

West Area Planning Committees

- 17th April 2013

Application Number: 12/03279/FUL

Decision Due by: 5th April 2013

Proposal: Demolition of existing building on site. Erection of 83 bedroom hotel on 3 floors accessed from Abingdon Road. Provision of 45 car parking spaces and bin and cycle storage (Amended and additional plans)

Site Address: UK Bathroom Warehouse Abingdon Road, **Appendix 1.**

Ward: Hinksey Park

Agent: Kemp And Kemp

Applicant: Anglo Holt Construction

Recommendation: Planning permission be REFUSED.

Reasons for Refusal

1. Having regard to the location of the proposed Travelodge in close proximity to the strategic road network, the amount of car parking provided is considered to be inadequate to serve the amount of accommodation proposed. The development would therefore be contrary to policy TR3 and Appendix 3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001 to 2016.
2. In the absence of a legal agreement securing financial contributions towards highways infrastructure, affordable housing, off - site landscaping and public art the proposed development would be contrary to the requirements of policies CP9 and CP14 of the adopted Oxford Local Plan 2001 to 2016; policy CS24 of the Oxford Core Strategy 2026 and accompanying Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document in respect of facilities required to mitigate the impact of the development.

NB: Notwithstanding the recommendation to refuse planning permission, if committee is nevertheless minded to support the proposals, then the application should be deferred in order to complete an accompanying legal agreement securing the following:-

1. Highways infrastructure: £26,600.
2. Affordable housing: £10,009.
3. Off - site landscaping: £12,000.
4. Public art: £15,785.

Main Planning Policies:

Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016

CP1 - Development Proposals
CP6 - Efficient Use of Land & Density
CP8 - Design Development to Relate to its Context
CP9 - Creating Successful New Places
CP10 - Siting Development to Meet Functional Needs
CP11 - Landscape Design
CP13 - Accessibility
CP14 - Public Art
CP17 - Recycled Materials
CP18 - Natural Resource Impact Analysis
CP22 - Contaminated Land
TR1 - Transport Assessment
TR2 - Travel Plans
TR3 - Car Parking Standards
TR4 - Pedestrian & Cycle Facilities
TR9 - Park & Ride
TR14 - Servicing Arrangements
NE15 - Loss of Trees and Hedgerows
NE23 - Habitat Creation in New Developments
TA4 - Tourist Accommodation

Core Strategy

CS2 - Previously developed and greenfield land
CS9 - Energy and natural resources
CS10 - Waste and recycling
CS11 - Flooding
CS12 - Biodiversity
CS13 - Supporting access to new development
CS14 - Supporting city-wide movement
CS17 - Infrastructure and developer contributions
CS18 - Urban design, town character, historic environment
CS19 - Community safety
CS24 - Affordable housing
CS28 - Employment sites
CS32 - Sustainable tourism

Other Policy Documents.

1. Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
2. Affordable Housing SPD.
3. Natural Resource Impact Analysis (NRIA) SPD.
4. Parking Standards, Transport Assessments & Travel Plans SPD.
5. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Public Consultation

Statutory Bodies:

- Oxfordshire County Council: Highways: Following comments on previous proposal 12/00249/FUL, Highway Authority are concerned regarding lack of car parking on site; hotel is within easy reach of A.34 trunk road but 2km from city centre and railway station, suggesting most customers will arrive by car, for both tourist and business purposes; hotel anticipates 80% occupancy but there will no doubt be times when it will seek 100% occupancy; Park and Ride is aimed at relieving problems in town centre; allowing developments which potentially attract high car numbers near Park and Ride is likely to encourage use of facilities for which it was not designed, contrary to the spirit and strategy of these facilities; no supporting information provided to support the amount of car parking proposed; Highway Authority consider that at such a location any hotel / motel 1 parking space per bedroom is provided to ensure parking is restricted to development itself; in the absence of such provision, Highway Authority object to proposals.
- Oxfordshire County Council: Drainage: Development should incorporate SUDS systems, soakaways, porous parking area and/or green roof.
- Environment Agency: (i): Flood storage design does not adequately prove there would be no loss of floodplain storage; floodplain compensation including use of voids and stilts should be designed to fill and drain naturally; proposed voids along one side of building would not function this way. (ii): Updated flood storage design will not lead to loss of flood storage capacity; if permitted conditions suggested on work being undertaken in accordance with Flood Risk Assessment submitted; details being submitted for approval to address ground contamination, surface water disposal and any piling methods proposed. With conditions in place objection withdrawn.
- Environmental Development: Site adjacent to large area of historic landfill; condition recommended to ensure site investigation and any required remediation

