

## PART 6: Planning Applications for Decision

## Item 6.3

## 1 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION DETAILS

Ref: 18/00831/FUL

Location: Queens Hotel, 122 Church Road, London, SE19 2UG

Ward: Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood

Description: The demolition of existing buildings to the centre and rear of the site and existing extensions to the roof; the construction of a new spine building, an extension to the south-west facing elevation of the existing locally listed building, a single storey extension to the restaurant and five subterranean levels which provide parking, hotel bedrooms, ancillary leisure facilities and servicing space, to create a total of 495 hotel rooms and 207 vehicle parking spaces; the re-cladding of the 1970's extension, provision of enhanced landscaping across the site including 5 coach parking spaces to the front and the adaptation of existing entrance to the hotel including the formation of a new access to facilitate one-way working within the hotel forecourt area.

Drawing Nos: A2702 100 – R7, A2702 101 – R7, A2702 102 – R7, A2702 103 – R7, A2702 104 – R7, A2702 105 – R7, A2702 106 – R7, A2702 107 – R7, A2702 108 – R7, A2702 109 – R7, A2702 110 - R7, A2702 140 – R7, A2702 141 – R7, A2702 199 – R8, A2702 200 - R16, A2702 201 - R16, A2702 202 – R16, A2702 203 - R17, A2702 204 - R18, A2702 205 - R18, A2702 206 - R19, A2702 207 - R17, A2702 208 - R17, A2702 209 - R17, A2702 210 - R17, A2702 211 - R17, A2702 212 - R17, A2702 400 - R15, A2702 401 - R15, A2702 402 – R1, A2701 SK 01 180606 -

Applicant: Queens Crystal Palace Euro Hotel (Jersey) Limited

Agent: Mr Quelch, Bilfinger GVA

Case Officer: Pete Smith

Type of floorspace	Existing floorspace	Amount lost	Amount proposed	Net increase following development
Hotel (C1)	10,015 sq m	3,013 sq m	24,310 sq m	21,045 sq m

Type of floorspace	Existing rooms / Rooms to be lost	Rooms proposed	Net additional rooms
Hotel (C1)	334/104 rooms (230 rooms retained)	265	161 rooms New total - 495 rooms

Number of car parking spaces	Number of cycle parking spaces	Number of coach parking spaces
207 (net increase of 144)	40 (net increase of 40)	5 (net increase of 2)

<b>Number of disability spaces</b>	21 spaces (net increase of 19 spaces)
------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

- 1.1 This application is being reported to Planning Committee because objections above the threshold in the Committee Consideration Criteria have been received and the former Ward Councillor for South Norwood Ward (Councillor Wayne Trakas-Lawler) and Ward Councillor for Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood (Councillor Pat Ryan) raised objections and requested that the case be determined by the Planning Committee. The Chair of Planning Committee (Councillor Paul Scott) separately referred the matter for Planning Committee consideration.
- 1.2 Prior to the May 2018 local elections, the application site was situated within South Norwood Ward and at the time the application was first submitted, South Norwood Ward Councillors were notified of the proposal. As former Councillor Trakas-Lawler is no longer able to speak as a referring Councillor and in view of the changes in Ward boundaries (with the site now situated within Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood Ward) Ward Members representing both South Norwood and the Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood Wards have been contacted to determine whether anyone would like to address the Planning Committee. Councillor Ryan has been invited to speak in any event, as he jointly referred the planning application to Planning Committee.

## **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
    - d) £20,000 contribution towards potentially establishing a controlled parking zone – with survey and reviews required after 12 months of 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 (including financial contribution towards employment and training initiatives for the construction and end user phases £67,968.50)
    - 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, all architectural features (including doors, windows and their surrounds), replacement canopies /shelters, roof, ventilation system, rainwater goods, cycle parking bin stores and platform lifts.
- 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 of west elevation (rear) of mews obscure glazed and fixture shut
- 9) Submission of details of hard and soft landscaping, boundary treatment, trees, green roofs and external lighting.
- 10) Tree protection
- 11) Submission of Delivery Servicing Plan prior to occupation (which shall include a site Waste Management Plan).
- 12) Submission of Construction Logistics and Demolition 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 S.278
- 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 and available prior to occupation of the east west spine building.
- 36) Food ventilation equipment.
- 37) C1 use only
- 38) 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 setting 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 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 30<sup>th</sup> September 2018, the legal agreement has not been completed, the Director of Planning and Strategic Transport has delegated authority to refuse planning permission.

### **3 BACKGROUND TO THE PROPOSALS AND PRE-APPLICATION PROCESSES**

- 3.1 At its meeting of the 19<sup>th</sup> October 2017, the Council's Planning Committee resolved to refuse planning permission for the following development (LBC Ref 17/02192/FUL)

*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.*

- 3.2 After much discussion and debate, two reasons for refusal were confirmed and incorporated into the eventual decision notice. The reasons covered under-provision of on-site parking facilities and the harm caused by the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Church Road Conservation Area. The reasons are detailed below:

1. The proposed development would represent an over-development of the site, with proposed extensions failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Church Road Conservation Area, contrary to Policy SP4.13 of the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies (April 2013), saved Policy UC3 of the Croydon replacement Unitary Development Plan (July 2006) and Policy 7.8 of the Consolidated London Plan 2016.

2. The intensification of the hotel use associated with the proposed development in an area characterised by relatively low levels of public transport accessibility, would be accompanied by inadequate on-site parking facilities, placing additional pressures on on-street parking capacity in the immediate vicinity, detrimental to highway safety and the locality, contrary to SP8.17 of the Croydon Local Plan Strategic Policies (April 2013), Saved Policy T2 of the Croydon Replacement Unitary Development Plan (July 2008) and Policies 6.12 and 6.13 of the Consolidated London Plan 2016.
- 3.3 As the application was referred to the GLA under the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008, the case was further considered by the London Mayor on the 13<sup>th</sup> November 2017 (at Stage 2 and post the Planning Committee resolution). Whilst the London Mayor determined that he was content to allow Croydon Council to determine the application itself (following on from the Planning Committee resolution) the officers' report highlighted a number of issues and concerns that remain relevant as part of this current planning application process. The London Mayor's comments on the current planning application are detailed later in this report.
- 3.4 Following on from this process, the decision notice was issued on the 29<sup>th</sup> November 2017.
- 3.5 The applicants and their advisors engaged with your officers following on from the refusal of planning permission, to discuss possible amendments to the scheme, with a view to overcoming the reasons for refusal. As part of this process, a further pre-application proposal was presented to Planning Committee on 11<sup>th</sup> January 2018.
- 3.6 The comments raised by Planning Committee at that time were confirmed as follows:
  - Meaningful consultation with residents needed to take place and details of the outcome of the consultation should be shared
  - The reduction in massing was welcomed
  - Careful consideration required as regards the materials used and the elevational treatment of the proposed extensions (the east-west spine and the Church Road elevation); should be simplified but still of exemplar quality
  - Design of the Church Road extensions required careful consideration to ensure it complements the historic central façade
  - Reduction in proposed number of rooms and increase in parking spaces generally welcomed
  - Transport mode estimates were needed to assess the impact
  - Clarity on how the developer aimed to encourage hotel guests to use the charged car park as opposed to on street car parking
  - Some concern over the impact of 5 coach parking spaces proposed within the hotel forecourt
  - Linked to the above issue, statement required on how off-site coach parking would be managed and capacity of available sites needs to be further clarified
  - Overlooking into surrounding properties; some support for the removal of the previously proposed angled windows
  - View that obscured glazing should be avoided if at all possible

