100 Minories, Tower Hill
in the City of London
planning application no. 12/00263/FULMAJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic planning application stage II referral (new powers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demotion of the existing vacant six-storey educational building and erection of an apart-hotel up to nine-storeys in height with 265 rooms and ancillary restaurant, bar, retail and tourist information desk at ground/first floor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The applicant is Grange Hotels, and the architect is Buchanan architects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having regard to the details of the applications and the matters set out in the committee report, the application is broadly consistent with the London Plan and there are no sound planning reasons for the Mayor to intervene in this particular case and no basis to direct the Council to refuse the application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Council’s decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this instance the City of London Corporation has resolved to grant permission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the City of London Corporation be advised that the Mayor is content for it to determine the case itself, subject to any action that the Secretary of State may take, and does not therefore wish to direct refusal or direct that he is to be the local planning authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. On 20 April 2012 the Mayor of London received documents from the City of London Corporation notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. This was referred to the Mayor under Category 1C and 3E of the Schedule to the Order 2008:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1C: Development which comprises or includes the erection of a building that is more than 25 metres high and is adjacent to the River Thames; |
3E: Development (a) which does not accord with one or more provisions of the development plan in force in the area in which the application site is situated; and (b) comprises or includes the provision of more than 2,500 square metres of floorspace for a use falling within any of the following classes in the Use Classes Order— C1 (Hotel).

2. On 28 May 2012 the Mayor considered planning report PDU/2913/01, and subsequently advised the City of London Corporation that the application did not comply with the London Plan, for the reasons set out in paragraph 77 of the above-mentioned report; but that the possible remedies set out in paragraph 78 of that report could address these deficiencies.

3. A copy of the above-mentioned report is attached. The essentials of the case with regard to the proposal, the site, case history, strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance are as set out therein, unless otherwise stated in this report. Since then, the application has been revised in response to the Mayor’s concerns (see below). On 27 November 2012 the City of London Corporation decided that it was minded to grant planning permission and on 18 April 2013 following a period of negotiation on the Section 106 Agreement it advised the Mayor of this decision. Under the provisions of Article 5 of the Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor may allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, direct the City of London Corporation under Article 6 to refuse the application or issue a direction to the Corporation under Article 7 that he is to act as the Local Planning Authority for the purposes of determining the application. The Mayor has until 1 May 2013 to notify the City of London Corporation of his decision and to issue any direction.

4. The decision on this case, and the reasons will be made available on the GLA’s website www.london.gov.uk.

Update

5. At the consultation stage concerns were raised in relation to urban design, inclusive design, climate change and transport. The issues raised and the applicant’s response are discussed below:

Urban design

6. At the consultation stage the applicant was advised to increase the size of the new Vine Street route. The applicant has now removed the protruding bay windows, which previously encroached on the route, creating a more generous passageway and this is strongly supported.

7. The consultation report raised concerns that the architectural quality of the building is not of a high enough standard for such a prominent location and it stated that whilst this was not considered to be a strategic concern, the designers should consider how the building can be made to appear more distinct and elegant by reducing unnecessary articulation and focusing on ensuring the detailing is simple and elegant. As set out below, Historic Royal Palaces has raised similar concerns.

8. The applicant has not made any significant changes to the appearance of the building in response to these comments. The Corporation’s committee report states that it considers “that the building is appropriately scaled and designed and that it would make a positive contribution to the appearance and coherence of the background against which the Tower of London is viewed.”

9. As stated above the issue raised at the consultation stage in relation to the appearance of the building is not considered to be a significant strategic concern and, whilst it is disappointing that the applicant has not sought to address the concerns raised, officers are content that the proposal will have an overall positive impact on the setting of the world heritage site and the design is acceptable is strategic planning terms.
**Inclusive design**

10 As requested the applicant has committed to providing 27 fully accessible rooms from the outset with a further 14 rooms which could be adapted at a later date and provided further details of the location and layout of the rooms which is welcomed.

**Climate change**

11 At the consultation stage, the applicant was required to confirm the level of carbon dioxide saved through energy efficiency alone. The applicant has now confirmed that there will be a 10.5% reduction in carbon emission from energy efficiency measures alone and a further 17.6% of carbon dioxide saving have been achieved through the introduction of CHP. As the combined savings exceed 25% savings beyond 2010 building regulations, the applicant is no longer proposing renewable energy sources and this is accepted.

12 As previously requested, the has confirmed that the aparthotel bedrooms, restaurant and retail space will all be served by a site heat network infrastructure served from a single energy centre. It has also provided floor area and location of the energy centre.

13 The application now complies with London Plan Policy 5.2.

**Transport**

14 At Stage 1 the car free nature of the scheme was supported and proposed provision of blue-badge holder spaces was considered acceptable. Clarification on matters relating to the level of cycle parking has been provided by the applicant, and the 40 spaces proposed meet London Plan requirements (policy 6.13), which is welcomed.

