

ITEM B

**St Aubyns School 76 High St, Rottingdean
BH2015 / 03110
Listed Building Consent**

20 April 2016

<u>No:</u>	BH2015/03110	<u>Ward:</u>	ROTTINGDEAN COASTAL
<u>App Type:</u>	Listed Building Consent		
<u>Address:</u>	St Aubyns School 76 High Street Rottingdean Brighton		
<u>Proposal:</u>	Conversion and refurbishment works to Field House (main school building), terraced cottages and Rumneys building to provide 9no two bedroom and 1no three bedroom dwellings with associated works and alterations to boundary flint wall along Steyning Road and The Twitten.		
<u>Officer:</u>	Liz Arnold Tel 291709	<u>Valid Date:</u>	08/09/2015
<u>Con Area:</u>	Rottingdean	<u>Expiry Date:</u>	03 November 2015
<u>Listed Building Grade:</u>	Grade II		
<u>Agent:</u>	Boyer Planning, UK House 82 Heath Road Twickenham London TW1 4BW		
<u>Applicant:</u>	Linden Homes & The Cothill Educational Trust, C/O Boyer Planning UK House 82 Heath Road Twickenham London TW1 4BW		

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** Listed Building Consent 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 8th 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. The playing field comprises;
- 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 school campus site is located within the Rottingdean Conservation Area, the boundary of which runs along the eastern side of the Twitten.
- 2.7 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.

BH2015/03108 - 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. Concurrent Full Planning 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.

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.

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.

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.

BN76/1389 (LBC 527) New entrance door and lavatory window, removal of chimney stacks; internal alterations to re-plan 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.

4 THE APPLICATION

- 4.1 Listed Building Consent is sought for the conversion and refurbishment works to Field House (main school building), terraced cottages and Rumneys building to provide 9 no. two bedroom and 1 no. three bedroom dwellings with associated works and alterations to boundary flint wall along Steyning Road and The Twitten.

5 PUBLICITY & CONSULTATIONS

External

- 5.1 **Neighbours: Thirty Seven (37)** 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:

- Steyning Road is already heavily used and has insufficient capacity for construction traffic or additional development traffic and concern raised regarding emergency services access,
- Inadequate infrastructure, including schools, sewers, dentists, doctors and roads,
- Damage to Listed Buildings, heritage assets and flint walls including Twitten,
- Lack of public consultation,

PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

- Increase traffic problems, including parking problem, worse road safety and traffic congestion,
- Increased air pollution,
- Submitted traffic assessment contains errors, is inaccurate and misleading,
- Increased danger for pedestrians and cyclists,
- Residents have not been able to view the viability report,
- Increased noise and disruption including during construction phase,
- Unsafe proposed access points onto High Street, A259 and Steyning Road,
- No more development can be accommodated in area, cumulative effects of all the proposed and approved developments in the area need to be taken into consideration,
- Lack of school places in village would mean additional traffic as children would have to be transported elsewhere,
- No affordable housing provision,
- Already too many care homes in area,
- Over-development, too high density, over-crowding and urban sprawl,
- Risk of flooding from surface water run-off, and poor sewerage infrastructure,
- Loss of valuable green space,
- Contrary to Council policies and NPPF,
- Loss of community facility,
- View from National Park will be changed,
- Adverse impact on tourism,
- Application is not a standalone application and should be considered in conjunction with the two other applications,
- Many historic buildings in the village do not have foundations and some have tunnels to the sea, excessive traffic puts these irreplaceable national treasures in jeopardy,
- 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,
- Although presented as one site there are two areas, which should be considered separately,
- Disruption to wildlife,
- Loss of Rottingdean's character and quaintness, and
- Brown-field sites in City should be developed first.

Following re-consultation of minor amendments and receipt of further information on the 29th February 2016 1 **One (1)** further representation of objection to the revised proposal have been received from the addresses which are contained in full within Additional points raised are as follows: of this report. Additional points of objection raised are as follows:

- The latest amendments do not change original objections,
- Jobs in the nursing home are unlikely to be taken up locally and will therefore exacerbate traffic issues. Also seems unlikely that

staff/visitors will cycle or come by public transport. No penalties on the developer/care home operator for failing to meet targets,

- Models/methodology used in air quality assessment, no penalties for getting it wrong, and
- If field has to be developed a small number of high value residential units would have less impact than a 62 bed care home.

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

- Welcomes retention of two-thirds of the playing 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
- 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.

5.3 **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.

5.4 **Rottingdean Parish Council:**

(12/10/2015) Comment. Has no objection, subject to in principle approval from English Heritage and the Council's own Heritage Team of the proposals to demolish almost 61% of the Grade 2 listed building, referred to as Field House. Seeking approval would be in accordance with the Planning Brief.

