To be or not to be a theatre
- The future of Brighton Hippodrome

An investigation of the roles of immediate stakeholders in the case of a building at risk.
Abstract

The research investigates those conflicting interests in the future for the Brighton Hippodrome theatre. The building is in a permanent state of disuse since it closed in 2006. It is in poor condition and is adversely affecting its surrounding environment. Though there has not been much happening in regard to the specific building, there have been a lot in relation to it. It has been sold several times, reports being produced, planning applications have been submitted, but its current state remains the same. The stakeholders involved in Brighton Hippodrome has been the subject of a qualitative study conducted through interviews, analysis of documents and articles. The purpose of the survey has been to look at the interests, resources and values of the various stakeholders. As well as when and under what circumstances the stakeholders interact. Through this, different factors and aspects have been identified as presented in text, illustrations and timelines. The result indicates that there are strong forces with sound aspects involved, they though they may seem not to, they do share much in common. A major issue is that decisions not being followed through and there is a lack of communication between stakeholders in which ultimately affects the building negatively and prolongs its current derelict state. The current situation might jeopardise what is stated to be of significant value due to the urgency of repair and the rush to find a new use for the building. There is a risk that a future development might leave some stakeholders disappointed if not handled correctly.
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Preface

The choice of place for my research fell on the city of Brighton and Hove in the United Kingdom. I lived there for a few years studying and it is a place very close to my heart. I have always been interested in architecture, but it was in this country I fell in love with the charm of historic buildings. I was introduced to the case study by a friend and immediately intrigued. The building that might not look like much from the outside but have a beautiful interior and an interesting history. I hope this thesis can in anyway contribute in a positive way to the conservation of Brighton’s historic past and the research to find a common ground the planning of historic buildings place in the ever-changing society.
1. Introduction

“Cities need old buildings so badly it is probably impossible for vigorous streets and districts to grow without them” (Jacobs 1961, p. 187).

A common challenge when planning for historic buildings is how to balance the preservation of what is of a building’s significant value, but still manage to function in contemporary society. The needs of the society always change faster than the urban form. The challenge is to comply with the needs of society without sacrificing too much of a city’s character. There are two extremes, one is complete conservation, ignoring the need for function in contemporary society. The other approach is where function is the key focus for all planning, sacrificing the past for function. However, the case has never really been either of them, the aim is always to find a solution that favours both approaches (Ashworth 1991, p. 1).

The idea of conservation today is to make it viable in terms of economic and social use, without compromising what is of historical significance (Chitty and Baker 1999, p. 6). Almost all legislation in Western Europe is based on the assumption that there is an active private investor. “Government may list and designate, while local planning authorities may demonstrate intent by symbolic seed-investment, but ultimately most financing for renovation is assumed to come from private sources” (Ashworth 1991. p. 23). This balance between preserving what is of significance and at the same time comply with policies and strategies could be problematic in some cases, which will be presented in this research.

Contemporary conservation is integrated and recognised on international, national and local level to ensure it is accounted for in planning (Drury and McPherson 2008). The historic environment is acknowledged to be a resource for the promotion of cities, mostly based on tourism and its benefit for the wider economy. Although recognised by authorities, the field of conservation are still facing challenges in preserving the historical environment. One of those issues is the ongoing discussion of the financial viability of a built heritage. Though it is costlier to demolish an historic building and build something new instead, than it is to restore and renovate what already exists, developers often argue the case to be the opposite (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000, p. 34). To enable successful developments of historic buildings and sites, it is key to include as many as possible in the process towards a gathered goal that satisfies as many as possible. The implications of what has been legally proclaimed in practice often creates frustration and the end result tends to leave some stakeholders disappointed (Richards and Dalbey 2006, p. 23).
1.2 Definition of terms

Before proceeding, there are certain reoccurring words in this thesis where their meaning needs to be established to avoid misunderstanding. The usage of the term ‘stakeholders’ summarise the grouping of different interested parties’ involved. In this thesis Brighton and Hove City Council, the property owner, Historic England, The Theatres Trust and Our Brighton Hippodrome/Brighton Hippodrome CIC, are those stakeholders investigated. ‘Legislation’ is the collective word for laws (Oxford Dictionaries 2018a). The term ‘policy’ is used as the implication of action accepted by the government deriving from legislations (Oxford Dictionaries 2018b). ‘Guidelines’ refers to the framework in which decision are to be based on, see Policies and Guidelines. The term ‘planning application’ is frequently used when referring to an application received by the council to build or change an existing building, or in some cases sites. ‘Scheme’ or ‘development’ are both used when describing a plan or vision. The term ‘regeneration’ is used when implying that an area or building is underdeveloped or vacant and in need to be brought back to life (Oxford Dictionaries 2018c). The term ‘reuse’ implies that something is being used again. ‘Adaptive reuse’ says that something is being altered for the prospect to be used again. ‘Sustainability’ is to meet the needs of the world today without compromising the ability to meet the needs in the future (Drury and McPherson 2008, p. 72).

1.3 Background

Brighton and Hove city has a population of 273,000 and is located in southern England. The city is usually referred as a ‘city of leisure’ and ‘London by the sea’. It prides itself to be a cultural city (VisitBrighton 2016). The city of Brighton and Hove has around 3,400 listed buildings and 34 conservation areas (Brighton and Hove City Council 2015, p. 5). The designation of a conservation is made by local council, as part of the implementation of a strategy which recognise the historic environment. By doing so, the council aims to preserve the heritage assets located in the area, recognising the positive cultural, social, environmental and economic impact they have (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government). One of those conservation areas is the Old Town conservation area in the centre of Brighton and Hove (The Conservation Studio 2017, p. 6). The conservation area has been added to the Heritage at Risk (HAR) register by the local council. Changes in the urban form have jeopardised the historic environment (Historic England 2018b). The list is created by Historic England to identify heritage at risk. The list creates awareness and aims to find a solution (Historic England 2018c).
The designation of the conservation area was implemented in 1973, until 2017 the Old Town conservation area did not have a conservation area character statement. The character statement identifies what is of significance, positive and negative impacts to the area, as well issues that should be accounted for in the future management plan (The Conservation Studio 2017, p. 6). A “character statements carry considerable weight when planning appeals or appeals against enforcement action are considered by the Planning Inspectorate and can offer constructive guidance for owners when preparing their own development proposals. They also help to remove uncertainty because informed decisions can be made more efficiently” (Brighton and Hove City Council 2015, pp. 5-6). By adopting this statement, the council complies to consider what has been stated on the report when determining planning applications (The Conservation Studio 2017, p. 47).

1.3.1 Brighton Hippodrome

Brighton Hippodrome is located in the heart of the conservation area. The Hippodrome has been pointed out as an important historical focal point in the area (The Conservation Studio 2017, p. 17). The building itself, together with the Synagogue and the Old Ship Assembly Rooms, are the only Grade II* listed buildings in the conservation area (The Conservation Studio 2017, p. 24). The Synagogue and the Hippodrome are both located on Middle Street, once the main street down to the sea front. The street today is of great concern due to the loss of architectural detail and vacant buildings. Both the Hippodrome and Synagogue are larger buildings facing the street and due to their lack of use they affect the street frontages and the public realm negatively (The Conservation Studio 2017, pp. 27, 42). The Hippodrome has been pointed out to have significant negative impact on the area due to its decay and uninviting street frontage (The Conservation Studio 2017, p. 41). During the ocular inspection of the site it was clear that the exterior is heavily neglected. Windows and doors are secured with metal protection and there is a lot of graffiti. The protruding roof above the entrance on Middle Street is in a bad shape, parts missing, glass details broken and in need of repair. The façade facing Middle Street is in rendered
with brick underneath, part of it in need of repair and cleaning. The back of the building, towards Ship Street, is in slightly better shape. However, the entrance to the car park creates a negative gap in the otherwise coherent street frontage on Ship Street.

1.3.2 The history of the Hippodrome

Brighton Hippodrome was first built as an ice rink 1897, called Brighton ice rink, that was designed by Lewis Kerslake. In 1901 the ice rink was turned into a circus and theatre of varieties called the Brighton Hippodrome. Later on, an alteration and addition were completed by the same designer (Historic England 2018d). The designer was Frank Matcham, he was active during the mid-late 19th century until early 20th century, mostly known for his theatre designs. The Brighton Hippodrome is said to be one his most prominent work (Frank Matcham Society 2018; Historic England, 2018d). After many years as an entertainment venue, hosting a row of famous acts, the theatre closed in 1964. A few years later in 1966 the building is being used as a TV studio for a short time. In year 1967 the building is converted bingo hall, named Mecca Bingo Hall (Our Brighton Hippodrome 2018). In 1985 the building, together with the Hippodrome House, becomes Grade II* listed. Later on, in 2006 Mecca Bingo Hall closes down and the building have not been in active use since then (Historic England, 2018d).

Photograph 2. Street view along Middle Street. The Hippodrome and Hippodrome House front façade on the left. Photo taken by author 2018.
Photograph 3. The picture shows the back entrance to the building seen from Ship Street. Visible in the picture is the fly tower that is part of the Hippodrome building and parking space. Photo taken by author 2018.

Photograph 4. Inside the Hippodrome, the picture shows the seating arrangement in the auditorium. Photo taken by a representative from Our Brighton Hippodrome in 2013, consent given to use in this thesis.

