

COMMITTEE	PLANNING AND LICENSING
DATE	20 JULY 2004
SUBJECT	PLANNING BRIEF FOR ALL SAINTS HOSPITAL, DARLEY ROAD
REPORT OF	REPORT OF PLANNING MANAGER
Ward	Meads
Purpose	To report the representations received on the draft Planning Brief as a result of public consultation; to note the minor amendments made as a result of the representations and to approve the publication of the Planning Brief.
Contact	Lisa Rawlinson, Senior Planning Officer, Telephone 01323 415250 or internally on extension 5250.
Recommendation	That the Planning Brief for All Saints Hospital be adopted and authorised for publication.
1.0	<u>Introduction</u>

1.1	At a meeting of the Planning and Licensing Committee on 27 April 2004, Members resolved that the draft Planning Brief for All Saints Hospital be approved for consultation. Councillor Harris, as Cabinet Member for the environment, was also contacted and had no objection to public consultation on the document.	
2.0	<u>Consultation</u>	
2.1	Letters were sent to in excess of 600 local residents, notifying them that the draft Planning Brief was available for inspection at the Council Offices, the Central Library and the University of Brighton's Sports Centre in Denton Road. It was also made available on the Council's website.	
2.2	A public surgery was also held at the St. John's Meads Church of England Primary School in Rowsley Road on 7 June 2004, between 6.00 and 8.00pm.	
2.3	A copy of the Brief was also sent to Meads Community Association, Eastbourne Society, English Heritage and The Victorian Society.	
3.0	<u>Representations Received on the Draft Planning Brief</u>	
3.1	At the end of the four week consultation period, eight letters and two e-mails were received from Meads residents. In addition, comments were received from the Environment Agency, The Victorian Society, Eastbourne Ratepayers Association, Stiles Harold Williams on behalf of St Bede's School, Nigel Waterson MP and the Director of Facilities of East Sussex Hospitals NHS Trust.	
3.2	Appendix A of this report is a schedule of all the comments received on the draft Planning Brief, with an Officer recommendation for each representation. There is very little adverse comment on the principle of the proposals contained in the Planning Brief. The most common comment received are about preferences for particular uses. In this respect the brief does contain a wide range of options for the reuse of this building and this is appropriate for a number of reasons. The building is a large complex with a range of different sized spaces making it adaptable for a variety of different uses. It is also important to offer the widest range of options possible, but remain acceptable on this sensitive site, to encourage a future use to be found for this important building.	
4.0	<u>Environmental Implications</u>	

4.1	There are important environmental implications associated with the All Saints Hospital site. Having regard to the status of the Grade II* listed Hospital buildings and Chapel, and the fact that the site occupies a prominent position adjacent to the Seafront and within the Meads Conservation Area, it is considered essential to guide any development proposals for the site. This will ensure as little change as possible to those parts of the buildings considered particularly significant as well as seeking to ensure that alternative uses for the Hospital are found and continued use of the Chapel secured to guarantee a long term future for the buildings.	
5.0	<u>Other Implications</u>	
5.1	There are no financial, human resource, youth, human rights or anti-poverty implications as a result of this report.	
6.0	<u>Conclusion</u>	
6.1	This report sets out the responses to the public consultation on the draft Planning Brief for the All Saints Hospital and the proposed response to the representations received. It is proposed that Members recommend the Brief for adoption, subject to the minor modifications as indicated in the responses to the representations received. A modified copy of the draft Planning Brief has been placed in the Member's Room.	
Lisa Rawlinson Senior Planning Officer		
Background Papers: The Background Papers used in compiling this report were as follows: 1. Eastbourne Borough Plan (2001-2011) 2. Draft Planning Brief for the All Saints Hospital, Darley Road To inspect or obtain copies of background papers please refer to the contact officer listed above.		

Appendix A: Representations Received on draft Planning Brief for All Saints Hospital

Section/ Paragraph No.	Name/Organisation	Representation	Officer Response
General	The Victorian Society	<p>The Society is concerned to ensure a satisfactory new use for this important complex and site. The Hospital is one of Henry Woodyer's most important works. Henry Woodyer is a very important Victorian architect. The Planning Brief and Historic Buildings Survey will be very useful in guiding applicants as to the importance of the building and the areas of special importance.</p> <p>The Planning Brief should stress that any scheme should deal with the entire site. The Society has had unfortunate experience of proposals where Chapels have been omitted from a scheme and then neglected while the rest of a complex is converted. This then leads to a situation where inhabitants of a converted building have a decaying former Chapel as a neighbour with the consequent difficulties. Given the importance of the Chapel it is clear that its use will have a pivotal role in the use of the site. The Society is thus not prepared to contemplate a scheme that does not address the future use of the Chapel.</p>	<p>The Planning Brief acknowledges the importance of the Grade II* listed Hospital and Chapel.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.8 of the Planning Brief acknowledges the importance of the chapel and requires any planning application to demonstrate that its long term future is secured and therefore the Chapel protected against being left without a future.</p> <p>[JC1]</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>

