Site address: Kings College Hospital, Denmark Hill, London, SE5 9RS.

Ward: Herne Hill

Proposal: Erection of a helipad on top of the existing ten-storey Ruskin Wing building in the south-east corner of the hospital site, including the supporting structure, associated office space, access ramp, new lift core and first floor bridge link.

Application type: Full Planning Application

Application ref(s): 13/03008/FUL

Validation date: 09 July 2013

Case officer details: Name: Faye Tomlinson
Tel: 020 7926 1271
Email: ftomlinson@lambeth.gov.uk

Applicant: Kings College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust

Agent: Metropolis Planning and Design

Considerations/constraints: London Distributor Road


Recommendation(s): Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions.
Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department(s) or Organisation(s)</th>
<th>Consulted? (y/n)</th>
<th>Date response received</th>
<th>Comments summarised in report? (y/n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways &amp; Transport</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>24/07/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation &amp; Urban Design</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>01/08/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention Design Advisor</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>13/09/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Spaces</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>07/08/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Services Noise &amp; Pollution</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12/08/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19/08/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>18/07/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Fire and Civil Defence Authority</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Air Traffic Safeguarding Office</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16/07/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Executive</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerodrome and Air Traffic Standards Division, Civil Aviation Authority</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15/07/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport for London</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>05/09/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Rail</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16/07/2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Borough of Southwark</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background documents**

Case File (this can be accessed via the Planning Advice Desk, Telephone 020 7926 1180)

For advice on how to make further written submissions or to register to speak on this item, please contact Governance & Democracy by emailing democracy@lambeth.gov.uk or telephoning 020 7926 2170. Information is also available on the Lambeth website www.lambeth.gov.uk/democracy
1 Summary of Main Issues

1.1 The main issues involved in this application are:

- whether the provision of a helipad would be an appropriate use on the hospital site.
- the impact of the helipad and associated structures on the visual appearance of Ruskin Wing and the setting of the wider hospital campus, the streetscene along Denmark Hill, the adjacent conservation area and listed buildings.
- the impact of the development upon the amenity of the occupiers of the hospital and neighbouring properties.
- the implications of the development for the function of the surrounding road network, conditions of on-street parking, highway safety and public transport capacity.
- the sustainability of the development.
- whether the development would include suitable measures to minimise opportunities for crime.
- whether any planning obligations are required to mitigate the impact of the development and to secure and contribute to the delivery of infrastructure.

2 Site Description

2.1 The King’s College Hospital campus lies south of Coldharbour Lane and west of Denmark Hill. The campus is separated from Ruskin Park to the south by a railway line cutting. To the west of the campus is an area of terraced residential properties and a light industrial site occupied by EDF. There are also residential properties to the north, between the campus and Coldharbour Lane. The campus is occupied by King’s College Hospital and King’s College.

2.2 The site has no specific designations within the Lambeth Core Strategy but it adjoins a Key Industrial and Business Area to the west. In addition, Ruskin Park, a Grade II Registered Park and Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) lies to the south.

2.3 Denmark Hill forms the borough boundary with the London Borough of Southwark to the east. Directly opposite the hospital campus, running east off Denmark Hill, are streets known as Champion Park and De Grespigny Park.

2.4 This planning application relates to the construction of a helipad and supporting structures on the roof of Ruskin Wing. Ruskin Wing, at ten-storeys plus plant enclosure, is the tallest building on the hospital site. Ruskin Wing is located in the south-east corner of the campus and is occupied by hospital wards, imaging suits and clinical support units.

2.5 The following properties are located immediately adjacent to Ruskin Wing:

- To the west (rear) is a two-storey theatre block. Planning permission has recently been granted, subject to the completion of a S106 agreement, for a three-storey extension on the roof of this building to provide a critical care unit.
- To the north is a part two, part three-storey building (The Denmark Wing) which is occupied on the ground floor by the Accident and Emergency
department (A&E).
- To the east is a three-storey hospital building which fronts onto Denmark Hill and is occupied by Academic Neurosciences. Directly opposite the site on the eastern side of Denmark Hill are three, two/three storey buildings occupied by the Maudsley Hospital.
- To the south is a surface car park located above a railway cutting, which is accessed off Denmark Hill.

Figure 1: Site location plan indicating Ruskin Wing (located in the south east corner of the plan outlined with a dashed black line) within the hospital campus (outlined with a continuous black line).
Figure 2: Aerial photograph of the hospital site looking north. Ruskin Wing is located in the bottom right hand site of the photograph.

**Kings College Hospital Major Trauma Centre**

2.6 Kings College Hospital is a ‘Major Trauma Centre’ and the hub of the South East London, Kent and Medway Major Trauma Network (SELKaM). Major Trauma Centres treat the most seriously injured patients. They are linked with local trauma units in A&E departments, which treat less serious injuries. Kings College Hospital supports seven trauma units, covering a population of 4.5 million people.

2.7 The major trauma system in London comprises four major trauma centres which act as hubs for the following major trauma networks:

- North East London and Essex - The Royal London Hospital, Whitechapel.
- South East London Kent and Medway - Kings College Hospital, Denmark Hill.
- South West London and Surrey - St George’s Hospital, Tooting.
- North West London - St Mary’s Hospital, Paddington.

2.8 In each of these hospitals, specialist teams provide treatment for major trauma injuries 24 hours a day, seven days a week. According to the applicant, there are approx 1600 major trauma cases each year in London (0.1% of all accident and emergency cases), the majority of these cases occur in central London.

