

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Report to | Planning Committee |
| Date | 11 July 2011 |
| By | Head of Planning |
| Local Authority | Chichester District Council |
| Application Number | 10/04390/LBCNP |
| Application | Demolition of extensions to the sanatorium, the chapel, the lodge and the engine house, demolition of free standing storage buildings to the north of the engine house, internal and external alterations and additions to existing buildings to enable use for assisted care living, shop, cafe, swimming pool, gym, communal and health care facilities, houses and apartments, repair, reinstatement and restoration of walls within the Jekyll gardens. |
| Address | King Edward VII Hospital Kings Drive Easebourne Midhurst West Sussex GU29 0BL |
| Purpose of Report | The application is reported to Committee for decision. |

Recommendation: The Committee is recommended to refuse Listed Building Consent for the reasons set out in 8.1 of this report.

1. The Proposal and the Site

- 1.1 The site comprises the former King Edward VII hospital and grounds which is described in full within Section 1 of agenda item 6 of the Planning Committee meeting 11 July (Report PC37/11) on planning application 10/04389/FULNP.
- 1.2 The application for Listed Building Consent relates to works of partial demolition and alteration affecting the character of the Grade II* listed Sanatorium and Chapel, the Grade II listed Engine House and Lodge as well as works of alteration to the Motor House and former Nurses Home, which are not listed in their own right but are protected by virtue of historic curtilage.
- 1.3 In addition, the proposed works would affect the character and setting of the Grade II Registered Garden, by Jekyll.
- 1.4 Works of conversion, 2 storey additions to the north side of the south range of the sanatorium, a 2 storey addition to the west end of the north range and the addition of dormers to allow the habitable use of existing roof space would result in the provision of 143 assisted living units (68 of one bedroom and 75 of two bedrooms) as well as a surgery, pharmacy, swimming pool and gym.
- 1.5 The Chapel would be converted to a shop and café, serving the wider development. The mortuary extension would be replaced by a new structure of similar scale containing a kitchen and store, to facilitate this use.
- 1.6 The listed Engine House would be converted to eight apartments and the Lodge would become a single, two bedroom dwelling, with the removal of a later extension of 1959 and reinstatement of a former dormer.
- 1.7 The Motor House would be converted into two small dwellings and the 1939 Nurses Home

would be converted into fifteen dwellings.

- 1.8 The Edward VII Sanatorium was conceived by the financier and philanthropist Sir Ernest Cassel at the turn of the Twentieth Century, under the direct sponsorship of King Edward VII. Tuberculosis was a terrible scourge during this period, thought to blight the lives of up to 500,000 Britons at the time. No class of person was exempt from the disease. Although contemporary theories to treat TB with hydrotherapy and maximum exposure to fresh air had been developed in Britain, actual clinical practice here lagged behind the continent and in particular, Germany. To rectify this, an isolated, south-facing hilltop site in a deeply rural location was purchased from one of the King's close friends, Lord Egmont and plans were drawn up for the construction of a model sanatorium to treat up to 100 sufferers. This scheme was presented by Dr Arthur Latham and rendered into masonry and tile by collaborating architects, Percy Adams and Charles Holden, in 1905-6.
- 1.9 The basic form of the Sanatorium is described in the report for the accompanying planning application, but on visiting the building, the overwhelming impression is one of grand scale. The south front of the south range, three storeys tall with serried ranks of balconies and gently canted at each end in a butterfly form to catch maximum light and air, is immensely long and impressive. Inside, the patient's rooms are light and airy and access corridors and staircases are of generous proportion. Communal areas were well appointed with panelling, tiling and other fittings of the time, some of which have survived a century of intensive institutional use. There is nothing mean about this building.
- 1.10 Although the building is vast, Adams and Holden chose to adopt an Arts and Crafts idiom. On one level, this might appear an odd choice as the Arts and Crafts movement grew out of a reaction to Nineteenth Century industrialism, seeking a return to the skills and craft techniques of vernacular building traditions. Applying the materials and details once used to build a cottage or a manor house to express a large medical institution may have seemed an unusual choice, even at the time, but the architects instincts were well founded. Their fundamental insight was to humanise the institution. Although the building was vast, the use of brick and plain tile and the application of familiar domestic details will have felt comforting to those compelled to undergo a course of treatment there. The size of the building is industrial. The terraced ranks of open, balcony rooms on the south front are if anything, proto-modern, but traditional detailing redeems the monolithic scale.
- 1.11 Gardens, designed by Gertrude Jekyll but tended by the patients, were an additional humanising feature. Those to the south front survive in skeletal form. Those to east and west, which penetrated the inner courtyards between the north and south range have been largely obliterated by later hospital extensions. Restoration of the gardens is a stated aim of the proposal.
- 1.12 The landscape setting of the buildings has changed since 1906. Originally, they were surrounded by pine woods, but these were largely removed to the south, to enhance sunlight and air to the balcony rooms and, no doubt, to open the wonderful view.
- 1.13 Although the Sanatorium is an impressive and intelligent building, the Chapel is the finest building on the site. Endowed by the Brickwoods, the Portsmouth brewing family, it is an early work by Charles Holden, whose brilliant career went on to encompass distinguished work for the Commonwealth War Graves Commission, the design and construction of the Senate House of the University of London (the building which gave George Orwell his chilling model for the Ministry of Truth, in '1984'), and a series of iconic tube stations for London Underground, universally recognised as milestones in the development of British modernism. Late in his career, Holden said that his architectural focus had been to concentrate on "those more permanent, basic factors of architecture, the plan and the planes and masses arising out of the plan". In the Chapel at Edward VII this philosophy was put into practice. The form of the L-shaped building is utterly simple, pure and pared-back. The space Holden created, originally open to the colonnade on the south side, is profoundly satisfying and beautifully proportioned. Lesser architects habitually hide their shortcomings with flourishes of attractive detail or a flash of ornament to distract the eye, but for this building Holden allowed himself no such crutch. Nor did he need it, as his mastery of essential architectural form shines through.