General	Environment Agency	<p>The Agency is pleased to note that issues identified during an earlier consultation have been included in the brief. However the Agency would recommend the utilisation of grey water and rainwater recycling in the development.</p>	<p>Reference to such matters are considered to be too specific and detailed for a document of this kind which offers general guidance on development guidelines. However the Planning Policy Section of the Brief (Section 7) makes reference to the Structure Plan's aim of securing a more sustainable future for the County.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>
General	Eastbourne Ratepayers Association	<p>The Association considers that the best use for the building would be as a private hospital or nursing home as this would necessitate minimum disturbance to the status quo.</p> <p>If the building and curtilage are to be converted for residential purposes, then conditions should be attached to ensure the Chapel is retained for religious purposes.</p> <p>If major housing development is to take place on site then provision must be made for adequate infrastructure i.e. schools, local shopping facilities etc.</p> <p>The playing field should be retained as such.</p> <p>A religious organisation might wish to utilise the Chapel for religious services.</p>	<p>Paragraph 10.9 of the Planning Brief acknowledges that a Hospital use would cause the least disruption to the original fabric of the building.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.8 of the Planning Brief requires any planning application for an alternative use of the Hospital building to demonstrate how the long term future use and maintenance of the Chapel can be secured.</p> <p>As part of any new residential development proposed on the existing playing field site, it will be necessary to provide outdoor playing space contributions, education contributions and contributions to libraries, in accordance with East Sussex County Council's Interim Supplementary Planning Guidance "A New Approach to Development Contributions" (July 2003).</p> <p>The principle of allowing development on the existing playing field has already been established by the granting of planning permission in May 1990 for the erection of 27 three bedroom flats and 6 penthouses (EB/89/736).</p>

<p>Development on existing playing field (paragraph 10.52)</p>	<p>Stiles Harold Williams on behalf of St Bede's School</p>	<p>Playing field is used on a daily basis for a variety of sports. It has been used by the School for 35 years and has been a playing field for 85 years.</p> <p>Only three short paragraphs of the 25 page Brief relate to the provision of outdoor playing space contributions.</p> <p>Greatly concerned that consideration is being given to developing the playing field at all and even more concerned that no provision is being made for its replacement.</p> <p>Acknowledge that planning permission was granted on appeal for development on the playing field but this was some 15 years ago and it has never been renewed. Comments expressed by Inspector about playing field at that time are in marked contrast to current thinking and policies. Playing fields are now viewed as an asset to be preserved.</p> <p>Whilst the 1990 form of development was included in the new Borough Plan Policy LCF19, it is surprising that the Council now endorses this development having regard to its opposition to the original application in 1989. Furthermore, the development of playing fields is contrary to national, regional and local planning policies.</p> <p>Planning Brief does not include any policies relating to loss of playing fields. Policy LCF2 of the Borough Plan states that " proposals which result in a</p>	<p>The comments/concerns are noted. However the principle of allowing development on the existing playing field has already been established by the granting of planning permission in May 1990 for the erection of 27 three bedroom flats and 6 penthouses (EB/89/736). Furthermore, adopted Borough Plan Policy LCF19 allows for some development on the playing field site "which is no greater in scale and impact than that which already has planning permission (subject to a S.106 agreement)".</p> <p>In addition, the Brief states that as part of any development on the existing playing field, the developer will be required to provide a public park and informal recreation area between the existing hospital buildings and the new buildings on site.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>
--	---	---	---

net loss of playing fields will not be permitted.” Whilst this policy permits development in exceptional circumstances, where alternative provision is made, there does not appear to be any exceptional circumstances which justify the loss of this playing field and the Brief does not provide any details to confirm that an alternative playing field will be available.

The Borough Plan acknowledges that the provision of playing fields in the town is below the Sport Council’s standard.

Planning Brief also makes no mention of Structure Plan Policy LT13 which also states that proposals which involve the loss of playing fields will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the remaining facilities in the area are adequate.

The Planning Brief fails to address the guidance contained in PPG17.

With reference to the provision of a public park and informal recreation area, it is considered that with Helen Gardens and Holywell Gardens within a few hundred yards, there is hardly a shortage of public parks and informal recreation areas in the vicinity. However there is an acute shortage of playing fields in Meads.