2.9 With the exception of St Mary’s Hospital Paddington, the major trauma centres in London are served by Helicopter Emergency Medical Services (HEMS). The Royal London Hospital (Whitechapel) is the main base for HEMS and has had an on-site helipad since 1989. Planning Permission was granted by the London Borough of Wandsworth in February 2012 for a helipad at St George’s Hospital, Tooting. Until the helipad at St George’s Hospital is operational (anticipated in 2014), HEMS will continue to land at Battersea Heliport with patients transferred by ambulance. Given the longer transfer time from Battersea, major emergencies from Surrey tend to be diverted to Kings College. Once the St Georges Hospital Helipad is operational, the number of landings at Kings College Hospital from the Surrey network should reduce.
Existing helicopter arrangements at Kings College Hospital

2.10 Kings College Hospital does not have an on-site helipad and landings take place in neighbouring Ruskin Park. Patients are transferred from the helicopter to the hospital by ambulance, involving up to a 20 minute transfer time. It is understood that this arrangement has been in place for the past ten years. Helicopter landings take place in Ruskin Park during daylight hours and require the attendance of the police to secure the site. The applicant has confirmed that Ruskin Park is a Civil Aviation Authority recognised landing site.

3 Planning History

3.1 There is a long planning history relating to development on the hospital campus. The development considered to be most relevant to this application is outlined below:

3.2 On 19 September 2013 the council responded to a request from Kings College Hospital for a Screening Opinion in accordance with Regulation 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) England and Wales Regulations 2011. This request related to the proposed erection of a helipad on top of the existing ten-storey Ruskin Wing in the south-east corner of the hospital site. The Council's Screening Opinion (13/03601/EIAFUL) advised that the development is not EIA development for the purposes of the Regulations and therefore an EIA would not be required.

3.3 Planning permission was granted by Planning Applications Committee on 6 August 2013 (subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement) for the construction of a three-storey building on top of the existing two-storey operating theatre block to provide a critical care unit, including additional plant, re-cladding of all existing external facades and the re-provision of a clinical waste store (12/03858/FUL).

4 Current Proposal

4.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a helipad on the roof of Ruskin Wing. The helipad would provide a permanent facility to enable medical helicopters to land within the hospital grounds. The helipad would be used by helicopters from the South East London, Kent and Medway Trauma Network. The helipad would also facilitate the transfer of critically sick patients from other hospitals to Kings College and allow donated organs for transplants to be transferred to the hospital by helicopter.

4.2 The applicant seeks planning permission to enable operation of the helipad 24 hours, seven days a week. The helipad would be used by MD 902 Explorer helicopters, which are currently the type of vehicles used by HEMS. It is noted that larger army helicopters occasionally land in Ruskin Park. The applicant has confirmed that the helipad would not be large enough to accommodate such helicopters and therefore they would still need to land in Ruskin Park.
Figure 3: Proposed sectional elevation looking east.

Figure 4: Proposed Denmark Hill elevation looking west.

Figure 5: Visualisation of proposed development from Champion Park looking west.
4.3 The development would involve the erection of the following structures:

4.4 **Helipad Deck** - the deck would measure 25m x 25m in plan and would be surrounded by 1.7m deep safety netting attached to the underside of the deck. The deck would be elevated 5.0m above the existing plant enclosure via seven aluminium trusses affixed to a steel frame. The roof of the plant enclosure is approx 40m above street level and therefore the helipad deck would be approx 45m above street level. The trusses would include a damper system to minimise vibration when a helicopter lands. The deck (including safety netting) would over-sail the front elevation of Ruskin Wing by 3.5m. Only the safety netting (depth 1.7m) would over-sail the rear elevation of the building. Helicopter landing lights would be incorporated into the deck.
4.5 **Access Ramp** - The helipad deck would be accessed via an elevated ramp on steel supports affixed to the main roof of Ruskin Wing. The ramp would extend out from the south side of the deck by 16 metres and loop back on itself, to reach the level below (roof of the plant enclosure), maintaining a gradient of 1:20. The ramp would be 2.5m wide and railings would be affixed to its sides measuring 0.3m high at the ramp’s highest point, extending to 1.1m at its lowest point. Safety netting (1.7m deep) would extend alongside the highest part of the ramp where the railings are at their lowest. The ramp is required to transfer patients by gurney from the deck to the lift a level below. The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) requires that no structures project above the surface of the helipad in order to minimise any risk of collision. It is therefore not possible to configure a lift up to the helipad deck or provide handrails around the deck or the top of the ramp, hence the requirement for safety netting.

4.6 **Access Stairs** – access to the helipad would also be provided by two staircases, located on the north and south sides of the deck. The north staircase would extend two-storeys from the main roof of the building up to the deck and the south staircase would extend one storey from the plant enclosure roof up to the deck. Both staircases would have automated fire fighting systems, which would provide full coverage of the deck should a fire break out. Additional fire fighting equipment would be stored under the helipad deck.

4.7 **Amenity Block** – A single-storey building would be located above the plant enclosure, to the north side and slightly lower than the deck, to provide a support facility. The building would measure 19.6m x 9.8m and would be 3.7m high with a flat roof. The amenity block would accommodate a control room for air traffic and landing procedures, a staff area, male and female change and toilet facilities and a lift lobby. The building would be a pre-fabricated modular structure with brick cladding in dark grey to match the colour of the existing plant enclosure brickwork.

4.8 **Storage and Training Area** - a platform would be erected on the roof of the plant enclosure, underneath the helipad deck, to provide space for an external training area for the fire fighting crew, a storage enclosure for fire fighting equipment and a generator pump enclosure. The bottom of the access ramp would also be accommodated in this space. The storage and training area would be set back from the edge of the building and screen netting erected in between the main structural supports to provide a visual screen and to reduce the risk of birds accessing this area.