#### **4. PROPOSAL, LOCATION DETAILS AND PLANNING HISTORY**

## Proposal

4.1 The application seeks to overcome the previous reasons for refusal and now comprises the following elements:

- Redevelopment, extensions and excavation to provide a total of 495 hotel rooms and 207 car parking spaces.
- Demolition of buildings to the rear of the site. This would be replaced with a new rear extension (4-6 height in storeys) that would include two northwards projections; the western-most projection would be new at 2-3 storeys (plus basement accommodation) whilst the eastern-most projection would accommodate an additional floor of accommodation on top of an existing addition.
- The scheme would also include partial demolition of the rear mews building (including the glazed element and structures to the east of the enclosed mews courtyard). Critically, the structure to the west of the enclosed mews courtyard and adjacent to the rear boundary with properties fronting onto Wakefield Gardens would be retained. Proposed beneath this area would be subterranean accommodation (max 5 storeys) comprising on-site car parking, hotel bedrooms lit by light wells (and some with no windows), ancillary leisure facilities (swimming pool and gym) and servicing.
- A 5-storey extension on the south-western corner of the building with basement accommodation.
- Single storey rear dining room extension to the central section of the hotel.
- The recladding of the existing 1970s extension and the partial demolition of an unsightly addition to the roof and canopies (existing entrance porch and 1970's canopy).
- A new vehicle crossover/access, which would allow coaches to enter and exit the site without crossing the pedestrian entrance. The vehicle crossover to the north of the site would be retained to provide access to car club spaces to the front and a two-way access route along the northern site boundary to serve an access ramp down into the subterranean parking levels and hotel servicing area.
- A new exit would be provided immediately to the south-east of the main hotel entrance to be used by coaches and taxis. Space for 5 coaches and a taxi waiting area would be accommodated on site to facilitate on site pick up and drop off.
- Provision of landscaping including new trees to the front of hotel addressing Church Road.

4.2 The main amendments proposed (compared to the previously refused scheme) are as follows:

- A reduction in the number of hotel bedrooms (by 35 rooms)
- An increase in the number of on-site car and coach parking facilities (37 and 2 spaces respectively)
- Reductions in the scale and mass of the west-west spine building
- Simplification of external design elements with a simplified (albeit robust) materials palette;
- An increase in the number of family rooms available for guests (by 32 rooms)
- Modifications to the forecourt area – to accommodate a maximum of 5 coach parking spaces (on site)

## Site and Surroundings

- 4.3 The site falls within the Church Road Conservation Area and Queen's Hotel is a locally listed building (dating from around 1854). The only part of the original building which remains reasonably intact is the central element of the building which fronts onto Church Road. Church Road is designated as a London Distributor Road. To the north (approximately 150 metres) is the boundary of the Upper Norwood District Centre.
- 4.4 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. Around the same time, the hotel acquired the former 120 Church Road and demolished the historic building to construct a large new northern wing (1970s) which, according to the Council's Conservation Area Character Appraisal, fails to represent a positive built element and detracts from the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 4.5 The 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, including a projecting cornice supported by brackets, quoins and open balustrading. The site slopes relatively steeply down (from east to west) with the height of the existing east-west spine building following site topography.
- 4.6 The existing site is an operational hotel with 334 rooms with 38 car parking spaces at the front of the hotel and a further space for 25 cars at the rear, bringing total on-site provision to 63 spaces (ratio of 0.19 spaces per room). There are also 3 informal spaces for coaches to drop off/pick up. No dedicated facilities currently exist for on-site cycle parking.
- 4.7 The hotel overlooks a garden area to the west/south (known locally as "Regency Gardens") which provides communal amenity space for the houses in Fitzroy Gardens. The area to the south of the site is mostly residential, with a mixed character of hotel, office and residential accommodation to the north. As raised above, the land level drops significantly towards 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 ridge line of 18 Fitzroy Gardens.
- 4.8 112-116 Church Road (immediately to the north-east) and 181-203 Church Road are locally listed buildings. Also 124-128 Church Road (to the south-west) are statutorily listed.

## Planning History

- 4.9 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 2003 - **Dismissed** on appeal.

The Inspector concluded that the principle of refurbishment and re-use of building would have had a beneficial impact on appearance of conservation area, but detailed elements of the scheme which would have been inappropriate and would have resulted in harm to the character and appearance of the building.

Change of intensity of use of existing windows that face properties on Wakefield Gardens would have resulted in neighbours feeling that they

were overlooked. Also concern around the possibility that some noise and disturbance that would have arisen 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 roof-space 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. The various planning conditions associated with this planning permission have now been discharged and an application for a Certificate of Lawful Development has been approved confirming that a material start on site has progressed pursuant to this 2014 planning permission.

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 September 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

17/02192/FUL 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.

**Refused** for the reasons highlighted in paragraph 3.2 above. The applicant has recently appealed to the Secretary of State against this refusal of planning permission. The Planning Inspectorate has recently confirmed that this appeal will be considered by way of a Public Inquiry.

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

**Granted** October 2017.

17/06175/CONR Planning permission was **Granted** earlier this year, to vary the condition attached to the 2008 planning permission (LBC Ref 08/03440/P) to allow staff accommodation within the news building to be occupied by hotel guests as well as hotel staff.

18/01855/ENV A screening opinion **Issued** (advising that the development the subject of this planning application was not considered to be EIA development).

#### Land adjoining 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.

17/00318/FUL Erection of 2 three-storey three bedroom houses with basements: provision of associated parking

**Case Withdrawn** and is no longer under consideration

## **5 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- 5.1 The application is acceptable in principle, a view which has been confirmed by the London Mayor at Stage 1.
- 5.2 The proposals have satisfied the sequential test requirements and would contribute positively to the need for additional hotel accommodation in the borough. The scheme would deliver local employment benefits and should contribute positively to the Upper Norwood night-time economy, with hotel guests likely to use local restaurants and bars as part of their stay.
- 5.3 The proposed development would provide minor enhancements to the conservation area and would not harm the setting of nearby listed buildings. Whilst there would be some limited 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.
- 5.4 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 would not appear overly dominant and would suitably overcome the previous reason for refusal. The appearance of the massing is softened by the use of complementary materials and the

more simplified materials palette (with cues taken from the retained structures) and would suitably reflect the design and form of the original hotel.