Third Parties:

- Oxford Preservation Trust: Council should act with caution in relation to views from outside the city, and from Cold Harbour and Weirs Mill Stream; building should be smaller in height and size with changes to primary façade to Abingdon Road which is out of character and intrusive at the entrance to the city from the south; application should be refused and applicants requested to refine proposals to minimise visual impact.

Officers' Assessment

Background to Case

1. The application site consists of a rectangular parcel of land measuring approximately 0.21 ha. (0.5 acre) located at the junction of Abingdon Road and Old Abingdon Road. **Appendix 1** refers. Immediately to the south and west is the Redbridge Park and Ride site. Access is taken from Old Abingdon Road a short distance west of the junction. The site is currently occupied by a single storey building housing a bathroom warehouse, having previously been a car showroom.

2. Although the existing building has existed on the site for a number of years, since 2000 there have been several planning applications to redevelop the site. The first was in 2001 when application 01/01371/NFY sought to demolish the car showroom building and construct in its place a 3 storey office building consisting of 2,431 sq m of office accommodation served by 67 car parking spaces. The application was not permitted however but refused planning permission on the basis that commercial office development would be contrary to policies of employment restraint in operation at the time and that the building was overlarge in its context, being adjacent to open land and the Oxford Green Belt. The case was appealed but dismissed, the Inspector not accepting the arguments in relation to employment restraint, but concurring with the local planning authority that the building was overlarge in its context.
3. Subsequently a scaled down proposal for offices was submitted in 2003 under reference 03/01773/FUL. This was for 1,712 sq m of office accommodation on two floors served by some 36 car parking spaces and 40 cycle spaces. The application was granted planning permission, and although details were submitted subsequently in compliance with imposed conditions, the development has not been completed. As a start had been made on site however then the permission remains “extant” and could be completed without the need of a further permission.
4. More recently a similar proposal to the current application, also for a Travelodge with 83 bedrooms and 45 car parking spaces was submitted under reference 12/00249/FUL. The application was refused at West Area Planning Committee in July 2012 for the following reasons:

(i): Having regard to its height, mass, layout and overall appearance the proposed development would constitute an overlarge and over dominant feature at a prominent location at the southern edge of the city, close to open land and Oxford Green Belt. The development would therefore be contrary to policies CP1, CP8 and CP9 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001 to 2016 and policy CS18 of the Oxford Core Strategy 2026.

(ii): Having regard to the location of the proposed Travelodge in close proximity to the strategic road network, the amount of car parking provided is considered to be inadequate to serve the amount of accommodation proposed. The development would therefore be contrary to policy TR3 and Appendix 3 of the Oxford Local Plan 2001 to 2016.

Current Proposal

5. This latest proposal is similar to the Travelodge previously proposed and again proposes 83 bedrooms served by 45 car parking spaces in 2475 sq m of accommodation. However this latest proposal would possess a slightly modified footprint, allowing the accommodation to be distributed on 3 floors only, unlike the previous case which would have possessed some 6 bedrooms at a third floor level at its northern end where the building addresses the corner of Abingdon Road and Old Abingdon Road. Again lift access is provided to all

levels. At ground floor level a breakfast area is indicated with 48 covers plus an informal seating area adjacent to the reception area. No meeting rooms or other facilities are proposed. Of the bedrooms, four are to full disabled standard, two rooms being located on each of the first and second floors. Four of the 45 car parking spaces are for disabled use, with covered cycle parking provision for 10 cycles.

