



Reference number: 17/02192/FUL



PART 6: Planning Applications for Decision

Item 6.1

1 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION DETAILS

Ref: [17/02192/FUL](#) (*Link to associated documents on Planning Register*)
 Location: Queens Hotel, 122 Church Road, London, SE19 2UG
 Ward: South Norwood
 Description: Demolition of existing buildings to the centre and rear of the site and existing extensions to the roof, and the construction of a new spine building including glazed link to part retained mews building, an extension from the southwestern facing elevation of the existing locally listed building, a single storey extension to the restaurant, subterranean accommodation, parking, a swimming pool and servicing space, to create a total of 530 hotel rooms and 170 vehicle parking spaces, the re-cladding of the 1970's extension with ground floor canopy, provision of enhanced landscaping across the site including 3 coach parking spaces to the front, formation of a vehicle access and the adaption of existing entrance to the hotel.
 Drawing Nos: A2702 100 - R6, A2702 101 - R6, A2702 102 - R6, A2702 103 - R6, A2702 104 - R6, A2702 105 - R6, A2702 106 - R6, A2702 107 - R6, A2702 108 - R6, A2702 109 - R6, A2702 140 - R6, A2702 141 - R6, A2702 199 - R4, A2702 200 - R12, A2702 201 - R12, A2702 202 - R12, A2702 203 - R13, A2702 204 - R13, A2702 205 - R13, A2702 206 - R13, A2702 207 - R12, A2702 208 - R12, A2702 209 - R12, A2702 210 - R12, A2702 211 - R12, A2702 212 - R12, A2702 400 - R10, A2702 401 - R10, A2702 450 - R2, A2702 451 - R2 and A2702 452 - R2.
 Applicant: Queens Crystal Palace Euro Hotel (Jersey) Limited
 Agent: Mr Quelch, Bilfinger GVA
 Case Officer: Mr White

Type of floorspace	Existing floorspace	Amount lost	Amount proposed	Net increase following development
Hotel (C1)	10,015 Sq m	3,154 Sq m	24,199 Sq m	21,045 Sq m

Type of floorspace	Existing rooms / Rooms to be lost	Rooms proposed	Net additional rooms
Hotel (C1)	334 / 96 Rooms remaining 238	292	196 New total 530

Number of car parking spaces	Number of cycle parking spaces	Number of coach parking spaces
170 (net increase of 107)	40 (net increase of 40)	3 (net increase of 1)

Number of disability spaces	17
-----------------------------	----

1.1 This application is being reported to Planning Committee because objections above the threshold in the Committee Consideration Criteria have been received.

2 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That the Planning Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:

A. Any direction by the London Mayor pursuant to the Mayor of London Order

B. The prior completion of a legal agreement to secure the following planning obligations:

- a) Coach parking management plan
- b) Car parking management plan
- c) On site car club bay secured
- d) £20,000 contribution towards potentially establishing a resident's controlled parking zone – survey reviews 12 months after completion of the development
- e) Restriction of occupation 90 days
- f) Phasing
- g) £25,000 for improving signage in the vicinity
- h) Employment and Training Strategy
- i) Travel Plan monitoring
- h) Any other planning obligation(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport

2.2 That the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport has delegated authority to negotiate the legal agreement indicated above.

2.3 That the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport has delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions

- 1) Development to commence within 3 years of the date of permission
- 2) In accordance with submitted plans and documents.
- 3) Submission of details of external facing materials, key junctions, replacement canopy/shelter, roof, ventilation system, rainwater goods, cycle parking and platform lifts to the front.
- 4) Submission of details of lighting assessment.
- 5) Corridor windows on north west and north east elevations to be obscure glazed
- 6) Dining hall windows to be partially obscure glazed
- 7) Windows overlooking neighbouring communal garden from lower ground floor and upwards to be partial obscure glazed.
- 8) Windows of west elevation (rear) of mews obscure glazed and fixture shut
- 9) Submission of details of landscaping, boundary treatment, trees and green roofs.
- 10) Tree protection
- 11) Hours of use for function spaces and restaurant bars limited.
- 12) Use of gym, swimming pool, restaurant/dining areas and bar by hotel residents only.
- 13) Submission of Delivery servicing plan prior to occupation.

- 14) Submission of Construction Logistics and Demolition Plan (which shall include a site waste management plan).
- 15) In accordance with Sustainability and Energy assessment 35% betterment of building regulations in accordance with the submitted assessment.
- 16) Built to BREEAM 'Excellent' rating
- 17) In accordance with Noise Assessment
- 18) Limiting noise from air conditioning units.
- 19) Travel Plan
- 20) Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.
- 21) Basement Impact Assessment
- 22) Building recording.
- 23) Protection of Mews during the demolition and construction
- 24) Overheating strategy
- 25) 20% car parking spaces active electric vehicle charging points further 20% provided with passive provision.
- 26) Drainage schemes to be approved
- 27) Petrol / oil interceptors fitted in all car parking.
- 28) Piling method statement to be submitted
- 29) Impact study on water supply.
- 30) Highway works
- 31) In accordance with air quality report.
- 32) Contamination - site investigations
- 33) Roof space not to be used as outside amenity area etc.
- 34) CCTV, traffic signage, cycle stands, pedestrian visibility splays to be provided and retained.
- 35) Vehicle parking, access points, refuse storage and outdoor spaces to be provided as indicated in drawings.
- 36) Food ventilation equipment.
- 37) C1 use only
- 38) Phasing plan
- 39) Any other planning condition(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport, and

Informatives

- 1) CIL
 - 2) Removal of site notices
 - 3) Subject to Section 106 agreement
 - 4) Contact Network Management prior to commencement of development
 - 5) Thames water advice
 - 6) Ventilation guidance
 - 7) Any [other] informative(s) considered necessary by the Director of Planning
- 2.4 That the Planning Committee confirms that it has had special regard to the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and features of special architectural or historic interest as required by Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 2.5 That the Planning Committee confirms that it has paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Church Road Conservation Area Conservation Area as required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

- 2.6 That the Planning Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 2.7 That, if by 19 January 2018 the legal agreement has not been completed, the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport has delegated authority to refuse planning permission.

3 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

- 3.1 During the course of the application amendments were made, with the main ones being:
- The retention of part of the existing mews building forming boundary wall to rear of the site.
 - Reduction in proximity of basement car park to Wakefield Gardens.
 - Introduction of obscure windows overlooking Wakefield Gardens.
 - Windows provided at top floor level on the set back top floor of the Church Road façade.
 - Reduction in proposed massing of upper element of staircase in 1970s building.
 - The simplification of landscaping and canopy to front.
- 3.2 The application now comprises the following:
- Redevelopment, extensions and excavation to provide a total of 530 hotel rooms and 170 parking spaces.
 - Demolition of buildings to the rear of the site. This will be replaced with a new rear extension (4-6 height in storeys) that has two northwards projections (the eastern most is new at 2-4 storeys and the western one has one more floor of new accommodation on existing built form) and connect via a glazed courtyard to part retained mews building. Beneath this area is the subterranean accommodation (max 5 storeys) that comprises parking, servicing and hotel leisure facilities.
 - A 5 storey extension on the south-western corner of the building with basement accommodation.
 - Single storey dining room extension to the centre rear of the Hotel.
 - The proposals also include the recladding of the existing 1970s extension and the removal of an unsightly addition to the roof of the locally listed building and hotel canopies.
 - A new vehicle crossover is proposed, which allows coaches to enter and exit the site without crossing the pedestrian entrance. The vehicle crossover to the north of the site would remain providing access to car club spaces to the front and a two

way access road along the northern site boundary to serve an access ramp down into the subterranean parking levels.

- A new exit is to be provided immediately to the west of the main hotel entrance to be used by coaches and taxis. Space for 3 coaches to drop off/pick up.
- Provision of landscaping including new trees to the front of hotel addressing Church Road.