4.9 **Lift Enclosure** – a lift enclosure, with two lifts, would be erected adjacent to the north-west corner of Ruskin Wing, extending from ground level up to the amenity block lift lobby on the roof. The enclosure would measure 12.2m x 4.35m in plan and would extend out from the north elevation of Ruskin Wing by 4.6m and out from the west elevation of Ruskin Wing by 6.4m. The lifts would be large enough to accommodate a gurney and accompanying medical teams. The lower storeys of the lift enclosure would be finished in fibre cement cladding with a tiled pattern and banding, plus window features on the north facing elevation to match Ruskin Wing. The top of the lift enclosure would be finished in textured fibre cement cladding to match the colour of the existing plant enclosure brickwork. Both lifts would provide access to the A&E department and theatre block at ground floor level and proposed new Critical Care Unit at first and second floor levels.

5.0 **Consultations and Responses**

5.1 Letters were sent to 928 neighbouring properties. The following local societies, associations and ward councillors were also consulted:
5.2 Site notices were posted on 26 July 2013 and adverts placed in the Weekender on 26 July 2013 and the South London Press on 19 July 2013.

5.3 One letter of comment has been received from a local resident. The resident states that they are neutral to the planning application. However, they are concerned about the level and frequency of noise and building work already underway on the Kings College Hospital site. They are worried that the proposed development would lead to increased noise levels. The resident requests that, if planning permission is granted, restrictions are placed on the hours during which building work can be carried out.

5.4 The resident’s concerns are noted; however, matters relating to construction site noise are not planning considerations and instead should be addressed under Environmental Health legislation. It is recommended that, if planning permission is granted, an informative be attached to advise the applicant of their obligations in terms of construction site noise and the Control of Pollution Act.

Internal Consultation

5.5 **Conservation & Urban Design** – no objections subject to conditions.

5.6 **Transport Planning** – no objection subject to conditions.

5.7 **Parks and Open Spaces** – no objection subject to conditions.

5.8 **Regulatory Services Noise & Pollution** – no objection.

5.9 **Crime Prevention** – no objection.

5.10 Comments from internal consultees are incorporated within the report below.

External Consultation

5.11 **English Heritage** - advised that they do not considered it necessary for this application to be notified to English Heritage.

5.12 **Greater London Authority (GLA)** – The application is referable to the GLA under Category 2C of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 (development to provide – (b) a heliport (including floating heliport or a helipad on a building)). The GLA have advised that the proposed development does not raise any strategic planning issues. The GLA supports the proposal as the helipad would facilitate the hospital’s emergency medical services. The GLA confirmed that the LB Lambeth may proceed to determine the application without further reference to the GLA.

5.14 Aerodrome and Air Traffic Standards Division, Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) – advised that they are not a consultee on planning applications and therefore they would not be responding to this consultation.

5.15 Transport for London – no objection subject to conditions

5.16 Thames Water – no objection.

6 Planning Policy Considerations

National Guidance

6.1 Central Government guidance is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which was published on the 27th March 2012. This replaced all Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) that preceded it and, sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

6.2 The NPPF reinforces the Development Plan led system. The NPPF takes precedence where the local plan is ‘absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date’. The NPPF must now be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans and, is a material consideration in planning decisions.

6.3 It should be noted that the NPPF requires local planning authorities to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development when assessing and determining development proposals.

The London Plan 2011

6.4 The London Plan is the overall strategic plan for London, and sets out a fully integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of the capital over the next 20-25 years. All Borough plan policies are required to be in general conformity with the London Plan policies

6.5 The key policies of the plan considered relevant in this case are:

Policy 3.1 Ensuring Equal Life Chances for All
Policy 3.17 Health and Social Care Facilities
Policy 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy 6.3 Assessing Effects of Development on Transport Capacity
Policy 6.6 Aviation
Policy 7.2 An Inclusive Environment
Policy 7.3 Designing out Crime
Policy 7.4 Local Character
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology
Policy 7.15 Reducing Noise and Enhancing Soundscapes
Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and Access to Nature

Local Planning Policies

6.6 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material
considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in Lambeth is the London Plan (adopted 22 July 2011), the Lambeth Core Strategy (adopted 19 January 2011) and the remaining saved policies in the ‘Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2007: Policies saved beyond 5 August 2010 and not superseded by the LDF Core Strategy January 2011’. Material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework.

6.7 Local Development Framework: Core Strategy January 2011

Policy S1 Delivering the Vision and Objectives
Policy S4 Transport
Policy S7 Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy S9 Quality of the Built Environment
Policy S10 Planning Obligations

6.8 Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2007: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010

Policy 7 Protection of Residential Amenity
Policy 9 Transport Impact
Policy 26 Community Facilities
Policy 32 Community Safety/Designing Out Crime
Policy 35 Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy 36 Alterations and Extensions
Policy 41 Views
Policy 45 Listed Buildings
Policy 47 Conservation Areas
Policy 50 Open Space and Sports Facilities

7 Land Use

7.1 The provision of a helipad within the hospital campus would replace the current arrangement whereby helicopters land in Ruskin Park, and patients transferred to the hospital by ambulance. London Plan Policy 3.17 provides strategic support for the provision of high quality health and social care, appropriate for a growing and changing population, particularly in areas of under provision or where there are particular needs. More specifically, London Plan Policy 6.6 supports the provision of helipads for emergency services. The principle of the development is also supported by policies within the Lambeth Core Strategy. Policy S1(d) supports the provision of essential infrastructure and Annex 2 of the Core Strategy references the Kings College Hospital masterplan. In addition, Saved UDP Policy 26(f) supports further development of the major teaching hospitals.