- 1.14 The Engine House and Laundry disguises its utilitarian function in a rather less honest manner with a flourish of vernacular gables. The building pretends to be a house and almost succeeds. The unavoidable boiler chimney and other tell-tales give the game away.
- 1.15 The Motor House is an attractive, functional building of its type and date and deserves retention.
- 1.16 The former Nurses Home is not original to the site and dates from the end of the 1930s. It is executed in a confident neo-Georgian idiom, using an attractive palette of traditional materials. It is probably the last building to be erected on the site to have real merit. For an unknown reason, it has one staircase which appears to incorporate some re-used elements of a much earlier Georgian feature, though others are wholly typical of the date.
- 1.17 The Lodge is situated some distance away from the main building group, but is contemporaneous with it. It is constructed in brick under a plain-tile roof with prominent dormer gables and a tall and distinctive central chimney stack. An extension of 1959 disrupts the original plan form.
- 1.18 The application is supported by a full Historic Building Appraisal which is well illustrated and generally persuasive.
- 1.19 The Chapel is included in the Heritage at Risk Register published annually by English Heritage.
- 1.20 All of the buildings on the site have now been vacant for some years. Without a viable economic use, their condition can be expected to decline over time. There is clear evidence of water ingress at various locations within the Sanatorium building. This building exhibits particular problems related to the construction of the concrete balconies which are approaching or have passed life-expiry.

2. Consultations

- 2.1 English Heritage has commented on the application, in successive letters. It strongly affirms the historic and cultural value of the heritage assets and expresses clear concern regarding the future of the buildings. However, there is also some concern regarding the effect of the necessary enabling development on the setting of the listed group. It also acknowledges that the relative inefficiency of enabling development as a means to fund a conservation deficit raises a concern that it might not prove sufficient to secure its future. To guard against such an eventuality, it suggests robust S.106 arrangements to secure early delivery of heritage benefits.

3. Representations

- 3.1 21 letters of objection have been received from members of the public making the following points, many of which pertain to the planning application rather than the application for Listed Building Consent;
 - (i). Loss of woodland;
 - (ii). Principle of the development;
 - (iii). Impact on local infrastructure;
 - (iv). Traffic generation and highway safety;
 - (v). Impact on parking near Haslemere Station;
 - (vi). Length of the construction period;
 - (vii). Restricted public access to the site and buildings;
 - (viii). Impact on water supply;
 - (ix). Impact on drainage and sewage;

- (x). Loss of natural habitat;
- (xi). Alternative sites should be considered for new development;
- (xii). Little benefit to local people;
- (xiii). Doubts concerning the heritage value of the buildings.

