

London Borough of Islington

Planning Committee - 23 June 2020

Minutes of the virtual meeting of the Planning Committee held on 23 June 2020 at 7.30 pm.

Present: **Councillors:** Klute (Chair), Kay (Vice-Chair), Picknell (Vice-Chair), Clarke, Convery, Graham, Poyser, Spall and Woolf

Councillor Martin Klute in the Chair

176 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

Councillor Klute welcomed everyone to the meeting. Members of the Committee and officers introduced themselves.

177 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies were received from Councillor Mackmurdie.

178 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

There were no declarations of substitute members.

179 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)

There were no declarations of interest.

180 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be B2, B3 and B1.

181 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2020 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

182 10-18 REGENTS WHARF ALL SAINTS STREET, LONDON, N1 9RL (Item B1)

Redevelopment of the site at 10 - 18 All Saints Street including the refurbishment and extension of 10-12 All Saints Street (including part roof extension and installation of rooftop plant and enclosure) to provide additional Class B1 business floor space with ancillary flexible Class A1/A3 (retail/restaurant) and flexible Class A1/B1/D1 (retail/office/non-residential institutions); demolition of 14, 16 and 18 All Saints Street and erection of a part 5 (ground plus 4) and part 6 (ground plus 5) storey building with basement and rooftop plant and enclosures providing Class B1 office floor space and flexible Class A1/A3/B1/D1/D2 (retail/restaurant &

cafe/business/non-residential institutions/assembly & leisure) floor space at ground floor; and associated hard and soft landscaping.
(Planning application number: P2019/3481/FUL)

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer advised Members that the revised application seeks to address issues raised when it was previously refused (Ref. P2016/4805/FUL) by members and the subsequent appeal which was dismissed (Ref. APP/V5570/W/18/3203871) following a Public Inquiry that was held on 4-7 and 18-19 June 2019.
- Meeting was advised that the previous proposal was refused, in summary, on the grounds of its impact on residential amenity with the notable loss of day and sunlight on neighbouring properties and the impact of the scheme on the heritage assets and townscape.
- Members were informed that the subsequent appeal was not refused on grounds of its impact on living conditions due to a reduction of daylight to windows, rather the appeal was dismissed due to impact on the heritage assets/townscape and in particular impacts to the conservation area concerns especially to the Regents Canal West Conservation. The officers highlighted that it was very complicated and all aspects of the appeal scheme have been taken into account including impact to locally listed buildings and that the current scheme differs to the appeal scheme (and that there are material changes that improve upon the appeal scheme and others that differentiate it from the appeal scheme).
- Members were reminded that the site has a PTAL rating of 6b (the highest rating), primarily due to its proximity to Kings Cross Saint Pancras railway and underground station and is designated within an Employment Growth Area (General).
- With regards to the current scheme, the planning officer acknowledged that efforts had been made across the scheme in general to reduce the height and bulk of the proposals, especially with the applicants having improved the bulk and mass appearing behind the locally listed buildings along the canal. Impacts to sunlight daylight have been significantly improved compared to the appeal scheme (noting that impacts were considered acceptable by the Inspector).
- The Planning Officer highlighted some key changes to the locally listed buildings, for example with Nos 10 – 12 Regents Wharf: Silo Buildings (10c), The Mill (10b) and the Packing House (10a), listed in paragraph 4.5 of the report some of which are -
 - The removal of the large rectilinear dormer windows proposed to are no longer proposed;

Planning Committee - 23 June 2020

-The removal of previously proposed brick “upward” extension to Building 12, and replacement with a gabled roof extension;
-Retention of the original buff brickwork and ghost-signage above the head of Building 10(a);
- Reduction in height of extensions over the Buildings was also proposed.
Other improvements were also noted.

