

## DELEGATED DECISION

- Please select each of the categories that enables this application to be determined under delegated powers  
 - Criteria 1 to 5 or criteria 7 to 9 must be addressed for all categories of application, except for applications for Certificates of Lawfulness, etc.

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL		Select an Option
1.	No valid planning application objection in the form of a petition of 20 or more signatures, has been received	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Application complies with all relevant planning policies and is acceptable on planning grounds	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.	There is no Committee resolution for the enforcement action	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.	There is no effect on listed buildings or their settings	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	The site is not in the Green Belt (but see 11 below)	<input type="checkbox"/>
REFUSAL RECOMMENDED: GENERAL		
6.	Application is contrary to relevant planning policies/standards	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.	No petition of 20 or more signatures has been received	<input type="checkbox"/>
8.	Application has not been supported independently by a person/s	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	The site is not in Green Belt (but see 11 below)	<input type="checkbox"/>
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT		
10.	Single dwelling or less than 10 dwelling units and/or a site of less than 0.5 ha	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	Householder application in the Green Belt	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND RETAIL DEVELOPMENT		
12.	Change of use of retail units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000 sq. m other than a change involving a loss of A1 uses	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	Refusal of change of use from retail class A1 to any other use	<input type="checkbox"/>
14.	Change of use of industrial units on site less than 1 ha or with less than 1000sq.m. of floor space other than to a retail use.	<input type="checkbox"/>
CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS		
15.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for proposed use or Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>
16.	Certificate of Lawfulness (for existing use or Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>
17.	Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development	<input type="checkbox"/>
CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS		
18.	ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT (excluding Hoardings)	<input type="checkbox"/>
19.	PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
20.	OUT-OF-BOROUGH OBSERVATIONS	<input type="checkbox"/>
21.	CIRCULAR 18/84 APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
22.	CORPSEWOOD COVENANT APPLICATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
23.	APPROVAL OF DETAILS	<input type="checkbox"/>
24.	ANCILLARY PLANNING AGREEMENT (S.106 or S.278) where the Heads of Terms have already received Committee approval	<input type="checkbox"/>
25.	WORKS TO TREES	<input type="checkbox"/>
26.	OTHER (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>

The delegation powers schedule has been changed. Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm can determine this application

Case Officer:

Signature:

Date:

A delegated decision is appropriate and the recommendation, conditions/reasons for refusal and informative's are satisfactory.

Team Manager:

Signature:

Date:

The decision notice for this application can be issued.

Director / Member of Senior Management Team:

Signature:

Date:

NONE OF THE ABOVE DETAILS SHOULD BE USED IN THE PS2 RETURNS ODPM

**Item No.**                      **Report of the Interim Director of Planning, Regeneration & Public Realm**

**Address:**                      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER

**Development:**                Erection of 6 no. timber pergolas, rearrangement of car park, 1 no. outdoor bar, 2 no. outbuildings, 7 no. outdoor igloos, new boundary fence and planting against Field End Road, various privacy planting, paving to external pergola sitting area

**LBH Ref Nos:**                 **4726/APP/2023/248**

**Drawing Nos:**                A001 Rev P1  
A99 Rev P1  
A10 Rev P1  
A11 Rev P1  
A12 Rev P1  
A13 Rev P1  
A14 Rev P1  
A15 Rev P1  
A20 Rev P1  
A21 Rev P1  
A22 Rev P1  
A23 Rev P1  
A100 Rev P2  
A101 Rev P2  
A104 Rev P2  
A105 Rev P2  
A202 Rev P2  
A203 Rev P3  
A204 Rev P2  
A800 Rev P1  
A900 Rev P1  
A80 Rev P2

**Date Plans received:**    26-01-23                              **Date(s) of Amendments(s):**    20-03-23

**Date Application valid**    26-01-23

## 1. SUMMARY

Tudor Lodge is a grade II listed building of 16th century origin with later additions from the 17th

century up to the 21st century, located close to the meeting point of Field End Road, Bridle Road and St Lawrence's Drive, encircled by development in the C20th.

The proposal involves various elements to the curtilage of the building to facilitate outdoor dining opportunities alongside a reduction in available parking for the hotel. The Council's Highways Officer is not opposed to the scheme on parking and traffic grounds. However, the Council's Conservation Officer has reservations with the harm to the setting of the listed building. Following discussions with the applicant, there has been a reluctance to amend parts of the scheme and consequently, the harm to the listed building, whilst less than substantial, is unacceptable when weighed against the negligible public benefits.

## 2. RECOMMENDATION

**REFUSAL** for the following reasons:

### 1. NON2 Harm to the setting and views of the listed building

The design, materials, height, number and siting of the external fixtures including the outbuildings, igloos, pergola and bar, cumulatively contributes to harm to the setting and views of the listed building. In the absence of any significant public benefit, the proposal is contrary to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, Policies D8 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One 2012 and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 1, DMHB 2, DMHB 4 and DME 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two 2020.

### 2. NON2 Harm to neighbour amenity

In the absence of any noise assessment and mitigation, the proposed use of the external areas for outdoor dining and the collective capacity of the outdoor spaces has the real potential for excessive noise disturbance detrimental to the amenity of surrounding residential properties. This is contrary to Paragraphs 174 and 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, Policy D14 of the London Plan, Policies BE1 and DME 5 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (Part 1) 2012 and Policies DME 5, and DMHD 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (Part 2) 2020.