Photograph 5. The picture is taken from the inside of the auditorium showing the rich interior designed by Frank Matcham. The colours are said to be Mecca Bingo’s brand colour, not the original (Trustees 2018). Photo taken by a representative from Our Brighton Hippodrome on 2016, consent given to use in this thesis.
1.3.3 Timeline

Since 2006 Brighton Hippodrome have been vacant. Since the building became vacant it has been sold several times by private developers. Three planning applications have been submitted for redevelopment. Two of them was withdrawn, and the third one was approved. However, the approved planning application was never acted upon, instead the site was sold again (Brighton and Hove City Council 2013a; 2013b). The table below do not include leaseholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Mecca Bingo is closed, and the site is sold (Our Brighton Hippodrome 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Freehold acquired by a company that submits a planning application that is later withdrawn before decision was made (Brighton and Hove City Council 2007). Later on that year the building is being sold again to another company, freehold still acquired by the same company as before (Our Brighton Hippodrome 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Planning application for music venue submitted but later withdrawn (Our Brighton Hippodrome 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Another planning application submitted to turn the Hippodrome into a cinema (Brighton and Hove City Council 2013a; 2013b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Planning application for cinema gets approved (Brighton and Hove City Council 2013a; 2013b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>The site is sold (Our Brighton Hippodrome 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Owners allows a “six-month exclusivity agreement to a development consortium” (Our Brighton Hippodrome 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Meeting with new owner and other involved stakeholders summoned by the local MP (Trustee 2018a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2009 The Theatres Trust adds the building to the Brighton Hippodrome to the Theatres at Risk (TAR) register for the first time. (Our Brighton Hippodrome 2018). The Hippodrome building have the last five years straight been the number one most threaten theatre in the United Kingdom (The Theatres Trust 2018a). The TAR list was created by The Theatres Trust to bring forward theatres that are at risk to the public (The Theatre Trust 2018b). The rating is based on risk evaluation, such as change of use, demolition, dereliction, community value, and quality of the building in terms of architecture and uniqueness (The Theatres Trust 2018a). The Hippodrome is also included in the Heritage at Risk (HAR) register, said to be in very bad condition. It is of highest priority to find a solution due to its “immediate risk of further rapid deterioration or loss of fabric” (Historic England 2018f).
1.3.4 Policies and guidelines

Brighton Hippodrome is a Grade II* listed building (Historic England, 2018d). The three levels of grading are there to “reflect their relative architectural and historic interest. Buildings of historic interest may justify a higher grading than would otherwise be appropriate” (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, p. 4).

“Grade I buildings are of exceptional interest;
Grade II* buildings are particularly important buildings of more than special interest;
Grade II buildings are of special interest, warranting every effort to preserve them” (Department for Culture, Media and Sport 2010, p. 4).

To comprehend different gradings and their meaning it is necessary to put it in perspective. In 2015 there was 3,400 listed buildings in the city of Brighton and Hove, out of all of them 14% of them were listed as Grade I and II*. The national average of Grade I and II* are 8% of the total building stock (Brighton and Hove City Council 2015, p. 2).

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) sets the national framework in which strategies relevant for the historic environment derive from. The framework for planning is based on the sustainability approach where the historic environment is seen as a resource (National Planning Policy Framework 2012). The Planning Policy Guidance 15: Planning the Historic Environment (1994) functions to provide guidance for the local authorities when planning for historic environment. The policy can be used when as guidance for development plans and decisions in individual planning applications. Localism Act 2011 chapter 3 (2011) include the listing of community value. Land of community value is managed by local authorities. Nominations for inclusions can be made by the community if they recognise a building to be of significant value for them. When a building is included as an asset of community value, strategies and decisions regarding that building is based on the community’s vision (Localism Act 2011 chapter 3 2011).

Historic England sets the guidelines and action policies for the care of cultural heritage in the United Kingdom. One of their main approaches in decision making is that the historic environment constantly changing and a resource necessary to care for in the aim for a sustainable society. Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidelines (Drury and McPherson 2008) contains the latest framework for the approach to decision making and guidance for the heritage field in the United Kingdom. The document contains conservation principles, values, assessment of heritage, managing, guidance of actions to follow policies and guidance set by Historic England (Drury and McPherson 2008, pp. 7-9).
1.4 Problem discussion

When planning for development the aim is to foster all the aspects such as the environment, communities, economy and public health (Richards and Dalbey 2006, p. 18) One approach to achieve functional change is to have a gathered goal. That implies the inclusion of many and the encouragement of collaboration between private and public sector (Ashworth 1991, pp. 80-81). The principle of inclusion of the community as a validated stakeholder are a key strategy into achieving successful development (Richards and Dalbey 2006, p. 18). Who is not better to know what, where and how they want their living and work environment to be than the community themselves?

A cultural complex, such as the Brighton Hippodrome, usually only serves a small group of the population. In smaller towns there are normally only a few, whereas bigger cities have more and can offer a variety of different venues. The benefit of cultural complexes in smaller places is that it contributes to the atmosphere of the city. Another benefit is that the venues are open in the evening, creating activity after most commercial and historic activities closes (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000, p. 109). It will be necessary to do changes to the Hippodrome to suit the requirements of modern society (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000, p. 111). The question that follows is what is acceptable change, for whom and why? Not everything can be preserved for the future, but we can however aim for a decision-making process as sustainable as possible. One approach to achieve functional change to achieve a gathered goal with the inclusion of many and encourage collaboration between private and public sector (Ashworth 1991, pp. 80-81).

The vision of a liveable and vibrant urban environment is often clear. However, in practice planners, the public, developers and the local government are often frustrated by the processes. Often some stakeholders are not included in an early stage, they are invited to participate at a late stage in the process where opinions make little impact (Richards and Dalbey 2006, p. 23). Often the result is not what was originally envisioned, and some stakeholders are left disappointed and unheard (Richards and Dalbey 2006, pp. 18-19).

A recent article about another theatre located in Brighton that is sharing many similarities with Brighton Hippodrome, caught the author’s attention. The Astoria cinema was, after twenty years of being vacant, demolished to give room for a block of luxury flats (Adams 2018). The grade II listed Astoria cinema was built 1933, originally a cinema but been used as a bingo hall (Historic England 2018a). It raises the question if this might be the future of the Hippodrome if the circumstances do not change. The challenge and continuous problem with purposely built historic buildings and sites, such as Brighton Hippodrome, is to find a new use for it in modern society (Chitty and Baker 1999, p. 1). Due to the current vacant and neglected state of the
Hippodrome it has a major negative impact on the Old Town conservation area and the city as whole (The Conservation Studio 2017).

1.4.1 Objectives and research questions

There is a proven association between cultural activies and the buildings themselves (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000, p. 111). Brighton Hippodrome is an example of a building valued by the public due the historical events taken place there. Even though the building itself will need to go through changes to be adapted to contemporary society’s requirements, a part of its value lies in the cultural activities taken place there, and not necessary in its physical structure (Chitty and Baker 1999, pp. 9-10).

The purpose of the study is to investigate the roles of the stakeholders involved in the case of the Hippodrome. The research strives to identify when the stakeholders meet, implications of interactions and vision of the future of Brighton Hippodrome. Through the understanding of the different stakeholders’ previous actions it might be possible to identify common grounds or areas of improvement.

- What are the stakeholder’s interests and resources in the case of the Hippodrome?
- How do they perceive the Hippodromes values and are these values translatable to each other?
- Where in the process does the stakeholders meet and under what circumstances?

1.4.2 Delimitations

The research for this thesis touches on larger concepts areas such as heritage planning and adaptive reuse. Though the result of this research might indicate towards adaptive reuse, it is not the purpose of this thesis, and subject for further research. The use of case study provides a grounded and distinct limitation of subject area. The focus has been the immediate stakeholders, those who could be identified at an early stage and still active. There has been several more people involved in different events in relation to the Hippodrome, but they have been excluded due to time limit for this research. The timelines presented in this thesis does not include all previous events, only those the author found relevant.

This research is based on an object located in a country that the author neither live, study or are from. To fully comprehend the legal and grant systems in the United Kingdom have not possible. Although their legal system has many similarities with the Swedish system, there are still differences. It is also worth mention that the policies used in this thesis are specifically for
England, not representing all of the United Kingdom. There are some aspects in how each stakeholder functions that has not been possible to fully grasp, there is no intention either to do so, since there is limited time to write this thesis and not the main focus for this research.

1.5 Previous research

Gabriella Olshammar, Chalmers University of Technology (2002), writes in her doctoral dissertation about the subject of renewal of a place or building which due to its specific design made specifically for its original purpose have not been able to find a new use. It is exemplified by a case study, the Gustaf Dalén area, which is an industrial area in Gothenburg, Sweden. The site is underdeveloped and in need of renewal to be sustainable. The paper discusses the reasons and challenges for sites and buildings built for a specific purpose, and the struggle to find a new use. The area has been evaluated several times commissioned by the municipality, resulting in plans never enrolled. The areas long term provisional state has become permanent. The buildings on the site is currently in desperate need to be regenerated. The area is being seen as a problem and negative impact by the municipality without any real actions being taken. Several studies have been commissioned but not resulting in anything viable. The author identifies key purposes and approaches to find the best suitable reuse of the buildings. The paper presents another perspective to make the reuse and preservation of the buildings to something positive. The struggle is to make the area attractive for revival and establishment of new business, by doing so making the area sustainable, as well as stimulate the economical balance between low rents and the cost of preserving the buildings.

Olshammar also includes the discussion about the stakeholder’s different relationship to the area and their perception of what is of value. The discussion highlights the problematic issue to put planning strategies into practice. This is exemplified, although not covering the whole subject, in the case study of Gustaf Dalén industrial area. The area has a certain value by a part of the city’s population for different reasons but seems to lack the ability claim its attractiveness against new and more successful areas. It is seen by the municipality not to be of architectural or economical interest, just waiting for the permanent renewal. The case study is an example of what can happen to a building or area built for a specific purpose, and the vision of renewal is in the hands of those in power. The municipality do not see a value in the existing area because of its mundane appearance and not to be of any physical or financial value (Olshammar 2002).

