

<b>Planning Board</b>	<b>Agenda Item: 6</b>
<b>28 July 2020</b>	<b>Reference Nos: 20/0662/MA</b>

**Applicant:** Nine Group Hotel Ltd.

**Agent:** Tibbatts Design Ltd.

<b>Site Address:</b> Part Built Hotel Site, 228 Tunnel Avenue, Greenwich, SE10 0PL	<b>Ward:</b> Peninsula  <b>Application Type:</b> Full Planning
--	--

## **I.0 Recommendation**

I.1 The Planning Board is requested to grant Planning Permission, as outlined below:

- An application submitted under Section 73 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 for a minor material amendment in connection with the planning permission 18/0257/F, dated 17/12/2018 for the construction of two additional part-storeys and extension of fourth and fifth floors to create a Part 4, Part 6 and Part 8-storey Hotel providing 68 Bedrooms (Amendment to previously approved planning permission 16/2965/F) to allow:
  - Alterations to ground floor shopfront and parking arrangements
  - Alterations to ground floor layout, including the construction/retention of a single storey rear extension
  - Alterations to external materials and colours
  - Addition of window surrounds to the rear elevation

I.2 Recommendation:

- A. To resolve to grant conditional planning permission subject to the prior completion of an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) containing the planning obligations as summarised in the heads of terms set out in this report (Section 12), its addendums and according to the conditions (Appendix 2) to be detailed in the notice of determination;
- B. To authorise the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to:

- i. make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in this report (Appendix 2) and its addendums, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice; and
  - ii. finalise the detailed terms of the planning obligations pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), as set out in this report (Section 12).
- C. In the event that the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within three (3) months of the date of this Planning Board meeting, to authorise the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to consider whether permission should be refused on the grounds that the proposals are unacceptable in the absence of the benefits which would have been secured, and if so, to determine the application with reasons for refusal which will include the following;
- I. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure highways works and Employment Training contributions, the development fails to mitigate its impact on local services, amenities and infrastructure contrary to policies H3, IM1 and EA(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (Adopted July 2014) and the Planning obligations (s106) Guidance SPD (adopted July 2015).

## 2.0 Summary

2.1 Detailed below is a summary of the application:

<b>The Site -</b>	
Site Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	794m <sup>2</sup>
Site Designations	Strategic Development Area Flood Risk Area
Flood Risk Zone	Zone 3 - Area benefiting from flood defences

<b>Non-Residential Uses</b>		
Existing Use(s)	Existing use (Classes) / Operator	CI
	m <sup>2</sup>	2677.3sqm
Proposed Use(s)	Proposed use(s) (Classes) / Operator	CI
	m <sup>2</sup>	10.29sqm

Employment	Existing Number of Jobs	N/A
	Proposed number of jobs	Up to 23 FTE

<b>Transportation</b>		
Car Parking	No. existing car parking spaces	13 on-site spaces
	No. Proposed Car Parking Spaces	11 on-site spaces
	Complies with policy	Yes
Public Transport	PTAL Rating	3

<b>Public Consultation</b>	
Number in support	0
Number of objections	1
Number of comments	1
Main issues raised by objectors - These are addressed in Section 6 (Consultations) and throughout Sections 9-19 (Main Considerations).	– Use of site as hotel.

- 2.2 The report details all relevant national, regional and local policy implications of the scheme, including supplementary planning guidance.
- 2.3 The application is considered acceptable and is recommended for approval, subject to the recommendation set out in section 1.2 above.

### **3.0 Site and Surroundings (in detail)**



**Figure 1: Site Plan**

### 3.1 The Site

3.2 The application relates to a partially built hotel located on the eastern side of Tunnel Avenue. The consented scheme was for a part 4/part 6/part 8 building, to be finished in a mixture of dark brick, white render and metal cladding. While most of the shell and core was completed in 2015, construction on the site stalled and the building has been covered in scaffolding and sheeting since.

3.3 The surrounding area is primarily industrial in nature, although several residential properties are located to the south of the site.

## 4.0 Relevant Planning History

4.1 **09/2796/F** - Demolition of existing house and erection of a 6 storey building to provide a hotel with 47 bedrooms, bar and restaurant and associated parking. **Refused**, 17/03/2010.