### 3. NON2 Lack of car parking details

There is contradictory information submitted in support of the proposed car parking arrangements such that the level of car parking may not be appropriate for the intended use, contrary to Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, Policy T6.1 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies DMT 2, DMT 6 and DMEI 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan 2020. :

### 4. NON2 Loss of landscape character

With contradictory information in the submitted arboricultural documentation and wholesale and unjustified removal of a large number of mature and Category B trees, the proposal will result in a net deterioration in landscape character of the site, the streetscene and the adjacent Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area, contrary to Sections 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, Policy G7 of the London Plan 2021, Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (Part 1) 2012 and Policy DMHB 14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (Part 2) 2020.

### 5. NON2 Ecological impacts

In the absence of sufficient ecology information, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would not have an adverse impact upon protected species and nature conservation or that there would be protection and enhancement of biodiversity. This is contrary to Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, Policies BE1, DMH 6, DMHB 14 and DMEI 7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan 2020 and Policy G6 of the London Plan 2021.

## INFORMATIVES

### 1. I71 Discussion

In dealing with the application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies from the Local Plan Part 1, Local Plan Part 2, Supplementary Planning Documents, Planning Briefs and other informal written guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service. We have however been unable to seek solutions to problems arising from the application as the principal of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

### 2. I52 Human Rights Act

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

### I53 Policies

The decision to REFUSE planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 (2012) and Part 2 (2020) set out below, including Supplementary Planning Guidance, and to all relevant material considerations, including The London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (2016) and national guidance.

NPPF16 NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment

NPPF6 NPPF 2021 - Building a strong, competitive economy

NPPF9 NPPF 2021 - Promoting sustainable transport

LPP D12 (2021) Fire safety

LPP D14 (2021) Noise

LPP D4 (2021) Delivering good design

LPP D5 (2021) Inclusive design

LPP E10	(2021) Visitor infrastructure
LPP G7	(2021) Trees and woodlands
LPP GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG5	(2021) Growing a good economy
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.4	(2021) Hotel and leisure use parking
LPP T6.5	(2021) Non-residential disabled persons parking
LPP T7	(2021) Deliveries, servicing and construction
BE1	Development within archaeological priority areas
DME 5	Hotels and Visitor Accommodation
DME 6	Accessible Hotels and Visitor Accommodation
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMEI 2	Reducing Carbon Emissions
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 2	Listed Buildings
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking

### 3. CONSIDERATIONS

#### 3.1 Site and Locality

The approximately 0.366ha site is located on the west side of Field End Road, south of its junction with Bridle Road. It is occupied by Tudor Lodge Hotel, comprising three main, generally two storey

C1 use buildings finished in white render with mock Tudor details and a part gable, part hipped, tiled roof.

Tudor Lodge is a grade II listed building of 16th century origin with later additions from the 17th century up to the 21st century, located close to the meeting point of Field End Road, Bridle Road and St Lawrence's Drive. It was once located out in the fields to the east of Eastcote Village and was part of a scattered hamlet to the west of a track and open fields known as "Field End". During the twentieth century suburban development has encircled it.

The site is not located in a conservation area but is adjacent to Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area to the north and can be seen within views looking out of the conservation area and as such makes a positive contribution to its setting. It is also in close proximity to Eastcote Village Conservation Area to the west.

The building was converted into a hotel in the 1990s and since then two detached accommodation blocks have been added within the curtilage and the garages converted to offices.

#### Site Constraints

- Listed Building (Grade II listed Tudor Lodge Hotel)
- Adjacent to Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area
- Tree Preservation Order 461 (south western corner of site only)
- Public Transport Level 2
- Flood Zone 1
- Potentially Contaminated Land (Orchard) to southern boundary
- Surface flooding (to front boundary)
- Tree Preservation Order 461

### 3.2 Proposed Scheme

The proposal, as amended on 3 March 2023, involves the following works:

- Demolition of the existing sheds to the south west of the main building and erection of a single storey outbuilding comprising store, prep store and WC
- Creation of a covered outdoor bar to the south of the main building, surrounded by seven detached igloo pods and associated landscaping
- Reconfiguration of the car park, resulting in a reduction in parking spaces from 26 to 22 and the relocation of disabled parking
- Outdoor dining area to the north east of the main building, including new paving, pergola and new outbuilding serving as an outdoor kitchen
- Hard and soft landscaping around the site and new boundary fencing to Field End Road
- New refuse store to the north of the main building with direct access to Field End Road

The demolition of the existing sheds to the south west of the main building form the scope of the listed building consent application.

### 3.3 Relevant Planning History

4726/APP/2023/249            TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Erection of 6 no. timber pergolas, rearrangement of car park, 1 no. outdoor bar, 2 no. outdoor food

preparation huts, 1 no. outdoor store and WC, 7 no. outdoor igloos. New boundary fence and planting against Field End Road, various privacy planting, paving to external pergola sitting area (Application for Listed Building Consent)

4726/APP/2022/3782      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Erection of a single storey extension to create a spa centre

4726/APP/2022/3783      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Replacement of existing side conservatory to solid masonry construction. Erection of a single storey rear extension to kitchen and a single storey side extension to Tudor room

4726/APP/2022/3784      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Replacement of existing side conservatory to solid masonry construction, erection of a single storey rear extension to kitchen, single storey side extension and removal of internal wall to Tudor Room (Application for Listed Building Consent)

4726/PRC/2022/176      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Erection of outdoor pergola, kitchen, pantry hub and glass igloos and provision of landscaping.  
Erection of 3m rear kitchen extension and replacement of existing conservatory to Hotel Building 1 and single storey spa centre extension to Hotel Building 2.