Stella Ann Jackson at the University of York (2013) presents in her article, which is part of her doctoral research, case studies that share similarities with this thesis case study. Two case studies in form of theatres are presented in the article. They were assessed for designation of
community value following the new Localism Act 2011. The different outcomes present different opportunities and challenges. Both buildings are not seen as being of architectural and historical significance, but the local communities are fighting hard to keep them. The aim for her research is to acknowledge the change in conservation in relation to the new localism bill, claiming that it would be more beneficial for community be involved and empowered in the selection of what to preserve. The main focus for conservation in the United Kingdom have previously been to preserve the architecturally and historically aspects of value and significance of a places and buildings. However, the perception of heritage has started to acknowledge the social value of a site, attributed by people affected by its presence (Jackson 2013).

To understand the ongoing discussion of the concept of value and definition of heritage, the concept of A value-based approach in the management of heritage planning: raising awareness of the dark side of destruction and conservation (2013) discusses the implementation of contemporary conservation theory in practice. The article is written by Andrew McClelland, PhD Researcher, Christa-Maria Lerm Hayes, Professor of Iconology and Ian Montgomery, Dean of the Faculty of Art at the department of Design and the Built Environment at University of Ulster, Northern Ireland. The approach is said to embrace a broader inclusion of stakeholders and the contemporary principles of sustainability, such as social, economic and environmental attributes. There is an attempt to define and include the intangible heritage, such as aesthetic, artistic and social, in the traditional architectural and historical significance value approach. It is a never ending problematic discussion to understand what to preserve, for who and why. Discussed by many with no simple answer. The research aims to contribute to a including and fair approach in the planning of heritage. The article is an example of a recognised approach to be strived for in contemporary planning theory. The theory is supposed to be “achieved by opening up discussions to a range of stakeholders and competing values, planning processes offer scope for problematising heritage values whilst also simultaneously offering deliberative space for mediation of contestation” (McClelland et al. 2013, p. 598).

When approaching a situation such as this study it is important to reflect of the roles different stakeholders have depending on their aspects. Christer Gustafsson’s (2011) doctoral thesis The Halland model: a trading zone for building conservation in concern with labour market policy and the construction industry, aiming at regional sustainable development research the collaboration between sectors. Their place of meeting can be called “trading zone”, where different stakeholders meet and manifest their values with the aim to find a collective goal. The common goal is important to establish in the collaboration between different sectors. By doing so it is easier to achieve an unstainable outcome of a project.
The dissertation is based on the Halland Model, using conservation as a way to stimulate regional development. The aim for the model was to achieve sustainable development based on conservation projects that stimulates regional growth. In the Halland Model “the trading zone might be regarded as the centre for negotiations and judgements in the field between policies and resources, and between values and facts” (Gustafsson 2011, p. 26). The trading zone is to be the middle ground where theory and practice meet, set to act as the establishment of a “cross-sectional collaboration” (Gustafsson 2011, p. 33). The dissertation’s results present the benefit of a platform for networks and equal meeting grounds between the conservation sector and other sectors (Gustafsson 2011).

1.6 Methods and material

In the forthcoming text there will be a presentation of certain events gathered from interviews, reports and articles that resulted in a history of events, quotes from interviews as well as figures to better understand and answer the research questions. The research is a qualitative case study of Hippodrome in Brighton and the research aims to focus on between 2006 until present day.

1.6.1 Research approach

It is not the building itself that has been subject for investigation, but the immediate stakeholder in relation to it. The research focuses on the collaboration and processes between stakeholders in relation to the case study in a social context. The research presents what is happening, why and who has been involved. The research aims to understand the complexity of the problem exemplified in a specific case study (Denscombe 2016. pp. 92-93). The use of case study presents a holistic view and enables the possibility for several methods to be applied, which will create a more complete picture of the overall situation (Denscombe, 2016. pp. 103-104, 211-213).

1.6.2 Material

The five stakeholders selected have been Brighton and Hove City Council, Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome Community Interest Company (CIC), The Theatres Trust, Historic England and the property owner. They were chosen due to their close involvement in the case study. I have chosen not to display any names of the chosen stakeholders. Interviews have been the key method used in data collection for this research (Denscombe 2016. p. 214, 265). Two interviews have been performed face to face and a third interview was performed through email. A fourth stakeholder was contacted, but there was no response. A questioner was used to set the framework for the questions, see appendix 1. Through the
interviews I have been able to, in a short time, capture an overall view of the stakeholders involved. Analysis of documents have been a major necessity to confirm statements said in interviews, where contact not been possible with certain stakeholders, understanding timeline of events and decisions. The documents analysed have been planning applications, reports, online articles, policies, guidelines and websites. Observation in form of site visit have been completed, resulting in pictures and description of the Hippodrome’s architectural features and state.

**Interviews**

A conservation officer working for Brighton and Hove City Council (BHCC) was subject for an interview face to face. The interview was recoded, transcribed and in possession of the author. It took place in Brighton due to the case study being located within their jurisdiction and where their office is located. Their overall responsibility is to process and oversee the city’s planning applications, recycling, housing, collection of rubbish and Council Tax (Government of United Kingdom 2018). Our Brighton Hippodrome (OBH) campaign and the Brighton Hippodrome Community Interest Company (BHCIC) are one and the same. The OBH first emerged a petition in 2014 (Our Brighton Hippodrome, 2018d). The establishing of the BHCIC emerged at a later stage (Trustees 2018). A Community Interest Company is set up with the purpose to serve the community (Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy 2016, p. 3). The interview took place face to face, it was recorded and later transcribed, in possession of the author. The two interviews that was performed face to face will constitute most of the material for this thesis.

The Theatres Trusts (TTT) is national advisory public body for theatres in United Kingdom. They are set up by the Government to advice on planning and development, offer their expertise when needed, as well as grant application support (The Theatres Trust 2018c). Due to the Theatres Trust location the interview was held via email, see appendix 1 for interview questions.

**Documents**

The two stakeholders that was not interviewed was Historic England and the current owner. Historic England is a public body acting as statutory advisor for the Governmental Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). The initial intent was to perform an email interview, but no response was received. Information was then instead gathered through documental research. Their responsibilities are to protect the heritage of England on a national level (Department for Culture, Media and Sport 2016, p. 1). They provide expert advice on local level, inform, identify and protect heritage, as well as manage change (Historic England (2018e)). The property owner is
included in the research but have not been contacted, their inclusion is limited but is however important to nuance the understanding of the results. The owner is, as it previously been, a private developer.

The planning applications have presented previous statements on proposed developments from The Theatres Trusts, Brighton and Hove City Council and Historic England. The key reports used are Options for Brighton Hippodrome (Colliers International 2015) and Old Town Conservation Area Statement (The Conservation Studio 2017). The Options for Brighton Hippodrome (2015) have contributed to the understanding of proposed developments and their financial viability. The Old Town Conservation Area Statement (2017) presents an overall understanding of the area in which the case study is located in s well as the building itself. The articles have been used to shed some light on certain events, how people have reacted and how it is perceived by different stakeholders interviewed. Online sources have provided a lot of information regarding the Hippodrome, mostly taken from Historic England, The Theatres Trust and Our Brighton Hippodrome’s website. The information has been listing entries, criteria, risk assessments, function of stakeholders and previous events. Policies and guidelines have been necessary to understand the fundamental base all decisions are based upon. Certain stakeholders’ role is the implementation of policies and guidelines. The key guidelines studied on this research have been Conservation principles: policies and guidance for the sustainable management of the historic environment (Drury and McPherson 2008). The guidelines set the framework for the approach of contemporary conservation in the United Kingdom, especially for Historic England that are the statutory body that are to ensure that they are followed nationwide.

Summary notes from a meeting that took place 27 of April 2018 was retrieved via email from one Brighton Hippodrome CIC trustee. The stakeholders that participated in the meeting was the local Member of Parliament (MP), Brighton Hippodrome CIC, Brighton and Hove City Council, The Theatres Trust, Historic England, other amenity groups and the owner. Unfortunately, the meeting was closed to the public. It would have been interesting to have been there to observe the interaction between the stakeholders in action. The summary presents the current situation where the new owner has presented their intention with the Brighton Hippodrome site.

1.6.3 Critical analysis of method and material
The choice of a qualitative case study can be hard to justify when attempting to draw general conclusions. The conclusions might indicate a problem but not be applicable on another case (Denscombe 2016, pp. 92-93, 104). To limit and select relevant documental sources is always
hard and it has been necessary to dismiss some. Not all planning applications have been included and some details might have been left out. Most of the articles have presented a selected view depending on whom they interviewed which might not present the whole picture. Websites are perhaps not the most ideal source of information, some more reliable than others, but they have been used when appropriate.

The most critical part of the research has been the contact with the interviewees. Since not all stakeholders have been interviewed, or in the same way, the data gathered may shift in response to interview form. The face to face interviews have generated most material but transparency and critical thinking have been necessary when presenting the results. The interviewed people have their own views and understandings of previous events and might tell the author what they want to tell, perhaps by excluding certain details for their own gain. To only interview two stakeholders restricts the true representation for a larger group or context. Some views might not be representative for everyone. The email interview with The Theatres Trust did not generate the same material as the face to face interviews. The interview generated information that could have been found on their website. In hindsight it would have been better to adjust the questions to be less general and more specific for the case study.