- 4.2 **APP/E5330/A/10/2127740/NWF** – Appeal concerning the above. **Allowed**, 06/10/2010.
- 4.3 **I2/0308/F** - Demolition of existing house and construction of a part 6/part 4-storey building to provide 62-bed student accommodation. **Refused**, 16/05/2012.
- 4.4 **APP/E5330/A/12/2178469/NWF** – Appeal concerning the above. **Dismissed**, 29/10/2012.
- 4.5 **I4/3599/V** - Removal of basement, reconfiguration of car parking, changes to elevations and addition of roof level structures and plant equipment as Material Amendment and Variation of condition 2 (Approved Drawings) of appeal decision dated 06/10/10 (planning ref: 09/2796/F). **Approved**, 27/04/2015.
- 4.6 **I6/2965/F** - Conversion of plant rooms to guest rooms resulting in 3 additional rooms as Minor Material Amendment and Variation of Condition 1 (Approved Drawings) of planning permission dated 27/04/2015 (Reference: I4/3599/V).
- 4.7 **I8/0257/F** - Construction of two additional part-storeys and extension of fourth and fifth floors to create a Part 4, Part 6 and Part 8-storey Hotel providing 68 Bedrooms. (Amendment to previously approved planning permission I6/2965/F).

## **5.0 Proposal**

- 5.1 The application proposes several changes to the previously approved design. Most notably, this comprises a variation to the approved material pallet, with the incorporation of a darker brick to lower levels and a dark metal cladding to the top floors. The proposed darker Charcoal Blue brick currently proposed would be retained alongside the previously approved light grey brick.
- 5.2 The ground floor shopfront would also be amended under the current application, with the main entrance to the building moved to the southern end of the building and a small external porch added. The openings within the shopfront would remain largely unchanged, but would see the incorporation of a crittall glazing style. Due to internal layout changes and the relocated entrance, the proposal would also see two existing on-site parking spaces to the front of the property removed.

- 5.3 Within the south-eastern corner of the site at ground floor level a single storey extension has been constructed without the benefit of planning permission. The current application seeks to regularise this addition. Said extension features a flat roof with a height of 3.4m. It covers some 10.2sqm, with a depth of 3.6m and width of 3.1m. It is to be finished in matching materials.
- 5.4 Finally, it is proposed to incorporate window surrounds to the rear elevation of the building. This element has been incorporated at the request of Greenwich's Urban Design Officer in order to improve the appearance of the rear elevation with increased visual interest.

## 6.0 **Consultation**

- 6.1 Since being submitted in February 2020 the application has been subject of public consultation, comprising of 52 individual letters sent to neighbouring properties. Local Ward Councillors, statutory and internal bodies were also consulted.

### 6.2 Statutory Consultees

A summary of the consultation responses received along with the officer comments are set out in table below:

Details of Representation	Summary of Comments	Officer's comments
TFL	No objections raised to proposed amendments.	Noted.

### 6.3 Internal Consultees

A summary of the consultation responses received from internal parties, along with the Officer comments are set out in table below:

Details of Representation	Summary of Comments	Officer's Comments
Highways	No objections raised to proposed amendments.	Noted.

### 6.4 Local Residents

A summary of the consultation responses received from local residents, along with the officer comments are set out in table below:

Summary of Comments	Officer's comments
---------------------	--------------------

Concerns raised regarding use of the site as a hotel.	Use of the site has already been established under previous permissions, with the current proposal seeking external alterations only
---	--

6.5 In addition to the above, a letter was received from another neighbouring occupier. However, the resident simply enquired as to why they had been consulted and did not raise any point/concerns in relation to the current proposal.

## 7.0 Planning Context

7.1 This application needs to be considered in the context of a range of national, regional and local planning policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents.

- **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF – 2019)**
- **The London Plan (March 2016)** - Full details of relevant policies refer to Appendix 3.
- **The Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (“Core Strategy” – 2014)** - Full details of relevant policies refer to Appendix 3.