**Decision:** 25-11-2022      Objection

4726/PRC/2020/242      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Removal of existing unsympathetic extensions to Grade II listed building; refurbishment of listed building and erection of new extension to form 70-bed registered care home for the frail elderly (Class C2) with associated landscaping and parking.  
Existing/Last known Use(s): Hotel (Class C1).

**Decision:** 28-02-2022      No Further  
Action(P)

4726/PRC/2018/162      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
redevelopment of hotel for a 73 bed care home

**Decision:** 20-01-2020      Pre-App Meeting  
Held

4726/PRC/2016/118      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
30 units of retirement living (category 11) housing for the elderly with associated communal facilities, parking & landscaping.

**Decision:** 12-10-2017      Pre-App Advice  
Given

4726/APP/2015/2713 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Erection of conservatory to south facade  
**Decision:** 21-09-2015 Refusal

ENF/794/15/

PEO - Unaut Alt to Listed Build/Conserv Area  
**Decision:** No Further Action(P) **Appeal:** 22-03-16 Dismissed

ENF/530/10/

Unauthorised signage.  
**Decision:** No Further Action(P)

ENF/360/10/

Alleged breach of condition 13 of 4726/APP/2002/2716, relating to gates adjacent to highway.  
**Decision:** No Further Action(P)

4726/APP/2005/2363 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
USE OF ONE LOUNGE AREA FOR MARRIAGE CEREMONIES (APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED USE OR DEVELOPMENT)  
**Decision:** 20-10-2005 General Perm.Devt.

4726/APP/2003/597 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
DETAILS OF NOISE INSULATION AND VENTILATION SCHEME IN COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITIONS 8 AND 10 OF PLANNING PERMISSION REF.4726/APP/2000/2716 DATED 21/12/2001; ALTERATION TO EXISTING HOTEL, NEW ANNEX AND ALTERATION TO EXISTING ACCOMMODATION  
**Decision:** 03-02-2012 No Further Action(P)

4726/APP/2003/450 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
DETAILS OF A LANDSCAPING SCHEME (INCLUDING TREE PROTECTION) AND LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE IN COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITIONS 3 AND 4 OF PLANNING PERMISSION REF.4726/APP/2000/2716 DATED 21/12/2001; ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING HOTEL AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ANNEXE  
**Decision:** 13-06-2003 Approval

4726/APP/2003/153 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
DETAILS OF NEW DOORS AND WINDOWS IN COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITION 7 OF LISTED BUILDING CONSENT REF.4726/APP/2000/2725 DATED 21/12/2001; ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING HOTEL, CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ANNEX AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING ACCOMMODATION (APPLICATION FOR LISTED BUILDING CONSENT)

**Decision:** 18-03-2004      Approval

4726/APP/2002/1887      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
INSTALLATION OF 3 PORTAKABINS FOR TEMPORARY KITCHEN WORKSHOP AND  
STORAGE FACILITY FOR DURATION OF NEW BUILDING WORKS

**Decision:** 21-03-2003      Approve Limited  
Time

4726/APP/2002/1829      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
VARIOUS MINOR CHANGES TO INTERNAL LAYOUT AND EXTERNAL ELEVATIONS;  
VARIATION OF PLANNING PERMISSION REF. 4726/APP/2000/2725 DATED 21/12/2001  
(APPLICATION FOR LISTED BUILDING CONSENT)

**Decision:** 02-03-2012      No Further  
Action(P)

4726/APP/2000/2725      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING HOTEL, CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ANNEX, ALTERATIONS TO  
EXISTING ACCOMMODATION (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF REDUNDANT BUILDINGS)  
(APPLICATION FOR LISTED BUILDING CONSENT)

**Decision:** 21-12-2001      Approval

4726/APP/2000/2716      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING HOTEL, CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ANNEX, ALTERATIONS TO  
EXISTING ACCOMMODATION (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF REDUNDANT BUILDINGS)

**Decision:** 21-12-2001      Approval

4726/APP/2000/2240      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
ERECTION OF TWO TEMPORARY BUILDINGS (RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION)

**Decision:** 08-12-2000      Approve Limited  
Time

4726/APP/2000/992      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
DEMOLITION OF OUTBUILDINGS, ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING HOTEL INCLUDING  
KITCHEN EXTENSION AND CONSERVATORY, ERECTION OF A 32-BEDROOM ANNEXE  
AND NEW CONFERENCE FACILITY (APPLICATION FOR LISTED BUILDING CONSENT)

**Decision:** 18-10-2000      Refusal

4726/APP/2000/993      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
ERECTION OF A 32-BEDROOM ANNEXE, CONFERENCE BUILDING, CONSERVATORY AND  
KITCHEN EXTENSION TO EXISTING HOTEL AND MINOR ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING  
ACCOMMODATION (INVOLVING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING OUTBUILDINGS)

**Decision:** 18-10-2000      Refusal

4726/PRE/2000/225      TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER

PRE-CORRES:- ERECTION OF TWO TEMPORARY OFFICE BUILDINGS (RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION). (APPLICATION RETURNED DUE TO LACK OF RESPONSE).