(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.

- 5.5 **SAFE Rottingdean:** The heritage assessment is incomplete and misleading.

The more significant issues identified to date are exceedence of air quality levels, extant school principle, plying 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.

- 5.6 **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.

- 5.7 **Councillor Mears: Objects** to the proposal. Letter Attached.

Internal:

- 5.8 **Heritage:** (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. It should be noted that the Listed Building Description is for identification purposes only, and does not indicate the extent of listing. 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.

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.

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.

(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.

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
CP15 Heritage

Brighton & Hove Local Plan:

- HE1 Listed Buildings
HE2 Demolition of a listed building
HE4 Reinstatement of original features on Listed Buildings

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- SPGBH11 Listed Building Interiors

Supplementary Planning Documents:

- SPD09 Architectural Features

St Aubyns School Planning Brief

8 CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 In association with the proposal set out in the concurrent Full Planning Application, Listed Building Consent is sought for the conversion and refurbishment works to Field House (main school building), terraced cottages and Rumneys building to provide a total of 9 no. two bedroom and 1 no. three bedroom dwellings with associated works and alterations to boundary flint wall along Steyning Road and The Twitten.
- 8.2 The proposed works to the Field House/Cottages/Rumneys include;
- the provision of new masonry and stud walls,
 - the creation/blocking-up of openings,

PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

- provision of new doors including apartment front doors and glazed bi-fold doors,
 - alterations to existing external walls,
 - the insertion of a new lift,
 - the creation of bathrooms and kitchens,
 - creation of new bay windows,
 - new windows,
 - insertion of new cupboard doors to form storage,
 - the raising of mezzanine floor level,
 - new roof construction,
 - insertion of new dormer window,
 - insertion of new rooflights,
- The proposal also includes;
 - the blocking-up of existing openings in the Twitten wall, and
 - the creation of new openings in the Twitten wall and wall fronting Steyning Road.

8.3 Many of the issues raised by third party objectors set out in section 5 above relate only to the concurrent Full Planning Application and are not material planning considerations in the determination of this Listed Building Consent Application. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to whether the proposed works and alterations would have a harmful impact on the historic character, architectural setting and significance of the Grade II Listed Building/curtilage listed buildings/structures.

Planning Brief

- 8.4 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 15th January 2015.
- 8.5 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.
- 8.6 The purpose of the brief is to provide a planning framework that helps bring forward a sensitive redevelopment on the site. In terms of Heritage the brief sets out the following development objectives;
- To breathe new life into this Listed Building in the heart of Rottingdean village,
 - To preserve those features that contribute to the special interest of the Listed Building, and

- To encourage new development of the highest design standard, by preserving and enhancing the character of the Conservation Area and setting of the Listed Building.
- 8.7 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. In terms of demolition the brief states that subject to the findings of the Built Heritage Assessment development proposals should have regard to;
- 8.8 “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”.
- 8.9 The document acknowledges 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.

Policy

- 8.10 The NPPF states that in considering applications for development Local Authorities should take account the desirability of sustaining or enhancing the significance of heritage assets and that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that “When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation”.
- 8.11 As heritage assets are irreplaceable, developers are required to provide clear and convincing justification for any loss of or harm caused to these assets in order to provide 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.
- 8.12 Policy HE1 states that proposals involving the alterations, extension, or change of use of a listed building will only be permitted where:
- a) the proposal would not have any adverse effect on the architectural and historic character or appearance of the interior or exterior of the building or its setting; and
 - b) the proposal respects the scale, design, materials and finishes of the existing building(s), and preserves its historic fabric.
- 8.13 Policy HE2 of the Local Plan prohibits the demolition/major alteration of a Listed Building except in exceptional cases and where 3 stated criterion are all met including that clear and convincing evidence has been provided that viable alternative uses cannot be found, redevelopment would produce substantial benefits for the community which would decisively outweigh resulting loss and

the physical condition has deteriorated through no fault of the owner/applicant for which evidence can be submitted. This policy also states that demolition or major alterations will not be considered without acceptable detailed plans for the site's development.

- 8.14 Policy CP15 of the City Plan requires the promotion of the City's Heritage and to ensure that the historic environment plays an integral part in the wider social, cultural and economic and environmental future of the City through aims including the conservation and enhancement in accordance with its identified significance, giving the greatest weight to designated heritage assets and their settings and prioritising positive action for such assets at risk through neglect, decay, vacancy or other threats.

