



Application Reference:	P1866.18
Location:	Harefield Manor Hotel, 33 Main Road
Ward:	Romford Town
Description:	The Proposal is for the addition of lift access and addition of roof accommodation to the annex along with extension to the rear of the annex (2-3 storeys). The Proposal is also for extensions on the first floor to the Main hotel building.
Case Officer:	Kevin McLaughlin
Reason for Report to Committee:	A Councillor call-in by Councillor Joshua Chapman has been received which accords with the Committee Consideration Criteria.

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The application was called in by Councillor Joshua Chapman who expresses concern that the development, through its size and bulk, will have a significant impact on the light afforded to neighbouring residents.

2. SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 The proposal is not judged to adversely affect the character of the application sites or the visual amenities of the streetscene. This development would not cause an excessively detrimental impact upon the residential amenities enjoyed by neighbouring properties.

3 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions.

- 3.2 That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions to secure the following matters:

Conditions

1. SC4 – Time Limit (3 years).
2. SC32 – Accordance with plans.
3. SC10 – Matching materials.
4. SC11 – Landscaping (Pre-Commencement).
5. SC42 – Noise (Pre-Commencement).
6. SC46 – Standard flank window condition
7. SC57 – Wheel Washing (Pre Commencement)
8. SC62 – Hours of Construction
9. SC63 – Construction Methodology (Pre Commencement)

4 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposal

- 4.1 Planning permission is sought for an extension to both the main site and the annexe building.
- 4.2 With regards to the annexe, the works will be largely focussed towards the rear of the site and at roof level in order to establish lift access and an additional ten single bedrooms.
- 4.3 Works to the main building will again be directed towards the rear of the existing structure. Again, additional accommodation is sought, this time through five double rooms at first floor level.

Site and Surroundings

- 4.3 Harefield Manor Hotel is split into two parts. The main hotel building is located at No.33 Main Road, on the corner of Pettits Lane. Split over three floors, the main hotel is finished with a face brick exterior and has been extended on numerous occasions over the years.
- 4.4 Also split across three levels, the annexe building is on the opposing side of Main Road, on the junction with Erroll Road. This part of the application site is formally recognised as No.48 Main Road.
- 4.5. Parking spaces are available upon both sites.

Planning History

- 4.6 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:
- P1949.16 - Rear Extension – Approved with conditions
 - P1485.16 - Boundary wall erection, Removal of obstruction to neighbouring property – Refused

- N0033.12 - Minor Amendment to remove secondary window within hotel room at ground, first and second floor level; amendments to gable – Approved no conditions
- P0993.10 - Extensions and alterations to provide front reception and rear extension (3 storey) and first floor extension to annex – Approved with conditions
- P0836.10 - Two storey link and alterations revised layout of first floor (amendment to application P0091.05.) – Approved with conditions
- P0825.10 - Wall adjoining highway – Approved with conditions
- P0064.09 - Single storey side extension – Approved with conditions

5 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

5.1 The views of the Planning Service are expressed in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section below.

5.2 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- LBH Street Management Department - No objection.
- LBH Waste and Recycling - No comment
- LBH Environmental Health - No objection to the development provided conditions are added in order to minimize noise and restrict the hours of construction.
- Romford Civic Society - No objection.
- Heritage Consultants (Place Services) - No comment.

6 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

6.1 32 neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment.

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

No of individual responses: 3 which objected.

6.3 The following Councillor made representations:

Councillor Joshua Chapman wishes to call the application in on the grounds that:

- The development, through its size and bulk, will have a significant impact on the light afforded to neighbouring residents.

Representations

6.4 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application, and they are addressed in substance in the next section of this report:

- Overdevelopment
- Loss of amenity and light afforded to neighbouring residents.
- Overlooking and loss of privacy.
- Increased noise, disturbance and light pollution.
- Detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area.
- Lack of additional parking.

Non-material representations

6.5 The following issues were raised in representations, but they are not material to the determination of the application:

- As the 'loss of a view' is not a material planning consideration, it is not something that can be taken into account in the consideration of a planning application. It therefore this does not form part of the assessment.
- Any disturbance stemming from the behaviour of future customers is not a matter for the planning department to police.
- The construction phase of development cannot be controlled by the planning department. As with future occupation, planning officers cannot base a decision on anticipation or pre-empt any structural issues which may or may not arise.

7 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

- The principle of development.
- The impact upon the character and appearance of the application site.
- The impact upon the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.
- Any parking or highway implications.

8 Principle of Development

8.1 Policy DC14 states that Romford is the preferred location for large scale hotel development and advises that hotels strengthen the wider role of town centres and provide a range of employment opportunities. The supporting text refers to the GLA hotel Demand Study 2006 which states that between 2007 and 2026 an additional 300 hotel bedrooms will be required in Havering.

