rental price, and there is no valuation report.

Since March 2024 to March 2025 interest was shown from 5 residential developers, 2 nursery's, 3 showrooms (bathroom and interiors), and 2 car garages. The reasons for declining to proceed include inappropriate layout of the building, too small a site, limited visibility/ lack of frontage footfall and the amount of work required to the building to make it suitable.

Whilst not all the requirements of Annex 3 have been met, the secluded location away from any identified local commercial centre within a residential area is unlikely to generate substantial interest in a commercial use due to its lack of visibility, and the small footprint is likely to limit viability for a business. In any case, it is considered that EMP4 (c) has been met on the basis that a commercial operation, particularly one involving a light industrial use, is likely to generate a greater level of disturbance for residents. The marketing report suggests that the buildings fall within uses class B and E. The planning history suggests that the site has been used for general industrial uses dating back to 1970 when it was used as a builder's yard. There are no restrictions imposed on the building that would prevent the building being used for a range of industrial uses that would be undesirable for a residential area. Therefore a residential use in this location would be considered a benefit in this case. Part 2 of policy EMP4 of the DMP has been met on the basis that given the isolated nature of the site there are no other nearby employment uses that would be adversely affected by the loss of the existing use. The Holmethorpe industrial estate, a principle employment area in the Borough, is less than 1km away, and provides greater opportunity for employment uses. The application site would make use of underutilised brownfield site, in accordance with para. 125 (c) which requires LPAs to give substantial weight to using brownfield sites within settlements for homes, proposals for which should be approved unless other substantial harm would be caused.

Considering the above considerations there would not be an objection to the principle of the loss of the existing employment use. The proposed development is therefore deemed to comply with Policy EMP4 in this regard.

DESIGN AND IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA

The proposed development would comprise two pairs of semi-detached two bedroom dwellings and a detached two bedroom dwelling, following the demolition of existing buildings on site. The dwellings would be 9m in height to the ridge and approx. 7.5m in depth. They would be pitched roof gable ended properties with decorative bargeboards above one of the front windows. There would be a mix of red and yellow stock bricks for external construction with a mix of red and dark grey roof tiles. Windows and doors would be white. Three rooflights and solar panels would feature to the rear roof plane along PV panels. The overall plot depths would vary between approx.. 13m and 13.5m accounting for the irregular rear boundary. The separation between plots 2-3 would be 1.3m and between plots 4-5 would be 1.1m.

Bike storage is proposed to the rear and refuse stored at the front. Each dwelling would feature an air source heat pump. Parking would be contained to the northern corner of the site.

Policy DES1 of the DMP 2019 requires new development to have due regard to the layout, density, plot sizes, building siting, scale, massing, height, and roofscapes of the surrounding area, the relationship to neighbouring buildings, and important views into and out of the site.

Policy DES2, in relation to infill development, requires developments to be designed to respect the scale, form and external materials of existing buildings in the locality to reinforce local distinctiveness. It should be of a height, bulk, mass, and siting to ensure the development is in keeping with the existing street scene, and incorporate plot widths,

front garden depths, building orientation and spacing between buildings that are in keeping with the prevailing layout in the locality.

The proposed external appearance of the dwellings would not be objectionable. Their form would not be out of keeping with the Victorian and interwar period housing that typifies the area, including the proposed materials. There is a mix of materials in the street including yellow stock bricks.

However due to the height, depth, scale and layout/ siting of the dwellings, coupled with the shallow plot size and limited separation between the dwellings, the scheme would appear unacceptably cramped and overdeveloped. The existing scale of development at this site is single storey with a maximum height of approx. 4.9m. The footprints of the dwellings are situated to the very front of the plots, very close to the access, leaving minimal space for meaningful soft landscaping in front of the dwellings. This further exacerbates the cramped appearance of the development. Having considered the surrounding area, whilst there is clearly a range of plot size along both Monson Road and Lyndale Road the majority are substantially larger than the proposed. Whilst the separation between plots 2-3 and plots 4-5 would be comparable to other properties locally in isolation, the limited distance in conjunction with the issues of height, scale, depth and plot size would contribute further to the overdeveloped nature of the proposal. The scheme would result in harm to the character of the area and is deemed to fail to accord with the requirements of policies DES1 and DES2 of the DMP 2019 in this regard.