- The Planning Officer highlighted other changes to the proposed “new-build” element, Nos 14 -16 and 18 All Saints Street, the plans to demolish Nos. 14-18 All Saints Street and replace it with one building to be called Thorley House. Meeting was informed that the replacement building would be a part 5, part 6 storey building with further rooftop plant and basement on the western part of the site, fronting on to both All Saints Street to the south and Regent’s Canal to the north. The building would have an active frontage on to All Saints Street with access from the street and also from the internal courtyard.
- Officers highlighted that the view of the Conservation officer, the scheme would result in less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area, and as such great weight and importance should be given to this in the planning balance.
- Meeting was informed that the proposal would provide affordable workspace, on terms that would exceed the Council’s policy requirement. Members were advised that the affordable workspace would be provided to an Islington approved affordable workspace provider at a “peppercorn rent” for a period of 15 years and is considered to be a public benefit of the scheme.
- The Planning Officer informed Members of an addendum report which had been circulated to members and published recently on the council website which clarifies a few errors in the previously published agenda. All details are highlighted in the addendum report. In addition, the Planning Officer informed the meeting that representation had been received from Regents Network expressing support for the proposals to use canal freight for demolition and construction logistics.
- Members were reminded that the site is located within an Employment Growth Area where the intensification, renewal and modernisation of existing business floor space is encouraged and the maximum amount of business floor space reasonably possible on the site, whilst complying with other relevant planning considerations.
- Members were reminded that as with the previous refused application, the current proposal has generated a substantial number of objections from residents in near-by buildings notably in relation to loss of light, loss of privacy, visual impact from excessive height, scale and massing, environmental impacts and noise and disturbance and light spill.

Planning Committee - 23 June 2020

- Other concerns raised by residents were that the elevations of Ice Wharf South, that facing onto the application site's west elevation would be impacted by loss of light, overlooking and outlook.
- The Planning Officer made reference to the Planning Inspectors decision appended to the report, where the Inspector did not find the sunlight daylight impacts to be unacceptable. The officer highlighted changes made in the current scheme to reduce overshadowing and overlooking issues including changes to the amount of windows facing neighbors and privacy measures to be introduced to prevent overlooking (fins etc)
- The Planning Officer informed the meeting that privacy concerns could be satisfactorily addressed through a condition requiring details of a scheme of obscure glazing to the western elevation of Thorley House. Similarly concerns regarding noise and disturbance could be dealt with / mitigated through the imposition of conditions on any consent granted. For example, from delivery and servicing activity could be addressed through an updated Delivery and Servicing Plan which includes appropriate measures to minimise noise and disturbance to occupants of Ice Wharf, in particular during night-time hours.
- Officers highlighted that issues of light spill could be controlled via conditions recommended in the report
- With regard to the size and massing concerns with the scheme, members were advised that compared to the appeal scheme many of the elements (e.g dormer windows on 10c and canal wall extension to 12) were no longer proposed. Retention of buff brick to building 10a are also proposed to address concerns raised at appeal.
- In response to amenity (sunlight/daylight) concerns, the Planning Officer informed the meeting that the impacts associated with the appeal scheme were considered acceptable by the Planning Inspectorate.
- Compared to the previous scheme, it is notable that the overall losses in daylight/sunlight terms have been reduced since the previous appeal. Officers highlighted that the approach to sunlight daylight assessment has been undertaken with BRE guidance, case law and high court judgements and the planning history. The starting point being an assessment of actual impacts, not simply a comparison to the appeal scheme. It was highlighted however that the planning history in this case is an important material consideration. The planning history in the case involving a recent appeal where the Inspector found greater sunlight daylight impacts compared to the current proposal to be acceptable.
- The Planning Officer informed members that on balance, officers were of the view that having regard to the relationship of the site with the adjacent development, the significant benefits of the revised proposal (including the canal freight proposals) outweigh the harms identified. The appeal history

Planning Committee - 23 June 2020

did not identify loss of light as being unacceptable, and the current scheme was an improvement in terms of light impacts.