- 5.5 The quality of accommodation for future hotel users would be acceptable.
- 5.6 No trees will be lost and those existing will be suitably protected. A landscaping scheme would be delivered as part of the proposals, which should further enhance the surroundings.
- 5.7 The application has demonstrated that the proposed buildings would not have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of adjoining occupiers.
- 5.8 The need for the proposed parking at a provision of 0.42 a room and 5 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. Vehicle manoeuvring would be satisfactory and adequate space would be accommodated to ensure that vehicle drop off will be able to operate efficiently and safely
- 5.9 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.

## **6. CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

- 6.1 The views of the Planning Service are expressed in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section below.
- 6.2 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 additional 161 rooms would make a welcome contribution towards the London Plan requirements for additional hotel bedrooms. The enhancement of existing provision is also welcomed, especially as the hotel is relatively close to the Crystal Palace National Sports Centre
- The scheme suitably passes the sequential test requirements
- The proposed massing, layout and re-cladding of the existing extensions is appropriate and the proposed south extension would enhance the appearance of the conservation area
- The use of materials (light coloured brickwork and metal cladding) would contrast with the stucco facing and would be in keeping with other buildings in the conservation area
- The proposals to improve accessibility for disabled guests, providing level access via a lift from basement level and via a platform lift to the front of the hotel, should be welcomed. Also support the level of hotel rooms available for guests with disabilities
- Further evidence is required to confirm reasons why PV panels are unable to be installed as part of the development
- Car parking within the basement should be reduced

- Support the provision of 20% active electric charging points within the car parking area, but 20% passive provision should also be provided. The car club space is welcomed and the level of cycle parking is in accordance with London Plan requirements
- The previous £25,000 towards pedestrian environment improvements (signage) remains a requirement and should be secured via the S.106 Agreement. A Travel Plan should also be secured via the legal agreement process.

#### **TFL (Statutory Consultee)**

- Trip generation should be amended through the use of on-site surveys and TRICS data – especially as the walk-in trips are likely to be high – with those trips needing to be re-assigned
- It is requested that the applicant investigates the possibility of reducing car parking spaces consistent with the London Plan and the draft London Plan
- Provision of electric vehicle charging points for taxis should be provided in accordance with T6.4 of the draft London Plan
- Further work should be undertaken to identify a dedicated taxi rank on site
- TfL would have preferred space for 7 coaches to be accommodated on site, given existing usage and anticipated daily demand
- Cycle parking levels are supported
- £25,000 should be secured for additional signage – to facilitate improved navigation and wayfinding in and around Upper Norwood District Centre
- Travel Plan should be secured through a legal agreement process and Construction Logistics and Servicing and Delivery should be managed through the imposition of planning conditions.

#### **Historic England – Listed Buildings (Statutory Consultee)**

- Historic England raised previous concerns (with reference to the previous application) regarding the loss of buildings and extensions that contribute positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area. They also previously raised concerns about the impact of the large extensions on key views along Church Road. Following initial comments, refinements of the street fronting elements (which improved the relationship with the Victoria hotel building) Historic England confirmed that it had no major concerns.
- Historic England referred to the comments made in relation to the previous proposals (dated 11 September 2017) and the positive moves made by the applicant (including design changes) to overcome previous objections and concerns. This previous letter concluded that whilst some elements (in particular the demolition of the southern wing) were undesirable, Historic England considered the revised scheme to be a significant improvement on the original application.
- Recommended that the application be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance and that it was not necessary to consult further.

#### **Historic England – Archaeology (Statutory Consultee)**

- Recommend No Archaeological Requirement

#### **LLFA (Statutory Consultee)**

- No objections but require planning conditions to be attached to any planning permission to require a detail surface water drainage scheme to be submitted and approved – in consultation with the LLFA.

#### **Thames Water (Consultee)**

- Recommends conditions and informatives.

#### **North Croydon Conservation Area Advisory Panel (Consultee)**

- Massing still detracts from the character and appearance of the conservation area and the amended scheme has not addressed the previous issues and reasons for refusal
- Compared to the previous refused scheme, the reduction in mass is negligible
- The immediate area is characterised by domestic scale of development and the proposed additions would exacerbate the already over-dominant appearance of the hotel
- Overdevelopment of an already excessively large building complex. The hotel is already larger than what would be expected for a local centre
- The proposed new buildings would be detrimental to a valued conservation area by virtue of their scale. Larger is not better
- Concerned about the large number of rooms with inadequate light
- Proposals for the Church Road frontage are of concern, exacerbating the already piecemeal appearance

## **7 LOCAL REPRESENTATION**

- 7.1 The application has been publicised by way of one or more site notices displayed in the vicinity of the application site and through notification of a number of residential occupiers living in the vicinity. The application has also been publicised in the local press. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups and other interested parties (including elected representatives) in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

Neighbours notified: 91; No of individual responses: 354; Objecting: 302; Supporting: 70 (including a large number of pro-forma letters); Comment: 4

No of petitions received: 0

- 7.2 Representations were received from referring Ward Councillors (former Councillor Wayne Trakas-Lawler and Councillor Pat Ryan) raising the following issues and concerns

- The scheme represents an over-development of the site which is not conducive to the street-scene. Issues of size and massing have not been adequately addressed since the previous proposal was considered and refused by Planning Committee
- On street car parking is already a problem in the area and with parking enforcement already at capacity, the scale of development will make the situation potentially worse. Charging guests to park on site will mean that hotel users will naturally gravitate to using free parking on street that is available locally

- Coach parking will cause traffic congestion leading to disruption of traffic. The parking of 5 coaches in front of the hotel will be detrimental to the street-scene and the conservation area.
- The basement excavation is not viable to construct and may constitute a “stalking horse” to gain consent for a follow up application. The basement car park might well end up being smaller to be more financially viable.

7.3 Councillor Steve O Connell (London Assembly Member) has made representations, raising objections to the proposed development.

7.4 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

## AREAS OF OBJECTION

### Principle of Use

- No justification for scale of extension and increase in capacity. Sequential test should include Croydon Town Centre. A hotel of this size should be located away from areas where public transport accessibility is low and instead, directed towards town centres
- No need/demand for a large hotel in this location; the hotel does not generate local tourism – coaches full of students will visit Central London
- No impact assessment
- No need for a further budget hotel
- Not convenient for Central London and airports

### Design and Heritage

- Design fails to preserve or enhance the environs of the heritage assets
- Extensions do not reflect the same Victorian architectural styles of the immediate area
- Recladding the 1970s extension would only result in minor benefits, bearing in mind that the scale of development is incongruous (in terms of height and massing)
- Scale of building is out of proportion with the neighbouring residential accommodation
- The ugly 1970s extension should be demolished and the hotel made smaller;
- New extension to the south will do nothing to address the current lop-sided effect; the original harmony would not be re-introduced
- The proposed cladding is not respectful of the hotel’s heritage
- Reductions in the height of the east-west spine building would not be sufficient to overcome previous concerns and would remain detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area;
- The buildings proposed to be demolished should be retained, as they are in keeping with conservation area character
- Concerned with the quality of the submission and lack of proper heritage analysis
- The addition of more contemporary built structures would not be in keeping with the character of Church Road
- The views of the hotel would be significantly downgraded in view of the proposed coach parking area; detrimental to conservation area character and the views of the locally listed building
- Object to so many rooms with limited light/no light and reliance on light-wells