4726/APP/1999/2548 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
CREATION OF EN-SUITE FACILITIES IN BEDROOMS (APPLICATION FOR LISTED BUILDING  
CONSENT)

**Decision:** 09-02-2000 Approval

4726/AN/97/0925 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Erection of conservatory at front of building

**Decision:** 18-03-1998 Refusal **Appeal:** 30-09-98 Dismissed

4726/AP/97/0939 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Erection of conservatory at front of building (Application for Listed Building Consent)

**Decision:** 18-03-1998 Refusal **Appeal:** 30-09-98 Dismissed

4726/AJ/0514/95

Enforcement (Contravention of planning permission staff accommodation being used as hotel  
rooms)

4726/AJ/95/1928 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Removal of condition 13 of planning permission ref. 4726AF/94/227 dated 13/09/94 and condition  
14 of planning permission ref 4726AC/92/669 dated 21/08/92; to allow use by either hotel guests  
or hotel staff

**Decision:** 12-06-1996 Approve Limited **Appeal:** 17-03-97 Allowed  
Time

4726/AL/95/1930 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Retention of under eaves lights along frontage of building (Application for Listed Building  
Consent)

**Decision:** 12-06-1996 Approval

4726/AK/95/1891 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Erection of a single storey side extension to form a conservatory

**Decision:** 12-06-1996 Refusal

4726/AH/95/1832 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Erection of a single storey side extension to form a conservatory (Application for Listed Building  
Consent)

**Decision:** 12-06-1996 Refusal

4726/AF/94/0227 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Erection of a two-storey building providing 3 units of staff accommodation (retrospective application)  
**Decision:** 13-09-1994 Approval

4726/AD/93/3047 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Installation of one floodlit hoarding advertisement  
**Decision:** 16-11-1993 Approval

4726/AC/92/0669 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Erection of two storey building to provide accommodation for three staff  
**Decision:** 21-08-1992 Approval

4726/AB/91/1611 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Erection of a two storey building to comprise of four self-contained flats for staff accommodation  
**Decision:** 06-01-1992 Withdrawn (P)

4726/AA/91/0909 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Relaxation of condition 2 of planning permission ref.4726C/13426 dated 15.6.73 restricting the use of the hotel functions room for residents only  
**Decision:** 01-10-1991 Approval

4726/Z/90/0250 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Erection of a two-storey building for use as living quarters for staff  
**Decision:** 04-04-1991 Refusal

4726/Y/88/2819 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Erection of a two storey building to provide accommodation for 3 staff  
**Decision:** 14-09-1989 Refusal **Appeal:** 31-07-90 Allowed

4726/W/85/1754 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Listed building consent to develop/alter (P)  
**Decision:** 14-02-1986 Approval

4726/X/85/1753 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Lock-up garages (P)  
**Decision:** 14-02-1986 Approval

4726/R/85/0387 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Householder development (small extension, garage etc.)(P)  
**Decision:** 03-06-1985 Approval

4726/S/85/0386 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Listed building consent to develop/alter (P)  
**Decision:** 03-06-1985 Approval

4726/P/84/0641 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Details in compliance with 04726/83/0257 (P)  
**Decision:** 01-06-1984 Approval

4726/M/84/0042 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Listed building consent to develop/alter (P)  
**Decision:** 13-03-1984 Approval

4726/N/84/0043 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Extension/Alterations to Hotel (P) of 22 sq.m.  
**Decision:** 13-03-1984 Approval

4726/K/83/1127 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Residential development - Hotel (Full)(P)  
**Decision:** 13-03-1984 Approval

4726/L/83/9098 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Advertisement (P)  
**Decision:** 12-03-1984 Approval

4726/J/83/0257 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Residential development - Hotel (Full)(P)  
**Decision:** 13-03-1984 Approval

4726/G/78/0997 TUDOR LODGE HOTEL, 50 FIELD END ROAD EASTCOTE PINNER  
Two-storey rear extension.  
**Decision:** 01-11-1978 Approval

### **Comment on Planning History**

This application is accompanied by a listed building consent application 4726/APP/2023/249. There are also three other current undetermined applications:

- 4726/APP/2022/3782: Erection of a single storey extension to the rear unlisted building to create a spa centre
- 4726/APP/2022/3783: Replacement of existing side conservatory to solid masonry construction, erection of a single storey rear extension to kitchen and a single storey side extension to Tudor room

- 4726/APP/2022/3784: Replacement of existing side conservatory to solid masonry construction, erection of a single storey rear extension to kitchen and a single storey side extension to Tudor room (listed building consent)

#### 4. Advertisement and Site Notice

4.1 Advertisement Expiry Date: **1st March 2023**

4.2 Site Notice Expiry Date: Not applicable

#### 5. Comments on Public Consult

Neighbour consultation occurred to 52 properties, the Eastcote Residents Association, Eastcote Conservation Panel and Ruislip Northwood and Eastcote Local History Society from 31 January to 21 February 2023. 11 submissions (including from Eastcote Conservation Panel, Eastcote Residents Association and Ruislip Northwood and Eastcote Local History Society) were received raising the following issues:

- Side extension approved under separate applications conflicts with food prep building

Officer comment: There is no conflict between this application and other applications recently submitted/approved. The proposed fixtures can be accommodated without affecting practical completion of other works.

