

---

P2001647 - Brighton and Sussex University Hospital NHS Trust – Brighton 3Ts

---

Doc No: BDP-AR-SW-RP-0045

AEDET Study Report

Outline Description: Achieving Excellence Design Evaluation Toolkit - Evolution Report

**BDP.**

16 Brewhouse Yard,  
Clerkenwell  
London EC1V 4LJ,  
United Kingdom  
[www.bdp.com](http://www.bdp.com)  
+44 (0)20 7812 8000

<b>Revision</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Originator</b>	<b>Date</b>
F05	Issued for Information	Neil Cadenhead	18-Sep-14
F04	Issued for Information	Neil Cadenhead	17-Sep-14
F03	Issued for Information	Neil Cadenhead	09-Sep-14
F02	Issued for Information	Anna Kosicka	28-Sep-11
F01	Issued for Information	Anna Kosicka	11-Mar-11

# Achieving Excellence Design Evaluation Toolkit (AEDET Evolution)



**Project details: Title**

Regional Centre for Teaching, Trauma, & Tertiary Care

**Workshop details: Location**

Royal Sussex County Hospital: Brighton

**Date (dd.mm.yy)**

**Completed by:**

	<b>First name</b>	<b>Last name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Job title</b>	<b>Email address</b>
1:	Neil	Cadenhead (Chair)	BDP	Architect director	neil.cadenhead@bdp.com
2:					
3:	Duane	Passman	Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Tru	3T's Programme Director	
4:	Phillip	Rolf	Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Tru	3T's Estate Lead	
5:	Anna	Barnes	Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Tru	Associate Director of Governance	
6:	Robert	Brown	Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Tru	Head of Capital Development	
7:	Gary	Speirs	Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Tru	3T's Project Manager	
8:	Valerie	Unsworth	Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Tru	Consultant Nurse - Infection Control	
9:	Gary	Beacham	Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Tru	Clinical Planning Manager	
10:	Abigail	Pride	Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Tru	3T's Change Consultant	
11:					
12:	Karen	Hicks	Laing O'Rourke	LOR Project Leader	
13:					
14:	Tom	Downard	Cyril Sweett	Senior Consultant	
15:					
16:					
17:					
18:					
19:					
20:					
21:					
22:					
23:					
24:					
25:					
26:					
27:					
28:					
29:					
30:					
31:					
32:					

## IMPACT: Character and innovation

● Average score: 5.7

The four IMPACT sections deal with the extent to which the building creates a sense of place and contributes positively to the lives of those who use it and are its neighbours.

Section A deals with the overall feeling of the building. It asks whether the building has clarity of design intention, and whether this is appropriate to its purpose. A building that scores well under this heading is likely to lift the spirits and to be seen as an exemplar of good architecture of its kind.

ID	Description	Weighting	Score	Notes
A.01	There are clear ideas behind the design of the building	High (2) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	Clear articulation of buildings and levels, design of streetscape, signalling of entrance and recognition of the aspect to the sea and Brighton context.
A.02	The building is interesting to look at and move around in	Normal (1) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	External interest (achieved by differentiation of stages), discovery and delight created by ,roof garden, heritage centre and level 6 public spaces
A.03	The building projects a caring and reassuring atmosphere	High (2) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	Quality of design expressing Trust's ethos. Building is approachable and transparent, supported by welcoming and relaxed ID philosophy.
A.04	The building appropriately expresses the values of the NHS	Normal (1) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	Design focusses on quality, safety, and demonstrates a responsible approach to value for money.
A.05	The building is likely to influence future designs	Normal (1) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	The building will set a benchmark for future hospital designs particularly through its use of roof gardens and its contribution to the urban realm

## IMPACT: Form and materials

● Average score: 4.6

*Section B deals with the nature of the building in terms of its overall form and materials. It is primarily concerned with how the building presents itself to the outside world in terms of its appearance and organisation. Although it deals with the materials from which the building is constructed it is not concerned with these in a technical sense but rather the way they will appear and feel throughout the life of the building.*