- Dis-benefits are not outweighed by the benefits of the development
- Inadequate landscaping proposed to mitigate impact of the extensions and coach parking

#### Scale of Development and Neighbour Amenity

- The proposals would represent over-development – in terms of bulk and mass and the effect of increased scale and activity (generating more traffic movements, noise, air pollution, privacy issues and highway safety concerns)
- A reduction of only 35 rooms (from the previous refused scheme) is not enough
- Increased scale of development not suitably mitigated
- Development is three times above the density guide recommended for a comparable residential scheme
- Overshadowing and loss of daylight
- Overlooking neighbouring residential properties and “Regency Gardens”
- Risks to the structural integrity of adjoining properties from basement. There needs to be further analysis (Phase 2 Basement Impact Assessment) before planning permission is forthcoming
- Extension to the south of the main building will be on made ground – with clay sub soil. Not appropriate in terms of drainage
- No information on management methods for safe and efficient basement construction
- Will increase anti-social behaviour, noise and crime
- Noise and disturbance from operation and construction
- Construction may cause subsidence
- Increased sense of enclosure created

#### Environment

- Increase air and light pollution (construction and end user phases)
- Impact on water flows
- Wildlife and trees destroyed; concern that basement excavation will affect existing trees and the retention of trees facing onto “Regency Gardens”
- Impact of increased vehicle activity on air quality
- Site already affected by poor levels of air quality and additional traffic movements will make matters considerably worse

#### Transport

- Increased congestion - Church Road and Crystal Palace Triangle cannot take more traffic – with additional vehicle movements in and out the hotel (servicing, visitor access, coach access)
- PTAL is relatively low and TRICs should not be used. The applicant should understand and apply local characteristics
- Cycle and pedestrian modal share is over stated - in view of hills in the vicinity of the site which will reduce access by more sustainable travel choices
- Highway safety implications associated with poor vehicle manoeuvrability - especially coach movements and the interplay with taxi drop off arrangements
- Swept path analysis is inadequate and the forecourt area will not operate satisfactorily – with issues spilling out onto Church Road
- The Transport Assessment is inadequate
- Travel plan should be submitted and approved prior to the grant of planning permission

- The additional activity on site will be a strain on existing public transport infrastructure

#### Parking

- Insufficient parking – when considering PTAL levels and the scale of extension and growth of hotel
- Parking will spill into local streets – preventing residents from accessing forecourt parking area
- Local residents drive around trying to find a parking space
- Charging for car parking will mean that visitors will park on street to avoid charge
- On site car parking should be free for all users
- London Plan states that more than 5 coach parking spaces is required (1 coach parking space per 50 bedrooms)
- No support for CPZ – as residents would need to pay to park outside their houses

#### Other

- Litter problems will increase
- Inadequate consultation with the applicant prior to submission, with debate and agendas strictly managed by public relations consultant to avoid proper discussion on the planning application (COMMENT: The extent of pre-application consultation and how it is managed is a matter for the applicant. The application has been advertised by the Council in accordance with requirements).
- Concerned that the site will continue to be a budget hotel attracting EU school parties and building contractors – or potentially hostel accommodation
- No evidence that those staying in the hotel will make use of Crystal Palace Triangle and contribute to the local economy

#### 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 – although planning conditions are recommended)
- 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)

#### AREAS OF SUPPORT

- More life offered to Crystal Palace – promotes the increase in jobs in the area of Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood
- Supports improvements to the hotel offer – as it does not currently meet the required standards expected for clients wishing to stay. Look forward to standards improving – to be more attractive to overseas clients.
- The sachem will bring more jobs to the borough (at London Living Wage);
- The area has close associations with the historic development of South London and the architecture of the old Crystal Palace
- Systemic contribution that benefits the area and residents who live in Crystal Palace

- The plans present an opportunity to significantly improve the hotel's accommodation and enhance the building's heritage assets
- Likely to support increased capacity at Selhurst Park – once the capacity of the football ground has been completed
- The development has the potential to provide 100 new jobs – with an annual spend to surrounding businesses of an estimated £2.3 million.

## PROCEEDURAL ISSUES

- Why would Croydon Council even consider any of their development applications (OFFICER COMMENT: If someone submits a planning application in the proper way, as is the case in this instance, the Council has to process/deal with it. In the vast majority of cases, the Council is unable to refuse to validate and determine 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 applicant engaged with residents at pre-application stage. The application has been advertised by the Council in accordance with requirements).

## **8 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES AND GUIDANCE**

- 8.1 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 (2018) and the South London Waste Plan 2012.
- 8.2 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
- 8.3 There is a new draft London Plan that is currently out for public consultation which was concluded on the 2nd March 2018. The GLA current program is to have the Examination in Public into the Draft London Plan in Autumn 2018, with the final London Plan published in Autumn of 2019. The current 2016 Consolidation Plan still forms part of the adopted Development Plan and is a primary material consideration. However, the Draft London Plan is a material consideration in planning decisions although its weight will increase as it moves through to the process of adoption. At present the Draft London Plan is considered to carry minimal weight.

8.4 The main policy considerations raised by the application that Planning Committee is required to consider are:

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

Croydon Local Plan (2018)

- 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
- SP14 Employment and Training.
- DM8 Development in Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Locations

- SP4.1-4.2 Urban Design and Local Character
- SP4.11-13 & 14 Character, Conservation and Heritage
- DM10.1 - 10.11 Design and Character
- DM13 Refuse and Recycling
- DM14 Public Art
- DM18.1 -18.9 Heritage Assets
- 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
- DM23 Development and Construction
- DM24 Land Contamination
- DM25 Sustainable Drainage Systems
- SP7.4 Biodiversity
- DM27 Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity
- DM28 Trees
- SP8.3-8.4 Development and Accessibility
- SP8.6 Sustainable Travel Choice
- SP8.13 Motor Vehicle Transportation
- SP8.15-16 Parking
- DM29 Promoting Sustainable Travel
- DM30 Car and Cycle Parking

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

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

## **9 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

9.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the Planning Committee is required to consider are as follows:

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 of Development**

#### Provision of Additional Hotel Accommodation

9.2 Policy 4.5 of the London Plan (2016) as consolidated, states that visitor economies should be supported and their growth encouraged whilst seeking to improve the range and quality of hotel provision (especially in Outer London areas). The strategic target is set to provide 40,000 net additional hotel bedrooms by 2036. It also advises that at least 10% of hotel accommodation should be suitably planned for wheelchair users.