15 Previously it was recommended that a dedicated taxis bay be provided in the Crescent. In consultation with the City of London, such provision has been considered as part of a wider scheme to improve traffic management on The Crescent, Hammett Street and Vine Street. The City has confirmed that provision of a small layby to allow all vehicles, including taxis, to set down passengers and turn safely will be secured through the necessary 278 agreement. It is acknowledged that a larger dedicated provision has been discounted by the City in the interests of maintaining adequate footway space and on balance, this is considered acceptable.

16 Financial contributions were initially requested towards implementing step-free access at Tower Hill station and it is disappointing that this has not been secured. Although a dedicated contribution towards the Mayor’s Cycle Hire scheme has also not been met, the draft section 106 makes specific reference to the scheme as a possible beneficiary of the £127,890 contribution secured towards transport in line with the City of London’s Planning Obligations SPG. This is welcomed in line with London Plan policy 6.9.

17 Following final confirmation of the proposed Gross Internal Area floorspace figures, ,the full contribution towards Crossrail of £1,067,341.40 will be secured through the section 106 agreement, in line with London Plan policy 6.5. This reflects the methodology contained in the updated Supplementary Planning Guidance on Crossrail and any CIL payments will be treated as a towards the Crossrail contribution.

**Response to consultation**
The Corporation advertised the proposal in the press and with site notices. The Corporation received four letters from local residents/business of which three were letters of objection and one comment neither objecting nor supporting the application.

The main concerns raised were lack of mechanism/training initiative to ensure new jobs go to local people, saturation of hotels in the local area, lack of local consultation, noise during construction and afterwards, access and parking arrangements in the Crescent, impact on local residential amenity and commercial uses including loss of light, impact on local residents' views, and the loss in value of local properties, design, and loss of historically important views from the Crescent.

An objection was also received to the demolition of 100 Minories building which states that it has been requested that the building be listed to protect this example of modernist intervention into a unique historic context to maintain the debate about authenticity and architecture. The letter promotes the refurbishment and reuse of the existing building for an educational purpose, in light with its original design.

The City of London Conservation Area Advisory Committee states it does not object to the principle of the proposal but requests that consideration be given to replacing the timber cladding to the bay above the entrance to Vine Street with another material and setting back the visible top storey a little further if possible.

The GLA and TfL received a Freedom of Information request from a solicitor acting on behalf of a neighbouring hotel developer requesting correspondence regarding the application. The Corporation also received several letters from the same solicitor raising procedural issues regarding the validity of the application and the supporting material. The Corporation responded directly to the solicitor on these points.

The issues raised above are largely local concerns and have either been considered within the Corporation's committee report or within this report or in report PDU/2913/01. The issues raised regarding the lack of local consultation and validity of the application, are procedural matters that are beyond the Mayor's planning remit.

**Statutory Consultees**

Southwark Council- Southwark Council does not formally object to the proposal but observes that the dark treatment of the upper levels of the proposed building amplify its presence with the view from HMS Belfast when considered against the light stone cladding of the lower part of the building and that a lighter colour could reduce this impact.

Tower Hamlets Council- Tower Hamlets Council objects to the proposal as it states the design, massing, scale, materials and elevational treatment represents an inappropriate form of development and fails to preserve or enhance the character, appearance, and setting of the Tower of London World Heritage site and adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument. It also states the proposal will have a detrimental impact upon Strategic views protected by the London Views Management Framework SPG.

These issues are considered in paragraphs 29-32 of report PDU/2913/01 and in paragraphs 6-9 of this report.

English Heritage- No comment.

Historic Royal Palaces (HRP)- HRP Welcomes the principle of the proposed hotel with active frontage at street level and the re-opening of the pedestrian route north along Vine Street. It states the building height is appropriate and will cause no problems in long views of the Tower. However it states it is not convinced by the design, which lacks sophistication and fails to achieve
the enduring, timeless quality that the site needs, whilst avoiding being dull. It states that present proposal, despite the choice of high quality materials and careful detailing, appears overly horizontal in composition and disappointingly monolithic.

29 Thames Water- provide detailed comments on surface water drainage and water supply and requested a condition and informative, which the Corporation have secured.

**Article 7: Direction that the Mayor is to be the local planning authority**

30 Under Article 7 of the Order the Mayor could take over this application provided the policy tests set out in that Article are met. In this instance the Council has resolved to grant permission with conditions and a planning obligation, which satisfactorily addresses the matters raised at stage I, therefore there is no sound planning reason for the Mayor to take over this application.

**Legal considerations**

31 Under the arrangements set out in Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor has the power under Article 6 to direct the local planning authority to refuse permission for a planning application referred to him under Article 4 of the Order. He also has the power to issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. The Mayor may also leave the decision to the local authority. In directing refusal the Mayor must have regard to the matters set out in Article 6(2) of the Order, including the principal purposes of the Greater London Authority, the effect on health and sustainable development, national policies and international obligations, regional planning guidance, and the use of the River Thames. The Mayor may direct refusal if he considers that to grant permission would be contrary to good strategic planning in Greater London. If he decides to direct refusal, the Mayor must set out his reasons, and the local planning authority must issue these with the refusal notice. If the Mayor decides to direct that he is to be the local planning authority, he must have regard to the matters set out in Article 7(3) and set out his reasons in the direction.

