

<u>No:</u>	BH2016/05810	<u>Ward:</u>	Hollingdean And Stanmer Ward
<u>App Type:</u>	Full Planning		
<u>Address:</u>	Genome Centre & Land Adjoining To East Within The Science Car Park Science Park Road University Of Sussex Falmer		
<u>Proposal:</u>	Refurbishment of the existing Genome Centre building and erection of a new Life Sciences building (D1) (14,910 sqm) over four floors plus basement with associated access, servicing and landscaping.		
<u>Officer:</u>	Kate Brocklebank, tel: 292454	<u>Valid Date:</u>	11.11.2016
<u>Con Area:</u>	Adj Stanmer Conservation Area	<u>Expiry Date:</u>	03.03.2017
		<u>EoT/PPA Date</u>	14.04.2017
<u>Listed Building Grade:</u>	Within the Setting of Grade II* and Grade I listed buildings		
<u>Agent:</u>	Parker Dann Ltd, S10, The Waterside Centre, North Street, Lewes, BN7 2PE		
<u>Applicant:</u>	University Of Sussex, Sussex House, University Of Sussex, Falmer Brighton, BN1 9RH		

1. RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out below and resolves to be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission subject to a s106 agreement and the following Conditions and Informatives:

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings listed below.

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

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Floor Plans Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-03-DR-PL20-105	P01	21 January 2016
Floor Plans Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-RF-DR-PL20-106	P01	21 January 2016
Elevations Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-XX-EL-A-PL20-120	P01	21 January 2016
Elevations Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-XX-EL-A-PL20-121	P01	21 January 2016

Elevations Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-XX-EL-A-PL20-122	P01	21 January 2016
Elevations Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-XX-EL-A-PL20-123	P01	21 January 2016
Elevations Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-XX-EL-A-PL20-124	P01	21 January 2016
Elevations Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-XX-EL-A-PL20-125	P01	21 January 2016
Elevations Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-XX-SE-A-PL20-110	P01	21 January 2016
Elevations Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-XX-SE-A-PL20-111	P01	21 January 2016
Landscaping Proposed	8221-PL-GA-00-101	P01	21 January 2016
Landscaping Proposed	8221-PL-GA-02-101	P01	21 January 2016
Landscaping Proposed	8221-PL-GA-03-101	P01	21 January 2016
Block Plan Existing	1630-HKB-XX-DR-A-PL01-001	P01	21 October 2016
Block Plan Existing	1630-HKB-XX-DR-A-PL01-002	P01	21 October 2016
Site Layout Plan	1630-HKB-XX-DR-A-PL20-001	P01	21 October 2016
Block Plan Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-DR-A-PL20-002	P01	21 October 2016
Existing Elevations	1630-HKB-XX-XX-DR-PL01-101	P01	21 October 2016
Existing Elevations	1630-HKB-XX-XX-DR-PL01-120	P01	21 October 2016
Floor Plans Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-B1-DR-PL20-101	P01	21 October 2016
Floor Plans Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-00-DR-PL20-102	P01	21 October 2016
Floor Plans Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-01-DR-PL20-103	P01	21 October 2016
Floor Plans Proposed	1630-HKB-XX-02-DR-PL20-104	P01	21 January 2016

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To ensure that the Local Planning Authority retains the right to review unimplemented permissions.

- 3 Any tree works carried out in connection with the development hereby approved shall be undertaken in accordance with the approach detailed in paragraphs 4.3 to 4.4 of Appendix 1 (Bat Survey Report) received 21 October 2016.

Reason: To safeguard these protected species from the impact of the development in accordance with policies QD18 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP10 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

- 4 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted details showing the type, number, location and timescale for implementation of compensatory bat boxes shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall then be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard these protected species from the impact of the development and ensure appropriate integration of new nature conservation and enhancement features in accordance with policies QD18 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP10 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

- 5 No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until details of the construction of the green roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include a cross section, construction method statement, the seed mix, and a maintenance and irrigation programme. The roofs shall then be constructed in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the development contributes to ecological enhancement on the site and in accordance with policy CP10 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

- 6 No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until a drainage strategy detailing the proposed means of foul water disposal and an implementation timetable, has been submitted to and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and timetable.

Reason: To ensure adequate foul sewage drainage/treatment is available prior to development commencing and to comply with policy SU5 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.

- 7 No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until a detailed design and associated management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage for the site using sustainable drainage methods has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved drainage system shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal and to comply with policies SU4 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP11 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

- 8 No hedgerow, tree or shrub shall be removed from the site between 1st March and 31st August inclusive without the prior submission of a report to the local planning authority which sets out the results of a survey to assess the nesting bird activity on the site and describes a method of working to protect any nesting bird interest. The report must first be agreed in writing by the local planning authority and development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To safeguard these protected species from the impact of the development in accordance with policies QD18 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP10 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.
- 9 If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.
Reason: To ensure that any contamination identified during the construction works is fully characterised and assessed and to comply with policy SU11 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
- 10 Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods can result in risks to potable supplies from, for example, pollution / turbidity, risk of mobilising contamination, drilling through different aquifers and creating preferential pathways. Thus it should be demonstrated that any proposed piling will not result in contamination of groundwater in accordance with policy SU3 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
- 11 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the non-residential development hereby approved shall not be occupied until a BREEAM Building Research Establishment issued Post Construction Review Certificate confirming that the non-residential development built has achieved a minimum BREEAM New Construction rating of 'Excellent' has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable and makes efficient use of energy, water and materials and to comply with policy CP8 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.
- 12 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, details of the photovoltaic array referred to in the Energy Strategy received 21 October 2016 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The photovoltaic array shall then be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable and makes efficient use of energy, water and materials and has an acceptable appearance and to comply with policies CP8 and CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

- 13 Prior to first occupation, the development hereby approved shall be connected to University of Sussex's district heating system.

Reason: To ensure that the development is sustainable and makes efficient use of energy and to comply with policy CP8 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

- 14 No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until a sample of the external facing materials used in the construction of the development, including colour, along with details of the manifestations to be applied to the glazing and the following hard landscaping features; hard surfacing/paved areas, bollards, fixed seating and litter bins have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policy CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

- 15 The handrails used in the construction of the new extension of the monumental east-west steps up to the building hereby approved shall match the existing handrail in design, material and finish.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to comply with policy CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

- 16 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a scheme for landscaping shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include the following:

- a) Soft surfacing;
- b) Details of any boundary treatments;
- c) Details of all proposed planting to all, including numbers and species of plant, and details of size and planting method of any trees and shall include native species of local provenance.