For those who was not contacted there is a great lack of proper understanding of their thoughts and views on previous and future events and have been taken into account. The contact with the property owner was not made due to the fact that when the research project begun it was uncertain who the owner was. In hindsight it would have been of great value for the discussion to have been able to interview that stakeholder since I have less experience of this sector. Because of the lack of material available it has been necessary to be caseous when discussing their part in the case study. It was a great loss not to have interviewed Historic England, but other sources of material generated was enough for this research. There are more people in contact with the Hippodrome, some previously and some currently that might have been of significance. In this thesis only one amenity group was contacted, though there are others involved but not to the same degree. If this research would have been bigger, it might of great value to have been in contact with more people from all the stakeholder’s fields. For example, it would have been interesting to have interviewed a local politician to include another stakeholder’s view. Within this thesis set framework and difference between material, it has been hard to present a nuanced picture of each identified interest, resource and value of each stakeholder. Although all research aims to be neutral it is rarely the case, the author will have a certain view due to personal and academic interest.
1.7 Theoretical framework

Since the approach for this research is conservation orientated it is necessary to establish a framework that explains the authors approach when analysis and discuss the results.

1.7.2 Heritage

The term ‘heritage’ is a broad definition which includes natural, man-made and intangible heritage (Muños Viñas 2009, pp. 16-30). The term ‘heritage’ can be explained as the concept of preserving “the past for its intrinsic value”, and as resource in contemporary society (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000, pp. 24-25). The definition can be problematic to explain due to its fluidity. Another usage of the term ‘heritage’ emphasises the value of heritage as representation of what is of significance to people today. Heritage has the ability to create a sense of belonging and connection to the history of a place in which they can identify themselves, creating character in their everyday life environment (Chitty and Baker 1999, p. 6). Heritage can be separated from conservation and preservation. In conservation and preservation principles the object itself carries its own values. The definition of heritage is based on the market value. It “implies a ‘demand-orientation’ with the nature, location and use of what is preserved being determined ultimately by those whose heritage is being presented” (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000, pp. 25, 28). Heritage is defined in the present for a specific customer and to be passed on to the future and is created for a specific purpose in the present. The focus is never the object in itself (Ashworth 1991, p. 2).

‘Intangible heritage’ is the non-physical heritage, such as language, religious practice and folklore. (Muños Viñas 2009, pp. 16-30). The usage of ‘heritage asset’ is to summarise all artefacts, buildings and sites in one collective word. ‘Heritage planning’ can be described as a philosophy or method in the field of planning rather than preservation and specialised management (Ashworth 1991, p. 123).
The concept of value

To define what the stakeholders values it is necessary to define the concept itself. Thus, the perception of what, for who and where value is extremely fluent and individual. The value of historic buildings and sites will vary between different users (Ashworth 1991, p. 49). ‘Universal value’ is today mostly used on the nomination of World Heritage and other international collaboration. When something is of ‘universal value’, it means that a heritage asset, either natural or man built, is of such important significance that it is valuable to all mankind (Jokilehto 2002, p. 295). The authors Ashworth and Tunbridge (2000) describe the argument for the justification of historic buildings value can be placed in two categories. The ‘aesthetic’ category values what is beautiful. What is said to be beautiful varies depending on who are designated selector of the what is of aesthetic value. The other category is ‘antique’, which is the value of age. The ‘antique’ value usually increases the rarity of the building as well as a historical link to the past (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000, pp. 22-23).

Historic England (Drury and McPherson 2008) sets the guidelines and framework for conservation in the United Kingdom and are nationally recognised practice, therefore it is suitable to include their values in the framework. The term ‘place’ is the collective word for all physical and non-physical attributes that contribute to the ‘sense of place’ (Drury and McPherson 2008, p. 14). ‘Historic value’ is the connection to a place or building, it can be described both by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Decision makers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>Intrinsic qualities</td>
<td>Taste leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>designations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Areas</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Professional norms and practice</td>
<td>Professional planners and politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>designations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land-use</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Local plans</td>
<td>Professional norms and practice</td>
<td>Professional planners and politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulation</td>
<td>resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Planning</td>
<td>Urban product</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>The market</td>
<td>Users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ashworth 1991, p. 77). The table suggest what different philosophies within heritage management focuses upon when approaching an historic object. Following with what application of instruments based on the criteria’s set by the decision makers (Ashworth 1991, p. 77).
association and being illustrative. By associate something means linking things together creating historical value. The illustrative value is to present an interpretation of the past. ‘Evidential value’ is mostly applicable when speaking of archaeology, where age is an important factor. However, it is not always the case, it focuses on the possible trace of human activity. ‘Aesthetic value’ is what can be physically seen and appreciated, usually associated with age of a place or a design. The ‘communal value’ is described the collective meaning of a place. It can have symbolic value, meaning that the value is the emotional connection to a place. Another branch is the social value, which often occurs when a place is threatened, the value often lays in the association with a place rather than the physical (Drury and McPherson 2008, pp. 28-31).

1.7.4 Conservation principles

“Modern conservation is principally characterised by the fundamental change of values in contemporary society, a paradigm based on relativity and the new concept of historicity” (Jokilehto 2002, p. 295). The emergence of the conservation movement was a reaction towards urbanisation and demolition of historic buildings and areas (Ashworth 1991, p. 17). In this research the term ‘conservation’ will be used both as a collective word for all activities in the field of conservation, as the author Muños Viñas defines it in his book (2009, pp. 14-15).

There are two approaches in treatments of historical objects worth mentioning that are acting against each other. Modern conservation emphasises the history of the object. The treatment approach wants to show the different layers of the building, patina, change over time and preserve what is original. Stylistic restoration is also relaying on history but is driven by the awareness of attracting tourism (Jokilehto 2002, p. 303). Successful preservation manages to present what has been preserved (Chitty and Baker 1999, pp. 7-8). The concepts of preservation and restoration, although they share many similarities, are different (Ashworth, 1991. p. 2). ‘Preservation’ are conservation in practice. Preservation are not to intervene, but to preserve an object just as it is (Muños Viñas 2009, p. 15). The term ‘restoration’ is to restore something to its original state. This is however not always how it is applied in reality, it may also mean that something is restored to a preferred layer or a better state than it was originally (Muños Viñas 2009, pp. 16-18; Price et alt. 1996, p 314).

The challenge for contemporary planning principles is to enforce heritage as a positive contribution in collected aim for a sustainable society (Jokilehto 2002. p. 318). Contemporary conservation is mostly driven to find economic justification for the preservation of built heritage, it is reflected in national legislations and policies. The massive stock of built heritage is in need of constant maintenance and finding an appropriate use is proven to be costly in many cases. The
West European countries are treating their heritage as a commercial resource which have resulted in the hunt for economic benefit of the use of built heritage (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000, p. 33). It is not possible to continue with what has previously been the romantic preservation of a few selected objects of significance (Jokilehto 2002, pp. 18, 213). The contemporary conservation approach should be “redefined in reference to the environmental sustainability of social and economic development within the overall cultural and ecological situation on earth” (Jokilehto 2002, p. 18). This is due to the growing global awareness of the limits of earth and the need to set up principles of sustainability, where the heritage is included as a resource. This has resulted in the discipline being accepted by the governmental authorities an international organisation (Jokilehto 2002, p. 213, 290-292). The shift in responsibilities have resulted in more decision about historic environment being made on local level. Conservation is now to be determent based on local value rather than national (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000, p. 17).

To manage heritage is well described by Jukka Jokilehto (2002) as a major task in the discipline of conservation. The role of conservation today is to work preventive and create awareness of the need to maintain assets through systematic inspections and data collection. This is to be implied on local level, making owners aware, as well as inform the value of heritage and just judgment in planning processes against financial aspects (Jokilehto 2002, p. 318). To make sound decisions based on value it is necessary to define of what is to be conserved, for whom and why (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000, pp. 16-17).

2. Result

The results are presented by first identifying why the stakeholders are involved, what are their interests in Brighton Hippodrome. By understanding their interests, it is possible to find out what each individual stakeholder’s resources are and how they apply those in practice. Deriving from that sound foundation an overview of what is of value for each individual stakeholder have been presented. An understanding of circumstances of interaction between stakeholders have been presented through a timeline of two events, as well as the current situation. The figures in the results use the abbreviation of the stakeholder’s names. Brighton and Hove City council (BHCC), Our Brighton Hippodrome (OBH) and Brighton Hippodrome Community Interest Company (BHCIC), The Theatres Trust (TTT), Historic England (HE) and property owner (O).
2.1 Interests

Figure 1 presents an illustration of the established interest that each stakeholder might have. Four aspects of interests were identified, the building itself, interest on local and national level, and financial interest. The concept of interest could be defined as responsibility. Either it was legal responsibility or sense of responsibility for a cause. The arrows connect the stakeholders with interests in their connection to the Hippodrome. The owner’s arrows have been dotted due to the fact that there is some uncertainty to those claims that should be clear for the reader.

2.1.2 Brighton and Hove City Council

Local authorities, such as the council, have the responsibility to integrate the conservation policies with the planning policies in their jurisdiction (Department of Environment and National Heritage 1994). Their responsibility is to provide specialist advise to private owners and colleagues where consent from the authority is required. When a planning application for a listed building or a property in a conservation area submitted, advice from a conservation officer is mandatory. Due to the fact that the Hippodrome have been vacant for a number of years, the urgency to find a new use for it have been crucial. It is of high priority to secure the building’s future for at least thirty years ahead, as well as to establish what exactly is significant with the building. They expect the development to ideally be viable long term, that the proposition will be financially sufficient to secure proper restoration. The conservation officer implies that they are not just looking at the conservation of the Hippodrome, but the regeneration of the conservation area Old Town as whole. The implies that something that is positive for the singular building might be a negative impact in a larger historic environment. It is a fine balance to achieve suitable
use of Brighton Hippodrome, as well for it to be a positive contribution in the revival of the historic environment it is part of (Conservation Officer 2018).

