

**Application Number**

P/2016/0704

**Site Address**Preston Sands Hotel  
10-12 Marine Parade  
Paignton  
TQ3 2NU**Case Officer**

Mrs Ruth Robinson

**Ward**

Preston

**Description**

Demolish existing hotel. Formation of 10 apartments. (the proposed development to which the application relates is situated within 10 metres of relevant railway land, re-advertisement for re Consultation).

**Executive Summary/Key Outcomes**

The Preston Sands Hotel is located overlooking the beach at Preston. It is positioned mid way along a stretch of predominantly Edwardian detached dwellings which are in a mix of residential and commercial uses.

Originally two separate buildings, it is much altered through later extensions and now appears as a single building which dominates both plots.

Whilst other buildings along the Parade have been altered and extended, the original pattern of development is still evident and in this context, the Preston Sands Hotel is unsympathetic and out of character with other buildings along the Parade.

It is proposed to demolish the hotel and redevelop the site to provide 10 flats.

The loss of a hotel of this size in this location is in accordance with Policy TO2 of the Adopted Local Plan. It is not in a Core Tourism Investment Area, does not make a major contribution to the tourism offer and its loss would not undermine the holiday character of the area.

The replacement building, which is strongly informed by the historical pattern of development along Marine Parade, meets the second test in Policy TO2 in that it succeeds in reinstating a form of building more sympathetic to the original character of development on this site.

The scheme largely complies with the design, amenity and functional requirements of Policy DE1 and DE3 of the Adopted Plan. There are some deficiencies in respect of minimum garden sizes and parking levels.

To mitigate for the deficiency in garden size it is recommended that a

greenspace contribution is secured to be used in Hollicombe Park or on Preston Green. It is not considered that the minor shortfall in parking provision is significant given the location of the site.

The scheme is acceptable from a flood risk perspective and there are no adverse impacts on ecology. Biodiversity levels will be maintained through the mitigation included in the Conservation Action Plan which will be subject to a condition.

In terms of compliance with critical drainage, on site attenuation is needed and the applicant will seek to resolve this prior to issue of a decision.

### **Recommendation**

Approve: subject to no representations raising issues not already considered by the DM committee within the consultation period that expires on 23.11.16 and submission of details acceptable to the Executive Head of Business Services of attenuation measures and details of levels, a Unilateral Undertaking or S106 to secure a Greenspace contribution of £7780 and conditions in respect of the following:

- Large scale design details
- Samples of Materials and stone panel for inspection
- Landscaping details and triggers for implementation
- Geotechnical Report to confirm excavation
- Construction Method Statement to ensure no pollution to coastal waters
- Implementation of Conservation Action Plan.

### **Statutory Determination Period**

This application should be determined by the 19th November. The delay in determination has been due to an objection from the Environment Agency which has now been lifted. An extension of time has been agreed by the applicant until the 19th December.

### **Site Details**

The Preston Sands Hotel is located overlooking the beach at Preston. It is positioned mid way along a stretch of predominantly Edwardian detached dwellings which are in a mix of residential and commercial uses. Originally two separate buildings, it is much altered through later extensions and now appears as a single building which occupies the whole width of both plots.

Poor quality alterations to the roofscape through the introduction of dormers and mansard roofs have led to this building being the most dominant in this stretch of buildings. The frontage extends well beyond the established building line and whole of the front is hardsurfaced to provide car and coach parking.

Whilst other buildings along the Parade have been altered and extended, the original pattern of development is still evident and in this context, the Preston

Sands Hotel is wholly unsympathetic in terms of form and appearance and is thus out of character with other buildings along the Parade.

Vehicular access to the site is via Marine Parade, a cul-de-sac which runs across the back of the beach and in summer is host to a string of beach huts. This road also includes the route of the South West Coast Path and is part of the National Cycle network.

To the rear of the buildings along Marine Parade is a narrow access road and beyond this the railway embankment and Torquay to Paignton train line.

This is a defined Wildlife corridor.

The site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 and the Coastal Change Management Area.

### **Detailed Proposals**

This application involves the demolition of the hotel and its replacement with a new three storey building containing 8x2 bed flats and 2 x 3bed flats and basement car parking for 10 vehicles accessed from a central 'drive'.

The replacement building has been designed to reflect the original streetscape of detached Edwardian villas and reintroduces the gaps between plots evident in the street as a whole. It seeks to relate more effectively with the Parade as a whole in terms of form, appearance and height albeit in a more contemporary manner.

It is to be constructed in materials that reflect the neighbouring buildings including natural sandstone and render.