Heritage Significance

- 8.15 The St Aubyns School site includes the Grade II Listed '76 High Street' (the main school building known as Field House) and Grade II Listed associated flint wall to the front boundary. The listing includes all extensions attached to the original 76 High Street (including the chapel contrary to what is stated in the submitted Heritage Statement).
- 8.16 Curtilage Listed Buildings include all the pre-1948 structures and buildings located within the curtilage and in associated use at the time of the listing including structures on the playing field.
- 8.17 Field House is of particular significance due to its formal façade, facing on to the High Street. This is clearly visible from the High Street and views along Park Road. Despite being built over time, the near symmetry and formal architectural style, alongside the size and scale of the building, denote its status. This is particularly evident in relation to the scale and predominantly vernacular style neighbouring properties. The building is set back from the main 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. The school building is also of significance as an early large-scale residence in the village, and due to its early use as a school which then remained in educational use. In this regard, the plan form (which remains evident, despite alterations) and surviving historic features are of significance.
- 8.18 The main 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.

- 8.19 The curtilage listed cottages, with render, brick and weatherboarding exteriors, are modest early 20th century structures. Their quaint character contributes to the setting of the school buildings. They contribute to the understanding of the school's development in the early 20th century. Their architecture complements that of the chapel, sports pavilion and other early 20th century timber structures on the site.

Heritage Statement and Impact Assessment

- 8.20 A heritage statement and separate impact assessment have appropriately been included as part of the application submission. It is however considered that there are some limitations to these submitted documents. 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 (the comments below refer to the room references set out in this document as best as possible). Furthermore 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 be useful. The significance of individual features/areas impacted by the scheme and the level of impact on these individual features is not always identified.

Conversion of Field House

- 8.21 Field House, which comprises of four floor levels (including basement), has previously been in use as a single house, then as a school. As such, it is considered that it would be most appropriate for it to remain in single use; which would allow the historic plan form and circulation routes to remain, and minimize the amount of alteration/loss of fabric and features. It is however recognized that as part of an acceptable wider scheme and in order to find a viable use, its sensitive conversion is likely to be considered acceptable.
- 8.22 As set out above, the proposal would result in the conversion of Field House into 6 residential units, each providing two bedrooms. In converting this building sensitively to residential units it is important that the buildings front elevation remains intact and that the plan form and circulation routes are legible. The principal rooms should be retained in terms of their proportions and detailing. Where cornices, skirtings, doors, architraves and fireplaces survive, these should also be retained in situ.
- 8.23 Heritage benefits are required in order to outweigh the harm of subdivision. To this end, the original/historic plan form should be reinstated wherever possible, in order to better reveal the significance of the Listed Building.
- 8.24 The structural assessment submitted as part of the application suggests that additional steel beams/joists would be required. It is considered that such works has the potential to have a significant impact on historic fabric. Full details are required on the level of insertion and the proposed location of any new steels/structural interventions, in order to allow the Local Planning Authority to make a full assessment of the potential impacts of such works on the historic character and fabric of the Listed Building.

- 8.25 The retention of the main stair case is considered appropriate however any works required to upgrade the staircase (e.g. as a protected means of escape) should be indicated as part of the application for assessment, as these may impact on the historic fabric or appearance of the stair.
- 8.26 A riser is proposed to the hallway between the main entrance and the stair at ground floor level and in the same position at first floor level. It is considered that the positioning of the proposed riser at ground floor would interrupt views between the main entrance and stair, which from two of the main elements of the historic house and an important part of the legibility of its circulation routes. They are complemented by the archway within the hall, views of which would also be interrupted. The riser would also interrupt the sense of proportion to the hallway and the character of the space. To the first floor the proposed riser would disrupt the positioning of an historic door and architrave. Risers in these locations are therefore not considered acceptable.
- 8.27 A lift is proposed between ground, first and second floor levels. The proposed lift would impact on the proportions of two rooms to each floor, as well as the plan form and circulation routes of the property as a whole. The insertion of a lift would also require the loss of a number of historic doors and door openings. The lift shaft would also rise through the roof form, and therefore lead to the loss of a section of historic roof form and fabric of the Listed Building.
- 8.28 Furthermore, the insertion of the lift would require substantial structural intervention, where it rises through the floors, through the roof and to strengthen the ground floor to support its weight. Although some details of this structural intervention have been provided, it is considered highly likely this would have a significant impact on the historic fabric of the property. For these reasons, the lift is considered to cause unacceptable harm to the significance of the Listed Building, and as such is not considered acceptable.
- 8.29 A number of kitchens and bathrooms are proposed to be inserted/relocated within the building. Further information is required to ensure that the associated pipework/services/ventilation would be accommodated appropriately. It would be most appropriate for this to be accommodated within the floor void, but without notching or cutting through joists. As such, the direction of joists should be indicated. Boxed-in pipework above floor level/suspended ceilings would not be appropriate.