- Out of keeping with the area
- Harm to views and setting of listed building
- Boundary fencing that has been erected is inappropriate
- Heritage Statement refers to pre application drawings

Officer comment: The heritage impacts form Reason for Refusal 1. It does not extend to the boundary fencing which could be acceptable subject to suitable details by condition.

- Lack of car parking
- Parking overspill
- Overspill into surrounding streets
- Traffic report does not account for increased diners in outdoor areas
- Traffic congestion
- Discrepancies between the application form, Transport Assessment and plans with respect to existing and proposed parking provision
- Parking assessment does not use a comparative example as it uses hotels without these outdoor facilities
- No cycle parking

Officer comment: The Council's Highways Officer does not object on traffic generation grounds or the methodology used in reaching the conclusion that it is acceptable. There are reservations with the contradictory parking details submitted with the application and this forms the basis of Reason for Refusal 2. Refer to the body of the report.

- Capacity for outdoor dining is significant
- Noise increase, including during the evenings
- Outdoor hours of use would need to be curtailed

- Cooking odours

Officer comment: Noise issues form Reason for Refusal 3. It is likely that cooking odours can be managed through appropriate mechanical ventilation details by condition.

- Lack of Flood Risk Assessment to deal with surface flooding as a result of incremental extensions
- No drainage assessment

Officer comment: There are no in-principle drainage or flooding concerns and drainage details could be sought as a pre commencement requirement.

- Tree report is a draft and does not clarify which trees will be removed
- No ecology report

Officer comment: These issues form Reasons for Refusal 4 and 5.

- Potential for antisocial behaviour
- Will bring external parties to the hotel premises

Officer comment: Anti-social behaviour is a matter for the police. However, it is noted that the facilities would be available for non hotel guests.

- No accessibility measures are included outside of two disabled parking spaces
- No swept path, including for refuse collection

Officer comment: Refuse collection will be undertaken from the kerb at the north of the building, which is acceptable. Access arrangements are not entirely clear but could be sought by condition given the external nature of the scheme which would allow for level access and sufficient space.

- Land to the north of the site does not fall within the ownership and is Council land

Officer comment: Land registry documents have been supplied indicating that the red line site is limited to land owned by the applicant. In any event, there are no works within the area in dispute.

- Lack of dimensions on the plans
- No details of surfacing
- Lack of information for the outdoor fixtures

Officer comment: The plans are appropriate for scaling purposes. Details of paving and fixtures could be secured by condition in the event of an approval.

A Local Councillor also listed the application for Planning Committee in the event of an approval:

"...I am worried with how the applicant has been approaching the planning application process. It seems unnecessary confusing to put in a variety of applications that cover similar things. Residents who want to reject what is being proposed might not realise that they need to object more than once. It is disturbing that their plans try to grab a public green space, which they have no claim over."

## 6. Local Plan Designation and London Plan

The following Local Plan Policies are considered relevant to the application:-

Part 1 Policies:

Part 2 Polices:

NPPF16	NPPF 2021 - Conserving & enhancing the historic environment
NPPF6	NPPF 2021 - Building a strong, competitive economy
NPPF9	NPPF 2021 - Promoting sustainable transport
LPP D12	(2021) Fire safety
LPP D14	(2021) Noise
LPP D4	(2021) Delivering good design
LPP D5	(2021) Inclusive design
LPP E10	(2021) Visitor infrastructure
LPP G7	(2021) Trees and woodlands
LPP GG2	(2021) Making the best use of land
LPP GG5	(2021) Growing a good economy
LPP HC1	(2021) Heritage conservation and growth
LPP T6	(2021) Car parking
LPP T6.4	(2021) Hotel and leisure use parking
LPP T6.5	(2021) Non-residential disabled persons parking
LPP T7	(2021) Deliveries, servicing and construction
BE1	Development within archaeological priority areas
DME 5	Hotels and Visitor Accommodation
DME 6	Accessible Hotels and Visitor Accommodation
DMEI 10	Water Management, Efficiency and Quality
DMEI 2	Reducing Carbon Emissions
DMHB 1	Heritage Assets
DMHB 11	Design of New Development
DMHB 12	Streets and Public Realm
DMHB 14	Trees and Landscaping
DMHB 2	Listed Buildings
DMHB 4	Conservation Areas
DMT 1	Managing Transport Impacts
DMT 2	Highways Impacts
DMT 5	Pedestrians and Cyclists
DMT 6	Vehicle Parking

In addition: Development Plan

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The Development Plan for the London Borough of Hillingdon currently consists of the following documents:

The Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (2012)  
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020)  
The Local Plan: Part 2 - Site Allocations and Designations (2020)  
The RAF Uxbridge Supplementary Planning Document (2009)  
The London Plan (March 2021)

Material Considerations

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021) is also a material consideration in planning decisions, as well as relevant supplementary planning documents and guidance.