6. There are a number of trees which would be required to be lost to allow the development to proceed, though mitigation is offered through replacement planting. Access would continue to be from Old Abingdon Road as now. As the building would be located closer to its Abingdon Road boundary than is currently the case with the bathroom warehouse, then that planting would be in the adjacent highway verge. A financial contribution of £12,000 is offered accordingly.
7. Subject to all other material considerations Local Plan policy supports the provision of short stay visitor accommodation on the principal radial routes into the city, including Abingdon Road. Moreover although the planning permission for office use had commenced on site, only a minimal amount of work was undertaken and therefore there is no actual loss of employment land involved in these proposals. The small amount of employment at the bathroom centre would be matched by that at the Travelodge where it would be intended to employ 4 full - time and 15 part time staff.
8. As with the previous application, Officers consider the key determining issues in this case to be:
 - highways, access and parking;
 - scale and form of development;
 - landscaping;
 - flood risk; and
 - sustainability

Highways, Access and Parking

9. As with the previous planning application refused permission in 2012, vehicular access to the application site is taken via Old Abingdon Road approximately 45m from the controlled junction with the A.4144 Abingdon Road. Entrance to the car park is from the western side of the site to some 45 car parking spaces, including 4 for disabled use. Covered cycle parking is provided for 10 cycles adjacent to the entrance to the Travelodge building. Again as previously, a transport assessment accompanying the planning application assessed the additional amount of traffic through the controlled junction to amount to 11 movements in the morning peak and 4 in the evening peak. This increase in traffic generation was described previously by the Highway Authority as minimal and to have no material impact on the workings of the junction. Nevertheless in the event of planning permission being granted, then due to the overall increase in traffic movements compared to existing conditions a contribution would be sought by the Highway Authority towards highways infrastructure in line with the Planning Obligations SPD. The applicant is agreeable to such a contribution.

10. In terms of the level of car parking provision, the requirement within the adopted Local Plan distinguishes between hotels and motels. Although there is no definition of either within the Plan, officers would consider a motel to be a specialist form of hotel with limited facilities catering predominantly for car borne guests. Accordingly the parking requirement for motels is set at 1 space per bedroom, and for hotels at 1 space per 2 bedrooms plus 1 space per 2 resident staff. In this case 45 car parking spaces are provided to serve 83 bedrooms. Throughout negotiations with officers the applicant has insisted that the proposed Travelodge at this location should be regarded as a hotel rather than motel and therefore attract only the lower parking requirement, or 42 spaces as no resident staff are envisaged in this case. In this regard it is noted that other hotels on the periphery of the city possess a far greater ratio of car parking spaces to bedrooms than proposed here, whilst accepting that they may also provide additional facilities.
11. More important however than any precise label to be attached to the proposed Travelodge are the actual circumstances pertaining to this particular case. In this regard the proposed Travelodge would possess limited facilities and be sited at a highly accessible position on the strategic road network, being located in close proximity to the Southern By Pass / Oxford Ring Road, A.423 Henley road, and A34 trunk road. Officers are therefore of the view that it would be most attractive to car borne customers, whether business customers, tourists or other guests. Whilst it is acknowledged that a proportion of guests may arrive by modes other than the private car, in view of the excellent accessibility by road and 3km distance from the city centre railway and bus stations, it is envisaged that such guests would represent only a very small proportion of the total. It is recognised however that following their arrival guests seeking access to the city centre may use public transport rather than the private vehicle they may have arrived in.
12. Previously the transport assessment accompanying the earlier planning application made comparison between the parking needs of the proposed development and what was considered to be the company's most similar establishment located in Manchester. Neither the Planning nor Highways Authority considered that case to be comparable to the current one however as it was located at a more central site with other important differences. In the absence of convincing arguments to the contrary officers concluded therefore that insufficient parking was available to serve the development and recommended committee to refuse planning permission for that reason. That recommendation was accepted.
13. As a consequence, in pre application discussions in relation to this latest application the applicant was advised either that parking levels should be increased from the standard of 1 space per 2 bedrooms in view of its peripheral location with one space per bedroom as the starting point, or cogent arguments tabled demonstrating conclusively that the intended level of car parking proposed would be sufficient to serve an 83 bedroomed facility. It was envisaged that such evidence might include reference to other