Basement Level

- 8.30 Within the submitted Heritage Statement (paragraph 4.37) it is indicated that the basement appears to have kept its essential plan form, with a simple, utilitarian appearance. There does not appear to be any historic evidence submitted to justify the position of the proposed partitions. It appears that the partition between storage plots 26 and 27 is a substantial solid wall and thus likely to be original fabric. Its loss would alter the original plan form, reducing the possibility of its later reinstatement. There are also structural concerns regarding the loss of a solid wall at this level of the building, which are not covered by the structural assessment provided as part of the application. This wall should be retained.

8.31 The age and significance of the basement stair is unclear; it appears that it may be an original external rear stair. If the stair is original/historic, it should be retained as part of the proposal.

8.32 From the information submitted it is not known whether any fireplaces survive to the basement.

Ground Floor

8.33 *Main building Room A:* It is proposed to remove the partition within this room, which would allow for more traditional proportions to the room. It is however also proposed to remove the existing wall between the front and rear room (rooms A and D/E). The thickness of this wall shown on the building survey submitted suggests this is an original wall, as does its alignment with walls below (basement) and above (mezzanine/first floor). This is supported by the position of the two fireplaces to this room (although the inclusion of two fireplaces to one room of this size is unusual. The fireplaces are themselves non-original, although it is likely their positions/the chimney breasts are historic).

8.34 The proposed replacement wall abuts the chimney breast to the front room, leading to a non-traditional arrangement which disrupts any appreciation of this feature. This element of the proposed works is considered harmful to historic character and fabric of the Listed Building and therefore the wall should be kept in its original position.

8.35 The proposed opening with steps between this room and the north wing would lead to an awkward relationship with the neighbouring fireplace. Although it is acknowledged that access is required between these two elements, it should be located as sympathetically as possible.

8.36 *Main building Room B:* It is proposed to re-align the wall between the hall and front south room (room B and C in the photographic audit). Although it is unclear from the information submitted whether there is any evidence for its original location (this wall to the floor above is also differently aligned), it would align with the wall to the rear room and would accord with traditional layouts. As such, it is considered acceptable, provided the wall is finished to match the existing, including the door, architrave, cornices and skirtings, which should be re-used where possible.

8.37 The archway to the hallway is not currently shown on the plans; its retention should be indicated.

8.38 *Main building Room S:* The retention of the stair is appropriate. Details of the design of the existing rear door should be confirmed in order to determine the acceptability of its replacement.

8.39 *Main building Room C:* The proportions of this room are disrupted by the proposed lift. It is unclear why the wall between this room and room G to the rear is proposed to be totally rebuilt, it would be appropriate for this wall to retain its current alignment.

8.40 *Main building Room D/E:* Reinstatement of the proportions of this room is appropriate, through the removal of the corridor and realignment of the rear elevation. The wall between room A and D/E should be retained in its original position and the door to the north wall should thus be relocated.

- 8.41 *Main building Room F:* The loss of this lean-to glazed structure is considered appropriate.
- 8.42 *Main building Room G:* The insertion of the proposed lift would impact on the proportions of this room, as would the slightly re-aligned wall and proposed large opening. The wall should be retained on its current alignment and the opening reduced to the height and width of a double-door opening.
- 8.43 *South wing Room A:* The proportions of this room including the relationship between the fireplace and the remainder of the room are significant features which should be retained, as such the proposed bathroom is not considered acceptable and should be relocated.
- 8.44 Further information on the ‘doors’ proposed to be reinstated as ‘windows’ is required, including photographs of the existing and which existing window is proposed to be replicated. This would appropriately form part of a window inventory.
- 8.45 *South wing Room B/C/D/E:* This area is much altered and does not form part of the principal rooms of the property. The loss of the early 20th century spiral stair is considered acceptable. The reconfiguration of the spaces is also generally acceptable. However, it is unclear why the walls to rooms C require rebuilding; these walls should be retained on their current alignment unless suitable justification for their required rebuilding is provided. The doors, architraves and other historic features should be retained. The safe should also be retained. The retention of these features should be added to the plans. The fireplace within the proposed en-suite is currently boarded over. It should be confirmed whether a fireplace exists in this location, if it does, the fireplace should be reinstated.
- 8.46 Two windows to the southern wall are proposed to be blocked. These appear to be historic features and would appropriately be incorporated into the design.
- 8.47 *North wing Room A:* As per the south wing, the proportions of this room and the relationship between the fireplace and the room should be retained, as this reveals much about the status and use of this room historically. The proposed bathroom is thus considered unacceptable in this location, especially due to the resulting visual harm to the high status fireplace/mantel piece and the physical harm of the two walls abutting this feature.
- 8.48 *North wing Room B:* It would be appropriate for the tiled floor to be retained. The wall between this area and room A should be retained to allow the proportions of the room to survive.
- 8.49 *North wing Room C:* This area has been heavily altered through the insertion of a stair in circa 1980s. Rebuilding to a more coherent footprint is considered acceptable, although it is acknowledged that the proposed rebuilt form is not based on historic evidence.