**Financial considerations**

32 Should the Mayor direct refusal, he would be the principal party at any subsequent appeal hearing or public inquiry. Government guidance in Circular 03/2009 (‘Costs Awards in Appeals and Other Planning Proceedings’) emphasises that parties usually pay their own expenses arising from an appeal.

33 Following an inquiry caused by a direction to refuse, costs may be awarded against the Mayor if he has either directed refusal unreasonably; handled a referral from a planning authority unreasonably; or behaved unreasonably during the appeal. A major factor in deciding whether the Mayor has acted unreasonably will be the extent to which he has taken account of established planning policy.

34 Should the Mayor take over the application he would be responsible for holding a representation hearing and negotiating any planning obligation. He would also be responsible for determining any reserved matters applications (unless he directs the council to do so) and determining any approval of details (unless the council agrees to do so).

**Conclusion**

35 At the consultation stage concerns were raised in relation to urban design, inclusive design, climate change and transport. As set out above these issues have now been satisfactorily addressed and the application now broadly complies with the London Plan. Furthermore, the
proposal will make a positive contribution to the setting of the World Heritage Site and will not have a significant impact on any designated strategic views.

for further information, contact Planning Decisions Unit:

**Colin Wilson, Senior Manager – Planning Decisions**
020 7983 4783   email colin.wilson@london.gov.uk

**Justin Carr, Strategic Planning Manager (Development Decisions)**
020 7983 4895     email justin.carr@london.gov.uk

**Gemma Kendall, Case Officer**
020 7983 4310   email gemma.kendall@london.gov.uk
100 Minories, Tower Hill
in the City of London
planning application no. 12/00263/FULMAJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic planning application stage 1 referral (new powers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demotion of the existing vacant six-storey educational building and erection of a apart-hotel up to nine-storeys in height with 265 rooms and ancillary ancillary restaurant, bar, retail and tourist information desk at ground/first floor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The applicant is Grange Hotels, and the architect is Buchanan architects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The main strategic issue is whether the proposed hotel use is acceptable on this site previously used for educational purposes. The impact on the setting of the Tower of London, a World Heritage Site, is also another key consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relevant issues are urban design, inclusive design, climate change, air quality and transport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the City of London Corporation be advised that the application does not comply with the London Plan, for the reasons set out in paragraph 77 of this report; but that the possible remedies set out in paragraph 78 of this report could address these deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context**

36 On 20 April 2012 the Mayor of London received documents from the City of London Corporation notifying him of a planning application of potential strategic importance to develop the above site for the above uses. Under the provisions of The Town & Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor has until 31 May 2012 to provide the City Corporation with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. The Mayor may also provide other comments. This report sets out information for the Mayor’s use in deciding what decision to make.

37 The application is referable under Category 1C and 3E of the Schedule to the Order 2008:

1C: Development which comprises or includes the erection of a building that is more than 25 metres high and is adjacent to the River Thames.
3E: Development (a) which does not accord with one or more provisions of the development plan in force in the area in which the application site is situated; and

(b) comprises or includes the provision of more than 2,500 square metres of floorspace for a use falling within any of the following classes in the Use Classes Order — C1 (Hotel).

38 Once the City of London Corporation has resolved to determine the application, it is required to refer it back to the Mayor for his decision as to whether to direct refusal; take it over for his own determination; or allow the Corporation to determine it itself.

39 The Mayor of London’s statement on this case will be made available on the GLA website www.london.gov.uk.

Site description

40 The reverse L-shaped site is located at the southern end of the Minories, at the junction with Tower Hill and to the north of the Tower of London. The site is within the Central Activities Zone and it is designated as being within the Thames Policy Area in the City of London Corporation’s Core Strategy. The site is within the wider setting area of Strategic view 25A from the Queen’s Walk and it is within the local setting of the Tower of London. It is also adjacent to the Crescent Conservation Area.

41 The site is bound by raised train tracks to the north; Tower Gateway station and an office development to the east; Tower Hill gardens to the south, beyond which is the Tower of London; and Tower Hill underground station, a sub station and a historically significant crescent of rebuilt Georgian townhouses to the west. The remains of the Roman City Wall are located behind the Crescent to the west of the site.

42 The site is currently occupied by a 1960s educational building which was formally part of the London Metropolitan University. The building is between four and five-storeys in height. Part of the structure spans over Hammett Street in a flying freehold arrangement over City of London Corporation land.

43 Minories forms part of the Transport for London road network. The site is within 200 metres of Fenchurch Street national rail station, Tower Hill station (District and Circle lines) and Tower Gateway Docklands Light Railway station. Twelve bus routes operate within 450 metres of the site. The public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of the site is therefore 6, on a scale of 1-6 where 6 is excellent.