Site and Surroundings

- 3.3 The site falls within the Church Road Conservation Area and Queen's Hotel is a Locally Listed Building (dating to about 1854). The only part of the original building which remains relates to the central element of the building which fronts onto Church Road. Church Road is designated as a London Distributor Road and to the north of the site is the commercial area of Upper Norwood District Centre.
- 3.4 In the 1950s the southern wing of the Queens Hotel was demolished to create access to the Fitzroy Gardens housing estate to the west of Church Road. The hotel acquired number 120 Church Road and demolished the historic building to construct a large new northern wing in the 1970s.
- 3.5 The Queens Hotel occupies a prominent position on the street due to its large scale and massing set on a variety of planes. It is faced with stucco and decorative treatments include a projecting cornice supported by brackets, quoins and open balustrading. Unfortunately, the building includes a poorly designed extension from the 1970's.
- 3.6 The existing site is an operational hotel with 334 rooms, 38 car parking spaces at the front of the hotel and space for 25 cars to park at the rear of the hotel, bringing total onsite provision to 63 spaces (ratio of 0.19 spaces per room). There are also 2 informal spaces for coaches to drop off/pick up. No dedicated facilities currently exist for cyclists parking at the site.
- 3.7 The hotel overlooks a garden area to the west which provides communal amenity space for the houses in Fitzroy. To the south of the site is mostly residential, with a mixed character of hotel, office and residential accommodation to the north. The land level drops significantly to the rear of the site; ground level (level 0) is taken at the front of the site, the top of the ground floor level at the rear of the site is therefore roughly equivalent to the highest part of No.18 Fitzroy Gardens.
- 3.8 Nos 112-116 Church Road (immediately to the north-east) and Nos 181-203 Church Road are Locally Listed Buildings. Also Nos 124-128 Church Road (to the south-west) are statutorily listed.

Planning History

- 3.9 There is significant planning history for this site the most relevant of which is:
- 03/00366/P Alterations and refurbishment of residential/garage mews for use as boarding/guest house accommodation.
Not determined in December 2013 - **Dismissed** on appeal.
The Inspector concluded that the principle of refurbishment and re-use of building would have a beneficial impact on appearance of conservation

area, but detail parts are inappropriate and would result in harm to the character and appearance of the building, and in consequent the wider area.

Change of intensity of existing windows that face properties on Wakefield Gardens would result in neighbours feeling that they are being overlooked and harm amenity. Also additional possibility that some noise and disturbance would arise from time to time.

08/03440/P Alterations; use of mews block as staff accommodation.

Granted in October 2008

12/01967/P Installation of replacement white aluminium windows in front and rear block extensions

Granted in January 2013.

12/02331/P Erection of a four-storey front/side extension with accommodation in the roofspace to provide an additional 25 bedrooms.

Refused in October 2013 on grounds of design and appearance of the extension and traffic generation, congestion and parking.

12/03242/P Construction of canopy to north part of building.

Granted in May 2013.

13/02919/P Erection of external lift at entrance.

Refused in October 2013.

14/03670/P Installation of glazing to the northern flank elevation at lower ground floor level.

Granted in November 2014.

14/03472/P Erection of four storey front/side extension (including lower ground, ground, first and second floors) to provide an additional 24 rooms; alteration of car parking arrangement and associated landscaping works.

Granted in April 2015. Subject to S106 - not implemented as yet.
(this permission relates to the southern element proposed under a different guise for this scheme)

15/02363/LP Removal of existing internal fittings, and the construction of internal partitions and fittings. The application also sought to create an additional 64 bedrooms in connection with the existing Use Class C1 - Hotels.

Certificate Granted 24.09.2015.

15/05742/P Installation of new windows to the northern flank elevation at lower ground floor level to provide natural light to 5 hotel guest rooms.

Granted in March 2016

17/04332/FUL Erection of a ground and lower ground floor rear extension, to accommodate additional ancillary hotel space, and associated works.

Under Consideration.

Land adjoining No.2 Fitzroy Gardens

15/02255/P Erection of 2 three bedroom three storey attached houses; formation of vehicular access and provision of associated parking; provision of bin and cycle stores.

Refused in August 2015.

Allowed on appeal March 2016.

Pre-application

16/00019/PRE – Development Team Service application submitted in January 2016, has under gone a number of meeting and workshops, and been presented at a planning committee. The main issues raised at the Developer Presentation meeting (28 July 2016) were as follows:

Design and Massing:

- The Committee stressed the importance of newbuild being sympathetic to and enhancing the heritage design, also providing some symmetry
- Concern over 10% of windowless rooms (examples to be provided for information) - site visit may well prove useful
- Keen to see significant improvement to the street scene - overcladding of 1970s block welcomed.
- High quality design is important - modern interpretation enhancing the heritage building is a positive step but more work needs to be carried out to ensure that the vision is fully realised
- Enhancement of the historic elements of the scheme need to be captured early on in the project.
- Removal of additional top on existing building also considered positive.
- Canopy - the emerging design should not include the existing canopy arrangement, with a new entrance feature incorporated to complement emerging design approaches.

Transport and parking Issues:

- Increased parking provision welcomed with on site car parking higher % per room.
- Some concern over how parking will work - more detail required to ensure overspill kept to a minimum.
- Concern over coach parking - particularly in front of the hotel - not to have a negative impact.
- Possibility of ensuring overnight parking of coaches is off site.

Landscaping:

- Positive plans for landscaping at the front.
- Concern over impact of the basement excavations on trees at the rear.

Other issues:

- Considered a positive opportunity for up to 100 new jobs to be for local people as much as possible - but applicant will need to engage with the Council's job brokerage service.
- Importance of minimising the impact on neighbours.
- Opportunity to develop a more positive relationship with local residents with the public consultation - especially in respect of transportation impacts, car/coach parking and the overall vision for the hotel.

4 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 The application is acceptable in principle, a view which has been confirmed by the Greater London Authority.
- 4.2 The proposed development would provide minor enhancements to the Conservation Area and not harm the setting of nearby Listed Buildings. Whilst there is some minor harm to the locally listed building there are some minor enhancements and on balance the proposal would preserve the significance of the locally listed building.
- 4.3 The overall design successfully integrates the building within the wider context, ensuring that it respects the general character of the area through the use of high quality materials which respond to the historic context. The approach to massing ensures that both the south wing and rear spine elements do not appear overly dominant. The appearance of the massing is softened by the use of complementary but varying materials and interesting brick features.
- 4.4 The quality of accommodation for future hotel users is acceptable.
- 4.5 No trees will be lost and those existing will be suitably protected. A landscaping scheme will enhance the surrounds.
- 4.6 The application has demonstrated that the proposed buildings would not have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of adjoining occupiers.
- 4.7 The need for the proposed parking at a provision of 0.32 a room and 3 coach spaces has been evidenced through the submission of a Transport Assessment. Car and coach parking management plans, along with a travel plan and a post development survey will suitably control and mitigate the highway impact.
- 4.8 The development would meet BREEAM level 'Excellent' for the commercial aspect and would offset 35% of carbon emissions above a baseline of the 2013 Building Regulations. Subject to conditions suitable drainage, overheating, air quality and contamination mitigation/details can be secured.

5 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

- 5.1 The views of the Planning Service are expressed in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section below.
- 5.2 The following were consulted regarding the application:

GLA (Statutory Consultee)

- The principle of expanding the existing hotel and improving the quality of visitor accommodation is supported.
- The approach taken to layout and massing is appropriate.
- The proposal enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would not impact the setting of nearby statutory listed buildings.
- The proposals would enhance the appearance of the locally listed building. No harm to heritage assets as a result of the proposal.
- Whilst it is not possible to provide level access throughout, the accessibility of the building would be improved, which is welcomed. 10% of the new hotel rooms would be accessible.

