

# **ITEM A**

**St Aubyns School 76 High St, Rottingdean  
BH2015 / 03108  
Full Planning and Demolition in a  
Conservation Area**

**20 April 2016**



<b><u>No:</u></b>	<b>BH2015/03108</b>	<b><u>Ward:</u></b>	<b>ROTTINGDEAN COASTAL</b>
<b><u>App Type:</u></b>	<b>Full Planning and Demolition in a Conservation Area</b>		
<b><u>Address:</u></b>	<b>St Aubyns School 76 High Street Rottingdean Brighton</b>		
<b><u>Proposal:</u></b>	<b>Demolition of rectangular block and associated extensions to north of Field House (main school building), demolition of building to north-east of Field House and other associated structures. Retention of existing sports pavilion, war memorial, water fountain and chapel. Residential conversion and refurbishment works to Field House, terraced cottages and Rumneys building, construction of new residential blocks and dwellings houses to provide a total of 48no residential dwellings (C3). Construction of part 2no, part 3no storey residential care home building providing a total of 62 bedrooms (C2). Revised access and landscaping works, provision of garages, car parking spaces, cycle storage and refuse facilities, alterations to boundary flint wall along Steyning Road and The Twitten and other associated works.</b>		
<b><u>Officer:</u></b>	<b>Liz Arnold Tel 291709</b>	<b><u>Valid Date:</u></b>	<b>08/09/2015</b>
<b><u>Con Area:</u></b>	<b>Rottingdean</b>	<b><u>Expiry Date:</u></b>	<b>08 December 2015</b>
<b><u>Listed Building Grade:</u></b>	<b>Grade II</b>		
<b><u>Agent:</u></b>	<b>Boyer Planning, UK House 82 Heath Road Twickenham London TW1 4BW</b>		
<b><u>Applicant:</u></b>	<b>Linden Homes &amp; The Cothill Educational Trust, C/O Boyer Planning UK House 82 Heath Road Twickenham London TW1 4BW</b>		

**1 RECOMMENDATION**

- 1.1 That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 and the policies and guidance in section 7 and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission for the reasons set out in section 11 and subject to no new material considerations being raised during the re-consultation period ending on the 8<sup>th</sup> April 2016.

**2 SITE LOCATION & DESCRIPTION**

- 2.1 St Aubyns School closed in mid-2013 but had been a fee paying school with boarding facilities (use class C2). The former school is located in its own grounds on the eastern side of the High Street.
- 2.2 The site, which incorporates the playing fields to the rear/east of the school buildings and which is in a single use as a school, measures approximately

3.3Ha, although the campus and field is physically divided by a public Twitten that runs between Steyning Road and Marine Drive.

- 2.3 In addition to the main school building, the Chapel and the boundary wall flint wall fronting the High Street are Grade II listed however all buildings, structures and flint walls located within the site (school campus and playing field), which were built before 1948 and were in associated use at the time of listing are considered curtilage listed.
- 2.4 The school campus, which measures approximately 0.86Ha includes;
- The main a school building (known as Field House/76 High Street) and its adjoining Chapel (Grade II Listed),
  - The listed boundary wall fronting the High Street (Grade II listed),
  - A row of internally linked terraced cottages (including Rumneys) (pre-1948 and curtilage listed),
  - Other outbuildings associated with the school (circa 1980-1995) including classrooms, dormitories, gymnasium, changing rooms, and Headmaster's residence,
  - An outdoor swimming pool,
  - Shooting range (pre-1948 and curtilage listed),
  - Terraced gardens, and
  - Equipped children's play area.
- 2.5 The existing playing field measures approximately 2.5Ha and comprises of;
- Sports pavilion (pre-1948 and curtilage listed),
  - War memorial (pre-1948 and curtilage listed),
  - Water fountain (pre-1948 and curtilage listed), and
  - 2 tennis courts with associated net fencing and cricket nets.
- 2.6 The boundary treatment of the playing field is predominately a mixture of wooden fencing and bushes, with a bank of sycamore trees on the western boundary. There are a number of gates and entry points to the site which are secure other than the main entrance from the High Street. There is no general access to the playing field.
- 2.7 The school campus site is located within the Rottingdean Conservation Area, the boundary of which runs along the eastern side of the Twitten and therefore excludes the playing field. Nevertheless the playing field is considered an important part of the setting of the Conservation Area; it provides a reminder of the once rural setting of the village and a distinction between the historic village and surrounding suburban development. The Twitten is identified as an important spatial feature in the Conservation Area; it is bounded by a hedge to one side and a flint wall to the other. The flint wall to Steyning Road, as well as being curtilage listed, is an important part of the character of the Conservation Area as it helps to delineate the boundary to the school site as well as differentiate public and private space.
- 2.8 The site is located in a sloping hillside that rises west to east from the valley floor. There is a level change of approximately 5m between the school's main building

and the middle of the playing field. This change in levels accounts for the existing predominance of garden terracing to the east/rear of the school building.

- 2.9 A boundary of the South Downs National Park is located approximately 119m to the east of the playing field.

### 3 RELEVANT HISTORY

**BH2015/03112** - Demolition of rectangular block and associated extensions to north of Field House (main school building), demolition of building to north-east of Field House and other associated structures. Concurrent Listed Building Consent Application.

**BH2015/03110** - Conversion and refurbishment works to Field House (main school building), terraced cottages and Rumneys building to provide 9 no. two bedroom and 1no three bedroom dwellings with associated works and alterations to boundary flint wall along Steyning Road and The Twitten. Concurrent Listed Building Consent Application.

**BH2008/02986** - Installation of porous macadam tennis/netball court on school playing fields with fencing to height of 2.75m. Approved 15/01/2009.

**BH2005/01964/CL** - Certificate of lawfulness for proposed conversion of ancillary residential into classrooms. Approved 23/08/2005.

**BH2000/01649/LB** - Retention of existing classroom (Renewal of temporary listed building consent granted under ref. BN95/1443/LB). Approved 12/09/2000.

**BH2000/01648/FP** - Retention of existing classroom (Renewal of temporary planning permission granted under ref. BN95/1442/FP). Approved 12/09/2000.

**BN88/1870/F** – Provision of 3 velux rooflights in new classroom block (amendment to permission BN87/1849/F) Granted 9/11/88.

**87/1850/CAC** – Erection of single storey classroom block for use in conjunction with existing school. Granted 1/12/87.

**87/1849/F** – Erection of single storey classroom block for use in conjunction with existing school. Granted 1/12/87.

**86/1709/F** – Addition of front dormer windows to dwelling under construction (amendment to proposals approved under BN86/272 & 273) Granted 19/11/1986.

**86/0273/LBC-** Alterations and extension to north side of existing garages/staff accommodation to form staff house fronting Steyning Road. Granted 25/04/86.

**86/0272/F** – Alterations and extension to north side of existing garages/staff accommodation to form staff house fronting Steyning Road. Granted 25/04/86.

**81/1359 (LBC /1139)** – Construction of permanent gateway on to twitten for access from playing field to existing school. Refused 5/01/1982.

**BN81/493 (LBC/1055)** – Retention of opening in Twitten wall for duration of building works to new gymnasium, so as to give access to site. Granted 14/05/81.

**BN80/1838 (LBC/991)** – Additions to and conversion of old gym into changing rooms/lavs and Classroom X, erection of new Gymnasium. Granted 22/01/81.

**BN80/1085** – Demolition of parts of old buildings and erection of extension to Laboratory, Classroom IX, tennis court and new Art room. Granted 4/07/80.

**BN79/1828** – Erection of 25 terraced houses, 17 flats and 2 blocks of garages with estate road and landscaping. Granted 18/10/1979.

**BN78/729(LBC/CA)** – Demolition of existing dilapidated classrooms fronting Steyning Road and erection of buildings to form classrooms, changing room, dormitories and garage. Granted 30/05/78.

**BN78/728** – Proposed alterations/additions including new staircase. Granted 30/05/78.

**BN76/1389 (LBC 527)** New entrance door and lavatory window, removal of chimney stacks; internal alterations to replan and form new bathrooms, dormitories and staff accommodation to cottage/sanatorium block. Granted 14/10/76.

**BN75/2848 (LBC 474)** – Proposed construction of outdoor swimming pool. Granted 5/02/76.

**73/678** – Outline application for the erection of 4 shops with 4 flats over fronting Marine Drive and rear loading access. Refused 17/05/73.

**72/2948** – Erection of a detached house for headmaster. Granted 13/10/72.

**71/3163** – Outline application for the erection of a 5 bedroom detached house with integral garage. Granted 21/02/72.

**71/1900** – Outline application for the erection of a detached house for use by resident headmaster. Refused 30/09/71.

**71/1637** – Erection of two storey building comprising two classrooms with Library over and boiler house. Granted 12/08/71.

**17.60.1211** – Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment with shops, flats and houses (outline application) Refused 4/08/1960.

#### **4 THE APPLICATION**

##### **4.1 Planning permission is sought for;**

- the demolition of the rectangular block and associated extensions to north of Field House (main school building),
- the demolition of buildings to north-east of Field House and other associated structures,
- the conversion and refurbishment of Field House, terraced cottages and Rumneys building,
- the construction of new residential blocks and dwellings houses,
- the construction of part 2 no. part 3 no. storey residential care home building providing a total of 62 bedrooms (C2).
- revised access and landscaping works, provision of garages, car parking spaces, cycle storage and refuse facilities,
- alterations to boundary flint wall along Steyning Road and The Twitten, and
- other associated works.

##### **4.2 A total of 48 no. residential units (C3) would be created by the proposed development.**

##### **4.3 Pre-Application Consultation**

The submitted Statement of Community Involvement states that in advance of submitting an application individual meetings were held with stakeholders and that two community consultation events exhibition were organised. It is also stated that following these events an up-date newsletter, showing amendments to the proposal, was issued to local householders and businesses.

##### **4.4 On the 23rd June 2015 a proposal for the development of the former school site was presented to Councillors which included;**

- the redevelopment of the site to provide 48 new dwellings (38 new build and 10 via the conversion of retained buildings) providing a mix of 1, 2, 3 and 4

bedroom apartments/houses, which includes the demolition of some of the curtilage listed buildings,

- a construction of a new 62 bed residential care home (Use Class C2),
- the retention of 1.6Ha of the former playing fields,
- the provision of ancillary facilities to serve the retained open space including the refurbishment/improvement of the existing sports pavilion building,
- the formation of access to Newlands Road,
- alterations to the existing access off Steyning Road,
- landscaping, and
- alterations to existing flint walls.

4.5 The feedback from this presentation was as follows;

- Members considered that the proposed 10% affordable housing provision was extremely low and stated viability information would be needed in order to demonstrate if this is appropriate,
- Members considered that limited details has been provided of the elevations although the traditional/contextual approach was welcomed,
- Members considered that the Chapel should be retained,
- Members questioned if a care home was needed,
- Members stated that any building works encroaching on the playing field was a concern,
- Members queried whether there is too much development across the site,
- Members acknowledged playing field would alter from private to public, and
- Discussions appear to have been hampered by an absence of viability and heritage assessment details.

4.6 Associated pre-application with officers also resulted in an expression of concern regarding the lack of the submission of a heritage assessment, the potential loss of the Chapel, the lack of submission of viability information, the lack of affordable housing provision and provided comments on environmental health issues, air quality and transport issues.

4.7 In respect of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), prior to the submission of the application a Screening Opinion was issued by the Local Planning Authority confirming that the development is not an EIA development. Following a challenge from a local resident in August 2015, the Secretary of State also confirmed that the application proposal is not an EIA development.

## 5 PUBLICITY & CONSULTATIONS

### External

5.1 **Neighbours: Three Hundred and Ten (310)** representations of objection have been received from the addresses which are contained in full within **Appendix A** of this report. The following grounds of objection are stated:

Design/Visual Amenities/Landscape Impacts

- Planning Brief states no building on the playing field. There are very few green areas left in area and provides significantly for the community until it was locked up,
- The field is a significant feature in the character of the village, visible from Beacon Hill and other vantage points,
- Loss of unobstructed view of the sky and sea,
- Density and number of houses is too high and not in keeping with the village and will harm the conservation area,
- Out of character, out of scale and too high and will harm the character of the area,
- Harmful impact on views,
- The scheme does not meet the Planning Brief,
- Boundary walls are protected as part of the village setting, should not allow the removal of large chunks,
- Need to protect the South Downs National Park and Nature Reserve which are assets of much wider application and need protection,
- Overly dense development and materials are out of keeping,
- Overdevelopment – harmfully impacting on village character,
- Would demolish 60% of the Grade II Listed Building, heritage must be protected,
- Urban sprawl, and
- Will provide cheap, ugly, new build homes, which will be an eye-sore.

Amenity Issues

- Harmful impact on amenity and local business,
- Overlooking and loss of privacy,
- Noise and pollution from extraction,
- Location of bin stores,
- Overshadowing and loss of daylight/sunlight,
- Loss of views,
- Landscaping – hedgerow needs managing,
- Quality of life more important than viability,
- Increased noise and disturbance – during construction and following occupation, and
- Positioning of care home adjacent to the AQMA likely to expose elderly and/or inform residents to high levels of air pollution.

Transport/Highway/Access Issues

- Road safety concerns for cyclist and pedestrians,
- Steyning Road is already heavily used and has insufficient capacity for construction traffic or additional development traffic and concern raised regarding emergency services access,
- Transport Data/Assessment fails to comply with NPPF, has flawed methodology, misleading information, errors, inaccuracies, false assumptions, overestimated capacities, unverified analyses and fails to assess cumulative impact and the Woodingdean junction,
- Would severely damage sustainable transport services,



## PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

- It is not a sustainable development,
- Insufficient car parking – cycling not a realistic alternative, will add to severe parking pressures in the area,
- Traffic congestion and existing traffic in the High Street are damaging historic buildings and the aged infrastructure and causing congestion which will be exacerbated by proposal,
- High Street road and pavements are not wide enough, should not actually be a road. HGV's and buses have to mount the kerbs and cause traffic jams,
- Poor access arrangement, access road onto Marine Drive is not shown on the plans,
- Proposal should include a small to medium car park for visitors to the village,
- The Council's January 2016 Interim Report on the Lewes Road improvements has made it clear that Linden's traffic figures are even more inaccurate than previously realised, with a considerable impact on the Air Pollution Assessment for the AQMA, and
- There is no assessment provided on the strategic road network (A27).

### Other Issues

- Increased pollution, poor air quality levels and associated health problems. Disputes methodology of submitted Air Quality Assessment,
- Limited and inadequate existing infrastructure, including in terms of existing oversubscribed schools, nurseries, hospitals, doctor/dentist surgeries, power supplies and road networks,
- Construction operations and heavy construction plant and traffic would ruin the village with noise, dirt, dust and pollution,
- Harmful loss of open space and historic buildings which can never be replaced,
- Increased flood, drainage and sewage problems,
- An EIA is required due to the sensitivity of the site and differences between the screened proposal,
- Ground stability,
- Low level of landscaping provision,
- Section 106 monies should be spent locally,
- Removal of the hedge all the way down St Aubyns Mead,
- Position of trees in the rear gardens of plots 48 and 39 are so near the existing lampposts that security of parking and night viability will be reduced for St Aubyns residents,
- Adverse impact on tourism and commercial businesses in village,
- The campus is naturally separated from the field by The Twitten, believe the field and campus should be considered separately,
- Alterations to the boundary flint walls along Steyning Road and The Twitten are contrary to public consultation information,
- De-valuation of surrounding properties,
- Lack of public consultation on proposed demolition and provision of a care home,

## PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

- There are already existing/too many care homes in Rottingdean, many with current vacancies – this proposal does not support a balanced community,
- Loss of public sports field facilities where no alternative provision exists,
- Peacehaven urban area is growing and is prominent to Rottingdean,
- A smaller number of larger homes would be much more acceptable,
- No affordable housing provided,
- Boundary with Kipling Court must be installed and maintained by the developer,
- Proposal is contrary to Council policies, Planning Brief, Localism Act, One Planet City, the Parish neighbourhood development plan and the NPPF (especially paragraph 132),
- In 2015 elected members of the Council voted unanimously to endorse the designation of the playing field as a “Local Green Space” this should be upheld,
- Neither houses or care home provide any real benefit for village residents and is purely money-making schemes on behalf of the developer,
- Cumulative impacts of all other development in area need to be considered,
- No archaeological plan is present to ensure that if there are traces of ancient settlement that they are identified before being lost,
- Impact on wildlife. There are errors in biodiversity checklist. Bat survey is incomplete and inadequate and contradictions between reports prepared by different consultants re ecology,
- There are more suitable brownfield sites in City to develop before developing Greenfield sites,
- Only existing school buildings should be developed,
- Figures stated for staff of proposed care home is badly researched and figures incorrect,
- Proposed planting scheme between plots 19 to 23 to mitigate overlooking will eventually destroy neighbouring flint wall,
- Old school buildings should be retained for educational purposes,
- There are so many planning applications in place for the east of Brighton that unless the Council look at the bigger picture area is going to be overwhelmed by new builds with no infrastructure in place,
- Increased light pollution,
- Loss of tennis courts and swimming pool which are used by local residents
- Building on the playing field is not the only viable option – residents should be able to scrutinise the viability assessment,
- Electrical and gas surveys have been based solely on residential use and not a commercially run, very large care home,
- The scheme does not accord with Sport’s England’s exception or the guidance within paragraph 74 of the NPPF,
- Southern end of playing field is suitable for recreational and sporting use, assertion that the gradient makes it exempt is unfounded and absurd,
- Loss of the school but the provision of a care home is not a direct replacement as implied,

- Cothill Education Trust refused an offer made by parents and another private school to take it over. Acceptable redevelopment should determine the value Cothill will get from the sale of the site,
- Loss of trees have not been discussed with local community,
- Degree of opposition from local community, this is not made clear in Statement of Community Involvement which itself is flawed as at no time was the demolition of Listed Building presented to the community,
- Council rejected the Meadow Vale application which is on the outskirts of the village, how can it possibly justify approving this application which is right in the heart of the village on green space,
- The application is procedurally flawed. There is no such legal entity as “Linden Homes” as the identity of this apparent joint application (with Cothill) is not give, in breach of the legislation,
- Some large houses are planned, for which there is no demand,
- Offer to part fund the Council’s Air Quality improvement plan for the AQMA does not meet its obligation under planning law to contribute to a reduction in the AQMA’s air pollution, and
- The scheme is contrary to Rottingdean emerging Neighbourhood Plan in relation to traffic congestion, air quality and encouraging sustainable transport.

5.2 **Ten (10)** representations of support have been received from the addresses which are contained in full within **Appendix A** of this report. The following grounds of support are stated:

- Need more housing as people need to live somewhere and house prices are too expensive so more houses are needed to satisfy the demand, consider site to be an ideal place to add to the housing stock,
- Need site to be occupied, good for local economy,
- Would benefit the village and local businesses. Increase footfall in village should help traders and generate more local income,
- Would give residents use of surrounding field. The school field is no longer in use, the front of it was built on years ago,
- Badly need care homes for an aging population,
- Steyning Road would be made wider,
- Development would be in keeping with the village as a whole and will provide a further recreation ground for children and adults alike, and
- Traffic would be similar to when it was a school. Do not think that the development will add significant to the existing excessive traffic passing through the village.

5.3 **Five (5)** representations of comment have been received from the addresses which are contained in full within **Appendix A** of this report. The following comments are stated:

- Viability noted, reduction in unit numbers and increased green space supported,
- Improved pedestrian connectivity,
- Concern over impact on GP services,

## PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

- Should request a full report from the developers to ensure that they are considering how to minimise impact to the traffic flow during development,
- Should include additional car parking for visitors to the village,
- Stress need for as much underground car parking as possible,
- Due care and consideration of the Heritage assets needed,
- Visitor numbers to village are likely to increase, helping the viability of the retail shops and other businesses that rely upon local clientele,
- Care home should become retirement apartments,
- The remainder of the filed should be developed as family recreational ground with a variety of popular pursuits that all age groups are able to enjoy,
- The pavilion should be renovate together with the war memorial and converted into a light refreshment café and the hire of equipment,
- Hedgerow running north to south along the western boundary of the Twitten should be removed to expose the continuous listed flint wall and improve safety,
- Twitten should be widened and a cycle lane incorporated alongside, and
- The S106 Agreement with the City Council could partly pay for the recreational facilities and/or ongoing maintenance along with assessing potential for grant funding.

5.4 Following re-consultation of the revised plans and documents received on 29<sup>th</sup> February 2016 **Eighteen (18)** further representations of objection have been received from the addresses which are contained in full within **Appendix B** of this report. Additional points of objection raised are as follows:

### Transport/Highway/Access Issues

- Jobs in the nursing home are unlikely to be taken up locally and will therefore exacerbate traffic issues.
- Loss of existing parking spaces on Steyning Road/Newlands Road to create access to development. Additional on-street parking pressure will create more congestion as roads to narrow to allow two cars to pass and will make roads/pavements more hazardous especially to mothers with children and wheelchair users,
- Parking surveys undertaken on a Saturday, which is in fact one of the quietest days of the week for local shops and is therefore unrepresentative. It also does not acknowledge the twice-daily term-time impact of drop-off and pick up traffic to the two local primary schools,
- False traffic predictions,
- Insufficient parking for development especially for care home staff, doctors, ambulances and delivery trucks. No on-site parking to be provided to serve the playing field, and
- Road ware.

### Other Issues

- Lack of infrastructure including schools, GPs, sewerage and drainage systems,
- If field has to be developed a small number of high value residential units would have less impact than a 62 bed care home,

- In the developers facility report it is emphasised non-suitability of the SW corner of the playing field as a sports ground despite the total field having been used as a sports ground since the early 1920s. There are other recreational uses of the field, archery, cricket and tennis.
- Development of the existing school is fine, housing infilling where appropriate is not objected to,
- Care home residents will have no safe recreation space outside the care home as no enclosed space or garden is envisaged for residents,
- Based on staff numbers for existing care homes in area, more staff would be require for the proposed care home than stated,
- There are more suitable pieces of land to develop rather than destroy a place of great beauty in the name of profit,
- Proposed houses on plots 39 and 48 would abut the fence owned by Kipling Court Ltd at the top of St Aubyns Mead. These new properties would be located so close that they will need sash windows rather than those that open outwards. Sets harmful precedent to move the buildings north, which would impact further on proposals to maintain some of the existing field,
- False assertion that SW corner is not suitable as a plying field is clearly designed to weaken case for retaining the field in its entirety,
- Believe care home will fail and be converted to flats in the future,
- Developer had no intention of keeping school open, having rejected offers from other private schools to take it on,
- False stories about size of development required to make it viable,
- Flooding. Field acts as a flood plain for all the houses around it. Village will be flooded, especially the High Street, if houses and a large block (the care home) are built on the field. Village needs this small oasis of green for recreational uses as well as a safety measure, and
- The density is unacceptably high for the area.

5.5 **Blind Veterans UK:** Object. Development is out of keeping with surrounding area. School should retain its existing structure as historical building. No proper consultative process; Sets precedent for further development in small Downlands village.

5.6 **Former School Pupils/Chairman/Headmasters:** Comment. The Chapel was the central point of the school's day to day life. With important artefacts contained within.

All the fittings, the pews, memorial windows and roundels (smaller windows) were donated by parents and other relations, which contributed to the unique atmosphere of this place which became very special to generations of the school community.