Details of the proposal

44 The applicant is seeking full planning permission for the demolition of the existing vacant six-storey educational building and erection of a nine-storey hotel/apart-hotel with 265 bedrooms and ancillary restaurant, bar, retail and tourist information desk at ground/first floor.

45 The application also includes:

- Public realm improvements to the Crescent
- The erection of a screen connecting the hotel and the Crescent and screening the sub station.
- One blue badge parking space in the Crescent.

Case history

46 A pre-application meeting was held on 26 January 2012.
Strategic planning issues and relevant policies and guidance

The relevant issues and corresponding policies are as follows:

- **Education**  
  - London Plan

- **Tourism/leisure**  
  - London Plan; Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism (DCLG)

- **Historic Environment**  
  - London Plan; World Heritage Sites SPG; Circular 07/09

- **Urban design**  
  - London Plan

- **Inclusive design**  
  - London Plan; Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment SPG; Planning and Access for Disabled People: a good practice guide (ODPM)

- **Tall buildings/views**  
  - London Plan, Revised View Management Framework SPG

- **Climate Change**  
  - London Plan; Sustainable Design and Construction SPG; Mayor’s Climate Change Adaptation Strategy; Mayor’s Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy; Mayor’s Water Strategy

- **Ambient noise**  
  - London Plan; the Mayor’s Ambient Noise Strategy;

- **Air quality**  
  - London Plan; draft Early Minor Alteration to the London Plan; the Mayor’s Air Quality Strategy;

- **Transport**  
  - London Plan; the Mayor’s Transport Strategy; Land for Transport Functions SPG, draft Land for Industry and Transport SPG

- **Crossrail**  
  - London Plan; Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy; Crossrail SPG

For the purposes of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the development plan in force for the area is the 2011 City of London Core Strategy and the 2011 London Plan.

Principle of the development

London Plan Policy 4.5 ‘London’s visitor infrastructure’ recognises the need for 40,000 net additional hotel bedrooms by 2031. It seeks to ensure that new hotels are in appropriate locations and states that strategically important hotels proposed within the CAZ should be located within identified opportunity areas, with small scale provision in CAZ fringe locations with good public transport. It goes on to state that further intensification of provision in areas of existing concentration should be resisted, except where this will not compromise local amenity or the balance of local land uses. Part (e) of the Policy recognises the need for apart-hotels in the context of the broader policies of this Plan.

The proposal of 265 hotel rooms will contribute to meeting the Mayor’s target of an additional 40,000 and is supported. Furthermore, the provision of apart–hotel rooms for which there is a recognised need is also supported. The hotel is not located within an opportunity area and it is located in an area with a relatively high number of hotels, however, the concentration is not so great that the proposal is unlikely to compromise local amenity or the balance of local land uses.

London Plan Policy 3.16 ‘Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure’ states that proposal which would result in a loss of social infrastructure in areas of defined need for that particular type of infrastructure and without realistic proposals for re-provision should be resisted. It goes on to say that on redundant social infrastructure sites, alternative social infrastructure uses for which there is a defined need should be assessed before alternative developments are considered.
The proposal will result in the loss of a building which was formerly used by London Metropolitan University and Paragraph 3.86 of the London Plan defines colleges and universities as social infrastructure. The applicant states that the London Metropolitan University has sold the building as part of a process of consolidating its campus and the functions that took place in this building have been relocated to another London Metropolitan University property. Furthermore, the City of London’s Infrastructure Plan (March 2011) states that

“The London Metropolitan University is implementing its Estates Strategy which will reflect the evolving nature of the universities student demands which in recent years has seen an overall decline in the number of students. In the City the focus will be on the potential disposal of its current surplus site at 100 Minories and consolidation on the remaining sites.”

In summary, the principle of locating the proposed apart-hotel on this site is acceptable and the applicant has demonstrated that the educational function of the building is surplus to requirement. The application complies with London Plan Policy 4.5 and 3.16.

Urban design

Good design is central to all objectives of the London Plan, in particular the objective to create a city of diverse, strong, secure and accessible neighbourhoods to which Londoners feel attached whatever their origin, background, age or status. Policies contained within chapter seven specifically look to promote development that reinforces or enhances the character, legibility, permeability and accessibility of neighbourhoods by setting out a series of overarching principles and specific design policies related to site layout, scale, height and massing, internal layout and visual impact.

The scheme is reasonably well designed, maximising the potential of the site, enclosing and activating the public realm and improving permeability through the area. However, there are a number of elements that required further consideration.

Layout

Of particular relevance to this proposal are London Plan Policy 7.1, that sets out the requirement for developments to reinforce or enhance the permeability and legibility of neighbourhoods, so that communities can easily access community infrastructure, commercial services and public transport; and London Plan Policy 7.3 that sets out a series of overarching principals to ensure that the design of a development should look to reduce the opportunities for criminal behaviour by maximising activity throughout the day and night, clearly articulating public and private spaces, enabling passive surveillance over public spaces and promoting a sense of ownership and respect.

