

Address:	Elizabeth Garrett Anderson Building Huntley Street London WC1E 6DH	
Application Number:	2008/5900/P	Officer: Neil McDonald
Ward:	Bloomsbury	
Date Received:	15/12/2008	
Proposal: Demolition of the existing hospital building (Class C2) and erection of a 6-storey building plus two levels of basement accommodation for clinical treatment, care and research facilities comprising a new UCLH Cancer Centre.		
Drawing Numbers:		
<p>1500 C; 1501 C; 0201 B; 0202 B; 0203 B; 0204 B; 0205C; 1502 C; 1503 G; 1504 C; 1505 H; 1506A; 1510 H; 1511 J; 1512 J; 1513 J; 1514 J; 1515 J; 1516 J; 1517 I; 1518 Rev K; 1519 Rev K; 1530 Rev J; 1531 Rev J; 1540 F; 1541 G; 1542 G; 1543 G; 1550 G; 1551 G; 1552 G; 1553 F; 1554 G; 1555 G; 1556 D; 1557 D; 1558 D; Perspective Images- 9064 D, 9065 D, 9066 E, 9067 E, 9068 E, 9069 D, 9070A. Design and Access Statement by Highcroft Planning dated November 2008; Planning Support Statement by Highcroft Planning dated November 2008; Transport Assessment by Arup dated November 2008; Draft Servicing Management Plan by Tribal; Draft Construction Management Plan by EC Harris; Demolition Management Plan by H Smith dated January 2009; Noise & Vibration Survey & Assessment by Arup dated November 2008; Potential Ground Contamination Report by Arup dated November 2008; Daylight & Sunlight Report by Anstey Horne dated 19.11.08; Sustainability Assessment by Arup dated September 2008.</p>		
RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement		
Applicant:	Agent:	
UCLH NHS Foundation Trust Trust HQ, 2nd Floor Central 250 Euston Road London NW1 2PG	Highcroft Planning 70 Third Avenue Frinton-on-Sea ESSEX CO13 9EE	

ANALYSIS INFORMATION

Land Use Details:			
	Use Class	Use Description	Floorspace
Existing	C2 Residential Institutions		11,629 m ²
Proposed	C2 Residential Institutions		15,153 m ²

OFFICERS' REPORT

Reason for Referral to Committee: This application is reported to Committee because it proposes a major development of more than 1000 sq. mtrs of non-residential floorspace [clause 3(i)] and is subject to a Section 106 legal agreement [clause 3(vi)].

The application is a 'major development' as defined by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. The application therefore needs to be determined within 13 weeks from the date of submission which expires on 16th March 2009.

1. SITE

- 1.1 The site currently comprises healthcare buildings totalling 11,629 sqm floorspace over 6/7 storeys of accommodation including a seven storey central tower. The buildings are occupied mainly by the Elizabeth Garrett Anderson (EGA) Hospital for maternity wards and obstetrics (dealing with childbirth) and there is also a small Maxillofacial Unit (dealing with mouth, jaws, face, neck etc).
- 1.2 Built in the earlier part of the 20th Century it conforms to a solid red brick form of construction characteristic of many of the older UCLH buildings within this part of the Bloomsbury Area. It is not itself within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, or of any noted architectural or historic merit. However, the Conservation Area boundary borders the site to the east running along the middle of Huntley Street at this point. Also facing the site across from the opposite side of Huntley Street are a number of listed buildings; namely the UCH General Block by Alfred and Paul Waterhouse 1897-1906 (grade II), UCH Medical School and Nurses Home by Paul Waterhouse 1907 (grade II), and a row of Georgian terraces at Nos 70 and 46-68 (even), also grade II. Sitting in between the Medical School and the Georgian terrace directly opposite the site is a newly completed (2007) medical research institute by Grimshaw, known as the 'Paul O'Gorman Building'.
- 1.3 The existing building has full site coverage with four street frontages: the principal elevation fronting onto Huntley Street with its seven storey tower; two flank elevations of 5/6 storeys onto University Street and Capper Street; and a six storey rear elevation onto Mortimer Market which incorporates a small service yard.
- 1.4 The immediately surrounding area is densely urban in character being distinguished by other large scale healthcare buildings interspersed with other residential and commercial uses. Adjoining the site to the north-west is the Rayne Institute housing a UCL medical research based establishment. Also to the west is the Mortimer Market Centre owned by the Primary Care Trust (PCT). Both of these buildings share Mortimer Market for their servicing needs.
- 1.5 To the north of the site facing Huntley Street is the Rosenheim Building which is another health care institution in UCLH ownership. This lies adjacent to Paramount Court, a purpose built block of flats facing University Street, while to the rear of these lies the former Odeon Cinema site (fronting Grafton Way and Tottenham

Court Road) which is the subject of an approved but unimplemented UCLH redevelopment scheme for hospital and related uses.

- 1.6 UCLH also owns the now vacant Royal Ear Hospital directly to the south of the site on the corner of Capper Street and Huntley Street. The buildings on the opposite (east) side of Huntley Street facing the site comprise the newly developed Paul O’Gorman Building, and the grade II listed Medical School. These both are owned or leased by UCL, as also, is the grade II listed Cruciform Building to the north.
- 1.7 The site is within the UDP designated Central London Area and Clear Zone and is listed in the UDP Section 11 Schedule of Land Use Proposals as a surplus NHS Trust site to be developed as part of a number of such sites to provide funding for UCLH (Site 25). The preferred uses are stated as “mixed use, predominantly residential or C2/D1 (hospital/health use)”.

2. THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The proposal is to demolish the existing buildings and to erect a new building of 15,153 sqm gross floorspace to accommodate a new facility for the treatment of cancer patients. The Centre would include outpatient-only accommodation with 186 treatment spaces. The proposed Cancer Centre is a new concept to the UK where patients would attend on a daily basis for treatments delivered to them on site. There would be no overnight stays as would be expected for a conventional hospital, although attendance times would sometimes be for the whole day lasting from 8am to 8pm. There would also be no visitors attending except for an accompanying carer where required. Although considered to be an exceptional type of use by UCLH due to the lack of any residential care element, it is still identifiable a hospital by nature and therefore considered to fall within Class C2.
- 2.2 As well as care accommodation there would also be clinical and research facilities and ancillary offices. Most of the functions in the nearby Rosenheim building would be transferred to and expanded in the new development.
- 2.3 The new building would comprise six-storeys plus two basement levels, the lower of which would be for plant and cycle parking. The first basement level will accommodate diagnostics, recovery and clinical trials. The main entrance to the building will be on Huntley Street and a double-height entrance foyer will take up much of the ground floor area linking through to a secondary entrance on Mortimer Market. A pharmacy, cafe and Wellness & Therapy centre will also occupy the more public ground floor areas.
- 2.4 Above ground floor will be the main areas for treatment with Young Persons, Wellness and Clinical Trials on the 1st floor, Chemotherapy and Clinical Trials on 2nd, Haematology and Clinical Trials on 3rd, Outpatients on 4th and Private Patients on 5th. At roof level there will be further plant both in the form of external chillers and two enclosed plant rooms, on top of which would be solar panels.
- 2.5 The above ground accommodation will adhere to a general layout of day treatment rooms, offices and examination rooms laid out around a central ‘courtyard’. This will

be a daylit enclosed atrium at 1st – 4th floor and a sunken roof garden at 5th floor level. Daylight will be allowed to permeate to the atrium below by refractive light cones and glazed paving. Although the sunken garden will be overlooked by the private patient accommodation, this external amenity space will be accessible to all patients of the proposed Centre.

- 2.6 Externally, the building is hung around a steel or concrete frame in-filled by metal panels and glazed facades giving an unashamedly modern appearance. The design of the building, by Hopkins Architects, has been conceived as a 'contemporary centre of excellence' recognising the many neighbouring buildings of note, but also seeking to express its uniqueness in its own right. This design philosophy is described in detail in the submitted Design and Access Statement and appraised in the Conservation and Urban Design section of this report.

Revisions

- 2.7 Subsequent to validation of the original application the following amendments and additional information comprising part of the application have been submitted:
- Submission of a demolition management plan
 - Addition of a green roof to the development
 - Revised drawings setting back the roof plant and associated pergola/screening to reduce the visible bulk at roof level.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 The site has been identified by UCLH to comprise part of the phase 3 redevelopment of its central London facilities. The existing uses on the site are currently being relocated into the 'Elizabeth Garrett Anderson Wing', part of the new Phase 2 redevelopment on Gower Street.
- 3.2 The Phase 1 and 2 Redevelopment, involving the main hospital site (site bounded by Euston Road, Gower Street, Grafton Way, Beaumont Place and Tottenham Court Road) was approved on 10th July 2004. This was subject to a detailed section 106 Agreement part of which was to secure provision of affordable housing and EGA, Huntley Street was one of various sites scoped for this. However, the nomination of the Middlesex Annex Site on Cleveland Street by the UCLH to provide all of the required amount of affordable housing has enabled the relevant clause (4.1.3) to be complied with therefore leaves the other sites, including Huntley Street free from any obligation.
- 3.3 Save for the above, there is no previous planning history considered relevant for this site.

4. CONSULTATIONS

[Officer response given in italics where required]

Statutory Consultees

- 4.1 **English Heritage GLAAS** – Were notified but no response received [*The site is not within an archaeological priority area and therefore there is no obligation to await EH comments*]

Non-Statutory Consultees

- 4.2 **Bloomsbury Conservation Area Advisory Committee** – Objection: -“Over-bearing architecture, excessive size and lack of any empathy with the Conservation Area. It seems even more unsuitable than the new Grimshaw Building opposite. Surely one can accommodate the proposed use in a more appropriate envelope”. [*The form of the proposal respects historic building lines and is of a similar scale to the existing building, with the roof height including plant being still below that of the existing central tower (a storey higher than general roof level), and roughly equivalent to the recently completed O’Gorman building (Grimshaw) opposite. The tripartite divisions to the elevations respond to many of the large neighbouring Victorian and Edwardian buildings and their red brick character is picked up by the muted reddish brown colours of the bronze cladding. –see Conservation and Urban Design section of the report below for full design assessment.*]
- 4.3 **Met Police Crime Prevention Design Adviser** – Satisfied with the submitted crime statement.

Local Groups

- 4.4 **Charlotte Street Association** – concerned about proposals for demolition and disposal of demolition material, routing of vehicles and control of dust and noise in this residential area arising both during demolition and construction. Also concerned about the design but have not specified the nature of concern. The Association do not feel that the consultation on this application has been wide enough or enough time has been given to comment and notification should have been sent to the Association who cover this area west of Gower Street.

[Demolition/Construction issues: The concerns raised regarding demolition and construction can be addressed in the DMP and CMP submitted with the application and secured under S106. The amenity aspects of these are assessed under the ‘Amenity’ section of the report assessment below.

For comments regarding design see those addressing the CAAC’s concerns above.]