All hard landscaping and means of enclosure shall be completed in accordance with the approved scheme prior to first occupation of the development. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved scheme of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the first occupation of the building or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenities of the area and to comply with policies QD15 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

- 17 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of secure cycle parking facilities for the occupants of, and visitors to, the development shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved facilities shall be fully implemented and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be retained for use at all times.
Reason: To ensure that satisfactory facilities for the parking of cycles are provided and to encourage travel by means other than private motor vehicles and to comply with policy TR14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan.
- 18 The nine disabled car parking spaces shown on the approved plans shall be provided and available for use prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.
Reason: To ensure that adequate parking provision is retained and to comply with policy CP9 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One and SPD14 Parking Standards.
19. Before any equipment, materials or machinery are brought onto the site for the purposes of development, a pre-commencement site meeting between the Tree Officer, Arboricultural Consultant and Site Manager shall take place to confirm the protection of trees on and adjacent to the site in accordance with the Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement prepared by S J Stephens Associates Project ref 864.1 dated December 2016. The tree protection shall be positioned as shown on the Tree Protection Plan job no. 864.1 Dated Dec 16 before any equipment, materials or machinery are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development. The tree protection shall be retained until the development is completed and nothing shall be placed within the fencing, nor shall any ground levels be altered or excavations made without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority. This condition shall not be discharged until an arboricultural supervision statement, the contents of which are to be discussed and agreed at the pre-commencement meeting, is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority on completion of development.
Reason: As this matter is fundamental to protecting the trees which are to be retained on the site during construction works in the interest of the visual amenities of the area and to comply with policies QD16 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.
20. No development shall take place until a scheme of supervision for the arboricultural protection measures have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme will be appropriate to the scale and duration of the works and will include details of:
- a) Induction and personnel awareness of arboricultural matters.
 - b) Identification of individual responsibilities and key personnel.
 - c) Timing and methods of site visiting and record keeping, including updates.
 - d) Procedures for dealing with variations and incidents.
 - e) The scheme of supervision shall be carried out as agreed.

- f) The scheme of supervision will be administered by a qualified arboriculturist instructed by the applicant and approved by the local planning authority.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to protecting the trees which are to be retained on the site during construction works in the interest of the visual amenities of the area and to comply with policies QD16 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

- 21. Notwithstanding details already submitted within the Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement, no development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until full plans and particulars showing the final siting of the services and soakaways have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the protection of trees which are to be retained on the site during construction works in the interest of the visual amenities of the area and to comply with policies QD16 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP12 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

- 22. Prior to the first occupation of the buildings on the Phase 2 Site, a “lighting design strategy for biodiversity” for the buildings and car parks on the Phase 2 Site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The strategy shall:

- a) Identify those areas/features that are particularly sensitive for bats and badgers and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites, resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging; and
- b) Show how, and where, external lighting will be installed on the Phase 2 Site (through the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places.

All external lighting on the Phase 2 site shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy, and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy. No other external lighting shall be installed other than in accordance with the approved strategy.

Reason: To safeguard these protected species from the impact of the development in accordance with policies QD18 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP10 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

- 23. No works on the Phase 2 Site which include the creation of trenches or culverts or the presence of pipes shall commence until measures to protect badgers from being trapped in open excavations and/or pipe and culverts are submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The measures may include the creation of sloping escape ramps for badgers, which may be achieved by edge profiling of trenches/excavations or by using planks placed into them at the end of the working day; and open pipework greater than 150 mm outside diameter being blanked off at the end of each working day. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard these protected species from the impact of the development in accordance with policies QD18 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP10 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One.

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 favour of sustainable development. The Local Planning Authority seeks to approve planning applications which are for sustainable development where possible.
2. The applicant is advised to enter into a formal agreement with Southern Water to provide the necessary sewerage infrastructure and connection to water supply is required to service the development and should contact: Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or www.southernwater.co.uk. The design should take account of surcharging within the public sewerage system. Land uses such as general hardstanding that may be subject to oil/petrol spillages should be drained by means of oil trap gullies or petrol/oil interceptors.
3. The applicant is advised that under Part 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 disturbance to nesting birds, their nests and eggs is a criminal offence. The nesting season is normally taken as being from 1st March - 30th September. The developer should take appropriate steps to ensure nesting birds, their nests and eggs are not disturbed and are protected until such time as they have left the nest.

2. SITE LOCATION & APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application relates to the University of Sussex campus which occupies circa 94 hectares of parkland at Falmer, at the foot of the South Downs National Park. The campus sits within a valley with the A27 to its south. The South Downs National Park climbs to the north and east of the campus. To the west lies Stanmer Park, which is a Grade II registered historic park and garden.
- 2.2 The University was designed by Sir Basil Spence in the 1960s and was the first of seven new post war universities in the country. Sir Basil Spence prepared the masterplan in 1959 and the first buildings were ready for occupation in 1962. Ten of the University's original buildings have been listed, all of which are based around Fulton Court (nine at grade II* and Falmer House at grade I). These determine the general character, architectural tone and presence of the campus. Similarly, the landscape, designed by Spence in consultation with Dame Sylvia Crowe, plays an equally important role to the buildings in setting the tone and character of the campus. The listed buildings, essentially the core of the campus, have a very high degree of architectural significance in their careful contextual design and materials and historic significance in relation to the campus as a model of educational organisation.