The proposed development takes up the majority of the ‘L’ shaped site. It continues the existing building line along its southern and eastern edges, helping define and enclose the public realm along both Minories and the open spaces adjacent to tower Hill which is strongly supported. The scheme also continues the building line of the Crescent and Vine Street on the inside of the block which is also welcomed

Hammer Street runs under the building, linking Vine Street to Minories, and a new route is created along the alignment of Vine Street to the open spaces of Tower Hill. The pre-application note set out how that whilst this new route is strongly supported, consideration was needed to making this wider so that it is more legible and inviting. This remains a concern undermining the potential benefits this route might have on the permeability of the area.
The ground floor layout of the development relates well to both these internal streets, flanking them with active frontages which will ensure they are safe, well used and attractive. The aspiration them being “covered arcades” is also strongly supported.

The provision of active uses on the ground floor also has a positive contribution on Minories and Tower Hill, encouraging the public realm to be active and well used which is welcomed. Concern was previously expressed with the location of an apartment on the ground floor facing Minories, however this has since been replaced with a retail unit which is welcomed, better contributing to adding activity to the public realm and overcoming privacy issues.

Scale, height and massing

The scale, height and massing of a development will have an impact on the legibility, character and adaptability of its surrounding urban area. London Plan Policy 7.4B sets out the requirement for buildings to provide a contemporary architectural response to the site whilst having regard to the pattern and grain of development in the wider area and being human in scale. London Plan Policy 7.6B sets out the requirement for development to be of a proportion, composition, scale and orientation that enhances activates and appropriately encloses the public realm. London Plan Policy 7.7 sets out additional design requirements for tall and large-scale buildings, which are defined as buildings that are significantly taller than their surroundings and/or have a significant impact on the skyline. The policy includes requirements for buildings to emphasize points of civic or visual significance and have ground floor activities that provide a positive relationship to surrounding streets and to incorporate the highest standards of architecture.

The proposed development is L shaped in plan with the north-south leg approximately 25 metres deep and the east-west leg 20 metres deep. The building rises to a maximum of nine storeys in height with the upper four storeys set-back to create a five storey shoulder height. The top storey is sized to accommodate only one apartment at the end of the north-south leg. The upper storey of the east-west leg is 8m deep with a wide balcony along its southern edge.

The set back of the upper storeys successfully minimises the perceived scale of the building whilst providing good levels of enclosure to the surrounding streets and spaces which is welcomed. The overall height has little impact on views or the skyline and presents no strategic concern.

Strategic views

The applicant has provided a visual impact assessment of the proposal on the designated views 11B.2 from London Bridge, 25A.1, 25A.2, 25A.3 from The Queen’s Walk and 10A.1 from Tower Bridge North Bastion. Officers are satisfied that the proposed scheme does not have a significant impact on any of these views.

Appearance

The design of the elevations and appearance of the building have been worked up significantly since the pre-application meeting and the renderings provide a good indication of what the building will look like.

The scheme is now characterised by a simple tripartite brick and glass elevation with windows vertically aligned creating bays that brake up the elevation. Whilst this simple and established design strategy is welcomed, there is concern that the architectural quality of the building is not of a high enough standard for such a prominent location. Whilst this is not a strategic issues, the designers should consider how the building can be made to appear more distinct and elegant by reducing unnecessary articulation and focusing on ensuring the detailing is simple and elegant.
In summary further consideration is required to ensure the application complies with London Plan design policy. The applicant should increase the width of the new route through to Vine Street. The applicant should consider how the building can be made to appear more distinct and elegant.

**World Heritage Site**

The proposed development site is located within setting of the Tower of London World Heritage Site. In July 2009, the Government published a Circular on the Protection of World Heritage Sites (07/2009). The Circular establishes the Government’s objective to protect each World Heritage Site through conservation and preservation of its outstanding universal value. It sets out that World Heritage Sites and their settings, including any buffer zone should be protected from inappropriate development. The Circular identifies the setting of a World Heritage Site as the area around it (including any buffer zone) in which change or development is capable of having an adverse impact on the World Heritage Site, including an impact on views to or from the site.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) includes World Heritage Sites in the definition of Designated Heritage Assets. The NPPF states that applications for development affecting the setting of a designated heritage asset should treat favourably applications that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset. When considering applications that do not do this, local planning authorities should weigh any such harm against the wider benefits of the application. The greater the negative impact on the significance of the heritage asset, the greater the benefits that will be needed to justify approval.

London Plan policy 7.10 ‘World Heritage Sites’ states that development should not cause adverse impacts on World Heritage Sites or their settings (including any buffer zone). In particular, it should not compromise a viewer’s ability to appreciate its Outstanding Universal Value, integrity, authenticity or significance. In considering planning applications, appropriate weight should be given to implementing the provisions of the World Heritage Site Management Plans.

In line with policy 7.10, the London World Heritage Sites SPG (2012) gives guidance on the interpretation of settings and their importance in an appreciation of the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage Sites. Implementation Point 14 on page 65 of the SPG sets out a process to assess the impact of development on World Heritage Sites in relation to the impact on Outstanding Universal Value.