- 4.5 **Gordon Mansions Residents Association** –Feel that for the last 5-6 years this area of Huntley Street/Torrington Place/Chenies Mews has been a building site, much of this due to UCLH’s redundant buildings and UCL’s redevelopment plans and it is therefore important that residents and associations are able to comment. Also raise issue with the bulk of the building, service and other traffic and air-conditioning noise (the standard noise condition is not protecting flats from a/c noise from UCL buildings the other side of Gower Street). Since they were not consulted directly on this application they feel that they do not have time to formulate their comments and have requested that the time period for consultation on this proposal be extended. [*See officer response to CAAC and Charlotte Street Association above. Regarding the noise issue, Environmental Health are satisfied*

with the applicant's submitted noise report and the use of the standard condition on this occasion. They have been made aware of the Association's concerns regarding the other side of Gower Street.]

Adjoining Occupiers

	Original	Revisions
<i>Number of Letters Sent</i>	178	00
<i>Number of responses Received</i>	04	00
<i>Number in Support</i>	00	00
<i>Number of Objections</i>	04	00
<i>Number Electronic</i>	00	00

- 4.6 Consultation included a site and press notice plus notification letters sent to 178 addresses surrounding the site including those at Paramount Court, Presidential House and Jeremy Bentham Public House in University Street and flats within the converted Georgian terraces on Huntley Street. Four responses were received from residents living at Paramount Court and the Jeremy Bentham.
- 4.7 One of the respondents objected to the loss of the existing EGA building and to the design of the replacement which they considered to be an eyesore and out of keeping with its surroundings. *The building is not in a conservation area or otherwise protected and is not noted for its architectural value. Officers consider the design to be appropriate –see assessment below.*
- 4.8 All the respondents raised concerns about noise and disruption to the area, particularly in relation to the demolition and construction processes. It was suggested by a resident of Paramount Court that the works be managed so that no work takes place on weekends, the footway on the north side of University Street be continually kept open and consideration be given to opening Grafton Way to two-way traffic for any time that University Street is closed. [See response to Charlotte Street Association above regarding demolition and construction].

5. POLICIES

- 5.1 Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against, together with officers' view as to whether or not each policy listed has been complied with. However it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan –adopted June 2006

- 5.2 S1-S3 – Strategic policies, sustainable development (*complies*)
 S7 – Built environment (*complies*)
 S9-S10 – Transport (*complies*)
 S15 – Community uses (*complies*)
 SD1 – Quality of life (*complies*)

SD2 – Planning obligations (*complies*)
SD3 – Mixed use development (*complies*)
SD4 – Density of development (*complies*)
SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours (*complies*)
SD7B – Noise/vibration pollution (*complies*)
SD8 – Disturbance from demolition (*complies*)
SD9 – Resources and energy (*complies*)
SD10B – Contaminated land (*complies*)
SD12B – Reuse of construction waste
B1 – General Design Principles (*complies*)
B2 – Design and layout of developments large enough to change their context (*complies*)
B6 – Listed buildings (*complies*)
B7 – Conservation Areas (*complies*)
B9 – Views (*complies*)
N4 – Providing public open space (*complies*)
N5 – Biodiversity (*complies*)
T1 – Sustainable transport (*complies*)
T2 – Capacity of transport provision (*complies*)
T3 – Pedestrians and cycling (*complies*)
T7 – Off-street parking, city car clubs and bike schemes (*complies*)
T8 – Car-free housing (*complies*)
T12 – Works affecting highways (*complies*)
T16 – Movement of goods (*complies*)
C1 – New community uses (*complies*)
C2 – Protecting community uses (*complies*)
E2 – Retention of existing business uses (*complies*)
LU1 – Land use proposal site 25 (*complies*)

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- 5.3 Camden Planning Guidance 2006- Access for all; Biodiversity; Clear Zone; Conservation areas; Construction and demolition; Contaminated land; Cycle parking and access; Daylight and sunlight; Design; Designing safer environments; Energy and renewables; Materials and resources; Pedestrian movement; Planning obligations; Public open space; Sustainable design and construction; Transport assessment; Travel plans; Vehicle access/servicing; Waste and recyclables; Water.

Strategic and Government Policy

- 5.4 London Plan (Consolidated with alterations since 2004) February 2008
PPS1, PPG13.

6. ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 The main issues raised by this proposal are considered to be:
- The principle of the use proposed and the expansion of the hospital's facilities in this location in terms of the UDP land use policies;
 - the acceptability of the proposal in terms of its height, design and massing and whether the architectural approach is successful in enabling the facilities to be accommodated in the given envelope;

- the need to provide for the necessary transport and servicing requirements of the building without unduly impacting on the existing highways infrastructure;
- ensuring that the proposals fully embrace the Council's adopted principles of sustainable development;
- protection of the existing amenities enjoyed by the area and its residents and ensuring these are not harmed either by the finished building, or the construction process leading up to it.

Land use principles

- 6.2 The main proposed use is as an ambulatory (walk-in) centre for administering treatment of and care for cancer patients. This comprises some three-quarters of the overall accommodation although there are some secondary and/or ancillary uses for research and a shop/pharmacy and café. Although not accommodating overnight patients as is usually characteristic of a hospital, the use is still in many ways clearly identifiable as a hospital and firmly associated with the wider activities that comprise UCLH's extensive hospital campus in this part of Bloomsbury. The proposal is therefore still considered to comprise a C2 use under the Use Classes Order and therefore complies with the UDP Land Use Schedule site designation (site 25) which is for "mixed use, predominantly residential or C2/D1 (hospital/health use)".
- 6.3 The additional C2 floorspace of 3,524sqm in this location is to be welcomed in terms of UDP policy C1B and providing increased provision for the hospital's facilities in this part of the Central London Area.
- 6.4 The 25% increase in floorspace will bring about a some increase in staff numbers. In terms of additional demands on public open space, this is mainly considered to arise from hospital staff as the short term nature of stay by patients and the absence of visitors is unlikely to lead to their visiting local parks and gardens. The CPG does not state a guidance figure for number of people by development type expected for hospital uses. It quotes 50 people per 1000sqm for office and higher education but for hospitals this is estimated to be lower. It is therefore considered appropriate to take into account the UCLH Trust's own business case employment figures for the proposed Cancer Centre which envisage growth in employment of around 50 staff over the first 15 years. This would equate roughly with 25% of the 200 staff being transferred to Phase 2 from the existing obstetrics uses of the EGA, and given the 25% increase in floorspace proposed, this would seem reasonable. On this basis, the applicant is offering a total of £12,525 calculated as follows:
 50 staff x 3 square metres per person (being one third of the standard figure) x £55 = £8,250
 Plus annual contribution of £5.70 per square metre for five years i.e. 150 x £5.70 x 5 = £4,275
 This is considered acceptable and will form part of the S106 agreement attached to any permission granted.