The council is open to any development, the building does not necessary need to be a theatre, as long as what is significant is preserved. The challenge for planners is to plan for the future, making decision that is coherent with the city’s vision. The council is clear that it will need to be certain compromises. It is important to be aware that the process of enrolling a development after it has been approved can take years. During that time the dereliction of the building will continue, and in this specific case study the council needs to ensure that it is halted. This is usually approached through an inspection of the site. The last inspection of the Hippodrome was eighteen months ago, previously it has been issues to get access to the building (Conservation Officer 2018).

The issue of reuse of buildings built for a specific purpose, such as theatres, is that the needs of the society has changed. Some buildings during their time of creation fulfilled a purpose which is not needed today. This is however not an opinion shared by everyone interested in the future of the Hippodrome and is the main subject discussed. In cases where the building has been vacant for a longer period of time, it falls into disrepair. It is of biggest priority for the council to find a new use for the Hippodrome, it is one out of two listed vacant buildings in urgent needs a new use. When a building is vacant the council will try to act more proactive. In this case the council nominated the Hippodrome to the HAR register to make people aware of the threat the building is facing (Conservation Officer 2018).

2.1.3 Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC

Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC wants the Hippodrome to be a lyric theatre. They want the building to be able to receive larger performances. For this to be possible trucks will need to access the stage from Ship Street. A new development on the site might build something that will block the access and trucks will not be able to enter. This is seen as the major concern for those who wants to see the Hippodrome to be used as a theatre in the future. If the access where to be closed off, it would be an irreversible change and destroy the vison of the Hippodrome to receive larger performances. The Trustees refers to the Options for Brighton Hippodrome (Colliers International 2015) to understand what their vision for the Hippodrome in detail (Trustees 2018).

The group find it upsetting that a city such as Brighton and Hove, that base a lot of their trade on their heritage, is not doing enough to care for the historic environment in the city. The
members point out the accelerating decaying state the building have become in just a few years. One trustee visited the building not too long ago says that the building was in a terrible state. The Trustees (2018) refers to the City Plan document. Brighton Hippodrome is pointed out to as an important part of the city’s existing cultural infrastructure that should be protected and enhanced. Any proposed developed should be carefully selected and any possible changes should be based on a sound foundation (Brighton and Hove City Council 2016, p. 157).

2.1.4 The Theatres Trust

The Trust works as a charity to protect the theatres in United Kingdom, they believe that current and future generations should have access to a varied range of good quality theatres. They support and value the act of performance in which taking place in theatres, and the theatres are in their turn valued for their intrinsic significance. The Theatres Trust express the importance to meet the needs of the community and inform about the value of theatres. It is vital to ensure that there is open discussion and good communication with all stakeholders involved in a project, particularly a building such as Brighton Hippodrome (Advisor 2018).

2.1.5 Historic England

Historic England are to care for the heritage on a national level, they are required to advice in such cases as the Hippodrome due its national value (Department of Environment and National Heritage 1994). Their interest is supporting a financially viable development that can fund the needed repair and long-term use of the building (Brighton and Hove City Council 2013b). English Heritage said in an article, concerning a previous planning application, that it might be the only chance the Hippodrome has to have a future. They are eager to find a new use for the Hippodrome (Anon. 2014a). Their interest is said to be very similar to Brighton and Hove City Council (Conservation Officer 2018).

2.1.6 The owner

An article and notes form a meeting have implicated that the property owners interest so to build an 80-bed boutique hotel on the car park space behind the Hippodrome building. The Hippodrome building is to be a banquet, theatre and conference space (Adams 2017a; Trustee 2018).
2.2 Resources

![Resource Diagram]

Figure 2 shows that many stakeholders inhabit several resources. The arrows in the illustration shows each stakeholder’s possible resources. The key resources the research identified, labour, expertise, financial and legal. Labour was identified as the amount of people involved in the Hippodrome, as well as their cooperation with other stakeholders in general. Expertise was a resource all the stakeholders could claim. However, it cannot just be narrowed down into the field of conservation, it includes other fields as well. Financial resource is the access to financial support that each individual stakeholder either have, can provide or receive. The legal resource represents the stakeholders power in decision making. The owner’s arrows have been dotted due to the fact that there is some uncertainty to those claims that should be clear for the reader.

2.2.1 Brighton and Hove City Council

Within the Planning Service there is three people employed as conservation officers, two full time and one part time. It is not mandatory for councils to have conservation officers employed. Brighton and Hove City Council’s resources are stretched due to the low number of employees versus the high amount of listed buildings and areas they are responsible for. The council wishes to have more power to be able to be more proactive, follow up decisions and site visits to control maintenance of building (Conservation Officer 2018).

The council do not have any influence into who will purchase a building, they can only inform the new owner about the restrictions which comes with a listed building. They can require certain details in an application, such as restoration techniques and materials. A specification of agreement can be set up. But they cannot however appoint the contractors, that is up to the owners. If the owners fail to maintain the building to a certain standard, the council could compulsory purchase the building. This however is something they would like to avoid as far as
possible, it is a huge liability a building of that size and poor condition would be. To prevent this from happening the council have tried to work with the different owners over the years. An issue today is the difference in ownership, a company may have the freehold but someone else is leasing it. If so, the one who is leasing will not invest in renovation and restoration of a building which they do not own if it is not profitable. This is an issue that have been recognised in similar cases. However, the Hippodrome is a quite different building with its own unique set of challenges (Conservation Officer 2018).

2.2.2 Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC

The campaign, Our Brighton Hippodrome, founded a Community Interest Company (CIC). There are six trustees in the Brighton Hippodrome CIC. They are currently twenty trustees in Our Brighton Hippodrome campaign, but slowly deteriorating. This is because for a long time nothing has happened, and no positive action have been possible. They are currently waiting for the new owner’s proposed action, thereafter they will act and proceed according to what is being stated. The group is not shy to turn up with plackets and t-shirts if they feel as what is being proposed is wrong. To further move ahead, the campaign is trying to find help by people that are professionally work with fund raising campaigns for bigger conservation projects (Trustees 2018).

The group have a good relation to Historic England, they received funding for the Options for Brighton Hippodrome (Colliers International 2015) report from them. The Theatres Trust have been the main supporter of their campaign (Trustees 2018). The next step is for the Brighton Hippodrome CIC to set up a Business Plan, it will show revenue for at least five years ahead based on their proposed use of the Hippodrome. This would ensure other stakeholders of their vision’s financial viability long term (Trustees 2018).

2.2.3 The Theatres Trust

The Theatres Trust is a statuary consultee that was set up to specifically work with the protect theatres in the United Kingdom (The Theatres Trust 2018d). The trust consists of a small team of staff governed by a board of Trustees appointed by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport. They operate as a charity and are the national advisory public body for theatres. The Theatres Trust do not receive any public funding except a small grant from Historic England. The Trust aims to ensure theatre buildings meet the current needs and demands of the theatre
industry and the audiences they serve. The small staffing team have a broad range of professional skills, architecture, town planning, theatre operation, conservator, etc. They provide their expert advice on planning and development for free, as well as educating people about the importance of theatres, offering financial support for projects. They have a board of twenty Trustees, their expertise is also available if necessary. If further specialist input is required, the trust will seek advice from the relevant authority. The Theatres Trust also advice the Government for research grants, governmental strategies and proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (Advisor 2018).

The Theatres Trust works a with a lot of different stakeholders, such as councils, amenity groups and owners. They “determine involvement on a case by case basis” (Advisor 2018). Meetings with various groups are important and takes place regularly (Advisor 2018).

2.2.4 Historic England

The most influenceable opinion within the conservation sector in United Kingdom is Historic England (Conservation Officer 2018). They are a national body, their responsibility lays in the safekeeping of heritage at national, and sometimes international level. They give advice on ancient monuments, historic buildings and conservation areas, maintain registers and processes grants and loans (Government of United Kingdom 2018).

2.2.5 The owner

For a development to become reality, the property owner needs to be financially viable (Trustee 2018). It is safe to assume that the owner has some expertise, however maybe not be in the field of conservation but in other sectors. However, if they are financially viable, they can purchase labour and expertise.
2.3 Values

![Diagram](2.3_values_diagram.png)

Figure 3 presents a simplified illustration of the values established through the research. The historical value is where it has been possible to identify statements valuing the past. The community value acknowledged the meaning the building have to the community, a group in the society. Aesthetic value is shared by all the stakeholders, though they value it for different reasons, they have all claimed the value of its physical attributes. The financial value is a bit more uncertain, but it is presented as the potential for profit a stakeholder sees the Hippodrome carry, although their vision how to achieve it may differ. The owner’s arrows have been dotted due to the fact that there is some uncertainty to those claims that should be clear for the reader.

2.3.1 Brighton and Hove City Council

“[…] certainly, in the case of the Hippodrome, it is a Grade II* listed building, one of the most significant buildings. In general consent it is one of the most important buildings in the city” (Conservation Officer 2018).

What is of importance is that the building will be open for the public, private use would not be appropriate (Conservation Office 2018).

“So, if you have a building that is, where the exterior is most significant, and the interior is less interesting, you have more options and are more flexible in what we can do with that building. Because you can convert it internally into a number of different uses. When you have a building when it is the interior that is particularly important, when you have an auditorium use of large space, to conserve that, you don’t have many options to what uses you can put into large auditorium space. So, it makes it more difficult to find a new use for the building whilst still preserving what’s significant about it” (Conservation Officer 2018).
What makes the Hippodrome significant and worthy of Grade II* listing is its interior. It stated to be the auditorium, the entrance hall, plaster works and some of the back rooms. They understand that the original use of a building is the most ideal solution, however not always possible. The auditorium and plaster work restrict what can be done to the inside of the building, it may be challenging to find a suitable use which do not compromises that value. The Hippodrome have had many uses since it was first built, it has been adapted to suite different requirements several times. The Hippodrome have mainly been a performance theatre and bingo hall. Because of its various uses the council states that it is nothing that says it most definitely need to be a performance theatre again (Conservation Officer 2018).