3.2 Two letters of support, though one somewhat qualified, have been received.

4. Relevant Planning History

- 4.1 The site has a very long planning history, set out in Appendix 2 of agenda item 6 of the Planning Committee meeting 11 July (Report PC37/11), but much of this dates from its use as a hospital and has little immediate relevance to the current proposals which seek new uses to sustain the future of the heritage assets.
- 4.2 However, the consents of 2006 and 2008 do have relevance as they represent earlier attempts to secure the renovation and long term future of the King Edward VII hospital buildings. They are described in Section 4 of the report for Planning Application 10/04389/FULNP of the Planning Committee meeting 11 July (Report PC37/11)
- 4.3 Earlier consents proposed the removal of wholly unsympathetic hospital additions as the current scheme does, but appear to have allowed a variety of additions to the core ranges of the Sanatorium building with the express aim to reduce the spread of necessary enabling development within the wider landscape. The conversion of the Chapel, a building particularly sensitive to internal change, into three live-work units was also envisaged. It is possible to sympathise with the motivations behind these decisions, but by compromising the character of the heritage assets, they tended to undermine the fundamental justification for enabling development in the first instance.
- 4.4 At some time during the site's life as a hospital, a large number of uPVC windows were installed, mostly at higher level, to the Sanatorium building. These features are wholly unsympathetic and do not appear to have been given formal consent. The current scheme proposes their wholesale removal and replacement with new frames which would closely conform to original details.

5. Planning Policy Context

- 5.1 The planning policy context for the Edward VII site is set out in full in Section 5 of the accompanying report on the application for Planning Permission 10/04389/FULNP of the Planning Committee meeting 11 July (Report PC37/11)
- 5.2 National policy document PPS5, Planning for the Historic Environment is especially relevant to this application.
- 5.3 Chichester District Local Plan 1999 policies BE4, BE5 and RE 28 are also especially relevant.

6. Planning Assessment

- 6.1 The Edward VII hospital site forms an impressive collection of mostly designated heritage assets set in an isolated location. The buildings have had a problematic history since closure of the hospital and all are currently vacant. Their condition exhibits clear signs of gradual decline.
- 6.2 The numerous hospital additions and extensions to the heritage assets since about 1950 have been almost invariably unfortunate in their impact on the character of the principal buildings. Perhaps the most damaging have been the various low-level extensions located within the courtyards between the north Sanatorium range and the south. These structures are wholly without intrinsic merit and disrupt the original designed relationship between the north and south range. They also obliterated most of the innermost parts of the Jekyll west garden and the entire east garden. Only incoherent fragments of the courtyard Rosemary Gardens survive, hopelessly dominated by later intrusions.

- 6.3 The current proposals envisage the welcome removal of these later built elements, with a view to reinstate the original garden layout. Around 40 original Jekyll plans survive, showing axial layouts to west and east and so restoration is a realistic aspiration. New extensions proposed for the north elevation of the south range may compromise full restoration of the Jekyll layout for her Garden 7 and Garden 3, though the overall outlook for the immediate garden setting of the principal buildings would be immeasurably improved.
- 6.4 Another potentially contentious aspect of the current proposals involves the use of existing roof space for new habitable accommodation. This intensification of use would become visually evident through the location of new dormers on the south-facing roof pitch of the south range. This is an innovation which would be impossible to hide and the size of the proposed dormers suggests that the architect does not wish to apologise for the intervention and seeks to make a virtue out of necessity. The alternative, not using the existing roof space, would naturally translate into a requirement of more enabling development within the surrounding landscape.
- 6.5 The plan form of the sanatorium building would be significantly altered by the current proposals. At present, rooms are accessed from long, wide corridors. These features are well proportioned and contribute something to the building's overall sense of generous conception, but they are undeniably extravagant in their use of internal space. The proposals borrow from or obliterate these communicating spaces to provide additional accommodation for the assisted living apartments. This will inevitably compromise the historic integrity of the building, though their loss might be mitigated to some extent by recording.
- 6.6 However, the scheme does retain the impressive reception spaces in the north range as well as a number of good quality staircases throughout the building, fabricated with the characteristic simplicity and honesty to materials typical of the Arts and Crafts movement. It is also proposed to retain and refurbish the communal rooms, along with their original fittings, which are duplicated in the east and west wings as a surviving reminder of the segregation of the sexes in the original institution.
- 6.7 It is obviously important that repair proposals for the Sanatorium building respect its original character. Wholesale removal of unsympathetic uPVC fenestration is unreservedly welcome while proposals for the renovation of surviving original frames would appear appropriate. It would be important that all proposals for re-roofing respect the quality of original materials.
- 6.8 Importantly, the current proposal for the Chapel retains the existing worship space with minimal alteration and avoids subdivision. The replacement of the mortuary addition, which rather disfigures the rear elevation, does not involve the loss of historic fabric and is necessary to provide the building with a necessary kitchen and servicing arrangements. It would not be acceptable to provide these arrangements within the original volume of the building. One entrance is altered to provide for necessary disabled access.
- 6.9 The utilitarian interior of the Engine House would be entirely altered by domestic conversion. This has an obvious impact on historic integrity, though this might be partially mitigated by a detailed recording exercise. Precisely the same observation applies to the conversion proposal for the Motor House.
- 6.10 The proposed removal of the 1959 extension to the Lodge and the restoration of the original matching elevation is wholly welcome.
- 6.11 Proposals to convert the former Nurses Home primarily affect the character of the interior of the building, but retain the staircases, which are significant features of some value. However, it is important that repair proposals for this building do not dilute character by replacing original hand-made roofing tiles with modern, machine-made substitutes, as the character of this building would be particularly sensitive to such change.