Conservation and Urban Design

- 6.5 Although just outside of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, the area is defined by a typical Bloomsbury Georgian street pattern with street widths responding to the

hierarchical importance of each street. The original Georgian building lines still remain. Although some manipulation of this line exists on the existing buildings through bays and entrance towers, the main facades of the buildings are set back from the public realm, often behind traditional railed areas.

- 6.6 In contrast, the building heights are distinctly Edwardian and there is a general similarity of building height around the University Street/Huntley Street junction as perceived or sensed from the ground. Another layer to the context also inherited from the Edwardians is the red brick character which runs down Huntley Street terminating with red brick properties on Torrington Place to the south (Gordon Mansions). This provides some unity between the buildings and identity to this area.
- 6.7 Huntley Street forms the boundary of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, with the site outside but looking into the CA. The proposal will form part of the setting of the following listed buildings: 46-70 Huntley Street (grade II), University College Hospital Medical School and Nurses Home (grade II), University College Hospital General Block (grade II), University College (grade I).
- 6.8 The site falls partially within the Protected Vista of the Parliament Hill to the Palace of Westminster view corridor as identified in the Mayor's 2008 London Views Management Framework SPG. This designation supersedes the former Strategic View Corridor. The proposal sits just under the development height threshold for the Protected Vista. Roof plant is proposed above the maximum datum on the roof area but this is just outside of the protected area and therefore the SPG does not require consultation with the Mayor or any other bodies.
- 6.9 The form of the proposal respects historic building lines and is of a similar scale to the existing building, with the roof height including plant being still below that of the existing central tower (a storey higher than general roof level), and roughly equivalent to the recently completed O'Gorman building (Grimshaw) opposite. The building has a strong institutional character, with a grand symmetrically composed elevation to Huntley Street set around a generous public entrance. Both the character and the design of the entrance aid legibility. The elevations are modulated through the outward expression of fire escapes. The bay windows of consulting rooms on the end elevations provide human scale and interest through shadow and detail whilst maintaining internal privacy. On the Huntley Street elevation, where rooms are more public, large areas of glazing are used to raise daylight levels.
- 6.10 The elevations are divided horizontally in a traditional tripartite manner with ground storey base, four storeys of main façade, and attic storey setback with brise soleil 'cornice'. This tripartite division responds to many of the large neighbouring Victorian and Edwardian buildings. The red brick character of the area is reflected in scale, texture and hue through the elevational treatments. The muted reddish brown colours of the bronze cladding pick up on those of neighbouring brickwork. It is proposed that the cladding will be constructed from panels of a substantial thickness, expressed through the string lines, which will provide a solid character. An intimate scale and texture will also be expressed through details such as the

interstitial blinds on the Huntley Street elevation, the glass bricks of the stair towers and brise soleil.

- 6.11 The proposal includes a central atrium and sunken roof garden. Both will help provide a pleasant environment for users and visitors to the building and are welcomed.
- 6.12 Officers have negotiated with the applicant both during the application process and pre-application to ensure that roof plant and its associated housing will be as discrete as possible. To this end an increase in the setting back of the plant-screening pergola along the Huntley Street facade has been effected in revised drawings.
- 6.13 A high level of information and detail has been submitted to enable understanding of the proposals. However due to the unconventional nature of the bay panel detailing and their strong visual presence in the facades it is considered necessary to seek precise details of the materials and finishes for these for approval prior to their construction. Along with the usual approval of materials a condition requiring the production of two complete bay panels (one storey high and one bay wide), for the university street elevation and the Huntley street elevation are considered necessary.
- 6.14 Subject to the details as required being acceptable, it is considered that the proposed building will contribute positively to the street scene and will preserve the character and appearance of the adjacent conservation area.

Transport and servicing

- 6.15 Due to the 25% increase in floorspace, along with the emphasis on ambulatory patients rather than overnight stays, a different pattern and overall increased volume of transport and servicing activity can be expected in the area than was the case previously.

Travel Plan

- 6.16 A transport assessment (TA) has been prepared by Ove Arup to address the impact of the additional travel demand and also includes a draft travel plan.
- 6.17 The current building on the site accommodated a mixture of outpatient daytime facilities and 24 hour inpatient facilities. There is currently no car-parking or cycle parking on-site. There is an off-street servicing area off Mortimer Market, but the applicant states that this is currently used for long term parking by a UCLH van used for operational purposes and that servicing usually takes place on-street.
- 6.18 The proposed Cancer Centre (15,153sqm GFA) will result in approximately 30% increase in floorspace but solely for outpatients. Operating hours are intended to be 08:00 to 20:00 with the possibility of opening on Saturdays. Cancer outpatients and daycare functions at UCLH are currently located in the Rosenheim Building, which has a GFA of 9,209 sqm. The majority of the functions within the Rosenheim Building are cancer-related and a large proportion of these would transfer to and be

expanded in the proposed development, although a minority of functions would remain.