## 7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

### 7.1 Impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties

Policy DMHD 11 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings and no unacceptable loss of outlook, amenity, daylight and sunlight to neighbouring occupiers. Paragraphs 174 and 185 of the NPPF and Policy D14 of the London Plan also requires that proposals minimise noise pollution. Policy EM8 of the Local Plan promotes the maximum possible reduction in noise levels and seeks to ensure that noise impacts can be adequately controlled and mitigated.

The modest scale, siting away from the boundary (in most cases) and semi temporary nature of the additional development is such that there is no likely impact to surrounding properties with respect to overlooking, dominance or loss of light.

However, the proposal will involve large areas of outdoor dining space, including a covered pergola area to the north of the building (120m<sup>2</sup>), a covered bar area to the south of the building (65m<sup>2</sup>) and seven separate igloo pods (70m<sup>2</sup> in total). Increased maximum seating is likely to be up to 130 patrons.

This is in addition to the existing hotel bar and dining area. It is assumed that the outdoor dining area would be open to include external patrons not staying at the hotel. No operating hours have been specified and no Noise Assessment or general mitigation measures have been proposed.

The property operates as a hotel. It is set within a predominantly residential area. Background noise from Field End Road is relatively modest. Likely noise generation from the property is considered to be significant and certainly sufficient to warrant submission of a Noise Impact Assessment, including consideration of background noise levels. In its absence, the Council is not able to conclude that there would not be an acceptable impact upon surrounding residents. Even so, there

are significant reservations with the extent of the increase in outdoor dining areas, relative to the existing use and with regard to the residential neighbourhood.

There are new kitchen areas which will require management of odour through mechanical ventilation. The scope of the noise assessment would need to include this detail along with how the outdoor bar and waste area would be managed.

On this basis, the proposal is highly likely to have a measurable adverse impact on surrounding properties and this forms Reason for Refusal 1.

## **7.2 Impact on Street Scene**

Policy D3 of the London Plan requires that development proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Policy HE1 of the Local Plan seeks to conserve and enhance Hillingdon's distinct and varied environment, its settings and the wider historic landscape including listed buildings. Policy BE1 requires that all new development achieves a 'high quality of design in all new buildings, alterations and extensions'. Policy DMHB 11 states that new development will be required to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design and Policy DMHB 12 requires integration with the surrounding area.

The building dates from the 16th century but has been altered and extended throughout its history with significant additions in the 17th, 19th and early and late 20th centuries. The building is grade II listed and is situated on a prominent corner site where Field End Road meets Bridle Road and St. Lawrence Drive. Policy DMHB 2 states that works to listed buildings will only be permitted if they are considered to retain its significance and value and are appropriate in terms of the fabric, historic integrity, spatial quality and layout of the building. Any additions or alterations to a Listed Building should be sympathetic in terms of scale, proportion, detailed design, materials and workmanship.

The site is not within a conservation area but is adjacent to Eastcote Park Estate Conservation Area to the north and can be seen within views looking out of the conservation area and as such makes a positive contribution to its setting. It is also in close proximity to Eastcote Village Conservation Area to the west. Policy DMHB 4 of the Local Plan states that new development on the fringes of a conservation area will be expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. It should sustain and enhance its significance and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

There are three other buildings on site including a separate guest house, former garages now converted to offices to the south-west and a detached two-storey guest block to the north-west. Despite these later additions the principal listed building still dominates the site and its setting is enhanced within a spacious plot with mature verdant trees and planting.

The vast majority of buildings that surround the site are twentieth century residential properties that date from the early part of the 20th century to the early 21st century. The most attractive of these houses, seen in close proximity of the hotel, are those located on the Eastcote Park Estate to the north.

Currently the listed building is surrounded by large areas of hard standing for car parking and a small area of lawn on the south side and an outdoor decked area on the north side. Overall it is in need of enhancement.

The area to the north of the hotel and close to Field End Road will have a new outdoor kitchen building and six pergolas. The kitchen building has a pitched roof but is excessive in its footprint, poorly sited in proximity to and blocking views of the listed building. The pergola comprises a simple post and joist structure with glass roofs and glass doors. The reflective character of the glass would also obscure views through to the listed building in this prominent position and cannot be supported. The bin store appears to be open to the air and would not pose any real impact, subject to further details by condition.

The area to the south will have a new outbuilding and bar surrounded by seven igloos. There will be new soft landscaping and the car park will be rearranged as part of the encroachment of the bar. The pantry and plant room/WC includes a pitched roof and is sited to one side such that it has a less imposing presence. The bar is open sided with oak posts and a tiled roof. It is sufficiently removed from the listed building but its roof form is neither contemporary or sympatric and fails to relate appropriately to the listed building. The igloos will have timber sides with glass roofs. There is a concern of light spill in the evenings since there appears to be internal lighting. The overall number of igloos and their proximity to the listed building (on the northern side of the bar) is such that there is significant harm. It would be reduced if the number of igloos were reduced and located away from the listed building on the south side of the bar.

Collectively, there are a total of nine building and this adds an enormous number of new structures on this side in proximity to the listed building would be visually distracting as well as potentially obscuring the building. The views to and setting of the listed building is compromised.