The applicant has submitted an assessment which assesses the impact of the development on the World Heritage Site in relation to its Outstanding Universal Value and application complies with London Plan Policy 7.10.

**Inclusive design**

Inclusive design principles if embedded into the development and design process from the outset help to ensure that all of us, including older people, disabled and deaf people, children and young people, can use the places and spaces proposed comfortably, safely and with dignity. The aim of London Plan Policy 3.8 ‘Housing Choice’ and 7.2 is to ensure that proposals achieve the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion, not just the minimum. The applicant should therefore seek to design a scheme that is exemplary in terms of inclusive access.

London Plan Policy 4.5 London’s Visitor Infrastructure states that hotel developments should ensure that at least 10% of bedrooms are wheelchair accessible. The applicant is proposing...
14 accessible rooms dispersed throughout the hotel and an additional 13 rooms which could be adapted at a future date for disabled users. This does not comply with London Plan Policy and 10% of rooms should be provided as wheelchair accessible from the outset.

Furthermore, whilst the applicant has provided example room layouts, it has not demonstrated how these layouts are accessible. It is not clear, for example that a wheelchair user could easily move between the bed and the desk in the medium and large studios. It is also not clear whether the kitchenette facilities will be accessible. The applicant should refer to the Accessible Hotel Draft Best Practice Guidance (http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/accessible-hotels-draft-BPG.pdf)

The applicant should consider producing an access management plan, which addresses ongoing management issues regarding disabled customers, such as staff training, parking procedures, advertising of accessible rooms (on the applicant’s own website and/or the Inclusive London website).

The matter of blue badge parking is discussed in the transport section.

The application does not comply with London Plan Policy 7.2 or 4.5. The applicant should commit to providing 27 fully accessible rooms from the outset. The applicant should demonstrate how the proposed room layouts are accessible and it should consider producing an access management plan.

Energy

Energy efficiency standards

In line with the GLA energy assessment guidance, September 2011, the applicant should note that the target emission rate should be calculated assuming the building is heated from a gas boiler (for all tiers of the energy hierarchy.)

A range of passive design features and demand reduction measures are proposed to reduce the carbon emissions of the proposed development. Both air permeability and heat loss parameters will be improved beyond the minimum backstop values required by building regulations. Other features include energy efficient lighting and mechanical ventilation with heat recovery. The demand for cooling will be minimised through free cooling, high performance glazing and solar shading.

Based on the information provided, the proposed development appears to exceed 2010 Building Regulations compliance through energy efficiency alone.

For clarity, using Table 1 & 2 in the GLA energy assessment guidance, September 2011 the applicant should confirm the absolute value of regulated carbon dioxide savings from energy efficiency alone expressed in tonnes of carbon dioxide per annum and in percentage terms.

District heating

The applicant has carried out an investigation and there are no suitable existing or planned district heating networks within the vicinity of the proposed development. The closest district heating network is 750 metres from the site which is too far to make it viable at this stage. The applicant should however, provide a commitment to ensuring that the development is designed to allow future connection to a district heating network should one become available.
The applicant should confirm that the aparthotel bedrooms, restaurant and retail space will all be served by a site heat network infrastructure served from a single energy centre. The applicant should confirm the floor area (sq.m) and location of the energy centre.

**Combined Heat and Power**

The applicant has discounted the use of CHP in favour of ground source heat pumps and PV/solar thermal panels due to the low heating load.

Given CHP is particularly suited to the hotel sector and in line with the Mayor’s energy hierarchy, the applicant should prioritise the use of CHP prior to considering renewables. The applicant should provide load profiles to clarify the heat load.

**Renewable energy technologies**

The applicant has investigated the feasibility of a range of renewable energy technologies and is proposing to install ground source heat pumps. The applicant should confirm how the ground source heat pump would successfully work with CHP.

The applicant is proposing 150 sq.m. of PVs and 356 sq.m of solar thermal panels. Solar thermal panels are not compatible with CHP as both compete for the same base load so this should not be pursued. Roof drawings showing space for PV should be provided.

Taking into account the comments above the applicant should clarify the proposed savings from renewable in tonnes per annum and in percentage terms.

**Summary**

Taking into account the comments above and using Table 1 & 2 in the GLA energy assessment guidance, September 2011 the applicant should confirm the absolute overall value of regulated carbon dioxide savings as well as savings at each tier of the energy hierarchy expressed in tonnes of carbon dioxide per annum and in percentage terms.

Further revisions and information is required before the proposals can be considered to comply with London Plan energy polices. The applicant should confirm the absolute value of regulated carbon dioxide savings from energy efficiency alone expressed in tonnes of carbon dioxide per annum and in percentage terms, in line with Table 1 & 2 in the GLA energy assessment guidance, September 2011. The applicant should confirm that the aparthotel bedrooms, restaurant and retail space will all be served by a site heat network infrastructure served from a single energy centre and the floor area (sq.m) and location of the energy centre. The applicant should provide load profiles to clarify the heat load and reconsider the use of CHP and its proposed use of renewable technologies.