<p>General</p>	<p>Occupier of 10 Endcliffe Court, 18 Chesterfield Road</p>	<p>Pleased to note Hospital and Chapel are to be preserved and also delighted trees are safe from the chop.</p> <p>Main concern is height and extent of buildings on playing field. It would be preferable to have several two storey groups of flats.</p> <p>Fear of noise, excess</p>	<p>Support is welcomed.</p> <p>Concerns are noted. However having regard to previously proposed residential development, it is considered that any building on site should not exceed four storeys in height.</p> <p>Issues regarding residential amenity and</p>
----------------	---	---	---

Appendix 5	Occupier of Flat 34 Dolphin Court, 2 Cliff Road	It is noted that the Development Guidelines drawing shows a “possible parking area/garaging” with the arrow pointing to the Dolphin Court garden. Is this a mistake or are you suggesting that developers buy this area.	Error is noted and drawing has been corrected. Recommendation: Correction to Drawing in Appendix 5
General	Occupier of The Old Stables, 65a Meads Street	As an adjoining landowner, with communal boundaries to the former hospital, would be grateful to receive notification of any future planning applications	Request is noted. Recommendation: No change.
General	Occupier of 13 Dolphin Court, 2 Cliff Road	Main building should be gutted and converted into a student residence. The grounds including the site of the prefabricated buildings could be used as a large parking area for the students. The playing field should not be developed and could continue to serve the students and local children. Main building could be converted to apartments or flats. The site could accommodate a school of some type or an art gallery.	Suggestion is noted. Work is currently underway on the development of 354 new student bedspaces for the University of Brighton on the Welkin Campus. It is therefore unlikely that the University would require another site in Meads. The principle of allowing development on the existing playing field has already been established by the granting of planning permission in May 1990 for the erection of 27 three bedroom flats and 6 penthouses (EB/89/736). Paragraph 10.29 of the Brief suggests that the building could be divided horizontally into flats. Paragraphs 10.11-10.14 and paragraph 10.17 deal with both of these suggested uses. Recommendation: No change.

General	Occupier of 5A Staveley Road	<p>There are already enough educational establishments in the Meads. To introduce more would be to detract from the character and amenities of the Village.</p> <p>Eastbourne does not need more hotels.</p> <p>The site seems unsuitable for an art gallery/museum etc as it is not very central.</p> <p>Strongly oppose use of site for offices, casino and leisure centre.</p> <p>Preferred option would be for the site to be used for a modern complex of retirement flats/assisted living apartments/nursing home set in gardens with a communal park which might include some sports/social facilities.</p> <p>Second preferred alternative would be for the site to be developed for residential use as this would maintain the character of the village and help support the local shops.</p>	<p>Comments/suggestions are noted. However the Council believes that the uniqueness of this site has a wide range of potential uses and wants to give every reasonable opportunity for reuse of the buildings.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>
---------	------------------------------	--	--

General	Occupier of 37 Dolphin Court, Cliff Road	<p>Bearing in mind that the hospital building and Chapel are Grade II* listed buildings, it would be an outrage if the fabric of the buildings was altered or ruined in any way.</p> <p>It is hoped that the site could accommodate a patient convalescence use or care of the elderly.</p>	<p>The Planning Brief acknowledges the importance of the Grade II* listed Hospital and Chapel.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.26 of the Planning Brief acknowledges that the hospital could be used as a nursing/care home use.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>
General	Owners of 9 Endcliffe Court, 18 Chesterfield Road	<p>Site should be used sensitively and not given over to wanton developers who will only wish to cash in.</p> <p>Hope the Chapel will be kept as it is very beautiful.</p> <p>Hope that the sports ground will be kept for the local school.</p>	<p>Comment is noted and the Planning Brief acknowledges the unique sensitivities of the site.</p> <p>The Planning Brief acknowledges the importance of the Grade II* listed Chapel.</p> <p>The principle of allowing development on the existing playing field has already been established by the granting of planning permission in May 1990 for the erection of 27 three bedroom flats and 6 penthouses (EB/89/736).</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>
General	Occupier of 10 Fulbourne House, 56 Blackwater Road	<p>Use of building as a rest home/nursing home would be an excellent outcome.</p> <p>Chapel could be used as an exhibition hall plus conference centre.</p>	<p>Paragraph 10.26 of the Planning Brief acknowledges that the hospital could be used as a nursing/care home use.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.2 of the Brief states that no alterations to the interior of the Chapel will be permitted.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>