2.3.2 Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC
Our Brighton Hippodrome and Hippodrome CIC wants potential future development to respect the history of the Hippodrome as a theatre. The Hippodrome has been a function as a performance theatre and could be that again. The theatre as extremely flexible for all sorts of uses and should be restored to its former glory as a performance theatre. The main values are the building to be a functioning theatre and the Frank Matcham interior (Trustees 2018).

2.3.3 The Theatres Trust
In an earlier listing consent statement, The Theatres Trust objected a proposed planning applications alteration. The values stated by them then, which most likely have not changed since, Brighton Hippodrome is said to be of national value because of two reasons; “as it is the most intact and finest example of a free standing circus (without a water feature) illustrating a tent-like form following the design of travelling circuses: and it is also the only surviving statutory listed example of a building originally designed as an ice rink” (Brighton and Hove City Council 2014).

2.3.4 Historic England
The aim for Historic England, according to the Trustees (2018), are that the main auditorium with the Frank Matcham decoration and dome is to be protected. Some demolishing and other greater alteration would be acceptable as long as it is viable to retain the auditorium. Historic England’s statement in the listing consent for a planning application, confirms that it is the interior designed by Frank Matcham that is what makes the building significant (Brighton and
Hove City Council 2014). In an article a representative form English Heritage says that “the proposals would cause harm to the significance of the building”. But concluded that “the scheme represented the best chance to conserve this very vulnerable grade II* listed building, and that its conservation is a principal public benefit” (Anon. 2014a).

2.3.5 The owner

In an article the current owner stated that they are to engage people to bring the Hippodrome back to life, recognising its currently poor condition and need to be restored (Adams, 2017a).

2.4 Interactions

Two events of significance have been selected to present what has happened, why and when the stakeholders previously gotten involved. Firstly, there is the eight-screen cinema planning application submitted in 2007 (Brighton and Hove City Council 2007). Followed by the collaboration between stakeholders in 2015 (Trustees 2018) and the current situation.

2.4.1 The eight-screen cinema planning application

A planning application for an eight-screen cinema with four restaurants were submitted in the end of 2013 (Brighton and Hove City Council 2013a). An article disclosed that a petition against the proposal had started (Anon. 2014d). The planning application later on becomes approved by the Brighton and Hove City Council (2013a). The permission of the conversion from a theatre
to a cinema was very controversial and created a lot of resistance amongst the public and heritage organisations. Our Brighton Hippodrome campaign was effectively formed by this opposition (Trustees 2018). The council felt as if they did not have a choice if they wanted building to be used again, the proposed development complied with the national policy. The decision made by the council was agreed by English Heritage (Conservation Officer 2018).

Because of the objection from the petition campaign, amenity groups and The Theatres Trust, the planning application is forwarded to the Housing and Planning Minister. The referral is denied and returned to the council to decide (Anon. 2014b; 2014c). A Viability Study (Our Brighton Hippodrome 2013) report was produced by the Our Brighton Hippodrome campaign at an early stage. It was a response to the planning application submitted to convert the Hippodrome to an eight-screen cinema. The viability study was produced by the Our Brighton Hippodrome to argue against the previous viability study produces by District Valuation Service (DVS). The production of the viability study was to invalidate DVS’s viability study, so it could be dismissed. Our Brighton Hippodrome stood extremely critical to what the DVS report, stating it to be containing false data and misleading information (Our Brighton Hippodrome 2013, pp. 6-13).

The planning application resulted in some comments in articles. A representative of Theatres Trust commented in an article; “Unless the developers reconsider their scheme we will have lost the potential to stage lyric theatre and performance in the Hippodrome's unique theatrical space” (Anon. 2014c). A chairman of Brighton and Hove planning committee said;

“I sympathise with campaigners who, along with councillors, would absolutely love to see the Hippodrome turned back into a theatre. But this has been looked at and the district valuer confirmed that a theatre was sadly unlikely to be viable” (BBC 2014b).

Even though the council approves the cinema conversion, the development never goes ahead. The site is sold yet again. The petition campaign, Our Brighton Hippodrome, where pleased but concern with what the new owner’s vision for the building would be (Anon. 2015a).
2.4.2 Collaboration – The six months exclusivity agreement

The site was purchased by a new owner. An article is published announcing a collaboration between the new owners, Brighton and Hove City council, The Theatres Trust and Historic England, Our Brighton Hippodrome campaign, to find a viable use for the building. The study was given six months to come up with as new use. A council leader described it as a very positive initiative, though he stressed the fact that they “are keen to see a use that complements our ambitions for the economic development of this area of the city centre” (Anon. 2015b).

During the exclusivity agreement, one report were produced. The report Options for Brighton Hippodrome (Colliers International 2015) was produced to evaluate different options of uses for Brighton Hippodrome (Colliers International 2015, p. 5). The report argues for the positive impact the revival of the Brighton Hippodrome as a theatre would have, once up and running, on the area and therefore contribute to regeneration in the vacant buildings close by (Colliers International 2015, pp. 7-8, 74). The most discussed option is the conversion into a lyric theatre. A lyric theatre would be flexible enough to be able to accept larger productions with accompanying equipment, as well as smaller ones. There were, and still is, no venue like this in Brighton. The Hippodrome is stated to be not entirely suitable for larger touring productions due to the fact that it was originally not built for that purpose, the scheme also included a quite big changes to the Hippodrome House to meet the standard and needs expected today (Colliers International 2015, pp. 7-8, 28). The main challenge is the cost, or rather the funding, of the development which is estimated to be at least £15 million pounds. To be a proper functioning venue the cost would be £25-30 million pounds. There are other options investigated in the report, such as boutique cinema, residential, circus, cabaret venue, food market, restaurants etc. All be financially viable and more profitable at an earlier stage but might compromise what is of significance value of the building (Colliers International 2015, pp. 9, 31-51).
Another viable development of interest would be a theatre of varieties. The scheme would not require as much alterations as the lyric theatre scheme. For example, would no major changed be needed to be done to the Hippodrome House. The scheme would also enable profit from businesses set up during restoration to make the scheme profitable earlier. Though the scheme might be less costly than a lyric theatre, does it not mean that it will attracts more funding. It is because there is not as much of a need of a theatre of varieties, there are already existing theatres of that kind in Brighton and Hove. Another theatre of varieties would compete for customers in an already narrow market. The report may now not have the same purpose as it did when it was produced due to the fact there is a new situation today. The report however, validates what the Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC envisioned what the Hippodrome could become. They are promoting the suggestion to achieve the full scheme in stages. Firstly, to turn it in to a theatre of varieties, once up and running, then can proceed with the scheme to turn the building into a lyric theatre (Colliers International 2015, pp. 9-10, 77-78).

“The aim of the work is to find a use for the Hippodrome that is respectful of its heritage, is deliverable, and will give it a sustainable future. This includes consideration of the viability of the building being restored for use for live performance, especially as a theatre/events venue” (Colliers International 2015, p. 5).

Months later, after the six months exclusivity agreement, two articles published the same day expressed Our Brighton Hippodrome campaigner’s concern. They feared that the building being sold again might venture the future of the Brighton Hippodrome to be restored as a theatre venue. A member of the campaign expressed that the only way forward is to enable a scheme that fully return the building to a live venue, “or at the very least, ensure a scheme that would not preclude future reuse as a lyric theatre” (Quinn 2017). The campaigners fully trust in the potential that the restoration and revival of the Brighton Hippodrome to be a viable, positive and a needed contribution to the city of Brighton and Hove. The articles mention that both the council and the campaign have had problems getting in contact with the owner (Quinn 2017). Shortly after another article is published, announcing that the site has been sold yet again (Adams, 2017a). The new owner told the journalist that it was too early to make any solid statements of what is going to happen to the building. However, the proposed plan is to turn the site into a hotel with residential flats, as well as a concert, theatre and banqueting venue. Our Brighton Hippodrome campaign was not thrilled about the news of the proposed possible plans. They urged the council to deny any planning in that range. Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC
highlight the critical stage the future of the Hippodrome currently is, and that the proposed
development by the owner will hinder the possibility for the Hippodrome to be able to receive
major plays and larger performance theatres in Brighton (Adams 2017b).

2.4.3 Current situation

After no planning application had been submitted during the previous owner’s freehold, the
building was sold again to the current owner towards the end of 2017. After being asked for
reassurance as for the building’s future by a journalist, the new owner said: “It’s too early at the
moment to offer any assurances. Our strategy at the moment is to listen and consider all options
and engage with people interested in keeping the heritage asset. It needs love and attention, it’s
been neglected for many, many years” (Adams, 2017a).

In the beginning of 2018 an article titled Brighton Hippodrome has been named the most “at risk”
theatre in the UK for the fifth consecutive year is published. The article speaks of the negative threats
that includes demolition, dereliction due to lack of maintenance and development in the
surrounding area. The Hippodrome have been declining for a long time, during its time as a
Bingo hall not do more than necessary minimum in terms of repair was done (Conservation
Officer 2018).

“Now when it is new owners, there is, because now to some degree in order to get advice from
us now in about how to move forward the owner now will have to pay us to get advice. So, that
prides a bit more to the council. I mean that comes to dedicate a bit more resources for that. So,
I am optimistic now with the new owner, the new owner seems keen to move forward quickly.
So, I am optimistic that it will be some progress. Whether that will… It is going to be difficult to
find a solution that makes everybody happy” (Conservation officer 2018).