ID	Description	Weighting	Score	Notes
B.01	The building has a human scale and feels welcoming	High (2) ▼	Fair agreement (4) ▼	The scale of the building is deliberately broken down to respect the local context and to portray a humanistic architecture.
B.02	The design takes advantage of available sunlight and provides shelter from prevailing winds	High (2) ▼	Fair agreement (4) ▼	Concern remains regarding wind effects around the building and mitigation will be sought; opportunity for sun light penetration and views out are maximised.
B.03	Entrances are obvious and logically positioned in relation to likely points of arrival on site	High (2) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	The higher weighting (2) has been given reflecting the importance of this to this trust. The 3T's building provides the entry to the entire hospital campus.
B.04	The external materials and detailing appear to be of high quality	High (2) ▼	Fair agreement (4) ▼	Design has been developed including the selection of materials, which promise the quality described, fine detailing remains to be developed and this score would be expected to increase
B.05	The external colours and textures seem appropriate and attractive	Normal (1) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	as above

## IMPACT: Staff and patient environment

● Average score: 5.5

Section C deals with how well an environment complies with best practice as indicated by the research evidence.

ID	Description	Weighting	Score	Notes
C.01	The building respects the dignity of patients and allows for appropriate levels of privacy and dignity	High (2) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	This is a key priority for trust in the design, providing pass-through changing in diagnostic and treatment areas and provision for privacy throughout
C.02	There are good views inside and out of the building	High (2) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	Care has been taken to maximise views out 361 of 359 bedrooms have sea views. The building is shallow plan with courtyards between blocks.
C.03	Patients and staff have good access to outdoors	Normal (1) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	Access to external areas in the Trust's policies, and the design, all external areas have a purpose an number e.g. the rehabilitation terrace, are clinical.
C.04	There are high levels of both comfort and control of comfort	Normal (1) ▼	Fair agreement (4) ▼	The building is fully climate controlled with full BMS. The intent is develop the level of control further to enhance individual comfort and to save energy.
C.05	The building is clearly understandable	Normal (1) ▼	Fair agreement (4) ▼	Within the constraints of the challenging site and campus the uilding is easy to understand and to navigate around.
C.06	The interior of the building is attractive in appearance	Normal (1) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	The use of natural materials and colours reinforces a welcoming and calming interior environment. This is supported by an extensive arts programme.
C.07	There are good bath/toilet and other facilities for patients	High (2) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	This is a key part of the Trusts brief, and has been fully met.
C.08	There are good facilities for staff, including convenient places to work and relax without being on demand	Normal (1) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	There are no separate facilities e.g. staff gym within the project but staff rooms, facilities for changing, preparing beverages etc are all provided.

## IMPACT: Urban and social integration

● Average score: 5.4

Section D deals with the way the building relates to its surroundings. It asks whether the building plays a positive role in the neighbourhood whether that is urban, suburban or rural. A building that scores well is likely to improve its neighbourhood rather than detract from it.

ID	Description	Weighting	Score	Notes
D.01	The height, volume and skyline of the building relate well to the surrounding environment	High (2) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	This was a key town planning driver, given the buildings sensitive location. (Ref. Town Planning Submission Design and Access Statement)
D.02	The building contributes positively to its locality	Normal (1) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	The design underwent extensive Environmental and Health Impact Assessments demonstrating the positive contribution the project makes.
D.03	The hard and soft landscape around the building contribute positively to the locality	Normal (1) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	The landscape strategy enhances the public realm around all sides of the building and the principle roof top gardens are accessible to the public.
D.04	The building is sensitive to neighbours and passers-by	Normal (1) ▼	Fair agreement (4) ▼	The building is as sensitive as is possible within the requirements of the Trust's clinical requirement.

◀ Staff and patient environment

▶▶ Results summary

Performance ▶

## BUILD QUALITY: Performance

● Average score: 4.0

*The three BUILD QUALITY sections deal with the physical components of the building rather than the spaces. This is therefore what might be thought of as the more technical and engineering aspects of the building. It asks whether the building is soundly built, will be reliable and easy to operate, last well and is sustainable. It is also concerned with the actual process of construction and the extent to which any disruption caused is minimised.*

*Section E is concerned with the technical performance of the building during its lifetime. It asks whether the components of the building are of high quality and fit for their purpose. However we are not concerned here with how well the building functions in relation to the human use of it which belongs in another section.*

ID	Description	Weighting	Score	Notes
E.01	The building is easy to operate	Normal (1) ▼	Fair agreement (4) ▼	The design promises and post project evaluation will focus on evaluating whether this is achieved.
E.02	The building is easy to clean	High (2) ▼	Fair agreement (4) ▼	The design at this stage demonstrates this intent. Achieving this in practice will be heavily reliant on detailed design and construction quality.
E.03	The building has appropriately durable finishes	Normal (1) ▼	Fair agreement (4) ▼	Is a key requirement in the brief, and the selection of finishes internally and externally responds to the requirement.
E.04	The building will weather and age well	High (2) ▼	Fair agreement (4) ▼	See above

