

Minutes of the Hospital Liaison Group Meeting
Held on Monday 26th September 2011 (7pm to 9pm) in the Audrey Emerton Building,
Royal Sussex County Hospital, Brighton

Present:

Cllr Gill Mitchell, Cllr Warren Morgan, Mrs Jackie Nowell (Vice-Chair), 29 members of the public.

Brighton & Sussex University Hospitals:

Steve Gallagher, Operational Director, Estates & Facilities
Nick Groves, AD, 3Ts Service Modernisation

Trust Planning Advisors:

Tessa O'Neill, BDP Architects

Laing O'Rourke Supply Chain:

Richard Buckingham, BDP
Neil Cadenhead, BDP
Mark Elton, WSP Group
Karen Hicks, Laing O'Rourke
Rhod MacLeod, WSP Group
Chris Williams, WSP Group

Apologies:

Simon Kirby MP, Duane Passman (Director of 3Ts, Estates & Facilities), Cllr Craig Turton (Chair)

1. Welcome & Introductions

Jackie Nowell welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Minutes of Last Meeting

The minutes of the last meeting (22nd August) were agreed. Nick Groves apologised that the draft minutes had only been finalised that day and that there had not therefore been time to circulate them to members who receive hardcopies rather than email.

3. Matters Arising

3.1 'Front Car Park' Building Planning Application^{1,2}

Nick reported that the application for the temporary modular build (Imaging Department) in front of the Jubilee Wing had been approved by the City Council.

3.2 Planning Application

Nick confirmed that the application for Full Planning Consent had been submitted to the Council on 23rd September and should appear on the Council's website³ once validated. Cllr Mitchell added that residents would also see notices on street furniture. As discussed at previous meetings, the statutory consultation period is 21 days from the date the Council notices appear. The website gives details of how members of the public can see and comment on planning applications.

¹ http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/index.cfm?request=c1199915&action=showDetail&APPLICATION_NUMBER=BH2011%2F01558

² <http://www.bsuh.nhs.uk/EasysiteWeb/getresource.axd?AssetID=362107&type=full&servicetype=Attachment>

³ <http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/index.cfm?request=b1154189>

3.3 Filming HLG Meetings

Nick reported that the City Council notifies attendees if meetings are to be filmed but does not ask for signed consent. He rehearsed the issues from the previous meeting, concerns about the cost of filming and that meetings would need to be conducted more formally, which members might find a constraint. He added that a resident had mentioned to him before the meeting that filming would be a deterrent to asking questions.

It was agreed overwhelmingly that the meetings should not be filmed but that minutes should continue to be produced and presentations posted on the website.

3.4 Eligibility for Courtney King House

Post-meeting note:

At the August meeting⁴ a resident of Courtney King House (CKH) expressed concern that the Council is increasingly placing bed-bound residents in CKH rather than in nursing homes, which he attributed to budget cuts. Cllr Turton had replied that he was not aware this was Council policy and asked Nick to raise the issue with the Housing Office.

Nick has received a reply⁵ from the Housing Needs & Social Inclusion team and has forwarded this to the local resident who raised the issue.

4. Design Update

Jackie introduced this item and explained there would be four presentations summarising key aspects of the Trust's planning application: design, sustainability, Environmental Impact Assessment and Transport. *[These have been posted on the HLG website⁶].*

Design

Neil Cadenhead presented the design update. Jackie thanked him and invited questions:-

4.1 Air Ambulance Helipad: Height & Cladding

A resident asked how much the Air Ambulance helipad would add to the height Thomas Kemp Tower (Slide 40) and whether the void under the helipad could be clad.

Neil reported that following detailed Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) modelling, the helipad has had to be raised by c. 3m in the final design order to meet safety requirements. The heights will be confirmed in the minutes.

Neil noted that the initial designs did include screening around the space between the helipad and the top of the TKT to create a gauze effect, but this consistently failed the CFD/safety testing so has been removed.