The area will have hedge facing the road and a new picket fence to the boundary of the property, infill in parts and also to the southern boundary of the outdoor dining area to the south of the building. It is understood that a recently erected 2m high timber paling fence does not form part of what is proposed. Overall, the fencing and landscaping does not necessarily detract from the setting but this would need to be confirmed by the submission of details prior to commencement of any works (in the event of an approval).

While it is recognised that there is scope for enhancement to the current setting of the listed building, the proposal is cumulatively fussy and visually distracting in such close proximity to the listed building and the scheme as a whole, would benefit from simplification.

As it would be harmful to the setting of the listed building and the conservation area and elements lack a sufficiently high-quality sensitive design, it would be contrary to Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, 66(1) and to the requirements of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (2020) DMHB2, DMHB4 and DMHB 11. Whilst less than substantial, it is not outweighed by public benefit.

The works associated with the other planning applications can be accommodated without any undue additional cumulative impacts to the overall setting and on this basis, no further objection is raised in addition to that within this application.

### **7.3 Traffic Impact/Pedestrian Safety**

Policies DMT 1 and DMT 2 of the Local Plan require the Council to consider whether the traffic generated by proposed developments is acceptable in terms of the local highway and junction capacity, traffic flows and conditions of general highway or pedestrian safety.

The site consists of a Hotel (C1 use class) located on the edge of Eastcote district town centre. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and the locality is encompassed within a

controlled parking zone (CPZ) operating from Monday to Saturday - 9am to 6.30pm. The address exhibits a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 2 which is below average and therefore raises dependency on the use of private motor transport.

The applicant has applied a trip analysis based on the 'industry recognised' assessment tool (TRICS - Land Use Database) and the Highway Authority is satisfied that the submitted data is representative of likely activity generated by the proposal which is likely to be partially ancillary to the existing Hotel 'day to day' activities and not anticipated to measurably impinge on the most sensitive and therefore crucial peak morning and afternoon/early evening weekday traffic periods and that conclusion incorporates consideration of all aspects of servicing requirements.

In effect, the additional traffic generation from the outdoor areas, which will generally arise in the afternoon and evening period, can be accommodated within the surrounding road networks and no objections are raised.

## 7.4 Carparking & Layout

### Parking

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Policy - DMT 6 requires that new development will only be permitted where it accords with the Council's adopted parking standards unless it can be demonstrated that a deviation from the standard would not result in a deleterious impact on the surrounding road network. Parking requirements are on an individual basis.

The Council's Highways Officer has concluded that the relatively minor uplift of on-plot parking provision from 15 to 22 spaces inclusive of 2 disabled compliant (and 2 electric vehicle charging points) is considered acceptable given the scale of proposal and anticipated patronage, thus limiting any on-street reliance which could otherwise cause undesirable injudicious parking.

However this comment is based on the assessment contained within the Transport Assessment which states that "The hotel currently has 19no car parking spaces set out in a haphazard arrangement as identified by the topographical survey. The proposals will amend the car park layout to provide a more traditional parallel layout." There is an assumed uplift of at least three spaces. This conflicts with the application form which refers to 26 existing spaces and a reduction of four spaces. The submitted plans show 25 spaces.

On this basis, the level of information is contractionary. Where the conclusions were reached on the assumption of an uplift and the reality is likely that there is a net loss, it is not possible to conclude that there would be adequate on site parking and no additional pressure on on-street parking. It would also be beneficial to elaborate on how the parking arrangements will be managed for hotel guests and visitors. This forms Reason for Refusal 2.

### Cycle Parking

One space per 10 new staff is required and the applicant confirms that 4 'short' & 'long' stay spaces are to be provided which is considered acceptable in terms of quantum. The positioning of the spaces is unclear within the submission and because of the limitations of space and the clutter associated with the proposed buildings, it remains unclear how this can be achieved without further harm to the setting of the building and this forms part of Reason for Refusal 1 on character grounds only.

### Access

The existing access will be used, which is satisfactory. The 'low-rise' nature of the proposed boundary treatment is welcomed on highway safety grounds as it will not prejudice sight-line visibility for both pedestrians and vehicles entering and leaving the premises via the established site aperture.

#### Refuse collection

An established refuse storage area is positioned within a dedicated location on the edge of the site envelope and collections will be integrated within the established collection regime for the existing site use. Such an arrangement is considered satisfactory.

### **7.5 Urban Design, Access and Security Considerations**

#### Trees and Landscaping

Policy DMHB 14 of the Local Plan requires the retention and enhancement of existing landscaping, trees, biodiversity or other natural features, landscaping that supports and enhances biodiversity and amenity and replanting of new trees.

An Arboricultural Report (Cantia Arboricultural Services, dated August 2022) has been submitted with the application. It is watermarked with draft and includes omissions within the report itself. There is also some conflict between the Arboricultural Constraints Plan and the Tree Survey Data Table.

Overall there is 18 trees and three groups of trees proposed for removal, including two Category B trees. Some tree works are associated with the other applications for the site.

Several trees along the Field End Road frontage are to be removed and would be replaced with hedgerow planting. The arboricultural report refers to the trees being unremarkable species that have been poorly managed or with sparse foliage. However, one of the trees is listed as a Category B Horse Chestnut to a height of 17m. Their removal is not necessary to accommodate the proposed works. There is a degree of appropriateness to some tree removal to allow a more managed landscape approach for the site. However, the wholesale approach to the tree removal without proper consideration is of concern particularly when the trees on Field End Road provide a positive landscaped setting to the boundary.