- Further information regarding overheating, the on-site heat network and renewable energy is required.
- The applicant has identified a lack of comparable sites in the TRICS database; however, a site survey for the existing trips was not undertaken. The TRAVL sites used are also old and therefore contrary to TfL's TA Best Practice guidance, and the walk mode share is considered to be high considering the nature and location of the site. Further work is required.
- Applicant should further reduce the car parking provision. 20% of all car parking spaces will be active electric vehicle charging points which is welcomed, however, a further 20% of all car parking spaces should be provided with passive provision
- Off street car club bay is welcomed and should be secured through a S.106. A travel plan should monitor usage.
- Proposed drop-off/pick-up loop dedicated to coaches and taxis in front of the development is welcomed, however, the possibility of facilitating a taxi rank on site should be investigated.
- Coach parking bays have been proposed on site which is 8 spaces short the applicant should identify how the shortfall in spaces will be compensated for in a coach management plan, final version should be secured by condition.
- Level of cycle parking is policy compliant. Applicant is requested to reconsider the location and storage of long-stay spaces.
- Pedestrian environment review survey audit report is welcomed. As some of the low scores were a result of poor signage, a contribution of £25,000 payable to Croydon Council is sought towards improving signage in the vicinity.
- Draft travel plan and delivery and servicing plan should be amended to reflect TFL's comments.

TFL (Statutory Consultee)

- Trip generation should be amended through the use of on site surveys and TRICS data.
- Reduction in car parking to be investigated
- Passive EVCPs to be provided and secured
- Possibility of facilitating a taxi rank on site to be investigated
- Justification of off-site coach parking bays
- The location and storage of long-stay cycle parking spaces to be reconsidered
- Contribution towards signage in the vicinity is sought (£25,000)
- Travel Plan to be amended and secured through S106
- Delivery and Servicing to be amended and secured by condition
- Draft submission of a Construction Logistics Plan and thereafter secured by condition

Historic England – Listed Buildings (Statutory Consultee)

- Hotel makes a substantial contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, and is an important local landmark.
- Recognises the benefits in the proposed demolition of the 1970s northern extension. (Officer comment: the 1970's extension is to be cladded and the top canopy removed, but not demolished).
- Proposal includes the demolition of a significant number of ancillary structures and extensions, many of which feature historic elements. Single storey southern

extension has a particularly pleasing streetscape presence. These elements make a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area.

- The level of harm is clearly less than substantial. Harm should be weighed against the public benefits.
- Removal of the unsightly roof extension above the main entrance building will improve the architectural character of this key conservation area building. However, the introduction of a large extension at the south end would add a considerable bulk to the site. This could be mitigated by reducing the height of the northern extension by a storey, or at least setting the top floor back further, to improve the prominence of the historic hotel building in views along Church Road.

Historic England – Archaeology (Statutory Consultee)

- Recommend No Archaeological Requirement

LLFA (Statutory Consultee)

- Objection – further calculations and information required to overcome concerns.

Thames Water (Consultee)

- Recommends conditions and informatives.

North Croydon Conservation Area Advisory Panel (Consultee)

- Strongly object.
- Lack many of the amenities normally associated with large hotels.
- Question whether this is a suitable site for large extension.
- Result in the demolition of the historic mews building.
- Southern extension worsens piecemeal character as an unsympathetic element, and significantly increases the scale and massing of the structure.
- Buildings to the rear, of up to six stories, with no significant spaces between them to break up their visual impact, would further compound the huge detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the Conservation Area.
- Recladding improvement is negligible, since the incongruous scale, height and massing of this extension would be unchanged, and it is vastly outweighed by the expansion of the hotel to the south and to the rear.
- Detrimental to the setting of other attractive heritage assets nearby.
- Overdevelopment, out of keeping, which manifests itself in its numerous unacceptable features, including its visual impact on the Conservation Area and adjoining properties, the unsatisfactory nature of its accommodation, the need to undertake deep and disruptive excavations, and the highly negative traffic and parking impacts.

The following were consulted regarding the submission of amended drawings:

GLA (Statutory Consultee)

- No further comments received.

TFL (Statutory Consultee)

- Support the scheme.
- Trip generation - TfL sought the clarification of figures, and through discussion with the applicant, TfL are now satisfied with the trip generation.
- Reduction in car parking to be investigated - would have preferred to see a lower provision overall, however, the applicant should ensure measures are included within the Travel Plan to promote sustainable travel to / from the site. In addition it is understood that this level of parking is to resolve concerns over the impact for on street parking in the area which have been agreed with the Council.
- EVCP's - A further 20% of all car parking spaces should provide passive EVCPs. S106 should also secure the car club bay facility and contribution to review the CPZ requirements as agreed with the council.
- Taxi rank - accepts argument that the provision of a taxi rank would result in a reduction in coach parking, and are therefore content with the proposed provisions within the forecourt.
- Justification of offsite coach parking bays - welcomes that an updated CMP will be prepared and agreed prior to first occupation in consultation with LB Croydon and TfL, secured by condition.
- Long-stay cycle parking spaces - provision of a minimum 38 spaces satisfies the London Plan requirements.
- Travel Plan - requested that the use of car club bays are monitored through the Travel Plan (TP) to determine the demand for car club bays. This information was amended. The information on the Travel Plan is welcomed and the document should be updated. The final version secured, enforced, monitored and reviewed through a S106 agreement.
- Delivery and Servicing Plan - should be secured by condition and discharged in consultation with TfL.
- The final version of the CPMP should be secured by condition, discharged in consultation with TfL prior to occupation.

Historic England – Listed Buildings (Statutory Consultee)

- Pleased to see revisions that includes the reduction in height of the 1970s stair tower frontage which should improve the visual relationship between the Victorian entrance portion and the northern extension.
- Encouraged by the proposed retention of some of the ancillary rear elements such as the mews building.
- Textured brick samples as photographed in the overview document appear high quality.
- Whilst the main entrance canopy has now been simplified, further design details should be provided. (Officer Comment: Such details can be secured by condition).
- Whilst the demolition of the single storey southern wing is undesirable, consider this revised scheme to be a significant improvement on the original application.
- Content for your Council to determine the application without further Historic England involvement.

Historic England – Archaeology (Statutory Consultee)

- No further comments received.

LLFA (Statutory Consultee)

- No objection, subject to conditions.

Thames Water (Consultee)

- No change from first set of comments.

North Croydon Conservation Area Advisory Panel (Consultee)

- Despite the proposed retention of the mews buildings to the rear of the site which is welcome, previous comments are maintained. In addition concerns are raised over the quality of hotel rooms/accommodation and that it would be a continuation of the current downmarket budget hotel.

6 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 The application has been publicised by way of one or more site notices displayed in the vicinity of the application site. The application has also been publicised in the local press. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 249 Objecting: 249 Supporting: 0 Comment: 0

No of petitions received: 0

- 6.2 Representations have been made from the following local groups/societies (all objecting):

- The Norwood Society
- Fitzroy Wakefield Action group
- Regency Garden management (Upper Norwood) Ltd
- Crystal Palace Triangle Planning Group

- 6.3 The following issues were raised in representations. Those that are material to the determination of the application, are addressed in substance in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section of this report:

Principle

- No justification. Sequential test should include Croydon centre
- No need/demand for a large hotel in this location
- No impact assessment

Townscape

- Loss of attractive Victorian buildings as well as less attractive ones
- Out of keeping
- Overdevelopment
- Loss of historical buildings
- Adverse impact on the Church Road Conservation Area and nearby listed properties
- Out of character
- Massing / oversized / bulky design
- Uninspiring
- Unsympathetic
- Will not preserve and enhance

- Front extension and recladding will overwhelm the core building
- Original buildings destroyed.
- Diminish the significance of the original 1850's Queen's Hotel building as a locally listed landmark
- Three times above the density guide recommended for a comparable residential scheme
- View of hotel block by coaches.
- Unsightly
- Recladding must be fireproof
- Hotel should be viewed as a whole and therefore not assessed holistically
- Materials not derived from locality
- Does not relate to setting
- Not a suitable location
- Encloses end of street view

Neighbour amenity

- Outlook impacted
- Overshadowing and loss of daylight
- Overlooking
- Risks to the structural integrity of adjoining properties from basement.
- No information on management methods for safe and efficient basement construction
- Will increase anti-social behaviour
- Noise and disturbance from operation and construction
- Construction may cause subsidence
- Loss of a boundary wall
- Loss of a view (OFFICER COMMENT: This is not a material planning consideration)
- Sense of enclosure created