Travelodge establishments at similar edge of town or out of town locations. In the event no additional car parking has been proposed on site, and no evidence produced that 45 spaces would be sufficient to meet all envisaged parking and servicing requirements. As such officers are drawn to the same conclusion as to the 2012 application.

14. Whilst City and County Councils are committed to policies of traffic and parking restraint, concerns remain that with 45 car parking spaces only provided for 83 double rooms then at certain times the potential exists for car parking to spill over into Redbridge Park and Ride or uncontrolled residential streets nearby such as Bertie Place. Such a potential is especially so if as previously advised the Travelodge may seek to charge its customers separately for car parking at a price equivalent to Park and Ride charges. The applicants have been advised that officers cannot support the use of Park and Ride for these purposes as it is a facility specifically intended to serve city centre not local needs and has steadily grown in usage over the years and continues to do so. Their use for purposes other than serving city centre needs would seriously erode their function and the City and County Councils' long held policies of city centre parking and traffic restraint. Rather developments of all sorts at peripheral locations are required to meet their parking requirements on their own site.
15. In response to officers' concerns the applicant has submitted a legal opinion which argues that there are benefits from the proposals and that there should be a presumption in favour of the development. It goes on to indicate that the NPPF requires that any detriment from the development would have to be severe to justify refusal of planning permission, and that there is no evidence that parking problems would occur. Even if there were insufficient parking available on site at various times the opinion suggests that it would be legitimate that Redbridge Park and Ride be used as overspill. Officers do not accept these arguments. There are parking guidelines attached to the adopted Local Plan which have been subject to examination before adoption, and it is legitimate to apply them accordingly. In this case the issue is confused to an extent as the applicant insists the development is a hotel not motel in terms of parking requirements and that only the lower standard in the former should apply. Officers are cognisant however of the site's peripheral location in close proximity to the strategic road network and its 3km distance from the city centre railway and bus stations. For these reasons it is felt that a higher standard than 1 per 2 bedrooms as required for hotels should apply. In any event an opportunity has been provided for evidence to be brought forward that a lower standard would be sufficient, but has not been responded to.
16. For all these reasons Planning and Highways officers remain of the view that too little car parking is provided to serve the proposed Travelodge and that the development cannot therefore be supported.
17. In terms of cycle parking, as 11.5 full time equivalent staff are intended to be employed (4 full time, 15 part time), then the Local Plan requirement for 1 cycle space per 5 non residential staff is met. However officers had advised

that some additional provision be made to encourage staff to cycle to their place of work if possible and to cater for any very occasional guest who arrives by cycle. The provision of 10 cycle stands is therefore welcomed. As suggested the cycle parking is shown in covered, secure conditions. If the application gains planning permission further details of the structure would be requested.