Post-Meeting Note:

Measuring the height of the TKT from the bottom of the lift entrance on the service road to the top of the plant on the roof (excluding ductwork):

- *Total height of existing TKT = 57.4m*
- *Total height of helipad = 11.6m*

⁴ Minutes of 22nd August 2011, item 9.1.

⁵ 'I have made some enquiries in respect to this and I am informed that there is no knowledge to substantiate the fact that either the Council or the scheme's management are placing bed bound residents in this facility... This does not however mean that there may be residents that have moved in to Courtney King and then become more infirm... I note the concerns that residents may have and would only be able to say that should conditions at the scheme become difficult due to the demolition or redevelopment then the affected group may request a transfer to alternative sites through the Choice Based Lettings Scheme.' *Email of 27th September 2011.*

⁶ <http://www.bsuh.nhs.uk/EasysiteWeb/getresource.axd?AssetID=368514&type=full&servicetype=Attachment>
<http://www.bsuh.nhs.uk/EasysiteWeb/getresource.axd?AssetID=368515&type=full&servicetype=Attachment>
<http://www.bsuh.nhs.uk/EasysiteWeb/getresource.axd?AssetID=368517&type=full&servicetype=Attachment>
<http://www.bsuh.nhs.uk/EasysiteWeb/getresource.axd?AssetID=368518&type=full&servicetype=Attachment>

- *Total height (combined helipad plus tower) = 69.0m*

4.2 Air Ambulance Helipad: Noise

Cllr Morgan asked whether the CFD modelling had assessed the level of noise created by wind whistling around the helipad structure.

Post-Meeting note:

The CFD wind modelling undertaken for the air ambulance helipad does not take into consideration potential wind noise arising from within the development. The scope of the noise and vibration assessment, as agreed with the City Council, is set out in the Environmental Statement and does not make reference to wind noise associated with the proposed buildings. Consideration of the potential for wind-induced noise in or around buildings is a matter for the design and does not normally fall within the scope of an EIA for this type of development.

4.3 Stage 2 Balconies

A resident asked whether the balconies on the west side of the Stage 2 building would overhang the flint wall along Upper Abbey Road.

Neil confirmed that they would not. He presented a West-East architectural section⁷ showing the c. 14.5m gap between Upper Abbey Road and the west face of the Stage 2 building.

4.4 Garden Access

A resident asked whether the garden around the base of the Stage 2 building would be open to the public. Neil confirmed that the Trust's current brief is to provide maintenance access only to this garden.

4.5 Planting Around Roof Gardens

A resident asked whether patients/visitors would be able to look into local residences from the Stage 2 roof gardens.

Neil noted that this had been discussed at a previous meeting⁸. He referred to Slide 35 of his presentation, which shows the landscaping plan for the roof gardens. The paths around the edge of the roof will be for maintenance access only. The inner paths will be the closest patients/visitors are able to get to the glass balustrade around the edge of the roof. He was confident, therefore, that patients/visitors would not be able to look into Upper Abbey Road or Whitehawk Hill Road residences from the roof gardens.

4.6 Appropriate Landscaping

A resident asked whether the landscaping and choice of planting on the roof gardens/terraces would be appropriate for local weather conditions, in particular high winds and storms.

Neil replied as discussed at previous meetings⁹, the landscaping plan is being designed to be appropriate to the local climate.

4.7 Stage 2 Design

Jackie noted that at the previous meeting¹⁰ a resident had suggested redesigning the Stage 2 building without the central courtyard. She thanked Neil for the analysis (Slide 28), which showed that the 'cube' design the resident had suggested would need to be 22m higher than the current Barry Building to maintain the required floor area. However the resident's question was whether redesigning the Stage 2 building without the courtyard

⁷ <http://www.bsuh.nhs.uk/EasysiteWeb/getresource.axd?AssetID=368287&type=full&servicetype=Attachment>
⁸ Minutes of 25th July 2011, item 4.5.

⁹ Minutes of 15th March 2010, item 3.9; minutes of 7th February 2011, item 5.8; minutes of 25th July 2011, item 4.3.