General	Occupiers of 28 Darley Road	<p>The Hospital provides the opportunity to establish a medical practice in Meads.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed use of the hospital for an education/training centre, it is considered that the area could not support any more students cars.</p> <p>The Brief states that the trees in the orchard area do not provide significant visual amenity to the surrounding area. As residents bordering this area, consider that the trees do provide significant visual amenity and therefore strongly urge that they be retained.</p>	<p>Comment is noted. The establishment of a Medical Practice is not within the remit of the Council.</p> <p>However the Brief would not preclude this if such a proposal came forward.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.13 of the Brief recognises that on-site car parking will be a major consideration for any use of the main hospital building.</p> <p>The comments made in the Brief relate purely to the public amenity value of the trees.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>
General	Occupier of 3 Chalvington Road	<p>Consideration should be given to the site's unique history.</p> <p>It will be necessary to carefully appraise the architectural/design characteristics of the buildings and ensure the wonderful façade is preserved.</p> <p>The site would be well suited for old people's village with chalet type accommodation.</p>	<p>The Planning Brief acknowledges the importance of the Grade II* listed Hospital building and Chapel and details the history of the site. (Section 2)</p> <p>Paragraph 10.2 of the Brief acknowledges that the buildings have significant qualities and that any alterations to the physical fabric of the building should enhance its special interest and cause no harm.</p> <p>Paragraphs 10.52-10.67 provide guidance on any new residential development proposed on the playing field site. The guidance does not preclude sheltered housing/housing for the elderly.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>

<p>General</p>	<p>Nigel Waterson MP</p>	<p>Would not wish to see a casino built on the site.</p> <p>Have concerns about the Chapel. Would be grateful for some reassurance as to what measures will be taken to protect it now that the hospital is no longer operative. Would like to see it developed as a community resource perhaps for concerts and plays.</p> <p>Appreciate that part of the site is likely to be developed for housing, but it must be in keeping with the site and no higher than the existing building.</p> <p>If any housing on site is of sufficient high quality, then hope it would generate sufficient planning gain to enable other features of the site for example a state of the art rehabilitation unit plus perhaps some sheltered housing.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. However the Council believes that that the uniqueness of this site has a wide range of potential uses and wants to give every reasonable opportunity for reuse of the buildings.</p> <p>The temporary protection of the Chapel is the subject of a Listed Building Consent Application and is being carefully considered to minimise the chances of damage to this unique building.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.58 of the Planning Brief recognises the height constraints of the area.</p> <p>The Brief allows such uses to come forward.</p> <p>Recommendation: No change.</p>
----------------	--------------------------	---	---

<p>General</p>	<p>Director of Facilities of East Sussex Hospitals NHS Trust</p>	<p>If on-site parking is to be provided in north west corner of site then dramatic façade on south elevation of Hospital building will be hidden away. If principal access to site could be from King Edwards Parade property would become a landmark on Seafront.</p> <p>Consider existing vehicular gateway to King Edwards Parade should be widened with ideally two-way traffic. However would accept only one-way traffic off King Edwards Parade and two-way traffic off Darley Road.</p> <p>If principal access is off Darley Road then a number of buildings in north west corner should be demolished to provide a clear view of rear elevation of principal building.</p> <p>Walled garden/orchard should be able to be used for parking, so as to minimise impact of vehicle movements on setting of listed building.</p> <p>If the above is not considered acceptable the walled garden could be promoted as a possible development site for 4 terraced dwellings with gardens and on-site parking.</p> <p>Note proposal to impose a Tree Preservation Order on trees on site. Consider some of trees are too dense and should be thinned particularly those between the access track and Mother Superiors Garden.</p> <p>Do not consider TPO is necessary as trees are</p>	<p>Consideration was given to this in preparation of the Brief, however it was not considered acceptable for the following reasons:</p> <p>Increased use of this access would be likely to have a harmful impact on the amenities of occupiers of the adjacent residential property (South Lodge);</p> <p>Alterations to the original gated vehicular and pedestrian entrances on King Edwards Parade will not be permitted as they would be harmful to the setting of the listed building and this part of the Meads Conservation Area.</p> <p>This suggestion has not been the subject of public consultation. Such a proposal would therefore need to be considered as part of a formal planning application.</p> <p>Concerned about the potential impact on the amenities of occupiers of surrounding residential properties and that such proposals have not been the subject of public consultation. The merits of such a proposal have not been considered and would have to be tested with a detailed planning application.</p> <p>Comments are noted, however Tree Preservation Order is considered expedient in the interests of public visual amenity, taking into consideration the threat from potential development. Such an Order does not however preclude works to trees but any proposals will be subject to obtaining the consent of the Local</p>
<p>General</p>	<p>Quarter of South Lodge, King Edwards Parade</p>	<p>The area of open land to the north of the site will set a precedent for the development of the site. The area of open land to the north of the site will set a precedent for the development of the site.</p>	<p>Support in principle of a development on the site to include sheltered housing as an option for the area of the site. Sheltered housing is already in place by 1990</p>