Scale and Form of Development

18. The application site is located at the southern edge of the built up area of the city on a principal radial route and in close proximity to the Southern By Pass / Ring Road. To its north are residential areas whilst in other directions open land. To the south and west is the large Redbridge Park and Ride site which is generally well screened by perimeter planting, whilst to the east beyond the Abingdon Road are fields and meadowland leading to the River Thames and its tributaries within the Oxford Green Belt. The application site therefore occupies a prominent position at the southern entry to the city.
19. The proposed Travelodge is rectangular in shape within a rectangular site, as previously extending along its eastern boundary facing Abingdon Road in a linear fashion. Entrance to the reception area of the building is taken from its north - west corner through two alternative sets of doors located in the western elevation facing the car park and northern elevation facing Old Abingdon Road. The building would be constructed on 3 floors under a shallow pitched undulating roof, probably of a standing seam metal construction. Powder coated aluminium windows with a vertical emphasis are positioned in a rhythmical arrangement along the long elevations to east and west, but with windows offset at each level rather than being vertically aligned. Interspersed with the windows are cladding panels of the same size and proportions as for the upper floor windows with a red / orange brick plinth at ground floor level. The panelling is indicated to be of pastel shades, the colours intended to break up the mass of the building; to contrast with the red / orange brickwork at ground floor level; and in order to create more colour, interest and variety into the facades of the building. The precise choice of colours for cladding and brickwork would be subject to condition if the development were permitted.
20. At the northern end where the entrances to the building are located, the distinctive rhythm of the main facades is interrupted by full height brickwork with the roof extending to its highest point, emphasising the building's corner location. In addition to the entrances, at the north - east edge of the building the brickwork gives way to vertical glazing and panelling rising over two floors and more where the main stairs would be located.
21. The building displays an undulating pitched roof which generally extends to between 10.0m and 11.0m in height, other than at the more prominent northern end where it reaches a height of 13.0m. The pitched roof not only adds more interest to the building compared to the refused proposal, but also provides functional space to locate lift overruns, plus servicing plant and equipment. Although the overall height of the building is a little greater than

in the refused proposal of 2012, it is in a form which seeks to reduce and break down its apparent bulk, scale and mass, and does not now include a partial fourth floor of accommodation. The architect indicates that the general roof heights respond to those at Gordon Woodward Way to the east of Abingdon Road where flats on 3 or 3.5 levels attain a height of 11.4m to ridge in many cases.

22. A comparison of the building heights and other features of the proposed development with those of previous proposals at this site is attached as **Appendix 2**, and in this regard the 2002 appeal decision where a larger development of commercial offices was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate is a material consideration. In respect of that appeal the Inspector had concluded in terms of the impact of the development on the character of its surroundings:

“While the relationship of the appeal building to the nearby houses is acceptable in terms of height and scale, I consider that its impact on the open, green and low key character of the wider surroundings would be harmful. This would be particularly so because of the height and mass of the building and the fact that most of the site would be enclosed to form the ground floor parking area. Minimal space would be left on the eastern side for tree planting and the landscaped area on the northern side would not be generous. In my opinion this would make the development appear stark and over dominant by comparison with the green and open surroundings which characterise this area. The proposed building would intrude into views from the Green Belt and take away from its open character. For these reasons, I consider that the impact of the proposal on its surroundings would fail to accord with SP policy G2 and LP policy EN76 such that permission should be refused.”

23. The full text of the appeal decision is attached as **Appendix 3**. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Inspector’s decision was made some 11 years ago, it remains relevant and indeed recent advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasises the importance attached to good design and that innovation, originality and initiative should not be stifled. Rather evaluation of proposals should concentrate on guiding principles of scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access.
24. In relation to the refused application for a Travelodge at this location last year, officers had advised that that development would be located at a prominent position in an area which enjoys an open character, and that it would not abut other buildings but would stand alone. That development was described by officers as not being innovative or original in concept which the site demanded, but rather would lack character and distinctiveness as a consequence, for example, of its regularity of form in its flat roof structure and its use of square window types in a grid fashion throughout. This led to the building possessing only a rather utilitarian appearance. It was concluded that at such a prominent site the development could not therefore be supported by officers.

