

**Subject:** **Sussex Community NHS Foundation Trust:  
Development of a Community Health Hub at the  
Brighton General Hospital Site**

**Date of Meeting:** **23 January 2019**

**Report of:** **Executive Lead, Strategy, Governance & Law**

**Contact Officer:** **Name: Giles Rossington Tel: 01273 295514**  
**Email: giles.rossington@brighton-hove.gov.uk**

**Ward(s) affected:** **(All Wards);**

**FOR GENERAL RELEASE**

**Glossary/Explanation of Terms**

- **BGH:** Brighton General Hospital site
- **SCFT:** Sussex Community NHS Foundation Trust (local NHS community services provider)
- **CHH:** Community Health Hub
- **BSUH:** Brighton & Sussex University Hospitals Trust (local NHS acute provider)
- **SViS:** Substantial Variation in Services (NHS bodies are legally required to formally consult with HOSCs when planning to make substantial changes to patient services)

**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND POLICY CONTEXT**

- 1.1 Sussex Community NHS Foundation Trust (SCFT) plans to redevelop the Brighton General Hospital site, developing a Community Health Hub (CHH) as well as re-purposing land for housing.
- 1.2 SCFT brought a paper to the 27 June 2018 HOSC meeting, outlining various options for redevelopment of the BGH site. This report provides an update on progress.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 2.1 That the Committee notes the contents of the report.

**3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 3.1 The BGH site is located at the top of Elm Grove, near Brighton racecourse. The site is no longer used for inpatient care (the last inpatient beds were removed in 2009), but does host a range of community health, mental health, rehabilitation

and outpatient services as well as providing a base for a range of NHS and council community teams. SCFT, Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, Brighton & Sussex University Hospitals Trust (BSUH) and Brighton & Hove City Council all operate from the site.

- 3.2 Many of the facilities at BGH are very old and are no longer fit for purpose. Due to the condition of buildings and the way that the site is configured, only around 50% of facilities are currently being used.
- 3.3 SCFT developed a series of options for the redevelopment of the BGH site. These varied from doing nothing to various plans to construct a Community Health Hub (CHH) on part of the site or on adjacent land. The CHH would be a state of the art facility offering a range of health services to local communities. Developing a CHH would be self-funding on a capital basis: the costs of developing the CHH would be covered by the sale of land and assets on other parts of the BGH site.
- 3.4 After engaging with stakeholders and the public on these options, SCFT has decided to progress one of the options. This will see the construction of a CHH facing Elm Grove and the development of much of the remainder of the site for housing. Under this option, none of the community health services currently provided at the site will need relocating. (Some BSUH out-patient services, located at BGH will cease to be provided from the BGH site. These services include dermatology, rheumatology and some acute outpatient physiotherapy, which are planned to be located at Royal Sussex County Hospital as part of the 3Ts development – less than 1.5 miles away and less than 10 minutes' drive and 15 minutes public transport travel time).
- 3.5 At the June 2018 HOSC meeting, the committee resolved to require formal consultation with SCFT on the basis that some of the options being considered potentially constituted a Substantial Variation in Services (SViS), since they might involve the relocation of some community patient services. NHS bodies are obliged to consult formally with HOSCs on all SViS plans. However, since SCFT is now progressing an option that does not require the relocation of any patient services, there are no obvious grounds to classify the plans as a SViS, and hence no requirement for formal consultation with the HOSC under legislation relating to SViS. This is a largely semantic distinction, since the HOSC may still scrutinise this initiative using its general powers of scrutiny, receiving updates on developments and making recommendations to SCFT should members choose to do so.

#### **4. ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS**

- 4.1 Not relevant to this report for information.

#### **5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 None undertaken by HOSC. However it should be noted that extensive engagement has taken place, led by SCFT and delivered through a plan developed in partnership with communications managers at Brighton & Hove CCG, Brighton & Hove City Council and all statutory health and care providers in

the city.

- 5.2 The engagement activity included:
- A public engagement event in the Brighthelm Centre in June 2018, which was attended by over 60 people
  - 22 'roadshow' meetings with community groups, including voluntary organisations, patient groups and neighbourhood and community groups reaching over 150 people
  - A web and paper based survey with over 200 responses from staff (including staff from other providers based at the site) and 500 responses from patients and members of the public
- 5.3 There is overwhelming community support for the proposals, including 80% of all people responding supportive of development, the support for GP services being provided from the site has 80% staff and 85% patient/public support.
- 5.4 The priorities that respondents to the survey saw as most important are improved disabled access and public transport access.
- 5.5 There is widespread support for housing development on surplus land and the contribution of affordable and keyworker housing has strong support.

## 6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 Members are asked to note the progress of the scheme to redevelop the BGH site, and in particular SCFT's decision to progress an option that will retain all current health services on the site.

## 7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

### Financial Implications:

- 7.1 None to this report for information.

### Legal Implications:

- 7.2 There are no legal implications arising from this report.  
*Lawyer Consulted: Elizabeth Culbert; Date: 03/01/19*

### Equalities Implications:

- 7.3 None identified. As the plans being progressed do not involve the relocation of any patient services, there is no obvious detrimental impact on any protected group. However, it should be noted that the site gradient and current configuration of services in multiple buildings presents barriers to physical accessibility. The new proposal, which will see level access to buildings in a more compact campus and close to Elm Grove, will ensure a substantial improvement in disability and general access.

Sustainability Implications:

7.2 None identified.

Any Other Significant Implications:

7.3 None identified.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Appendices:**

1. Presentation to HOSC on Brighton General Hospital 23 January 2019.