The contents should be moved to another school where the Memorial Boards, photographs, roundels and pews would be displayed and seen every day by the children to serve as a reminder of the sacrifice that these Old Boys made in two World Wars. The Trust has offered to house all this in a suitable space in the middle of their school in Oxfordshire.

Have considerable concern that proposal retains Chapel in situ. Believe that is completely the wrong decision. Have already had a number of requests for items donated to the Chapel to be returned to the donors. Believe that this should be done.

Concern raised over who will be responsible for the maintenance of the Chapel and who will visit it. It will be in the middle of a housing development with have nothing in it and unlikely to be visited.

5.7 **Ovingdean Residents and Preservation Society:** Object. Development will place undue strain on the local infrastructure which cannot currently cope let alone in the future. Will have a high impact on the air quality in the area which is already above EU regulations. Is situated in an area which is an area of beauty, peace and calm in the village which will be irrevocably ruined. Feel a development on this site disrupted is totally inappropriate and not in keeping for such a lovely site.

5.8 **Regency Society:** Comment. Supports the development of the site for housing and the proposed treatment of most of the Listed Building that lie within the former school campus site which forms part of Rottingdean Conservation Area. Have some concerns about the proposals for the future of the Listed Chapel and feel a clearer statement is needed regarding its future.

Main concerns relate to the proposals for the former playing field. Believe that the application fails to make best use of this part of the site, which lies outside the Conservation Area.

Although the playing field does not fall within the urban fringe, believe that it too could and should be developed to help meet the City's housing needs given the serious shortfall of land and pressure on urban fringe.

The application proposes development on a relatively small area at the southern end of the playing field. Concern raised regarding the lack of affordable housing. Would argue for the development of the whole site with a mix of homes of varying sizes, including a significant amount of affordable housing. Affordable housing would be of more social benefit than the retain public open space.

There is a serious shortage of space in the City and therefore this site should be used to its maximum potential rather than retaining open space.

The playing field has not been publicly accessible in the past: it was a private space for the exclusive use of the school. The village and surrounding area has an abundance of public open space. For these reasons the argument for retaining it as an open space is unconvincing.

Have no objection to the principle of a care home on the site. However, the design of the proposed building is disappointing. There is no significant secure outdoor space for use by residents. The building itself is uninspired: A major new building in the centre of the village should offer a bold architectural statement which adds to the village's this diversity.

5.9 **Councillor Mary Mears:** Objects to the proposal. Letter Attached.

5.10 **Simon Kirby MP,** Objects to the application on the following grounds;

- Increased pollution and congestion resulting from a large number of additional properties and their associated cars. The A259 coast road and Rottingdean High Street already become extremely congested at peak times of the day, with hundreds of cars,
- Parking in Rottingdean is also likely to deteriorate due to the greatly increased number of cars,
- Concerns about the provision of school places and GP places locally, which are already under considerable pressure.
- Concern that the sewage and drainage infrastructure will not be sufficient to cope with the many additional residential properties,
- Application is for a very large number of properties in a relatively small area and so will be very high density. This would be likely to negatively affect the present character of the village, and
- Many local residents are concerned about the loss of the old school playing field. Many people feel that it is inappropriate that a precious green space in the village would be lost in order that more buildings can be constructed.

5.11 **Rottingdean Parish Council:**

(12/10/2015) Comment. Disappointed that the brownfield site could not be redeployed for its formerly designated C1 and C2 uses but recognise the limitations and challenges of the existing structures and the differing levels within the site.

Design - Welcome the retention and conversion of the original Field House (Grade II listed), Rumneys and artisan cottages to provide units of accommodation and are generally supportive of the principle of new residential development on the brownfield site to meet local needs and breathe new life into the High Street. Pleased to see the intention to retain the green courtyard areas, with existing trees and proposed additional planting but object to the removal of the terrace in the southern courtyard. Pleased to note the intention to use building materials and design features in keeping with the Conservation Area and to limit construction height to 2 to 2.5 storeys on the brownfield site. Believe the proposal for 38 dwellings, including the residential conversions, on the brownfield site represents a suitable density of development.

Housing Mix - The proposed varied housing mix is a good fit with the demonstrated needs identified by RPC's recently commissioned Housing Needs Survey. The Parish are dismayed at the removal of affordable units, as specified in the earlier outline plans. Feel that a shared ownership scheme would be of benefit to Rottingdean's older population and local young people to remain in or settle in the village.

Heritage Assets – Welcome the retention of the heritage assets of the site; the Chapel, war memorial, sports pavilion and fountain as these have significance not only for the Village but also for alumni, their families and former personnel at the school. Seeks assurances that English Heritage have been consulted on and have not objected to the proposed demolition of almost 61% of Field House,

## PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

including an area dating from 1830. Pleased to see that the scheme proposes to enhance the views of and access to the Chapel. RPC also welcomes retention of the boundary flint wall to west of Field House and respect for other flint walls to the north and east.

Former Playing Field - As detailed in the planning brief the playing field provides the village with a key green buffer adjacent to the Conservation Area and the congested High Street. Also provides key strategic views across the village to Beacon Hill and the Windmill that contribute to the characteristic pattern of green spaces throughout our downland village. Strongly welcomes the proposal to hand over part of the playing field for community use with a 10 year maintenance fund. However, is seeking Local Green Space designation for the entire playing field.

The Parish are of the view that the brownfield development proposals for this prestigious site at the heart of the village and its Conservation Area are viable on a stand-alone basis and therefore object to the partial development of the field.

Care Home – The Parish recognise need for dementia care facilities in the area and welcome the proposal in principle to make provision for these, preference would be for these to be provided within the boundaries of the brownfield site. However, the care home is too large a facility to be provided at this central location, it is out of scale with the immediate environment and would generate unacceptably high numbers of additional traffic movements from associated services, staff and visitors, leading to additional congestion on the seafront and in the village, especially along the Steyning Road/Newlands Road route.

Impacts on Local Infrastructure – Concerned about the reduction in available parking spaces as a result of this development particularly in Steyning Road and Newlands Road. Concern is also raised regarding the impact on existing GP surgeries. The site would be a good opportunity for a new surgery. Believe there is inadequate provision for education of younger children as the local primary schools are full.

(Additional comments 31/03/2016 following receipt of further information/ minor amendments) Parish Council's overarching concerns and objections raised previously are not addressed in latest applications in particular with regards to air pollution and traffic volumes. The location of the site makes a highly negative impact on both traffic flows and air quality inevitable without interventions to ease congestion or reduce traffic through the village. The cumulative impact of the proposal and other developments in area is significant to an already illegal situation.

Disappointed that it has been necessary for the Council to begin an enforcement case about the Chapel and its contents.

Remains a strong point that have not been given access to the Viability Report. Is impossible to present counter arguments when not allowed to see figures it is based upon. Is not in the spirit of the NPPF or Localism Act.



- 5.12 **Rottingdean Preservation Society:** Object. The granting of the application would bring more traffic to the village of Rottingdean which already suffers severe air pollution, more than anywhere in Brighton. The restricted High Street encloses south going traffic with cars, lorries and buses waiting at the lights with their engines running. The proposed dwellings would bring more traffic to the village with dire results. The residence of more people in the village would put strain on schools, doctor surgeries as well as drainage and sewerage. The serious problems need to be tackled before building can begin at the school site.
- 5.13 **SAFE (St Aubyns Field Evergreen):** Object. Have serious concerns regarding omissions and anomalies in the submitted Transport Assessment. Have received no response from Linden Homes about these concerns or clarification about which company has made the planning application (Linden or Cothill).

The applicant's maintain that development on the playing field is essential to the viability and as such their viability assessment should be made publically available.

SAFE contend that the scheme is not viable without building on the playing field. Financial viability on any scheme is going to be dependent on the price for the land. It is very important that the applicant's viability report is properly considered and its assumptions and modelling tested so that a fair decision can be reached. Accordingly the viability report should be subject to public scrutiny without which it should be disregarded. Consideration by the District Valuer alone is insufficient.

(Comments 16/12/2015) The following issues are the more significant issues identified to date; exceedence of air quality levels, extant school principle, playing field, areas of difference with planning brief, demolition of 60% of Listed Buildings, loss of green space, greenfield/brownfield designation, viability report disclosure, viability report land value, inadequate transport assessment, affordable housing, construction phase impacts, flooding, infrastructure, cumulative impacts and sustainable development.

- 5.14 **Saltdean Swimmer:** Object on grounds of;
- Loss of playing field,
  - Air Quality/pollution will be worsened, contrary to the NPPF and Council policy. Will effect health and be bad for business,
  - Increased water problems,
  - Increased traffic congestion, and
  - Need consideration of the cumulative impact of other recent approvals in area. There should be a halt to new developments in Rottingdean and the areas around until such time that air quality is in line with EU standards and adequate infrastructure is in place.
- 5.15 **The Brighton Society:** Comment. Supports the scheme for 48 new dwellings in the playing field as well as the retention of the Listed Buildings as a care home, although with some alterations. This is a welcome windfall site, therefore recommend refusal to the proposed dramatic reduction of new dwellings on the site. If an operator cannot be found for the care home the building should be converted to flats.

There are already several areas of open space in close proximity to the site, All open spaces have to be maintained and this involves costs. This space was not previously open to the public therefore much needed housing is not going to deprive residents of Rottingdean of a facility that they previously enjoyed.

Object to the design of the roofs at the entrance to the site, which is out of character.

Are not certain what future is proposed for the chapel – would recommend it is converted to provide more housing. Believe that there are already sufficient buildings in community use in Rottingdean.

5.16 **Brighton & Hove Archaeological Society:** Comment. The archaeology of Rottingdean is relatively unknown and as such any intervention may produce important records of past landscapes and ancient activity.

5.17 **CAG:** Recommend Approval with the following comments;

- Welcomes the retention of two-thirds of the play field and the preservation of listed structures. Strongly recommend that when retained open space is transferred to the Council it should be with a covenant that it is retained as a public space in perpetuity.
- There should be a full survey of Field House to identify any features in the part due for demolition and an investigation of the mathematical tiles at the front. Also suggest that the windows in the outer bays should be retained as two over two sliding sashes, but in the original part of the building the Victorian canted bays should be replaced with segmental tripartite windows.
- The garage in front of Field House must be removed as a condition of approval of the scheme.
- There needs to be greater clarity regarding the future use of the chapel, bearing in mind that most of the historic features have been removed, and
- The gables to the two buildings at the entrance to the site off Steyning Road should be reduced in prominence as they give a false impression of what is going to be within the site.

5.18 **County Archaeologist:** Comment. Site is situated within an Archaeological Notification Area defining the historic settlement of Rottingdean. An archaeological desk-based assessment and heritage statements for the built heritage at the site have been submitted.

Whilst there has been no standing building archaeological survey undertaken and the built heritage reports lacks phased plans for individual buildings or the site as a whole (there is map regression), the approach does seek to conserve and enhance the most obviously significant heritage assets at the site.

The archaeological desk-based assessment, which has drawn on evidence from the Historic Environment Record (HER) confirms that the site is likely to have archaeological interest with respect to below-ground evidence of prehistoric,

Romano-British and subsequent activity. The significance of any such remains, however, is likely to have been reduced by recent development impacts, including the levelling of the playing fields and the construction of relatively modern buildings and structures. Despite these impacts it is probable that archaeological remains will exist at the site.

In the light of the potential for impacts to heritage assets (including historic buildings and below ground archaeological remains) at this site, it is considered that the area affected by the proposals should be the subject of a programme of archaeological works.

**5.19 County Ecologist:**

(Comments 19/10/2015) Comment. Provided that the recommended mitigation measures are carried out the proposed development is unlikely to have a significant impact on biodiversity and can be supported from an ecological perspective. The site offers opportunities for enhancement that will help the Council address its duties and responsibilities under the NPPF and NERC Act.

(Additional comments 10/12/2015 regarding assessment of Arboricultural Report)  
It is recommended that any trees to be removed are assessed for their bat roost potential. If they have potential, further surveys will be required to inform appropriate mitigation.

(Comments 24/03/2016 following receipt of further information/ minor amendments) The amendments will not have any impacts on biodiversity, and as such, advice previously provided remains valid. The additional information confirms that trees on site were assessed as having negligible bat roost potential, and therefore that no further surveys are required.

**5.20 East Sussex Fire and Rescue Service:**

(24/09/2015) Comment. Plans do not appear to indicate satisfactory access for fire appliances for fire fighting purposes as will be required by Building Regulations the East Sussex Act 1981 which states that there should be a vehicle access for a pump appliance to private dwellings within a 45m of all points within each dwelling.

When considering active fire safety measures for all types of premises, would recommend the installation of sprinkler systems.

(Comments 14/03/016 following receipt of further information/ minor amendments) Access for fire appliances is satisfactory. Access for fire-fighting is satisfactory.

**5.21 East Sussex County Council Transport Officer: Comment.** Confirm that East Sussex County Council (ESCC) as Highway Authority does not consider that the development will have an impact on the ESCC highway network. The submitted TA demonstrates that the development is likely to generate 29 and 48 trips in the am and pm peak hours respectively compared to 116 and 39 as the existing use. This small increase in trips in the pm Peak (+9) will be diluted via a number of route choices and destinations so that the number of vehicles added to the ESCC

network is unlikely to be noticeable. It is also noted that the site is well located to take advantage of frequent bus services and many local services are within walking distance (schools, doctors' surgeries and shops). The proposed Travel Plan will further encourage use of sustainable travel.

5.22 **Environment Agency:** Comment. The site is located in Flood Zone 1, defined by the NPPF as having a low probability of flooding. In this instance have taken a risk based approach and will not be providing bespoke comments or reviewing the technical documents in relation to the proposal. The site lies on a principal aquifer. All precautions must be taken to avoid discharges and spills to the ground both during and after construction.

5.23 **Highways England:** No objection. The strategic road network (SRN) is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity. Would be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. Having considered proposal have no objection.

5.24 **Historic England:**

(Original comments 4/11/2015 and 16/03/2016 following receipt of further information/ minor amendments) Comment. Considers that an appropriate redevelopment of this now vacant site has the potential to secure the future of the Listed school building as well as that of the memorial Chapel, which is listed by virtue of its connection to and historical association with the school. Consider that further information and amendments to the scheme are required to achieve mitigation of harm and that further enhancements are also possible, as required by NPPF policy.

5.25 **Southern Gas Networks:** Comment. Note the presence of Low/Medium/Intermediate Pressure gas main in the proximity to the site. There should be no mechanical excavations taking place above or within 0.5m of the low pressure system, 0.5m of the medium pressure system and 3m of the intermediate pressure system. Should where required confirm the position of mains using hand dug trial holes.

5.26 **Southern Water:** Comment: Initial investigations indicate that foul sewage disposal can be provided to service the proposed development. Can provide a water supply to the site.

Under current legislation and guidance Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) rely upon facilities which are not adoptable by sewerage undertakers. Therefore, the applicant will need to ensure that arrangements exist for long term maintenance of the SUDS facilities. It is critical that the effectiveness of these systems is maintained in perpetuity. Good management will avoid flooding from the proposed surface water systems which may result in the inundation of the foul sewerage system.

**5.27 Sports England:**

(Original comments 12/10/2015) Objects. Whilst the transfer of land to the Council and the refurbishment of the pavilion is welcomed, it does not compensate for the loss of playing field and does not comply with National Policy as there is no replacement playing field being proposed which is equivalent or better in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location.

Sport England object as it is not considered to accord with any of the exceptions to Sport England's Playing Fields Policy or with Paragraph 74 of the NPPF.

(Additional comments 11/3/2016 following receipt of additional information) Objects. The applicant has submitted a report undertaken by TGMS to further argue the site is incapable of accommodating playing pitched or part of a playing pitch.

Sport England has considered the proposal in light of paragraph 74 of the NPPF. The submitted sport facility report addendum is useful but position on the application remains the same and an objection is raised on the basis that the scheme is not considered to accord with any of the exceptions to Sport's England's Playing Field Policy or with Paragraph 74 of the NPPF.

**5.28 Sussex Police:** (30/09/2015 and 21/03/2016) Comment. Pleased to note that the submission gave mention to some crime prevention measures to be incorporated into the design and layout. The NPPF demonstrates the Government's commitment to creating safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion.

Residential dwellings – the design and layout has produced outward facing dwellings and back to back gardens. This leaves the streets free, un-obscured and overlooked. Parking has been provided for with in-curtilage bays, garages, car ports and on street parking bays. Where communal parking occurs it is important that they must be within view of an active room within the property. Doors and ground floor including easily accessible windows are to conform to PAS 024-2012.

It is important that the boundary between public space and private areas are clearly indicated. It is desirable for dwelling frontages to be open view, so walls fences and hedges will need to be kept low or alternatively feature a combination (max height 1m) of wall railings or timber picket fence. As the first line of defence, perimeter fencing must be adequate with vulnerable areas such as side and rear gardens needing more robust defensive barriers by using walls or fencing to a minimum height of 1.8m. Gates that provide access to the side of the dwelling or rear access to the gardens must be robustly constructed of timber, be the same height as the fence and be lockable. Such gardens must be located on or as near to the front building line as possible.

Have concerns over the inclusion of the existing Twitten in encouraging access across the development. In order to provide a safe and secure pathway, the Twitten will need to be cleared of overgrown vegetation and foliage and a

maintenance policy introduced to keep it tidy and clear. At present it is an uninviting, narrow, unlit footpath and ideally requires illuminating to ensure the safety and security of the users.

Care Home – Access control will be essential in maintaining authorised access to and from the building. Reception is correctly situated to observe and greet visitors and to direct them accordingly. The main entrance doors should have remote entry facility when out of hours use. Trades person buttons are to be omitted. From a safety and security perspective for the resident's, consideration should be given to controlling the doors into the residential element of the building from reception and the lift coded.

All external doors, ground floor and any easily accessible windows are to conform to PAS 024-2012 or LPS 1175 SR2 with laminated glazing that confirms to BS EN 356 P1A. In the interest of reducing opportunist theft ask that limiters are fitted to all ground floor windows. External fire doors should devoid of any external furniture and be linked via an alarm to reception that indicate when a door is opened or left ajar.

Clear demarcation lines providing defensible space will need to be included into the design of the care home as there are vulnerable doors and windows from rooms 1-10.

The proposed cycle bin stores for plots 36-38 will need internal segregation to keep cycles security intact.

Finally lighting throughout the development will be an important consideration and is to conform to the recommendations within BS 5489:2013.

5.29 **UK Power Networks:** Has no objection.

**Internal:**

5.30 **Access Officer:** Comment. Comments relate to the new housing only. Amendments required with regards to Lifetime Homes generally. Note that the necessary wheelchair accessible units do not appear to be provided.

5.31 **Adult Social Care Commissioning Manger:** Comment. Strongly support care home development of those facilities that provide beds/facilities that the Council or Health is able to purchase using their set rates. Nursing homes and all care homes for people with dementia are particularly needed in the city.

5.32 **Arboriculturist:** Loss of 34 trees, three groups of trees and a section of hedging, none of which is worthy of re Preservation Orders. Overall no objection subject to conditions regarding tree protection and landscaping.

5.33 **City Clean:** Comment. Concerned about the access points for the refuse vehicle. Access from Steyning Road may be ok so long as there is a wide enough angle for the refuse trucks to turn into. However the other access point appears to be on a main road. Confusion about the bin collection points, City Clan would not collect waste and recycling from proposed care home. Would therefore request that the

development provide suitable storage for the separation of recycling ensuring the waste generated by its operations is in a sustainable manner. Storage of waste receptacles must be off street.

- 5.34 **City Parks: Objects**. If the maintenance contribution is for 10 years and limited to £93,000 then City Parks would not be able to take on the remaining section of the playing field and pavilion (the developer would either have to maintain or find alternative mechanism if the lost space is to be mitigated).

Could only take on the remaining section of the playing field and pavilion where a 25 year maintenance contribution is provided equivalent to £20,000 per annum (i.e. 500,000 total lump sum). This sum is based on the current layout and there being no identified use for the pavilion.

- 5.35 **Economic Development Officer: Comment**. Has no adverse comments to make in respect of the applicant and welcome the additional housing that will contribute to the City's challenging housing needs and the residential care home which will provide much needed accommodation for the City's ageing population and generate 60 fulltime and 18 part-time jobs.

Due to the size of the development, which includes 38 new build residential units (C3), if approved, an Employment and Training Strategy will be required to include a commitment to using an agreed percentage of local labour. It is proposed for this development that the percentage of 20% local employment (where appropriate) for the demolition and construction phases is required and full liaison with the Local Employment Scheme Co-ordinator is requested at an early stage in accordance with the Developer Contributions Interim Technical Guidance.

In addition to the Employment and Training Strategy requests a contribution through a S106 agreement for the payment of £19,000 towards the Local Employment Scheme in accordance with the Developer Contributions Guidance (10 units and above - £500 per unit.  $38 \times £500 = £19,000$ ).

- 5.36 **Education: (23/09/2015) Comment**. Would look to secure an education contribution of £171,400.60 for primary and secondary school provision in the part of the City.

- 5.37 **Environmental Health:**

Noise

(28/09/2015 & 14/10/16) Comment. Insufficient information has been provided to make an informed comment.

(Comments 21/03/2016 following receipt of minor amendments/additional information) Insufficient information to make an informed comment.

It is understood that the field will be handed over to the Council and that currently the exact use of the playing field is unknown. A worst case scenario has therefore been presented in a noise assessment. This report shows that there is the potential for residents to be affected by noise from a sports pitch, if it is placed

adjacent to resident's gardens. Given it is unknown where the pitch will be placed it would be unreasonable to expect mitigation to be installed at this stage. When/if the sports pitch is erected, consideration should be given to its location and potential mitigation if it proposed near to residents gardens.

It is also noted that the submitted report highlighted the need for the acoustically treated ventilation to be provided in habitable rooms, as WHO/BS8233 criteria can only be met with the windows closed. As such the need for ventilation should be conditioned.

The acoustic report also outlines that the care home development may have a number of fixed items of plant. The Council's standard condition for plant and machinery should therefore also be attached.

#### Air Quality

(Comments 12/11/2015 and 21/03/2016 following receipt of minor amendments/additional information) Recommend Refusal as insufficient information submitted in relation to air quality. In order to assess the application for air quality require clarification and updates on a number of matters.

5.38 **Flood Risk Management Officer:** Recommends approval subject to a condition regarding the submission and approval of the detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage for the site.

5.39 **Heritage:**

(Comments 2/11/2015) Recommends refusal. The site includes the Grade II Listed '76 High Street' and Grade II Listed associated flint wall to the front boundary. 76 High Street is the main school building. The listing includes all extensions attached to the original 76 High Street. This therefore includes the chapel, contrary to what is stated in the Heritage Statement (para 4.78).

Curtilage Listed Buildings include all pre-1948 structures and buildings within the curtilage and in associated use at the time of listing. This extends to structures on the playing field, given this was in the same ownership and associated use at the time of listing.

The Conservation Area includes the entirety of the camps site; such all buildings in this area form part of a designated asset.

The playing field is located to the east and divided from the campus by a Twitten. The playing field forms part of the setting of the Conservation Area. The Twitten itself is identified as an important permeation route in the Conservation Area.

A heritage statement and separate impact assessment have appropriately been included in the application. There are however some limitations to the submitted document: The heritage statement is not set-out in a legible manner; the text does not make reference to the room numbers and the room numbers themselves are repeated in a confusing manner. No phased plans or plans indicating the significance or historic integrity of different spaces have been



submitted. Given the complexity of the building/building extensions, this would usefully be submitted.