25. This latest application has sought to address these deficiencies by proposing a building of materials and form which would better address its surroundings and neighbours than previously, whilst not seeking to imitate any particular architectural language to be seen in the vicinity in what remains a stand alone building. To that extent it represents a more distinctive and original contemporary structure which better identifies this southern entrance point to the built up city than the existing bathroom warehouse or previous proposals for the site. Whilst the fenestration retains a horizontal rhythm, being offset and interspersed with coloured cladding panels rather than within a fixed grid at all levels, an element of visual interest merges where previously there was a certain monotony. Moreover the building, (and perhaps its shallow pitched undulating roof in particular), adds diversity of form as it rises at its northern end to address the junction of Abingdon Road with Old Abingdon Road. Or in the architects own words, *"...ripples then rises to the corner to address the junction and herald the entrance to the hotel"*.
26. All that said the building as now proposed is in the main slightly taller in height than the refused 2012 application, though without the partial third floor of accommodation previously proposed. Overall Officers have concluded that in terms of its presence at this prominent site, the proposal represents a more suitable development than the previous one with any marginal increase in height offset by its more appropriate, contemporary and original appearance and use of materials. These matters are required to be weighed in the balance however along with all other material considerations. Officers have formed the view, on balance, that the changes to the design and built form are now sufficient to consider them and the relationship of the proposed building to its immediate environment as acceptable, and do not propose to oppose the development on these grounds. Nevertheless, as this is a matter of judgement, members will need to reach their own conclusions but within the context of the officers' recommendation.

Trees and Landscaping

27. The application site is located at the southern edge of the city and some 12 trees of various sizes and species currently exist on the site or in its immediate environs. These consist of 3 willows, 6 cherries, 1 pear, 1 crab apple and 1 cotoneaster. These have been surveyed using British Standards recommendations in respect of trees in relation new buildings with 3 being assessed as category B (where retention is desirable) and 9 category C (trees which could be retained). In these proposals 10 are proposed for removal with 2 only retained, two category B willows along the southern boundary to the south - west corner. These two willows have a life expectancy in the range of 20 to 40 years. This varies from the 2012 proposal only in that the category C pear tree to the north - west corner previously intended for retention is now removed to allow car parking at this location.
28. Of particular concern however is the loss of the prominent weeping willow to the south - east corner of the site. This category B tree is the most significant specimen on the site, also with a life expectancy in the range of 20 to 40 years.

It was retained in the extant office development and ideally Officers feel it should be retained in these proposals. The applicant argues however that it cannot be incorporated into the development without a major redesign which would make the development unviable.

29. Whilst these losses, particularly the weeping willow, are regretted, and there is little or no scope for new planting within the application site as proposed, they can be mitigated by new planting within the adjacent highway verge to the north and east. To this end the applicant is prepared to contribute £12,000 towards off site planting which would allow 12 new trees to be planted and maintained by City and County Councils for the future. No objection was previously raised to such an arrangement.

Flood Risk

30. The application site is located within Flood Zone 2 as defined by the Environment Agency which equates to a medium risk of flooding. The site was in fact flooded in the worse recorded flood of 1947 but not in more recent flood events. Moreover since the 2007 flood various localised flood mitigation measures have been carried out in the vicinity by the Oxford Area Flood Partnership. Existing ground levels within the site are within the range of 55.90 AOD to 56.30 AOD.
31. In these proposals it is intended that the finished floor level to the building would be set at 56.50 AOD, or over 300 mm above the 1 in 100 year flood event level of 56.14 AOD with allowance for climate change. This would protect the building from flooding itself. In order to not increase flood risk elsewhere ground levels would be reduced below the building to compensate for a small loss of flood storage in levelling the site. This would increase the flood storage capacity of the site slightly by a net volume of 130 cu m. Voids would also be created beneath the building to allow floodwater to move freely under it in an extreme flood event. This is achieved by placing 1.4m openings with grills at intervals around the external walls to the building aligning with windows above. In a 1 in 100 year event with climate change the car park would then be flooded but would still allow evacuation of the building in accordance with an Evacuation Plan to be drawn up. In any event the site is vulnerable to fluvial rather than flash flooding, giving good prior warning of the onset of flood conditions.
32. These provisions are similar to those proposed in relation to the previous Travelodge application, and are not opposed by the Environment Agency, subject to appropriate conditions being imposed in the event of permission being granted.