- Members were advised by the agent that the scheme now includes the extension of the existing basement to allow for additional secure cycle parking and changing facilities, plant and equipment, and refuse storage. The basement would also accommodate more plant, removing it from the roof., improving the appearance of the roof scape.
- Members were advised that as in the case of the previous application, Nos. 10 and 12 Regent's Wharf would be retained and refurbished.
- In addition the top floor to No. 12 as previously proposed would feature a pitched roof (no canal wall extension is now proposed).
- The Chair invited 5 nominated speakers who had concerns with the revised scheme to address the committee. The issues although summarised in the report, included the following-
- Members were informed by residents of concerns with the appropriateness of the methodologies employed in the assessment of the impact of the proposed development and the way in which best practice guidance had been interpreted. It was suggested that in assessing the application, Committee should take into account the actual loss of light, rather than comparing it with an alternative scheme that had been rejected both by the council and on appeal. It was noted later by officers that the appeal dismissal was not on sunlight daylight impacts.
- An objector highlighted the worst affected dwellings in the Ice Wharf South, would be badly affected in terms of loss of daylight/sunlight, with losses outside of the BRE guidelines, and the rooms would have an impact on their Day light distribution (DD). Objector was concerned that the drop in VSC levels at first floor level was well below reasonable levels of what is expected in a typical dwelling. Similarly the loss of sunlight/daylight to rooms of flats 1-4 at flats: 313, 323, 333 and 343 should be considered as falling short of guidance. It was noted later by officers that the appeal dismissal was not on sunlight daylight impacts.
- An objector was concerned with the applicant's assertion that losses of light at 1-3 All Saints Street and Ice Wharf South were either the same or better than what was considered at the previous planning application.
- An objector suggested that if members were minded to grant planning permission, submitted conditions would need to be amended so as to address the impact on neighbouring residents.
- On the issue of improving the amenity for local residents particularly within the Ice Wharf development, an objector suggested that a further 'set-back'

of the top of the west facing façade should be considered.

- An objector was concerned that the scheme would result in harmful and substantial loss of light and that the overbearing structure will be very detrimental to Ice Wharf, and other streets surrounding the application site.
- Meeting was informed of the harmful increase in noise disturbance as a result of the development, particularly the additional office accommodation given the relationship with the neighbouring residential properties.
- Members were informed by an objector that in total, 38 windows do not meet the BRE vertical sky component guideline, and 21 rooms do not meet the daylight distribution guideline. For five flats in Ice Wharf South, the impact should be assessed as major adverse and not ignored simply because of the appeal decision or because other flats are minimally affected, this is little compensation for those affected.
- On the impact of the proposal on heritage assets, the objector reminded members that the height of the facade and the roof floor and plant structures on the All Saints Street side for the scheme continue to dominate over Building 10a, which is an important building in the context of the Conservation Area.
- In addition, the objector also note that in addition to the above, the plant roof structures atop Regents Wharf 10b could still be seen on the Canal side, contrary to Islington Council's own Conservation Area guidelines which indicate that all plant "should be invisible" from the canal towpath and in long views from the canal bridges.
- Members were advised by the objector that the proposed height of the redeveloped site is out of context with, and not of a similar scale to, other buildings in the setting of the Conservation Area.
- Concerns that objections stated by Historic England objections are being disregarded and officers assessment of the revised scheme had not been fully addressed.
- An objector was concerned that although the application site is situated within the Employment Growth Area (EGA), and in proximity to residential properties on three sides of the site that fall outside of the EGA, it is critical that neighbouring amenity including daylight is safeguarded.
- There was also concern that not enough consideration had not been given to the fact that rooms affected were likely to be living spaces and could be used for personal and work use which would therefore require adequate daylight levels