- 9.3 According to the GLA's Hotel Demand Study (2006), around 750 net additional hotel rooms are required to support LB Croydon projections (2007-2026). The Croydon Local Plan – Policy SP3.8 advises that the Council will promote and support the development of visitor accommodation within Croydon Metropolitan Centre, District Centres and Local Centres. Policy SP3.9 states that Croydon Metropolitan Centre will remain the principal location for hotel activity in the borough.
- 9.4 Over recent years, the operators of Queens Hotel have been keen to refurbish and modernise facilities, not only to attract higher levels of custom but also to establish and re-invigorate the hotel offer. Over the last year, the hotel has invested in modernising guest rooms and front of house and dining/breakfast areas in an attempt to enhance the visitor experience. Officers acknowledge the level of demand for accommodation in this location and it is clear that the current average level of occupancy (which has been confirmed at around 85%) is relatively high which bodes well in terms of the likely take up of further guest accommodation should planning permission be forthcoming. The hotel is aiming to capitalise through a re-branding exercise and the alterations and extensions would address the current issues facing the existing facility; which suffers from poor internal layout (caused by successive extensions and historic alterations/interventions). The proposed enhancements and general uplift in quality should deliver real benefits to the local area. Notwithstanding the level of objection raised by local residents and doubt that the local area will benefit from the level of investment envisaged, officers are satisfied that the proposal is a real opportunity to deliver enhancements to the existing hotel offer and should allow hotel to maintain and enhance its market share. Delivering a range of good quality hotel accommodation will raise the existing quality of the hotel, draw in new custom and subsequently boost spending capacity and investment in the local area.
- 9.5 The applicant has demonstrated that 10% of the proposed hotel rooms would be suitable sized to accommodate wheelchair users.

#### Sequential Test Considerations

- 9.6 The NPPF advocates a sequential approach when considering proposals for “town centre uses” (including hotel development) and advises that preference should be given to town centre sites and then edge of centre and then finally, out of centre sites (only if sequentially preferable sites are not available). The Guidance advises that preference will be shown where locations are accessible and well connected to the town centre. Crucially, demonstrating “need” is not required by planning policy.
- 9.7 Croydon Local Plan (2018) Policy DM8 advises that arts, cultural and leisure uses (again including hotel accommodation) should not be accommodated on edge of centre or out of centre locations unless sequentially preferable sites are neither suitable nor available. Where only edge of centre or out of centre sites are available and deliverable, they should be well connected to the town centre.
- 9.8 The Queen's Hotel is recognised as a “town centre use” and the Church Road site is considered to be an edge of centre location, albeit being situated reasonably close to the boundary of the Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood District Centre. A sequential test has been submitted which has assessed seven sites within the Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood District Centre. Officers support the limited extent of the sequential test exercise in this particular case, bearing in mind that the applicant currently operates in the vicinity of Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood and that the proposed development seeks to respond to the need for greater guest accommodation in the

Crystal Palace area. Consideration of alternative centres would not have met this specific need; relocation or annexation to smaller, more central sites would not have been able to deliver the quantum of floorspace sought by the applicant. It is also relevant that the Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood District Centre (a short 5-minute walk from the existing hotel) is well served by public transport (with a PTAL of 5 and 6a).

- 9.9 The submitted sequential test reviewed 7 sites in and around the Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood, all of which were considered to be unsuitable and/or unavailable to accommodate the proposed development. Officers accept these conclusions and are satisfied that the sequential test requirements have been met. The London Mayor is of a similar view. The sequential test has embraced the need for the developer to consider scope for flexibility of provision. Hotel guests should reasonably expect dining and entertainment facilities to be provided on site as part of their hotel experience, rather than annexed away from bedroom spaces. This also reflects a general preference to enhance existing facilities on the existing site, rather than provide satellite accommodation away from the main hotel complex.
- 9.10 The previous 2014 grant of planning permission (LBC Ref 14/03472/P) for an extension to the existing hotel (an additional 24 rooms) utilised the same sequential test methodology as currently advocated; as did the previous 2017 proposals. In both instances, the approach was found to be acceptable and in accordance with policy requirements.

#### Economic Benefits of Hotel Expansion

- 9.11 The proposed expansion will be accompanied by a number of associated employment and training benefits. It is envisaged that the proposals will generate an additional 99 jobs (across a range of managerial, clerical and day to day hotel maintenance staff) and the applicant has agreed to fully embrace Policy SP3.14 of the Croydon Local Plan (2018) which seeks to secure opportunities for employment and skills training to help the Council secure a minimum level of local employment (construction and end user phase). This will be secured through a planning obligation to deliver a financial contribution to support the Council's job brokerage service alongside non-financial strategies to ensure local people have the best opportunity to successfully compete for the various jobs on offer.
- 9.12 Whilst local residents have raised doubts over the scale of benefits of hotel expansion to the local economy, as the Crystal Palace and Upper Norwood District Centre is in easy walking distance from the Queens Hotel, it is inevitable that those staying at the hotel will be tempted to make use of the night-time activities (restaurants, bars and public houses) available locally. Hotel guests will be visiting Central London on a regular basis, although there will be occasions when guests would prefer to make use of local facilities as part of their stay.

#### **Impact on Townscape, Visual Amenities and Heritage Assets**

- 9.13 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 regarding 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

special regard to the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and features of special architectural or historic interest.

- 9.14 The Conservation Area General Guidance SPD (April 2013) 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 should be repeated or reflected in the design and detailing of any extensions.
- 9.15 A Heritage Statement has been prepared to support this development, recording the history and development of the Queens Hotel and providing justification for the proposed works.

### Heritage

- 9.16 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. The current proposal seeks to overcome one of the two previous reasons for refusal which focussed on the scale of development proposed and the extent to which it failed to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 9.17 The Conservation Area Appraisal sets out the history of the site and identifies some of its significant attributes. The document contains limited analysis of the rear wing, which was in place by 1896 and which is proposed to be demolished as part of the proposed development. Similarly, it does not highlight the significance of the southern-most single storey element of the front elevation (also proposed to be demolished). 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.
- 9.18 Notwithstanding this, the hotel is of historic significance due to its association with the relocation of the 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 character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. As demonstrated by the Heritage Statement, the building has developed in a piecemeal fashion over a period of time which forms part of its significance and is evidenced by the numerous buildings on different planes incorporated within the site.
- 9.19 It is evident that the frontage building previously displayed greater symmetry, which was lost in the 1950s and 1970s following the removal of the south wing to fire and the erection of the 1970s extension to the north. The overall approach adopted by the applicant as part of these proposals has been to remove/modify a range of previous unsympathetic alterations and additions to the building and to try and re-introduce a more symmetrical and proportionate solution to the Queens Road frontage whilst exploring opportunities for a more expansive east-west spine building (whilst still taking an architectural cue from the retained structures).
- 9.20 The built elements of the existing east-west spine building incorporate numerous phases of development which are mostly of little architectural interest although it is

appreciated that some elements, such as the building with bay window visible from Fitzroy Gardens, had of some limited interest. The various changes in levels, the inability to secure access across all floors by disabled guests and staff members and the general inefficiency of the space available renders the existing spine building limited in terms of its overall utility. The building at the very least, only represents evidential interest in what it might reveal about past use of the site and through its association with the existing hotel. The buildings have also been much altered and relate poorly to each other in urban design terms, which limits their overall significance. Officers are satisfied that the removal of this built element can be supported, albeit subject to the quality of the replacement structure.