The document makes limited reference to original historic documents, nor to the national/regional context as set out in Historic England Listed Selection Guides and other research, such that some statements appear unsupported. For example, para 4.75 states the chapel 'is understood to have been built in 1913', but it is unclear what evidence this date is based upon. Original sources should be referenced.

The significance of individual features/areas impacted by the scheme, and the level of impact on these individual features is not always identified.

Whilst retention of the main building as a single unit would be most appropriate, its sympathetic conversion to flats is accepted in principle. The proposed conversion requires amendment in order to preserve and better reveal the plan form, and to retain the proportions in particular of the principal rooms.

Further information is required in order to fully assess the acceptability of demolishing the northern block and associated extensions. It is considered likely that a portion of this should be retained. In any event, the proposed replacement block is of overly high status, such that it competes with the status of the main building and obscures the historic record.

The proposed retention of the listed Chapel (and should be repaired as part of the application) although there is concern that no future use for the chapel has yet been identified.

The proposed conversion of the curtilage listed cottages and new development to the campus site is considered acceptable in principle, subject to amendments. The site should reflect the character of 'backland development' in the area, and the courtyard character of the site.

No contextual view has been provided of the site from Beacon Hill. This is important in assessing the acceptability of the design of the new development, and in considering the scale of impact of the proposed development on the playing field. The green space of the playing field is an important part of the setting of the conservation area. It forms part of a green buffer (as identified in the conservation area character statement) which provides a visual separation between development associated with the historic village and surrounding 'suburban' development. Development on the field harms the setting of the conservation area, and is therefore unacceptable in principle in heritage terms.

(Comments 24/03/2016 following receipt of further information/minor amendments)

Wall to Steyning Road: Demolition of a section of a wall could be accepted as part of a scheme which is considered acceptable overall, on the grounds that this demolition is limited to the minimum required to achieve safe access to the site and thus achieve a viable re-use of the heritage assets on the site. Sympathetic

re-use of the site and its listed buildings could outweigh the less than substantial harm caused through demolition of a section of the wall.

It remains that the exact location of the entrance could be slightly adjusted (whilst retaining the same level of demolition) if necessary to accommodate an appropriate scheme, given that the size of the proposed opening is greater than the size of the existing opening. However, there is no in principle objection to the proposed location of this opening.

View from Beacon Hill: A contextual view has been submitted showing the view from Beacon Hill. It is unclear whether this is a verified view or not. Nevertheless, the submitted image of the existing view shows the significance of the existing space in providing a visual separation between development associated with the historic village and the 'suburban' development to the east which was developed without reference to the historic character and layout of the historic village. The significance of this portion of green buffer is clearly identified within the Rottingdean Conservation Area Character Statement.

Overall the harm caused to the setting of the Conservation Area is significant. In terms of the NPPF, the level of harm is considered to be at the upper extent of 'less than substantial harm'.

The proposed development on the playing fields causes harm to the setting of the conservation area, in addition to the harm caused to the listed (and curtilage listed) buildings. This further compounds the level of harm caused by the scheme as a whole. Development on the playing fields thus causes further disparity between the level of harm caused and the identified heritage benefits. It therefore follows that the heritage objection to the principle of development on the playing field remains.

Notwithstanding the above in principle objection, the contextual view also supports previous concerns regarding the massing of the proposed care home. The unbroken ridgeline and roofscape to this element contrasts with the small scale urban form of the historic village. It dominates over the form of the listed school, itself a large building in the conservation area. It would be appropriate for the massing of the building and its roof form to be broken down into smaller elements in order to reflect the character of the area.

**Housing Strategy:**

(Original comments 12/10/2015) The City-wide Housing Strategy has as Priority 1: Improving Housing Supply, with a commitment to prioritise support for new housing development that delivers a housing mix the city needs with a particular emphasis on family homes for Affordable Rent.

Scheme currently proposes to provide 48 residential units plus a 62 bedspace residential care facility to be run by private provider Porthaven. No affordable housing is currently offered on the site with the claim being that this would make the scheme unviable.

This is not accepted by housing. The required housing contribution should be provided in accordance with the council's affordable Housing brief and would equate to 19 units in line with our Housing Strategy 2015 and identified need our required tenure mix (as published in the Affordable Housing Brief) is 55% rented and 45% shared ownership. This would equate to 10 units rented and 9 shared ownership.

10% of the affordable housing is required to be wheelchair accessible (and 5% of all units in the scheme). For the affordable housing this equates to 2 units. Given our preferred tenure mix and experience of registered provider partners marketing wheelchair accessible shared ownership on other schemes, wheelchair accessible homes for Affordable Rent would be our preferred option as wheelchair accessible shared ownership has often proved unaffordable for local people. The scheme proposal does not appear to mention wheelchair housing.

The proposed space standards of the units fall within the acceptable space standards as outlined in the new nationally described space standards.

(Additional comments 7/3/2016 following receipt of further information/minor amendments) The provision of no affordable housing units due to viability is now challenged by an independent viability report provided by the DVS which confirms that a scheme with the required 40% affordable included would be viable.

Provision of zero affordable housing at this significant development is not accepted by housing. The required housing contribution should be provided in accordance with the Council's affordable Housing brief and would equate to 20 units in line with Council Housing Strategy 2015 and identified need required tenure mix (as published in the Affordable Housing Brief) is 55% rented and 45% shared ownership. This would equate to 11 units rented and 9 shared ownership.

**5.40 Planning Policy:**

(Comments 12/10/2015) Recommends refusal. The application needs to be to be considered against paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

The loss of a third of the playing field, including two tennis courts, raises a significant concern and weighs against the proposal. However this needs to be considered against the benefits arising from the transfer of the remainder of the playing field to public ownership, therefore improving the accessibility of this asset to the local community. Sufficient developer contributions should be secured through a S106 agreement to facilitate the maintenance of the playing field by City Parks for a period of 25 years.

The City has a significant unmet housing requirement. The development will make a welcome contribution towards the provision of new homes, with the residential redevelopment of the site supported in the recently adopted Planning Brief. This weighs in favour of the proposal. However, the proposal does not comply with policy due to the absence of an appropriate level of affordable housing provision. Additionally, only 10 dwellings are provided on the partially developed playing field at a relatively low density. Both of these factors weigh significantly against the proposal. This will need to be considered against the

findings of the District Valuer's Report in terms of the viability evidence submitted by the applicant.

In the context of paragraph 14 of the NPPF, provision of a private nursing home on the site is not considered a benefit that outweighs the partial loss of playing field and is considered unacceptable when considered against the policies in the Framework and Local Plan and emerging City Plan.

The ready reckoner gives a figure of £254, 936 for Open Space and Indoor Sport (£40,768 of which is indoor sport).

(1/02/2016 Revised Open Space Contribution) It is reasonable to negotiate the open space contribution figure to be commensurate with the net proposed residential provision (removed 1 x 4 bed unit, 1 x 2 bed unit and 1 x bedsit unit). Revised open space contribution figure is £245,704.58.

(Comments 16/03/2016 following receipt of further information/minor amendments) Recommends Refusal. In terms of the issue of loss of open space/playing field the application should be assessed against City Plan Policy CP16. The proposal is not considered to strictly meet any of the criteria and involves the loss of approximately one third of the existing school playing field. However this loss, and the implications for provision for sports facilities in the context of the historical public access which was restricted, needs to be weighed up against the proposal of the scheme to transfer the remaining part of the playing field into public ownership. This would achieve more effective use of the remaining open space in line with the aims part 1 of Policy CP16. This approach aligns with guidance in paragraph 74 of the NPPF.

In addition the applicant makes the case in the Planning Statement that development on part of the playing field is necessary to enable a viable scheme to bring forward the whole site for development. This assertion has been confirmed by the District Valuer's, therefore an exception to the policy to allow the partial redevelopment, in principle, of the field can be allowed in this instance in order to realise the wider benefits of the scheme.

One of the benefits of the scheme is the proposed development of 48 dwellings which would contribute to the city's housing target. A residential use is supported, in principle, by the Planning Brief for the site and the SHLAA. This represents a significant benefit of the scheme against the City's shortfall in meeting housing requirements. However, by far the majority of the residential units are provided on the campus part of the site and only 10 dwellings on the playing field at a density of approximately 26 dph. The gain of only 10 dwellings at a low density is not considered a significant benefit when weighed against the loss of 0.4ha of playing field.

The overall benefit of housing provision on the site and playing field is further diminished by the lack of affordable housing proposed in the scheme (normally 40 per cent of new residential units should be affordable in accordance with Policy CP20). The District Valuer's Report concludes that provision of affordable housing as part of the scheme on the basis of 40% overall provision (55%

Affordable Rent, 45% Shared Ownership) would be a viable proposition. The lack of any affordable housing provision is therefore considered to be unacceptable and contrary to city Plan Policy CP20.

It is understood that the City has sufficient private nursing home bed places, however there may be a specific need for dementia care and this should be clarified with Adult Social Care. It is acknowledged there is a shortfall in nursing home places that the Council and Health are able to afford to purchase using the set rates for those who receive public funding, however addressing this need this does not appear to be part of the nursing home proposal. Unless confirmation is received from Adult Social Care that the facility would meet a clear need in the city, the use of the land for this purpose is not an efficient use of the site in the context of the city's agreed housing target, and as such is contrary to part A (b) of City Plan Policy CP1.

The principle of loss of the private school was carefully considered in the Planning Brief for the site. It is considered acceptable when assessed against Policy HO20 in the Local Plan balanced against the need for housing in the city, and subject to the retention of a community facility on the site. It is considered that the retention of the chapel for future community use, secured as part of a S106 legal agreement, would satisfactorily offset the loss of the school and justify an exception to Policy HO20.

The other elements of the scheme on the former school campus are considered acceptable subject to the provision of 40 percent affordable housing; retention of a community facility as part of the scheme; the retention and maintenance of the playing field for public use; and subject to mitigation of the impact of car travel on air quality.

5.41 **Public Art Officer:** Comment. To make sure the requirements of local planning policy are met at implementation stage, it is recommended that an 'artistic component' schedule, to the value of £44,000, be included in the S106 agreement.

5.42 **Sustainability Officer:**  
(Comments 13/10/2015) Comment. Further information is requested as the scheme falls below expected standards.

(Comments 16/03/2016 following receipt of further information/minor amendments) Comment. Recommendation is to requests further information or apply suggested conditions to ensure development complies with policy CP8.

5.43 **Sustainable Transport Officer:**  
(Comments 27/10/2015 and 22/03/2016 following receipt of further information/minor amendments) Comments. The Highway Authority would not wish to restrict grant of consent subject to the applicant entering into the necessary S06 requirements and conditions regarding cycle parking, disabled parking, S278 standard highway works, pedestrian access, retention of parking areas and electric vehicle charging points.

Travel Plan

(Comments 24/10/2015)- The scheme of Travel Plan measures for the proposed residential element is welcome. The Initial Travel Plan for the care home use is generally acceptable for this stage of the submission, though a wider package of measures to include a one month bus saver ticket or cycle voucher for all new staff would be requested.

(Comments 30/03/2016 following receipt of further information/minor amendments) The implementation of the care home Travel Plan and scheme of residential Travel Plan measures should be secured by condition/S106 as appropriate.

**6 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- 6.1 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that “If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.”
- 6.2 The development plan is:
- City Plan Part One (adopted March 2016)
  - Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 (retained policies March 2016);
  - East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan (adopted February 2013);
  - East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Waste Local Plan (February 2006); Saved Policies WLP 7 and WLP8 only – site allocations at Sackville Coalyard and Hangleton Bottom and Hollingdean Depot.
- 6.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration.
- 6.4 Due weight should be given to the relevant retained policies in the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.
- 6.5 All material considerations and any policy conflicts are identified in the “Considerations and Assessment” section of the report.

**7 RELEVANT POLICIES & GUIDANCE**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One

SS1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
CP1	Housing delivery
CP5	Culture and Tourism
CP7	Infrastructure and Developer Contributions
CP8	Sustainable Buildings
CP9	Sustainable Transport
CP10	Biodiversity
CP11	Flood Risk
CP12	Urban Design
CP13	Public Streets and Spaces

## PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

CP14	Housing density
CP15	Heritage
CP16	Open space
CP17	Sports provision
CP18	Health City
CP19	Housing Mix
CP20	Affordable Housing

### Brighton & Hove Local Plan:

TR4	Travel Plans
TR7	Safe development
TR11	Safe routes to school and school safety zones
TR12	Helping the independent movement of children
TR14	Cycle access and parking
TR18	Parking for people with a mobility related disability
SU5	Surface water and foul sewage disposal infrastructure
SU9	Pollution and nuisance control
SU10	Noise nuisance
SU11	Polluted land and buildings
QD5	Design – street frontages
QD14	Extensions and alterations
QD15	Landscape design
QD16	Trees and hedgerows
QD18	Species protection
QD25	External lighting
QD26	Floodlighting
QD27	Protection of amenity
HO5	Provision of private amenity space in residential development
HO11	Residential care and nursing homes
HO13	Accessible housing and lifetime homes
HO20	Retention of community facilities
HE1	Listed Buildings
HE2	Demolition of a listed building
HE3	Development affecting the setting of a Listed Building
HE4	Reinstatement of original features on listed buildings
HE6	Development within or affecting the setting of conservation areas
HE8	Demolition in Conservation Areas

### Supplementary Planning Guidance:

SPGBH4	Parking Standards
SPGBH9	A guide for Residential Developers on the provision of recreational space

### Supplementary Planning Documents:

SPD03	Construction & Demolition Waste
SPD06	Trees & Development Sites
SPD09	Architectural Features
SPD11	Nature Conservation & Development

### St Aubyns School Site Planning Brief January 2015

Rottingdean Conservation Area Character Statement

**8 CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT**

8.1 The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to the principle of the proposed development, the impacts of the proposed development on the visual amenities of the site and surrounding area, (including the Rottingdean Conservation Area and its setting), the impacts upon the Listed Buildings located within the site and their setting and financial viability. The proposed access arrangements and related traffic implications, air quality, impacts upon amenity of neighbouring properties, standard of accommodation, ecology, and sustainability impacts must also be assessed.

**Planning Brief**

8.2 A Planning Brief for the site was prepared to guide the future redevelopment of the former school site following the closure of the school in April 2013. Planning Briefs do not form part of the Local Development Framework and so cannot be given full statutory weight however the guidance within the brief has been subject to public consultation and was approved by the Council's Economic Development and Cultural Committee, as a material consideration in the assessment of subsequent planning applications relating to the site, on the 15<sup>th</sup> January 2015.

8.3 The brief was prepared by the Council in partnership with Rottingdean Parish Council and with the engagement of the landowner, the Cothill Educational Trust (applicant of this application). The Rottingdean Parish Council are currently undertaking the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan and were keen to see a planning brief produced which would guide the future development of this strategically important site within the Parish.

8.4 The purpose of the brief is to provide a planning framework that helps bring forward a sensitive redevelopment on the site that achieves the following objectives;

- Making efficient use of the land and bringing forward a viable and deliverable scheme,
- Securing the re-use and ongoing maintenance of the Listed Building,
- Preserve the Listed Building and preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Rottingdean Conservation Area and their respective settings; and
- Maximising the use of the existing playing fields for open space and public recreation.

8.5 The planning brief sets out that a Built Heritage Assessment would be required for the site in its entirety which should outline the historic development of the site before identifying the special interest and significance of the site as a whole and of its constituent parts. Such assessment should inform the development of proposals for the site and dependent on the level of change proposed, a historic building record may also be required ahead of any redevelopment of the site.



The brief states that subject to the findings of the Built Heritage Assessment development proposals should have regard to;

- The Grade II listed main building (including Chapel), listed boundary wall and the curtilage Listed Buildings should in principle be repaired and retained. Strong justification would be required for the loss of the whole or any part of a listed or curtilage Listed Building, based on the findings of the Built Heritage Assessment,
- The green space adjacent to the Chapel (including Mulberry tree) and croquet lawn should be retained as part of any redevelopment,
- The 'courtyard' character should be preserved and enhanced,
- Surviving historic external and internal features to the main building should be retained. The building should remain as a single unit however there may be potential for subdivision to provide a viable scheme. This would need strong justification and as far as possible be sympathetic to the original plan form and circulation routes,
- The continued role of the existing playing fields as an open green space, acting as a buffer between the historic village and surrounding suburban development,
- Any new proposed development will need to be sensitively designed, of an appropriate scale and massing and the visual impact will need to be minimised. Development should remain deferential to the main Listed Building, and
- For parts of the site where development may be considered acceptable, it is likely that 2 storeys with attic would be an acceptable maximum height, dependent on design and topography.

8.6 Part 9 of the Planning Brief sets out the site constraints and opportunities for development. The brief states that developers should ensure proposals respond positively to the design challenges and ensure that their approach to the redevelopment of the site is design-led.

8.7 The Planning Brief acknowledges the requirements of the NPPF with regards to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the protection and enhancement of the historic environment and to provide sufficient housing to meet the needs of present and future generations. The brief states that the principle of residential use of the site within a scheme that acknowledges and respects the significance of the heritage assets present in and around the whole site as well as the presence of the playing field would, therefore be acceptable. In this respect the core aspects of any residential proposal would be expected to meet the following objectives;

- The reuse and retention of St Aubyns Listed school and curtilage listed cottages;
- Sympathetic new development of the remainder of the campus site as defined in the brief; and
- Development which takes account of the strategic views across the playing field.

The document states that it is important that the requirements of the Brief are realistic and deliverable however this should not be to the detriment of heritage assets and as such developers are required to provide clear and convincing justification for any harm caused to heritage assets as a result of putting forward a viable scheme. In these circumstances, the Local Planning Authority needs to assess whether the benefits arising from the proposed development outweigh the harm caused to heritage assets and/or the departure from policy.

### **City Plan**

- 8.8 The City Plan Part 1 Inspector's Report was received February 2016. This supports a housing provision target of 13,200 new homes for the city to 2030. It is against this housing requirement that the five year housing land supply position is assessed following the adoption of the Plan on the 24<sup>th</sup> March 2016. The City Plan Inspector indicates support for the Council's approach to assessing the 5 year housing land supply and has found the Plan sound in this respect. The five year housing land supply position will be updated on an annual basis.

### **Loss of School/Policy HO20**

- 8.9 Policy HO29 relates to the retention of community facilities, including schools unless one of four exceptions for their loss applies.
- 8.10 As set out above the Planning Brief for the site was prepared following the closure of the school in 2013. The principle of the loss of the private school (use class C2) was carefully considered and accepted in the Brief and as such the Brief does not necessarily seek the retention of educational facilities at the site.
- 8.11 Within the submitted Planning Statement it is stated that the proposed care home would "provide an alternative community facility that would also offset the loss of the previous school use and in itself provide a valuable facility for the community". However it is not considered that a privately operated care home can be considered as a community facility against criteria d of policy HO20.
- 8.12 Within the submitted Planning Statement it is also stated that "the proposals also involve the retention of The Chapel [Grade II listed] with discussions ongoing with local groups in respect to the potential future use and maintenance of the building." It is considered that the retention of the Chapel for a community use would satisfactorily offset the loss of the school and justify an exception to Policy HO20 however as set out below no future use of the Chapel is set out as part of the proposal.
- 8.13 Whilst the proposed care home and retention of the existing Chapel are not considered to provide other types of community facilities in terms of policy HO20 due to the adoption of the Planning Brief it is considered that the former school is no longer required, in accordance with criteria d of policy HO20.

### **Viability**

- 8.14 Housing affordability is a major issue for many residents within the City. Policy CP20 of the City plan relates to affordable housing on windfall sites and states that on sites providing 15 or more (net) dwellings (including conversions/changes

of use) 40% onsite affordable housing provision is required. No affordable housing provision is proposed as part of the application.

- 8.15 As part of the application a viability report was submitted in which it is stated that neither schemes assessed (school campus with part of the playing field and school campus only) would viably sustain any affordable housing provision.
- 8.16 The applicant's report was referred to the District Valuer (DV) for an independent assessment with regards to whether any on-site affordable housing provision could be provided as part of a viable scheme and whether a scheme without development on the southern part of the playing field would be viable (such assessment took into account the required maintenance fund for the retained playing field and S106 contributions).
- 8.17 The DV did not concur with the applicant's viability report and concluded that a development of the school campus site and a portion of the playing field would be viable with the inclusion of 40% affordable housing (equating to 20 units, of which 11 are affordable rent and 9 shared ownership). A scheme with 40% affordable housing provision was also considered viable even when taking into account the provision of the required retained playing field maintenance fund and S106 contributions set out later in this report (including a contribution towards open space which is no longer sought for reasons set out below). As such the applicant has failed to justify an exception to policy CP20.
- 8.18 It is acknowledged that the DV assessment also concluded that a scheme with no development in the playing fields and all private units (i.e. no affordable housing units) on the campus part of the site would not be viable.

**Design/Layout/Visual Amenities/Heritage**

- 8.19 City Plan policy CP12 relates to Urban Design and sets out the general strategic design criteria expected of new development whilst policies HE1, HE2, HE3, HE6 and HE8 of the Local plan and policy CP15 of the City Plan relate to Heritage issues.
- 8.20 The school building is of particular significance due to its formal façade, which faces onto and is clearly visible from the High Street and views along Park Road to the west. Despite the school building being built over time, the near symmetry and formal architectural style, alongside the size and scale of the building, denotes its status, which is particularly evident in relation to the scale and predominantly vernacular style neighbouring properties. The main school building is set back from the main High Street building line which further strengthens the contrast with neighbouring properties and therefore its relative higher status. This difference contributes to the understanding of the building and the character of the Conservation Area.
- 8.21 As set out above the campus part of the school site is located within the Rottingdean Conservation Area and therefore all buildings within the campus area form part of a designated asset. The enclosed 'courtyard' character of the campus site is akin to that seen in Kipling Gardens on the green.