Quality of accommodation

- Substandard hotel. Many rooms with no windows. Rooms small in size.
- Energy information needs expanding
- No staff accommodation
- No community/public benefit

Environment

- Increase air and light pollution
- Impact on water flows
- Wildlife and trees destroyed
- Map within FRA not correct

Transport

- Increased congestion. Church Road cannot take more traffic
- Travel assessment inadequate
- Insufficient vehicle parking
- Parking will spill into local streets
- Paid parking would create overspill
- Site not accessible
- Strain on public transport

- Object to any increase in car parking spaces
- Will increase foot traffic
- Will create inappropriate parking on local roads
- Contribution to CPZ would not be a good solution

Other

- Building works should be carried out at a reasonable time
- Phasing shows re-cladding last
- CIL should be spent locally
- Objection received but gives some credit to the extent to which the hotel has become a much better neighbour in recent years. Comment states that it is evident that the hotel has turned its focus away from often late, loud and disruptive parties to now providing accommodation for tourist groups and building firms

Non-material issues

- Impact on house values (OFFICER COMMENT: This is not a material planning consideration)
- Health, safety and assurances regarding construction works (OFFICER COMMENT: This is not a material planning consideration and separate legislation controls this)
- Poor reputation of operator (OFFICER COMMENT: This is not a material planning consideration)
- Hotel management/ Euro hotels group has not been receptive to issues previously raised with them (OFFICER COMMENT: This does not relate to the application submission and is not a material planning consideration)

Procedure issues

- Why would Croydon Council even consider any of their development applications (OFFICER COMMENT: If someone puts in a planning application in the proper way, as is the case in this instance, the Council has to process/deal with it. The Council cannot refuse to accept a planning application.)
- The hotel is buying properties in the local roads (OFFICER COMMENT: This is not relevant to the application submission)
- Further community engagement should have occurred in pre-app (OFFICER COMMENT: The extent of pre-application consultation is a matter for the applicant. The application has been advertised by the Council in accordance with requirements).

6.4 Steve O'Connell [London Assembly Member] has made the following representations (objecting):

- Overdevelopment and new visitor accommodation should be focussed in town centres which provide good public transport access
- Out of keeping with Church Road Conservation Area, which comprises a mid/low rise detached residential area with well-spaced buildings;
- Parking provision is inadequate and could negatively impact on surrounding residents;
- The site has poor accessibility to public transport;
- Negative impact on the designation of the 1850's Queens Hotel building as a locally listed landmark.

6.5 Fiona Twycross [London Wide Assembly Member] has made the following representations (objecting):

- Multi-story car close to resident's gardens and would overlook their properties.
- Impact on light has not been fully considered and will block out light for neighbouring properties.
- Not in keeping with the character of the area and heritage of that period will be lost
- The scale of the proposed hotel obtrusive. Larger than those that were first consulted on, so it seems consultation has been poor.

6.6 Helen Hayes MP – Dulwich and West Norwood (within adjoining London boroughs Lambeth and Southwark) (objecting):

- Demolish a number of listed Victorian buildings
- Not in keeping with the predominant Victoria style of architecture in the surrounding area
- Undermine the cultural and architectural heritage of the area.
- Inevitably increase demand for services such as deliveries, parking and staff accommodation
- Increase noise and anti-social behaviour
- Hotel has dismissed neighbours attempts to discuss concerns
- Request Council to refuse

6.7 Cllr John Wentworth has made the following representations (objecting):

- Objection. Will have a negative impact on the residents of Upper Norwood.

Following the submission of amended drawings the application has been re-publicised by way of one or more site notices displayed in the vicinity of the application site. The application has also been publicised in the local press.

6.8 The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 50 Objecting: 50 Supporting: 0 Comment: 0

No of petitions received: 0

6.9 Representations have been made from the following local groups/societies:

- The Norwood Society (objecting)

6.10 *The following issues were raised in representations. Those that are material to the determination of the application, are addressed in substance in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section of this report:*

Principle

- Not an appropriate location
- Does not adhere to the London Plan
- Reason for expansion not known / concern about feasibility

Townscape

- Overdevelopment
- Out of scale / character
- Does not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area
- Demolition not justified
- Design does not respect the heritage of the original hotel.
- Excessive massing and scale
- Overbearing design
- Loss of / no protection of trees
- Minimal landscaping
- Layout, siting, height do not respect local buildings
- Ignores nearby historic buildings

Neighbour amenity

- Overshadowing
- Noise and disturbance
- Diminish the ambience of the Regency Garden
- Create pollution, including light/air
- Flooding
- Visual intrusion
- Loss of light
- Plans do not accurately represent location of houses
- Possible subsidence from basement
- How will transient residents be managed
- Implications regarding basement impact

Quality of accommodation

- Not an improvement in hotel accommodation
- Normal hotel facilities missing

Transport

- Not enough coach spaces
- No car parking for staff
- Inadequate parking provided

Procedure

- Business is buying up homes nearby (OFFICER COMMENT: This is not relevant to the application submission)
- Need for potential access over land not discussed (OFFICER COMMENT: This is a civil matter between land owners)

6.11 Helen Hayes MP – Dulwich and West Norwood (within adjoining London boroughs Lambeth and Southwark) (objecting):

- Overdevelopment and loss of amenity – will cause loss of privacy and light.
- Parking and anti-social behaviour - demand for the limited amount of parking spaces will grow - increase of anti-social behaviour as Queen's Hotel prepare to receive more guests.

7 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

7.1 In determining any planning application, the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of its Development Plan so far as is material to the application and to any other material considerations and the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Council's adopted Development Plan consists of the Consolidated London Plan 2015, the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013 (CLP1), the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 Saved Policies 2013 (UDP) and the South London Waste Plan 2012.

7.2 Government Guidance is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), issued in March 2012. The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, requiring that development which accords with an up-to-date local plan should be approved without delay. The NPPF identifies a number of key issues for the delivery of sustainable development, those most relevant to this case are:

- Building a strong, competitive economy
- Ensuring the vitality of town centres and requiring sequential tests
- Promoting sustainable transport
- Requiring good design.
- Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

7.3 The main policy considerations raised by the application that the Committee are required to consider are:

7.4 Consolidated London Plan 2016 (LP):

- 4.5 London's visitor infrastructure
- 4.12 Improving opportunities for all
- 5.1 Climate Change Mitigation
- 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- 5.4A Electricity and gas supply
- 5.6 Decentralised energy
- 5.7 Renewable Energy
- 5.9 Overheating and cooling
- 5.10 Urban Greening
- 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
- 5.12 Flood risk management
- 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- 5.15 Water use and supplies
- 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste
- 6.3 Effects of development on transport capacity
- 6.8 Coaches
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.10 Walking
- 6.12 Road Network Capacity
- 6.13 Parking

- 7.1 Lifetime neighbourhoods
- 7.2 An inclusive environment
- 7.3 Designing out crime
- 7.4 Local character
- 7.5 Public realm
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
- 7.9 Heritage led regeneration
- 7.14 Improving air quality
- 7.15 Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes
- 7.21 Trees and Woodland
- 8.2 Planning obligations
- 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

7.5 Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013 (CLP1):

- SP1.1 Sustainable Development
- SP1.2 Place making
- SP1.3 Growth
- SP3.8 Employment – Development of visitor accommodation within Croydon Metropolitan Centre, District Centres and Local Centres.
- SP4.1-4.2 Urban Design and Local Character
- SP4.11-13 & 14 Character, Conservation and Heritage
- SP6.1 Environment and Climate Change
- SP6.2 Energy and CO2 Reduction
- SP6.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
- SP6.4 Surface water drainage, flood risk and SUDs
- SP7.4 Enhance biodiversity
- SP8.3-8.4 Development and Accessibility
- SP8.6 Sustainable Travel Choice
- SP8.13 Motor Vehicle Transportation
- SP8.16-17 Parking

7.6 Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 Saved Policies 2013 (UDP):