¹⁰ Minutes of 22nd August, item 9.4

would allow it to maintain the existing footprint of the Barry Building rather than extend further north (ie. closer to the residences on Upper Abbey Road).

Neil replied that as well as the overall floor area, a key determinant in the design is providing sufficient perimeter to allow light into most of the rooms, and in particular the inpatient bedrooms. It is unlikely that an alternative design that meets these criteria could be contained within the existing footprint of the Barry Building without being significantly taller.

Nick confirmed that having now submitted the planning application, the Trust would not be able to justify commissioning BDP to undertake this theoretical redesign exercise.

4.8 Pavement Widths

Cllr Mitchell asked what impact the designs have on pavement widths along Eastern Road.

Neil confirmed that the plans considerably extend the width of the pavements in front of both the Stage 1 and Stage 2 buildings. He agreed to provide the detail in the minutes.

Post-meeting note:

In front of the Stage 2 building, the pavement width (from kerb to edge of planter) will range from 2.0m to 8.0m. The current width ranges from 2.0m to 2.4m. In front of the Stage 1 building, the pavement width (from kerb to building) will range from 3.9m to 4.0m. The current width ranges from 2.6m to 3.9m. [A plan is available on the HLG website].

Neil added that it is not proposed to alter the width of pavement on the south side of Eastern Road, which would require a reduction in road width or a diversion of Eastern Road onto Trust property.

4.9 Additional Views

A resident asked whether views could be produced from the south side of Sudeley Terrace to show how much of the Stage 1 building could be seen above the Sussex Eye Hospital and Audrey Emerton Building, and from the residences on Eastern Road opposite the Latilla Building.

Nick will discuss with Duane whether these views, which would be in addition to the 52 verified views agreed with the City Council, could be produced. Jackie noted that Duane had also agreed to provide views from the roof gardens and upper floors of the Stage 2 building towards Upper Abbey Road (and vice versa).

Action: Nick

4.10 Bus Stops

A resident asked whether the Trust could use some of its land to create laybys on the north side of Eastern Road for busses to drop off/pick up.

Neil reported that this idea had been explored with the City Council and Brighton & Hove Bus Company. The Bus Company is happy with the proposed location of the bus stops and would prefer that they remain on the carriageway rather than in a layby. This position is supported by Council Highways officers. It is not clear that the use of bus laybys increases the flow of traffic; Cllr Mitchell explained that bus drivers' find it difficult to pull back out into the flow of traffic.

A resident noted that members of the public could express their views on this and other aspects of the design as part of the Council's consultation on the planning application.

4.11 Samples of Coloured Panels

A number of residents asked when they and the Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) would be able to see samples of the coloured panels to be used on the building.

Tessa O'Neill replied that the Trust's design team is discussing materials and samples as part of the ongoing liaison with the City Council. Samples will be presented to the CAG in advance of the Planning Committee. Discussions are underway about where/whether the panels can be put on display for members of the public.

4.12 Sustainability

Richard Buckingham presented the sustainability update. He explained BREEAM¹¹ (the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method), which was established in 1990 as a tool to measure the sustainability of new non-domestic buildings in the UK. NHS developments are required to have at least a BREEAM 'excellent' rating; there are only five buildings in the UK with an 'outstanding' rating. In addition, the City Council requires developments to score at least 60% in each of the 'energy' and 'water' sections, which the proposed development achieves.

Richard noted that the designs include PV (photovoltaic¹² - solar panel) cells on the easternmost of the three 'fingers' (Slide 4). The other two fingers will be designed so additional PV cells can be fitted once the economics make this financially viable.

Jackie thanked him and invited questions:-

4.13 Living Roofs

Cllr Morgan noted that some living roofs in the city have proved successful but others have not. He asked whether the proposed vegetation has been tried and tested in other similar locations, in particular given the proximity to the sea/salt air, adjacency to a main road and the stronger winds and microclimate experienced at that height.

Richard confirmed that the planting strategy will favour the selection of indigenous plants able to withstand the conditions in the area.