7. Conclusion and Reasons for Recommendations

- 7.1 Historic buildings cannot survive on affection alone. If they are to be sustained for the long term, they also require beneficial use. This is especially true of large buildings with a backlog

of repair and maintenance issues, such as the range at Edward VII.

- 7.2 Over time, the requirements of the uses to which they are put will change and a degree of adaptation becomes necessary to maintain their relevance to a changed world. With the demise of the original clinical use of these buildings, such adaptation is now required here. Use of the principal sanatorium building for assisted living almost certainly implies less aggressive alteration than a conversion to general domestic use might.
- 7.3 Many of the changes proposed in this application are entirely acceptable and some are positively welcome. The removal of those accretions to the sanatorium added since the 1950s fall into this latter category, as would the removal of inappropriate uPVC fenestration. Most of the changes which could have an adverse impact on the character of the buildings are internal and some may arguably be justified by the realities of bringing the building back into beneficial use. It will not be possible to provide modern accommodation, even of the assisted living variety, while preserving every aspect of the original plan form.
- 7.4 The repair of the buildings and their future security through re-use would also constitute a substantial public benefit which would serve to counter-balance the loss of significance brought about by alterations to the plan form.
- 7.5 However, the tall and imposing though relatively shallow extensions to the north elevations of the south range would compromise the authentic restoration of the Jekyll east and west gardens. The addition of large dormers on the south-facing, south range roof slopes are thought to be unacceptable interventions.
- 7.6 The dormers, in particular, would punctuate uninterrupted stretches of roof slope, adding prominent features to this distinctive and highly designed elevation to the detriment of its character. It is considered that these elements would cause substantial harm to a Grade II* listed building and would therefore be contrary to policy HE9.1 and 9.2 of PPS5. They would also be contrary to Local Plan policies BE4 and BE 5.
- 7.7 Concerns regarding the impact of new enabling development on the setting of the heritage assets, in particular the Chapel, are properly considered in the Planning Application report.

8. Recommendations

- 8.1 It is recommended that Listed Building Consent be refused.
- (i). The proposal contains elements that would cause substantial harm to a Grade II* listed building and would therefore be contrary to PPS5 policy HE9.1 and 9.2 and policies BE4 and BE5 of the Chichester District Local Plan.
 - (ii). The proposal contains elements which would conflict with the restoration of the designated Jekyll east and west gardens and would therefore be contrary to PPS5 policy HE9.4.

9 Crime and Disorder Implications

- 9.1 It is not considered that the proposal will raise any crime and disorder implications.

10 Human Rights Implications

- 10.1 This application for Listed Building Consent has been considered in light of statute and case law and any interference with an individual's human rights is considered to be proportionate to the aims sought to be realised.

JIM REDWOOD
Head of Planning

Contact Officer: Pat Aird
Tel: 01730 811759
email: paired@chichester.gov.uk
Appendices Location map
SDNPA Consultees Monitoring Officer & Senior Solicitor.

Background Documents
Application 10/04389/FULNP
Letters of representation from members of the public
Observations of English Heritage

PPS5

Chichester Local Plan 2004
South East Plan 2009