- 8.22 The Rottingdean Conservation Area Character Statement evaluates the location, setting and history of the village in which the site is located within. Within this document the school campus part of the development site is identified as being within The High Street distinct character area (stated to be the commercial heart of the village). The High Street area of the Conservation Area comprises buildings with varying architectural style and detailing, which emphasises the area's long history and piecemeal development.
- 8.23 The school playing field, whilst not within the Conservation Area, is considered to be of particular importance as part of the setting of the Conservation Area. It provides an important reminder of the once rural setting of the village, and a distinction between the historic village and surrounding development. This is a distinction between development that responds to the grain and form of the historic village and development that has been laid out without reference to this, rather than an arbitrary division based only on date of construction. Although the current form and shape of the green space are not historic, it is the open, green character which is of particular importance. This is evident in strategic views V1a and particularly V1c as set out in the associated Character Statement. The space is identified in its entirety as part of the green buffer surrounding the Conservation Area within the Character Statement.
- 8.24 The predominant building height in the area is two to three storeys, it is however noted that St Aubyns Mead flats are 4 storeys in height whilst properties adjacent to the Marine Drive access point are 3 storeys in height. The associated site Planning Brief states that the height of proposed new development must not exceed the indicative heights shown in the document, being a maximum of 2 to 3 storeys on the southern and northern side of the school campus and a maximum of 2 storey in the centre of the school campus site (the brief does not discuss development of the playing field in terms of site constraints and opportunities). The brief also states that development must be lower to the immediate east of the Listed Building to protect the relationship between the main building, its immediate curtilage and the playing field. It must also ensure that developments respond to the significant changes in level from west to east across the site.
- 8.25 The majority of the proposed development would comprise of two storeys however the proposed new building to be located either side of the proposed Steyning Road access point (Plots 3 and 4) would comprise two and half storeys as would the western part of the proposed care home. As such it is considered the proposed development heights accords with the Planning Brief.
- 8.26 The proposed development would incorporate a palette of materials including brick, tile hanging, white painted windows, flint, clay/slate tiles and render and features such as bay windows, chimneys and porches.
- 8.27 The impacts of specific elements of the proposal on visual amenities/heritage are discussed in more detail below;

Proposed Development on School Campus Site

- 8.28 It is noted that a number of contextual views have been submitted as part of the application including the later submission of a contextual view from Beacon Hill (view 1c in the associated Conservation Area Character Statement).
- 8.29 The school campus proposed development layout would be focused around a series of courtyards with housing facing these areas. It is considered that the layout of the new roads and buildings within the campus site should reflect the urban grain and character of the development in Rottingdean village and should seek to preserve and better reveal the courtyard/enclosed character of the existing site. Backland development in Rottingdean is generally characterised by a strong sense of linearity, strong building lines and small scale 'humble' vernacular buildings. As such it is considered that the linearity of the roads should be strengthened. It is noted that such alteration may require the entrance from Steyning Road to be realigned (which is discussed in more detail below).
- 8.30 The surface treatment of the proposed roads, pavements and the angle to the corners should reflect the character of area and as such the proposed Tegula permeable paving is considered inappropriate.
- 8.31 It is noted that the Council's Heritage Officer states that care should be taken to ensure that car parking with the development does not dominate the proposed streetscapes and that either more discreet locations for car parking should be sought or the amount of car parking should be reduced. The provision of parking within the site is discussed in more detail in the Transport section of this report.
- 8.32 The proposed new buildings would generally be of a vernacular revival style however it is considered that it would be appropriate for the proposed development to more accurately reflect the historic vernacular, rather than the vernacular revival. Although the proposed materials would all be local vernacular materials found in the area it is considered that the proposed designs display an untraditionally high level of variety. As such, it is considered that the palette of materials should be reduced. The level of detailing would also be appropriately modest. The eaves should not be boxed in (where these overhang) and openings should generally align between floors. Large expanses of blank wall should be avoided. Brick lintels above windows are appropriate, but should generally be segmental rather than flat. There should also be an adequate traditional brick/tile (or similar) sill detail.
- 8.33 Half-hipped roof forms are generally not a traditional feature of domestic architecture; being more normally employed within agricultural buildings.
- 8.34 The proposed porches on the new building dwellings would appear excessive in size. Any porches should reflect historic designs in the area and their size should be minimized and be no wider than the proposed door width.
- 8.35 The inclusion of chimneys and stepped roofs appropriately add interest and break-up the proposed roofscape.
- 8.36 It is considered that all elevations should be given appropriate consideration; particularly where 'rear' or 'side' elevations front on to public spaces including the Twitten. Secondary elevations may also be visible in longer views of the site.

- 8.37 It is considered that the proposed houses flanking the Steyning Road entrance would be over-dominant in the street scene, giving the impression of a 'major gateway' or similar. The scale of the proposed gable roof forms in particular of units 3 and 5 and the proposed hipped roof forms to units 6 and 7 should be reduced.
- 8.38 The proposed flat-roofed dormers to unit 5 are positioned in an untraditional manner; it is considered that they should either be set lower (such that the window breaks the eaves line) or a more traditional dormer approach may be appropriate (set higher within the roof slope). There should be more regularity to the opening sizes and proportions to this unit. Chimney stacks may appropriately be added. The car port below unit 5 should more appropriately include vertically boarded doors, to provide a sense of solidity and 'mews' appearance to the building.
- 8.39 In heritage terms it is considered that the proposed freestanding car port to be located to the east of the converted Cottages should be omitted from the proposal.
- 8.40 Proposed units 8 to 23 generally would have an appropriately strong sense of linearity and building line however the front boundaries to these proposed dwellings should be altered to form a solid boundary between public and private lane.
- 8.41 The design of proposed units 17 and 18 should be reconsidered in light of traditional designs within the village.
- 8.42 With regards to proposed new builds 19 to 23, although the inclusion as a gable end fronting the street is considered an acceptable approach, the proposed junction between it and the ridgeline in units would be awkward. It is noted that the proposed rear elevation is incorrectly labelled as 'south'.
- 8.43 From the plans submitted it is unclear how the existing change in level across the campus part of the site would be addressed, particularly to the rear of the main school building, and whether it is proposed to retain the existing terracing in this location. Further plans showing sections across the site particularly at the rear of Field House were requested but have not been submitted. The existing terracing, although the actual design is unlikely to be particularly historic, provides a clear distinction between the 'formal' grounds immediately behind the house which form its immediate setting, and the wider grounds and setting of the house. The distinct level change, steps and trees were in place by at least 1926. A distinction in this location would therefore appropriately be retained. An appropriate level of tree planting would also improve the setting of the Listed Building. Given the sensitivity of the setting of the Listed Building in this location, it would be appropriate for a contextual view to be submitted showing the view from the proposed rear entrance of the main building towards the east and larger scale details of the treatment of the terracing/level change (i.e. a section through here).
- 8.44 It is considered the layout of the proposed school campus development could be adjusted to retain the existing entrances onto the Twitten. As well as retaining an historic opening in use, this would also allow for greater access onto the Twitten and help improve its sense of security.

Impact on Listed Buildings/Curtilage Listed Buildings

- 8.45 The listing for the school includes all extensions attached to the original 76 High Street (including the chapel contrary to what is stated in the submitted Heritage Statement).
- 8.46 The campus site forms an important part of the setting of the Listed Field House whilst the playing field also lies within the setting of this Listed Building. In addition the curtilage listed sports pavilion and drinking fountain are important features on the school playing field and identify the intended use of the space. The curtilage listed war memorial, which is also located on the playing field, is linked to the commemorative significance of the Chapel described in this report. The memorial also commemorates those 'old boys' who dies in the War.
- 8.47 It is noted that the sports pavilion (which is stated to be refurbished as part of the proposal), drinking fountain and war memorial would be retained, which is considered appropriate. Repairs to these retained structures should be made as part of the proposed scheme. Any works other than minimal like for like repair would however also require Listed Building consent.

Demolition of Listed Buildings/Structures

- 8.48 Two Listed Building consent applications have also been submitted concurrent to this application with regards to the demolition of existing buildings/ structures across the site and the conversion and refurbishment of the Grade II Field House and curtilage Listed Buildings.
- 8.49 The post-1948 buildings located on site are proposed to be demolished as part of the proposal, which is considered acceptable in principle.
- 8.50 The main school building, northern block and extensions are of significance in revealing the development of the property over time, changes in education and the changing needs of school buildings over time. This includes the contrast between the balanced extensions to those areas in public view and the more ad hoc development to the north/north-east. The previous development of the building is particularly apparent in the varied architecture and roof forms of the northern extensions, and in the varied date/style of features that survive to some rooms. In particular, the buildings appear to have been much altered and extended in the early 20th century. This reveals much about the history of the school at this time (which expanded from 5 pupils at its foundation in 1895 to over 100 in the early 20th century), and should be viewed in the wider context of changes in education at this time.
- 8.51 Whilst a Heritage Statement and separate impact assessment have been submitted as part of the application it is considered that there are some limitations to these submitted documents. The submitted heritage statement provides a limited analysis of the historic phasing of the northern block of Field House and the associated extensions and the significance of the individual parts. The narrative provided is not cross-referenced to the room numbering or photographs, and no plans are provided as part of the submission to accurately indicate the phasing or significance of constituent parts. It is acknowledged that the buildings

have been extended/alterd in an ad hoc manner, and present little coherent form to the interior nor exterior. They are nevertheless significant in what they reveal about the development of the site, the changing needs and requirements of its educational use and in indicating the site's major expansion in the early 20th century. Parts of the complex date to the Regency period, and are of further significance due to the age of the fabric, and particularly where features such as cornicing and the Regency-style fireplace survive. Further analysis is required as to the phasing of the structures and their relative significance; these should be shown on plans to provide clarity and greater accuracy to the submitted narrative.

- 8.52 Notwithstanding that stated above, it is considered likely that at least some sections are of greater than 'low' significance and are thus of sufficient significance to warrant retention as part of the proposal. This should be determined through further in depth analysis as indicated previously but is likely to include at least the two sections of the northern block with hipped roofs and unpainted render elevations (ground floor rooms A and K) if not a greater extent. These sections in particular also contribute more greatly to the setting of the main building as viewed from the rear and from Beacon Hill.
- 8.53 Based on the information submitted it is considered that the submission fails to justify the demolition of the block and associated extensions to the north of Field House. Without sufficient information to allow a full assessment it is considered that a portion of the northern block of Field House and the associated extensions should be retained and that the proposed demolition would result in the loss of an important historic building.
- 8.54 The V-shaped buildings located to the north-east of the main school building are a curtilage listed structure. The flint walls of this building contribute to the character of the site. However, these buildings have been heavily altered, the spaces themselves are of limited interest and do not reflect an educational use and they have minimal relationship with the main school building. It is also acknowledged that their location and size/shape would make their retention and re-use difficult. There is therefore no objection to their loss as part of an acceptable scheme.
- 8.55 The shooting range building, which is located in the southern section of the site, is an early 20<sup>th</sup> century structure which is considered to be curtilage listed. The heritage statement and impact assessment should include consideration of this structure. This should establish whether the building was constructed as a shooting range and place it within the context of similar structures of this date.
- 8.56 Due to the lack of information provided as part of the application the Local Planning Authority is unable to assess the significance of the loss of the curtilage listed shooting range building.

External Alterations to Field House/Cottages/Rumneys

- 8.57 A number of internal and external works/alterations are proposed in association with the conversion of Field House into 6 residential units and the Cottages/Rumneys into 4 residential units. Whilst these proposed external alterations are discussed in concurrent Listed Building consent application



BH2015/03110, the proposed external works also need to be assessed within this application.

- 8.58 Field House, the main school building, is of significance as an early large-scale residence in the village and due to its early use as a school. In this regard, the plan form (which remain evident despite alterations) and surviving historic features are of significance.
- 8.59 Historic photographs support that the rear elevation of Field House was not historically symmetrical. The proposed external alterations to the Listed Building seek to introduce a level of regularity and symmetry which thus has no historic precedent. The subtle differences and irregularity of the existing rear elevation reveal much about the development of the building. This is significant in understanding the history of the building and should be preserved. Furthermore, the proposed alterations to the rear elevation are considered inappropriate where they would reflect inappropriate alterations to the interior of the building as subject of concurrent application BH2015/03110.
- 8.60 In principle, all historic window openings should be retained. Some existing windows have been altered to UPVC, however it is unclear whether these have consent. These existing UPVC windows should be replaced as part of the works to timber hung sashes to match the originals. Historic windows should be retained, unless it can be established that these are beyond repair. It would be appropriate for an inventory of windows to be submitted, including a photograph of the existing as well as the proposed design (where relevant).
- 8.61 As part of the proposed conversion of Field House a lift would be installed between ground and second floor levels. The associated lift shaft would break through the roof form of Field House. This would present an unacceptable impact on the historic fabric of the historic roof, and to its historic form and as such the proposed lift shaft is considered unacceptable.
- 8.62 The proposal includes an extension to the second floor level of Field House, northwards over the north wing. The existing north wing appears to retain its original roof form, a large section of which would be removed by this proposal (only a very small portion was impacted by the addition of the 1980s stair). This proposed roof extension would also be clearly visible from the front elevation, where it would join the mansard-style roof to the main building with the north wing, impacting on the juxtaposition and visual break between the two historic roof forms. The resultant roof form would also not be traditional. It is acknowledged that the south wing of the building provides some precedent for such an alteration to the roof; however it is considered that such a precedent is not sufficient to outweigh the visual and physical harm that would be caused by the proposal.
- 8.63 The proposal includes the insertion of new conservation style rooflights within the existing and altered rear/northern roofslope of the building. It is considered that the number of proposed new rooflights should be reduced to a minimum and the existing rooflight should be amended to a conservation style rooflight of appropriate proportions.
- 8.64 Removal of the modern garage building to the front of the main school building is considered appropriate as this structure currently detracts from the principal frontage of the building.

- 8.65 The retention of the curtilage Listed Cottages and Rumneys within the re-development of the school site is considered appropriate. However it is considered that some of the proposed external alterations, namely the proposed alterations to existing window/glazed door openings and the insertion of additional porches would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of these Grade II curtilage Listed Buildings.

Alterations to Boundary Flint Walls

Wall to Swimming Pool

- 8.66 The proposal includes the demolition of the existing flint wall located to the north of the swimming pool, in order to accommodate proposed plots 17 and 18. The loss of this wall would cause some harm to the subdivided/enclosed courtyard character of the site. The harm caused by such demolition of the wall would be considered in balance as part of an acceptable scheme as a whole. Its removal could also be appropriately mitigated through the inclusion of further flint walls/a sense of enclosure as part of the proposed re-development of the school campus site.

Steyning Road

- 8.67 The site currently has two existing driveway access points accessed off Steyning Road, one to the western end of the wall and one towards the centre, associated with the existing buildings known as Rumneys and The Lodge (Headmaster's House). Within the associated Planning Brief it is stated that Steyning Road is the preferred access point to the site and would allow for a two vehicle width ingress and egress, if the headmaster's house was demolished. The Brief however does also state that "Any proposed demolition of the flint boundary wall should be kept to an absolute minimum".
- 8.68 As part of the proposal the existing access point located towards the centre of the Steyning Road flint wall would be enlarged to provide a two way vehicular access point into the site from Steyning Road in addition to a pedestrian footway on the western side of the road and associated visibility splays. Such proposed enlargement would result in the loss of a substantial amount of early 20<sup>th</sup> century wall. The existing wall is considered to be a significant element of the street scene in addition to creating a strong sense of boundary to the site.
- 8.69 Whilst the acceptability of this proposed access point in terms of highway issues is discussed in more detail in the Sustainable Transport section of this report it is noted that the Transport Officer has stated that it would not be possible to reduce the width of the proposed access to below 5m if it is intended that vehicles such as refuse trucks are to enter the site from this proposed Steyning Road access point.
- 8.70 In terms of Heritage impacts, following initial concerns raised by the Council's Heritage Officer, in that it was considered that the size of the proposed opening would give undue prominence to the new opening in the Steyning Road street scene, the agent has stated that the proposed new entrance from Steyning Road has been designed to limit the amount of curtilage listed wall required to be demolished. The Heritage Officer has responded to state that demolition of a

section of a wall could be accepted as part of an overall acceptable scheme to redevelop the school site, on the grounds that such demolition is limited to the minimum required to achieve safe access to the site and thus achieve a viable re-use of the heritage assets on the site. It is considered that as part of an overall acceptable scheme the sympathetic re-use of the site and its Listed Buildings could outweigh the less than substantial harm caused through demolition of a section of the Steyning Road historic boundary wall.

- 8.71 With regards to the strengthening of the linearity of the proposed new roads (discussed elsewhere in this report) the Heritage Officer remains of the opinion that the exact location of the proposed Steyning Road access point could be slightly adjusted (whilst retaining the same level of demolition) if necessary to accommodate an appropriate scheme, given that the size of the proposed opening is greater than the size of the existing opening. There is however no in principle objection to the proposed location of the opening.

Twitten Wall

- 8.72 The proposal includes alterations to the existing historic flint wall located on the western side of the public Twitten. Two existing openings within this flint wall would be in-filled and a new access point would be created, to provide access from the Twitten to an area between proposed plots nos. 16 and 17. It is considered that the existing openings in the flint wall should be retained in use where possible but where they are required to be lost to accommodate an overall acceptable proposal, evidence of the original openings should be retained. If an overall acceptable scheme was proposed further details of the proposed new openings would be required in addition to the retained walls retaining their current detailing and finish (including capping and any piers) to that the differing age of the different elements remains legible and to ensure that a uniformity is not imposed to the site where there has not been one before, which would obscure the historic record. Such issues could be dealt with via a condition if overall the proposal was considered acceptable.

Chapel

- 8.73 Given that the existing Chapel is attached to the main Listed Building, it is considered to form part of the listing of the school, despite what is stated within the applicant's submitted Heritage Statement. As such any alterations to the Chapel would require Listed Building consent.
- 8.74 The Chapel is of significance as a rare example of a small early 20<sup>th</sup> century school Chapel, focused on children and due to its intimate connection with the school (for example former pupils of the school are depicted in the stained glass windows of the Chapel). The function of the Chapel is evident from its exterior but it is its interior that is of particular character and charm. The Chapel is of commemorative value due to its use as a memorial chapel, including photographs, panels and stained glass commemorating the schools 'old boys' who died in the world wars, such as the son of Rudyard Kipling who lived in Rottingdean village and therefore brings a local significance.
- 8.75 The proposal shows the retention of the Chapel but following demolition of parts of Field House the Chapel would become separated from the retained main

'school' building. Within the submission little information has been provided regarding any works required to separate (and make good) the Chapel from the remainder of the building and whether this would have structural implications for the Chapel. Such works are likely to require Listed Building consent.

- 8.76 The Chapel is currently in a poor condition. It is considered that works to repair, improve and enhance the Chapel's condition should be included as part of the proposed development (if these works go beyond exact like for like repair Listed Building consent may be required).
- 8.77 The interior of the Chapel is of particular significance and should be preserved intact. It is considered important that a use for the retained Chapel building is found as part of the re-development of the school site, in order to ensure that it is persevered and has a viable and sustainable future (it is acknowledge that some uses would require change of use permission).
- 8.78 The Chapel building currently has a limited setting, of which the green space and Tree Protection Order trees are the primary elements. It is noted that the trees and green space would be preserved by the proposal, although its setting would be impacted by the inclusion of car parking in close proximity. Its direct association with the school would however be lost through severance of the physical link and the proposed new block between Field House and the Chapel.
- 8.79 It is considered that the legibility/accessibility of the Chapel from the new site building could be appropriately enhanced, dependent on the end-use of the building.
- 8.80 No details of what improvements/repairs/enhancements would be made to the Chapel as part of the re-development of the school site are provided as part of the submission and no future use has been identified. Overall it is considered that the applicant has failed to identify the Chapel's architectural importance as part of the Listed school building and fails to demonstrate that the proposal would result in the viable retention, protection and preservation of the listed Chapel and its historic fabric.

New Building (Plots 30-35)

- 8.81 Following the proposed demolition of the existing northern block and extension to Field House, set out above, the proposal comprises of the construction of a new 2 storey block to the north-east of the retained part of Field House, which would provide 6 new residential units.
- 8.82 In addition to the harm that would be caused by the loss of the northern block and extensions of Field House (discussed above) it is considered that the proposed replacement block, forming plots 30 to 35, would cause harm to the setting of the retained Listed Building. The architectural style of this proposed building would be overly grand for its location, at the rear of a Listed Building. In addition its scale, bulk and massing is considered to be excessive. Both the proposed architecture and size of this new build building would compete with the dominance and architectural/historic interest of the main building. As such this proposed building would obscure the historic development and hierarchy of buildings on the site.

Proposed Development on Playing Field

- 8.83 The proposal includes the construction of a new care home and 10 new dwellings (3 and 4 bedroom) in the southern part of the existing playing field, resulting in a development of approximately 0.8Ha of the former playing field.

Dwellings

- 8.84 The proposed new residential buildings would be 2 storeys in height and would have vehicular access provided from Newlands Road.
- 8.85 The proposed residential development on the former playing field would not present a traditional layout and would not reinforce the local character or urban grain of the area. In addition this element of the proposal would fail to successfully address the street, without a strong sense of public/private space or strong building lines.

Care Home

- 8.86 The proposed care home would be sited in the south-western corner of the former playing field and would be accessed via Newlands Road. The proposed care home would predominately be 2 storeys in height however the western section would utilise the east to west gradient of the site and comprise a lower ground floor resulting in this part of the building being almost 3 storeys.
- 8.87 The proposed care home would have a U-shaped main built form with pitched roofs connected by flat roof sections. A series of projecting sections with flat or pitched roof forms would be located along the main northern, western and southern elevations of the proposed building. The elevations would comprise a mix of brick (lower ground floor base), flint (projecting bays) and render (flank elevations) whilst the roof would comprise clay tiles. Brise soleils would also be installed on various elevations.
- 8.88 It is considered that the proposed care home would be excessive in scale, massing and footprint and would appear dominant in relation to the footprint of the main Listed Building, which itself is a relatively large building. The proposed care home would also be an incongruous feature in relation to the tight-knit urban grain of the Conservation Area and to the setting of the Listed Building.
- 8.89 The roof form of the proposed care home is considered to be of an untraditional design. The resulting bulk of the proposed building would not be broken down into lesser parts, and therefore would appear unduly prominent in views, particularly from Beacon Hill where it would be seen in direct relation to the Listed Building and Conservation Area. The submitted contextual view from Beacon Hill supports the concerns regarding the massing of the proposed care home. The unbroken ridgeline and roofscape would contrast with the small scale urban form of the historic village and would dominate over the form of the listed school, which is itself a large building in the Conservation Area. As such it is considered that the massing of the proposed care home and its roof form should be broken down into smaller elements in order to reflect the character of the area.

- 8.90 It is considered that the proposed use of traditional materials in a modern manner would result in an uncomfortable relationship between the different elements, such as the proposed different materials, the large size of openings and the proposed brise soleils.

Impacts on Views from Beacon Hill

- 8.91 Since submission of the application, in response to the Heritage Officer's original comments, a contextual view (it is unknown if this is a verified view or not) has been submitted to show the existing and proposed view from Beacon Hill (a strategic view as set out in the associated character statement, image V1c). Such contextual view is considered important in order to assess the acceptability of the design of the proposed development and in considering the scale of the impact of the proposed development on the playing field.
- 8.92 The submitted image of the existing playing field shows the significance of the existing space in providing a visual separation between development associated with the historic village and the 'suburban' development to the east, which was developed without reference to the historic character and layout of the historic village. The significance of this portion of green buffer is identified within the associated Character Statement.
- 8.93 The Council's Heritage Officer considers that the proposed development of the southern part of the playing field (approximately one third) would significantly affect the effectiveness of the existing 'green buffer' as there would no longer be a significant break between the two distinct areas, with the proposed new development joining up the existing built form. It is considered that the proposal would result in the amount of built form which would be joined up becoming dominant over those areas where a distinct gap currently remains. As such the proposal would result in the edge of the historic village becoming blurred, eroding the legibility of the Conservation Area and its historic development.
- 8.94 The height and amount of development on the school campus site also encroaches on to the visual break in development, as the proposed roofline breaks into the existing vegetation on the playing field boundary. The Heritage Officer has however acknowledged that the harm that would be caused by this element in isolation would be relatively minor, however it would have a cumulative impact alongside the more significant harm caused by the development on the playing field itself.
- 8.95 Furthermore the Heritage Officer considers that the identified strategic views across the playing field towards the listed Beacon Windmill, where the windmill can be viewed in its isolated downland setting, and the extent of the Conservation Area is viewed in relation to its green buffer would be affected by the proposal. Although no view has been submitted as part of the application showing the proposal from this direction, it is considered the proposed development on the playing field would reduce the extent of this view and thus cause harm to the setting of the Conservation Area and the relationship between the village and the listed windmill.