- 2.3 The University's boundary lies predominantly within the local planning area of Brighton & Hove City Council although a small area in the south eastern corner of the site falls within Lewes District Council. This includes part of the current application site area running along the eastern edge.
- 2.4 The application relates to an area within Phase 2 of the masterplan known as the Academic Area. The site is steeply sloping and is formed of the existing three storey Genome building and surface car parking.
- 2.5 To the west of the campus lies Stanmer Park, which is a Grade II registered historic park and garden. The University campus occupies the former south-east corner of the park. Due to topography and the presence of ancient woodland the University campus has very limited inter-visibility with the registered park.
- 2.6 Stanmer Conservation Area occupies much of the registered park area and contains a significant number of listed buildings, particularly within Stanmer village, but also including the grade II listed Lower Lodges.
- 2.7 Application:
The proposal involves the refurbishment of the existing Genome Centre and construction of a new Life Sciences Building with associated access, servicing and landscaping. The application forms a standalone full planning application rather than reserved matters application on the basis that the location and footprint of the building and the access arrangements differ when compared with the approved masterplan outline planning permission (BH2013/04337).
- 2.8 The existing Genome Centre building totals 2,889sqm and this total will remain the same once refurbished. A new link extension is proposed from the Genome building to the new Life Sciences Building which is proposed to be sited to the east of the Genome building. The new Life Sciences building will total 14,911sqm. The proposed access points have been designed and located to link up to existing access routes throughout the campus and those previously approved under the wider masterplan. The majority of the building will accommodate research laboratories, meeting and seminar spaces and offices for the Life Science department along with a café area at ground floor level on the north side of the building. The maximum height of the new building is 97m AOD within the parameter of the approved masterplan of 97.5 AOD; the maximum height including the rooftop plant is 99.4m AOD. The main building will measure approximately 63m width (excluding the link extension) and 78m depth and to a maximum height of approximately 21m in height to the top of the proposed roof plant screen and 18.5m to the parapet.
- 2.9 A service yard is proposed to the rear of the Genome Centre and to the east of the new Life Sciences building which will also contain refuse/recycling storage, controlled waste and chemical stores for the two buildings along with cycle parking. The yard is proposed to be partially concealed behind a mesh screen with planting including climbing plants.
- 2.10 With the exception of 9 disabled parking spaces, no additional car parking is proposed. The existing science park car park contains a total of 467 car parking

spaces, following construction of the development 58 spaces will be retained in the wider car park area to the north of the site, the remainder will be re-provided across the campus as approved under the masterplan which includes the recent planning permission relating to the Jubilee car park (BH2016/03040). A total of 88 cycle parking spaces are also proposed as part of the development.

- 2.11 The Masterplan proposes no additional parking on site with the exception of an additional 61 car parking spaces for mobility impaired staff, students and visitors. The current application forms one of three car parks that are proposed for redevelopment across the campus, the loss of parking will be redistributed across the masterplan area in order to maintain the current level of parking at the University.
- 2.12 Amended masterplan (illustrative):
On the basis that the proposed building differs notably from the approved masterplan, the applicant has submitted an illustrative update to the masterplan layout. The illustrative plan aims to demonstrate how the development will be accommodated within the wider layout, whilst maintaining the key principles of the masterplan and to demonstrate how the proposed building would sit within the wider academic area as the rest of Phase 2 is brought forward. In addition the plan demonstrates how the quantum of academic floorspace will be adjusted in order to remain within the maximum of 43,034sqm of academic floorspace approved under the outline scheme.
- 2.13 Pre-application discussions and negotiations:
The proposed scheme has been the subject of pre-application negotiations and discussions and was presented to Planning Committee Members twice prior to formal submission.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

BH2016/03040: Erection of a 4no storey carpark with associated landscaping and improved pedestrian and vehicle access. Approved 16 December 2016.

BH2016/01001: Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to 'East Slope' to create a mixed use six storey building comprising entertainment and assembly venue, bar, meeting space, ancillary office space, flexible retail floorspace (A1, A3, A4) and 249 student bedrooms with associated landscaping and bicycle storage. Approved 22 September 2016.

BH2016/01004: Reserved matters application for approval of appearance, landscaping and layout in relation to 'Phase 1 - East Slope' development which includes 1,868 student bedrooms and ancillary accommodation, pursuant to outline approval

BH2013/04337: (Demolition of existing buildings and construction of new buildings providing new academic facilities (D1) circa 59,571sqm, 4,022no new student accommodation bedrooms (C1) and new mixed use building circa 2,000 sqm, providing (A1, A3, A4, C1 and D1) uses, incorporating new pedestrian,

cycle, vehicular and service routes, landscaping, new parking, upgrading of related infrastructure and associated works). Approved 9 August 2016.

BH2013/04337: Outline application with some matters reserved for demolition of existing buildings and construction of new buildings providing new academic facilities (D1) circa 59,571sqm, 4,022no new student accommodation bedrooms (C1) and new mixed use building circa 2,000 sqm, providing (A1, A3, A4, C1 and D1) uses, incorporating new pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and service routes, landscaping, new parking, upgrading of related infrastructure and associated works. Matters for approval include layout, access and scale. Matters reserved are appearance and landscaping. (Layout subsequently reserved at appeal) Appeal allowed 30 July 2015.

4. REPRESENTATIONS

- 4.1 **External:**
Neighbours:
None received.

5. CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 **County Ecology:** No objection
Surveys were carried out in accordance with best practice and are sufficient to inform appropriate mitigation, compensation and enhancement. There are no sites designated for their nature conservation interest that are likely to be impacted by the proposed development. The site comprises buildings and hard standing with scattered trees, a single continuous tree line with scattered scrub, areas of semi-natural woodland and introduced shrub, and is of relatively low ecological value.
- 5.2 No evidence of bats was found although the group of mature trees to the south of the site retain some potential for bats. A precautionary approach to tree works is therefore required; the approach detailed in paragraphs 4.3 to 4.4 of Appendix 1 (Bat Survey Report) is appropriate. The site is considered unlikely to support any other protected species and therefore no specific mitigation is required. If protected species are encountered during works, works should stop and advice should be sought from an ecologist on how to proceed.
- 5.3 **Mitigation Measures/Enhancement Opportunities**
The site offers opportunities for enhancement that will help the Council address its duties and responsibilities under the NPPF and the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act. Opportunities include the use of species of known value to wildlife within the landscape scheme, the provision of a biodiverse green roof and the provision of bat boxes. Species should be native and of local provenance where possible. Advice on suitable species is provided in Annex 7 of SPD 11.
- 5.4 The soft landscape scheme outlined in the Design and Access Statement is supported. The proposed development is unlikely to have any significant impacts 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. Conditions relating to protecting badgers during construction and securing a lighting design strategy for biodiversity are also recommended.