- UD2 Layout and siting of new development
- UD3 Scale and design of new buildings
- UD6 Safety and security
- UD 7 Inclusive Design
- UD8 Protecting residential amenity
- UD13 Parking design and layout
- UD14 Landscape design
- UC3 Development Proposals in Conservation Areas
- UC9 Buildings on the Local List
- UC11 Development proposals on Archaeological sites
- NC4 Woodland, Trees and Hedgerows
- T8 Parking
- EP1 - EP2 Pollution
- T2 Traffic Generation from Development

- T4 Cycling
- T8 Parking
- HT1 Visitor Accommodation

7.7 Emerging Policies CLP1.1

- SP1.1 Sustainable Development
- SP1.2 Place making
- SP1.3 Growth
- SP3.8 Employment – Development of visitor accommodation within Croydon Metropolitan Centre, District Centres and Local Centres.
- SP3.14 Employment & Training
- SP4.1-4.2 Urban Design and Local Character
- SP4.11-13 & 14 Character, Conservation and Heritage
- SP6.1 Environment and Climate Change
- SP6.2 Energy and CO2 Reduction
- SP6.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
- SP6.4 Surface water drainage, flood risk and SUDs
- SP7.4 Enhance biodiversity
- SP8.3-8.4 Development and Accessibility
- SP8.6 Sustainable Travel Choice
- SP8.13 Motor Vehicle Transportation
- SP8.16-17 Parking

7.8 Emerging Policies CLP2

- DM9 - Development in edge of centre and out of centre locations
- DM11- Design and character
- DM11.1- Quality and character
- DM11.2- Quality of public and private spaces
- DM11.6- Protecting residential amenity
- DM11.7- Design quality
- DM11.9- Landscaping
- DM11.10- Architectural lighting
- DM11.1 – Minimise inactive frontages.
- DM14- Refuse and recycling
- DM15- Public art
- DM17.1- Promoting healthy communities
- DM19.1- Character, appearance and setting of heritage assets
- DM19.2- Proposals affecting heritage assets
- DM19.3- Listed buildings, scheduled monuments and registered parks and gardens
- DM19.4- Conservation areas
- DM19.5- Locally listed buildings
- DM19.6- Local heritage areas
- DM19.9- Archaeology
- DM24- Development and construction
- DM25- Land contamination
- DM26.1- Flooding
- DM26.3- Sustainable drainage systems

- DM28- Biodiversity
- DM29- Trees
- DM30- Promoting sustainable travel and reducing congestion
- DM31- Car and cycle parking in new development

7.9 The Partial Review of Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies (CLP1.1) and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (CLP2) have been approved by Full Council on 5 December 2016 and was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State on 3 February 2017. The examination in public took place between 16th May and 31st May 2017. Main modifications have been received from the Planning Inspector and the Council are consulting on these modification during the period 29 August – 10 October 2017.

7.10 According to paragraph 216 of the NPPF, relevant policies in emerging plans may be accorded weight following publication, but with the weight to be given to them is dependent on, among other matters, their stage of preparation. Now that the main modifications to CLP1.1 and CLP2 have now been published for consultation, there are certain policies contained within these plans that are not subject to any modifications and significant weight may be afforded to them on the basis that they will be unchanged when CLP1.1 and CLP2 are adopted and the Inspector would not ask for consultation on Main Modifications if he was going to find the whole Plan unsound. However, none of the policies that can be afforded significant weight would have a bearing on the proposal to the extent they would lead to a different recommendation. The other policies that are subject to further consultation through the Main Modifications do not outweigh the adopted policies listed here and therefore, do not lead to a different recommendation.

7.11 There are relevant adopted Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans as follows:

- Conservation Area General Guidance
- Church Road Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan

8 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

8.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the committee must consider are:

1. Principle of development
2. Impact of the proposal on the townscape, visual amenities and heritage assets
3. The impact on adjacent occupiers
4. Transport
5. Environment
6. Other planning issues

Principle

8.2 The current use of the site is as a hotel and subsequently it is considered that the continuation of this land use is acceptable, subject to the application demonstrating acceptability against other policies.

8.3 Policy HT1 of the Croydon Replacement UDP states that the development or enlargement of hotels of 50 or more bedrooms, or the provision of conference or

exhibition facilities, will not be permitted outside Croydon Metropolitan Centre unless a need for the development has been demonstrated, and a sequential test approach to select a site has been undertaken. There is no policy requirement for the need for a development to be demonstrated in either the NPPF or the emerging Croydon Local Plan. Therefore the need for the development is not required to be demonstrated. Nonetheless the supporting documentation states that the occupation rates are consistently at 85% - 95% across the site and the proposed quantum of accommodation is strongly dictated by existing and anticipated occupancy levels. In contrast, the England Occupancy Survey (EOS) Results 2016, average occupancy levels for hotels for the year 2015 stood at 70%.

- 8.4 A sequential test has been submitted which has assessed seven sites within the Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood District Centre on the basis of the increased quantum of rooms. Planning permission (14/03472/P) was granted for an extension to the existing Queens Hotel to provide an extension of 24 rooms. This planning application included a sequential assessment and in granting planning permission for this application, the Council was satisfied that the sequential test had been passed. The sequential assessment attached to this current application uses the same methodology with the focus of the assessment on sites in the Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood District Centre. This reflects the fact that the application responds to a need for a greater provision of guest accommodation in the Crystal Palace area, therefore considering alternative centres would not enable this location specific need to be met. It is not expected that a proposal should relocate to a smaller, more central site which would not be able to deliver the quantum of floorspace sought by the applicant.
- 8.5 It is considered that the sequential test supplied with this application complies with paragraph 24 of the NPPF as seven alternative sites within the nearest district centre have been adequately assessed. The seven sites are of varying scales and location so the applicant has successfully demonstrated flexibility in considering other locations which could accommodate the proposed hotel development. The sequential assessment confirmed that the application site is the most suitable location for the proposed scheme as there are no alternative locations within Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood District Centre which can accommodate the proposed accommodation, with them all being unsuitable and unavailable. Therefore, the sequential test has been passed and the proposed development is supported in policy terms.
- 8.6 A number of consultation responses state that an impact assessment is required as the scheme is greater than 2,500 sq m. Paragraph 26 of the NPPF states 'when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres, which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m).'
- 8.7 The glossary of the NPPF is clear that a hotel is tourism development and not retail, leisure or an office use. On this basis there is no impact assessment requirement.
- 8.8 Following the publication of the Inspector's recommended Main Modifications to the Croydon Local Plan: Strategic Policies – Partial Review (Proposed Submission) and the Croydon Local Plan: Detailed Policies and Proposals (Proposed Submission) only minimal weight can be given to the policy DM9 Development in edge of centre and out of centre locations for the determination of this application. The draft policy required an impact assessment for such a scheme, however, practically no weight can be given

to the draft policy and the above consideration that an impact assessment is not required is sound.

- 8.9 London Plan policy 4.5 on Visitor Infrastructure states that across London there is demand for an additional 40,000 hotel rooms through to 2036 and requires at least 10% of rooms to be accessible. 10% of the new hotel rooms would be accessible. These are shown on the plans and are located within the new build element, with convenient level access to the lobby and Blue Badge parking spaces in the basement, which is supported.
- 8.10 The application has demonstrated that 10% of rooms will be wheelchair accessible and the assessments submitted evidence that there are no sequentially preferable locations in Croydon that can accommodate the development and subsequently it is considered that the development complies with policy 4.5 of the London Plan.

Impact of the proposal on the townscape, visual amenities and heritage assets

- 8.11 The application site is located within the Church Road Conservation Area and the Queens Hotel is a locally listed building. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 imposes a general duty as respects conservation areas and requires the Council to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that Area. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that the Council has had special regard to the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and features of special architectural or historic interest.
- 8.12 The Conservation Area General Guidance SPD provides guidance for development and maintenance in Croydon's conservation areas. This was adopted on 22 April 2013. The Guidance states the Council will pay specific attention to the quality of the proposal and how the design understands, respects, complements, interprets and enhances the conservation area's special character and appearance. In addition, extensions to historic buildings must be designed to complement the character of existing buildings and where appropriate architectural detailing on existing properties should be repeated or reflected in the design and detailing of any extensions.
- 8.13 A Heritage Statement has been prepared to support this development, recording the history and development of the Queens Hotel and providing justification for the redevelopment.