- 8.96 Overall it is considered that the harm that would be caused to the setting of the Conservation Area from the proposed development on the playing field would be significant. In terms of the NPPF, the level of harm is considered to be at the upper extent of 'less than substantial harm'.
- 8.97 In considering the acceptability of a development proposal, the NPPF states that harm at this level should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use. The NPPG defines optimum viable use (where a range of uses are possible), as the use likely to cause least harm to the significance of the assets. The public benefits of the proposal, weighed against the harm, are assessed at the end of this report.
- 8.98 For the reasons set out later it is considered that there is a disparity between the heritage benefits of the proposal and the harm that the proposed development on the playing field would have on the setting of the Conservation Area and to the Listed/curtilage Listed Buildings. An objection on heritage grounds to the principle of development on the playing field therefore remains.

**Residential Accommodation Provision/Density/Standard of Accommodation**

- 8.99 The City is subject to very significant constraints on the capacity of the City to physically accommodate new development. The City Plan was adopted in the 24<sup>th</sup> March 2016 and proposes a modified housing target for a minimum of 13,200 new homes to reflect the capacity and availability of land/sites in the City. This housing target means that the City is significantly short of being able to meet its own objectively assessed full housing requirement, which has been assessed to be 30,120 dwellings over the Plan period.
- 8.100 The provision of 48 dwelling units, via a mix of refurbishment/conversion of existing buildings and new build apartments/houses would make a welcome contribution to the City's housing requirements and to the five year supply of deliverable housing sites in accordance with CP1 of the City Plan Part One. A residential use is supported, in principle, by the Planning Brief for the site and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).
- 8.101 The issue regarding lack of affordable housing with regards to policy CP20 has already been discussed above.
- 8.102 The proposed housing mix would be as follows;
- 2 x 1 bedroom apartment (both new build)
  - 11 x 2 bedroom apartments (5 new build, 6 conversion),
  - 9 x 2 bedroom dwellings (6 new build, 3 conversion),
  - 22 X 3 bedroom dwellings (21 new build, 1 conversion), and
  - 4 x 4 bedroom dwellings (all new build).
- 8.103 Developments should provide a good housing mix and choice of housing type. The proposal comprises an overall mix of 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom properties which is considered to satisfy the requirements of policy CP19.
- 8.104 Policy CP14 relates to housing density and states that to make a full efficient use of the land available, new residential development will be expected to

PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

achieve a minimum net density of 50 dwellings per hectare. The density and quantity of housing proposed on the playing field (10 new build units) would equate to approximately 26 units per hectare, a density which is considered relatively low.

- 8.105 Policy CP14 allows for lower densities where it can be adequately demonstrated that the development would reflect the neighbourhood’s positive characteristics or would better contribute towards creating a sustainable neighbourhood. In order to meet the requirements of the policy, it is considered that a more efficient use could be made of the land and the housing should be of a higher density, taking into account potential heritage and amenity impacts. This would make a greater contribution towards the unmet housing requirements and make full use of the site in the context of CP14.

The proposed dwellings would provide the following size accommodation;

No. of Beds	1 Storey	2 Storey	Detail
1	50m <sup>2</sup>	-	ments
2	82.6 m <sup>2</sup>	61m <sup>2</sup> - 71 m <sup>2</sup>	hed Cottages
2		72.6 m <sup>2</sup>	Detached
2		79.4 m <sup>2</sup>	ce/End of Terrace
2	75m <sup>2</sup>		ments
2		73m <sup>2</sup> - 127m <sup>2</sup>	hed School Apartments
3		5.7m <sup>2</sup> -119.1m <sup>2</sup>	Detached/End of terrace
3		5.7m <sup>2</sup> - 96.9 m <sup>2</sup>	ce/Detached
4		04m <sup>2</sup> - 107 m <sup>2</sup>	hed

- 8.106 Whilst the Local Planning Authority does not have adopted space standards for comparative purposes the Government’s Technical Housing Standards – National Described Space Standards March 2015 document sets out recommended space standards for new dwellings. It is noted that some of the proposed converted units would have floor areas slightly below the standards set out in the national document referred to however overall it is considered that adequate accommodation would be provided throughout a majority of the proposed dwellings and as such refusal on this basis of some of the proposed converted units not meeting the standards is not considered warranted.

- 8.107 Policy HO13 requires all new residential units to be Lifetime Homes compliant, with 5% of all residential units in large scale schemes to be wheelchair accessible. It is not apparent from the submission which units would be able to provide wheelchair accessible units in compliance with policy HO13.

- 8.108 Policy HO13 requires all new residential dwellings to be built to Lifetime Homes standards whereby they can be adapted to meet people with disabilities without major structural alterations. The requirement to meet Lifetime Homes has now been superseded by the accessibility and wheelchair housing standards within the national Optional Technical Standards. Part 7 of the submitted Design and Access Statement refers to access within the site and states that level access



would be provided to a majority of the proposed new residential units however this is not reflected in the submitted elevational plans due to the presence of a step into the proposed entrances of the new build properties. The comments raised by the Council's Access Officer are also noted such as the lack of entrance level such accessible WCs and turning circles however it is considered that the issues raised could be addressed via amendments to the layout of the properties. Where step-free access to the proposed dwellings could be achieved, should permission be granted, a condition to ensure the development complies with Requirement M4(2) of the optional requirements in Part M of the Building Regulations would be required.

**8.109 Care Home Standard of Accommodation**

It is stated within the submission that the proposed 62 bed (single occupancy) care home would provide nursing care for residents with high dependency nursing needs as well as those living with dementia (it is stated that the proposal would include 31 beds on a dedicated dementia unit, although such specialist care is not indicated on the plans submitted).

8.110 Policy HO11 relates to the provision of new residential care/nursing homes and states that permission will be granted where it can be demonstrated that the proposal;

- a) Will not adversely affect the locality or neighbouring properties by way of noise or disturbance; or by way of size, bulk or overlooking,
- b) Provides adequate amenity space,
- c) Is accessible to people with disabilities; and
- d) Provides for operational parking in accordance with the Council's standards.

8.111 Criteria a, b and d are discussed elsewhere in this report. With regards to criterion c it is considered that the proposed care home layout and the facilities proposed (including a lift and bathrooms with hoist) would result in the proposed care home being accessible to people with disabilities.

8.112 Paragraphs 7 and 50 of the NPPF seek to ensure sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities are created and a mix of housing is provided to meet the needs of different groups in the community.

8.113 As part of the application a needs assessment for elderly care provision has been provided in support of the proposed care home provision. This submitted report concludes that, based on the assessed market catchment area, there would be a large shortfall of market standard bedspaces (207), assuming that all planned beds are developed, with a higher shortfall (367) if only considering only planned bed spaces under construction. With regards to the Local Planning Authority catchment area it is stated that the proposed supply is in equilibrium with demand when all planned beds are included however a shortfall of 132 bedspaces would exist when only planned beds under construction are included. The assessment also calculates that there will be a significant shortfall of beds providing specialist dementia care within dedicated environments for both market and local authority catchment areas (503 and 481 respectively). As such the applicant considers

that the proposed care home, which includes a dedicated dementia unit, would make a valuable contribution to meeting the bedspace shortfall in the assessed area.

- 8.114 In the context of the City's significant housing requirements, as set out in policy CP1, the need for additional care/nursing home places in the City on part of a playing field should be carefully considered. The Council's Adult Social Care Commissioning Manager has commented that as the proposal is for a private care/nursing home it would not meet the primary needs in the City in terms of Council/health funded places, however nursing/care homes for people with dementia are particularly needed in the City. If the care home did not meet a specialist care need in the City, the provision of a care home would not be considered an efficient use of the land in the context of the City's agreed housing target and Policy CP1.
- 8.115 The provision of specialist dementia care could be secured if overall the proposal is considered acceptable.
- 8.116 The proposed care home would provide accommodation over 2 floors, with 31 bedrooms (each with en-suite wet room) on each floor. In addition a number of ancillary facilities would be provided including a cafe (with outside terrace), visitors lounge, a resident activity room, cinema and private dining room. A lower ground floor level would also be provided on the western side (which would utilise the existing topography of the site) to accommodate a kitchen, a laundry, ancillary storage and staff office space/facilities. It is considered that the standard of accommodation throughout the proposed care home is acceptable.
- 8.117 It is noted that within the submission it is identified that the proposed care home would provide between 70 and 80 new jobs (a mix of full and part time qualified and unqualified roles).
- 8.118 It is also stated in the submission that the proposed care home would include private rooms that could, in agreement with the site manager, be used by local groups and organisations however no further details of such arrangements have been provided and as such it is not considered that such elements could be considered as providing community facilities.

**Amenity/Open Space/Recreation Provision/ Loss of Southern Part of Playing Field**

- 8.119 The Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study 2008 objectively assessed the open space needs of the City. It found that overall the City does not have any surplus open space and with the increased demand from an increasing population, an additional amount in excess of 160 hectares is required by 2030. The 2011 Update reviewed the findings of the 2008 study and considered the extent of open space provision in each ward of the City. The open space studies took into account open space studies carried out in 2006-2007, pre-dating the designation of the South Downs National Park. Sites identified which now fall within the National Park therefore now have less flexibility in their use, particularly is they fall within a natural/semi natural classification. Thus whilst Rottingdean Coastal Ward, in which the site is located, is not shown to have an overall deficit

in open space either now or in 2030, this is primarily due to the extent of natural/semi natural open space within the National Park, which serves a different purpose to playing fields.

- 8.120 The outdoor sports facilities provision for Rottingdean Coastal ward will be in deficit by 2030 (after correcting an error in the Study which included a pitch and putt golf course, since closed). Due to the central location of the St. Aubyn's school playing field in Rottingdean Village, it is considered a key open space that should be retained unless material circumstances justify a partial loss.

Loss of Southern Part of Playing Field

- 8.121 The part of the application site to the east of the public Twitten currently provides a playing field which is privately owned by the school and currently provides no formal recreational facilities to local residents.
- 8.122 The proposal comprises of development on the southern part of the existing playing field (approximately 0.9Ha) for a care home and 10 new dwellings, whilst the retained part of the playing field (approximately 1.6Ha) would be transferred to the Council.
- 8.123 Within the submission it is stated that the transfer of the northern part of the existing school playing field to the Council would result in the retained field becoming a public open space. The applicant has stated that "In order to secure such a key benefit it is necessary for some development to take place on the former playing fields in order to provide sufficient funding to enable the transfer and maintenance of the retained area of open space for public use. If not, this area of open space would remain private and not accessible to the general public".
- 8.124 Evidence indicates there is no surplus open space within the built up area and that there is a need to retain existing and increase the amount of open space within the City and locality in order to meet requirements. There are concerns that an incremental loss of open space is not sustainable in view of the predicted increase in population and the constraints of the City. As a consequence the ability to provide alternative/additional open space is limited and there is also an impact on flexibility (as an open space reduces in size the flexibility in its use also reduces).
- 8.125 Two tennis courts would be directly lost as part of the proposal with no plans indicated for replacements, resulting in a specific loss of this type of facility.
- 8.126 Paragraph 74 of the NPPF specifically considers open space and states that existing open space, including playing fields, should not normally be built on unless one of the exception criteria is met. One of the criteria is that "the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location". It is acknowledged that the increased accessibility of the remaining open space would result in a better quality provision in the local area, however, this is counterbalanced by the loss of the tennis courts and the reduction in quantity.

- 8.127 Such level of protection is reflected in policies CP16 (Open Space) and CP17 (Sports provision) of the City Plan. Policy CP16 resists the loss of open space, stating that planning permission will not be granted for proposals that result in the loss of open space unless one of four criteria is met. It is not considered that any of the four criteria are strictly met; however it is noted that the overall aim of the policy does include seeking better, more effective and appropriate use of all existing open space.
- 8.128 Sport's England also has a Playing Field Policy to ensure that there is an adequate supply of quality pitches to satisfy the current and estimated future demands of the pitch sports. This policy identifies 5 exceptions to Sport England's normal position of opposing development which would result in the loss of playing fields
- 8.129 Sport's England has stated that the proposal would result in the loss of a playing field which is considered capable of accommodating an adult size football pitch in addition to the loss of two tennis courts. Furthermore Sport's England has stated that whilst the proposal would result in the retention of the existing sports pavilion no plans have been provided to demonstrate what existing/proposed facilities this retained structure would provide.
- 8.130 Following Sport's England's original objection to the proposal an Addendum to the applicant's Sports Facility Report has been submitted in which the part of the playing field to be lost has been assessed with regards to the capability of the land forming part of a playing pitch (in relation to Sport's England Policy Exception E3). It is stated in the Addendum report that policy exception E3 forms a significant part of the applicant's case supporting the partial redevelopment of the playing field. Whilst the report acknowledges that the area has been used in the past, it is concluded (following a an appraisal and assessment against the performance quality standards benchmark) that the proposal affects only land incapable of forming all or part of a pitch due to the topography/gradient of the related part of the field.
- 8.131 Sport's England has assessed the proposal and, despite the submission of the Addendum, continues to object to the proposal on the grounds that whilst the relevant part of the playing field does not meet with the performance quality standards, it is still a playing field, which is capable of accommodating formal sport and that "The severity of slopes may limit the level of competition which can be played, but it does not demonstrate the playing field is not capable of accommodating sport". As such Sport's England does not considered that the proposal complies with any of the exceptions to their Policy or Paragraph 74 of the NPPF.
- 8.132 As set out above whilst the land forms existing open space, it is not formally usable/accessible by local people. One objective of the site's Planning Brief is "to encourage public use of existing open space for outdoor recreation in order to secure improvements in the health and social well-being of the local community".
- 8.133 The development on part of the playing field is deemed necessary by the applicant to provide a viable scheme to the development, which has been

confirmed within the DV Viability Report therefore an exception to policy to allow the partial development, in principle, of the playing field could be allowed in this instance in order to realise the wider benefits of the scheme.

Retained Playing Field

- 8.134 Approximately 1.6Ha of the existing playing field (the northern section) would be retained within the proposal. Currently the playing field does not benefit from public access.
- 8.135 The existing sports pavilion, war memorial and drinking fountain would be located within the retained playing field area.
- 8.136 With regards to the retention of the existing open space, policies CP16 and CP17 of the City Plan are relevant. These policies aim to safeguard, improve, expand and promote access to the City's open spaces and facilitate the Council's aspiration to increase participation in sports and physical activity.
- 8.137 The existing playing field is an identified open space and sports area. In respect of the current proposal the partial loss of the existing school playing field is being considered on the basis that the loss would be mitigated by the retention of the remainder for public use. Retention is required in order to meet the existing objectively assessed open space needs. The option explored in the application is for the transfer of the retained playing field land to the City Council with a maintenance fund of £93,000 to cover a 10 year period. It is stated that such transfer and fund provision is proposed in order to secure the long term public access. However due to public sector austerity the Council is only in a position to accept additional land where sufficient monies are provided to ensure maintenance for 25 years, for which a maintenance cost of £500,000 would be required. Without the transfer of the retained playing field and associated features, such as fencing and the existing sports pavilion in a good state of repair, and the provision of the maintenance fund the applicant would need to demonstrate how the land would be retained and maintained to provide satisfactory/unrestricted public access (which is a material consideration regarding the loss of part of the existing open space).

Proposed Amenity Space

- 8.138 Policy HO5 relates to the provision of private amenity space in residential development. Apart from proposed units 5 and 30 to 35, all of the proposed new build residential units would have access and use of private external amenity space.
- 8.139 With regards to the proposed converted buildings and unit 5 and units 30 to 35 communal open space would be provided to the rear of Field House, adjacent to the Chapel and in front of the converted Cottages/Rumneys.
- 8.140 With regards to the proposed care home a landscaped external amenity area would be provided to the west of the proposed care home in addition to a small strip along the southern elevation and a central courtyard. From the landscape plans submitted it would appear that the proposed external amenity space would have a mix of landscaped features and would include seating areas.

- 8.141 The proposal would not meet the amenity space standards set out within criterion (b) of policy HO11 however it is acknowledged that the proposed care home would provide care for residents with high dependency nursing needs as well as those living with dementia and therefore some residents may be less mobile and as such it is considered that a lower standard can be accepted.
- 8.142 It is considered that outlook from bedrooms and proposed communal areas (such as the proposed internal lounges, activity room and café) are a particularly crucial issue for less mobile residents. The development has been designed so that all of the proposed bedrooms and communal areas would have windows which either overlook the external garden/courtyard area or the street surroundings, and as such there are no principle internal rooms proposed. In addition the rooms proposed on the northern side of the care home would face towards the retained playing field and therefore out have outlook onto an open space.
- 8.143 Overall criterion b of policy HO11, relating to adequate amenity space, is considered to have been addressed by the proposal in that while there is less outdoor amenity space than required by the standards, there is adequate indoor amenity space and open space outlook from within the bedrooms and internal communal areas. The internal space provided, together with the external areas laid out for walks/seating meets the needs of the future residents so that refusal is not warranted for failure to comply with the external amenity standards stated.

Open Space Contribution

- 8.144 New housing development such as that proposed is deemed to increase the population in an area and therefore generates demand for additional open space.
- 8.145 Notwithstanding the principle of partial development of the playing field discussed above, part 2 of City Plan Policy CP16 relates to new development and requirements for new open space. It is considered that the opening up of the currently private playing field for public use would significantly improve the quality and accessibility of open space in the vicinity. As a result a contribution towards off site provision is therefore not considered required in this instance.

**Impact upon Amenity**

- 8.146 Policy QD27 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan states that planning permission for any development or change of use will not be granted where it would cause material nuisance and loss of amenity to the proposed, existing and/or adjacent users, residents, occupiers or where it is liable to be detrimental to human health.
- 8.147 It is noted that the Planning Brief refers to the heights of buildings that would be considered acceptable across parts of the site and that the heights of the development in this application accords with such constraints however the proposed heights etc. of the development must be assessed, as below, in terms of impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Lighting

- 8.148 The proposal would comprise lighting to communal areas, external doors, car parking and garage areas and some footpaths. It is considered that details of

external light of the development would be obtained via a condition if overall the proposal was considered acceptable to ensure that such lighting would not have an adverse impact upon the amenities of future residents of the development and neighbouring residents.

Noise and Light from Retained Playing Field

- 8.149 As set out above it is intended that the retained part of the playing field would be transferred to the Council however it is not set out in the application how the retained playing field would be utilised. There are several references in the application to it becoming a sports pitch of some kind (it is stated that the retained area would be large enough to accommodate a football pitch or cricket pitch) and that a sports pitch may have flood lights to allow it to be used at night.
- 8.150 Following the Council's Environmental Health Officer's original comments a Noise Assessment report has been submitted in which an assessment of a 'worst case' activity (namely noise from a football pitch) has been assessed.
- 8.151 The applicant has also stated that historically the existing field has been used for sports pitches. Therefore given the previous use of the field for a number of years within a predominantly residential area the applicant does not consider that should the retained field be used for sports pitches that there would be any adverse impact on local residents due to noise.
- 8.152 The Environmental Health Officer has assessed the submitted noise report and has acknowledged that the retained field would transfer to the Council with the proposed position of any formal sport pitches currently unknown. The report shows that there would be a potential for residents to be affected by noise from a proposed sports pitch if placed adjacent to resident's gardens. However, given that it is unknown at this stage where a pitch would be created it is considered unreasonable to expect mitigation to be installed at this stage. When a sports pitch is to be created consideration should be given to its location and potential mitigation if proposed near to resident's gardens (it is acknowledged that such creation is likely to be after transfer to the Council should overall the proposal be considered acceptable).
- 8.153 It is also noted that the submitted noise report has highlighted the need for acoustically treated ventilation to be provided in habitable rooms, as WHO/BS8233 criteria could only be met with windows closed. It is considered that the need for ventilation should be dealt with via a condition.

Construction Noise

- 8.154 It is considered that local residents could be affected during construction of the proposed development as there would be a vast amount of construction proposed, in very close proximity to local residents.
- 8.155 Construction by its very nature does have noisy phases and would inevitably be noticeable at various stages to various individuals throughout the build and therefore the onus is on the developer to come up with a plan to minimise complaints, design their timetable with best practicable means in place, meet with residents, have complaint handling systems in place and generally be a good

'neighbour'. This issue could be ensured via a Construction Environmental Management Plan if overall the proposal was considered acceptable.

Conversion of Field House

- 8.156 The proposal would result in the conversion of the retained part of Field House into 6 new residential units. Due to the former nature of Field House as a school it is not considered that the principle of the conversion of this building to residential would have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties.
- 8.157 It is considered that views from windows towards neighbouring properties would either be oblique due to the positioning of Field House in respect of existing neighbouring properties. It is noted that Field House and the proposed new build (Plots 30-35) would be in close proximity to one another however it is considered that any views between these two properties would also be oblique.
- 8.158 Overall it is not considered that the proposed conversion of Field House would have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Conversion of Cottages/Rumneys

- 8.159 The existing Cottages and Rumneys are located in the north-western section of the site, adjacent to the boundary with commercial/residential properties located on the High Street. The proposal would result in the conversion of these existing buildings into 4 new residential units. It is not considered that such conversion in principle would have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties given the existing mix commercial and residential nature of the surrounding area.
- 8.160 Due to the nature and positioning of the purposed new window/door openings in these converted properties it is not considered that such works would have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties with regards to overlooking or loss of privacy.

New Build Residential Units on Campus Site

Plots 2-7

- 8.161 Proposed Plots 2 to 7 would replace existing buildings located within the school campus. The built form of the proposed new builds would be located further away from the boundary with Steyning Road than the existing. The proposed built forms of Plots 4 to 7 would be located opposite existing properties on Steyning Road whilst Plots 2 and 3 would be located single storey garages. A majority of the proposed ground floor level of the proposed 2/2½ storey properties would be located behind the retained boundary flint wall, the height of which reflects the east to west gradient of Steyning Road.
- 8.162 A distance of approximately 16m would be located between the built form of the proposed new dwellings fronting Steyning Road and the existing properties located to the north of the site. Despite the proposal resulting in an increase in height of buildings located on the northern side of the school campus compared to the existing buildings, overall it is not considered that the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of the northern



neighbouring properties including with regards to loss of light/sunlight, overlooking, loss of privacy or outlook due to the distance that would be located between the built forms of the proposed and existing buildings and the fact that an area of open space would be retained to the east of the proposed terrace in addition to a gap in built form to the south provided by the proposed main access point into the campus part of the site.

Plots 8 to 16

- 8.163 Due to the siting of the proposed dwellings within Plots 8 to 16 it is not considered that the construction of these new dwellings would have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Plots 30-35

- 8.164 The demolition of the rectangular block and associated extensions to the north of Field House would result in increased open space at the rear of adjacent properties located on the High Street. The proposed new build (Plots 30 to 35) would be constructed approximately 15m from the boundary with these western neighbouring properties. Due to this proposed distance and the existing built form of Field House it is not considered that the proposed new build to comprise Plots 30 to 35, would have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties located on the High Street.