Mezzanine

- 8.50 The rebuilding of the mezzanine room at a higher level represents a substantial alteration to the historic building. Such works would impact on the historic fabric, plan form and circulation routes of the historic building. This element of the proposal would also require the canted bay window and fireplace to be rebuilt. The impact of the proposed works to the mezzanine level on these features is

considered unacceptably harmful to the historic significance and understanding of the historic building.

- 8.51 The proposed layout of the altered mezzanine level would leave the fireplace in isolation and protruding into the room, compounding the harm caused to this feature.

First Floor

- 8.52 *Main house Room A*: The loss of the inserted partitions to this room is an improvement. However, the loss of the historic wall between this room and the mezzanine is unacceptable, particularly given the physical impact this would have on the mezzanine fireplace. The wall should be retained in its existing position.
- 8.53 *Main house Room C/E*: The loss of the corridor is considered to be an improvement. The wall between this room and room F should be retained rather than rebuilt.
- 8.54 It is unclear why the wall between room B and C requires rebuilding. This would appropriately be retained and the existing (fixed shut) door re-used. The proposed lift disrupts the proportions of the room and the location of doors (thus the circulation routes of the building).
- 8.55 *Main house Room F*: The proposed lift would also disrupt the proportions to this room. From the information submitted it is not known why it is proposed to deepen the thickness of the wall between the stair and room C.
- 8.56 The conversion of the cupboard to the west of the fireplace (cast iron insert and mantelpiece survive) to a new door opening is considered acceptable given the current arrangement and provided the door is replaced with a more appropriate design.
- 8.57 *South wing Room A*: This forms one of the principal rooms of the historic building. Its proportions should be retained; there is the potential to improve these proportions through removal of the existing partition walls to the southeast corner. The relationship between the room and its fireplace should also be retained.
- 8.58 From the submission it is unclear why it is considered necessary to remove the south-facing windows to this room, these windows should be retained.
- 8.59 *South wing room B and C*: The loss of the spiral stair and reconfiguration of this part of the property is considered acceptable, given the lesser status of this space and the high level of alteration. However, the windows to the south elevation should be retained wherever possible, the majority of these windows appear original to the construction of the wing, and were certainly in situ by 1926. The exception to this is the small window third from the south, the opening for which does not appear to be original. This window would appropriately be removed. The existing UPVC windows do not appear to have obtained consent, and thus should be reinstated as timber hung sash windows.
- 8.60 *North wing Room A*: As one of the principal rooms, its proportions should be retained.
- 8.61 *North wing Rooms to rear (unnumbered)*. This area is heavily altered through the insertion of a stair; evidence survives to its previous arrangement: Its

reconfiguration to a more traditional footprint and layout is considered appropriate.

8.62 Second Floor

The spine wall running parallel with the front/rear walls of the main house is a strong feature in the current plan form. It would be appropriate for this to remain a strong feature throughout, and be reinstated between rooms A and B. The removal of the lift would help allow this feature to be retained.

- 8.63 It appears that the existing self-contained flat was not included in the photo survey/heritage assessment. At least one fireplace survives, which should be retained. The proportions of the rooms should be retained within the conversion and historic doors/architraves and other features retained.

External:

- 8.64 Historic photographs support that the rear elevation 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 discussed above, for example the raised height of the mezzanine room. A light touch approach should be taken, which seeks to retain as much historic fabric as possible, although it is acknowledged that the appearance/condition of the elevation can be improved. The subtle change in plane between the two halves of the property should be retained.
- 8.65 In principle, all historic window openings should be retained. Some existing windows have been altered to UPVC, it is unclear whether these have consent. These UPVC windows should be altered 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).
- 8.66 The proposed lift shaft would break through the roof form. 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 and associated lift shaft are considered unacceptable.
- 8.67 It is proposed to extend the second floor northwards over the north wing. The 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). The proposed 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 of the proposal.

- 8.68 The proposal includes the insertion of new conservation style rooflights within the existing and altered rear/northern roofslope of the building. 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.
- 8.69 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.
- 8.70 Whilst retention of the main building (Field House) as a single unit would be most appropriate, overall its sympathetic conversion to flats is considered acceptable in principle as part of a wider acceptable scheme that restores and provides a viable use of the Listed Building. However as a result of the issues set out above, it is considered that elements of the internal and external alterations proposed in association with the conversion of Field House into 6 residential units would have significant harmful impacts upon the character, appearance, significance and historic fabric of the Grade II Listed Building.