- 5.5 **Conservation Advisory Group (CAG): No objection**
CAG recognised that Sussex University campus is a microcosm of the city and has the same problems. The University needs to grow and have new buildings but is short of space.
- 5.6 Various views were expressed. There were some reservations about the mass of the building at a high point and some thought the suggested development would be visually inappropriate. Others thought more could have been done in terms of adhering to Spence's original design. Overall it was considered that it was a reasonable design and would be acceptable.
- 5.7 After discussion the Group recommend Approval
- 5.8 **Southern Gas Network: No objection**
A low/medium/intermediate pressure gas main runs near the site. There should be no mechanical excavations taking place above or within 0.5m of a low/medium pressure system or above or within 3.0m of an intermediate pressure system. Where required confirmation of the position should be made using hand dug trial holes.
- 5.9 Safe digging practices, in accordance with HSE publication HSG47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services" must be used to verify and establish the actual position of mains, pipes, services and other apparatus on site before any mechanical plant is used.
- 5.10 Access to the pipeline shall be maintained throughout the duration of the operations.
- 5.11 **East Sussex Fire and Rescue: No objection**
When considering active fire safety measures for all types of premises, including residential and domestic buildings, East Sussex Fire & Rescue Service would recommend the installation of sprinkler systems. Information concerning guidance and standards for domestic and commercial sprinkler systems is available by reference to British Standard, Codes of Practice BS 9251 & BS EN 12845.
- 5.12 **Environment Agency: No objection**
Conditions we requested for application BH2016/01001 should be applied which relate to unsuspected contamination, piling and a construction method statement.
- 5.13 **Southern Water: No objection**
The results of an initial desk top study indicates that Southern Water currently cannot accommodate the needs of this application without the development providing additional local infrastructure. The proposed development would

increase flows into the wastewater sewerage system and as a result increase the risk of flooding in and around the existing area.

- 5.14 A condition should be attached to secure foul and surface water disposal along with an informative regarding the need for a formal agreement with Southern Water to provide necessary sewerage infrastructure.
- 5.15 Alternative means of draining surface water from the development is required - it is noted that reference is made to SUDS.
- 5.16 The design should take account of surcharging within the public sewerage system.
Land uses such as general hardstanding that may be subject to oil/petrol spillages should be drained by means of oil trap gullies or petrol/oil interceptors.
- 5.17 A formal application for connection to the water supply is required in order to service the development.
- 5.18 **Sussex Police: No objection**
A Secured by Design (SBD) application for the above development has been received from the Architect.
- 5.19 The SBD security topics discussed in order to satisfy the SBD scheme were; Access control, external and internal security rated doors, windows and glazing, position of reception, delivery vehicle roller shutter, control of hazardous substances and under-croft construction, positioning types of secure cycle storage and CCTV.
- 5.20 **Historic England: Comment**
The broad parameters for change at Sussex University are set out in the approved masterplan. No in principle objection is raised to the altered configuration of the Life Sciences building as now proposed.
- 5.21 The principal concerns with this full application for planning consent are to ensure that the new development conserves, and where possible enhances the significance of the listed buildings as derived from their setting as required by the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 137 and amplified in our Good Practice Advice Note 3, The Setting of heritage assets.
- 5.22 To this end, Historic England are pleased to see that the monumental stair rising from the historic campus at Fulton Court beyond Pevensy I and II to the Genome Centre will not be terminated by built form; and that the form of the stair will continue east to provide access to the new building.
- 5.23 Similarly, it is clear that much consideration has been given to the elevational treatment of the new building, which actively seeks to reinforce the language of Spence's buildings, without slavishly copying it.
- 5.24 The only outstanding concern is with the roof top plant screen, which adds some considerable height to the new building. From the top of the library steps this

would be a particularly visible element of the new building which would Historic England think starts to impinge on the appreciation of the campus buildings sitting within the valley with treetops visible above built form - a similar point was made in Historic England's representations about the development proposed on the east slopes in the masterplan application. The visualisations included in the design and access statement from this viewpoint show the trees in full leaf, which Historic England consider could be misleading.

- 5.25 It is acknowledged that roof plant will be necessary, but would urge the Local Planning Authority to ensure that the amount proposed has been minimised as far as possible, and to explore the effect of omitting the perimeter screen, or reducing its height. It would be helpful to show this view to the building in winter conditions to properly assess the impact on the landscape context of the historic campus.
- 5.26 Recommendation:
Historic England has some concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds and consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 132 and 137 of the NPPF.
- 5.27 **Lewes District Council:** No objection
The Council has no objections in principle to the proposal, subject to BHCC being satisfied that the development would not cause parking and traffic problems outside the campus or have an inappropriate landscape impact.
- 5.28 **County Archaeology:** No objection
Although this application is situated within an Archaeological Notification Area, it is unlikely that any significant below ground archaeological remains would be affected by these proposals.
- 5.29 **Brighton & Hove Archaeology Society:** No objection
The Brighton and Hove Archaeological Society are unaware of any archaeological implications with regards changes to the building structure unless it is listed. The proposed new development is close to find spots from the Roman period and it is possible that vestiges of this ancient landscape may remain.
- 5.30 The Brighton and Hove Archaeological Society suggest that you contact the County Archaeologist for his recommendations.
- 5.31 **UK Power Networks:** No objection
- 5.32 **Internal:**
- 5.33 **Planning Policy:** No objection
The university is seeking to maximise the universities' own campus land for both academic floorspace as well as residential accommodation. This proposal is considered to comply with adopted city plan policy DA3 Lewes Road Area in securing new academic floorspace for the university campus.