- 9.21 Notwithstanding the above, it is recommended that if planning permission is forthcoming, a planning condition should be imposed to require a survey of the building to be removed. 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.
- 9.22 The wall and associated structure towards the rear of the site (backing on to Wakefield Gardens) forms part of a building identified in the Heritage Statement as a 'mews building'. The scheme proposes to retain a significant part of this structure - especially the part of the building that backs onto the rear gardens of Wakefield Gardens properties which will continue to provide guest and staff accommodation. The previous Planning Inspector's decision on the planning application determined in 2003 (LBC Ref 03/0366/P) described the "mews building" as moderately attractive and of generally solid appearance. This building does retain some evidential interest and its partial retention is supported. A condition is recommended to require a method statement to control the removal of the glazed courtyard roof and the eastern element of the mews structure, with the retained elements suitably protected.
- 9.23 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 single storey arcade element forms part of the original hotel building and would be demolished as part of the proposed extension. It is recognised that the loss of this element does cause some harm to the locally listed building, although it is acknowledged that its significance has been eroded through previous alterations and loss of symmetry throughout the building's history.
- 9.24 Officers are satisfied that the scheme proposes a number of significant improvements to the front of the building that would enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and the locally listed building. Partial removal of an unsightly addition at roof level above the main entrance area and the replacement of the current canopy are both positive changes. Furthermore, the reduction in the overall mass (removing roof canopy) and the re-cladding of the 1970's element alongside the re-landscaping of the hotel forecourt are also welcomed.
- 9.25 The proposed dining room (which has already received separate planning permission) would sit above an existing extension and although the existing tripartite windows to the rear elevation would be removed, the more contemporary appearance of the extension would be sensitive to the locally listed status of the existing hotel.

- 9.26 Following on from the previous reason for refusal, the applicant has re-considered the elevational treatment of the southern wing which now focusses on brick facades with deep window reveals, stone effect window surrounds and a set-back metal clad top floor. A similar treatment is proposed for the recladding of the north wing. Links to the existing retained structures would be formed by recessed glazed elements to ensure that the historic fabric continues to stand proud when viewed from Church Road, with the wing elements representing a more contemporary and sympathetic take on more traditional building proportions and architectural styles.
- 9.27 Four listed buildings that front onto Church Road (Beulah Villa, Westow Lodge, Rockmount and Rosebank) and 11 locally listed buildings are identified in the vicinity of the proposal. Although the proposed new south wing would be visible in the setting of these listed buildings (particularly to the immediate south of the site) the scheme would not have a harmful impact on their setting. The nearest locally listed building is located to the north of the site on the neighbouring plot closest to the proposed improvements to the 1970's extension which, as raised above, would be enhanced. The setting of all the surrounding locally listed buildings along Church Road would not be harmed and the general surrounds would be preserved.
- 9.28 The parking of potentially five coaches within the forecourt of the hotel will have some detrimental effect on the setting of the locally listed building, the Church Road street-scene and the wider conservation area. However, it is worth noting that coaches will not always be parked in front of the hotel (with guests being transported during the day) and the parking of 5 coaches immediately in front of the hotel range will therefore represent "worst case". It also needs to be recognised that there were firm expectations (as previously raised by Planning Committee) that the hotel should seek to accommodate coach parking requirements on site. Whilst it is unfortunate that there will be occasions when coach parking might well dominate the views of the hotel, this would be mitigated to a certain extent by the general façade improvements and through the introduction of a subtle lighting scheme – to ensure that the hotel presents itself to Church Road in the best possible light.

#### Layout, Height, Scale and Massing

- 9.29 In many ways, it was the overall height, scale and massing of the previously proposed east-west spine building and the proposed south wing (linked to elevational treatments) that caused most concern as part of the previous reason for refusal. There was previous concern about the overall dominance of the south wing and the east-west spine building and their impact when viewed from Church Road, from within Regency Gardens and neighbouring residential properties.
- 9.30 Demolition and rebuilding of the rear wing would provide a consistent and improved relationship with the main building in urban design terms. The height of the current proposed east-west spine building has been reduced (especially as site topography drops from east to west) and whilst objectors to the scheme feel strongly that the changes are minimal and do not overcome the previous reasons for refusal, officers feel that the scale of development and the relationship with the neighbouring Regency Gardens (removing a floor of accommodation off the two western-most elements of the east-west spine building and associated elevational adaptations) has been significantly enhanced. The amended east-west spine building would maintain subservience to the main Church Road hotel range and would suitably overcome the previous reasons for refusal. Again, the façade design has been simplified to focus almost exclusively on brick detailing (two tone), deep window reveals and artificial stone window surrounds

with a more vertical articulation and enhanced rhythm to the north and south elevations.



- 9.31 The building would also sit below the height of the main building and would step down towards the boundaries of the site. The topography would help reduce the impact of the replacement building and the proposed gap between the main building and the rear building would assist in the degree of separation and subordination. 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) would be limited.
- 9.32 There would be views of the proposed spine building from Fitzroy Gardens (particularly the Fitzroy Gardens spur) and from the adjacent "Regency Gardens"; the latter of which is located within the conservation area. The reductions in height and mass would lessen the visual impact of the proposed east-west spine building to a significant extent when viewed from these two locations. In view of the extensive tree coverage close to the boundaries of the application site and the overall design quality of the proposed development, officers are satisfied that the scheme would provide an appropriate backdrop to "Regency Gardens" and the Fitzroy Gardens properties and should respect the existing character of this part of the conservation area.
- 9.33 The elevational/façade amendments to the proposed south wing has significantly enhanced the appearance of that part of the scheme and alongside the enhancements to the appearance of the existing north extension and the removal of inappropriate roof additions, officers consider that the scheme satisfactorily addresses the need to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of other heritage assets. The elevational changes have enabled greater sense of verticality which should help improve the perceived mass in relation to the retained hotel range. The actual mass would be further reduced by the setting back of the existing top floor (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) which 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 should be welcomed and supported. Whilst this stairwell should ideally be recessed and the top floor completely removed from the 1970's extension, the setting back of top floor elements should enhance the situation

### Design and Appearance

- 9.34 The proposed design of the south wing and re-clad north extension would suitably 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 would allow the historic building to remain prominent and the quoins to remain uninterrupted.