Heritage

- 8.14 The Queen's Hotel is a locally listed building within the Church Road Conservation Area. It is identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan as a landmark in the area, due to its historic character and large scale and massing.
- 8.15 A heritage statement has been submitted with the planning application which sets out the history of the site and identifies some of its significances. The document contains limited analysis of the rear wing, which is shown on mapping by 1896, and also does not identify the significance of the southernmost one storey element of the front elevation; both of these elements are proposed for demolition. It identifies the significance of the main façade in relation to the conservation area/townscape, but not as a locally listed building in its own right.

- 8.16 Notwithstanding this: The hotel is of historic significance due to its association with the relocation of Crystal Palace nearby, and the major impact this had on the affluence and development of the area. The principal architectural interest of the locally listed building lies in the historic elements of the main elevation. This is also the element that is most prominent in the townscape and thus makes the greatest contribution to the conservation area. As demonstrated by the heritage statement, the building has developed in a piecemeal fashion over a period of time. This forms part of its significance and is evidenced by the numerous buildings on different planes incorporated within the site. It is noted that the frontage previously displayed greater symmetry, which has been lost in the 1950s and 1970s through the loss of the south wing to fire, and extension to the north. The extension to the north is considered harmful to the conservation area.
- 8.17 The buildings to the rear wing incorporate numerous phases of development which are mostly of little architectural interest. Some elements such as the building with bay window visible from Fitzroy Gardens display some architectural interest. It is understood the rear areas were mainly previously used for service uses including stabling (although the use of those elements visible from Fitzroy Gardens is questioned). They represent evidential interest in what they reveal about past use of the site and through their association with the existing hotel. They are however much altered and relate poorly to one another in urban design terms, which reduces their overall significance. Notwithstanding this it is recommended that in the event of permission a condition is attached to require a building record. The record should include further analysis of the uses and significance of the different buildings and areas, alongside a photographic survey of the site. A copy of the resultant report should be submitted to the local archive to be made available to the public.
- 8.18 The wall and associated structure to the very rear of the site (backing on to Wakefield Gardens) form part of a building identified in the Heritage Statement as a 'mews building'. Following significant concerns from neighbouring occupiers regarding the retention of the rear boundary wall and mews building the scheme has been significantly altered to accommodate this. The mews building along the rear of the site has been retained and a glazed canopy introduced to the courtyard space to connect with the new hotel accommodation. The Inspectors decision on application 03/0366/P described the building as moderately attractive and of generally solid appearance. This building is of limited architectural interest but does retain some evidential interest and is supported. A condition is recommended to require a method statement for how the wall and mews building will be protected and retained during construction.
- 8.19 Part of the significance of the Queen's Hotel lies in its multiple phases of development which are evident in the built fabric. This character, alongside evidence for a former south wing on the same site, justifies the acceptability in principle of an extension to the south. The arcade forms part of the original hotel building, and would be demolished as part of the proposed extension. The loss of this fabric causes some harm to the locally listed building. It is however acknowledged that the significance of this element has been eroded by the alteration of the building and loss of symmetry throughout the building's history.
- 8.20 There are a number of major improvements to the front of the building and plot that enhance the Conservation Area. The reduction in an unsightly addition at roof level above the main entrance area and the replacement of the current canopy are both positive changes. Alongside this is the reduction of mass (removing roof canopy) and re-cladding of the 1970's element are welcome improvements. Car parking to the front

would be reduced and replaced with greater levels of soft landscaping and hard landscaping upgraded. These are all welcomed and would enhance the area, as these elements currently detract from the conservation area.

- 8.21 The proposed dining room sits above an existing extension. Although the tripartite windows to the rear elevation would be lost, which is regrettable, the contemporary appearance of the extension is sensitive to the locally listed building. The palette of materials, bronze metal cladding (including window frames), matching render and bronze aluminium coping to the roof, would also be complimentary and sympathetic to the Queens Hotel
- 8.22 Four listed buildings (Beulah Villa, Westow Lodge, Rockmount and Rosebank all on Church Road) and 11 locally listed buildings are identified in the vicinity of the proposal. Although the proposed new south wing will be visible in the setting of the listed buildings particularly to the immediate south of the site, it is not considered to have a harmful impact on this setting and the general surrounds would be preserved. The nearest locally listed building is to the north of the site on the neighbouring plot, this building is closest to the proposed improvements to the 1970's extension. The setting of all the surrounding locally listed buildings along Church Road would not be have their setting harmed and the general surrounds would be preserved.

Layout, Height, Scale and Massing

- 8.23 The layout of the proposals is influenced by the existing and historic built form and is in principle acceptable.
- 8.24 The height of the proposed south wing retains a subservience to the main locally listed façade and is considered acceptable. The width and overall massing similarly relates well to the overall composition, providing an improved terminus and balance to the overall composition.
- 8.25 Enhancements to the appearance of the existing north extension enable a greater sense of verticality which improves the perceived mass in relation to the historic building. The actual mass of the building would benefit from reduction and this has been achieved through the proposed top floor being set back above the main central section of the building and at the top of the 1970s extension with the canopy being removed. The 1970's part of the building is identified as out of keeping with the conservation area (as identified in the CAAMP) and also detracts from the locally listed building. The stairwell on this side of the proposal has also been reduced down in height through the revisions to the scheme, which is welcomed and supported. Ideally this stairwell would be recessed and the top floor completely removed from the 1970's extension, however, it is acknowledged that the massing is existing and this does improve on it, and therefore largely preserves and improves the existing situation.
- 8.26 Demolition and rebuilding of the rear wing provides a consistency and improved relationship with the main building in urban design terms. The proposed extension is of a large scale and massing, but sits below the height of the main building and steps down towards the boundaries of the site. The topography helps reduce the impact of an extension of this size and the proposed gap between the main building and the rear extensions is appropriate. Views of the rear extension from Church Road (where the extension would be viewed in association with the main elevation of the locally listed building and in the conservation area) are limited.

8.27 There are views of the site from Fitzroy Gardens, particularly from the spur, and from the adjacent private communal gardens, the latter of which is within the Conservation Area. During the course of the application the massing of the scheme has been reduced in this location. Parts of the building would still be visible, however, the combination of the reduction in massing and the existing trees result in an acceptable impact on the street scene and neighbouring gardens.

Design and Appearance

8.28 The proposed design of the south wing and re-clad north extension relate to the rhythm and proportion of the existing building and are therefore considered appropriate. The set-back section at the junction of the existing building and proposed extension allows the historic building to remain prominent and the quoins to remain uninterrupted.

8.29 The simplicity of the design of the new brick and bronze elements relies on the use of high quality detailing and deep reveals to ensure an appropriate level of relief to the elevation. Large scale sections and details of the proposed new elements would be secured by condition, to ensure appropriate design quality and slim detailing.

8.30 The overall elevational treatment of both the re-clad existing elements and the new elements at the front and at the rear have been revised during the course of the submission. Further brick detailing has been included and this patterned brickwork of some bricks pulled out and in will help create interest and depth without dominating or cluttering the elevations. The variety in the elevational language and materials helps to break up the elevation, particularly the rear spine, predominantly through the treatment of the brickwork.

8.31 The contrasting modern, lightweight design to the proposed dining room helps limit impact on the massing of the overall building and allows the historic building to remain legible.

8.32 Removal of the existing canopies to the front elevation is welcomed. Large scale details are required of the proposed replacement canopy and that to the front of the refurbished 1970's extension and can be secured by condition.

8.33 It is noted in the Heritage Statement that the rainwater goods and service runs will be rationalised. In principle this is welcomed, subject to details to ensure appropriate rationalisation and that the works do not remove any historically significant rainwater goods. Details could be provided by condition.