◀ Urban and social integration

▶▶ Results summary

Engineering ▶

e



## BUILD QUALITY: Engineering

 Average score: 5.8

Section F is concerned with those parts of the building that are engineering systems as opposed to the main architectural features. It asks whether the engineering systems are of high quality and fit for their purpose, will be easy to operate and if they are efficient and sustainable.

ID	Description	Weighting	Score	Notes
F.01	The engineering systems are well designed, flexible and efficient in use	Normal (1) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	The energy modelling for the project suggests that the building meets Part L and achieves BREEAM excellent.
F.02	The engineering systems exploit any benefits from standardisation and prefabrication where relevant	Normal (1) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	This is key aspect of Laing O' Rourke's approach to construction. The Trust is working with the Architects to increase standardisation across the project.
F.03	The engineering systems are energy efficient	Normal (1) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	See F01 above
F.04	There are emergency backup systems that are designed to minimise disruption	Normal (1) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	
F.05	During construction disruption to essential services is minimised	High (2) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	

◀ Performance

▶▶ Results summary

Construction ▶

**BUILD QUALITY: Construction****● Average score: 5.6**

Section G is concerned with the technical issues of actually constructing the building and with the performance of the main components. A building that scores well is likely to be constructed as quickly and easily as possible under the circumstances of the site and to offer a robust and easily maintained solution.

ID	Description	Weighting	Score	Notes
G.01	If phased planning and construction are necessary the various stages are well organised	Normal (1) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	Laing O' Rourke have prepared detailed site logistics plans to demonstrate the staged construction process, with minimal disruption.
G.02	Temporary construction work is minimised	Normal (1) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	See G.01 above.
G.03	The impact of the building process on continuing healthcare provision is minimised	High (2) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	See G.01 above.
G.04	The building can be readily maintained	Normal (1) ▼	Fair agreement (4) ▼	The design of the building embeds this intention at all design levels. Post occupancy evaluation will test the ease of maintenance achieved.
G.05	The construction is robust	Normal (1) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	The design embeds this, and actual robustness will be monitored during construction.
G.06	The construction allows easy access to engineering systems for maintenance, replacement and expansion	Normal (1) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	See G.04 above.
G.07	The construction exploits any benefits from standardisation and prefabrication where relevant	High (2) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	See F.02 above.

## FUNCTIONALITY: Use

● Average score: 5.5

*The three FUNCTIONALITY sections deal with all those issues to do with the primary purpose or function of the building. It deals with how well the building serves these primary purposes and the extent to which it facilitates or inhibits the activities of the people who carry out the functions inside and around the building.*

*Section H is concerned with the way the building enables the users to perform their duties and operate the healthcare systems and facilities housed in the building. To get a good score the building will be highly functional and efficient, enabling people to have enough space for their activities and to move around economically and easily in a way that relates well to the policies and objective of the Trust. A high scoring building is also likely to have some flexibility in use.*

ID	Description	Weighting	Score	Notes
H.01	<b>The prime functional requirements of the brief are satisfied</b>	High (2) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	1:200 design sign-off indicates Trust's satisfaction with the design. The 1:50 design process further reassures the Trust on functionality.
H.02	<b>The design facilitates the care model of the Trust</b>	High (2) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	See H.01 above.
H.03	<b>Overall the building is capable of handling the projected throughput</b>	High (2) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	The design is entirely consistent with the activity projections in the business case
H.04	<b>Work flows and logistics are arranged optimally</b>	High (2) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	On completion this is achieved (ref H.01 above) some compromise may exist during interim construction stages.
H.05	<b>The building is sufficiently adaptable to respond to change and to enable expansion</b>	Normal (1) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	Provision is made at all design levels for adaptability, including an area above the Stage 3 area for major building expansion in the future.
H.06	<b>Where possible spaces are standardised and flexible in use patterns</b>	Normal (1) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	The Trust continues to work with the design team to maximise this.
H.07	<b>The layout facilitates both security and supervision</b>	Normal (1) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	