The Arboricultural Report refers to encroachments into the root projection area of T25, T26 and T26 but the accompanying Arboricultural Method Statement refers to their removal. The latter would be opposed as unnecessary and unacceptable, with the Sycamore, Ash and Cypress all listed as Category B trees to 20m in height.

The remaining works involve minimal intrusion into the ground but there is a relatively large expanse of additional paving around the east of the building in the vicinity of the pergola. It is feasible that retained trees are likely to be unaffected subject to appropriate tree protection measures and a revised Arboricultural Method Statement.

Overall, there is a lack of clarity with the biocultural information and the wholesale and unnecessary removal of a large number of trees. These trees provide good landscape coverage to the site and the road and contribute to the setting of the listed building. A more considered approach is required and as it is currently proposed, it forms Reason for Refusal 3.

#### Access

The works are limited to external or outdoor areas where level access and adequate manoeuvring can be ensured. Two disabled parking spaces are proposed alongside the main entrance of the hotel, which is a better outcome than the existing spaces in the south western corner of the car park. At 9% of the total spaces, this is satisfactory provision. On this basis, no objection is raised.

## 7.6 Other Issues

### Principle of Development

The existing hotel is use class C1. Whilst the proposal involves a large amount of outdoor dining areas and this would facilitate a large number of external patrons not staying on site, it is still felt that the works facilitate a use that is ancillary to the existing hotel use, both in terms of capacity, floorspace and likely impacts. On this basis, there is no material change of use of the land (to a public house for example) and the principle of the development is accepted, subject to other considerations.

### Refuse Storage

Policy EM11 of the Local Plan refers to the minimisation of waste. A bin store is located to the north of the main building. It is sufficiently sized for the likely waste generation and suitably located on character and odour transfer grounds. Access is provided to Field End Road which is supported. Final details would need to be submitted by condition.

### Ecology

Section 15 of the NPPF and Policy DMEI 7 of the Local Plan aim for the retention of existing features of biodiversity or geological value within the site and enhancement and net gain of biodiversity within a proposed development. Policy DMEI 7 requires appropriate surveys and assessments to demonstrate that the proposed development will not have unacceptable effects.

The site falls within a relatively leafy area of Pinner, offering opportunities for birds and bats. There are no proposed works to the building but given the extent of tree removal, the ecological implications are potentially significant and these have not been considered in any detail. The absence of this detail and any biodiversity enhancements forms Reason for Refusal 4.

### Flooding and Drainage

Policy SI12 of the London Plan states that development proposals should ensure that flood risk is minimised and mitigated, and that residual risk is addressed. The property is in Flood Zone 1 and there is no change to the classification of the use such that there is no flood risk within the site or impacts elsewhere. However, the pergola and outdoor kitchen to the north of the main building will be partly within an area identified for surface water flooding. Neighbour submissions have also referred to anecdotal surface flooding issues.

Given the proposal partly encroaches within the area identified as being susceptible to surface flooding and as it correlates with Field End Road itself and because of the relatively modest and/or lightweight nature of the fixtures and buildings, there are no in-principle drainage objections though this would be subject to sustainable drainage details by condition in the event of an approval. This is important given it appears that there is a net increase in hard surfacing across the site.

### Building Sustainability

Policies BE1 and DMEI 2 of the Local Plan seeks to achieve reductions in carbon dioxide emissions

through energy efficient design and effective use of low and zero carbon technologies, including the use of SUDS, water efficiency, lifetime homes and sustainable design and construction techniques to increase the re-use and recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste and reduce the amount disposed to landfill.

The proposed works are outdoor elements mostly involving pre fabricated or lightweight elements. In terms of representing sustainable construction, there are no immediate objections.

#### Community Infrastructure Levy

The development is not CIL liable.

#### Planning Balance

Policy E10 of the London Plan states that London's visitor economy and associated employment should be strengthened. Policy DME 5 of the Local Plan recognises the need to support a range of visitor accommodation. Paragraph 81 of the NPPF states that decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.

The proposal would facilitate economic activity both through the construction phase and because it allows for a more attractive destination for hotel guests and other customers. There are two other applications on the site which are an indication of the desire to invest in improving the accommodation and the overall experience at the Tudor Lodge Hotel. The economic benefits are significant and given moderate weight.

There is a degree of social benefit associated with the provision of these facilities in a community sense. However, this is significantly outweighed by the perceived harm to neighbour amenity arising from increases in noise and activity on and around the site. It is afforded minor weight.

There are limited environmental benefits because of significant tree loss though this is tempered somewhat with the increased economic activity allowing for upkeep of the listed building. The environmental benefits could be considered as negligible to minor.

The harm to the listed building turns on public benefit grounds. Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Paragraph 200 states that any harm should require clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 202 states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

The building currently operates as a hotel and it would appear that it is not imperative that the proposed works are necessary to allow continued upkeep. The public benefits associated with the provision of the community aspects are noted but are significantly restricted by neighbour amenity, character and traffic/parking impacts and the benefits would outweigh the harm.

**Contact Officer:**

Simon Taylor

**Telephone No:**