- 5.34 Principle of development:
It is understood that further growth of the academic part of the campus was identified within the outline planning application for campus development submitted to the Council in December 2013 and approved on appeal (BH2013/04337) 30th July 2015. Under the outline planning permission, the proposed development will introduce a net increase of 2,530 beds and a net increase of 43,034 sq m of academic floorspace.
- 5.35 DA3 Lewes Road corridor The University campus falls within the DA3 Lewes Road area identified in the City Plan. The scheme is considered to be generally consistent with Local Priority 1 for the area and is considered not to raise any conflicts with policy DA3 of the Adopted City Plan Part One.
- 5.36 Waste Management:
Policy WMP3d of the Waste and Minerals Plan requires development proposals to minimise and manage waste produced during construction demolition and excavation. An SWMP has been submitted by the applicant. Compliance with Policy WMP3d should be required by condition.
- 5.37 **Public Art:** No objection
To make sure the requirements of local planning policy are met at implementation stage, it is recommended that an 'Artistic Component' schedule be included in the section 106 agreement.
- 5.38 Level of contribution:
This is arrived at after the internal gross area of the development (in this instance approximately 14,910 sqm) is multiplied by a baseline value per square metre of construction arrived at from past records of Artistic Component contributions for this type of development in this area. This includes average construction values taking into account relative infrastructure costs.
- 5.39 It is suggested that the Artistic Component element for this application is to the value of £37,000.
- 5.40 **Sustainability:** No objection
A Sustainability Statement has been submitted with the application which includes a BREEAM pre-assessment demonstrating a pathway and commitment to achieving a BREEAM 'excellent' standard.
- 5.41 The pre-assessment has been carried out for the development based on the BREEAM 2014 New Construction scheme which shows the Project can achieve a BREEAM 'Excellent' rating with a predicted score of 74.68%. The proposed building is targeted to achieve an EPC rating of 34, resulting in a "B" Rating.
- 5.42 The proposals respond well to policy CP8 and policy for decentralised energy in DA3.
- 5.43 The low and zero carbon energy solution proposed is to adopt district heating, air source heat pump and photovoltaics for the development. It is proposed that a site wide district heating infrastructure loop will be provided to the East of the

campus from the existing system in time for the Life sciences to connect to, for the heating and hot water for the building.

- 5.44 This approach addresses Policy CP8 and DA3, which seek decentralised and renewable energy proposals integrated into schemes.
- 5.45 The design has made the best use of site orientation, building form, layout, landscaping and materials to maximise natural light and heat, whilst avoiding internal overheating through appropriate ventilation and passive shading solutions.
- 5.46 It is especially welcomed that the scheme is proposing to explore grey water recycling.
- 5.47 It is proposed that only materials that are certified under a Green Product Certification Scheme in order to minimise the embodied energy and associated environmental impact and that during both construction and operation,
- 5.48 Approval is recommended with suggested conditions:
- BREEAM new construction 'excellent'
 - Details on decentralised energy proposals as set out in the Energy Strategy, confirming installation of the photovoltaic array, and connection to the site-wide district heating infrastructure has been achieved.

5.49 **Environmental Health:** No comment

5.50 **Heritage:** No objection

The Proposal and Potential Impacts:

The principle of new academic buildings on this site was established by the approved master plan application. That envisaged two separate buildings in an L shape on the southern half of the car park, with a landscaped courtyard to the west of them, whereas this proposal is for a single large building with a rectangular footprint. There is no objection in principle to this provided that a landscaped courtyard is instead created to the north of the site as part of a future phase, as indicated in the new illustrative masterplan, and this should be controlled via a s106 Agreement limiting the floorspace to that previously approved. The proposed footprint would be large by the standards of the campus, with only the Library being obviously larger. However, it would have deeply recessed entrances to the north and south and would be pierced by four open courtyards, which are a feature of original Spence academic buildings. It would also have an internal covered 'street' running through it.

5.51 The approved height parameter for this part of the site is 97.5m AOD; the proposed 4 storey building would have a parapet height of 97m, but the screening for the roof top plant would result in a total height of 99.4m (though the screening is set back from the main elevation). Whilst this total height does exceed the parameter height a little, the building height would still sit comfortably into its topographical and built context, as shown in the site section

drawings, where it maintains a comfortable 'stepping up the hill' in relation to its neighbours.

- 5.52 As demonstrated in the submitted views, the slightly greater overall height of the building, and its greater massing, would not make it very visible in the key views from the historic core of the campus and trees would continue to over-top the built development. It would also appear appropriate in scale in the key view up the long east-west steps as seen from North-South Road, where it would be seen in context with the grade II* listed Pevensey II building which sits in the foreground. The submitted Heritage Statement concludes that the building would have a negligible impact on the setting of the listed buildings and this conclusion is considered to be accurate; certainly there would be no harmful impact. In terms of wider views and impact, it is considered that there would be no impact on the setting of the Stanmer conservation area or on the registered park and garden at Stanmer, due to the minimal inter-visibility between them and the lack of strong historic connection.
- 5.53 The proposed design of the building has been subject to extensive pre-application discussions and follows a careful analysis of the original Spence design concept, as set out in the Design and Access Statement. It is considered that the design is a clearly contemporary building of suitably high architectural quality but makes strong reference to Spence design concepts, motifs and materials in its form and in its elevational treatment, albeit using these motifs and materials in a contemporary and distinct manner. The building would have the clear horizontality favoured by Spence but with a counterbalancing vertical rhythm provided by the scalloped brick columns and, above that, the series of colonnaded concrete fins. The choice of facing brick (and mortar) for the lower floors will be of crucial importance to ensure that the brickwork relates well to the original Spence buildings and especially Pevensey II. This ample brick should be submitted with the application. The faceted bronze-coloured metal screening to the roof top provides a suitable level of visual interest to this functional requirement. Manifestations to the glazing will need to be controlled by condition.
- 5.54 In terms of public realm and landscaping, the extension of the monumental east-west steps up to the new building is a welcome re-statement of a typical Spence feature. The handrails should match the existing. In general the approach to the public realm around the building is considered to be appropriate, subject to control of the hard surfacing materials by condition to ensure that they satisfactorily reflect the simple palette of materials seen on the original core campus.
- 5.55 Mitigations and Conditions:
As above, sample of all facing materials and hard landscaping materials should be submitted by condition, together with details of all manifestations to be applied to the glazing.
- 5.56 **City Regeneration:** No objection
City Regeneration fully supports this application as the development of this site will contribute to the enhanced offer for students from within and outside of the

UK, adding to the local talent pool of highly qualified graduates who will contribute to the local economy during their study and beyond.