7.2 In support of their application, the hospital states that the existing arrangements for emergency helicopter transfers are undesirable for the following reasons:

- The transfer time of a patient from landing in the park to treatment in the A&E department can be up to 20 minutes. This can be too long for critical life saving procedures, impacting on patient outcomes.
- The additional transfer can present risks to patients with brain injuries or severe injuries to spine or internal organs, for example, the exacerbation of injuries resulting from negotiating road bumps and unmade ground.
• The current arrangements present a safety risk to helicopter crew, patients and the public using the park (although the applicant states that no incidents or accidents have been recorded).

• Helicopter landings require the presence of the police and an ambulance, which can cause delays in transferring patients if ambulance/police crews are not available. This also uses police and ambulance resources that could be needed elsewhere.

7.3 The hospital has previously discussed the provision of a new formalised helipad within Ruskin Park with the Council’s Parks and Open Spaces team. However, it was considered that this would present a major intrusion into the park. Concerns were also raised about who would maintain the helipad and how public safety would be assured and public access prevented. The Parks and Open Spaces team support this planning application, given it would reduce the number of helicopter landings and ambulance movements in the park.

7.4 The new helipad would be utilised by HEMS helicopters travelling from London, Kent and Sussex. Specialised arrivals from outside the region by larger military type aircraft such as Sea Kings, Pumas and Chinooks would still need to land in Ruskin Park. These events are not as frequent as HEMS and the council’s parks and open spaces team accept that these landings will always need to be accommodated in the park.

7.5 It is understood that the location of the helipad and its design has been developed in collaboration with a specialist helicopter consultant. Due to the number of buildings and structures on the hospital site, there is insufficient space to accommodate a helipad at ground level. Therefore an elevated location, the roof of Ruskin Wing, is the preferred location. Ruskin Wing is the highest building on the site, with sufficient space for the helicopter to land safely. The south-east corner of the site is also on the existing flight path adopted by the HEMS helicopter. Structural investigations have been undertaken and concluded that the building could support the helipad and supporting structures. The proposed location would provide direct access from the landing deck to the A&E department, Critical Care Unit and theatre block.

7.6 The helipad would provide a facility ancillary to the use of the site as a hospital and therefore would not result in a change to the existing hospital use. The provision of enhanced medical facilities on the hospital campus is supported by the London Plan and Lambeth’s Planning Policies. The helipad would bring benefits, namely; reduced patient transfer times and consequent improvements in patient care and health outcomes, and a safer landing area than the existing arrangement. The development would also result in a significant reduction in the number of helicopter landings in Ruskin Park thereby reducing noise and disturbance to residents and park users. The location of the helipad on the roof of Ruskin Wing is acceptable in principle subject to the detailed design considerations discussed later in this report.

7.7 The applicant states that the helipad would be utilised by HEMS only and would not be used by commercial helicopters. The council considers that commercial use of the helipad would not be appropriate. Commercial use would also not be supported by London Plan Policy 6.6 which states that ‘development proposals for helipads should be resisted, other than for emergency services’. It is therefore recommended that a condition be attached to the planning permission, if granted, to restrict the use of the helipad for purposes associated with medical emergencies only.
8 Design

8.1 London Plan Policy 7.6, Core Strategy Policy S9 and Saved UDP Policy 36 all seek the highest quality of design in new buildings and extensions in relation to architecture, scale and massing, integration with the public realm and visual impact. Of particular relevance to this application is Saved UDP Policy 36(e) and (f). Section (e) relates to building services equipment and states that service equipment ‘should be located in visually inconspicuous positions on the least important elevations, and be of an acceptable design, positioning and visual impact, with minimal effect on local amenity’. Section (f) seeks to ensure that roof level alterations and extensions ‘create good roofscapes and are successfully integrated with their surroundings’.

8.2 The primary design issues arising from the proposed development relate to the impact on Ruskin Wing, the wider hospital campus, the neighbouring heritage assets and surrounding views.

Ruskin Wing and hospital campus

8.3 Ruskin Wing was built in the latter part of the twentieth century. It has a restrained and pale material palette and a simple rectangular form with strong horizontal emphasis to the elevations, consisting of alternating projecting solid bands and windows. The helipad, lift enclosure and amenity block constitute substantial extensions to the building which would be visible from street level and within long views towards the hospital (see figures 3 to 7 above).

8.4 The helipad, with its associated fixtures, would have an engineered aesthetic due to its structure. Hovering above Ruskin Wing, the helipad is likely to be seen as a dramatic roof feature terminating the building. As the helipad would be seen to be quite separate from the main part of the building, it is considered that the architectural integrity of Ruskin Wing would be unaffected.

8.5 The lift enclosure and amenity block would be bulky structures, the lift enclosure spanning 11 storeys to the side of the building. Officers queried whether the existing lifts within Ruskin Wing could be used to access the helipad and whether the support facility could be located within Ruskin Wing. In response, the applicant has advised that the lifts in Ruskin Wing are in constant use and currently insufficient for the building. In addition, the lifts are located in the centre of the building and only extend up to the ninth floor. There is also no direct access from the lifts within Ruskin Wing to the A&E department or proposed Critical Care Unit. It is for these reasons that the use of the existing lifts would not be feasible.

8.6 The new lifts would provide a direct link from the helipad to the A&E department and Critical Care Unit, shortening patient transfer times from up to 20 minutes to 2-3 minutes. The applicant has advised that two lifts would ensure provision in the event that one lift fails. With the provision of a single lift, there is a risk of the helipad being out of use whilst the lift is repaired.

8.7 The applicant has also advised that the support facility must be located in immediate proximity to the helipad to enable direct access in the event of an emergency. It is therefore not possible to locate the support facility within the existing Ruskin Wing, notwithstanding that there is no spare space within the building. In addition, there is no room at the plant level of Ruskin Wing for the support facility as it is already occupied by mechanical and electrical plant for the building.