- 9.35 The simplicity of the design of the new brickwork (but with architectural references to the retained structures) would be entirely appropriate although it is crucial that this detail and design quality is followed through on site. It is therefore considered necessary and reasonable to require large scale sections and details of the proposed new elements to be submitted for approval to ensure that appropriate design quality and scheme detailing is delivered on site.
- 9.36 Removal of the existing canopies to the front elevation is welcomed. Large scale details are required of the proposed entrance canopy, which can be secured by condition.
- 9.37 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

- 9.38 The selection of brick and metal roof cladding represents an appropriate and sympathetic materials palette which retains a clear contrast with the historic building – but with some architectural references suitably represented. A planning condition would 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

- 9.39 The proposals include introduction of greater soft landscaping to the forecourt which is supported.
- 9.40 Whilst the forecourt is expected to accommodate a number of functions (including coach parking and coach/taxi drop off) the areas of soft landscaping should help mitigate the effects of these interventions (especially adjacent to the Church Road frontage and in the vicinity of the main pedestrian entrance into the hotel reception). Efforts have been made to de-clutter the existing forecourt area and it is important that the re-landscaping of the area utilises high quality materials – which will be secured through use of a planning condition.
- 9.41 This more simplified space should work well with improved circulation whilst still accommodating a car club bay. The reduced clutter and increased soft landscaping represents an improvement and would enhance this frontage of the site (notwithstanding the implications of coach parking on the views of the hotel from Church Road).
- 9.42 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

- 9.43 This is already the largest and most prominent building in the conservation area and despite alterations, the building range has retained its overall integrity and legibility as a hotel, dating back to the 1850s. Taken together, the works proposed for the main frontage are well subordinated and differentiated compositionally and officers consider that the extensions and alterations would preserve the significance of the locally listed components that form the centrepiece of the Church Road elevation.
- 9.44 The development would not undermine or diminish the quality of the building and would enhance the appearance from Church Road. The extensions to the rear have been reduced in scale and bulk, with a simplified external treatment (compared to the previous refused scheme) and would remain sufficiently subservient in relation to the existing buildings and would not appear harmful or overbearing. Moreover, they would be significantly obscured by trees situated within the large neighbouring private communal garden.
- 9.45 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 well with the building and preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area. Any harm (which in any case would constitute less than substantial harm) would be outweighed by the following benefits of the scheme:

- Employment and wider regenerative benefits associated with the proposal (jobs and additional spend)
- The rationalisation of the existing hotel range, the recladding of the 1970s extension and removal of previous canopy structures
- Delivering a more sustainable future for the hotel and enhanced hotel guest facilities (including enhanced disabled access and provision)
- High quality design and elevational/landscape treatment

9.46 The scheme as proposed contains a number of subterranean rooms with partial windows, light-wells 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%	43	33	78	15%
Rooms with lightwells	0	0%	0	33	33	7%
Rooms with partial/obscure windows	39	12%	31	0	31	6%
Rooms with full windows	256	77%	156	199	355	72%
Total	334	100%	230	265	495	100%

9.47 Although the hotel does have a number of rooms that are not full windows, there are currently no policies that seek to protect amenity of occupiers in hotel accommodation. Furthermore, the applicant has previously provided officers and Members of Planning Committee the opportunity to view windowless rooms of a similar size in the existing hotel. Officers found the accommodation acceptable in terms of overall design quality.

9.48 These proposals will deliver a net increase of 161 new hotel rooms across a range of accommodation formats. 64 of the additional rooms will be specified as 'family rooms' and will have a slightly larger layout than the remaining rooms which is welcomed.

#### Landscaping and Trees

9.49 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 would be 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 would greatly increase levels of landscaping within the site.

## **Amenity Impact on Neighbouring Occupiers**

### Privacy and Visual Impact

- 9.50 The proposed extension on the south side of the building would be removed from 124 Church Road by 20.5 metres and separated by Fitzroy Gardens. Whilst there are some flank windows that would face onto this neighbouring property, these would be secondary and corridor windows and could be obscure glazed to prevent any loss of privacy. The distance would be sufficient to prevent any harmful loss of outlook or visual intrusion.
- 9.51 2 Fitzroy Gardens and the recent permission (granted on appeal) for residential development adjacent to 2 Fitzroy Gardens would be orientated so that outlook and intrusion would be limited. However, there would be windows facing these garden areas at a distance of 8.5 metres and 14.5 metres respectively from the adjacent plot and 2 Fitzroy Gardens respectively. The distance would be 1.5 metre closer than the previously approved south extension (LBC Ref 14/03472/P). Whilst it is appreciated that there would be 5 storeys of accommodation and 5 windows per floor facing onto these garden areas, there would be no direct window to window over-looking and the distance would be sufficiently comparable to that previously found to be acceptable and would not be sufficient to warrant a reason for refusal.
- 9.52 18 Fitzroy Gardens is located to the south of the rear part of the building. With the reductions in height to the western-most element of the east-west spine building, the hotel at this point would be of a similar height to Fitzroy Gardens properties (ridge height) and would not extend beyond rear building line 18 Fitzroy Gardens. There is a tree between the front of this neighbouring property and the hotel, which helps to obscure the buildings from each other. The development would be at an angle from this neighbouring building and separated by 10 metres which should ensure a suitable relationship, thereby minimising visual intrusion. 18 Fitzroy Gardens has habitable accommodation at first and second level, although these windows do not have a direct relationship to the proposed building (being perpendicular to the proposed east-west spine building) which would therefore limit overlooking to a significant degree. It is considered that there is no need to obscure glaze windows in the vicinity of this neighbouring property.
- 9.53 The existing “mews building” would be retained alongside the boundary with the rear gardens of 7-15 Wakefield Gardens. Existing relationships would be maintained and the windows present on this boundary are obscure glazed, which will be retained as such in the future. This will be secured through use of a planning condition. The proposed basement is proposed to be excavated approximately 22.3 metres from this property boundary.
- 9.54 The extension to the rear of the building would, in part, extend northwards towards Silverton Cottage. This northwards projection would in effect step down from 3 to 2 storeys, sited 11 metres from Silverton Cottage. Given the distance, height and orientation, the outlook from this property would not be significantly adversely impacted. Other than corridor windows which can be obscure glazed, there would be no flank windows on this part of the extension. Significant overlooking would therefore not occur and restriction of roofs as terraces would also limit potential for overlooking and general disturbance.

- 9.55 The dining room extension would be 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. Whilst this extension would face towards Regency Gardens, the windows would be screened up to a height of 1.4m which would be 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.
- 9.56 Window to window separation between the proposed east-west spine building and the rear elevations of 2-16 Fitzroy Gardens would be around 40 metres which would be acceptable in terms of maintaining acceptable levels of privacy. It is appreciated that there will be some overlooking of "Regency Gardens", but this would be mitigated to a certain extent by existing vegetation and tree coverage to the northern boundary of the communal garden area. In short, there is no justification for obscure glazing to proposed hotel windows and a refusal on the basis of loss of privacy to the garden area would not be sustainable on appeal.

#### Daylight and Sunlight

- 9.57 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. 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 would comply with guidance. This is due to the majority of proposed structures being sited to the north of the majority of neighbouring properties and the communal garden area.

#### Noise

- 9.58 It is appreciated that an increase in floor space and additional hotel accommodation will increase the potential for noise and disturbance, particularly from additional comings and goings. A noise assessment was submitted in support of the proposed development which recommends the use of planning conditions to control the fixed plant noise impact. In terms of noise impact the Council's Environmental Consultant has raised no objection to the proposals and is satisfied that noise can be suitably contained and/or controlled.
- 9.59 Whilst there are limited details regarding the proposed ventilation system, neighbouring occupiers are well removed from the dining area and on that basis a condition to secure details prior to any installation would be acceptable.