- 6.19 Although many trips to the site will be redirected from the Rosenheim Building which currently holds many of the UCLH's existing cancer treatment functions, the Rosenheim will continue for other uses so there is still likely to be a net increase in trips.
- 6.20 The UCLH already has a voluntary campus wide (i.e. all the UCLH sites in the area) Travel Plan. The applicant proposes to update this Travel Plan to cover the new functions and associated trip patterns generated by this development and to continue to work with Camden and TfL in maintaining it. A S106 which secures only part of this travel plan would be impractical and it would be too onerous to insist that it be secured for the whole of the UCLH campus. Therefore a S106 to secure a travel plan in this case is not considered a requirement.

Cycling

- 6.21 Camden's Parking Standards for cycles would normally require a total of 122 cycle parking spaces for a new Class C2 use (residential institution) of this size. However the applicant has made the case that due to the nature of the use, and particularly the absence of visitors due to there being no overnight stays, this figure would be excessive. Therefore the applicant has proposed that 70 cycle parking spaces be provided that is shared between both staff and patients/visitors. This lower number is considered acceptable.
- 6.22 A cycle parking area is shown in the proposed basement. This will be accessed via a lift which is large enough to accommodate a cycle without it having to be upended. The detailed arrangements for the cycle parking are not shown but the applicant has indicated that Josta two-tier stands will be used, which is a type normally accepted by Camden in terms of accessibility and security. The area dedicated would appear feasible for the 70 spaces proposed. A condition should be placed on any planning permission requiring that full details of the cycle parking arrangements are submitted and the details implemented as approved.

Car parking

- 6.23 No additional car parking is proposed.
- 6.24 Camden's UDP (Appendix 6 - Parking Standards) would specify a minimum of 5 wheel-chair accessible parking spaces for employees, visitors and patients. It is proposed that disabled drivers park on-street using the disabled (blue badge) parking bays on Mortimer Market and the local pay-and-display, residents' bays and disabled (green badge) bays on University Street, using green badge disabled parking permits that can be issued by the hospital. The submitted TA provides evidence of spare capacity from parking occupancy surveys that of the 40 pay-and-display spaces local to the site there was a minimum of 19 spaces free throughout the survey day (25th September 2007). On the same survey day there was a minimum of 4 free spaces in residents bays and some spare capacity in the disabled bays most of the time.

6.25 Officers believe from their own observations on site that there are sufficient spaces available for wheelchair users and therefore consider no changes to on-street parking arrangements are needed. If however, the UCLH were to decide at a later date that there was a need for increased on-street disabled parking provision, then the Council would seek that the UCLH cover the cost of feasibility, design, consultation and implementation of any changes brought about by their needs.

Servicing

6.26 The scheme does not involve an off-street loading area but instead proposes that a new lay-by be created on Mortimer Market (as shown on the indicative drawing in the submitted TA). The new layby would extend partly onto the application site and therefore this land would need to be adopted as public highway. However the footway to be created at the back of the new lay-by would preferably be secured as a public right of way as adopting it would create the need for an overhang licence and a full structural survey repeated every year. The applicant should be required as part of the S106 to submit a detailed highways plan of the new arrangement – this should include attention to levels so that drainage can be appropriately directed to the carriageway without a central channel being needed.

6.27 Officers consider that the proposed layby would be capable of accommodating the majority of delivery vehicles associated with the use and would not interfere unduly with other traffic using Mortimer Market. Occasional overspill and/or visits by larger sized vehicles would still be able to service the site from the single yellow line roadside stretch along the Huntley Street frontage. The applicant proposes to continue using Huntley Street for daily dropping-off and picking-up by patient transport, ambulances, taxis and private cars and this is considered acceptable.

6.28 The applicant has submitted a draft Service Management Plan including a waste strategy, which is generally acceptable. There are a few sections that still need to be completed, specifically:

- Section 2 - Location and layout of servicing bays
- Section 6 - Which refers to a swept path drawing in the submitted TA (Ref: 125424-67-012), however this drawing will need to be inserted into the SMP
- Section 8 - A statement about pedestrian and highway safety
- Section 11 - A statement about why on-street servicing is required

These should all be addressed in the final version secured by the S106.

Pedestrians

6.29 As described in the submitted TA there will be an increase in trips to this site, therefore the S106 for the application should include highways works to improve the pedestrian environment around the building. This will include repaving the footway around the perimeter of the site in York Stone and repaving the footway on the opposite side of the road along the section of Mortimer Market that runs past the site, relocation of the signs and street lighting at the junction of Mortimer Market and Capper Street nearest to the site as well as the insertion of a raised entry treatment into Mortimer Market at this junction.

Demolition and construction

6.30 The application treats demolition and construction as independent phases and submits separate management plans.

- 6.31 A demolition management plan has been submitted in the form of a final document to bind the applicant upon signing of the S106 with the intention being to commence demolition with minimum delay upon receiving planning permission. This is acceptable in principle from a Highways point of view (Environmental Health aspects are dealt with under the 'Amenity' section of this report below) subject to certain amendments and additions being incorporated **prior to signing the S106**. These include, but are not necessarily limited to:
- Detail of the number, frequency and size of vehicles that will attend the site during demolition
 - Start and end dates of various phases of demolition
 - The routes that vehicles will take to and from site
 - Details of any required waiting and loading suspensions/dispensation
 - Working hours
 - Access points to the site
 - Details of hoarding lines and scaffolding to be placed on the public highway.
 - Details of any required storage on the public highway of materials and waste.
- 6.32 A draft Construction Management Plan has been submitted with the application. As with the DMP there are additions and alterations that are needed to the draft CMP before it can be accepted. The details of this would again need to include (but not necessarily be limited to) those set out for the CMP above, and can be agreed in a final document for approval as part of the process signed up to by the applicant in the S106.