Materials

8.34 Buff brick and bronze materials are proposed for the new build and re-clad elements. This provides an appropriate sympathetic palette which nevertheless retains a clear contrast with the historic building. Samples are shown within the design and access addendum which show a high quality, nonetheless, a condition will be required to ensure that all the materials are of appropriate quality and that the tone and warmth of the materials complements the existing building.

Landscaping and Trees

8.35 The proposals include introduction of greater soft landscaping to the front and the revisions during the course of the application have increased this again which is welcomed.

- 8.36 On the first submission drawings there were a number of structures and other additions which cluttered the front amenity space. To rectify this tables and free standing planters have been removed and cycle stands moved away from the building. The pergola / shelter area has also simplified into a lightweight contemporary bronze aluminium design. The soft landscaping area to the front has also been increased which will allow for larger trees to be planted. This more simplified space works well with better circulation whilst still accommodating two car club bays. The reduced clutter and increased soft landscaping represent an improvement and enhance this area of the site. Nonetheless, full landscape proposals and samples of hard landscape materials will be required by condition.
- 8.37 Retention of the front boundary wall is appropriate. Widening of the proposed vehicle entrances are limited to the minimum necessary. Details in relation to a lighting strategy and installations used can be secured by condition.

Summary

- 8.38 This is already the largest and most prominent building in the conservation area, and despite alterations remains legible as an 1850s hotel. Taken together, the new works to the main frontage are well subordinated formally and differentiated compositionally so as to preserve the significance of the locally listed components that form the centrepiece of the Church Road elevation.
- 8.39 The development would not undermine or diminish the quality of the building, but balance and enhance the appearance from Church Road. The extensions to the rear are large, but sufficiently subservient in relation to the building not to appear harmful or overbearing. Moreover, they are significantly obscured by trees within the large neighbouring private communal garden.
- 8.40 The contemporary architectural treatments have interest and would be finished with high quality materials. A number of improvements to the central frontage building have also been made, along with an improved area to the front of the building. The overall finish is one that works with the building and preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 8.41 The scheme as proposed contains a number of subterranean rooms with partial windows, lightwells and some windowless as identified in the table below.

	Existing		Proposed			
	Existing	% of total existing rooms	Existing retained	New build	Total proposed	% of total proposed rooms
Rooms with no windows	39	12%	39	37	76	14%
Rooms with lightwells	0	0%	0	38	38	7%
Rooms with partial/obscure windows	39	12%	35	0	35	7%

Rooms with full windows	256	76%	164	217	381	72%
Total	334	100%	238	292	530	100%

8.42 Although the hotel does have a number of rooms that are not full windows, it must be noted that there are currently no policies that seek to protect amenity of occupiers in hotel accommodation. Furthermore, during the pre-application the applicant provided officers and Members of Planning Committee the opportunity to view windowless rooms of a similar size in the existing hotels. Officers found the accommodation acceptable and the number of these rooms is not considered to present as poor quality design.

8.43 These proposals will deliver a net increase of 196 new hotel rooms across a range of accommodation formats. 30 and 32 of the additional rooms will be accessible and 'family rooms' respectively and will have a slightly larger layout than the remaining rooms which is welcomed.

Landscaping and Trees

8.44 No trees are to be removed and the proposed development has been designed to avoid conflicts with retained and neighbouring trees. Subject to suitable tree protection measures, which can be secured by condition, the proposals are acceptable in relation to existing trees in and close by to the site. A landscaping scheme, with new tree and shrub planting is proposed, which greatly increases the greenery within the site, particularly to the front, which is supported.

The impact on adjacent occupiers

8.45 The proposed extension on the south side of the building would be removed from No.124 Church Road by 20.5m and separated by Fitzroy Gardens. There are some flank windows facing towards this neighbour, but these are secondary and corridor windows and could be obscure glazed to prevent any loss of privacy. The distance is sufficient to prevent any harmful loss of outlook or visual intrusion.

8.46 No.2 Fitzroy Gardens and the recent permission for a new house at land adjacent to No.2 would be orientated so that outlook and intrusion would be limited. However, there would be windows facing the garden areas, at a distance of 8.5m and 14.5m from the adjacent plot and No.2 Fitzroy Gardens respectively. The distance is 1.5m closer than that allowed under previous applications 12/02331/P and 14/03472/P. It is appreciated that there would be 5 storeys of accommodation and 5 windows per floor rather than 3 storeys and 3 windows per floor, however, there is no direct looking into the properties and the distance is sufficiently comparable to that previously allowed for it to be acceptable in this instance and would not be sufficient to warrant a refusal reason. Given the orientation of this element in relation to the properties along this side of Fitzroy Gardens no harmful loss of outlook or visual intrusion is envisaged.

8.47 No 18 Fitzroy Gardens is located to the south of the rear part of the building. The hotel at this point would be of a similar height to the properties along Fitzroy Gardens and not extend beyond the rear building line of No.18. There is a tree between the front of No.18 and the hotel, which partly obscures the buildings from each other. The development would be at an angle from this neighbouring building thereby and

separated by 10m, accordingly there would be no harmful visual intrusion. No.18 has habitable accommodation at first and second level making it more sensitive to overlooking, however, projecting windows that face eastwards away from the neighbour have been proposed so that privacy is maintained.

- 8.48 The building, 2 storeys in height, currently abuts the boundary to the rear of the site with No.7-15 Wakefield Gardens. Following revisions during the course of the application the majority of this 'mews' building would be retained thereby maintaining the same relationship with properties on Wakefield Close as existing. The proposed basement beneath this has also be moved away from properties on Wakefield Close to a distance of 22.3m (increased from 10.2m). There are existing windows on the rear elevation, these are retained, but a condition is recommended to obscure glaze these to prevent any overlooking. The relationship with these neighbours is acceptable.
- 8.49 The extension to the rear of the building would, in part, extend northwards towards Silverton Cottage. This northwards projection steps down in height from 4 to 2 storeys in height 11m from Silverton Cottage. This projection would extend beyond the rear of Silverton Cottage or encroach a 45 degree angle from the front of Silverton Cottage. Given the distance, height and orientation the outlook would not be significantly adversely impacted. Other than corridor windows which can be obscure glazed there are no flank windows on this part of the extension so no overlooking would occur. There are windows facing west (towards Silverton Cottage) from an extension, however, this is above existing hotel accommodation facing the same way and at a distance of 20m. Given this no harmful overlooking is envisaged.
- 8.50 The dining room extension is sufficiently removed from the neighbouring house plots for there to be no loss of outlook or privacy, particularly as the addition would not be in direct alignment and screened by vegetation. This extension would face towards the communal private garden, however, the windows are to be screened up to to height of 1.4m which is acceptable given the nature of the dining room use and communal neighbouring land. Subject to a condition securing the obscured screening no harmful overlooking is envisaged.
- 8.51 Revisions to the scheme have also seen the introduction of partially obscure glazed windows to the rear spine elevation facing the private gardens, which prevents any harmful overlooking.
- 8.52 All the adjoining properties have been subject to a daylight (109 windows), sunlight (67 windows) assessment. The report clearly demonstrates that there is no harmful impact of the development on the nearest residential properties to the site. These have been assessed in accordance with the 2011 BRE Guidelines. In addition the large open amenity space to the south would have a minimum of 2 hours of sunlight on 21 March over at least 80% of the analysed space and therefore comply with guidance.
- 8.53 It is appreciated that the hotel use is existing, however, there is an increase in floor space creating noise and other disturbances, particularly from comings and goings. An environmental noise assessment has been submitted and suggests conditions are used to control the fixed plant noise impact. In terms of noise impact the Councils Environmental Consultant has raised no objection to the proposals.
- 8.54 There are limited details regarding the proposed ventilation system, however, neighbour occupiers are well removed from the dining area and on that basis a condition to secure details prior to any installation would be acceptable.

8.55 A Basement Impact assessment has been submitted and viewed by the Councils Building Control team. The report is effectively a structured first stage risk assessment and such a report is as expected at this stage as planning permission has not been secured. The revisions to the scheme will effectively reduce the risk of ground movement impacts to neighbouring buildings as the basement boundary will be further from the properties on Wakefield Gardens. A condition is recommended that secures a suitably qualified chartered engineer with membership of the appropriate professional body to inspect, approve and monitor the critical elements of the basement construction works throughout their duration. It should be noted that the appointed building control body would have no control over the temporary support and construction methods employed by the developer. Such aspects of the work are influenced and governed by separate legislation e.g. Party Wall Act, Construction Design and Management regulations and civil law.