Proposed Conversion of the Cottages and Rumneys

- 8.71 The two storey terraced block, known as the Cottages and Rumneys, are located in the north-western corner of the campus part of the school site. Within this Listed Building application consent is also sought for the conversion of these properties to 3 two bedroom properties and a three bedroom property (Rumneys).
- 8.72 The retention of these curtilage listed structures within the re-development of the school site is considered appropriate. The existing interiors of these buildings are already much altered and therefore the proposed internal changes, including the insertion of staircases is considered acceptable. Where fireplaces/chimney breasts exist, it would be appropriate for these to be retained or reinstated. The window surrounds/other details should be re-applied where it is proposed to add insulation to the walls, such issues could be ensured if overall the proposal was considered acceptable.
- 8.73 To the exterior, significant alterations are proposed to the window/glazed door openings on the main elevation (east elevation) of the Cottages and southern elevation of Rumneys. It is considered that such alterations would produce an inappropriate uniformity to the group of properties which would obscure the historic record. These openings should be retained in their existing locations. The exception would be the small window fourth from the south, which appears to be a later insertion.
- 8.74 The proposed addition of two new porches to the main elevation of the Cottages to match the existing porch is considered inappropriate as this would obscure the historic record by introducing uniformity to the front elevation of the cottages. The junction between the existing brick dressings and the new porches would also be awkward, as they were not designed to accommodate such a structure (this is in contrast to the door with an existing porch, where the porch was built in conjunction with the remainder of the building).

- 8.75 It is also not considered appropriate to extend the existing weatherboarding across to the pebble-dashed building.
- 8.76 Historic windows should be retained wherever possible. The acceptability of replacement windows should be determined following the receipt of a window inventory.
- 8.77 Conservation rooflights are considered acceptable to the west elevation, as these will be largely invisible in the street scene and rooflights currently exist to this elevation.
- 8.78 The removal of the existing single storey extension and associated external staircase located to the southern end of the cottages, the removal of the existing single storey extension and poor quality lean to extension located towards the northern side of the main elevation of the cottages and the removal of the first floor protruding section located between the cottages and Rumneys (above the lean to extension) is considered acceptable.
- 8.79 The loss of the top light casements to the northern elevation of Rumneys is considered appropriate. The proposed porch which would be inserted on the northern elevation however would lead to an awkward junction with the roofslope, which is a significant feature of the property and should be removed from the proposal.
- 8.80 It is noted that the style of the Rumneys dormer windows on the submitted roof plan appears to be gable end rather than hipped however no alterations to these dormers other than the replacement of the windows are proposed and therefore it would appear that the roof plan is incorrect.
- 8.81 Overall the proposed conversion of the curtilage listed Cottages and Rumneys to residential units is considered acceptable in principle however for reasons stated above, elements of the proposed external works would have detrimental impacts on the character, architectural setting and significance of the Grade II curtilage listed buildings.

Alterations to Boundary Flint Walls

- 8.82 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.
- 8.83 It is noted that the existing flint wall located to the north of the swimming pool would also be demolished in order to accommodate proposed plots 17 and 18,

however the removal of this wall is discussed in the concurrent Listed Building Consent application as relates to its complete demolition.

- 8.84 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".
- 8.85 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 20th 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.
- 8.86 Whilst the acceptability of this proposed access point in terms of highway issues is discussed in more detail in full planning application 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.
- 8.87 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.
- 8.88 With regards to the strengthening of the linearity of the proposed new roads (discussed in the associated full planning application) 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.

9 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 In conclusion it is considered that elements of the proposed alterations to the interior/exterior of Field House, the Cottages and Rumneys would have a detrimental impact on the historic fabric and plan form and character and appearance of the Grade II Listed Building and curtilage Listed Buildings, contrary to polices of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and City Plan.
- 9.2 In addition, in the absence of an acceptable scheme for the redevelopment of the site, the demolition of parts of existing historic walls fronting Steyning Road and the Twitten would result in the loss of historic fabric and form and a large prominent gap in the Steyning Road boundary, which are considered to be of harm to the historic character and appearance of the existing flint walls, the historic school site and the Steyning Road street scene.
- 9.3 It is not considered that the benefits arising from the proposed development, including the provision of new residential units and the occupancy of an existing vacant Listed Building, outweighs the adverse harm caused to the heritage assets and the departure from policy.

10 EQUALITIES

None identified.