**Air Quality**

London Plan policy 7.14 ‘Improving air quality’ seeks to ensure that development proposals aim to be air quality neutral and not lead to further deterioration of existing poor air quality, that offsetting should be used to ameliorate negative impacts associated with development proposals, and that increased exposure to existing poor air quality should be minimised.

The Mayor’s air quality strategy (Dec 2010) and the London Plan aims to ensure that new developments shall as a minimum be ‘air quality neutral’ through the adoption of best practice in the management and mitigation of emissions. Mitigation measures could include, but is not limited to: best available technologies in managing emissions to air, local air quality management support (financial contribution to borough local air quality management activities), travel plan, vehicle
retrofits/alternative fuel use. Low and zero carbon energy supply for London should not be significant in terms of local air quality impact and should create opportunities to improve local air quality.

94 The applicant has submitted an air quality strategy which has been assessed. The assessment is considered to be sound and the mitigation proposed is appropriate. The application complies with London Plan Policy 7.14.

Transport

95 The proposed development will be car free, which is welcomed and in line with London Plan policy 6.13. A dedicated parking bay will be provided for blue-badge holders within The Crescent. Should demand exceed this supply, a concierge service will arrange for disabled drivers to be met at the site entrance and their car parked elsewhere off-site, which is acceptable. This should be enforced through the section 106 agreement. Notwithstanding this, the applicant should consider options for converting existing on-street car parking bays into dedicated blue-badge parking, which would ensure more inclusive parking provision for the site in line with London Plan policy 6.13. Further clarification on this point is required.

96 Whilst secure and accessible cycle parking will be provided in line with the minimum London Plan requirements, the applicant should confirm the precise level of this provision to ensure they are acceptable, as this is currently unclear from the submission.

97 Considering the absence of any car parking, there will be little impact on the capacity of the TfL road network at Minories, especially as the hotel entrance lies on Hammett Street/The Crescent. The Crescent and the hotel service yard will be accessed from Minories via Hammett Street. Currently, Hammett Street has a two-way operation, although the applicant has aspirations for this to be changed to a one-way operation from Minories to limit the volume of traffic through the area. Whilst the principle of this is acceptable, the City will need to engage with TfL to agree any formal changes which might affect the operation of the TfL road network.

98 Given the scale of the proposed development and the density of the surrounding public transport network, and in line with London Plan policy 6.1, the additional trips generated by the hotel can be accommodated and this is accepted.

99 Notwithstanding this, and as demonstrated in the applicant’s transport assessment, employees and visitors to the hotel will rely largely on the underground network to access the site, and Tower Hill station is likely to be well used. This station attracts a large number of daily visitors to the Tower Hill area, although step-free access to the station is not currently possible. TfL has developed a scheme to deliver step-free access (street to platform) at the station (overall cost of circa £7.5m), and is requesting financial contributions, as well as the safeguarding of physical infrastructure, from nearby developments. Given the benefits such a scheme will have to the accessibility of the application site, TfL requests a financial contribution towards the delivery of step-free access at Tower Hill station, in line with London Plan policy 6.4. Further discussion with the applicant and City is welcomed in this respect.

100 The applicant proposes to accommodate taxi drop-offs in the Crescent/Service Yard, via Hammett Street although no formal space has been allocated for this. In the interests of inclusive access and to reduce the impact of taxi movements on the TLRN, TfL requests that a formal taxi bay is marked out in the service yard area. Whilst London Plan policy 6.13 usually requires dedicated coach parking to be provided for hotels, the proposed development is unlikely to generate sufficient demand for coaches.
The redevelopment of this site will generate an uplift in demand for the cycle hire scheme, particularly as residents of an apart-hotel are unlikely to have access to their own bicycle. The scheme is already heavily used in the local area. To support further expansion and intensification of the scheme, and in line with London Plan policy 6.9, TfL requires a contribution of £60,000 towards the provision of additional capacity in the nearby area, for which TfL Cycle Hire has some off-site options available.

The travel plan submitted as part of the application is considered robust; it contains realistic and measurable targets to encourage walking and cycling and explains the methodology behind specific interventions. This should be secured through the section 106 agreement. The proposed servicing arrangements are also acceptable in principle and the draft structure of the Delivery and Servicing Plan is welcomed. The submission of a full delivery and servicing plan for approval by the City, in consultation with TfL, should be secured by condition. Similarly a construction logistics plan should also be produced, secured by condition and agreed with the City and TfL prior to implementation of development.

Crossrail and CIL

In view of the strategic regional importance of Crossrail to London’s economic regeneration and development, and in order to bring the project to fruition in suitably timely and economic manner, contributions will be sought from development likely to add to or create congestion on central London’s rail network that Crossrail is intended to mitigate. This will be through planning obligations, arrangements for the use of which are established at strategic level in accordance with relevant legislation and policy guidance (London Plan Policy 6.5).