Sustainability

33. An Energy Strategy Report and Natural Resource Impact Analysis accompany the planning application. Although a partial air source heat pump system is contemplated in terms of on - site renewable energy plus a gas fired CHP system, generally the emphasis of the development in sustainability terms is in

incorporating energy efficiency measures into the building wherever possible. This is achieved by minimising energy consumption through passive measures; by utilising efficient building services; and including low and zero carbon technologies. This translates into the use of naturally ventilated double glazed window units throughout with mechanical ventilation only required in specific areas such as the breakfast area. Insulation and air permeability would meet or exceed Building Control requirements with low energy lighting and control systems in place throughout. All appliances would be A rated.

34. Timber would be sourced from a Forestry Stewardship Council (FSC) supplier. Other materials would be sourced from the UK wherever possible, with the demolished building reused as aggregate. A site waste management plan would be operated with recycling facilities on site. Dual flush WCs and low flow water systems would be utilised throughout.
35. With these features in place an overall a score of 7 out of a possible 11 is achieved on the NRIA with the minimum score exceeded in each of the categories of energy efficiency, renewables, use of materials and water resources.

Other Matters

36. Planning Obligations in the Event of Approval. Notwithstanding the recommendation at the head of this report that planning permission be refused, if committee is nevertheless minded to grant planning permission, then various contributions are payable in line with the requirements of the adopted Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The applicant is agreeable to such contributions. In addition a further sum has been agreed with the applicant for off - site tree planting and landscaping in the highway verges adjacent to the development as mitigation for the trees lost to construction. The contributions would be as follows, index linked:
- Highways infrastructure: £26,600.
 - Affordable housing: £10,009.
 - Off - site landscaping: £12,000.
 - Public art: £15,785.
37. Biodiversity. A phase 1 habitat survey of the application site undertaken in November 2011 indicated no evidence of protected species or reptiles, and only low potential for bat roosts. The existing trees on site, especially the willows, provide some potential habitats for bird life. In the event of planning permission being granted mitigation of the lost trees is provided by new tree planting whilst bird and bat boxes can be incorporated into the development, secured by condition.

Conclusion

38. Whilst the provision of low cost visitor accommodation can generally be supported along the main radial routes into the city centre, in this case the development is sited at a highly prominent location close the strategic road

network. Planning and Highways Officers assess it will therefore be most attractive to car borne guests where a parking standard of 1 space per 2 bedrooms is considered to be insufficient to respond to the demands likely to be put upon an 83 bed Travelodge, especially at busy periods. With the central bus station and railway station 3km away to the north it is judged that only a minority of guests would be arriving by public transport. Nor has there been any evidence produced by the applicant to suggest that 45 car parking spaces only would be sufficient to meet its needs. Moreover use of the adjacent Redbridge Park and Ride car park as overspill is not appropriate as it is a facility specifically to serve city centre needs, and in any event developments at non - central locations are expected to provide all their parking and servicing requirements on their own land.

39. For the reasons indicated, Officers have concluded that the planning application cannot be supported.

Human Rights Act 1998

Officers have considered the implications of the Human Rights Act 1998 in reaching a recommendation to refuse this application. They consider that the interference with the human rights of the applicant under Article 8/Article 1 of Protocol 1 is justifiable and proportionate for the protection of the rights and freedom of others or the control of his/her property in this way is in accordance with the general interest.

Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

Officers have considered, with due regard, the likely effect of the proposal on the need to reduce crime and disorder as part of the determination of this application, in accordance with section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. In reaching a recommendation to refuse planning permission, officers consider that the proposal will not undermine crime prevention or the promotion of community safety.

Background Papers: Applications 01/01371/NFY, 03/01773/FUL, 12/00249/FUL, 12/0329/FUL.

Contact Officer: Murray Hancock

Extension: 2153

Date: 5th April 2013

This page is intentionally left blank