8.8 Officers queried whether the lift and lift enclosure could be glazed to reduce its bulky appearance. In response, the applicant has advised that a glazed lift and lift...
The applicant has provided a clear description of the different elements of the development, an explanation of why each element is required and their necessary locations. Officers are satisfied that alternative locations for the lifts and support facility have been considered by the applicant and that the only feasible locations are those proposed in this application.

The cladding materials proposed for the lift enclosure and amenity block have been revised from those originally proposed to better reflect the materiality of Ruskin Wing. The lift enclosure would be clad in materials and banding to match the elevations of Ruskin Wing and the amenity block would be clad in brickwork to match the brickwork of the existing plant enclosures.

Whilst the scale of development proposed on the roof of Ruskin Wing would not normally be appropriate, it is considered that the proposed use outweighs any detrimental impacts that the development may have upon the character and appearance of the building. In addition, the structures have been designed to be in-keeping, as far as possible, with the design and materiality of the building. It is therefore considered that the helipad and associated structures would be acceptable, subject to the submission of samples and detailed drawings of the cladding materials for the lift enclosure and amenity block. It is recommended that these details be secured via a condition, if planning permission is granted. The Council’s Conservation and Design Team have raised no objection to the application.

Heritage Assets and views

Saved UDP Policies 41, 45, 47 and 50 seek to ensure development does not detract from important views, backdrops or the setting of listed buildings, conservation areas and historic parks.

Ruskin Park is the only Lambeth heritage asset located close to the site. However, there are a number of heritage assets within neighbouring LB Southwark making this site particularly sensitive. The Camberwell Grove Conservation Area and the following Grade II listed buildings are located adjacent to the site to the east:

- Maudsley Hospital administration block, Denmark Hill;
- No’s 11, 93, 95, 97, 99, 103 Denmark Hill (Maudsley Hospital);
- Denmark Hill station, cutting walls and platforms;
- Phoenix and Firkin Public House, Windsor Walk;
- William Booth Memorial Training College (main block), Champion Park.

The buildings of King’s College Hospital form part of the backdrop to these heritage assets and as such the proposals are likely to affect their setting. The hospital campus is separated from the listed buildings and conservation area by Denmark Hill and from Ruskin Park by a railway line. The helipad and supporting structures would be visible from various points within the conservation area and park. However, it is considered that the additional bulk and scale of the helipad would not intrude or significantly harm the setting of the neighbouring heritage assets. Instead it would be
seen as part of the wider collection of hospital buildings of differing scale and architectural styles in the background that constitute the hospital campus. It is therefore considered that the development would not cause material harm to the setting of these neighbouring heritage assets and is therefore acceptable and in compliance with relevant planning policies.

9 Impact on Ecological Assets

9.1 Ruskin Park, located south of the hospital site, is designated as a ‘Site of Nature Conservation Importance’. London Plan Policy 7.19 seeks to ensure that development proposals make a positive contribution to the protection, enhancement, creation and management of biodiversity. The council’s Parks and Open Spaces team has advised that the helipad is unlikely to have an adverse impact upon the flight or movement of protected species, like birds or bats in the park, given the existing helicopter landings in the park do not appear to affect them.

9.2 Whilst it is unlikely that Ruskin Wing is used by bats, it may be used by birds, which are protected by law from avoidable disturbance. Therefore the council’s Parks and Open Spaces team has recommended that an ecological assessment of Ruskin Wing be undertaken in order to determine if there are any risks to protected species. The ecological assessment should include an evaluation as to whether the proposed location of the helipad would have an adverse impact upon the movement of local bat or bird populations and establish if any mitigation is required to reduce or eliminate any impacts.

9.3 It is recommended that a condition be attached to the planning permission, if granted, to require the applicant to undertake an ecological assessment of Ruskin Wing prior to the commencement of development. If it is found that the building is used by nesting birds then the development should be undertaken outside of bird nesting season and if bats are suspected, appropriate monitoring and mitigation measures should be put in place.

10 Amenity Impacts

10.1 Saved UDP Policies 7 and 36 and Core Strategy Policy S9 seek to ensure that, during the assessment of a development proposal, due consideration is given to protecting neighbouring residents in terms of visual intrusion, overbearing impact, loss of natural light, loss of privacy, noise and disturbance.

Noise Impacts

10.2 The area surrounding Kings College hospital is predominately residential and therefore it is important to assess the impact of noise associated with helicopters landing and taking off from the helipad. The residential properties located closest to Ruskin Wing are approx 140m to the south east, fronting Denmark Hill and Champion Park and approx 200m to the north-west fronting Venetian Road. The potential noise impact to patients and staff within the hospital has also been considered.

10.3 The London Plan (Section 6.30) states that ‘the noise impacts from helicopters can be considerable in an urban environment like London, where there are few locations where a helicopter could be located without having major impacts on residents’. London Plan Policy 7.15 states that ‘the transport, spatial and design policies of this plan will be implemented in order to reduce noise and support the objectives of the Mayor’s Ambient Noise Strategy’. The Mayor’s Ambient Noise Strategy (2004) states that ‘Boroughs should, in general, resist proposals for private helicopter facilities, with the exception of predominantly emergency use facilities’ (Policy 53) and ‘Helicopter
10.4 Saved UDP Policy 7 seeks to ensure that proposed new development respects the right of people to the quiet enjoyment of their homes. Policy 7 states that ‘in predominantly residential areas the establishment of a new or intensification of an existing, incompatible non-residential use, likely to have a materially adverse environmental impact will not be permitted’.