Summary of Transport S106 requirements

- 6.33 The proposed development is considered acceptable from a Highways point of view provided that a S106 agreement is entered into securing the following:
- Final Demolition Management Plan being secured upon signing of the agreement;
 - Service Management Plan –final document based on submitted draft with amendments/additions as required by officers to be submitted and agreed prior to works of construction;
 - Highways works comprising:
 - New loading layby to Mortimer Market with associated changes to parking bays and road markings (Highways plans including levels to be submitted)
 - Adoption of layby and securing the new footway around the proposed layby as public right of way
 - Appropriate road markings on Huntley Street (including zigzag markings converted to ambulance cage)
 - Improved pedestrian environment including repaving around perimeter, relocation of signs and street lighting and raised entry treatment around Mortimer Market/Capper Street junction.

Sustainable development

- 6.34 The application is accompanied by a Sustainability Assessment undertaken by Ove Arup. This sets out the developers' approach to sustainability and use of resources under various headings including energy, water, materials and BREEAM.

Energy

- 6.35 The design approach has reduced the proposed building's annual energy consumption to well below the requirements of the current Building Regulations (2006) Part L. This achieved primarily through careful attention to the building form and envelope combined with efficient mechanical systems. The design and choice of materials, through careful consideration to aspect, orientation, and high performance insulation, combined with the use of efficient lighting and ventilation systems, will result in an approximated 17.4% savings in carbon emissions. (See section 5.2 of the applicant's Sustainability Assessment for further details on the specific measures that are to be implemented).
- 6.36 The applicant's Sustainability Statement explains the special nature of the energy needs related to the hospital use. The hospital has a high heating requirement for both space heating and hot water. There is also some need for mechanical ventilation to ensure infection control which will be delivered in conjunction with various energy saving measures.
- 6.37 The primary source of energy supply will be the existing Gower Street Heat and Power community heating system, which includes CHP heating plant. This will reduce the development's carbon emissions by a further 19.5%.
- 6.38 As the site is to connect to a decentralised Heat and Power network, most of the building's heating requirements will be met by a low carbon technology. This means that there is no need for a renewable technology, such as solar thermal panels that will generate heat, as this would compete with the heat provided by the decentralised heat and power system. Therefore the most suitable renewable technology for this development is one that generates electricity. The two main renewable technologies for this are solar PVs and wind turbines. Wind turbines are not ideal in urban areas due to the number of obstacles that disrupt the wind flow. Therefore the use of PVs as the proposal's renewable technology contribution to further reduce emissions is acceptable. However the efficiencies already achieved and limited roof space limits the further contribution that can be made towards carbon reduction to approximately 1.5%. However, this in combination with the savings achieved by the district heating and CHP results in an overall 21% carbon reduction from low and zero carbon technologies.
- 6.39 The applicant's proposed energy strategy should be secured by S106 in the form of an energy plan, which as well as the district heating, should include full details of the PVs location and final calculation on their likely energy contribution to reducing carbon emissions from the development.

BREEAM

- 6.40 A BREEAM pre-assessment has been prepared using BREEAM Healthcare 2008, which is the most up to date version for this type of development. The scheme aspires to achieve a rating of 'Excellent' and meets the CPG's sub-targets of 40% and 60% in materials and energy respectively. However, due to the particular functions of the Cancer Centre and a need to maintain far higher than usual control over routes of infection, there are some technologies, such as aerated taps and

grey water for flushing of toilets, which cannot be pursued. This has led to a slightly lower rating than the target 60% in the water category.

- 6.41 Further details will be required during the design process in the form of a 'sustainability plan' secured by S106 to ensure the BREEAM rating of 'excellent' can be achieved. This process should culminate with a post-construction review achieving 'excellent' BREEAM Healthcare 2008 as well as achieving 60% of the credits in Energy and 40% of the credits in Materials and best endeavours to achieve 60% of the credits in Water.

Water

- 6.42 The applicants have stated that they will capture rainwater from each roof and store it centrally to redistribute it around the building for irrigation purposes. There is also provision for a green roof system which will assist in controlling surface water run-off. Further information will be required of this system prior to implementation, including:

- The extent to which green/brown roofs and other landscaped areas will be implemented and how this will reduce run-off;
- whether the system will pick up water from the remaining hard surfaces e.g. footpath, driveway and any generated from the cooling system;
- have purification processes such as treatment with UV-light or others been considered, especially if there is spare heat capacity in the decentralised energy network;
- the capacity of the storage tank, including what rain fall event it will cater for – e.g. average, 1 in 50;
- how much irrigation is proposed;
- what will be the average out flow rate to the sewer;
- is the whole system resource/energy efficient, especially if water is being pumped large distances around the site.

This information should form part of a sustainability plan for the Council's approval secured under section 106.

Materials (including construction and demolition)

- 6.43 The applicant has identified 53% of the credits in the Materials category of BREEAM, which is very welcome. This will be achieved by using the BRE's Green Guide to Specification and accredited suppliers for steel and concrete and ensuring there is recycled content in their building materials.
- 6.44 In addition the applicant has stated that the construction process will be managed and monitored to ensure that the amount of non-hazardous construction waste reused or recycled will be at least as good as best practice levels. Further details as to how this would be achieved should feature in the final version of the Construction Management Plan, which is submitted in draft at present. The contractor has also prepared a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) in accordance with the applicant's legal duty under the Waste management Plan Regulations 2008. This details how construction waste streams will be separated on site and recycled/disposed of.