Transport

8.56 The site is located in an area with a PTAL rating of 3, which is moderate and is also well located for the services and facilities afforded by Upper Norwood District Centre.

8.57 The application is supported by a Preliminary Construction Management Plan and a Transport Assessment, which includes a Car Park Management Plan, Coach Management Plan, Delivery and Service Plan, and Framework Travel Plan.

8.58 The proposed expansion would increase the number of rooms to 530 and provide a total of 170 parking spaces (0.32 spaces per room, up from 0.2 spaces per room)). Of these there would be a total of 17 disabled spaces located on over levels -2 and -3 and 15 van spaces on level -2. In addition there will be parking for 3 coaches to the front of the site and space for 2 car club bays with 1 being provided initially and the second used as a drop-off bay until demand is determined. There is also space within the front forecourt area for drop-off and pick-up.

8.59 The London Plan Policy 6A.8 does not set maximum parking standards for C1 land use, however sites located in areas with PTALs between 1 and 3 should be consistent with policy objectives to reduce congestion and traffic levels. Whilst it is recognised that the level of parking provision could be considered as excessive, given that the proposed is a more conventional hotel marketed towards for tourists and business travellers a greater turnover of rooms is expected. This coupled with the potential impact on-street parking stress, along with local residents concerns regarding the impact of on-street parking on the surrounding road network the proposed expansion could cause, an objection to the proposed increase in the level of parking provided on-site is not raised. This level of parking is also supported by the trip generation rates outlined in the Transport Assessment (TA).

8.60 A Car Park Management Plan is included in the TA and includes a commitment to monitor usage of the car park and nearby streets, and if it is evident that parking associated with the hotel is contributing towards additional on-street parking pressure in the vicinity of the hotel, the applicant is willing to agree a reasonable contribution towards establishing a resident's controlled parking zone. No timescale or contribution figure is provided and this would need to be included in a legal agreement. The Councils parking services have viewed the proposals and suggest that 12 months post completion is a suitable time to conduct the post development surveys and that £20,000 is a reasonable financial contribution for works to be completed if required.

- 8.61 The TA states that provision will be made for 34 Electric Vehicle Charging Points within the parking areas (20%), which can be secured by condition.
- 8.62 The TA provides vehicle trip generation details for the proposed expansion and it is clear that the level of increase would not be significant in terms of impacting on the surrounding road network.
- 8.63 Parking is to be provided for 3 coaches. Whilst this is below the London Plan standards of 1 space per 50 rooms, which would require 11 spaces, the TA provides evidence that this should be sufficient to meet the requirements of the hotel. Estimated daily coach person trips indicate approximately eight coaches could visit the site across an entire day on average. It is currently proposed to provide three coach parking bays on the development site, which will cater for the likely demand from coaches visiting at any one time. The parking spaces will require pre-booking, therefore ensuring that coach arrivals are pre-planned and catered for on-site. Beyond this a Coach Management Plan has also been provided, which sets out the system for booking coaches in to ensure that a space is always available and identifies available sites where coaches can park off-site once passengers have been dropped off. A vehicle swept path analysis has also been provided to show that coaches can exit and enter the site in forward gear and manoeuvre within the site. Given the size and nature of coach spaces, and the desire to keep the frontage as open and green as possible, the limitation of coach spaces also helps to preserve the setting of the building and Conservation Area.
- 8.64 The proposals require the provision of a new vehicular access which will in turn require the modification/loss to an on-street parking bay (sufficiently for 4/5 spaces). No plans have been submitted to show whether this will be modified or removed, however, the loss of these spaces is acceptable in principle, particularly given it will aid the free flow of traffic along Church Road. The details of the changes would be secured via highway agreements (S284 and S278) and a Grampian condition can ensure that these are entered into.
- 8.65 A service yard is located to the rear of the site and a vehicle swept path analysis of this area has been provided indicating that vehicles can enter and leave in a forward gear. The Delivery Service Plan provides detail of the frequency of service vehicle trips and justifies the single bay provided.
- 8.66 A cycle store for long stay parking of 20 cycles is provided to the west of the site and stands for 12 short stay cycle spaces to the east adjacent to the main entrance to the hotel. This complies with the standards set out in the London Plan and is therefore considered acceptable.
- 8.67 A Framework Travel Plan and a Preliminary Construction Management Plan have been submitted, the structure of both documents are acceptable, full and final versions will be secured by condition when further details such as the contractor are known. A full Construction Logistics Plan will also be secured by condition.

Environment

Sustainability

- 8.68 The application has submitted an energy assessment which evidences that the development follows the Energy Hierarchy (Be Lean, Be Clean, Be Green). Through

energy efficiencies, CHP and air source heat pumps the resultant expected savings equate to an on-site reduction of 851 tonnes of Carbon Dioxide per annum, this equates to 61% savings against a mixed 2013 Building Regulations and existing building baseline compliant scheme. This presents an acceptable approach to carbon reduction, and is compliant with the London Plan target of 35% for non-domestic buildings. Documents have also been submitted to show that BREAAAM Excellent is achievable. Notwithstanding this, it is considered appropriate to include conditions that will require the submission of a report showing the target has been met together with the SAP and EPC Certificate(s), detailed evidence of the CHP installed and any evidence of renewables installed. Prior to the first occupation of the building a report and certification will also be required to be submitted confirming that the standard has been achieved in construction.

Flooding

- 8.69 As the application relates to a major application a Flood Risk Assessment and Surface water Management Plan is required under Local Plan policy SP6.4 and London Plan Policy 5.12 and 5.13. SuDS and an FRA have been submitted with the application and reviewed by the Lead Local Flood Authority. The Lead Local Flood Authority have considered the information and found it to be acceptable subject to the inclusion of pre-commencement conditions which require the submission of detailed drainage information.

Air Quality

- 8.70 The Councils Environment Consultant has raised no objection to this aspect of the proposals, but does suggest that the mitigation measures identified within the air quality report should be secured by condition. Mitigation measures relate to the construction period of the development and primarily to control dust. During operation the development impact is negligible and therefore no mitigation is required. The predicted air concentrations at the building façades are within the relevant air quality standards and the energy centre emissions are air quality neutral.

Contamination

- 8.71 A Phase 1 Contamination Assessment has been submitted that, given that there is some uncertainty as to the presence or otherwise of contamination onsite it is recommended that an intrusive site investigation is conducted and secured by condition.

Overheating

- 8.72 An overheating analysis has been undertaken, the assessed hotel bedrooms are predicted to satisfy the overheating risk criteria for the historic weather data with the use of efficient lighting, mechanical ventilation, solar control glazing and retractable blinds. However, passive design strategies alone cannot satisfy overheating for future years. Accordingly some form of cooling is suggested to insure satisfactory levels of thermal comfort and future proof the overheating risk, the details of such could be secured by way of condition.

Other Planning Issues

- 8.73 The phasing order would run with the dining extension, south wing/frontage in front of original building, rear spine and the re-cladding/western spine finger/frontage of 1970's

extension as phases 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively. The re-cladding and a small area of frontage works falls within the last stage. To secure these works it is considered that a phasing programme is secured in the S.106 that restricts occupation of rooms until the re-cladding is completed. There are 63 rooms (11.8% of total) within the 1970's block that fronts Church Road, it is recommended that these cannot be occupied until the re-cladding is completed. This retains a commercial incentive to finalise the scheme.

8.74 In relation to staff accommodation, the hotel operates a 'local employment' policy in which it actively employs local staff. The expansion of the premises will enable any staff that do need to stay overnight within the hotel accommodation, furthermore, the car parking management plan could cater for staff parking following guests as the preference.

Conclusions

8.75 The recommendation is to grant planning permission subject to a S.106 legal agreement.

8.76 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account.