10.5 Helicopters would approach and depart from the hospital in a westerly and easterly direction on the same flight paths that existing helicopters take to/from Ruskin Park. It is anticipated that the time between the arrival and departure of a helicopter at the helipad (for between 20 and 40 mins) would be the same as the current operations in the park. Between arrival and departure, the helicopters engines are shut down.

10.6 The applicant has submitted a noise study, which provides an assessment of the predicted noise that would arise from helicopter activities associated with the helipad. The noise study compares local noise conditions prior to and after the introduction of the helipad, during both daytime and night-time hours at eight locations surrounding the hospital. The criteria used for the assessment of the impact upon neighbouring residential properties are as follows:

- During the daytime - interference with communication (speech between two people) within rooms with open and closed windows.
- During the night-time - disturbance to sleep within rooms with open and closed windows.

Figure 8: The locations assessed in the Noise Study (Identified as Pos A – H) and the helicopter approach and departure route (identified as a black line running from west to east).
10.7 The results of the assessment are summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Daytime</th>
<th>Night-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Windows open</td>
<td>Windows closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Windsor Walk</td>
<td>ß</td>
<td>Ô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Camberwell Grove</td>
<td>Ô</td>
<td>Ô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C De Grespigny Park</td>
<td>Ô</td>
<td>Ô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Bavent Road</td>
<td>Ô</td>
<td>Ô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Champion Park</td>
<td>Ô</td>
<td>Ô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Denmark Hill</td>
<td>Ô</td>
<td>Ô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Herne Hill Road</td>
<td>Ô</td>
<td>Ô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Northway Road</td>
<td>Ô</td>
<td>Ô</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

ß Helicopter noise likely to interfere with communication/sleep
Ô Helicopter noise unlikely to interfere with communication/sleep

10.8 The assessment identified that, during the daytime, helicopter noise is likely to interfere with communication for some residences with open windows. However, when windows are closed helicopter noise is unlikely to interfere with communication in all but one of the locations assessed. During night-time there is an increased chance of sleep disturbance for properties close to the helicopter flight path, however, the chance of disturbance is reduced when windows are closed in all but one of the locations tested.

10.9 The noise study also provides an assessment of predicted noise disturbance within Ruskin Wing during helicopter activities. This study concludes that helicopter noise would exceed recommended levels. Noise disturbance is likely to be significantly reduced with the installation of improved glazing to the building, although some noise disturbance may still occur.

10.10 It is also important to assess the anticipated frequency of helicopter flights during the daytime and night-time and the duration of the helicopter noise, in order to fully consider the potential impact upon residential amenity.

10.11 The noise study indicates that for the properties affected, interference with communication is likely to occur for a few minutes when the helicopter is approaching and leaving the helipad. The report advises that in a room with an open window a talker would have to raise their voice or stop speaking for the duration of the helicopter event or would need to close the window.

10.12 A log book of flights has been provided with the planning application. This record is taken from the A&E department log of flights. The log indicates that between 25 January 2012 and 7 April 2013 there were 182 HEMS helicopter landings in Ruskin Park. This is an average of three landings per week, although it is noted that in some weeks there were up to seven landings and in other weeks there were none. The frequency of flights is incident driven and difficult to predict. Transfers to Kings College Hospital being dependent on a number of factors including location of the incident, nature of the injuries and availability of specialist services at the time of the incidents.

10.13 The log does not include flights not undertaken by HEMS which, for example, involve patients delivered by the coastguard or organ transplants arriving by other
helicopters. The applicant states that the frequency of these other landings is not significant when compared with the HEMS helicopter landings. The applicant estimates that the total number of landings that currently take place in the park are on average one a day (HEMS and none HEMS landings combined).

10.14 With regard to landings by military helicopters, the applicant refers to comments made by local residents who attended their public consultation exhibition. Residents commented that Chinook events were in the build up to the 2012 Olympics and the helicopter would not necessarily land but would hover and depart. Ruskin Park is identified as a Civil Aviation Authority landing site for emergency use and therefore military exercises take place periodically. The applicant has confirmed that the size of the proposed helipad is not sufficient to enable the landing of a larger helicopter the size of a Chinook.

10.15 The applicant does not anticipate that the helipad would result in an increase in the frequency of flights from their current level of approximately one per day, particularly in light of the helipad at St George’s Hospital becoming operational in 2014. However, the applicant does acknowledge that the ‘upgrade’ of facilities for helicopter landings may make Kings a more viable destination for trauma patients. However, an increase in helicopter landings by, for example 30%, would average at less than one additional helicopter landing per week.

10.16 The Noise Study indicates that the helipad would normally operate between 07:00 hours and 19:00 hours for patient transfers and emergencies and could operate 24 hours for emergencies. The HEMS service is currently replaced by a rapid response vehicle outside of daylight hours, however, the applicant has advised that night flying may be introduced in the future and therefore this application seeks permission for 24 hour operation. The applicant states that there is likely to be no more than one flight per night on average. As outlined above, the Noise Study has considered the impact of night flying.

10.17 In light of the anticipated frequency and duration of the helicopter activities and the results of the Noise Study, it is considered that the proposed helipad would not result in undue noise disturbance during the daytime, detrimental to the amenity of residents who live near to the hospital. Taking into consideration that helicopter noise is already an established part of the environment surrounding the hospital due to landings already taking place in Ruskin Park, the proposal could not be resisted on the these grounds alone.

10.18 At night-time it is acknowledged that residents living close to the hospital could have their sleep disturbed by helicopter noise at least once during the night, which is not the case at present. It is therefore considered reasonable to limit the hours during which the helipad could be used to between 07.00 and 21.00 hours in order to reduce the likelihood of resident’s sleep being disturbed. Whilst the applicant seeks 24 hour operation of the helipad, the applicant has indicated that they would agree to a condition restricting the hours of operation if the council considered this to be necessary.