- 8.165 It is acknowledged that the northern sited properties within the Deans Mews development (approved under application BH2011/01773) were required to comprise non-obscured glazing in parts of the north facing windows below 1.7m above floor level however it does not appear that such requirement has been complied with in all properties facing the former school site.
- 8.166 The southern elevation of the proposed new build (Plots 30-35) would be located approximately 29m from the boundary with Denes Mews. Whilst objections have been raised from residents of Denes Mews with regards to overlooking and loss of privacy overall due to the separation distance it is not considered that the proposed new build(Plots 30-35) would have a significant adverse impact with regards to the amenities of Denes Mews. In addition it is not considered that this element of the proposal would have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of properties on the High Street, again due to the distance between these properties and the proposed new building.

Plots 18-23

- 8.167 Objections received refer to the impacts of proposed Plots 18 to 23 on the new residential development at Denes Mews. However no windows are located in the eastern elevations of this neighbouring development. Although the proposed new dwellings forming Plots 18 to 23 would be visible from front and rear windows in the Denes Mews development, overall it is not considered that the proposed two storey residential would have a significant adverse impact upon the residents of Denes Mews given the distance between the built form of the new dwellings and the existing neighbouring properties, their associated orientation to one another and the lack of windows in the Denes Mews development directly facing the proposed new buildings.

- 8.168 A minimum distance of approximately 7m would be located between the southernmost sited new dwelling (Plot 23) and the existing built form of the northern part of Marine Court. No windows would be proposed within the southern elevation of this end of terrace property. Any views from the proposed eastern facing windows in this proposed terrace towards Marine Court would be oblique.
- 8.169 It is considered that the existing windows in the lower part of the northern elevation of Marine Court face onto the existing northern boundary. The proposed roof form of the southern end of terrace property would slope away from Marine Court whilst the proposed southern flank elevation would not extend across the width of the northern elevation of Marine Court; it would only be located opposite the western part of the neighbouring northern elevation, with open areas either side. Whilst it is acknowledged that the southern elevation of the proposed terrace forming Plots 19 to 23, which would be lower than the Marine Court, would have some adverse impact upon the amenities of the occupiers located on the western side of the northern part of Marine Court, as a result of the proximity of the proposed development to this neighbouring property, it is not considered that the harm would be so significant to warrant refusal.

New Build Residential Units on Former Playing Field

- 8.170 A distance of approximately 24m would be located between the eastern building line of the proposed dwellings to be constructed in the south-eastern corner of the former playing field and existing properties on Newlands Road whilst a distance of approximately 11m would be located between the southern building line of these new dwellings and neighbouring properties located on St Aubyns Mead.
- 8.171 Due to the topography of the site and the surrounding area the proposed two storey dwellings to be constructed on the former playing field would be located lower than that of the existing properties on Newlands Road. Due to the distance that would be located between the built forms of the proposed and existing dwellings it is not considered that the proposed residential units in the south-eastern corner of the former playing field would have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of existing properties on Newlands Road with regards to loss of sunlight/daylight or overshadowing.
- 8.172 Proposed Plots 39, 40, 41 and 42 would comprise window openings facing east towards properties on Newlands Road. However due to the slight variation in height between the properties on the eastern side of Newlands Road and the development site and the distance that would be located between built forms, it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of the eastern neighbouring properties with regards to overlooking or loss of privacy.
- 8.173 Due to the proposed 2 storey built form and positioning in respect of existing properties located on St Aubyn's Mead it is not considered that the proposed new build residential development on the former playing field would have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of the southern neighbouring properties with regards to loss of light/sunlight or over shadowing.

- 8.174 Due to the positioning of proposed window openings in the southern elevations of Plots 39 and 48, which would face onto St Aubyns Mead, and the positioning of windows in the southern neighbouring properties it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of the southern neighbouring properties with regards to overlooking or loss of privacy from these proposed new build dwellings.
- 8.175 Whilst the proposed playing field development would have an impact upon the outlook from eastern and southern sited neighbouring properties with regards to loss of views across the former playing field, the loss of such views is not a material planning consideration. The impacts upon strategic views into and out of the Conservation Area are discussed elsewhere in this report.

#### Care Home

- 8.176 As set out above, the proposed care home would be located on the south-western part of the former playing field. The proposed care home would be located on a west to east gradient which results in the western side being formed of almost 3 storeys and the eastern side as 2 storeys in height.
- 8.177 As seen in submitted section FF (plan no. 701) the height of the proposed care home would be lower than Kipling Court, located to the south-east of the proposed care home. The proposed care home would however be sited higher than Marine Court (located to the west of the site) and the 2 storey dwellings located to the south of the site on St Aubyn's Mead. However due to the separation distances between the proposed built form of the care home and that of the southern and western neighbouring properties, the orientation of the St Aubyn's Mead dwellings in relation to the proposed care home, the orientation of the sun and the minimal amount of windows in the side elevation of the southern/western neighbouring properties (a majority of windows in the eastern elevation of Marine Court are located below the existing eastern boundary treatment) overall it is not considered that the proposed care home would have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of the existing southern/western neighbouring properties with regards to outlook, loss of light/sunlight or overshadowing.
- 8.178 It is also not considered that the proposed care home would have a significant adverse impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties with regards to overlooking or loss of privacy due to the positioning of existing neighbouring windows and the separation distance between the built form of the proposed care home and the existing neighbouring properties.
- 8.179 The recently submitted noise assessment outlines that the proposed care home may have a number of fixed items of plant. It is considered that noise generated by such proposed plant could be controlled via the attachment of a condition if overall the proposal was considered acceptable.

#### **Sustainable Transport**

##### Pedestrian Access

##### To the Site

- 8.180 Given the nature and scale of the development proposed the applicant is proposing several pedestrian access points into the site from the adopted highway;
- Steyning Road – pedestrian access from proposed vehicular access point and retaining the existing pedestrian access point onto the playing field ,
  - Newlands Road – pedestrian access from proposed vehicular access point and direct access onto Newlands Road from the properties fronting Newlands Road,
  - High Street – existing pedestrian access retained shared with vehicular access,
  - Marine Drive (A259) – existing access retained shared with existing vehicular access, and
  - Twitten – existing access points onto the playing field are to be retained however proposal would provide alternative access points into the campus element of the development.

Within the Site

- 8.181 The proposed new access routes from Steyning Road and Newlands Road would serve the majority of the proposed development. A shared surface approach to the internal access routes is proposed, which would remain in private ownership and not be adopted by the Council.
- 8.182 In terms of permeability through the site it is considered that the proposal would ensure that there are direct pedestrian routes from the majority of residential development in all directions.
- 8.183 Since submission of the application amendments have been made to the proposal to provide a clear pedestrian route to properties 8 to 13, to address the Transport Officer's original concerns.
- 8.184 It is noted that the proposed steps to the north of Field House have not been replaced by a ramp as requested originally by the Highway Authority as the applicant has stated that due to the level distance the provision of a ramp is not possible.
- 8.185 Within their original comments the Highway Authority requested that improvements were made to the route to and from the proposed care home. It is noted that some minor amendments have been made with a small area of additional hardstanding being created. The applicant has stated that Highway Authority's request would result in steps being required meaning that the route would not be wheelchair accessible. However it is not apparent which element of the requested improvements would require steps and as such the Highway Authority is still of the view that improvements could be made, especially by extending the footway just outside the entrance to the care home car park so that a continuous route is provided from Newlands Road. It is considered that such further improvements could be obtained via a condition if overall the proposal is considered acceptable.
- 8.186 The Highway Authority also requested that the applicant considered the provision of an additional alternative pedestrian access route to the care home from the west, via the existing Twitten in order to provide a shorter, more direct route between the proposed care home and the High Street. The applicant's response

receive on the 29<sup>th</sup> February states that “It is also not proposed to incorporate a gate on the northern boundary given the security implications this would have...”. However the Highway Authority’s request was for access to be provided on the western boundary to the Twitten not the northern boundary. Such access could be controlled to retain security of the premises or for the additional access to be for staff only, which would have the benefit of shortening pedestrian trips between the site and High Street. It is considered that such access could be obtained via a condition if overall the proposal is considered acceptable.

Cycle Parking

- 8.187 With regards to the proposed residential units SPG04 states that a minimum of 1 cycle parking space is required for every dwelling plus 1 space per 3 dwellings for visitors. For the proposed development of 48 residential units the minimum cycle parking standard would be 64 cycle parking spaces in total (including 48 for the residential units and 16 visitor spaces).
- 8.188 Since submission of the application it has been confirmed that with the exception of proposed plots 9, 12 and 15, all other plots would have rear garden access for cycle storage and/or designated cycle storage. The Council’s Transport Officer has however stated that such access appears to require carrying bikes through a property and as such is not deemed acceptable. Either cycle parking should be provided at the front of properties or direct rear access should be provided where possible. It is considered that this issue could be addressed via a condition if overall the proposal is acceptable, rather than warranting refusal.
- 8.189 In terms of the proposed care home the minimum standard is 1 cycle parking space per 10 staff. It is stated within the application that the proposed care home would employ 27 staff; therefore the minimum standard would be 3 cycle parking spaces. The proposal includes 4 Sheffield stands providing a total of 8 spaces, which is above the minimum standard required for a care home as set out in SPG04. Since submission of the application it has been confirmed that such storage provision would be covered.
- 8.190 5 Sheffield stands are also proposed within the retained part of the playing field, close to the retained sport pavilion. Such provision is welcomed. Given the relative short stay nature of this proposed cycle parking demand, covered stands are not required in this location.

Car Parking

Residential Development

- 8.191 SPG04 states that a maximum car parking standard for residential units outside of a controlled parking area is 1 space per dwelling plus 1 car space per 2 dwellings for visitors.
- 8.192 Based on the proposed residential development the maximum car parking standard would be;
- Campus site - 38 residential units with 57 spaces,
  - Field development – 10 residential units with 15 spaces.

The proposal includes the following parking provision;

## PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

- Campus site – 49 spaces and 6 garages/car port,
- Field development – all 10 proposed residential properties would have a driveway and a free standing garage.

8.193 9 visitor spaces are also proposed, 8 being on the campus site and 1 on the field development site.

8.194 No objection is raised to the proposed level of car parking proposed for the residential element of the proposal.

8.195 Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure is proposed in the garages of the 10 dwellings to be constructed on the former playing field however the Highway Authority would require such charging points to be provided in all garages of the proposal, an issue which could be addressed via a condition.

### Care Home

8.196 SPG04 states that the maximum car parking standard for a C2 nursing home is 1 space per 3 beds for staff and visitors and 1 car space per resident staff. Based on the proposed residential development of a 62 bed care home the maximum car parking stand would be 21 spaces. It is noted that the proposed development would provide parking provision slightly above the maximum parking standards permitted however the Transport Officer does not consider that refusal is warranted as no significant harm would be caused by the additional provision in this instance.

8.197 Given the proposed level of car parking provision of the care home and the proposed travel plan to be produced it is not considered that there would be significant overspill car parking from the proposed care home which would cause parking or road safety concerns.

### Playing Field

8.198 No on-site parking is proposed for the retained playing field which would be transferred to the Council for public use however the applicant has forecast from first principles the likely parking demand associated with the retained playing field.

8.199 Taking a worst case scenario of the sports field being used by both adults and juniors on a weekend the applicant forecasts the largest parking demand would be 36 vehicles. Even assuming that a higher proportion of people travel to the site by car this could result in a demand of 42 vehicles associated with the retained playing field. The Transport Officer has stated that when checking this against the number of parking spaces within the survey area for the Saturday survey there would be between 76 and 95 spaces available. As such it is considered that the potential overspill parking from the proposed retained playing field would not cause a significant transport impact which would warrant refusal.

### Retained Chapel

8.200 The existing Chapel was formally a facility for the school pupils and had no public use. Whilst the Chapel building would be retained as part of the proposal no

future use is identified and no car parking provision would be provided for the Chapel.

Disabled Parking

Residential Development

- 8.201 With regards to the proposed residential units SPG04 states that the minimum standard for disabled parking for a residential land use is 1 disabled space per 10 residential units.
- 8.202 All residential units proposed would have access to at least 1 car parking space and as a result if a resident was disabled they would have a dedicated parking space which would be for their sole use. Therefore in this instance it is not considered necessary for any of the residential units to have a dedicated disabled bay.

Care Home

- 8.203 In terms of the proposed C2 care home SPG04 states that the minimum standard is 1 space per establishment up to 20 beds then 1 additional space per 20 beds. Therefore the minimum disabled car parking standard for the proposed 62 bed care home is 3 spaces. It is noted that since submission of the application the number of disabled car parking spaces, which would serve the proposed care home, has been reduced from 4 to 3 spaces however such level of provision would still be in accordance with the minimum standards as set out in SPG04 and therefore is deemed acceptable. The layout of the retained bays has also been altered to ensure that they accord with required standards.

Servicing and Deliveries

- 8.204 The main servicing activity associated with the proposed residential development would be that of the collection of refuse and recycling. There may however be more servicing movements associated with the operation of the care home.
- 8.205 The applicant is proposing that refuse and recycling would be collected from within the site and that the main access points would be from Steyning Road for the proposed residential element and from the proposed access road off Newlands Road for the care home. As part of the application a swept path analysis of a large refuse vehicle (9.86m in length, 3 axle) has been submitted with shows vehicle movements within the development demonstrating that a vehicle of such a size could access and turn around within the site.

Vehicular Access

- 8.206 The site currently has vehicular access points via two existing driveways onto Steyning Road, a single width access onto High Street and a gated maintenance access to the current private playing field, from Newlands Road. Private access from Marine Drive (A259) to the south of the site also exists.
- 8.207 Within the Planning Brief access points from Steyning Road, Marine Drive and St Aubyns Mead were examined and it was also noted that the current access to the school site from High Street is both inadequate and challenging for vehicles exiting from this access point, as visibility is obscured by the high boundary wall and the two storey house flanking the exit. However the Brief states that "Whilst

this access point is currently substandard in terms of visibility, its re-use for a comparable level of movement would not be ruled out”.

- 8.208 The following access points are proposed to serve the development;
- New priority access on Steyning Road – to serve 16 house and 11 apartments,
  - New priority access on Newlands Road – to serve 7 houses and the care home,
  - Two new vehicle crossovers on Newlands Road – to serve 3 houses,
  - Retained access on High Street – to serve 6 apartments, and
  - Retained access on Marine Drive (A259) - to serve 5 houses.
- 8.209 The applicant states that such access points would help with traffic dispersal from the site across the surrounding Highway Network and hence to help minimise traffic impact.

#### Public Transport

- 8.210 Whilst local bus stops and main bus services routes are located within the vicinity of the site improvements would be needed to public transport infrastructure in order for the development to benefit from a quality public transport service that provides a real choice for residents.

#### Trip Generation

- 8.211 As part of the application, in order to forecast the likely impact of the proposal on the road network, traffic surveys have been submitted and the applicant has forecast the vehicle trip generation for the extant use (as a residential school and nursery), the proposed use (residential and care home) and a permitted use which would not need planning permission to occupy and operate from the site (a private hospital).
- 8.212 From cross checking the TRICS database the Council’s Transport Officer has confirmed that the vehicle trips associated with the land uses are broadly in line with what the Highway Authority would expect. However it is noted that the trip rate for a private hospital use appears to be slightly high when checked against other sites within the TRICS database.
- 8.213 The applicant has calculated the extant use on the basis that there would be 163 pupils. Even assuming a worst case scenario of not including the 20 pupils who were boarders the forecast vehicle trips would reduce to 351 (143 pupils x 1.991 trip rate = 285 vehicle trips). Plus the nursery trips of 66 equals 351 total vehicle trips, the same as the forecast proposed uses. It is considered a worst case scenario reducing the number of pupils by boarders as the trip rates for the sites from TRICS would have included some level of boarding as they are residential schools.
- 8.214 The applicant has undertaken further sensitivity testing of the proposed vehicle trips in light of comments made by the Highway Authority at pre-application stage where the use of edge of town centre sites was questioned. The applicant has removed edge of town centre sites for the purposes of this sensitivity analysis and primarily used suburban and edge of town sites.



8.215 The Transport Officer has stated that the addition of 4 additional trips on the network when comparing the existing and proposed uses would not be considered significant.

Highway Impact

- 8.216 In order to assess a future year scenario (2017) the applicant has grown the base traffic flows to 2017 using the industry standard TEMPRO growth factors. Brighton Marina has been included as a committed development for 2017 base and development scenarios and the applicant has also included a proposed residential development at 6 Falmer Avenue and Meadow Vale, Ovingdean even though these applications are not classed as committed developments as they currently do not have planning permission.
- 8.217 The trip distribution is based upon a gravity model which predicts traffic movements on the basis of distance from a location and the destinations size or draw and 2011 census travel to work data for the locality. Trips then have been assigned to the road network based on the likely route to locations based upon the trip purpose. This general approach to trip assignment is one of several methods which are accepted and common practice. The applicants assumed routing of vehicles could under forecast the number of vehicles using High Street in the proposed scenario. The assignment of parents dropping off; which primarily is assumed to take place on Steyning Road, is different to how residents will access the site in the proposed scenario (Appendix S) even though they are travelling to the from the same place to same location.
- 8.218 This approach has enabled the applicant to have traffic flows for the road network for future year 2017 scenario with committed development and development flows included and a 2017 extant traffic flows scenario which also included committed development flows.
- 8.219 The applicant has then undertaken junction modelling work of particular junctions with the appropriate industry standard modelling software.
- 8.220 In the 2017 scenarios without development traffic but including committed developments the junction would operate above theoretical capacity at peak times; specifically on the Marine Drive (A259) arms. If the school was re-occupied again the Marine Drive arms of the junction would operate above theoretical capacity (A259 Marine Drive E AM peak RFC 102.9% & A259 Marine Drive W PM peak RFC 105.2%). When assessing the 2017 with development traffic scenario it can be seen that the impact is broadly similar to the impact of the extant school use (A259 Marine Drive E AM peak RFC 103.2% & A259 Marine Drive W PM peak RFC 105.7%).
- 8.221 The junction assessments of the Marine Drive (A259)/High Street junction, undertaken by the applicant indicate that the proposed development would not have a significantly greater impact than that of the extant permission or a future year scenario with committed development traffic.

- 8.222 From knowledge of how the Marine Drive (A259)/High Street junction operates the Highway Authority is aware that it can currently operate over theoretical capacity at peak times. The proposed trip generation from the development is not considered to significantly add additional trips above those that could be generated by the extant use, especially given the requested mitigation and therefore the residual cumulative impacts of this development are not considered to be severe, as set out by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and therefore would not warrant a refusal on these grounds.
- 8.223 Highways England has also assessed the application with regards to impact upon the strategic road network but has raised no objections to the proposal.

Travel Plan

Residential Travel Plan

- 8.224 The submitted scheme for residential Travel Plan measures is considered to be in line with what would be expected for a residential development of the type proposed. The provision of welcome packs and a choice of two £250 travel vouchers for each household in particular is welcomed, though given the location of the site it is considered that the latter would be best restricted to bus and cycle as opposed to including bus and car clubs. The residential Travel Plan measures set out in the application could be secured via a S106 Agreement if overall the proposal is considered acceptable.

Care Home Travel Plan

- 8.225 Since submission of the application the Interim Care Home Travel Plan has been updated following the originally comments made by the Council's Transport Officer. The inclusion of the emergency taxi ride home for car sharers is noted. The associated restrictions are acknowledged and considered appropriate, the purpose would be to give car sharers the confidence that they could return home (at potentially anti-social hours for a use of the nature proposed) in the unlikely event that their planned journey fails and it is considered this would be achieved.
- 8.226 Given that the majority of the travel plan measures are aimed at staff, it would be important for these to be in place prior to occupancy of the care home so that staff traveling to the site for the first time can make decisions about how they will travel sustainably.
- 8.227 The proposed 10% reduction in single occupancy car trips by care home staff over five years and interim targets of 5% and 8% in years one and three respectively are considered suitable and realistic. These should however be reviewed in light of baseline surveys following occupation as the applicant's agent has stated. Although the focus is on staff travel and targets for visitor travel would not necessarily be expected, a package of measures directed specifically at visitors (as is included in the submitted Travel Plan) would be.
- 8.228 The Council's Transport Officer requested that the package of proposed measures set out in the original care home Travel Plan submitted include measures to provide staff with a sustainable travel voucher of their choice or monthly bus season ticker to strengthen the current package of measures set out and to help encourage new staff to try out sustainable travel options. Despite

such request it has been confirmed by the agent that it is not proposed to include a sustainable travel voucher for staff. The Council's Transport Officer however considers that the likely cost of the level of sustainable travel voucher that would be expected for the care home use (e.g. monthly/ one-week bus ticket) would be relatively low and as such it is not considered that there is a strong reason for not including them. An example would be the provision of a one week bus saver ticket (although one month would be more desirable) for each new employee on opening of the care home (approximately £20 per employee). It is considered that without the inclusion of such measures, the Travel Plan would provide limited incentive for staff to try out sustainable modes from the outset of their employment, a key moment in time for encouraging behaviour change towards sustainable modes.

- 8.229 It is recommended that the implementation of a Travel Plan, to include baseline monitoring and details of a Travel Plan Coordinator and the associated sustainable travel vouchers be included as part of any subsequent conditions/S106 agreement should overall the proposal be considered acceptable.

#### Highway Works

- 8.230 The proposed highway works to Newlands Road and Steyning Road to implement new vehicle crossovers should be undertaken through a section 278 agreement with the Highway Authority. The applicant is proposing a vehicle entry treatment within the site at the Steyning Road and Newlands Road access. The Highway Authority would look for the entry treatment to be placed on the immediate entry into the side road. This has the benefit of slowing vehicles down but also provided a level pedestrian access and priority on the footway. Further details should be secured via condition.

- 8.231 The applicant is proposing that the internal access roads from Newlands Road and Steyning Road are to remain private and not adopted by the Highway Authority.

#### S106

- 8.232 The Highway Authority would look for the applicant to make a financial contribution of £83,000. This requested S106 contribution would ensure that the proposed development provides suitable and safe access to the site by all modes including walking and public transport, that suitable routes are provided between the development site and key local destinations such as local schools, medical facilities, shops and public transport and that fullest possible use of sustainable travel has been made to the site, in line with the NPPF.

- 8.233 In addition the Highway Authority would require the S106 Agreement to include the provision of a Construction Management Plan, a Travel Plan for the care home and a Residential Travel Pack, measures which have been discussed elsewhere in this report.

#### **Arboriculture/ Landscaping**

- 8.234 As part of the application an Arboricultural report has been submitted which provides an assessment of the proposed development on 66 individual trees and 10 groups of trees or hedges growing on or immediately adjacent to the site. The

submitted report is considered to be comprehensive and the contents of which is agreed with by the Council's Arboriculturist.

- 8.235 The proposal would result in the loss of 34 trees including three groups of trees and a section of hedge located along the southern boundary wall of the site.
- 8.236 The semi-mature Beech Tree (categorised as a "B" grade tree) is considered to be of moderate quality and has no public amenity value and therefore it is not considered to be worthy of a Tree Preservation Order.
- 8.237 27 trees have been categorised as a "C" grade tree which means they are of low quality. These trees include a line of 9 Sycamores in the middle of the site that have previously been pollarded at 4 to 5m. Further Sycamores would also be lost along with an Elder, Euonymous and Willow. None of these trees are considered to be worthy of a Tree Preservation Order.
- 8.238 6 further trees have been categorised as "U" grade trees namely Apple, Elder, Pear and Mulberry meaning that they should be removed regardless of whether the development proceeds.
- 8.239 The Council's Arboriculturist has no objection to the removal of the trees. The 3 trees on the site covered by a Tree Preservation Order would be retained and accommodated within the proposed development.
- 8.240 Landscape plans have been submitted as part of the proposal; these plans are considered to be comprehensive. In addition details of the proposed hard landscaping materials are set out within the submitted Landscape Design and Appraisal Statement.
- 8.241 As previously stated the proposal would result in the loss of some of the existing trees/hedges located across the site. New tree planting would comprise of a total of 48 replacement including new street/garden and parkland trees, which would mitigate those that are to be removed.
- 8.242 Should the proposal overall be considered acceptable conditions regarding the submission of a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement regarding tree protection and the landscaping of the development would be required.