11 REASON FOR REFUSAL / INFORMATIVES

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The internal works proposed in association with the conversion of Field House to form 6 self-contained residential units, including the rebuilding of the mezzanine room at a higher level, the insertion/removal of partition walls, the insertion of a riser at ground and first floor levels and the insertion of a lift, would have an adverse impact on the original plan form and circulation routes of the Listed Building, and would result in the disruption/loss of original historic fabric/features. As such the proposed works would be harmful to the character and historic fabric of the Grade II Listed Building, contrary to policies HE1, HE2 and HE4 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP15 of the City Plan.
2. The proposed external alterations to the rear of Field House would introduce a level of regularity and symmetry to the elevation which has no historic precedent and subsequently would result in an adverse impact upon the understanding of the historic development of the building, currently apparent from this rear elevation. In addition the proposed external alterations to the rear elevation would reveal inappropriate internal alterations, such as the raising in height of the mezzanine level. As such the proposed alterations would be harmful to the character, appearance and historic significance of the Grade II Listed Building, contrary to policies HE1, HE2 and HE4 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP15 of the City Plan.

PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

3. The proposed external alterations to the roof of Field House, namely the insertion of a lift shaft, the northern wing roof extension and the insertion of a number of rooflights, 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 the roof form 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.
4. Insufficient information has been provided for the proposed alterations to Field House with regards to existing window openings, the insertion of steel beams/joists related to the proposed lift, pipework/services/ventilation to proposed kitchens and bathrooms and details of any works required to upgrade the existing main staircase, to demonstrate that such works would be appropriately accommodated and would not have a harmful impact on the historic fabric of the Listed Building. It is not therefore possible to determine that the proposed works would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the Grade II Listed Building, contrary to policies HE1 and HE4 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP15 of the City Plan.
5. 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 policies HE1 and HE4 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan and CP15 of the City Plan.
6. In the absence of an acceptable scheme for the redevelopment of the site, the demolition of parts of existing historic walls fronting Steyning Road and the Twitten would result in the loss of historic fabric and form and a large prominent gap in the Steyning Road boundary, which are considered to be of harm to the historic character and appearance of the existing flint walls, the historic school site and the Steyning Road street scene. The scheme is considered contrary to policy HE1 and HE2 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 (submission document) 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. This decision is based on the drawings listed below:

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Red Line Plan	50A	Rev. C	29 th February 2016
Developable Area Plan	50A1	Rev. A	29 th February 2016
Existing Site Survey	51	-	24 th August 2015

PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

Existing Site Sections	52	-	24 th August 2015
Existing Site Sections	53	-	24 th August 2015
Existing Street Scenes	54	-	24 th August 2015
Existing Street Scenes	55	-	8 th September 2015
Proposed Site Layout	56	Rev. D	29 th February 2016
Site Location Plan Showing Buildings & Structures to be Removed	59	Rev. B	29 th February 2016
Proposed Site Sections	700	-	24 th August 2015
Proposed Site Sections	701	-	24 th August 2015
Proposed Street Scenes	702	-	8 th September 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Floor Plan	190	-	24 th August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Floor Plan	191	-	24 th August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Floor Plan	192	-	24 th August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Floor Plan	193	-	24 th August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Floor Plan	194	-	24 th August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Elevation	195	-	24 th August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Elevation	196	-	24 th August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Elevation	197	-	24 th August 2015
Plots 24-29 Proposed Elevation	198	-	24 th August 2015
Plots 1, 36-38 Proposed Floor Plan	210	-	24 th August 2015
Plots 1, 36-38 Proposed Floor Plan	211	-	24 th August 2015
Plots 1, 36-38 Proposed Roof Plan	212	-	24 th August 2015
Plots 1, 36-38 Proposed Elevation	213	-	24 th August 2015
Plots 1, 36-38 Proposed Elevation	214	-	24 th August 2015
Plots 1, 36-38 Proposed Elevation	215	-	24 th August 2015
Proposed Street Scenes	703	-	8 th September 2015
Existing & Proposed Wall along Steyning Road	80	-	8 th September 2015
Proposed Site Layout Showing Developable Area	950	Rev. B	29 th February 2016
Building Survey Main Building - Basement	LH/1501018/ MB	-	8 th September 2015
Building Survey Main Building - Ground Floor	LH/1501018/ MG	-	8 th September 2015
Building Survey Main Building - First Floor	LH/1501018/ MF	-	8 th September 2015
Building Survey Main	LH/1501018/	-	8 th September 2015