#### Basement Impact Assessment

- 9.60 A Basement Impact Assessment was submitted alongside the previous planning application (back in 2017) which has been submitted again, in support of these amended proposals. At the time, the document was reviewed by the Council's Building Control team. The report is effectively a structured first stage risk assessment and as such, the report sufficiently captures the issues and consequently, there is no need to require further details to be investigated at this stage of the process. A condition is recommended that secures a suitably qualified chartered engineer with membership of the appropriate professional body to inspect, approve and monitor basement excavation works. The appointed building control body would have no control over the temporary support and construction methods employed by the developer. Such works

would need to be influenced and governed by separate legislation (Party Wall Act, Construction Design and Management Regulations, Health and Safety issues and Civil Law).

## **Transport**

- 9.61 The site is located in an area with a PTAL rating of 3, which is moderate and is also well located in terms of accessibility to services and facilities available in Upper Norwood District Centre.
- 9.62 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.
- 9.63 The proposed expansion would increase the number of hotel rooms to 495 rooms and provide a total of 207 parking spaces (0.42 spaces per room). The current car parking ration is 0.2 car parking spaces per room and the previously refused scheme proposed a car parking ratio of 0.32 which was found to be inadequate by Planning Committee and was subsequently previously refused on that basis. The increase in the level of car parking seeks to deal with previous concerns and it is worth noting that the level of provision goes well beyond what would normally be expected and TfL and the London Mayor (in his Stage 1 response) encourages the applicant to investigate a reduction in on site car parking. With this in mind, officers feel that the level of car parking proposed to support this development is acceptable and would be concerned if insufficient car parking continues to be sited as a potential reason for refusal, bearing in mind the overarching policy to limit reliance on the private car. Car parking for disabled guests would be suitably accommodated in accordance with required standards and full provision of vehicle charging spaces can be delivered through the imposition of planning conditions. Space would also be accommodated within the basement to accommodate van parking.
- 9.64 Whilst the London Plan Policy 6A.8 does not set maximum parking standards for C1 land use, 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 excessive, given that the proposal is a more conventional hotel marketed towards tourists and business travellers, a greater turnover of rooms might well be expected. This, coupled with the potential impact on on-street parking stress, as highlighted by local residents, justifies a higher levels of on-site car parking.
- 9.65 The charging for parking on site has been an issue for local residents with concern that charging for parking would encourage guests to park on street – thereby avoiding the car parking charge levied by the hotel operator. Charging for on-site hotel parking is a common occurrence across London and in many urban situations where limited on street car parking is available and/or where on street car parking charges are common-place. The charging for car parking currently operates as part of the existing hotel operation and officers are satisfied that with a Car Parking Management Plan in place, which would be a planning condition requirement, on and off- street car parking can be properly managed and controlled. There have been situations where on street van parking has been an issue for local residents and the current position, as confirmed by the applicant, is that guests wishing to park vans on site will be able to do so in dedicated van parking bays without charge – thereby ensuring that van parking is

contained on site. There is also space within the front forecourt area for taxi drop off and a car club space, which is welcomed.

- 9.66 Whilst it is appreciated that residents might not agree to a Controlled Parking Zone being instigated in the immediate area, it is still considered prudent to require monies from the applicant (as part of a S.106 Agreement) to further investigate the need and desire for a Controlled Parking Zone (if necessary) in the vicinity of the site and in Upper Norwood more widely. The Council's 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.
- 9.67 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.
- 9.68 In response to previous concerns raised by Planning Committee and local residents and as inferred by the previous reason for refusal, the applicant has elected to increase the level of on-site coach parking; with the plans indicating space within the forecourt area for 5 coaches at any one time. Whilst TfL has advised that they would prefer space for additional coach parking, it is clear that there would be insufficient space for further coach parking which in any case would further harm the views of the hotel from Church Road. The London Plan advises that a hotel of the size envisaged would require 10-11 coach parking spaces which, in the vast majority of situations, would not be achievable and would not represent best use of previously developed land. Officers are satisfied that the 5 coach parking spaces would suitably cater for the likely demand from coaches visiting at any one time. A preliminary Coach Management Plan was submitted in support of the planning application which sets out the system for booking coaches in to ensure that a space is always available. The Plan also identifies available sites where coaches can park off-site once passengers have been dropped off (Elm Nursery Car Park, Mitcham; Camberwell Bus Garage and Stockwell Bus Garage) 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 (although it is accepted that there is some potential conflict when coaches wish to leave the site when taxis are dropping off and picking up). It is also important that on site coach parking is properly managed on a day to day basis (linked to the Coach Management Plan). However, officers are satisfied that this conflict will only be an issue on a very limited basis and should not cause significant issues on the highway, with any conflict being manageable on site by the hotel operator
- 9.69 The proposals require the provision of a new vehicular access which will in turn require the modification to/loss of an on-street parking bay (4/5 spaces). Whilst no plans have been submitted to indicate how this will be modified or removed, the loss of these spaces is acceptable in principle; particularly given that the removal of spaces should aid the free flow of traffic along Church Road. The details of the changes would be secured via highway agreements (S.284 and S.278) and a Grampian condition can ensure that these are entered into.
- 9.70 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 – which will be delivered through planning conditions.

- 9.71 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.
- 9.72 A Framework Travel Plan and a Preliminary Construction Management Plan have been submitted and 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

- 9.73 The applicant 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 would be compliant with the London Plan target of 35% for non-domestic buildings. Documents have also been submitted to show that BRE AAM 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

- 9.74 As the application relates to a major application a Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Management Plan is required under Local Plan Policies SP6.4 and DM.25 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 (LLFA). The LLFA has 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

- 9.75 The Council's 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

- 9.76 A Phase 1 Contamination Assessment has been submitted that, given that there is some uncertainty as to the presence or otherwise of contamination on site, it is

recommended that an intrusive site investigation is conducted and secured by condition.

#### Overheating

- 9.77 An overheating analysis has been undertaken and 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**

##### Phasing

- 9.78 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 and arguably is critical to the overall success of the development as it represents an important benefit of the scheme in terms of the overall planning balance. 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 commenced and completed. These restrictions need to ensure that the enhancements are delivered and the benefits realised.

##### Community Engagement

- 9.79 Local residents have been critical of how the applicant has approached community engagement throughout this whole process (over the last couple of years). Community engagement on planning applications is not mandatory, although the NPPF encourages applicants to engage with local communities at pre-application stage and to continue engagement throughout the development process. A Statement of Community Involvement was submitted in support of the application and there is evidence that meetings and engagement took place at pre-application stage. As highlighted earlier in this report, the eventual planning application submission has generated significant comment.
- 9.80 The scheme remains controversial locally and meetings under such circumstances need to be managed, to ensure that engagement is helpful to all parties. Overly adversarial approaches to such forms of engagement can be unhelpful. Officers are satisfied that the applicant has suitably engaged with local residents and has fully embraced the process under difficult and challenging circumstances.

#### **Conclusions**

- 9.81 The recommendation is to grant planning permission subject to a S.106 legal agreement.
- 9.82 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account.