Environmental Impact Assessment

Mark Elton noted that following the EIA presentation to the August HLG meeting¹³, a summary of the key issues had also been posted on the HLG website¹⁴ as requested. He presented the key EIA findings and invited questions:-

4.14 Methodology & Use of Averages

A resident expressed concern that the EIA methodology uses averages to assess impact, which masks areas where greater impacts will be experienced. She also asked whether the cumulative impact of noise, vibration, dust etc. is assessed.

Mark noted that this issue had been raised at the last meeting¹⁵. The standards/best practice methodologies used for each of the technical assessments vary from topic to topic but are based on fully outlined regulations and experience on similar projects elsewhere in the UK. The EIA includes a chapter¹⁶ on cumulative impacts both from previous and other projects with planning permission in the area, together with cumulative effects from different types of impact that affect a single 'receptor' (eg. local residences).

¹¹ <http://www.breeam.org/page.jsp?id=66>

¹² <http://www.greenspec.co.uk/pv-cells.php>

¹³ <http://www.bsuh.nhs.uk/EasysiteWeb/getresource.axd?AssetID=365431&type=full&servicetype=Attachment>

¹⁴ <http://www.bsuh.nhs.uk/EasysiteWeb/getresource.axd?AssetID=367992&type=full&servicetype=Attachment>

¹⁵ Minutes of 22nd August, item 7.10.

¹⁶ cf. <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/eia-studies-and-reports/guidel.pdf>

4.15 Construction Traffic Routes

A resident asked how the environmental impact of construction traffic could be assessed until the location of the Consolidation Centre has been determined.

Tessa noted that wherever the Consolidation Centre is located, there are a limited number of routes that construction traffic can take within the city. These have been agreed with City Council officers. Nick noted that these routes were presented to the June meeting¹⁷ (Slide 36). Mark explained that as discussed at previous meetings¹⁸, all these routes have been assessed in the EIA and Traffic Impact Assessment.

Transport Assessment Report (TAR)

Rhod MacLeod presented the TAR. He noted that it had been prepared in close consultation with Council officers and had not changed significantly since the presentation to the July HLG meeting¹⁹. Jackie thanked him and invited questions:-

4.16 Consolidation Centre

A number of residents expressed disappointment that the location of the Consolidation Centre had not been identified as part of the main planning application. Residents of Wilson Avenue felt that this was the most significant aspect of the redevelopment plans.

Cllr Morgan reported that following discussion at the last meeting²⁰ about the Shoreham Cement Works, he had clarified the issues with colleagues on Horsham District Council and has passed details of the current owner to the Trust. Nick thanked him for this information and said that Laing O'Rourke would be following up in due course.

Rhod confirmed that Sheepcote Valley is not now a realistic option for the Consolidation Centre given environmental and amenity concerns.

4.17 Parking Provision for Staff

A resident asked about the planned increase in dedicated staff parking on site (Slide 2) from 18% of 508 spaces²¹ currently to 46% of 820 spaces, which seems inconsistent with the ambition to shift from use of private cars to public transport.

Rhod replied that dedicated patient and visitor parking would increase under the plans from 11% of 508 spaces (56 spaces) to 48% of 820 spaces (394 spaces). By changing shared spaces to patient/visitor-only spaces, the number of parking spaces available to staff would in effect be reduced from 419 spaces to 377 spaces.

The number of staff on the RSCH site, some of whom will be transferring from Princess Royal Hospital, is expected to increase by 450 whole-time equivalents. The number of dedicated on-site staff spaces is considered a 'worse case': the preferred option is to use an offsite 'park & ride' both during and following construction; this is still under discussion with the City Council.

On staff travel, Rhod noted that as reported previously²² the hospital's travel plan for staff already performs well: 22% of staff travel to work by bus and only 42% travel by car alone, compared to national figures of 12% and 57% respectively.

¹⁷ <http://www.bsuh.nhs.uk/EasysiteWeb/getresource.axd?AssetID=360307&type=full&servicetype=Attachment>
¹⁸ Minutes of 25th July, item 3.4; minutes of 22nd August, item 5.1.