Planning Committee - 23 June 2020

- Another objector was concerned that the proposal was excessive in scale, bulk and mass and the roof top plant is contrary to planning policy and guidance. Members were reminded that a neighbouring building was refused permission for rooftop plant, that the revised scheme should not be allowed to proceed especially as it fails to meet conservation area guidance.
- Ward Councillor Sarah Hyde reiterated most of the concerns raised above and in particular but wanted to highlight the impact of the proposal on the amenity of Peabody residents as a number of elderly and vulnerable residents live in the affected dwellings.
- In summary the objectors requested that the item be deferred so that the applicant could reconsider the issues of amenity and the impact of the roof plant on the conservation area.
- The applicant acknowledged that the revised scheme before committee was as a result of many years of collaborative work with different stakeholders, planning officers and a number of public consultation exercise. The applicant advised that the proposal intends to provide a sustainable campus of workspace for the creative industries that will encourage inter-sector collaboration and catalyse business growth.
- In response to concerns about the roof level plants, the applicant informed the meeting that the scheme had been designed to minimise roof-level plants, with most of it being relocated to the basement level, and the removal of part of the 'building nib' to the western elevation will help facilitate townscape views and address some neighbouring amenity impacts.
- With regards to the consultation exercise, the applicant advised that this was fully carried out and the amendments in the revised scheme had taken into consideration issues raised by the objectors . Members were reminded that the proposed development is considered to have addressed the previous reasons for refusals and the scheme has delivered a number of key improvements on the earlier scheme and considered to represent a high standard of design.
- During deliberation, members noted concerns raised by the objectors about sunlight/daylight, some members indicating that they did not feel it had been fully addressed. Members noted the comments of the conservation officers and the council design officers and its impact. Another issue raised by a member was with the height of the plant on the roof, acknowledging the reduction and some of the units being moved to the basement but felt more could be done. A member enquired if other alternative options for the plant had been considered so that all plant could be taken off the roof.
- In response to Members concern that transgressions of both sunlight and daylight should not be accommodated, the Planning Officer reminded members that this had been considered by the Planning Inspector,

concluding that the scheme was policy compliant. The Council's legal officer highlighted that a risk in any further appeal would be that setting aside the Inspectors views relating to the acceptability of sunlight daylight impacts could be construed as unreasonable behaviour.

- With regard to the roof top plant and its possibility of it being reduced in the future and condition 44, members were of the view that this was not sufficient enough as this would be difficult to enforce once planning permission had been granted. Members were of the view that although the height of the plant had been reduced, it was still visible and had an impact on the conservation area which is contrary to policy. Officers advised that if required, this condition could be brought back to committee for determination.
- Councillor Graham proposed a motion to refuse planning permission based on neighbour impacts and this was seconded by Councillor Spall. Motion was put to vote and it was lost.
- Members acknowledged the benefits of the proposal and noted the attempts by the applicant to introduce significant improvements to the previously refused scheme but suggested that the item be deferred so that the applicant be given a further opportunity to address the scale, height and massing of the scheme, reduction in the height of the plant on the roof; consider alternative heating options such as hybrid energy plant or for it to be removed from the roof, and to amend the design of the scheme such that the heritage buildings and the new buildings align better. Issues of noise and light spill should also be addressed.
- On the issue of loss of daylight, meeting noted that this is not a reason for deferral especially as the Inspector had considered this issue and agreed that the scheme was policy compliant.
- Councillor Klute proposed a motion to defer the application so as to give the applicant another opportunity to reconsider the issues highlighted above. This was seconded by Councillor Clarke.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of the application be deferred for the reasons outlined above.

183

BLOCK G AND BLOCK S WHITTINGTON HOSPITAL CAMPUS, DARTMOUTH PARK HILL, LONDON, ARCHWAY, N19 5HH (Item B2)

Demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a new 78no. bedroom mental health inpatient facility with associated landscaping and cycle parking. (Planning application number: P2020/0687/FUL).

The Chair informed the meeting that both items B2 and B3 will be considered

Planning Committee - 23 June 2020

together however recommendations of the different applications will be voted on separately.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer informed the meeting that the site is located within the existing Whittington Hospital campus and bound by Dartmouth Park Hill to the west, Holbrook Close to the north and the wider Whittington Hospital campus to the south and east. Highgate Conservation Area was located to the west and the listed Jenner Building was located immediately to the south.
- Members were provided with two updates since the agenda was published. With regards to Appendix 2 of Item B3 (Page 306), that the existing plans and demolition plans should be added into Condition 2. Also meeting was informed that paragraph 9.99 should be amended to read 5No wheelchair accessible parking bays.
- With regard to land use consideration, Members were advised that the application proposes a social infrastructure use in the form of a 78 bed mental health inpatient facility which was consistent with London Plan and Islington's Local Plan policies.
- The Planning Officer acknowledged the demolition of the Whittington Education Centre which is curtilage listed, being within the curtilage of the listed Jenner Building and that this had been taken into consideration during the assessment of the proposal.
- The Planning Officer informed members that the proposed height, bulk and massing are considered appropriate for the site and that the scheme successfully addresses the significant change of levels across the site.
- The Planning Officer explained that the building covered a large footprint but had been set in from the sides to protect the existing green edge to the north and to leave sufficient space for a new landscaping along the street frontage. The application was also accompanied by a well-developed landscape strategy improving the public realm, routes through the site, semi-public areas & creating small gardens and terraces for staff & residents.
- The Council's Design & Conservation Officer commended the scheme's design and explained how the proposed building had been designed to be sympathetic to the surroundings and sensitive to surrounding heritage assets. Members were advised that the design of the scheme was conscious and respectful of its sensitive heritage setting which has been ably addressed in the height and massing arrangement on the site, the building's configuration including the echo of the Jenner's E shaped footprint and form, and the use and selection of appropriately traditional materials.