**Archaeology**

- 8.243 Policy HE12 of the Local Plan relates to scheduled ancient monuments and other important archaeological sites. The policy states that development proposals must preserve and enhance sites known and potential archaeological interest and their setting.
- 8.244 The development site is situated within an Archaeological Notification Area defining the historic settlement of Rottingdean. An archaeological desk-based assessment and heritage statements for the built heritage at the site have been submitted. The latter comprises heritage audits (including photo audits), statements of significance and heritage impact assessment for both the school campus site and for the former playing field site.

- 8.245 Whilst there has been no standing building archaeological survey undertaken and the built heritage reports lacks phased plans for individual buildings or the site as a whole (there is map regression) the approach does seek to conserve and enhance the most obviously significant heritage assets at the site.
- 8.246 The archaeological desk-based assessment confirms that the site is likely to have archaeological interest with respect to below-ground evidence of prehistoric, Romano-British and subsequent activity. The significance of any such remains however is likely to have been reduced by recent development impacts, including the levelling of the playing fields and the construction of relatively modern buildings and structures. Despite these impacts it is probable that archaeological remains will exist at the site.
- 8.247 In light of the potential for impacts to heritage assets (including historic buildings and below ground archaeological remains) at the site the County Archaeologist requests that the area affected by the proposals be subject of a programme of archaeological works should permission be granted. This would enable any heritage assets with historic or archaeological interest that would be impacted by the development to be either preserved in situ or where this is demonstrably not possible, recorded in advance of their loss.

**Ecology/Biodiversity/Nature Conservation**

- 8.248 Policy CP10 of the City Plan aims to conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity and promote improved access to it whilst SPD 11 on Nature Conservation & Development, provides further guidance regarding development and biodiversity.
- 8.249 As part of the application a Bat Roost Survey and an Ecological Constraints and Opportunities Assessment have been submitted. The County Ecologist has confirmed that the submitted surveys have been carried out broadly in accordance with national best practice and are sufficient to information suitable mitigation, compensation and enhancement.

Designated Sites/Protected Species

- 8.250 Given the location, nature and scale of the proposed development it is considered that there are unlikely to be any significant effects on any site designated for their nature conservation value.
- 8.251 The site currently comprises amenity grassland, species poor hedgerows, buildings, bare ground, hard standing, scattered ornamental trees and ornamental planting and is of relatively low Protected Species.
- 8.252 During the survey undertaken no evidence of roosting bats was found in any of the existing buildings however it is considered that they have the potential to support bats and as such a precautionary approach should be taken to their demolition or refurbishment, an issue which could be secured via a condition should the application overall be considered acceptable.
- 8.253 Since submission it has been confirmed that the existing trees on site which are to be removed as part of the proposal were also assessed for bat roost potential

as part of the ecological assessments and were judged to have no bat potential. As such the County Ecologist has confirmed that no further bat surveys are required.

- 8.254 The site has been shown to provide foraging and commuting habitat for bats and there are known bat roosts in the local area. A sensitive lighting scheme should therefore be designed in line with national best practice guidelines.
- 8.255 The site has the potential to support breeding birds, which are protected. In order to avoid disturbance to nesting birds any demolition or removal of vegetation that could provide nesting habitat should be carried out outside the breeding season (generally March to August). Or a nesting bird check should be carried out prior to any clearance work by a qualified ecologist.
- 8.256 The County Ecologist considered that it is unlikely that the site supports any other protected species and therefore no specific mitigation is required. However if protected species are encountered during demolition/construction, work should stop and advice should be sought from an ecologist on how to proceed.

Mitigation Measures/Enhancement Opportunities

- 8.257 With regards to protected species it is considered that bird and bat boxes and/or bricks should be provided on site to mitigate for the loss of nesting and potential roosting habitats.
- 8.258 In addition it is considered that the site offers opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. The County Ecologist refers to opportunities such as the provision of green walls and/or biodiverse roofs, the use of species of known value to wildlife within the landscaping scheme and the establishment of native wildflower grassland.
- 8.259 The County Ecologist states that whilst the submitted soft landscape scheme includes a good proportion of native and/or wildlife species, the proposed Rosa rugosa should be excluded from the schedule as this species offers comparatively few benefits for wildlife in urban areas and within SPD11 the use of such species in landscaping schemes is discouraged.
- 8.260 Whilst it is noted that some of the County Ecologist's suggested biodiversity opportunities would be unsuitable within the proposal it is considered that opportunities for biodiversity enhancement and a revised landscape scheme could be dealt with via a condition if overall the proposal was considered acceptable.

**Sustainability**

- 8.261 City Plan policy CP8 requires that all development incorporate sustainable design features to avoid expansion of the City's ecological footprint, radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and mitigate against and adapt to climate change.
- 8.262 Policy CP8 sets out the residential energy and water efficiency standards required to be met, namely energy efficiency standards of 19% reduction in CO2 emissions over Part L Building Regulations requirements 2013 and water

efficiency standards of 110 litres/person/day. With regards to major non-residential development a BREEAM 'excellent' is expected to be achieved.

- 8.263 In instances when the standards recommended in CP8 cannot be met, applicants are expected to provide sufficient justification for a reduced level on the basis of site restrictions, financial viability, technical limitations and added benefits arising from the development.
- 8.264 The Planning Brief refers to sustainability. For example the Brief recommends that an energy strategy be produced for the site including an assessment of the feasibility of sustainable refurbishment of the historic building; potential for renewable technologies and the potential for a site district heat network. The building standards recommended in the Brief are; BREEAM 'excellent' for the refurbished Listed Building; BREEAM 'excellent' for new builds; Lifetime Homes and Code Level 4 for housing (subject to the Governments Housing standard review). The Government has now indicated changes to national Housing standards and therefore the Code Level 4 can longer be required. The Brief also refers to sustainability opportunities such as biodiversity enhancements, greening of buildings, planting of an orchard, food growing areas, rainwater harvesting and the employment of a sustainability caretaker.
- 8.265 The information submitted as part of the application does not refer to policy CP8 and consideration of this policy has not been well incorporated into the scheme design and many elements of the policy has not been addressed. The overarching standards proposed for the development falls short of the standards expected by policy CP8.
- 8.266 The information submitted sets out that the proposed dwellings would achieve a standard of 7.10% reduction in carbon emissions against Part L 2013 whilst a standard of BREEAM 'very good' (shell and core) rating has been targeted for the proposed care home. As such the required overarching standards for both residential development and the non-residential development have not been met by the proposal and there is no justification offered for proposing a lower standard.
- 8.267 Whilst it is acknowledged and welcomed that the proposed residential dwellings are proposed to be built to a reasonable fabric performance standard that improves on Building Regulations minimum performance thresholds, the proposed dwellings, care home, layout and landscaping fail to address sustainability policy to a satisfactory level and no reason has been provided to explain why policy has not been addressed.
- 8.268 Overall the proposal would fail to meet the minimum sustainability standards and the applicant has failed to provide justification for the lower standards set out in the submission, as such the proposal is contrary to policy CP8 of the City Plan.

#### Waste Management

- 8.260 Part 9 of the submitted Design and Access Statement relates to refuse and recycling storage and collection and the submitted plans show the proposed storage facilities and the intended positions for the development. An assessment

of proposed servicing/delivery vehicular access, such as for the collection of such refuse, is set out in the transport section above.

- 8.270 The comments received from the Council's City Clean department are noted however it is considered that sufficient details of the proposed storage of refuse and recycling facilities have been provided, in accordance with policy, and that issues regarding collection and access points could be resolved should overall the proposal be considered acceptable.
- 8.271 With regards to the proposed care home, as this would be a commercial property refuse collection would not occur by the Council's City Clean department.
- 8.272 It is noted that no information has been submitted with regards to the minimisation and management of waste that would be produced during construction, demolition and excavation however it is considered that this issue could be dealt with via a condition if overall the proposal is considered acceptable.

#### **Developer Contributions**

- 8.273 In addition to the transport contribution and the transferred playing field maintenance fund discussed above, should overall the proposal be considered acceptable contributions towards the local employment scheme, education and public art/realm would also be required. Such S106 contributions amounts were taken into consideration as part of the DVs Assessment of the proposed development and it was concluded that such amounts would not affect the viability of the scheme (even if 40% affordable housing provision were to be provided).

#### Local Employment Scheme

- 8.274 The Developer Contributions Interim Technical Guidance provides the supporting information to request a contribution towards the Local Employment and Training Scheme in addition to the commitment to using 20% local employment, for the demolition and construction phases. In this instance a financial contribution of £19,000 would be sought (based on £500 per each new build residential unit).

#### Education

- 8.275 A contribution of £171,400.60 towards the cost of providing primary and secondary education infrastructure in the related part of the City, for the school age pupils the development would generate, would be required.

#### Public Art/Realm

- 8.276 Policy CP5 supports investment in public realm spaces suitable for outdoor events and cultural activities and the enhancement and retention of existing public art works whilst policy CP7 seeks development to contribute to necessary social, environmental and physical infrastructure including public art and public realm. In addition policy CP13 seeks to improve the quality and legibility of the City's public realm by incorporating an appropriate and integral public art element. An 'artistic component schedule' should be included as part of a S106 agreement, to the value of at least £44,000, in order to ensure that the proposal complies with the stated policies.



**Other Considerations**

Flood Risk and Water Drainage

- 8.277 Policy CP11 states that the Council will seek to manage and reduce flood risk and any potential adverse effects on people or property.
- 8.278 The Environment Agency has stated that the site is located within a Flood Zone 1, defined as having a low probability of flooding.
- 8.279 The Council's Flood Risk Management Officer has assessed the application and has no objection in principle, however it is requested that further information is required regarding the detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage should overall the proposal be considered acceptable, which could be obtained via a condition. A maintenance plan is important to ensure that the system would be monitored, maintained and repaired as needed by a competent person. The maintenance plan would need to be clear as to who is responsible for the drainage system for the lifetime of the development.

Air Quality

- 8.280 Policy SU9 of the Local Plan relates to pollution and nuisance control. This policy states that development that may be liable to cause pollution and/or nuisance to land, air or water will only be permitted where human health and safety, amenity and the ecological well-being of the natural and built environment is not put at risk, when such development does not reduce the Local Planning Authority's ability to meet the Government's air quality and other sustainability targets and development does not negatively impact upon the existing pollution and nuisance situation.
- 8.281 Since 2013 an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) has been designated in the centre of Rottingdean, along the High Street, between the A259 and the T-junction with Vicarage Lane, declared in relation to nitrogen dioxide levels and as such air quality and the impact of the proposal on the AQMA needs to be considered. Although a small part of the site is located within the AQMA it is noted that neither the proposed care home nor none of the proposed residential units built/created as a result of the proposal would sit in the footprint of the AQMA.
- 8.282 As part of the application an Air Quality Assessment has been submitted. As a result of the Council's Air Quality Officer's original comments on the proposal an Addendum to the assessment has also been submitted.
- 8.283 In summary the submitted Air Quality Assessments argues negligible impacts from the proposed and other proposed developments and significant impacts on the AQMA from multiple developments (cumulative). The submitted costing calculator suggests the cost of pollution due to the proposed development would be £100,000. The submitted Addendum outlines that mitigation measures already proposed as part of the development exceed the estimated cost of the impact.

- 8.284 Despite the submission of the Air Quality Assessment an associated Addendum the Council's Air Quality Officer concludes that insufficient information has been submitted as part of the application and clarification and further information regarding the following matters is required;
- The impacts of other committed developments (with planning permission) should be assessed cumulatively,
  - Whilst a Verification Process is presented it is requested that an adjustment factor is avoided. It appears road traffic emissions calculations for the High Street scenario are under estimated,
  - The traffic data for the High Street based in the new surveys is lower than expected and lower than the flows used to declare the AQMA and to determine the Council's Air Quality Action Plan. It should be explained how the Annual Average Weekday Traffic was derived and which source it was obtained from,
  - The archive monitoring from Telscombe Cliffs is compared with Rottingdean High Street and the main reason for differences offered is the street canyon or confined space. However also of importance is the close proximity of the residential façade, the attitude of the street to the hills and the window and the very slow movement of traffic for most of the year. Slow stop-start traffic would have higher emissions rates,
  - Defra's Emissions Factor Toolkit (EFT) is used to estimate emissions from road traffic. EFT uses the European Environment Agency's COPERT 4 v10 to assess emissions. The Council's Air Quality Officer believes that this tool underestimates diesel emissions in slow traffic. A critique is required on the suitability of COPERT using the Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants (CERC) presentation document. If an adjustment is applied to the emissions rates as CERC suggests, the developments impact on the AQMA is likely to more than predicted,
  - Particulate model predictions or emissions seem not to have been verified. At least 50% of  $PM_{2.5}$  emissions are not from the vehicle exhaust and derive from brake, tyre, road wear and re-suspension. Contributions for these impacts should be included in the emissions cost calculator. If included the cost of pollution from the development would be more than the stated £100,000. The contribution from particles is compared with the EU  $PM_{2.5}$  objective quoted as  $25 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ . It is suggested this is part of the Air Quality Strategy (AQS national strategy for England). A comparison with the objective set out in the next point below is required,
  - To complement the 2015 Air Quality Action Plan for nitrogen dioxide the Council is working towards compliance with the National Exposure Reduction Target for  $PM_{2.5}$  to be achieved by 2020. For the UK's reference year (2010) the Average Exposure Indicator (AEI) was  $13 \mu\text{g} \text{m}^{-3}$ ; on this basis, the Air Quality Directive sets an exposure reduction target of 15%. This equates to reducing the AEI to  $11 \mu\text{g} \text{m}^{-3}$  by 2020. The detailed methodology and results of this calculation are presented in the Defra's technical report on UK air quality assessment. A target of  $11 \mu\text{g} \text{m}^{-3}$  is less than the concentrations of  $PM_{2.5}$  outlined in the Addendum for the proposed development. The percentages compared against other assessment levels are not deemed to be relevant to the targets that the Council is working towards,

- The Preston Park background monitor is more than 200m from any road or premises and therefore has much lower pollution than almost all of the local urban area. Pollution is very low for much of the South Downs National Park, especially close to ridges and hilltops. However this is not the same scenario as the sheltered village in a valley with a clustered building canopy and emissions from wood and coal fireplaces, stoves, oil ranges and gas boilers. Inclusion of Preston park background is justified although it is noted the higher results from 2010 have been excluded from the Air Quality Assessment Addendum, and
- The submitted Air Quality Assessment Addendum includes an assessment of significance. It is suggested that one of the diffusion tube monitors, E22, is not a relevant location for exposure, because it is outside a shop rather than a residence. The façade tubes E22 and E23 on both sides of the High Street are representative of the residential building façade. Defra's Local Air Quality Management Guidance states that monitors need to be relevant for nearby exposure for example the same distance from a road section as the faced or nearby residential receptor. Therefore an explanation is required as to why the two High Street monitors are stated to be 'not applicable' in the significance table 7 of the submitted Air Quality Assessment Addendum.

8.285 Due to the clarification and additional information required as set out above the Local Planning Authority is unable to make a full assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on the Rottingdean AQMA and local air quality.

#### Land Contamination

8.286 A Phase 1 Environmental Assessment and a partial site investigation report have been submitted as part of the application with regards to land contamination. The submitted report has identified a potential hot spot of lead which is considered to present a potential risk to human health. The report therefore recommends that a full Phase II Intrusive Investigation is undertaken at the site, an issue which could be dealt with a condition if overall the proposal was considered acceptable.

8.287 It is noted that the submitted report makes reference to asbestos within the structure of the existing buildings. As some of these buildings would be converted to residential use, the Council's Environmental Health Officer would expect a structural asbestos report detailing how any asbestos identified would be dealt with to ensure that it does not impact on future residents.

8.288 Whilst a site report presents what has been intrusively examined, the Council's Environmental Health Officer has stated that there will always remain a degree of uncertainty over what else may be on the site which was not planned or expected and therefore an approval should be subject to a discovery strategy to ensure that any unexpected or accidental discoveries made during the construction phase be dealt with in a controlled manner.

#### **Proposal Public Benefits versus Development Harm Assessment**

8.289 Following adoption of the City Plan on the 24<sup>th</sup> March this year no relevant policies are out-of-date. It is acknowledged that the NPPF makes clear that developments should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of

sustainable development. The NPPF also makes it clear that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development (as defined by paragraphs 18 to 219 of the NPPF taken as a whole), especially in terms of three dimensions, being economic, social and environmental.

- 8.290 The public benefits of the proposal are identified as being a contribution towards the City's housing target, the provision of a care home providing some specialist dementia care, the transfer of the retained playing field into public ownership, the provision of jobs at the proposed care home and during the demolition and construction phases, the provision of a construction and training and employment strategy including the encouragement of local workers during construction and demolition phases (part of the required S106 agreement), an increase in local household spending, increased demand for services and bringing Field House and the curtilage listed cottages/Rumneys back into use which would ensure their future conservation, benefits which would be consistent with the three dimensions of sustainability.
- 8.291 Whilst the loss of a third of the playing field (including two tennis courts) raise a significant concern and weighs against the proposal it has been acknowledged above that the loss of part of the playing field would enable a viable re-development of the school site to be achieved, as confirmed by the DV. Furthermore the transfer of the retained playing field to the Council, with an associated maintenance fund, would not only allow formal public access/use but would achieve a more effective use of the remaining open space than at present. Under these circumstances it is considered that the partial loss of part of the playing field for development could be allowed in order to secure the benefits of the wider redevelopment of the site.
- 8.292 Whilst the Chapel building would be retained, the proposal fails to provide a future use of the Chapel that would ensure that it is persevered and has a viable and sustainable future.
- 8.293 Whilst the benefits of additional housing provision is noted and the principle of the loss of part of the playing field is acceptable (in order to realise the wider benefits of the proposal previously discussed) it is however considered that the proposed development on the playing field as proposed is disappointingly low (approximately 26dph). A gain of only 10 dwellings at such a low density is not considered a significant benefit when weighed against the loss of approximately 0.4ha of playing field. The overall benefit of housing provision within the proposal is further diminished by the lack of affordable housing provision (40% provision was considered viable by the DV). The density of the development on the playing field combined with the lack of affordable housing represents a lost opportunity for housing delivery in the City considering our housing need.
- 8.293 The proposed design and scale of the new residential buildings across the site and the design, scale, footprint and massing of the proposed care home are considered to be inappropriate and of harm to the character and appearance of the school site and the wider area including the Conservation Area and its setting and the setting of Listed Buildings within the site.

- 8.294 The proposed development would fail to meet the minimum sustainability standards and the applicant has failed to provide justification for the lower standards set out in the submission.
- 8.295 With regards to heritage, as set out previously the harm that would be caused by the proposal to the setting of the Conservation Area is considered significant. In terms of the NPPF the level of harm is considered to be at the upper extent of 'less than substantial harm'. In considering the acceptability of a development proposal, the NPPF states that harm at this level should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use (para 134).
- 8.296 The National Planning Policy Guidance defines optimum viable use (where a range of uses are possible), as the use likely to cause least harm to the significance of the asset. In heritage terms, the optimum use of the main listed building would therefore be in single institutional use to avoid subdivision of the interior. It is nevertheless acknowledged that there is a heritage benefit of bringing the Listed Building back into use to ensure its future conservation.
- 8.297 For the reasons set out in this report the proposed conversion of Field House into 6 residential units would cause considerable harm to the significance of the Listed Building and as such the proposed conversion would not be consistent with the conservation of the building, nor that it is optimal.
- 8.298 Other adverse harm to the Listed Buildings/curtilage Listed Buildings/structures has also been discussed within this report such as the proposed external alterations to the cottages. It is considered that the overall identified level of harm to the Listed Buildings/curtilage Listed Buildings on the site is considered too great to be outweighed by the identified heritage public benefit of bringing the site back into use.
- 8.299 Whilst the loss of part of the playing field is considered acceptable in principle for reasons set out previously, in heritage terms it is considered that the proposed development on the playing fields would cause harm to the setting of the Conservation Area, in addition to causing adverse harm to the listed (and curtilage listed) buildings. This further compounds the level of harm caused by the scheme as a whole. Development on the playing field thus causes further disparity between the level of harm caused and the identified heritage benefits.

## **9 CONCLUSION**

- 9.1 The public benefits of the proposed development are noted, including the re-use of currently vacant school buildings, the future conservation of Listed Buildings, the delivery of much-needed housing and the transfer of the retained playing field to the Council for public open. However these public benefits are outweighed by the overall shortcomings of the proposed development, including the lack of provision of affordable housing, the failure of the proposal to secure a future use of the Chapel, the harm caused by the massing/design of new buildings and the harm that would be caused to Listed Buildings/curtilage Listed Buildings as a result of the proposed conversion and/or

alterations in addition to the harm caused to the Conservation Area and its setting and the setting of Listed Buildings.

**10 EQUALITIES**

If overall considered acceptable the proposal would be required to comply with Building Regulations Optional Requirement M4(2) (accessible and adaptable dwellings). However the applicant has failed to demonstrate that a proportion of the proposed residential units would be built to a wheelchair accessible standard.