Front gardens and boundary treatments are reinstated in place of the existing car park.

### **Summary Of Consultation Responses**

The Environment Agency: Have withdrawn an initial objection following further information in relation to flood resilience which confirms that the height of the habitable accommodation is above the 200 year high water mark.

Strategic Transport: Is satisfied that the level of parking is adequate due to the central location of the site and proximity to public transport. A space for disabled users is required if it can be accommodated without adverse impact on the reinstated front gardens.

Drainage Engineer: Is concerned that the means of dealing with surface water runoff is not properly dealt with and will require on site attenuation as the site is within a critical drainage area. Details of this are required prior to issue of a decision.

Police Architectural Liaison Officer: Raises detailed points in relation to means of access.

Design Review Panel: It was considered at its meeting of the 10th July 2015.

As the redevelopment of this site will form a benchmark for future redevelopment on adjacent sites consideration by the DRP was considered vital. It strongly recommended that the design be informed by 'the historical pattern of built form that characterised Marine Parade in its early years and still persists today' and that a contemporary approach was acceptable providing these compositional principles were adhered to.

### **Summary Of Representations**

One comment has been received concerned at encroachment on neighbouring land.

### **Relevant Planning History**

Most of the planning history relates to its use as a hotel.

An initial pre app inquiry was 'refused' due to the failure of the proposal to adequately reflect the existing character and grain of the street. Following consideration by the Design Review Panel and reworking of the design approach the pre app was met with a positive response.

### **Key Issues/Material Considerations**

The key issues are whether the loss of the hotel use is acceptable, whether it complies with Policy TO2 in terms of the improvements to the form and appearance of the building, whether the resulting flats comply with policy DE1 in terms of design quality, DE3 in terms of residential amenity, functioning and relationship to neighbours and whether there is sufficient car parking in line with Policy TA3.

It is also necessary to consider flood resilience, drainage requirements, any ecological impact and whether the scheme should contribute towards local infrastructure to mitigate the impact of the development on the area. Each will be addressed in turn.

### **Is the loss of the Hotel acceptable?**

The hotel is not within a defined Core Tourism Investment Area where tourism related uses are protected and should be retained.

Outside defined CTIA's this protection only applies if the use makes a 'major contribution' to the tourism offer, the holiday character of the area would not be undermined by the loss of facilities and at least one of the following criteria apply; it is of limited significance, there is no reasonable prospect of it being used for

tourism related purposes and/or there are regeneration benefits that outweigh the loss of holiday accommodation.

Preston Sands Hotel is a small/medium sized hotel with 31 bedrooms and located on a street that is, despite its location, predominantly in residential use. Only two other plots are in a tourism related use.

The hotel therefore does not make a major contribution to the tourism offer of the area and its loss would not undermine the holiday character.

It is also the case that the much extended building is of a very poor quality and redevelopment would only be viable if a higher value residential use were permitted.

Policy TO2 requires buildings that have been damaged through extensions and alterations in connection with a tourism related use to take the opportunity to restore buildings and land to their original historic form in the event that a change of use is permissible. This generally applies to conversions but equally should apply to new build schemes.

Marine Parade is not in a Conservation Area however it is part of a street with a distinctive urban form and appearance. The detached villa forms mostly have a consistent plot size or grain, a defined building line, height and appearance which creates a distinctive and characteristic streetscape.

These design references were taken on board in evolving the design for the replacement building. It gives the appearance of two distinct buildings through the modelling of the elevations which project forward paired lightweight bays with a recessive rear wings. This reflects the pattern of gaps between buildings and gaps are reinstated between the site and adjacent plots.

The height of the building is reduced and whilst the strong character of hipped roofs is not replicated in the new design, the recessed character of the majority of the roof storey and the projection forward of roof pods is broadly consistent with the proportion and form of the wider roofscape.

A more consistent building line is achieved with adjacent buildings at ground and first floor level through the reduction in depth of the building as it increases in height. Some extension at lower ground floor level is required to accommodate access, parking and the level of floorspace needed to deliver a viable scheme. This is however reduced from the extension forward of the existing building at this level and so is considered acceptable.

In terms of appearance, a common theme of design details and palette of materials ties the building in with its neighbours.

In terms of frontage treatment, the existing car park which cuts across the whole of the frontage is replaced by new terrace gardens and sandstone boundary walls which again ties this site in with its neighbours.

Thus it is considered that the loss of the hotel is considered acceptable as it complies with Policy TO2 both in terms of its location and the restoration of a more historically appropriate character of building.