NEIGHBOUR AMENITY

The proposed development site would back on to the rear gardens of numbers 16 to 20 Monson Road, and the rear elevations would face across the rear gardens of 6 to 16 Monson Road. The south east elevation would face towards 18 and 20 Monson Road. The front elevations would face towards the rear gardens of 2 to 18 Lyndale Road, as well as obliquely towards the rear gardens of 20 to 36 Lyndale Road and 24 to 34 Monson Road.

Beginning with the relationship with 6 to 20 Monson Road, the bulk of plot 1 would be 7.1m from the rear garden boundary of 20 Monson Road and 1m from that of number 18. The development would not be particularly overbearing in nature on number 20 however this would not be the case with 18 and 16, with the two storey scale appearing particularly dominant over the rear gardens of these properties. The rear facing first floor windows of the 5 dwellings would result in a level of overlooking over rear gardens, particularly of 6 to 16 Monson Road, that would be unacceptable. Whilst some overlooking occurs mutually from these properties already, it is not as direct as would be the case from the new dwellings, which would feel particularly unneighbourly. A window in the side elevation of plot 1 would face 18-20 however this could be conditioned to be obscure glazed to restrict overlooking. It is noted that detail of light impact/ overshadowing has not been provided, however the increase in scale and positioning relative to the neighbouring properties would likely give rise to limited overshadowing to a significant portion of the rear garden of 16 Monson Road.

Turning to properties to the north east of the site along Lyndale Road (2-18), the distance between dwellings would be in excess of 25m therefore the relationship with the new dwellings would not be particularly overbearing, nor would there be substantial enough views in to rear facing windows such that overlooking would be an issue. However the front facing windows would look into the rear gardens to a level that would be unacceptable. Harmful overlooking would occur to the rear gardens of 2 to 12 Lyndale Road. There would be a greater level of separation with 14-18 Lyndale Road such that the level of overlooking would be less harmful. The separation with 20-36 would be approx. 19m at the closest which would not be overbearing. The views from

front windows would be more oblique and limited such that there is not a concern about overlooking. The single proposed side window of plot 5 could be conditioned to be obscure glazed. This would also be the case with 24 to 34 Monson Road, where views would be reasonably oblique resulting in limited overlooking.

There would be some noise associated with vehicle movements along the access and parking area. However this site was previously commercial where there would have been a comparable level of vehicle movements such that level of harm in this respect would be quite neutral.

In light of the above it is considered that the proposed development would give rise to substantial harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties and would therefore not comply with Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 in this regard.

AMENITY OF FUTURE OCCUPANTS

Policy DES5 of the Development Management Plan 2019 (DMP) emphasises the importance of ensuring that new residential development must be of a high quality and provides good living standards for future occupiers. One of the requirements of policy DES5 is that new accommodation must meet the Nationally Described Internal Space Standard (NDSS). Policy DES2 of the DMP requires new development to be carefully designed to ensure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants.

The standards require a two storey two bedroom property to a minimum of 70sqm of residential floorspace. The proposed floorplans demonstrate that this standard has been met. The dwellings would be appropriately laid out avoiding awkward shaped rooms, and rooms would be served by appropriately placed windows providing light and outlook.

Each dwelling would have a rear garden. However the gardens would be very small, with plot 1 having the deepest garden at approx. 5.3m, plot 5 having the smallest at approx. 4.1m. Whilst national and local Policy does not provide a minimum garden size that should be provided and each case should be assessed on an individual basis, it is considered that in this case the garden sizes would be unacceptably small even for a two bedroom dwelling. It is noted that each dwelling would feature a large study in the roof. Whilst assessed as a two bed property, this room would be of a sufficient size to provide a further double bedroom. Should this occur then this would generate further concern regarding the small size of the garden. On this basis it is not considered that the development would be acceptable in terms of outdoor amenity provision for future occupants, failing to accord with Policies DES2 and DES5 of the DMP 2019.