- 5.57 If approved, City Regeneration requests a contribution through a S106 agreement for the payment of £149,100 towards the council's Local Employment Scheme in accordance with the *Developer Contributions Technical Guidance.
- 5.58 In addition, an Employment and Training Strategy is also required, to be submitted at least one month in advance of site commencement. The developer will be required to commit to using at least 20% local employment during the demolition phase (where possible) and construction phase (mandatory), and through their main contractor or sub-contractors will be expected to provide opportunities for training to include, but not limited to, apprenticeships and work experience.
- 5.59 **Sustainable Transport:** No objection
- 5.60 **Cycle Parking**
The applicant is providing 88 covered cycle parking spaces as part of this application. The majority of these (52 spaces) shall be located within a secure store and the remaining spaces (18 stands for 36 bikes) will be located within the under crofts of the north and south entrances; full details should be secured by condition. The applicant is also providing shower and changing facilities on the ground floor of the Life Sciences building which is welcomed.
- 5.61 **Disabled Parking**
The applicant is proposing 9 disabled car parking spaces as part of this specific planning application. These are located to the north west of the Life Sciences building. The bays are correctly designed in accordance with Traffic Advisory Leaflet 5/95 in that they have a 1.2m clear zone either side of each bay.
- 5.62 **Servicing and deliveries**
No objection is raised to the servicing arrangements, the majority of which will be undertaken from the service yard.
- 5.63 **Vehicular Access**
A new shared surface access route will be provided to the east of the proposed building that will link Science Park Road with the campus to the north. This route will be the main means of access the building by vehicle.
- 5.64 **Car Parking**
As part of these proposals it is intended to provide 9 disabled car parking spaces, no other car parking shall be retained as part of these proposals, within the red line boundary. As part of the wider masterplan for the campus additional car parking is proposed including the retention of 61 parking spaces on the Science Car Park which lie outside of this planning application red line boundary. The existing car parking to be removed within the Science Car Park (approx. 400 spaces) are to be relocated to alternative car parks on the periphery of the campus as part of the wider masterplan development. The

masterplan application proposes no additional parking on-site, other than 61 additional disabled car parking spaces; with the majority of car parking spaces displaced by development to be relocated elsewhere on the campus.

5.65 Trip Generation/Highway Impact

The proposals in terms of trip generation and the potential transport impact of the proposed development have already been considered and granted approval as part of the outline masterplan application (BH2013/03040) for the campus. The applicant is not proposing any increase in academic floor space above that approved as part of the masterplan application and the Highway Authority is also aware that as part of this application a legal agreement shall be entered into limiting the floor space to that approved as part of the masterplan application. Therefore these proposals are not considered to have a greater transport impact than that already approved as part of the outline masterplan application.

5.66 Travel Plan - Car parking levels across the campus will fluctuate up and down during the delivery of the masterplan, for which this development is part of. Therefore the Highway Authority would look for an updated Travel Plan to be produced prior to commencement of this development which details how car parking will be managed, both during and post construction.

5.67 In addition to car parking management the travel plan should also include but not be limited to:

- Measures to promote the sustainable travel to staff and students.
- Details of car park management.
- Details of delivery and servicing movements and how to reduce/consolidate these.

5.68 Arboricultural Services: Comment:

5.69 Summary:

The development will result in considerable tree losses from the site and reduced scope for replacement planting. Overall, the Arboricultural Section does not support the proposal but understand the difficulties in supporting a refusal. Should, the application be granted it is recommended that a condition is imposed to further support the Arboricultural consultants recommendations for protection of the retained trees.

5.70 Main comment:

The Arboricultural report submitted with the application is technically very good and the Arboricultural Section agrees with the majority its findings. It identifies both trees shown for removal in the master plan that are now to be retained under this planning application and trees shown for retention in the master plan now to be removed under this planning application. In summary, 6 additional trees shown for retention in the masterplan are now proposed for removal in this planning application together with a thicket of damson, sycamore and yew. Of these, 2 of the trees are category A trees with the remainder category B/C or below.

- 5.71 The proposed scheme will, result in the loss of two additional good quality trees (a beech and a sycamore) but allow for additional retention of a good quality copper beech and a group of sycamore.
- 5.72 Overall whilst the tree loss differences between the earlier agreed masterplan are not substantial, however, the overall loss in tree cover to this area is considerable. When this is coupled with the losses around the East Slope redevelopment a large mass of the wooded nature to this side of the valley will be lost.
- 5.73 **Sustainable Urban Drainage:** Comments awaited.

6. MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 In accordance with Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, this decision has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Development Plan, and all other material planning considerations identified in the "Considerations and Assessment" section of the report
- 6.2 The development plan is:
- Brighton & Hove 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 Due weight has been given to the relevant retained policies in the Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

7. POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One

- SS1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- CP2 Sustainable economic development
- CP7 Infrastructure and developer contributions
- CP8 Sustainable buildings
- CP9 Sustainable transport
- CP10 Biodiversity
- CP11 Flood risk
- CP12 Urban design
- CP15 Heritage
- CP18 Healthy city
- DA3 Lewes Road

Brighton and Hove Local Plan (retained policies March 2016):

TR4 Travel plans
TR7 Safe Development
TR14 Cycle access and parking
SU3 Water resources and their quality
SU5 Surface water and foul sewerage disposal infrastructure
SU9 Pollution and nuisance control
SU10 Noise Nuisance
QD15 Landscape design
QD16 Trees and hedgerows
QD18 Species protection
QD27 Protection of amenity
HE3 Development affecting the setting of a listed building
HE6 Development within or affecting the setting of conservation areas
HE11 Historic park and gardens
HE12 Scheduled ancient monuments and other important archaeological sites

Supplementary Planning Documents:

SPD03 Construction & Demolition Waste
SPD06 Trees & Development Sites
SPD11 Nature Conservation & Development
SPD14 Parking Standards

Developer Contributions Technical Guidance

8. CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

8.1 The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to design and impacts on heritage, sustainability, amenity and sustainable transport along with the impact on the outline approval (BH2013/04337) and associated masterplan.

8.2 Planning Policy:

The University campus falls within the DA3 Lewes Road area identified in the City Plan. The scheme is considered to be generally consistent with Local Priority 1 for the area and does not conflict with policy DA3 of the Adopted City Plan Part One.