7.2 For full details of relevant SPD / Documents refer to Appendix 3.

7.3 In addition to the above, Officers also have regard to the Draft London Plan, The Mayor published his Intend to Publish (ItP) version of the London Plan on 9 December 2019, and on 13 March 2020 the Secretary of State wrote to the Mayor setting out eleven directions for modifications to the Intend to Publish version of the London Plan necessary to remedy inconsistencies with national policy. The Mayor is considering the Secretary of State's response and will take the statutory steps to finalise the Plan.

7.4 The ItP version has reached an advanced stage in the adoption process, and save for those areas where the Secretary of State has directed modifications the policies in the ItP version are considered to have substantial weight as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

## 8.0 Planning Considerations

- 8.1 The planning considerations relevant to this application are as follows:
- Design
  - Neighbouring Amenity
  - Highways

## 9.0 Design

- 9.1 London Plan (2016) Policy 7.4 requires developments to have regard to the form, function, and structure of an area, place or street and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings, while Policy 7.6 requires them to be of the highest architectural quality. These objectives are carried through into Policy DI of the draft London Plan and are similarly replicated in the Council's own Core Strategy Policy DH1

### *Change to materials and installation of window surrounds*

- 9.2 In terms of the revised materiality, the proposal seeks to change the white rendered elements of the approved scheme to light grey brickwork to the front. The darker brick to the front elevation, as originally approved is to be maintained.
- 9.3 The proposal also seeks to replace the approved ceramic panel to the rear elevation with light grey brickwork placed in wide strips inserted between the dark brickwork. The top floor element which was previously to be finished in a light grey metallic is now sought in a black/dark grey metal cladding with lines between the materials amended to suit the overall design of the building.
- 9.4 Finally, the rear elevation would also see the incorporation of aluminium window surrounds to all windows.
- 9.5 The incorporation of an all brick finish is considered acceptable, given brick constitutes a high quality finish. Furthermore, this combined with the darker finish proposed would likely result in a visual improvement to the host building over time, as its location adjacent to a busy dual carriageway would likely have resulted in severe weathering to the previously approved lighter finishes. It is noted that the darker brick to the front elevation is to remain as approved, whereas to the rear there would be a slight increase in the use of this. Nevertheless, both the approved and proposed bricks have been reviewed by Officers and the Council's Urban Design Officer and were found to be acceptable. The building is located in a primarily commercial/industrial area, with other similarly large buildings such as the nearby low carbon energy centre also featuring dark cladding. The proposed bricks to the main building



and dark metal cladding to the top floor element is therefore considered acceptable.

- 9.6 The applicant has also introduced window surrounds to the rear elevation, at the request of the Council's Urban Design Officer. This has resulted in an improved level of visual interest to the rear, which improves the overall quality of the scheme.
- 9.7 On this basis no objections are raised to the proposed material changes.

#### *Change to shopfront and parking arrangements*

- 9.8 The changes to the shopfront would consist of minor alterations to layout of the glazing and the introduction of crittall fixtures. The main entrance would be relocated to the southern half of the building and would feature an external glazed porch. Finally, an additional servicing door would be added to the northern end of the shopfront. The relocated entrance would result in the loss of two car parking spaces.
- 9.9 The changes to the shopfront are not considered to have any harmful impact on the appearance of the building, rather the incorporation of crittall windows would relate well with the industrial nature of the surrounding area. No objections are raised to the relocation of the main entrance on design grounds, although the highways impacts resulting from the consequential loss of parking spaces will be assessed in the Highways section of this report. The introduction of the external porch/entry is considered acceptable and would be similar to the previous design which included a projecting caracal door.
- 9.10 On this basis no objections are raised in respect of the alterations to the front elevation.

#### *Rear extension*

- 9.11 The application also seeks the retention of an existing single storey rear extension which has been constructed without permission. In design terms, the addition of the rear extension has no impact, as it is not visible from the public realm and is constructed in matching materials.

### **10.0 Neighbouring Amenity**

- 10.1 Royal Greenwich Local Plan; Core Strategy with Detailed Policy (2014) Policy DH(b) states that developments will only be permitted where it can be

demonstrated that the proposal does not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers by reducing the amount of daylight, sunlight or privacy they enjoy or result in an un-neighbourly sense of enclosure. This is supported by London Plan Policy 7.6.