Biodiversity

- 6.45 The applicant has stated that they will employ an ecologist to mitigate any potential ecological impact from the scheme. However, policy N5 expects development schemes to enhance as well as conserve existing biodiversity, including by creating wildlife habitats. A condition should therefore be attached to any approval to require details of planting for the roof garden and green roofs, along with other habitat-creating features such as nesting boxes to ensure compliance with this policy.
- 6.46 In summary, the applicant's submitted sustainability statement satisfies the main relevant UDP policies (SD9 and N5) subject to a S106 agreement to secure;
- BREEAM Healthcare 2008 'excellent' with 60% of the credits in Energy, 40% in Materials and by best endeavours 60% in Water;
 - Connection to a decentralised energy and power system;
 - Use of PVs as an on-site top up renewable energy source, achieving an overall reduction of 21% carbon emissions from low and zero carbon technologies (on top of the 17.4% improvement beyond the 2006 Building Regulations baseline already achieved from sustainable design);
- There should also be a condition imposed securing details of how biodiversity can be improved across the site.

Amenity

- 6.47 The proposal has the potential to impact on the surrounding area in various ways. The applicant has produced statements to cover the main sources of impact –i.e. transport and servicing, noise and disturbance during construction and demolition, noise and vibration impact from plant and possible effects on sunlight and daylight. These are assessed from an amenity point of view below:

Transport and servicing impacts

- 6.48 The servicing needs of the development are likely to be similar to that generated by the existing building with little overall additional noise or activity that would impose upon residential amenities. The service layby in Mortimer Market and pick-up drop off zone along the Huntley Street frontage is unlikely to raise conflict with the nearest residential properties, which are in University Street.

Construction and demolition

- 6.49 Of more concern would be the demolition and construction phases. A demolition management plan has been submitted by the demolition contractor. This is a comprehensive document intended to be agreed in final form upon the signing of the S106 agreement for the application. This confirms that working hours will be in line with environmental health legislation (Mon-Fri 7.30am – 6pm, sat 8am – 12pm) and states that daily noise, dust and vibration monitoring will be carried out and records maintained for inspection. A list of mobile numbers for contacting contracts managers will be posted on site prior to the start of works and emergency mobile telephone facilities also made available. Subject to the additional information on start and end dates, vehicle size, delivery frequency and routes as requested by Transport officers, it is considered that the Demolition Management Plan has addressed all the usual requirements regarding protection of amenities and is acceptable.

6.50 The submitted Construction Management Plan is in draft form but sets out the information to be included in the final document such as traffic routes, size of vehicles, monitoring and performance measures. The final version would need to be agreed with both Transport and Environmental health officers and particular attention would need to be given to the Risk Assessment and Work Related Method Statement referred to at section 15. The applicant's approach and intentions as so far stated towards the management of the construction phase is considered acceptable.

Noise and vibration

6.51 There will be an extensive amount of roof mounted plant necessary in connection with the proposed use and therefore a noise and vibration assessment has been prepared by Arup Acoustics. This includes a full background noise survey and makes recommendations for mitigation setting target noise criteria. Providing the report recommendations are observed, officers see no reason why the plant should not remain within the Council's standard guidelines for noise in residential areas – i.e. 5dB(A) less than the existing background levels. The standard noise condition should be imposed in this respect. It is also envisaged in the light of the report recommendations, that vibration will be similarly contained so as not to be a problem.

Sunlight and daylight

6.52 A BRE daylight and sunlight study was undertaken by consultants Anstey Horne. This looks at the potential overshadowing impact of the proposed building in relation to the neighbouring properties –Paramount Court, Jeremy Bentham Public House and 68 Huntley Street. The methodology uses 3 tests –the Vertical Sky Component (VSC), Daylight Distribution and Annual Probable Sunlight Hours.

6.53 The first of these two tests look at daylight. VSC is a factor of the potential skylight reaching a window wall of a building and would measure 40% for a totally unobstructed wall. A VSC of 27% or above is considered by BRE to afford potential for good natural daylighting, but clearly the actual level of daylight in a room depends on other factors such as the size and/or number of windows and depth of the room. BRE also considers that under normal conditions a reduction in VSC to up to 0.8 times its former value can be experienced before the light reduction in a room starts to become noticeable. The results of this test show that for all the windows of the 3 buildings concerned, the reduction in VSC will remain above 0.8 times its former value, i.e. potential for good daylighting is retained.

6.54 The second test is the 'Daylight Distribution' which enables one to ascertain the extent to which the skylight would fall within a room and therefore, whether the room will retain light to a good depth. It can be a much more precise tool for measuring light where the internal arrangements of the property being assessed are known and is therefore normally used to look in more detail at the actual affect on lighting conditions where a noticeable reduction in VSC is evident. In this instance it has already been shown that VSC will not be seriously reduced. However, the exercise carried out by the consultants who have estimated the likely sizes of rooms serves as a useful supplement to the VSC figures in providing a fuller picture. This shows virtually no change for almost all the rooms affected, apart from a minor exception over the Jeremy Bentham Pub -minor being that the

reductions experienced are still within an acceptable 20% deviation from their former values.