¹⁹ <http://www.bsuh.nhs.uk/EasysiteWeb/getresource.axd?AssetID=368518&type=full&servicetype=Attachment>
²⁰ Minutes of 22nd August, item 5.3.

²¹ This includes additional spaces to be provided at St Mary's Hall, which are included in the Transport Assessment Report but were excluded in the figures at Appendix A of the notes of the August HLG.

²² Minutes of 25th July, item 4.11.

A resident suggested that the Travel Plan's proposed targets (Slide 3), eg. 5% reduction in the number of staff and visitors travelling to the hospital by car, were derisory, even given the relative success of the existing plan. Rhod replied that the Council might want these targets to be increased, although modal shift requires a range of measures, many of which are outside the Trust's direct control.

4.18 Impact on Resident Parking

A resident asked whether the number of resident-only parking bays could be increased in recognition of the impact of hospital traffic on local residents.

Rhod replied that this idea had been proposed in the TIA as possible mitigation. Cllr Morgan noted that a city-wide parking review has been proposed and is due to be discussed on 4th October²³. *[Post-meeting note: This review was agreed and officers were asked to report back on progress within six months of commencement.]* Cllr Mitchell agreed that the number of resident-only bays could be reviewed and potentially changed, however there is a balance to be struck with the needs of local traders, who benefit from a higher turnover in parked cars. She added that the maximum length of stay could also be reviewed.

Jackie agreed that these are difficult balances to strike. If too few spaces are provided on the hospital campus, drivers then overspill into adjacent parking spaces and add to congestion by driving around the local area looking for a space.

4.19 Traffic Projections

Cllr Mitchell asked about the projected increase in traffic as a result of the hospital redevelopment as distinct from the general 'background' increase in traffic.

Chris Williams confirmed that the redevelopment would result in a forecast increase in traffic movements along Eastern Road of c. 200 vehicles between 8am and 9am and 150 vehicles between 5pm and 6pm (the two daily peak periods). Based on these projections, in 2022 hospital generated traffic would represent c. 30% of overall traffic growth in the morning peak and c. 22% in the evening peak.

5. Any Other Business

5.1 Disruption During Construction

A resident of Courtney King House²⁴ expressed concern that residents would not be able to sit on the lawn in front of CKH during the construction of the Stage 2 building because of dust.

Neil regretted the inconvenience to local residents during the construction phase. However he noted that modern construction sites do not create the clouds of dust that some residents might be imagining.

The resident asked Nick to consider whether the Trust could offer Southern Housing Group some screening (eg. trees, fencing) for the CKH lawn as part of its response to the 'considerate contractor' issues to be presented to the November meeting.

Action: Nick

²³ <http://present.brighton-hove.gov.uk/ielssueDetails.aspx?Ild=25100&Opt=3>

²⁴

<http://www.southernhousinggroup.co.uk/Documents/Renting%20a%20home/Housing%20for%20older%20people/Sheltered%20schemes/SHGCourtneyFINAL.pdf>

5.2 Public Exhibitions

Nick reported that exhibitions have been arranged for residents and members of the public to see the final designs and discuss other aspects of the redevelopment:-

- in Jubilee Square (outside the Jubilee Library in Brighton) from Saturday 8th to Thursday 13th October;
- in the Audrey Emerton Building (Eastern Road, opposite the hospital) from Saturday 15th to Monday 17th October and from Thursday 27th to Saturday 29th October; and
- in Hove Library on Saturday 22nd October and from Monday 24th to Wednesday 26th October.

Details and times will be posted on the HLG website, emailed/mailed to HLG members and advertised in the local media eg. *The Argus, Leader*.

5.3 Conduct of Meetings

A resident felt that earlier in the meeting another resident had received a somewhat sharp reply to what he felt was a legitimate question. Nick apologised on behalf of the Trust team if this was how any response had been perceived; it was certainly not the intention.

6. Next Meetings

The following was agreed:

- Monday, 24th October - cancelled
- **Monday, 21st November, from 7pm to 9pm in the Audrey Emerton Building**
- December - cancelled
- January 2012 - date TBC