8.2 Policy 4.5 of The London Plan states that new visitor accommodation should be focused in town centres, where there is good public transport access to

central London and international and national transport termini. In terms of accessibility the site occupies a highly accessible and sustainable town centre location.

- 8.3 Although Harefield Manor Hotel is not located within Romford Town Centre, the proposal does not seek permission for a completely new development. The intensification of use is not considered excessive and as such, the scheme has been deemed acceptable given the hotel's 'edge of town centre' location.
- 8.4 Notwithstanding the above, any approval will be dependent on the proposal details. It must be noted that there is a degree of judgment involved as to the suitability of the works.

9 Impact upon character and appearance of application sites

- 9.1 As noted above, the majority of the additional built form will be located towards the rear of the application sites. As such, the development will be suitably removed from Main Road. Considering the siting and scale of the works, the character and overall appearance of the area will not be compromised by the proposed scheme. While officers recognise that the extensions will be observed from both Pettits Lane and Erroll Road, the considerate and in keeping design will ensure that the additions will not be overly prominent or readily visible from the public realm.
- 9.2 This scheme will not present an unacceptable impact upon the street scene.
- 9.3 Elements of landscaping and planting have been included within the scheme and will ensure the aesthetics of the garden environment are not lost as a result of the scheme.
- 9.4 Overall the proposal would integrate appropriately within the character of the surrounding area.

10 The impact upon the amenity of neighbouring residential properties

- 10.1 The Residential Design SPD states that new development should be sited and designed such that there is no detriment to existing residential amenity through overlooking and/or privacy loss and dominance or overshadowing. Policy DC61 reinforces these requirements by stating that planning permission will not be granted where the proposal results in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of sunlight/daylight, overlooking or loss of privacy to existing properties.
- 10.2 After considering the scale, location and design of the proposed works, it is anticipated that the development will adhere to the requirements of DC61. In terms of the neighbouring No.16 Sydenham Close, officers have noted the orientation of this property and the extent of the works proposed to the main hotel building (to the south west). After doing so, officers do not envisage the scheme resulting in a notable loss of daylight/sunlight or similarly

overshadowing in this direction. Although the proximity to the shared boundary and neighbouring dwelling has been considered, the extension to the rear of the hotel is respectful of the residential building line, which will not only limit any overshadowing/loss of light but will also prevent any undue sense of enclosure. As confirmed by the occupant, the first floor flank window serves a bathroom as opposed to a more sensitive habitable room. A combination of orientation and the protection of the neighbouring front building line have led officers to the conclusion that the ground floor window (currently serving a lounge) will not be significantly affected by the proposed works. Given the neighbouring arrangement, the north facing windows will not present overlooking issues or unacceptably compromise the level of privacy currently afforded to nearby residents.

- 10.3 With regards to the annexe building, the majority of the works are well removed from the nearest neighbours. Although the ground floor addition will extend to the boundary shared with Hill Court (to the south west) no flank windows are proposed. What is more, this element of the development will be sufficiently screened from this direction by existing boundary treatment.
- 10.4 The first floor development above has been removed from the shared boundary by approximately 3.5m meaning this addition to the hotel annexe will be over 10.5m from those flats on the other side. After also considering the absence of flank windows, officers do not foresee significant overshadowing, a notable loss of sunlight/daylight, or unacceptable overlooking/loss of privacy to existing properties. As such, the LPA does not envisage the first floor rear extension detrimentally impacting upon the level of amenity currently afforded to the residents of Hill Court.
- 10.5 The roof level development will be positioned a considerable distance away from the nearest residents. Again, flank windows are not sought and as such, officers do not envisage the scheme having a significant impact upon surrounding neighbours in regard to any overlooking or privacy.
- 10.6 In light of the above, this proposal is not considered to adversely affect the amenity of adjoining residential properties to an unacceptable degree.

11 Parking or Highway Implications

- 11.1 The application site has a PTAL rating of 5 and less than 100m from a PTAL rating of 6. As such, staff can conclude that The Harefield Manor Hotel has very good access to public transport and as such the requirement for on-site parking is not high in this instance.

- 11.2 London plan policy states the following:

'In locations with a PTAL of 4 - 6, on-site provision should be limited to operational needs, parking for disabled people and that required for taxis, coaches and deliveries/servicing.'

- 11.3 Officers consider the hardstanding around both the main hotel and the annexe is able to satisfy the requirement above.
- 11.4 Similarly, the Council's Street Management department has not raised an objection to the development.

Conclusions

All other relevant policies and considerations have been taken into account. Planning permission should be approved subject to conditions and for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.