- 10.2 In this instance the proposed changes to the materials are not considered to result in any significant impact to neighbouring residential occupiers, as the section of the building closest to these properties is to retain the materials as previously approved. The remaining sections of the building are set back away from the residential neighbouring, thereby minimising the impacts.
- 10.3 The alterations to the shopfront are also unlikely to impact on neighbouring amenity. While the main entrance is now closer to residential neighbouring properties, this is still some 10m away from the nearest neighbouring boundary. Furthermore, the plans show vegetation along the boundary which could provide additional screening to the neighbouring property; a condition will be attached to secure this. The other changes to the fenestration at ground floor level would have no impact.
- 10.4 In terms of the rear extension, the only impacts would be felt by the directly adjacent property, 226 Tunnel Avenue. To this end, as the extension is located directly to the north, there would be no significant loss of light or increased overshadowing to No.226. Furthermore, given the setback of 1.3m-1.7m from the shared boundary, the proposed height of the extension at 3.4m is unlikely to result in any significant overbearing impact or increased sense of enclosure. The extension has no windows or openings facing towards the boundary, nor does the neighbouring dwelling, meaning there would be no loss of privacy. On this basis it is considered that the extension has an acceptable impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property.
- 10.5 Given the above, it is considered that the proposed changes would not result in any significantly detrimental additional impacts on neighbouring amenity than would have otherwise occurred as a result of the consented scheme.

## **11.0 Highways**

- 11.1 London Plan Policy 6.3 states that development proposals should ensure that impacts on transport capacity and the transport network, at both a corridor and local level, are fully assessed, and that development should not adversely affect safety on the transport network. This is carried forward in Draft London Plan Policy T4.

- 11.2 The revised front layout would result in the loss of two on-site parking spaces, which has the potential to lead to an increase in parking stress on Tunnel Avenue. However, a Transport Statement has been submitted in support of the application in which a parking survey was undertaken. The findings of the survey showed there to be sufficient on street parking capacity, with this to remain the case following the removal of the on-site spaces.
- 11.3 TfL and the Council's Highways team were also consulted and confirmed that they raised no objections to the proposal.
- 11.4 On this basis it is considered that the proposal would not have any significant impact on the highways network in comparison to the approved scheme, and thus can be considered a minor amendment.

## **12.0 Legal Agreement**

- 12.1 Policy IM1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan sets out that all qualifying developments will provide for the infrastructure, facilities, amenities and programmes that are considered necessary to support and serve the development and offset any harm. When applicable, this is in addition to the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- 12.2 The original application was subject to a S106 legal agreement which secured the following Heads of Terms:
- Highways
    - Implementation of Travel Plan in full from Occupation Date.
    - Subsequent reviews of Travel Plan
  - Employment Training contribution including GLLAB
    - Participation in GLLAB
    - Financial contribution of £12,760 towards GLLAB.
- 12.3 The current proposal would not require any amendments to the Heads of Terms as secured by the original application. A Deed of Variation will therefore be secured to tie the original S106 legal agreement to the current application if approved.

## **13.0 Conclusion**

- 13.1 The proposed amendments would constitute a minor material amendment to the consented scheme and the impact of these would not be significant, rather the changes would have a largely positive impact.
- 13.2 Based on the above, it is therefore recommended that permission be granted for application reference 20/0662/MA, subject to the conditions outlined in Appendix 2.

Background Papers: National Planning Policy Framework (2019)  
The London Plan (2016)  
The Draft London Plan (2019)  
Royal Greenwich Local Plan; Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014)

Report Author: Andrew Harris  
Tel No.: 0208 921 6121  
Email: [Andrew.Harris@royalgreenwich.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Harris@royalgreenwich.gov.uk)

Reporting to: Victoria Geoghegan - Assistant Director Planning &  
Building Control  
Tel No.: 0208 921 4296  
Email: [Victoria.Geoghegan@royalgreenwich.gov.uk](mailto:Victoria.Geoghegan@royalgreenwich.gov.uk)