The new plans for the Brighton Hippodrome is yet unknown. During this research the new
owners are to meet with the council, having disclosed very little about who they are and what
their plans are, it is all quite confidential at this stage. However, the council have heard that the
auditorium will be restored and used as a single use space. Adding to that, it will be a lot of more
developments on the site to make it financially viable and justify that high restoration amount
stated in the Options for Brighton Hippodrome (Conservation Officer 2018).

A member of the campaign is frustrated that the potential is not being recognised by the
council to turn the building to a live performance theatre venue (Anon. 2018). The campaigners
are keen to speak to the new owner for a possible collaboration. Theatres Trust still strongly
believes that the building should be a theatre. They are stating that it is the most viable solution that not damages the building’s significance assets (Calder and Bastable 2018). Brighton Hippodrome CIC are taking part in a meeting with all stakeholders, summoned by the local Member of Parliament (MP) (Trustees 2018). The MP have invited the owner, Brighton and Hove City Council, the Ward, Brighton Hippodrome CIC, Historic England, The Theatres Trust, and other amenity groups to participate in a meeting. Unfortunately, the meeting was not for the public, otherwise the author would have been there to observe. In the meeting, though nothing has been decided, the new owner has proposed that he wants to build an eighty-bed boutique hotel. He will keep the auditorium and part of the stage, intending to do minimum changes, setting up a trust to run it. The use of the Hippodrome building would be performances, conferences and banquets. The hotel will be built on the back on the building, towards Ship Street, demolishing the fly tower and the stage building (Trustee 2018).

The result from the face to face interviews with the two stakeholders Brighton and Hove City Council and Brighton Hippodrome CIC, generated a deeper understanding of their relation to each other and the other stakeholders. In the interview with the Conservation Officer, he pointed out that it is important to understand the process of planning; an approved planning application can take years before it is even started and by then gone out of fashion. It is hard to predict what is a trend now and what the market wants in the future (Conservation Officer 2018).

2.5 Analysis and implications

The following figures 6-8 illustrates a very simple positioning of the different stakeholders within the four identified interest, resources and values based on the results. They are placed in each square based on the similarities. The further apart they are from each other the less similarities they have. The closer they are, they share more similarities. Each stakeholder has been designated a colour which is presented beside each figure.
2.5.1 Interests

The result showed that the common interest for all the stakeholders are the Hippodrome, although the reasons differ between some of them. Brighton and Hove City Council, Historic England and The Theatres Trust’s interests is based on their responsibility through work. Brighton and Hove City Council are responsible for planning on local level, there is a wider spectrum to be accounted for (Conservation Officer 2018). The area of responsibility for Historic England are planning for the historic environment on a national level. The task recognises that not all can be preserved, conservation needs to accept change to enable the continuous life for historic buildings. Historic England take special interest in buildings such as the Brighton Hippodrome due to the national significance the building is stated to carry. Their opinion weighs heavy in decision making (Drury and McPherson 2008; Conservation Officer 2018). Although The Theatres Trust and Historic England both works on national level, caring for a large part of the United Kingdom’s heritage, they do not share the same opinion regarding the Hippodrome’s future.

“(…) in general, we have a good working relation with Historic England, us officers. So, in generally we would normally find, in terms of our view using their views, they are fairly well aligned. Because we work generally to the same national policy and the same legal framework. So, from that point of view, I don’t envision that there are problems in that perspective. Obviously, interest groups nationally, you got the Theatres Trust, and there will be other national societies which might in this one the Victorian Society, 20th Society. The building is a very late Victorian, early 20s, so both those are of interest. And there are local conservation groups, Brighton and
Hove based ones, like Our Hippodrome for example that have an interest. Different groups may have slightly different objectives, for example the Theatres Trust want the building to be used as a theatre. And that is what Our Hippodrome is seeking ideally a livid theatre or general-purpose theatre” (Conservation Officer 2018).

Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC separates distinctively from the other stakeholders. Their interest is to see the Hippodrome become a lyric theatre, it derives from a genuine interest of the building’s past as a performance theatre. The Theatres Trust is sharing most similarities with them in terms of interest, standing behind their vision for the Hippodrome. Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC’s interests are not based on responsibilities in the same way as the other stated stakeholders, excluding the owner. Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC’s interest is their own individual sense of responsibility towards the city’s historic environment.

Due to lack of information and the constant change of owners, the research has mostly been able to make vague conclusions about the owners. Though it is safe to assume that the core interest for the owners is financial profit, otherwise it is doubtful that they would have purchased the building. The owners and Brighton Hippodrome CIC/Our Brighton Hippodrome do not carry any legal responsibility for the building. However, when the owners purchased the site they did take on a certain legal responsibility as owners of the property.

2.5.2 Resources

Figure 7 illustrates each stakeholders position in regard to their resources and similarities with others. Their location in each square is only based on their similarities or differences in relation to each other.

- Brighton and Hove City Council
- The Theatres Trust
- Owner
- Our Brighton Hippodrome/Brighton Hippodrome CIC
- Historic England
Brighton and Hove City Council have resources with legal power, probably the highest, to implement decisions. However, they express that they are understaffed and cannot work as proactive as they would like to. Historic England have the resources in terms of labour, finance and expertise, but functions just an advisor. The Theatre Trust works as a charity with a small group of staff and their key resource is expertise. They do have some financial resources, such as grants, but they mostly function as advisors on planning applications and restoration projects. A strong resource for them is the work they do together with other organisation groups. Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC have manpower and some expertise, but they have little influence in decision making. They founded Brighton Hippodrome CIC as a step to establish them as a valid stakeholder with the potential to present a viable plan for the Hippodrome to be a lyric theatre in the future (Trustees 2018).

The resources that the owners have are the same as interest, finance. They do distinctively differ from the other stakeholders in expertise. Thus, they might not have the same expertise as the others, they may have expertise in other fields that are part of any development scheme. Moreover, with financial backup they can purchase expertise and labour.

2.5.3 Values

Commonly for all the stakeholders are the shared appreciation of the aesthetic value. Concerns regarding the building’s poor condition is recognised by all of them. The dereliction has accelerated for such a long time, it might have jeopardised what has been pointed out to be of significant value. However, most stakeholders are not shy to support propose changes to the
building that will have a massive impact on the building’s structure. Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC’s proposal in the *Options for Brighton Hippodrome* (Colliers International 2015) report suggest massive changes in the Hippodrome House, as well as alteration of the fly tower. The exterior is to be changed to a certain degree too. This is justified by the financial gain and the need to modernise the building to suite contemporary requirements (Colliers International 2015 p. 28). There are different attitudes towards the building’s flexibility. In conversation with Brighton Hippodrome CIC trustees, they see the building as extremely flexible with loads of potential. In conversation with Brighton and Hove City Council the impression was that of the opposite. They perceived that valuable interior is restricting adaption for possible new (Conservation Officer 2018).

The historical and community value is recognised by all the stakeholders that are part of the conservation field. Both the historic and communal values are transferable to each other in this case. The communal value is the attachment to a place or building through its and historical significance to one individual or larger group. The history and community value of the building is not dismissed by stakeholders in the conservation field, however, they may be used differently. The strong sense of symbolic and social value for the community was the reason that Our Brighton Hippodrome campaign even started. Although The Theatres Trust do not have a direct local connection, they value the community engagement. Brighton and Hove City Council is well aware of the building’s historical meaning for the community in Brighton and Hove, but due to the circumstances and the legal framework they seem restricted in their actions to encourage this.

The financial value, meaning the possible profit to be gained, is shared between the owner and Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC. They both see that the building needs to find a new use and they are both have vision for its future. However, for Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC the financial value derives from their interest and value in the building. They need to make it financially viable to ensure the building’s future to be as a lyric theatre. The owner most probably purchased the building just for the financial profit to be gained (Adams 2017).

The approach towards the building is different between the stakeholders. Ashworth and Tunbridge (2000) write about the approaches where the building’s intrinsic value is justification enough. The decision and criteria thereafter are based on the attributes of the building (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000, pp. 24-25). The approach can be identified in Our Brighton Hippodrome campaign and The Theatres Trust (Trustees 2018; Advisor 2018). The Brighton and Hove City Council’s approach is different. They are keen to find a new use as soon as possible; the building has a negative impact on the city and they are ready to compromise to achieve it. As for the
owner, it is too early to draw any conclusions, but their approach is to make a profit. They want to develop something for a consumer and when the customer is in focus, instead of the building, the criteria and decisions differ massively and changes further away from conservation (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000, pp. 24-25).

2.5.4 Interactions
The community value is recognised at a national level in the conservation field to be part of the sustainability approach and selection of heritage. This is to be implemented on local level, which the conservation officer says in the interview. This case study is an example when it is not working in reality and some stakeholders will most likely be disappointed. The Theatres Trust, and at some degree even Historic England and the Brighton and Hove City Council, supports Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC in their attempt to turn the Hippodrome into a lyric theatre. There is a campaign, several amenity groups and individuals have expressed that the want the building to be a theatre.

“[…] We knew they did not have the financial backing, and so, after a period of time, several years the consent lapses which is now the situation which a new purchase can come a long and buy it” (Trustees 2018).

“Right, one of the other criticism is that is what one would make of the council is that this is an important conservation area, and yet it had no Character Study or Management Plan. The Management Plan is currently being produced, but it is twenty-five years later then when it should have been done. So, we, that is the organisation, in which is trying to restore the Hippodrome funded the Character Study. We paid for it because it was evident that the only way we could push the council into doing, that is by paying for it ourselves” (Trustees 2018).