PLANNING COMMITTEE LIST – 20 APRIL 2016

Building - Second Floor	MS		
Building Survey External Floor Plans	LH/1501018/ EFP	-	8 th September 2015
Building Survey Elevations Sheet 1	LH/1501018/ E1	-	8 th September 2015
Building Survey Elevations Sheet 2	LH/1501018/ E2	-	8 th September 2015
Building Survey Elevations Sheet 3	LH/1501018/ E3	-	8 th September 2015
Building Survey Elevations Sheet 4	LH/1501018/ E4	-	8 th September 2015
Elevation Layout	LH/1501018/ EL	-	8 th September 2015
Topographical Survey - Sheet 1	LH/1501018/ T1	-	8 th September 2015
Topographical Survey - Sheet 2	LH/1501018/ T2	-	8 th September 2015
Topographical Survey - Sheet 3	LH/1501018/ T3	-	8 th September 2015
Topographical Survey - Sheet 4	LH/1501018/ T4	-	8 th September 2015
Heritage Impact Assessment	AHC REF: ND/9273	August 2015	24 th August 2015
Heritage Impact Assessment and Justification	AHC REF: ND/DB/9273	August 2015	24 th August 2015
Heritage Audit and Assessment of Significance	AHC REF: ND/DB/9273	August 2015	24 th August 2015
Heritage Audit and Assessment of Significance Photographic Audit I	AH REF: ND/DB/9273	August 2015	24 th August 2015
Heritage Audit and Assessment of Significance Photographic Audit II	AH REF: ND/DB/9273	August 2015	24 th August 2015
Heritage Audit and Assessment of Significance Photographic Audit III	AH REF: ND/DB/9273	August 2015	24 th August 2015
Heritage Audit and Assessment of Significance Photographic Audit IV	AH REF: ND/DB/9273	August 2015	24 th August 2015
Structural Appraisal for Conversion of Existing Field House at St Aubyns School Rottingdean	G1190	August 2015	24 th August 2015
Structural Appraisal of Retained Cottages at St Aubyns School Rottingdean	G1190	August 2015	24 th August 2015

Appendix A - St Aubyns School, 76 High Street, Rottingdean – BH2015/03110

Letters of Objection

Property Name / Number	Street	Town	Postcode
Bazehill House			BN2 7DB
Beacon Point			BN2 7BE
Dale Cottage			BN2 7HA
Mulberry House			BN2 7GA
Steven Warriner			BN2 7BB
15	Chailey Avenue	Rottingdean	BN2 7GH
22(x2)	Chailey Avenue	Rottingdean	BN2 7GH
37	Chailey Avenue	Rottingdean	BN2 7GH
11	Challoners Close	Rottingdean	BN2 7DG
44	Chichester Drive West		BN2 8SH
17	Court Ord Road		BN2 7FD
5 Tudor Close	Dean Court Road	Rottingdean	BN2 7DF
13	Falmer Avenue		BN2 8FH
27 (x2)	Gorham Avenue	Rottingdean	BN2 7DP
Flat 2, 44	Grand Crescent	Rottingdean	BN2 7GL
23 St Margaret's	High Street	Rottingdean	BN2 7HS
72	High Street		BN2 7HF
Stanley House 116	High Street	Rottingdean	BN2 7HF
16	Lenham Road West	Rottingdean	BN2 7GJ
6	Longhill Close	Ovingdean	BN2 7AX
Point Clear	Lustrells Road	Rottingdean	BN2 7DS
2 Marine Court, 65	Marine Drive	Rottingdean	BN2 7LG
21	Nevill Road	Rottingdean	BN2 7HH
36	Nevill Road	Rottingdean	BN2 7HG
101(x2)	Oaklands Avenue		BN2 8PD
74	Saltdean Drive		BN2 8SD
7 Kipling Court	St Aubyns Mead	Rottingdean	BN2 7JT
Rotherdown	Steyning Road	Rottingdean	
The Hideaway	Steyning Road	Rottingdean	BN2 7GA
Dale Cottage	The Green	Rottingdean	BN2 7HA
14	The Vale	Ovingdean	BN2 7AB
8	Wanderdown Drive		BN2 7B2
7	Wanderdown Way	Ovingdean	BN2 7BX
8	Wanderdown Way	Brighton	BN2 7BX

COUNCILLOR REPRESENTATION

From: Mary Mears
Sent: 13 October 2015 8:58 AM
To: Liz Arnold
Cc: Jeanette Walsh
Subject: Objection to Planning Application BH2015/03110

Liz Arnold .
Principal Planning Officer.
Development Control.

12th October 2015

**Re: Planning Application BH2015/03110 St Aubyns School 76 High Street
Rottingdean. Listed Building Consent.**

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

This planning application follows on from planning application BH2015/0312 Demolition of a Grade 11 Listed Building. This proposes to demolish 60% of the former school building Application BH2015/03110 covers the conversion and refurbishment works.

The most serious element of this application in my view is the removal of large areas of the flint wall along side Steyning Road and the Twitten.

Rottingdean is a Conservation Area. In my opinion the approval of these plans would contravene the Rottingdean Conservation Area Character Statement that identifies St Aubyns school campus as of special architectural interest. This planning application if approved would destroy part of the history of the site and also the character of Rottingdean Village.

As this is part of a major planning application, I wish to reserve my right to speak at the planning committee.

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