**11 REASON FOR REFUSAL / INFORMATIVES**

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed development fails to provide any affordable housing provision despite being assessed as financially viable when including the maximum 40% affordable housing provision and as such is contrary to policy CP20 of the City Plan.
2. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that a proportion of the proposed residential units would be built to a wheelchair accessible standard. The development is therefore contrary to policy HO13 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
3. The proposed development would fail to achieve minimum sustainability standards and the applicant has failed to provide justification for the proposed lower sustainability standards. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CP8 of the City Plan and the St Aubyns School Site Planning Brief.
4. The Local Planning Authority has not been able to assess the likely impacts of the proposed development with respect to Air Quality within the Rottingdean Air Quality Management Area, due to omissions in the submission. Consequently it has not been possible to identify whether and what mitigation measures may be appropriate and therefore the Local Planning Authority is unable to complete a full assessment of the proposal. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policies SU9 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
5. The submission fails to justify the demolition of the block and associated extensions to the north of Field House. Based upon the information submitted the proposed development would result in the loss of an important historic building, contrary to policy HE2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and policy CP15 of the City Plan.
6. The submitted Heritage Statement and Impact Assessment fails to include the curtilage listed shooting range and as such the Local Planning Authority is unable assess the significance of the loss of this building, contrary to policy HE2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and policy CP15 of the City Plan.
7. The proposed external alterations to the rear of Field House would introduce a level of regularity and symmetry to the rear elevation which has no historic precedent and subsequently would result in an adverse impact upon the understanding of the historic development of the building. In addition the proposed external alterations to the roof of Field House would result in the loss of sections of the historic roof form and would have harmful impacts upon the historic fabric and historic form of the Grade II Listed Building. As such the proposed alterations to Field House would be harmful to the character, appearance and historic significance of the Grade II Listed Building, contrary

- to policies HE1 and HE2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP15 of the City Plan.
8. The proposed alterations to the window/glazed door openings and the extension of the of the weather boarding on the main elevation of the Cottages and the addition of porches to the Cottages and Rumneys would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of these Grade II curtilage Listed Buildings, contrary to polices HE1 and HE4 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP15 of the City Plan.
  9. The proposed building providing units 30 to 35, by virtue of its grand architectural style, excessive scale, bulk and massing would compete with the dominance and architectural/historic interest of the retained Field House, obscuring the historic development and hierarchy of buildings on the site whilst the design, palette of materials, detailing roof forms and layout of the proposed new residential dwellings and new roads fail to reflect the local character, urban grain and character of development in Rottingdean village. Furthermore the proposed care home, due to its excessive scale, massing and footprint would appear dominant in relation to the footprint of the Listed Field House and would have an unbroken ridgeline and roofspace that would contrast with the small scale urban form of Rottingdean village. As such the proposed new buildings are considered to have an adverse and harmful impact upon the visual amenities of the site, the associated street scenes and the wider area including the Conservation Area and its setting and the setting of Listed Building, compromising the quality of the local environment. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policies QD5, HE3 and HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and policies CP12 and CP15 of the City Plan.
  10. In the absence of an acceptable scheme for the redevelopment of the site, the demolition of all/part of existing historic flint walls across the site is considered harmful to the historic character and appearance of the former school site, contrary to policy HE2 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan CP15 of the City Plan.
  11. Whilst the proposal would result in the retention of the school Chapel the submission fails to identify the Chapel as a Listed Building and fails to identify its historic significance. Insufficient information has been submitted regarding any works required to separate and make good the Chapel from the remainder of the school building and what structural implications this may have for the Chapel. Furthermore the proposal fails to identify a future use for the retained Chapel to ensure its viable and sustainable future. As such the proposal is considered contrary to policies HO20 and HE1 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan CP15 of the City Plan.
  12. The proposed development on the southern part of the playing field would erode the visual separation between development associated with the historic Rottingdean village and the suburban development to the east, and would therefore have an adverse impact upon the setting of the Rottingdean Conservation Area contrary to policy HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan CP15 of the City Plan.

Informatives:

1. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy SS1 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One the approach to making a decision on this planning application has been to apply the presumption in

PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

favour of sustainable development. The Local Planning Authority seeks to approve planning applications which are for sustainable development where possible.

2. This decision is based on the drawings listed below:

<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
Red Line Plan	FD14-1132 -50A	Rev. C	29 <sup>th</sup> February 2016
Developable Area Plan	FD14-1132 -50A1	Rev. A	29 <sup>th</sup> February 2016
Existing Site Survey	FD14-1132 -51	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Existing Site Sections	FD14-1132 -52	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Existing Site Sections	FD14-1132 -53	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Existing Street Scenes	FD14-1132 -54	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Existing Street Scenes	FD14-1132 -55	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Proposed Site Layout	FD14-1132 -56	Rev. D	29 <sup>th</sup> February 2016
Proposed Site Layout showing Brighton & Hove City Council Tra Area	FD14-1132 -57	Rev. B	29 <sup>th</sup> February 2016
Site Location Plan Showing Buildings & Structures to be Removed	FD14-1132 -59	Rev. B	29 <sup>th</sup> February 2016
Plots 2 & 3 Proposed Floor Plans	FD14-1132 -110	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 2 & 3 Proposed Floor Plan & Roof Plan	FD14-1132 -111	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 2 & 3 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -112	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 2 & 3 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -113	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 4-7 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -120	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 4-7 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -121	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 4-7 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -123	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 4-7 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -124	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 4-7 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -125	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 4-7 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -126	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015



PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

Plots 4-7 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -127	-	24th August 2015
Plots 8-10 Proposed Floor Plans	FD14-1132 -130	-	24th August 2015
Plots 8-10 Proposed Roof Plan	FD14-1132 -131	-	24th August 2015
Plots 8-10 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -132	-	24th August 2015
Plots 8-10 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -133	-	24th August 2015
Plots 8-10 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -134	-	24th August 2015
Plots 11-13 Proposed Floor Plans	FD14-1132 -140	-	24th August 2015
Plots 11-13 Proposed Roof Plan	FD14-1132 -141	-	24th August 2015
Plots 11-13 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -142	-	24th August 2015
Plots 11-13 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -143	-	24th August 2015
Plots 14-16 Proposed Floor Plans	FD14-1132 -150	-	24th August 2015
Plots 14-16 Proposed Roof Plan	FD14-1132 -151	-	24th August 2015
Plots 14-16 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -152	-	24th August 2015
Plots 14-16 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -153	-	24th August 2015
Plot 17 Proposed Floor Plans & Roof Plan	FD14-1132 -160	-	24th August 2015
Plot 17 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -161	-	24th August 2015
Plot 18 Proposed Floor Plans & Roof Plan	FD14-1132 -170		
Plot 18 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -171	-	24th August 2015
Plots 19-23 Proposed Floor Plans	FD14-1132 -180	-	24th August 2015
Plots 19-23 Proposed Roof Plan	FD14-1132 -181	-	24th August 2015
Plots 19-23 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -182	-	24th August 2015
Plots 19-23 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -183	-	24th August 2015
Plots 19-23 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -184	-	24th August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -190	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 24-29	FD14-1132	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015

PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

Proposed Floor Plan	-191		
Plots 24-29 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -192	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -193	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -194	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -195	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -196	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -197	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -198	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 30-35 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -200	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 30-35 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -201	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 30-35 Proposed Roof Plan	FD14-1132 -202	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 30-35 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -203	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 30-35 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -204	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 30-35 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -205	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 30-35 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -206	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 1, 36-38 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -210	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 1, 36-38 Proposed Floor Plan	FD14-1132 -211	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 1, 36-38 Proposed Roof Plan	FD14-1132 -212	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 1, 36-38 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -213	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 1, 36-38 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -214	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 1, 36-38 Proposed Elevation	FD14-1132 -215	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 39 & 48 Proposed Floor Plans & Roof Plan	FD14-1132 -220	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 39 & 48 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -221	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 40 & 41, 46 & 47 Floor Plans & Roof Plan	FD14-1132 -230	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 40 & 41, 46 & 47 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -231	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015

PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

Plots 42 & 45 Proposed Floor Plans	FD14-1132 -240	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 42 & 45 Proposed Roof Plan	FD14-1132 -241	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 42 & 45 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -242	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 42 & 45 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -243	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 43 & 44 Proposed Floor Plans & Roof Plan	FD14-1132 -250	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 43 & 44 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -251	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 43 & 44 Proposed Elevations	FD14-1132 -252	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 30-35 Bin & Cycle Store Plans & Elevations	FD14-1132 -400	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 24-29 Bin Store Plans & Elevations	FD14-1132 -401	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 36-38 Bin & Cycle Store Plan & Elevations	FD14-1132 -402	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 6-7 Bin Store Plans and Elevations	FD14-1132 -403	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plot 9, 12 & 15 Bin Store Plans and Elevations	FD14-1132 -404	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 19-23 Bin Store Plans and Elevations	FD14-1132 -405	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 39, 40, 47 & 48 Garage Plans & Elevations	FD14-1132 -450	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 41 & 46 Garage Plans and Elevations	FD14-1132 -451	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Plots 1-3 Car Barn Plans & Elevations	FD14-1132 -452	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Generic Cycle Store Plans & Elevations	FD14-1132 -453	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Proposed Site Sections	FD14-1132 -700	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Proposed Site Sections	FD14-1132 -701	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Proposed Street Scenes	FD14-1132 -702	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Proposed Street Scenes	FD14-1132 -703	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Existing & Proposed Wall along Steyning Road	FD14-132 -800	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Proposed Site Layout Showing Developable Area	FD14-1132 -950	Rev. B	29 <sup>th</sup> February 2016
Care Home Proposed Floor Plan	14-075-119	Rev. G	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015

PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

Care Home Proposed Floor Plan	14-075-120	Rev. G	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Care Home Proposed Floor Plan	14-075-121	Rev. G	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Care Home Proposed Floor Plan	14-075-135	Rev. D	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Care Home Proposed Elevations	14-075-150	Rev. E	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Care Home Proposed Elevations	14-075-151	Rev. E	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Care Home Proposed Elevations	14-075-152	Rev. E	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Building Survey Main Building - Basement	LH/1501018 MB	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Building Survey Main Building - Ground Floor	LH/1501018 MG	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Building Survey Main Building - First Floor	LH/1501018 MF	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Building Survey Main Building - Second Floor	LH/1501018 MS	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Building Survey External Floor Plans	LH/1501018 EFP	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Elevation Layout	LH/1501018 EL	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Building Survey Elevations Sheet 1	LH/1501018 E1	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Building Survey Elevations Sheet 2	LH/1501018 E2	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Building Survey Elevations Sheet 3	LH/1501018 E3	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Building Survey Elevations Sheet 4	LH/1501018 E4	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Topographical Survey - Sheet 1	LH/1501018 T1	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Topographical Survey - Sheet 2	LH/1501018 T2	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Topographical Survey - Sheet 3	LH/1501018 T3	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Topographical Survey - Sheet 4	LH/1501018 T4	-	8 <sup>th</sup> September 2015
Combined Hard and Soft Landscape General Arrangement Plan(Sheet 1 of 4)	D2294 L. 201	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Combined Hard and Soft Landscape General Arrangement Plan(Sheet 2 of 4)	D2294 L. 202	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Combined Hard and Soft Landscape General Arrangement Plan(Sheet 3 of 4)	D2294 L. 203	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015

PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

Combined Hard and Soft Landscape General Arrangement Plan(Sheet 4 of 4)	D2294 L. 204	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Soft Landscape Schedule and Specification	D2294 L. 205	-	24 <sup>th</sup> August 2015

**Appendix A - St Aubyns School, 76 High Street, Rottingdean – BH2015/03108**

**Letters of Objection**

<b>Property Name / Number</b>	<b>Street</b>	<b>Town</b>	<b>Postcode</b>
12A			BN2 7GR
4			BN2 7HA
Abe Hill			
Adam Stemp			
Alison Sherring			
Alison Wilkins			BN2 7GA
Audrey Lazarus			
Bazehill House			BN2 7DB
C Hilder			
Cecilia Roseberry			
David Lazarus			
Elizabeth Plumb			
Emma Cockburn			
Geoffrey Lazarus			
Henrietta Palmer			
James Lawson			
John, Michael & Monica Wells			
Kay Notley			
Lis Rosser			
Mrs G Vincent			
P Kilby			
Paul Goodall			
Ross Dargahi			
Sheila Baker			
Steven Warriner			BN2 7BB
55	Ainsworth Avenue		BN2 7BG
15	Arlington Gardens		
1	Ashdown Avenue		
2	Ashdown Avenue		
113	Bannings Vale		
184	Bannings Vale		
82	Bannings Vale		
19	Bazehill Road		
Apartment 5, 27	Bazehill Road		
Canon Gate (x2)	Bazehill Road		
9	Brambletyne Avenue		
19	Burnes Vale		
21	Burnes Vale	Rottingdean	BN2 7DW

25	Burnes Vale		
7	Burnes Vale		
15	Chailey Avenue		
16(x2)	Chailey Avenue	Rottingdean	BN2 7GH
18(x2)	Chailey Avenue		
20(x2)	Chailey Avenue		
22(x2)	Chailey Avenue	Rottingdean	BN2 7GH
3	Chailey Avenue		
31	Chailey Avenue		
37	Chailey Avenue		
41	Chailey Avenue		
47(x2)	Chailey Avenue		
9	Chailey Avenue		
11	Challoners Close		
14	Challoners Close		
6	Challoners Close	Rottingdean	BN2 7DG
24	Chichester Drive West		
27	Chichester Drive West		
44	Chichester Drive West		
18	Chorley Avenue		
20 Saint Matthews Court	College Terrace	Brighton	BN2 0EX
78	Coombe Vale		
12	Court Farm Road		
7	Court Ord Cottages		
12	Court Ord Road		
17	Court Ord Road		
324(x2)	Cowley Drive		
12	Cranleigh Avenue		
13	Cranleigh Avenue		
25	Cranleigh Avenue	Rottingdean	BN2 7GN
27(x2)	Cranleigh Avenue		
34	Cranleigh Avenue		
37(x2)	Cranleigh Avenue		
122(x2)	Crescent Drive North		
115	Dean Court Road		
12 Tudor Close	Dean Court Road		
15	Dean Court Road		
5 Tudor Close(x2)	Dean Court Road		
54	Dean Court Road		
58	Dean Court Road		
61	Dean Court Road		
69	Dean Court Road		
79	Dean Court Road		
82	Dean Court Road		

85	Dean Court Road		
91	Dean Court Road		
2	Denes Mews		
6	Denes Mews		
7	Denes Mews		
8	Denes Mews		
5	Eileen Avenue		
29	Eley Crescent		
24	Eley Drive		
26	Eley Drive		
34	Eley Drive		
50	Eley Drive		
6	Eley Drive		
67	Eley Drive		
68	Eley Drive		
27	Elvin Crescent	Rottingdean	BN2 7FF
39	Elvin Crescent		
40	Elvin Crescent		
61	Elvin Crescent		
18	Falmer Avenue		
60	Falmer Avenue		
29	Falmer Road		
3 Winton Cottage(x2)	Falmer Road		
Bellaria	Founthill Road		
2 Heathshott	Friars Stile Road	Richmond	TW10 6NT
16	Gorham Avenue		
23	Gorham Avenue	Rottingdean	BN2 7DP
25(x2)	Gorham Avenue		
27(x2)	Gorham Avenue		
28	Gorham Avenue		
42(x2)	Gorham Avenue		
50	Gorham Avenue		
11	Grand Crescent		
16	Grand Crescent	Rottingdean	BN2 7GL
19	Grand Crescent		
28 (x2)	Grand Crescent	Rottingdean	BN2 7GL
29	Grand Crescent		
36	Grand Crescent		
41	Grand Crescent		
50	Grand Crescent		
Flat 2, 44(x2)	Grand Crescent		
9	Greenbank Avenue		
18	Hailsham Avenue		
2(x2)	Hempstead Road		
102/104(x2)	High Street		
112	High Street	Rottingdean	BN2 7HF



23 St Margarets	High Street		
33 St Margarets Court	High Street		
61A	High Street		BN2 7HE
69	High Street		
72/74	High Street		
IF 1 Margos Mews	High Street		
Just So, 3 Margos Mews	High Street		
Stanley House, 116	High Street		
46A	Inwood Crescent		
12	Knole Road		
5(x2)	Knole Road		
13	Lenham Road West		
16	Lenham Road West		
2A	Lenham Road West		
5(x2)	Lenham Road West		
8	Lenham Road West		
39	Lewis Road	Chichester	PO19 7LZ
17	Linchmere Avenue		
18	Little Crescent		
6	Longhill Close		
20	Longhill Road		
Beacon Point	Longhill Road		BN2 7BE
126	Lustrells Crescent		
23	Lustrells Crescent		
Point Clear	Lustrells Road		
3	Marine Close		
111	Marine Drive		
14 Marine Court, 65	Marine Drive		
2 Marine Court, 65	Marine Drive	Rottingdean	BN2 7LG
8A	Marine Drive		
11	Meadow Close		
47	Meadow Close		
1	Meadow Vale		
15	Nevill Road		
21	Nevill Road		
27	Nevill Road		
28	Nevill Road		
36(x2)	Nevill Road		
40(x3)	Nevill Road		
7	New Barn Road		
12	Newlands Road		
16(x4)	Newlands Road		
18	Newlands Road		
20(x2)	Newlands Road	Rottingdean	BN2 7GD
22	Newlands Road		

24	Newlands Road		
28(x2)	Newlands Road		
3 Ocean Reach	Newlands Road		
30	Newlands Road		
Flat 8, Ocean Reach, 2	Newlands Road		
West Winds, 6	Newlands Road		
5	Northgate Close		
101(x2)	Oaklands Avenue		
Honeysuckle Cottage	Olde Place Mews		
18	Ovingdean Close	Brighton	BN2 7AD
6 Meadow Vale	Ovingdean Road	Brighton	BN2 7AA
Threeways	Ovingdean Road		BN2 7BB
Woodingcote House	Ovingdean Road	Ovingdean	BN2 7AA
1	Park Crescent		
17	Park Crescent		BN2 7NH
7 Cownway Court	Park Crescent		
11	Park Road		
15	Park Road		
20	Park Road		
25	Pinewood Close	Eastbourne	BN22 0SA
22B	Pippins Field	Uffculme, Devon	EX15 3BS
32	Rowan Way	Rottingdean	BN2 7FP
33(x2)	Rowan Way	Rottingdean	BN2 7FP
33(x2)	Rowan Way		
34	Rowan Way		
37	Rowan Way	Rottingdean	BN2 7FP
43	Rowan Way		
61	Saltdean Drive		
74(x2)	Saltdean Drive		BN2 8SD
28	Southdown Avenue	Peacehaven	BN10 8RX
1	St Aubyns Mead		
1 Kipling Court	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	BN2 7JT
12 Kipling Court	St Aubyns Mead		
13	St Aubyns Mead		
15	St Aubyns Mead		BN2 7HY
18	St Aubyns Mead		
2	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	BN2 7HY
2 Kipling Court	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	BN2 7JT
20	St Aubyns Mead		
23	St Aubyns Mead		
24	St Aubyns Mead		
25	St Aubyns Mead		
3	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	BN2 7HY
3 Kipling Court	St Aubyns Mead		
5 Kipling Court	St Aubyns Mead		

7	St Aubyns Mead		
7 Kipling Court	St Aubyns Mead		
9 Kipling Court	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	BN2 7JT
Unknown	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	BN2 7JT
Windmill View	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	BN2 7HY
64	Stanstead Crescent		
110	Station Road	Hampton	TW12 1AS
Braemar House (x2)	Steyning Road	Rottingdean	BN2 7GA
Eagles	Steyning Road		
Eastfield(x2)	Steyning Road	Rottingdean	BN2 7GA
Emsworth(x2)	Steyning Road		
Ground Floor Brookside	Steyning Road	Rottingdean	
Rotherdown	Steyning Road		
St Edmunds(x2)	Steyning Road		
Strood	Steyning Road	Rottingdean	BN2 7GA
The Hideaway(x2)	Steyning Road	Rottingdean	BN2 7GA
29 The Dene	The Green	Rottingdean	BN2 7HA
Aubrey House	The Green		
Court Barn	The Green		
Dale Cottage(x3)	The Green		
Hillside(x2)	The Green		
Pax	The Green		
Squash Cottage	The Green		
St Martha's Convent (x2)	The Green		
The Elms	The Green		
Saint Martha's Convent	The High Street		
16	The Rotyngs		
9	The Rotyngs	Rottingdean	BN2 7DX
20 Trafalgar Gate	The Strand, Brighton Marina		
11	The Vale		
14	The Vale		
15	The Vale		
2 Forge House	Vicarage Lane		
2	Vicarage Terrace		
3	Victoria Mews		
5	Wanderdown Close		
8	Wanderdown Drive		
7	Wanderdown Way		
8	Wanderdown Way		
7	Welesmere Road		
18(x2)	West Street	Rottingdean	BN2 7HP
18A	West Street	Rottingdean	BN2 7HP
39	Westfield Avenue North		
61(x2)	Westfield Avenue North		

18	Westfield Avenue South	Saltdean	BN2 8HT
69	Westmeston Avenue		
96	Wicklans Avenue		
8	Wilkinson Close		

### Letters of Support

Property Name / Number	Street	Town	Postcode
Unknown	Unknown		
57	High Street		
47(x3)	High Street		
100	High Street		
45	Rottingdean Place		BN2 7FS
Corner House	Steyning Road		BN2 7GA
40	Ashdown Avenue		BN2 8AH
The Old Engine House			SN7 7QD

### Comment Letters

Property Name / Number	Street	Town	Postcode
Cara Starbuck			
24	Chailey Avenue	Rottingdean	
Homeleigh, 8	Northgate Close	Rottingdean	BN2 7DZ
Kipling Cottage	The Green		
58	Unknown		BN2 7FP

**Appendix B - St Aubyns School, 76 High Street, Rottingdean – BH2015/03108**

**Letters of Objection**

<b>Property Name / Number</b>	<b>Street</b>	<b>Town</b>	<b>Postcode</b>
20 Newlands Road		Rottingdean	BN2 7GD
29 St Aubyns Mead		Rottingdean	BN2 7HY
7 Denes Mews		Rottingdean	BN2 7AH
8 Kipling Court		Rottingdean	BN2 7JT
61a	High Street	Rottingdean	BN2 7HE
1 Kipling Court	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	BN2 7JT
12 Kipling Court	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	BN2 7JT
2 Kipling Court	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	BN2 7JT
3 Kipling Court	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	BN2 7JT
5 Kipling Court	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	BN2 7JT
7 Kipling Court	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	BN2 7JT
Windmill View	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	
3	St Aubyns Mews	Rottingdean	BN2 7HY
Corner House (Flat 1)	Steyning Road	Rottingdean	BN2 7GA
Eastfield	Steyning Road	Rottingdean	BN2 7GA
Our Lady of Lourdes Queen of Peace Church	Steyning Road	Rottingdean	BN2 7HB
Rotherdown	Steyning Road	Rottingdean	BN2 7GA
Bernard Turnball	Unknown	Unknown	

COUNCILLOR REPRESENTATION

**From:** Mary Mears  
**Sent:** 13 October 2015 5:28 PM  
**To:** Liz Arnold  
**Cc:** Jeanette Walsh  
**Subject:** Objection to Planning Application BH2015/03108 St Aubyns School.

Liz Arnold.  
Principal Planning Officer.  
Development Control.

13<sup>th</sup> October 2015

**Re Planning Application BH2015/03108 St Aubyns School 76 High Street Rottingdean..**

As a Councillor for Rottingdean Coastal ward, I wish to object to the above planning application for the following reasons:

In my view this planning application is a serious over development of the former St Aubyns School. And will have a detrimental impact on Rottingdean village. The proposal to build 48 residential homes, Plus a 62 bed home is too large a development on the site for the village, where the infrastructure is already at breaking point.

So much so that the council earlier this year included Rottingdean High Street in its Local Transport Plan 4 the council's own officer reported over 14 thousand vehicles per day using Rottingdean High Street, with pollution levels higher than EU regulations higher even than North Street in Brighton. The high Street has no cycle lanes, has narrow or no pavements and has a bottle neck at its narrowest point.

This application with additional care home staff, new residents, deliveries extra car journeys will increase the congestion levels not only in the High Street but also will impact on Steyning and Newlands Road the application also includes a proposal to use an entrance at Marine Dive just above the very busy junction at Rottingdean, In my view this is a very dangerous access and has potential for very serious accidents.

Rottingdean already has three care homes in the village, providing 75 bed spaces. As well as a retirement home, all have vacant places. A new care home would increase the already large numbers of elderly and disabled residents in the village, and put additional strain on our local GP services

This proposed development would not only have a detrimental impact on road capacity in the village but also on the sewage and drainage. The High Street has been flooded in the past unable to cope with heavy surface water. The village has insufficient school places for a development of this size.

As a ward Councillor I wish to reserve my right to speak on this application at the planning committee.

**Councillor Mary Mears**  
**Conservative Member for Rottingdean Coastal Ward**