8.3 The current proposal seeks to refurbish the existing Genome Centre (2,889sqm (GIA)) and construct a new Life Sciences Building (14,911sqm (GIA)) however this provision would not be in addition to the 43,034sqm of academic floorspace which has approval under the outline planning permission (BH2013/04337). The applicant has agreed to sign up to a Section 106 (S106) Agreement to maintain the current maximum of the previously approved level of academic floorspace within the masterplan area. As such the application does not raise any additional concerns in relation the impacts of this provision which were fully assessed under the approved outline (BH2013/04337).

8.4 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA):

On the basis of the above and the fact the proposal is inextricably linked to the outline permission which constituted EIA development, the current scheme is being considered as an amendment to EIA development. The relevant information has been refreshed in the Environmental Statement (ES) and the combination of the originally submitted Environmental Statement (ES), the newly submitted ES addendum and the additional supporting information submitted with the current application (along with a legal agreement to restrict the amount of academic floor area, in line with the approved outline permission) sufficiently take account of all the potential environmental effects of the scheme.

8.5 Masterplan considerations, design and heritage impacts:

8.6 Masterplan implications:

The principle of new academic buildings on this site was established by the approved masterplan/outline application (BH2013/04337). The masterplan envisaged a pair of slim buildings located in an 'L' shape around a courtyard space, the current proposal clearly differs from this approach with a single larger building with a rectangle roof print. As noted by Heritage there is however no objection to this approach provided that the landscape courtyard is instead created to the north of the building (outside the current application boundary) as part of a future phase, as illustrated in the updated illustrative masterplan for the academic area as shown on drawing no. 331 revision D.

8.7 As part of the pre-application discussions and negotiation, the applicant was advised to consider how the illustrative masterplan approved under the outline would be impacted and updated to accommodate the new layout. As such a new illustrative masterplan has been submitted by the applicant which demonstrates how a landscape courtyard space could be accommodated within the wider layout to the north of the building, which is supported in principle and the detail of which would be agreed under later phases. The aforementioned S106 agreement to limit the amount of academic floorspace to the maximum level approved under the outline scheme would provide adequate security that this important landscape feature could be accommodated on the site. The updated illustrative masterplan also includes the amended academic floorspace quantum to clarify how the remaining buildings within this phase could be developed within the agreed parameter of 43,034sqm.

8.8 Heritage:

Heritage note that although the building would be large by the standards of the campus, second only perhaps to the Library. However, features such as the deeply recessed entrances to the north and south elevations, along with the four open courtyard spaces which pierce the building, which are a feature of the original Spence academic building and the internal street running through it would help to break up the bulk whilst maintaining a sympathetic interpretation of the original Spence academic buildings.

8.9 In addition, although the current maximum height of the building (measured to the top of the rooftop plant screen) is marginally (1.9m) over the approved parameter set out of this area of the campus masterplan, the screening is set back from the building edge and the maximum height of the main elevation of

the building is 0.5m below the approved parameter. Notwithstanding this, the proposed four storey building would sit comfortably within the topographical and built context, maintaining a comfortable 'stepping up the hill' in relation to neighbouring buildings. As demonstrated by the submitted views, the slightly greater overall height and massing of the building would not be particularly visible in key views from the historic core of the campus and trees would continue to over-top the development. The conclusion of the Heritage Statement is supported by Heritage and there will be no harmful impact on the setting of any of the listed buildings. In addition, there would be no impact on the setting of the Stanmer Conservation Area or on the Registered Park and Garden at Stanmer.

8.10 Design:

The proposed design of the building has been subject to extensive pre-application discussions and follows a careful analysis of the original Spence design concept by the applicant, as set out in the Design and Access Statement. As noted by Heritage the design is a clearly contemporary building of suitability high architectural quality but makes strong reference to Spence design concepts, motifs and materials in its form and elevational treatment in a contemporary and distinct manner.

8.11 In addition, the building would have the clear horizontality favoured by Spence but with a counterbalancing vertical rhythm provided by the scalloped brick columns and the series of colonnaded concrete fins above. The detail of the scalloped brickwork and mortar and how it relates to the original Spence buildings is of crucial importance and it is recommended that sample brickwork is submitted.

8.12 The faceted bronze-coloured metal screening to the roof top is considered to provide a suitable level of visual interest to its functional requirement. It is noted that Historic England are in general support of the scheme however raise concern regarding the rooftop plant and associated screen. The level of plant and proposed screen has been the subject of pre-application discussions and efforts have been made to keep the plant to a minimum and it is noted that the amount of plant cannot be reduced any further as the proposed uses require specialist facilities in order to function accordingly. As noted by Heritage, it is considered more appropriate to include screening for the plant as an integral element of the design. In the view from the Library steps in winter the upper part of the building, including the screening, would be visible through the tree branches but this is a distant view and the screening would be a recessive feature. Most importantly, the building would not over-sail the tree canopy in this view.

8.13 Notable consideration and effort has been focused on the plant screen and as supported by Heritage it is considered more appropriate to include screening for the plant as an integral element of the design than to have none or to retro-fit screening to parts of the building. In the view from the Library steps in winter the upper part of the building, including the screening, would be visible through the tree branches but this is a distant view and the screening would be a recessive feature. Most importantly, the building would not over-sail the tree canopy in this

view. It is also noted, that following the second Planning Committee Member's Pre-application presentations, in response to comments made by some members, the screen design was amended to introduce a faceted profile to the screen to soften the visual impact and provide an interpretation of the Spence vernacular which was supported by Heritage prior to submission of the application.

8.14 The proposed glazing manifestations illustrated in the Design and Access Statement are considered to add additional interest and some indication of the functions within the building and it is recommended that the final details is controlled by condition.

8.15 Public Realm and Landscaping:

The Design and Access Statement contains a robust landscape strategy with thorough analysis of the existing campus and comprehensive justification of the approach to the landscape design. Key objectives identified by the applicant include: improving the challenging levels of the site to increase ease of access for site users and setting levels that work with the future aspirations of the masterplan to increase accessibility across the campus generally. In addition, the proposal seeks to develop a scheme which responds positively to its campus setting whilst setting a precedent for the future developments to deliver the wider masterplan.

8.16 In relation to hard landscape features, the proposed extension to the monumental east-west steps up to the new building is welcomed and represents a typical Spence feature around. Subject to securing details by condition, as noted by Heritage, the approach to the public realm around the building is considered appropriate.