The approach for collecting contributions towards Crossrail is set out in the Mayor’s Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) ‘Use of Planning Obligations in the funding of Crossrail’ (July 2010). The SPG states that contributions should be sought in respect of retail, hotel and office development in central London which involves a net increase in floorspace of more than 500 sq.m. (GEA). As the proposed development falls within the central London contributions area, the proposed indicative level of charge is £60 per sq.m. for new hotel floorspace.

A requirement for a Crossrail contribution from this development will therefore relate to the net additional impact from the new development, taking into account the theoretical charge that would be paid by the existing uses. On the basis that there are no chargeable uses currently on the site, there is a requirement for a contribution of £1,196,820 from the proposed development (based of an uplift in hotel floorspace of 19,947 GEA). This should be secured through the section 106 agreement and be paid, in full, on commencement of the proposed development.

In accordance with London Plan policy 8.9, the Mayor has agreed his CIL charging schedule. The levy applies to developments consented on or after 1 April 2012, and will be collected by London boroughs once development commences. This application is liable to pay a CIL charge, the cost of which in the City is £50 per square metre. Any payment made under CIL will be treated as a credit towards the overall amount required for Crossrail under the Mayor’s SPG.

Summary

Additional information and discussion is required to ensure the application complies with London Plan Transport Policy. The applicant should: consider options for converting existing on-street car parking bays into dedicated blue-badge parking and confirm the precise level of this provision of secure cycle parking. The applicant should also provide: a financial contribution towards the delivery of step-free access at Tower Hill station; a £60,000 contribution towards the provision of additional capacity in the nearby area; and a £1,196,820 Crossrail contribution.
The applicant should submit a full delivery and servicing plan and a construction and delivery plan which, along with the Travel Plan, should be secured by condition/Section 106 agreement.

Local planning authority’s position

The City of London’s position is not known.

Legal considerations

Under the arrangements set out in Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 the Mayor is required to provide the local planning authority with a statement setting out whether he considers that the application complies with the London Plan, and his reasons for taking that view. Unless notified otherwise by the Mayor, the Council must consult the Mayor again under Article 5 of the Order if it subsequently resolves to make a draft decision on the application, in order that the Mayor may decide whether to allow the draft decision to proceed unchanged, or direct the Council under Article 6 of the Order to refuse the application, or issue a direction under Article 7 of the Order that he is to act as the local planning authority for the purpose of determining the application and any connected application. There is no obligation at this present stage for the Mayor to indicate his intentions regarding a possible direction, and no such decision should be inferred from the Mayor’s statement and comments.

Financial considerations

There are no financial considerations at this stage.

Conclusion

London Plan policies on are relevant to this application. The application complies with some of these policies but not with others, for the following reasons:

- Principle of development: In summary, the principle of locating the proposed apart-hotel on this site is acceptable and the applicant has demonstrated that the educational function of the building is surplus to requirement. The application complies with London Plan Policy 4.5 and 3.16.

- Urban Design: Further consideration is required to ensure the application complies with London Plan design policy.


- Inclusive design: The application does not comply with London Plan Policy 7.2 or 4.5.

- Climate change: Further revisions and information is required before the proposals can be considered to comply with London Plan energy polices.


- Transport: Additional information and discussion is required to ensure the application complies with London Plan Transport Policy.
On balance, the application does not comply with the London Plan. The following changes might, however, remedy the above-mentioned deficiencies, and could possibly lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan:

- **Urban design:** The applicant should increase the width of the new route through to Vine Street. The applicant should consider how the building can be made to appear more distinct and elegant.

- **Inclusive design:** The applicant should commit to providing 27 fully accessible rooms from the outset. The applicant should demonstrate how the proposed room layouts are accessible and it should consider producing an access management plan.

- **Climate change:** The applicant should confirm the absolute value of regulated carbon dioxide savings from energy efficiency alone expressed in tonnes of carbon dioxide per annum and in percentage terms, in line with Table 1 & 2 in the GLA energy assessment guidance, September 2011. The applicant should confirm that the aparthotel bedrooms, restaurant and retail space will all be served by a site heat network infrastructure served from a single energy centre and the floor area (sq.m) and location of the energy centre. The applicant should provide load profiles to clarify the heat load and reconsider the use of CHP and its proposed use of renewable technologies.

- **Transport:** The applicant should: consider options for converting existing on-street car parking bays into dedicated blue-badge parking and confirm the precise level of this provision of secure cycle parking. The applicant should also provide: a financial contribution towards the delivery of step-free access at Tower Hill station; a £60,000 contribution towards the provision of additional capacity in the nearby area; and a £1,196,820 Crossrail contribution (minus any CIL charge). The applicant should submit a full delivery and servicing plan and a construction and delivery plan which, along with the Travel Plan, should be secured by condition/ section 106 agreement.

---

for further information, contact Planning Decisions Unit:

**Colin Wilson, Senior Manager - Planning Decisions**
020 7983 4783 email colin.wilson@london.gov.uk
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