Planning Committee - 23 June 2020

- Members were advised that although the loss of the WEC building would have some impact on the setting of the Jenner building, given the extent of the many alterations and extensions, the legibility of the historic relationship between the WEC and the Jenner building has been substantially compromised and thus its loss was not considered to result in a significant harm to the setting of the Jenner building.
- Members were reminded that the loss has been carefully and fully considered in accordance with legislation, in particular Section 66 of the relevant Act and officers were of the view that the harm would be less than substantial and in this case public benefits associated with the overarching development, not least the importance of the proposed health services and the high quality design of the buildings being proposed, which are designed to be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the listed Jenner Building are compelling would outweigh the harm. Members were advised that on balance, the loss of the WEC is considered to be offset by the significant benefits of the overall proposal.
- The D&C Officer informed the meeting that the scheme would facilitate and improve the key east/west pedestrian movement route across the whole of the hospital site, from Dartmouth Park Hill to the west to Highgate Hill to the east.
- With regards to daylight and sunlight loss, the meeting was advised that a Daylight & Sunlight Report was submitted with the application, acknowledging that with regards to 1-5 Holbrook Close, good levels of sunlight would be retained for these neighbouring residential properties following the proposed development. The losses of sunlight and retained sunlight levels would meet the criteria of the BRE guidelines.
- The Planning Officer advised that the residents from Holbrook Close had objected on grounds of loss of views and outlook and that the proposal would reduce some of the views of the London skyline from the top floor of these properties, partly because of the location of the proposed 4th floor and plant room. However, there was an operational rationale for locating the top floor here as described in the report, as well as a design and heritage logic. The loss of view, which is generally not considered to be a material planning consideration, would not outweigh the significant planning benefits of the proposed design and layout.
- In response to overlooking and privacy concerns, members were advised that the northern and western edges of the site will be characterised by dense green wedges and mature trees which will provide an attractive setting as an effective green screen separating the hospital from the primary school and residential terrace to the north and the resident streets off Dartmouth Park Hill and that a condition would require further detail on privacy screens and obscured glazing.

Planning Committee - 23 June 2020

- In terms of loss of trees, the application would result in the loss of a number of trees on the site's western boundary. The majority of the trees are Category C or U and the proposal does include a detailed landscape strategy with tree replacement resulting in an overall increase in tree canopy cover on site.
- Members were advised that objections had been raised to the quality of design and the quality of accommodation proposed but that the proposal had gone through a rigorous process involving several Design Review Panel sessions and was considered to result in a high quality contextual building providing well-considered quality accommodation and health services as detailed in the report.
- A neighbouring resident informed members that although he was not against the proposal in principle he was concerned that the plans being altered after 18 months of discussion with the applicant. Overlooking concerns as a result of the proposed height of the building was raised especially as this would give rise to unacceptable impact on neighbouring occupiers. The objector was also concerned that some of the objections had been misrepresented in the report and had not been fully addressed and requested for item to be deferred to address residents concerns.
- The agent informed the meeting that the architecture as proposed was quiet yet urbane and presented a proportionately acceptable mass and height to this edge that read as a 2 – 4 storey building. On the quality of accommodation it was noted that the proposed facility would be suitable for the intended occupiers in terms of the standard of facilities provided and the level of independence required.
- Members were advised that the proposed facility would also be accessible to public transport, shops, services and community facilities appropriate to the needs of the intended occupiers. The top floor element was needed to be located at the south-western section of the building as there was a need for medical and administration offices away from the wards that could be accessed without crossing the secure line into the service user access areas. This needed to be accessed and controlled via the main reception point. So the offices to the southern elevation to the ground, first and fourth floors would need to be stacked vertically for ease of access and interaction. The location of the top storey office element was a result of the design rationale and the functional need to provide the correct clinical and non-clinical pathways.
- Members welcomed the scheme, noting their concern about taking a decision without the benefit of an overarching masterplan for the broader hospital site. Members noted that the designs have been crafted in a suitably respectful manner that ensured that any future redevelopment