10.19 The council’s Environmental Health Noise Team has no objections to the application.

Other residential amenity considerations

10.20 Saved UDP Policy 36(c) seeks to ensure that alterations and extensions to existing buildings do not unacceptably overbear on surrounding development or unacceptably harm the amenities (privacy, outlook, sunlight and daylight) of adjoining residents or create an unacceptable sense of enclosure.
10.21 The helipad structure would increase the height of Ruskin Wing by 5.0 metres. However, due to the distance between Ruskin Wing and the nearest neighbouring residential properties, it is considered that the helipad would not have a detrimental impact on the levels of daylight and sunlight received by these properties or create an undue sense of enclosure detrimental to residential amenity. In addition, due to the distance between the helipad and neighbouring residential properties it is considered that the development would not result in direct overlooking to habitable rooms or gardens detrimental to residents privacy.

10.22 In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed helipad would not be detrimental to the amenity of local residents and therefore complies with the council’s planning policy in this regard.

11 Transport and Highways

11.1 Core Strategy Policy S4 seeks to ensure that new development contributes to a sustainable pattern of development, minimising the need to travel and reducing dependence on the private car. Saved UDP Policy 9 states that ‘planning applications will be assessed for their transport impact, including cumulative impacts on highway safety; on the environment and the road network; and on all transport modes, including public transport’.

11.2 The Council’s Transport Planner has no objections to the application. It is considered that the helipad would not have any direct impacts on existing access arrangements for the public and staff at the hospital. In addition, the helipad is not expected to have any significant impacts on the local transport network. The applicant has confirmed that no refuelling or servicing of helicopters would take place on the helipad and the helipad would not have any specific ongoing servicing requirements. Transport for London (TFL) have also raised no objection to the development.

11.3 The Council’s Transport Planner and Transport for London have requested further information about the construction of the helipad in order to assess the potential impact on the operation of the strategic road network. Both consultees have requested that a condition be attached to the planning permission, if granted, to require the submission of a Construction Management and Logistics Plan and TFL have requested that they be consulted on the discharge of this condition.

11.4 It is the applicant’s intention that the helipad and associated structures would be manufactured ‘off site’ to minimise any disruption to the adjoining highway and the hospital. A large crane would be required to lift the structures into place. TFL has advised that they are keen to explore all solutions, including the use of the railway, to ensure the safe operation of the railway and strategic highway and hospital during the project.

12 Sustainability and Renewable Energy

12.1 Core Strategy Policy S7 and Saved UDP Policy 35 seek to ensure that all development achieves the highest standards of sustainable design and construction. The proposed development would comprise 147sq/m of new floorspace and therefore falls below the threshold (of 1000sq/m) whereby specific targets for CO2 reduction are applicable. However, the applicant has advised that modular units would be used to create the amenity block and these units would have the highest standards of insulation in order to minimise any impact on CO2 emission targets. It is considered that the proposed development is acceptable in terms of sustainability and renewable
energy.

13 Community Safety /Designing Out Crime

13.1 Core Strategy Policy S9(f) seeks to create safe and secure environments that reduce the scope for crime, fear of crime, anti-social behaviour and fire, having regard to secure by design standards. Saved UDP Policy 32 states that ‘development should enhance community safety’ and ‘development will not be permitted where opportunities for crime are created or where it results in an increased risk of public disorder’.

13.2 The council’s Design out Crime Officer has no objections to the application but queried whether access to the roof and helipad would be controlled. It is understood that the helipad would only be accessible from within the existing hospital buildings, which have secure access controls and therefore only authorised persons would be able to gain access. It is considered that the proposed development would not result in an increase in crime or a reduction in community safety.

14 Other Considerations

Aircraft Safety

14.1 It should be noted that matters of air traffic control are outside the scope of planning regulations. However, the applicant has advised that the helipad has been designed to comply with international and national civil aviation regulations, with advice from a specialist helicopter consultant and in consultation with the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). The CAA will have the final ‘sign off’ prior to the helipad becoming operational. Ruskin Wing is on the existing flight path helicopters use to land in Ruskin Park and the applicant has confirmed that the flight paths would not change only the landing zone. Therefore the helicopter route is already identified and operational.

14.2 The helipad would be manned by trained fire fighting teams 365 days of the year. The applicant has advised that discussions with London Fire Brigade on detailed fire control measures are ongoing.

Planning Obligations

14.3 Core Strategy Policy S10 states that planning obligations will be sought to mitigate the direct impact of development and to secure and contribute to the delivery of infrastructure. The Council’s SPD S106 Planning Obligations (2012) sets out the type and form of planning obligations that will be sought for new developments. The proposed development falls below the threshold (1000sq/m of new floorspace) whereby planning obligations are sought. Therefore, a financial contribution is not required for this development.

15 Conclusion

15.1 The proposed development is considered acceptable in land use terms and would provide a valuable facility for the hospital. However, it is recommended that a condition be attached to the planning permission, if granted, to restrict the use of the helipad to flights related to medical emergencies only.

15.2 The scale of the development would be significant and as such highly visible. However, it is considered that the helipad and support structures have been designed to be, as far as possible, in-keeping with Ruskin Wing and to limit its visual impact on
the nearby heritage assets. It is also considered that the impact on local ecological assets would be minimal, however, an ecological survey of Ruskin Wing should be undertaken to ensure that any existing nesting sites are not affected; a condition is recommended to require this.

15.3 The development would not result in unacceptable impacts to the amenity of neighbouring residents or upon community safety and crime. Whilst helicopter noise would be audible, it is considered that, subject to a condition restricting helicopter flights to between 0700 and 2100 hours, the development would be acceptable in this regard.