### **Do the Flats comply with Policy DE1 and DE3 of the Adopted Local Plan?**

This requires that new residential development is both visually in keeping and provides a satisfactory level of amenity for future occupiers of the site and neighbours. This lays out minimum unit sizes and garden space and describes a minimum standard of amenity in terms of layout and outlook.

Each of the flats has access to outdoor space in the form of terraces or balconies and there is some communal space to the front of the building. Four of the units have less than the 10m<sup>2</sup> minimum specified in policy DE3 although the rest are well in excess of the minimum standard.

Adequate storage, bin stores and bike storage is included in the basement car park.

The scheme is slightly deficient in terms of car parking as it doesn't include visitor parking or provision for disabled users. However, Strategic Transport do not consider this grounds to resist the application due to the sustainable location of the development and the constraints of the site. They would like to see a space for disabled users included in the front garden but this would present design difficulties due to the levels and limited space available.

### **Flood Resilience and Ecology.**

These are issues of importance as the site is located in a Flood Risk Zone 1 and adjacent to a Wildlife Corridor.

#### *Flood Risk*

The site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 and in a critical drainage area. The EA is now satisfied that the flood resilience issues are adequately dealt with as the applicant has demonstrated that the habitable accommodation is above the 200 year high water mark.

In terms of the Critical Drainage Area the Councils Drainage Engineer is not satisfied that the scheme can discharge surface water to the mains system and to meet Greenfield run off rates it should introduce on site attenuation. The applicant is agreeable to this and will provide details of this prior to the issue of any consent.

### *Ecology*

A phase 1 Habitat survey has been submitted due to the location of the site adjacent to a wildlife corridor and the risk to bat populations from demolition of buildings. The study does not identify any risk to habitats or wildlife. It recommends a Conservation Action Statement to avoid, mitigate and compensate for any anticipated ecological impacts. This clarifies preventative action in the event of bats or nesting birds being found and mitigation in the form of sparrow terraces and swift boxes all of which can be secured by condition.

### **S106/CIL -**

Government guidance in relation to S106 contributions in schemes of 10 units or less is that pooled tariffs are not appropriate and that contributions should only be sought where they can be justified on the basis of being site related. This scheme is slightly substandard in relation to on site amenity space with 4 of the units only having access to terraces that are below the 10m<sup>2</sup> minimum.

In view of this, and mitigating for the existing use it is thought appropriate that a green space contribution should be sought but that this should 50% of the tariff included in the SPD 'Planning Contributions and Affordable Housing' reflecting the impact of the current use of the site. This would amount to £7,780. It is recommended that the greenspace contribution is secured to be used in Hollicombe Park or on Preston Green.

### **Conclusions**

The loss of a hotel of this size in this location is in accordance with Policy TO2 of the Adopted Local Plan. The existing building is of very poor visual quality through the scale of alteration and extension to the extent that it dominates the plot and is intrusive within the immediate area.

The replacement building, which is strongly informed by the historical pattern of development along Marine Parade meets the second test in Policy TO2 in that it succeeds in reinstating a form of building more sympathetic to the original character of development on this site.

The scheme largely complies with the design, amenity and functional requirements of Policy DE1 and DE3 of the Adopted Plan although 4 of the units are below the minimum garden size and it does not include visitor parking or provision for disabled users.

In respect of the slight deficiency in garden size it is recommended that a greenspace contribution to be used in Hollicombe Park or on Preston Green is secured via a S106 or Unilateral Undertaking.

There is a ratio of 1 parking space per unit with no visitor parking. It is not considered that this shortfall warrants a refusal of planning permission due to the central location of the site and proximity to public transport. The inclusion of a

space for disabled users would not be possible without erosion of the reinstated front garden.

The scheme is acceptable from a flood risk perspective and there are no adverse impacts on ecology. Biodiversity levels will be maintained through the mitigation included in the Conservation Action Plan which will be subject to a condition.

In terms of compliance with critical drainage, on site attenuation is needed and the applicant will be required to resolve this prior to issue of a decision.

### **Recommendation**

Approve: subject to prior submission of attenuation measures and details of levels, a Unilateral Undertaking or S106 to secure a Greenspace contribution of £7780 and conditions in respect of the following:

- Large scale design details
- Samples of Materials and stone panel for inspection
- Landscaping details and triggers for implementation
- Geotechnical Report to confirm excavation
- Construction Method Statement to ensure no pollution to coastal waters
- Implementation of Conservation Action Plan.

### **Relevant Policies**

-