would not be adversely impacted on.

- Members also noted that the scheme had established a suitably high design benchmark for future developments on the Whittington Hospital campus.
- Members acknowledged the residents' objections but felt that their main point of contention was the loss of outlook and views, which was not considered to be sufficiently harmful given the overall benefits derived from the scheme.
- Members agreed that the proposed development would contribute positively to the surrounding public realm, streetscape and wider context and would result in improved public health services.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to grant planning permission. This was seconded by Councillor Convery and carried.

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations and objections provided verbally at this meeting, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report and subject to the prior completion of a Deed of Planning Obligation made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

184

BLOCK G AND BLOCK S WHITTINGTON HOSPITAL CAMPUS, DARTMOUTH PARK HILL, LONDON, ARCHWAY, N19 5HH (Item B3)

Demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a new 78no. bedroom mental health inpatient facility with associated landscaping and cycle parking (Planning application number: P2020/0761/LBC)

The Chair informed the meeting that both items B2 and B3 will be considered together however recommendations of the different applications will be voted on separately.

In the discussion the following points were made:

- The Planning Officer informed the meeting that the site is located within the existing Whittington Hospital campus and bound by Dartmouth Park Hill to the west, Holbrook Close to the north and the wider Whittington Hospital campus to the south and east. Highgate Conservation Area was located to the west and the listed Jenner Building was located immediately to the south.

Planning Committee - 23 June 2020

- Members were provided with two updates since the agenda was published. With regards to Appendix 2 of Item B3 (Page 306), that the existing plans and demolition plans should be added into Condition 2. Also meeting was informed that paragraph 9.99 should be amended to read 5No wheelchair accessible parking bays.
- With regard to land use consideration, Members were advised that the application proposes a social infrastructure use in the form of a 78 bed mental health inpatient facility which was consistent with London Plan and Islington's Local Plan policies.
- The Planning Officer acknowledged the demolition of the Whittington Education Centre which is curtilage listed, being within the curtilage of the listed Jenner Building and that this had been taken into consideration during the assessment of the proposal.
- The Planning Officer informed members that the proposed height, bulk and massing are considered appropriate for the site and that the scheme successfully addresses the significant change of levels across the site.
- The Planning Officer explained that the building covered a large footprint but had been set in from the sides to protect the existing green edge to the north and to leave sufficient space for a new landscaping along the street frontage. The application was also accompanied by a well-developed landscape strategy improving the public realm, routes through the site, semi-public areas & creating small gardens and terraces for staff & residents.
- The Council's Design & Conservation Officer commended the scheme's design and explained how the proposed building had been designed to be sympathetic to the surroundings and sensitive to surrounding heritage assets. Members were advised that the design of the scheme was conscious and respectful of its sensitive heritage setting which has been ably addressed in the height and massing arrangement on the site, the building's configuration including the echo of the Jenner's E shaped footprint and form, and the use and selection of appropriately traditional materials.
- Members were advised that although the loss of the WEC building would have some impact on the setting of the Jenner building, given the extent of the many alterations and extensions, the legibility of the historic relationship between the WEC and the Jenner building has been substantially compromised and thus its loss was not considered to result in a significant harm to the setting of the Jenner building.
- Members were reminded that the loss has been carefully and fully considered in accordance with legislation, in particular Section 66 of the relevant Act and officers were of the view that the harm would be less

than substantial and in this case public benefits associated with the overarching development, not least the importance of the proposed health services and the high quality design of the buildings being proposed, which are designed to be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the listed Jenner Building are compelling would outweigh the harm. Members were advised that on balance, the loss of the WEC is considered to be offset by the significant benefits of the overall proposal.