15.4 It is also considered that the development would not be detrimental to highway safety subject to a condition requiring the submission of a construction management and logistics plan.

16 Recommendation

16.1 Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Summary of Reasons

In deciding to grant outline planning permission, the Council has had regard to the relevant Policies of the Development Plan and all other relevant material considerations. Having weighed the merits of the proposal in the context of these issues, it is considered that planning permission should be granted subject to the conditions listed below. In reaching this decision the following Policies were relevant:

**Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2007: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010**

Policy 7 Protection of Residential Amenity  
Policy 9 Transport Impact  
Policy 26 Community Facilities  
Policy 32 Community Safety/Designing Out Crime  
Policy 35 Sustainable Design and Construction  
Policy 36 Alterations and Extensions  
Policy 41 Views  
Policy 45 Listed Buildings  
Policy 47 Conservation Areas  
Policy 50 Open Space and Sports Facilities

**Local Development Framework: Core Strategy January 2011**

Policy S1 Delivering the Vision and Objectives  
Policy S4 Transport  
Policy S7 Sustainable Design and Construction  
Policy S9 Quality of the Built Environment  
Policy S10 Planning Obligations

**Conditions**

1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning from the date of this decision notice.
Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in this notice.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

**Land Use**

3 The helipad shall be used by helicopters associated with medical emergencies only and no regular or scheduled flights shall be permitted without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the use of the helipad is limited to purposes associated with emergency medical care and that minimal nuisance and disturbance detrimental to the amenities of adjoining occupiers and of the area generally is caused, in accordance with Policies 7 and 36 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and Policy S1 of the Lambeth Core Strategy (2011)).

**Amenity**

4 The helipad hereby permitted shall not operate otherwise than between the hours of 0700 to 2100 Mondays to Sundays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring residential properties in accordance with Policies 7 and 36 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and Policy S1 of the Lambeth Core Strategy (2011)).

**Design**

5 No development shall commence until samples of the cladding materials for the lift enclosure and amenity block hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and this condition shall apply notwithstanding any indications as to these matters which have been given in the application. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the local area in accordance with Policies 32, 33, 38, 41 and 47 of the Lambeth Unitary Development Plan: Policies as saved beyond the 5th August 2010 and Policy S9 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011).

6 No development shall commence until detailed drawings of the elevations of the lift enclosure and amenity block, in particular to illustrate the recesses, banding and window details to the lift enclosure and the window details to the amenity block, hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and this condition shall apply notwithstanding any indications as to these matters which have been given in the application. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the local area in accordance with Policies 32, 33, 38, 41 and 47 of the Lambeth Unitary Development

**Ecology**

7 No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a report regarding the outcomes of surveys for legally protected species or habitats which might be present on Ruskin Wing, with particular reference to bats (Chiroptera) and birds (Aves). The details of mitigation measures proposed or which will be implemented should protected habitats or species be found on site shall thereafter be implemented as part of the development, and if appropriate shall be retained thereafter for the duration of the permitted use of the site.

The survey should take the form of a desk and field based assessment based on existing good practice to identify the presence or absence of protected species or any roosts/nests or habitats used. Where such species are found or suspected the report should include proposals to minimise and avoid disturbance to or destruction of these species. The report should include details of:

- a) appropriate measures, such as building works undertaken outside the normal bird nesting season, unless otherwise agreed in writing;
- b) a watching brief during building works to response to any bat and bird activity, and;
- c) remedial actions and mitigation options which will be implemented should active bird nests, bats or bat roosts be found within the building.

Reason: In order to ensure that the development minimises its impact with respect to protected wildlife species that may be present on site or on adjacent properties in accordance with Policy 7.19 of the London Plan (July 2011).

**Highways and Transport**

8 No development shall take place until a Construction Management and Logistics Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and Transport for London. The details of the approved Construction Management and Logistics Plan must be implemented and complied with for the duration of the construction process.

Reason: to avoid hazard and obstruction being caused to users of the public highway and in the interest of public safety in accordance with Policy 9 of the London Borough of Lambeth UDP: Policies saved beyond 5th August 2010 and Policy S4 of the Lambeth Core Strategy (2011)).

**Informatives**

1 This decision letter does not convey an approval or consent which may be required under any enactment, by-law, order or regulation, other than Section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 Your attention is drawn to the provisions of the Building Regulations, and related legislation which must be complied with to the satisfaction of the Council's Building Control Officer.

3 You are advised of the necessity to consult the Principal Highways Engineer of the
Highways team on drw@lambeth.gov.uk in order to obtain necessary prior approval for undertaking any works within the Public Highway including Scaffold, Temporary/Permanent Crossovers, Oversailing/Undersailing of the Highway, Drainage/Sewer Connections and Repairs on the Highways, Hoarding, Excavations, Temporary Full/Part Road Closures, Craneage Licenses etc. You are advised to contact the Highways team at the earliest possible opportunity.

4 You are advised to consult Transport for London (TFL) in relation to the discharge of Condition 8 (Construction Management and Logistics Plan) to discuss the implications of the construction of the helipad on the railway line and strategic road network.

5 You are advised to contact Thames Water Utilities regarding mains/supply pipe connections for the development at Network Services Waterloo District, Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Waterworks Road, Brixton Hill, London SW2 1SB. Contact Mr D Kirk on 0645 200800 for details.

6 Your attention is drawn to the need to comply with the requirements for the Control of Pollution Act 1974 concerning construction site noise and in this respect you are advised to contact the Council’s Environmental Health Division.

7 You are advised that all conditions which require further details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority need to be accompanied by an application form and a fee. The application form and fee schedule can be viewed at: http://www.lambeth.gov.uk/Services/HousingPlanning/Planning/PlanningApplicationForms.htm