TREES AND LANDSCAPING

The site is largely devoid of trees and vegetation, however the submitted Tree Survey identifies 1 silver birch (T1) along the access, an off-site silver birch (T2), and an off-site cypress hedging trees (G3) in relation to existing site boundary. T1 is categorised as B1 moderate quality with a life expectancy of 20+ years, T2 as low quality with a life expectancy of 10+ years, and G3 as low quality with a life expectancy of 20+ years. The root protection area (RPAs) were identified and no incursions in to the RPAs are required. Minor trimming and pruning are recommended for T1 and T2 to improve the access. Trimming would occur to G3 to create separation from the proposed development. No trees are proposed to be removed to accommodate the development. The proposed buildings are outside the shading area therefore it is not anticipated that there would be pressure to remove the trees to prevent shading. Appropriate tree protection measures would be in place, including fencing, trunk wrapping and careful demolition practices. On this basis, subject to a condition requiring a tree protection plan

to be submitted for approval, the development would not harm trees and would comply with Policy NHE3 of the DMP in this regard.

BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN

In accordance with government guidance, the application site would be considered as a de minimis exemption for Biodiversity Net Gain contributions. The applicants' planning statement sets out the following:

The application site is entirely hard-surfaced with concrete and buildings and the development will therefore not have any adverse impact upon on-site priority habitat. It impacts on less than 25 square metres of on-site habitat with a biodiversity value greater than zero (in that there is no on-site habitat), and it impacts on less than 5 metres of on-site linear habitats such as hedgerows (in that there are no hedgerows). Furthermore, there are no statutory or non-statutory designations within or near the site and there are no natural habitat features within the site to which a 10% increase can be applied. It is therefore conclusive that the development is subject to the de-minimus exemption and below the threshold for the biodiversity gain condition.

Having carried out a site visit it is clear that the site is devoid of any meaningful habitats and is comprised almost entirely of built form and hard surfacing. Where vegetation is present it falls within the ownership of neighbouring properties surrounding the site and outside of the site boundary. In the event that planning permission were granted a landscaping scheme would offer the opportunity for modest improvements to the biodiversity of the site, however in this case the required 10% biodiversity net gain provision is not applicable.

HIGHWAY MATTERS

The site is located in an area of medium accessibility. In accordance with standards each 2 bed dwelling would require 1 parking space. A single visitor space would be required, therefore 6 required in total. The site layout shows that the required parking would be provided. The existing access would be utilised.

The county Highway Authority (CHA) has been consulted on the application. They have raised no objection to the parking provision, however they note that information relating to pedestrian visibility splays and sightlines from the access point have not been provided, and that there is an absence of detail relating to turning circles/ visibility splays for larger vehicles. In the absence of this detail it cannot be determined whether or not the development would impact the safe operation of the highway. Therefore the development would fail to meet the requirements of Policy TAP1 in this regard, which requires developments to provide safe and convenient access for all road users, including increasing the risk of accidents or endangering the safety of road users including pedestrians, cyclists, and other vulnerable road users.

FLOODING AND DRAINAGE

Policy CCF1 of the DMP 2019 requires that new development proposals must not increase the existing and future risk of flooding elsewhere. Where possible, proposals should seek to secure opportunities to reduce both the cause and impact of flooding for existing and proposed development. The NPPF 2024 states at para. 170 that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Paragraph 181 advises that when determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that

flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment. Applications which could affect drainage on or around the site should incorporate sustainable drainage systems to control flow rates and reduce volumes of runoff, and which are proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal.

The Environment Agency (EA) has been consulted on this application as a statutory consultee. The EA advise that the proposed development would require building upon a culverted main river. The submitted information has failed to identify the presence of the culverted main river on site and proposes residential units on top of the path of the culvert. Building on top of the culvert will likely adversely affect the construction and stability of the culvert, which will compromise its function. The proposed development will therefore increase the risk of flooding to the immediate area. Additionally, the proposal would impede any future flood risk management activities necessary for the culvert (e.g. widening), and restrict maintenance and emergency access to the watercourse. The permanent retention of a continuous unobstructed area is an essential requirement for future maintenance and improvement works. Paragraph 67 of the Planning Practice Guidance for Flood Risk and Coastal Change, which states that:

"Proposals to introduce new culverting or to build on top of existing culverting are likely to have adverse impacts on flood risk, ecology, human health and safety and amenity whilst increasing maintenance costs and hindering future options to restore the watercourse. Such proposals are likely to run contrary to natural flood management objectives and the objectives of River Basin Management Plans."