- The D&C Officer informed the meeting that the scheme would facilitate and improve the key east/west pedestrian movement route across the whole of the hospital site, from Dartmouth Park Hill to the west to Highgate Hill to the east.
- With regards to daylight and sunlight loss, the meeting was advised that a Daylight & Sunlight Report was submitted with the application, acknowledging that with regards to 1-5 Holbrook Close, good levels of sunlight would be retained for these neighbouring residential properties following the proposed development. The losses of sunlight and retained sunlight levels would meet the criteria of the BRE guidelines.
- The Planning Officer advised that the residents from Holbrook Close had objected on grounds of loss of views and outlook and that the proposal would reduce some of the views of the London skyline from the top floor of these properties, partly because of the location of the proposed 4th floor and plant room. However, there was an operational rationale for locating the top floor here as described in the report, as well as a design and heritage logic. The loss of view, which is generally not considered to be a material planning consideration, would not outweigh the significant planning benefits of the proposed design and layout.
- In response to overlooking and privacy concerns, members were advised that the northern and western edges of the site will be characterised by dense green wedges and mature trees which will provide an attractive setting as an effective green screen separating the hospital from the primary school and residential terrace to the north and the resident streets off Dartmouth Park Hill and that a condition would require further detail on privacy screens and obscured glazing.
- In terms of loss of trees, the application would result in the loss of a number of trees on the site's western boundary. The majority of the trees are Category C or U and the proposal does include a detailed landscape strategy with tree replacement resulting in an overall increase in tree canopy cover on site.
- Members were advised that objections had been raised to the quality of design and the quality of accommodation proposed but that the proposal had gone through a rigorous process involving several Design Review Panel sessions and was considered to result in a high quality contextual building

providing well-considered quality accommodation and health services as detailed in the report.

- A neighbouring resident informed members that although he was not against the proposal in principle he was concerned that the plans being altered after 18 months of discussion with the applicant. Overlooking concerns as a result of the proposed height of the building was raised especially as this would give rise to unacceptable impact on neighbouring occupiers. The objector was also concerned that some of the objections had been misrepresented in the report and had not been fully addressed and requested for item to be deferred to address residents concerns.
- The agent informed the meeting that the architecture as proposed was quiet yet urbane and presented a proportionately acceptable mass and height to this edge that read as a 2 – 4 storey building. On the quality of accommodation it was noted that the proposed facility would be suitable for the intended occupiers in terms of the standard of facilities provided and the level of independence required.
- Members were advised that the proposed facility would also be accessible to public transport, shops, services and community facilities appropriate to the needs of the intended occupiers. The top floor element was needed to be located at the south-western section of the building as there was a need for medical and administration offices away from the wards that could be accessed without crossing the secure line into the service user access areas. This needed to be accessed and controlled via the main reception point. So the offices to the southern elevation to the ground, first and fourth floors would need to be stacked vertically for ease of access and interaction. The location of the top storey office element was a result of the design rationale and the functional need to provide the correct clinical and non-clinical pathways.
- Members welcomed the scheme, noting their concern about taking a decision without the benefit of an overarching masterplan for the broader hospital site. Members noted that the designs have been crafted in a suitably respectful manner that ensured that any future redevelopment would not be adversely impacted on.
- Members also noted that the scheme had established a suitably high design benchmark for future developments on the Whittington Hospital campus.
- Members acknowledged the residents' objections but felt that their main point of contention was the loss of outlook and views, which was not considered to be sufficiently harmful given the overall benefits derived from the scheme.

Planning Committee - 23 June 2020

- Members agreed that the proposed development would contribute positively to the surrounding public realm, streetscape and wider context and would result in improved public health services.

Councillor Klute proposed a motion to grant Listed Building Consent . This was seconded by Councillor Convery and carried.

RESOLVED:

That following consideration of the case officer's report (the assessment and recommendations therein), the presentation to Committee, submitted representations and objections provided verbally at this meeting, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report and subject to the prior completion of a Deed of Planning Obligation made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

The meeting ended at 11.15 pm

CHAIR