8.17 The proposed soft landscaping strategy has been designed to respond to its setting and includes native tree and shrub planting, grass banks, gabion terraces and graded lawns. The service yard landscaping has also been carefully considered to aim to reduce its visual appearance through the use of pre-grown climbing plants and green roofs. The research gardens/open courtyard spaces that will serve the building providing internal atria bringing light and greenery into the deep footplate of the structure have been designed to incorporate planting found naturally within the differing landscape of the South Downs National Park. The concepts illustrated in the submission are broadly supported however full details are recommended to be secured by condition.

8.18 Trees:

The Arboricultural Impact Assessment submitted with the application identifies the trees previously approved to be removed under the outline approval. Six additional trees are proposed to be removed under the current application. Four of the six trees to be lost are a category A beech tree, category A sycamore tree, category B/C sycamore tree and a category U dying larch, together with two yew trees growing in a thicket (category B/C) and a thicket of damson, sycamore and low quality yew (category C). The amended layout does however result in one good quality copper beech (category A) tree formally agreed to be lost under the outline approval can now be retained under the current

application along with a group of 6 Sycamore and associated vegetation, the majority of which can now be retained which are category B.

8.19 Reference is also made in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment to the mitigation of new native tree planting proposed as part of the development to compensate for the loss of the additional trees. Arboricultural Services agree with the majority of the findings within the assessment however regret the loss of the additional trees coupled with the agreed loss within the masterplan area.

8.20 Impact on Amenity:

The application site is located within the existing academic area of the campus and neighbouring non-university uses are therefore located some distance from the development and are therefore unlikely to be adversely affected by matters such as noise disturbance from the use. The proposal includes a significant level of roof top plant along with a large service yard containing varying forms of waste and chemical storage in order to adequately serve the functions with the building. However given the nature of the development and site characteristics, Environmental Health has determined it unnecessary to comment on the scheme.

8.21 Sustainable Transport:

As noted above the applicant has agreed to sign a S106 agreement to limit the amount of academic floorspace to that previously approved under the outline permission (BH2013/04337) and as such the wider transport implications remain the same as approved with no additional impacts identified.

8.22 The final detail of the proposed cycle parking is recommended to be secured by condition along with implementation of the disabled parking spaces prior to occupation of the building. A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is also recommended to be secured on the basis of the scale of the development. The parking levels across the campus will fluctuate as the masterplan and subsequent applications are built out and as such and as recommended by the Highway Authority, an updated Travel Plan and including details on how car parking will be managed, both during and post construction is also recommended to be secured.

8.23 Sustainability:

A Sustainability Statement has been submitted with the application which includes a BREEAM pre-assessment demonstrating a pathway and commitment to achieving a BREEAM 'excellent' standard.

8.24 As noted by the Sustainability Officer, the proposals respond well to policy CP8 and policy for decentralised energy in DA3 Lewes Road which seek decentralised and renewable energy proposals integrated into schemes.

8.25 The low and zero carbon energy solutions proposed are to adopt district heating, air source heat pump and photovoltaics for the development. It is proposed that a site wide district heating infrastructure loop will be provided to the East of the campus from the existing system in time for the Life Sciences to connect to, for the heating and hot water for the building.

- 8.26 Conditions are recommended to ensure BREEAM 'excellent' is achieved along with details on decentralised energy proposals as set out in the Energy Strategy, confirming installation of the photovoltaic array, and connection to the site-wide district heating infrastructure is achieved.
- 8.27 **Ecology:**
As noted by the County Ecologist the soft landscape scheme outlined in the Design and Access Statement is supported. The proposed development is unlikely to have any significant impacts on biodiversity and can be supported from an ecological perspective.
- 8.28 Surveys were carried out in accordance with best practice and are sufficient to inform appropriate mitigation, compensation and enhancement. The site is of relatively low ecological value and although no evidence of bats was found bar some potential within the group of mature trees to the south of the site and as such a precautionary approach to tree works is therefore recommended in accordance with the Bat Survey findings. The site is considered unlikely to support any other protected species and therefore no specific mitigation is required.
- 8.29 The enhancement opportunities identified as part of the scheme include the use of species of known value to wildlife within the landscape scheme, the provision of a biodiverse green roof and the provision of bat boxes. Species should be native and of local provenance where possible as recommended by the County Ecologist.
- 8.30 **Other Considerations:**
The site is within an Archaeological Notification Area, however the County Archaeologist does not believe that any significant below ground archaeological remains are likely to be affected by the proposal.
- 8.31 **Section 106 Legal Agreement:**
Public Art reasonably considered the application as a standalone planning application, however on the basis that the applicant is willing to enter into a legal agreement limiting the floor area to that approved under the outline scheme; it is not considered reasonable to secure the additional contribution of £37,000 under the current scheme. This matter was given consideration under the outline scheme and a contribution secured via S106 agreement; the policy position has not altered since that time.
- 8.32 Since consideration of the outline application (BH2013/04337) the Developers Contribution Technical Guidance has been updated and financial contributions are now being sought for the Local Employment Scheme as set out in City Regenerations comments totalling £149,100 which is recommended to be secured via S106 Agreement along with securing a minimum of 20% local employment during the demolition/construction phase.

8.33 Heads of Terms:

Academic floor area restriction:

- Restriction of the academic floor area to a total of 43,034sqm within the approved masterplan area as approved under BH2013/04337.
- Local Employment Scheme:
- Securing a minimum of 20% local employment during the demolition/construction phase along with a financial contribution of £149,100.
- Produce a Travel Plan and car parking management plan
- In addition to car parking management the travel plan should also include but not be limited to:
 - Measures to promote the sustainable travel to staff and students.
 - Details of car park management.
 - Details of delivery and servicing movements and how to reduce/consolidate these.

8.35 Construction Environmental Management Plan:

To include the following required by the Environment Agency:

- Information on the demolition and construction design;
- Management of pollution during construction
- The storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development; and
- Wheel washing facilities;

9. EQUALITIES

- 9.1 The site has very challenging level changes and the development has been designed with the aim of addressing long-standing accessibility issues that exist on campus due to the valley context. It has been designed to meet Part M of the Building Regulations and level thresholds will be provided at entrances/exits to the building which will provide accessible routes through this part of the campus where they cannot be provided externally.