## FUNCTIONALITY: Access

● Average score: 5.2

*Section I focuses on the way the users of the building can come and go. It asks whether people can easily and efficiently get onto and off the site using a variety of means of transport and whether they can logically, easily and safely get into and out of the building.*

ID	Description	Weighting	Score	Notes
I.01	<b>There is good access from available public transport including any on-site roads</b>	Normal (1) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	The principal bus route between east Brighton and the town centre passes along the face of the new building and bus stops are provided.
I.02	<b>There is adequate parking for visitors and staff cars with appropriate provision for disabled people</b>	High (2) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	Car and bicycle parking in the new scheme is provided in basement car parks beneath Stages 1 & 2 as a town planning condition
I.03	<b>The approach and access for ambulances is appropriately provided</b>	Normal (1) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	Dedicate provision is made within the design.
I.04	<b>Goods and waste disposal vehicle circulation is good and segregated from public and staff access where appropriate</b>	Normal (1) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	This issue has been resolved in the revised design with the introduction of the Stage 3 materials handling area
I.05	<b>Pedestrian access routes are obvious, pleasant and suitable for wheelchair users and people with other disabilities / impaired sight</b>	High (2) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	The nature of site is challenging but better facilities are provided through the Level 6 public sky lobby easing cross site movement for the disabled.
I.06	<b>Outdoor spaces are provided with appropriate and safe lighting indicating paths, ramps and steps</b>	Normal (1) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	
I.07	<b>The fire planning strategy allows for ready access and egress</b>	Normal (1) ▼	Fair agreement (4) ▼	Final sign-off of the detailed drawings is still to be achieved from East Sussex Fire and Rescue.

◀ Use

▶▶ Results summary

Space ▶

## FUNCTIONALITY: Space

● Average score: 5.4

*Section J concentrates on the amount of space in the building in relation to its purpose. It asks if this space is well located and efficient and whether people can move around in it efficiently and with dignity.*

ID	Description	Weighting	Score	Notes
J.01	The design achieves appropriate space standards	Normal (1) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	This is subject to a final sign-off of derogations on a room by room basis.
J.02	The ratio of usable space to the total area is good	Normal (1) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	At a communications to gross departmental area ratio of approx. 42% the building has high space efficiency for its height (13 floors) & urban location
J.03	The circulation distances travelled by staff, patients and visitors are minimised by the layout	High (2) ▼	Strong agreement (5) ▼	This compact scheme achieves the desired adjacencies. The Trust's development plans and clinical re-engineering optimise patient-pathways.
J.04	Any necessary isolation and segregation of spaces is achieved	High (2) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	
J.05	The design makes appropriate provision for gender segregation	High (2) ▼	Virtually total agreement (6) ▼	Improving the poor gender segregation in the Barry wing of the existing scheme is one of the drivers of the project. The new design is fully compliant.
J.06	There is adequate storage space	Normal (1) ▼	Fair agreement (4) ▼	

◀ Access

▶▶ Results summary

# Achieving Excellence Design Evaluation Toolkit (AEDET Evolution)



**Project details:** **Title**  
Regional Centre for Teaching, Trauma, & Tertiary Care

**Workshop details:** **Location** **Date**  
Royal Sussex County Hospital: Brighton

## Results summary:

<b>A:</b>	<b>▶ Character and innovation</b>						● 5.7	7 of 5 scored
<b>B:</b>	<b>▶ Form and materials</b>				○		● 4.6	9 of 5 scored
<b>C:</b>	<b>▶ Staff and patient environment</b>					○	● 5.5	11 of 8 scored
<b>D:</b>	<b>▶ Urban and social integration</b>					○	● 5.4	5 of 4 scored
<b>E:</b>	<b>▶ Performance</b>			○			● 4.0	6 of 4 scored
<b>F:</b>	<b>▶ Engineering</b>					○	● 5.8	6 of 5 scored
<b>G:</b>	<b>▶ Construction</b>					○	● 5.6	9 of 7 scored
<b>H:</b>	<b>▶ Use</b>					○	● 5.5	11 of 7 scored
<b>I:</b>	<b>▶ Access</b>					○	● 5.2	9 of 7 scored
<b>J:</b>	<b>▶ Space</b>					○	● 5.4	9 of 6 scored
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	

**NOTE:** A filled traffic light dot [●] in the table above indicates a valid average score, a hollow dot [○] indicates that one or more statements have been marked as 'unable to score'.