- 6.55 The third test undertaken, Annual Probable Sunlight Hours, looks at sunlight and only applies to windows facing within 90-degrees of due south and which lie north of the obstruction –i.e. Paramount Court and the Jeremy Bentham. This measures potential access to sunlight expressed in terms of a percentage of probable sunlight in an average year to a totally unobstructed flat piece of ground. The two main parts to the test are total annual sunlight and winter sunlight which BRE recommends should be at least 25% and 5% respectively. Reductions below these figures would again become noticeable if below 0.8 times their former value.
- 6.56 The submitted sunlight study this time identifies some failings, these being to some of the windows in the first, second and fourth floors of Paramount Court and the second floor of the Jeremy Bentham. The failings are through either total annual sunlight or winter sunlight being reduced below the BRE guideline figures and in no cases is it both. Furthermore, in Paramount Court most of the rooms are served by a number of windows making up a bay arrangement and the failings on some windows are mitigated by other windows to the same room which are less affected. In total, 3 rooms out of 13 tested measure an overall failing. Two of these concern smaller rooms with only one window which are reduced to 0.61 and 0.78 of their former value, but one room on the first floor is served by a bay with its total annual sunlight to each sub-window reduced to between 0.6 and 0.0 of its former value. However, a key factor here is the very low sunlight levels that are afforded already by these first floor windows, which have access to only between 4% and 17% of annual probable sunlight compared with the guideline 25%. This equates to an average of only 41 minutes of sunlight per day from the sunniest corner of the bay being reduced to about 22 minutes. In an urban context such as this, such a reduction in sunlight to a first floor window is not surprising and unlikely to be significantly detrimental to the living conditions of the flat concerned.
- 6.57 As for the Jeremy Bentham, the 2nd and 3rd floors of which comprise a single residential unit, the 6 windows would all continue to receive relatively good levels of sunlight throughout the year accept for 3 second floor windows in winter only. Two of these windows are thought to be bedrooms for which the BRE states guide states sunlight is less important than main living rooms.
- 6.58 Overall, the results of the above tests would confirm that there will be very little impact on daylight and sunlight reaching neighbouring properties. Officers concur with the results of these tests and find the level of impact acceptable.

Other Issues

- 6.59 There is a history of previous industrial uses on the site which may have lead to contamination. As such, a site investigation should be undertaken prior to development and a report including any recommendations for remediation submitted. Any required remediation must be agreed with the Council prior to the commencement of any works. An appropriate condition should be attached to secure this.

6.60 As would be expected, the proposed hospital building has been designed with wheelchair users and other access needs in mind. However the Council's access officer has identified a number of issues which would need to be resolved prior to attaining Building Regulations approval. None of these are considered to impinge upon the design or appearance of the building for planning purposes and therefore the applicant is advised to consult with Building Regulations Officers as necessary.

7. CONCLUSION

7.1 The proposed redevelopment would enable the UCLH to increase the scope of its cancer treatment facilities on this existing hospital site within the core part of the University/Hospital 'zone'.

7.2 The proposed building for this purpose offers a high-quality architectural envelope to accommodate the facilities and portrays a positive image for workers and patients alike. While modern in style it remains sympathetic to the area both in form and scale, while respecting existing building lines. The building also efficiently employs available technology to accord with the most up to date benchmark of sustainable development for its category (BREEAM Healthcare 2008).

7.3 The applicant has demonstrated a commitment to making sure that the necessary building and works of demolition will not impact upon the lives of existing residents any more than absolutely necessary through the production of Demolition and Construction Management Plans. These will be secured and adhered to as a legal obligation made under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act. Also, as part of the Agreement will be the securing of longer term, benefits and enhancements to the pedestrian environment coupled with a Service Management Plan to ensure the continued smooth operation of the sites servicing and transport needs.

7.4 In view of the above, it is considered that the proposal will provide a considerable benefit to both the local residents of Camden and the wider public without any undue impact on the amenities of its surroundings. Approval is therefore recommended.

8. LEGAL COMMENTS

8.1 Members are referred to the note from the Legal Division at the start of the Agenda.

9. RECOMMENDATION 1: Grant planning permission with conditions and subject to a S106 legal agreement with the following heads of terms:

- **Sustainability Plan to achieve BREEAM excellent rating including post-construction review demonstrating 60% of the credits in Energy, 40% in Materials and by best endeavours 60% in Water;**
- **Energy Plan;**
- **Contributions to public open space and play facilities in the local area of £12,525;**
- **Highway works contribution to include new service layby to Mortimer Market; adoption of layby and designation of footway to back of layby**

as public right of way; improved pedestrian environment including repaving around perimeter, relocation of signs and street lighting and raised entry treatment around Mortimer Market/Capper Street junction;

- Service management plan;
- Construction management plan;
- Local employment plan for construction jobs;

10. **RECOMMENDATION 2:** That in the event of the S106 referred to in Recommendation 1 not being completed within 13 weeks of the date of complete submission of the application, the Head of Development Control be authorised to refuse the application for the following reasons:

- *The proposed development, in the absence of a sustainability plan, would fail to ensure a sustainable and resource efficient approach contrary to policy SD9 (Resources and energy) of the Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.*
- *The proposed development, in the absence of an energy plan, would fail to assist in the overall reduction in carbon emissions contrary to policy SD9 (Resources and energy) of the Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.*
- *The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement for securing contributions for public open space, would be likely to contribute to pressure and demand on the existing open space in this area contrary to policies N4 (Providing public open space) and SD2 (Planning obligations) of the Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and Camden Planning Guidance 2006.*
- *The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing necessary highway works, would fail to secure adequate provision for and safety of pedestrians and cyclists contrary to policies T3 (Pedestrians and cycling), T12 (Works affecting highways) and SD2 (Planning obligations) of the Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.*
- *The proposed development, in the absence of a service management plan, would be likely to give rise to conflicts with other road users and pedestrians especially at peak times contrary to policy T12 ((Works affecting highways) of the Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.*
- *The proposed development, in the absence of a construction management plan, would be likely to give rise to conflicts with other road users, and be detrimental to the amenities of the area generally, contrary to policies T12 (Works affecting highways), SD6 (Amenity for occupiers and neighbours) and SD8B (Disturbance from demolition and construction) of the Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.*

- ***The proposed development, in the absence of a local labour agreement will be likely to lead to the exacerbation of local skill shortages and lack of training opportunities and would fail to contribute to the regeneration of the area contrary to policies SD1 (Sustainable communities) and SD2 (Planning obligations) of the Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and Camden Planning Guidance 2006.***