The development would be contrary to Reigate and Banstead's Development Management Policies (2019), Policy CCF2: Flood risk, and guidance set out in Reigate and Banstead's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1, in particular section 10.2 (development management policy). The proposal is also contrary to the flood risk requirements of the NPPF, in particular the requirements for future flood risk management (paragraph 172) and demonstrating proposals do not increase flood risk elsewhere (paragraph 170). The EA advise that as submitted, it is unlikely that a flood risk activity permit would be granted for this application.

SUSTAINABILITY, INFRASTRUCTURE AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Policy CCF1 of the Councils Development Management Plan 2019 seeks to ensure that all new development contributes to reducing carbon emissions. New development will be encouraged to incorporate passive and active energy efficiency measure and climate change resilience measures and renewable energy technologies. In order that the proposed development contributes to achieving these aims, in the event that planning permission is granted for development in the future, conditions requiring demonstration that it will meet the national water efficiency standard of 110litres/person/day. A further condition requiring the provision of broadband connection, in accordance with Policy INF3 of the DMP 2019, would also be attached to any grant of planning permission.

CIL (COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY)

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a fixed charge which the Council will be collecting from some new developments from 1 April 2016. It will raise money to help pay for a wide range of infrastructure including schools, roads, public transport and community facilities which are needed to support new development. This development would be CIL liable although, the exact amount would be determined and collected after the grant of planning permission.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Core Strategy Policy CS15 and the Council's Affordable Housing SPD require financial contributions towards affordable housing to be provided on housing developments of 1-9 units. However, the 2019 NPPF makes clear such contributions should not be sought from developments of 10 units or less.

In view of this the Council is not presently requiring financial contributions from applications such as this resulting in a net gain of 10 units or less. The absence of an agreed undertaking does not therefore warrant a reason for refusal in this case.

OTHER ISSUES

A number of issues have been raised within objections that are addressed below.

Loss of private view - there is no right to a view protected by the planning system. Whilst immediate outlook is a material consideration, it is not the view that this would be the case here.

Impact on property values - this is not a material consideration that can be taken into account.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set out above I consider that planning permission should be REFUSED.

In reaching this conclusion I have taken account of all other matters raised by this application but have found nothing that outweighs the main planning issues upon which I have based my recommendation. In reaching this conclusion I have had due regard to the articles and conventions of the Human Rights Act.

Permission be Refused

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposed development of 5 dwellings, by virtue of the height, depth, scale and footprint, coupled with the small plot sizes with limited opportunity for meaningful landscaping, would result in a cramped form of overdevelopment that would result in an unacceptable level of harm to the character of the area. The scheme would therefore be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 and Policies DES1 and DES2 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019.
2. The proposed development of 5 dwellings, by virtue of the height, depth, scale, footprint, coupled with the proposed front and rear facing windows, would result in a form of development that is both unacceptably overbearing on 16 and 18 Monson Road. The scheme would therefore be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 and Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 with regard to impact on neighbouring amenity.
3. The proposed development of 5 dwellings, by virtue of the front and rear facing windows, would give rise to unacceptable levels of overlooking to the rear gardens of 6 to 16 Monson Road and of 2 to 12 Lyndale Road. The scheme would therefore

be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 and Policy DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 with regard to impact on neighbouring amenity.

4. The proposed development of 5 dwellings, by virtue of the depth and footprint of the dwellings, would result in rear gardens that are unacceptably small for the size of dwellings proposed. The scheme would therefore be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 and Policies DES1, DES2 and DES5 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 with regard to impact on neighbouring amenity.
5. In the absence of sufficient information it cannot be determined whether the proposed development would give rise to highway safety issues at the site and whether larger vehicles would be able to enter or exit the site in a forward gear. The development would therefore fail to meet the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 and Policy TAP1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019.
6. The proposed development would build upon a culverted main river. The submitted information has failed to identify the presence of the culverted main river on site and proposes residential units on top of the path of the culvert. In the absence of evidence to the contrary it has not been demonstrated the development would not harm the construction and stability of the culvert, or compromise its function, and therefore increase the risk of flooding to the immediate area. Additionally, the proposal would impede any future flood risk management activities necessary for the culvert (e.g. widening), and restrict maintenance and emergency access to the watercourse. The permanent retention of a continuous unobstructed area is an essential requirement for future maintenance and improvement works. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 and Policy CCF2 of the Reigate and Baanstead Development Management Plan 2019.

Pro-active Statement:

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and whilst planning permission has been refused regard has been had to the presumption to approve sustainable development where possible, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.