What has become apparent, that is most crucial today, is that the Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC is now pushing is that the new owner not to build on the car park towards Ship Street. If so, the only entrance for bigger productions trucks will be cut off and not be able to enter the theatre. It would mean that the theatre will therefore never be able to function as a lyric theatre. What is also important to note is even if the building previously been a performance theatre, a lyric theatre today require more from the buildings they perform in. Brighton Hippodrome has actually never been a lyric theatre and therefore it will be necessary with some major adaption changes to function so (Conservation Officer).
“Sometimes you think you are moving towards a solution. And that collapses, and you think… So, I think, it would have been good to have got and done that exercise, because what we found here, and this is the case always; The public only start telling us what they think when the building is threatened. So, all the time it is there, it is not in the news, it is not threatened, nobody pays attention. It was vacant for a long time and we did not keep that quiet, we made sure that everybody new that this building is at risk. And it was at Historic England’s own ‘Buildings at Risk’ register, it was on the Council’s own ‘at Risk’ register… We got them to put it on their register. To spread this message, this building is at risk, might get people interested, might generate ideas. It was only when there was an application, a planning application, to convert it to a cinema. This generated a lot of objections, and then people get together and organised to try to do something. It is only at that last stage… It needs to find a way to mobilising people I suppose. Peoples motivation, once it is threatened people are motivated to get involved and do something. And volunteer their time… They don’t see that as an immediate threat, so, people are not so keen to get involved. Ideally you need to find a way” (Conservation Officer 2018).

Andrew McClelland et al. (2013) points out the same observation as Brighton and Hove City Council gathered from own experience and others; the active role the public plays only once the heritage is being threatened (McClelland et alt. 2013, pp. 585-586; Conservation Officer 2018).

In general, most stakeholders get a long, but it is clear that Brighton Hippodrome CIC Trustees are frustrated. They feel as if the council is not doing enough and feel little support in their fight for the Hippodrome. All the stakeholders participated in the collaboration that resulted in a report that evaluated options, conclusions from discussions and finally presented a gathered goal. Once that reports purpose fell through and the site was sold, they had to start all over again. The Theatres Trust and the local MP is clearly wanting a dialog between all the stakeholders at an early stage to avoid history to repeat itself and another planning application to fall through.

“I know that people from Brighton Hippodrome, we worked on the *Old Town Conservation Statement* (2017). And we still continue to work with them on that, we do not have a bad relationship. They are just disappointed because they were hoping to in effect built up a partner in effect the Hippodrome. Which probably would have been an ideal situation. But we, they, did not get the building, so now in effect they are going to be around putting a lot of scrutiny of what the new owners do. We have a good relationship with them, but we may, ultimately, we might take different views on what the new owner wants to do, it may not be the exact same view” (Conservation Officer 2018).
The idea of being more proactive is something the Officer points out as something that could contribute to avoidance of future issues, or at least minimising them. One thing that could be done, which is often suggested as successful planning framework, is the inclusion of the public in the process. The public could be introduced in an early stage, such as asking them for suggestion of use of vacant space. It would be a workshop that would result in some kind of guidelines in the future of buildings and how it can be incorporated in planning decisions (Conservation Officer 2018).

The Theatres Trust, owner, Our Brighton Hippodrome and Brighton Hippodrome CIC sees opportunity. They are sharing an approach that value the building. Although, The Theatres Trust and Brighton Hippodrome CIC sees beyond profit, the intrinsic value and uniqueness of the building to be if such great meaning that it would be a major loss that cannot be replaced (Trustees 2018; Brighton and Hove City Council 2014).

3. Discussion

It has become very clear that the conflict in interests have resulted in the continuous state of disrepair for the Hippodrome. The case has some similarities to the case study in the authors Olshammar (2002) doctoral thesis. When the solution was only supposed to be temporary, has now become the permanent state. Because of certain circumstances the places are left to deteriorate. One significant difference between this thesis case study and Olshammar's, is that Brighton Hippodrome is nationally, locally and communally recognised and valued. Thus, this is well known and a lot of events happening in regard to the building, nothing is actually being done. The genuine interest in the revival of the building is there but they do not have the finances to incorporate. On the other spectrum there is the ones with the power and finances to actualise it, but choses to only see the impossible.

There have been suggestions that there is a lot happening soon that involves the future for the Hippodrome. The compromises that are necessary for the Hippodrome be a functional building in our contemporary society seems quite huge when understanding what is going on (Trustee 2018). Due to the urgent status of the structure of the building and the proposed development, it raises the question about that compromises are to be acceptable.

“Most old urban structures are the result of much adaptive reuse. Restoration therefore faces the problem of choosing which past from many should be restored. In practice the solution to this
problem has generally depended on little more than prevailing architectural taste” (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000, pp. 24-25).

Conservation includes the aspects of social, economic, academic, cultural and educational to achieve a successful result. It is important that the heritage professionals know what they are trying to communicate and for whom. Heritage professionals may easily follow their ideals, which they should, but needs to be aware of what was previously stated (Chitty and Baker 1999, p. 8). It is of great importance to properly understand what is of value, this can be done through identification of the nature and historic features. Only then can decisions be done to determine what further actions will be.

“Failure to clarify properly the historical characteristics of a whole class of survivals can lead to uncertainty as to whether individual ones belong to it or another category; in turn, that can lead to inappropriate conservation strategies and misunderstanding about interpretation and presentation” (Chitty and Baker 1999, pp. 7-8).

There is a clear link between economic revitalisation and heritage planning. They use each other as argument to strengthen their case. Heritage is included as an obvious part of revitalisation as well as revitalisation is a foundation to argue the economic viability of conservation (Ashworth, 1991, p. 100). It has been documented and proven that conservation has revitalised an area that previously had a high amount of vacant buildings and loss of footfall (Ashworth 1991, p. 118).

“A glance at national legislation that seeks to establish legal regulations for this special category clearly shows the difficulty: attempts at definition often quickly become drawn-out cataloguing process. Readily applicable criteria are undoubtedly symbolic of the capacity of the society under consideration to understand and represent its present and past, as well as those of others; their fluctuation according to place and era is obvious to anyone.” (Price et al. 1996, p. 248).

It is quite clear that when making decision regard the Hippodrome it would be best to include as many stakeholders as possible. Community value shines through as a strong force but is not recognised as an asset in this case, rather an issue. Brighton Hippodrome CIC have little say in decision making, but a lot of drive that makes them a stakeholder to count on. Amenity groups do not really have an established role in development and therefore do not have any power in decision making. This excludes them to be heard early in the process and it is little they can do once a development is enrolling. If a scheme would enrol that aggravates some of the
stakeholders, it is most possible that the scheme will not be recognised as successful according to planning principles. Perhaps this do not bother certain stakeholders too much, but it should definitely be a problem for the council and the Brighton Hippodrome CIC since the relationship is slightly infected due to a frustration situation for both stakeholders.

What would be a suitable use for the building might be harder to discuss. Previous reports present valid options. The lyric theatre is a sound suggestion for future use, it is proven to be needed and viable with the right funding. However, the proposed development that the owner is suggesting is also intending to keep the auditorium and interior with minimum intervention. Both suggestions are to make significant changes to parts of the site, demolition and extensions. Who are to say one is right and wrong? Decisions like these should be made on a sound ground where all the stakeholders are to meet and agree on a gathered goal.

“Almost all the legislations include assumptions about an active role for private investment. Governments may list and designate, while local planning authorities may express intent through local plans and symbolic public investments, but ultimately most financing for the renovation of public buildings assumed to come from private sources” (Ashworth and Tunbridge 2000, pp. 16-17).

There is definitely an issue as the Conservation Officer said, when the public really only gets involved at a stage when something is threatened. In that stage the process of change is usually so far long that little can be done. But this is not completely fair towards the public. The system created around built environment is based on the assumption of an active private investor.

The conservation principles established in the theoretical framework can be found in all the stakeholders. Though it is apparent that it is restoration and not preservation. The value each individual stakeholder carry is not in the physical structure, but rather the past as a theatre. What is interesting as well is the different opinion the two conservation expert stakeholders, The Theatres Trust and Historic England have about the Hippodrome. How come they are not of the same opinion? This is an interesting lead but cannot be discussed in depth due to the fact that it is not the purpose of this thesis. There is a certain reluctance and distance between some stakeholders though they have much in common. I am certain that if an approach similar to the exclusivity agreement were to be performed again, where all the stakeholders meet early in the process to find a solution that benefits all, would result in the best outcome. The issue now is that the two stakeholders, the owner and Brighton Hippodrome CIC, are not working together towards a common goal. The owner now already has a vision for the site and Brighton
Hippodrome CIC are planning their next move. They will most certain work together again in the future, the question is under what circumstances and are they working towards the same goal? Since they share more similarities then they perhaps know I think they could come to an agreement that will benefit them both. However, this only depends if the owner acknowledges the value of the community and choose to involve them early in the process.

**Conclusion**

This research is an example of the problematic challenge to incorporate heritage into planning. It shows that what is being decided on a higher level, policies and guidelines are problematic to implement on local level. When the research started it was no obvious problem, just a neglected building causing a lot of debate. What has previously happened and can so easily happen again creates a sense of hopelessness. There is no obvious stakeholders fault, they are acting accordingly to what is “expected” of them. Although, the Brighton Hippodrome CIC is definitely exceeding expectations. Their engagement is admirable and impressive. I believe Brighton and Hove City Council could in the future should have a clear stand of what is acceptable or not in terms of changes to the building. Their eagerness to find a new use might lead them to accept changes that might be irreversible and diminish what makes the building valuable. It is most definitely necessary to have an open discussion where everyone can be heard and validated.

It is clear that it is an obvious fear, which is justified, that the new owner promise something he will not fulfil. It is not unusual when private developers chose an historic building or an area to develop that they do not have a connection to the place, usually based somewhere else, and only focuses on their narrow view for them to make a profit, rather than the city as a whole. The new owner might not do this, it is too early to say.

The care for historic buildings are often encouraged to be performed by the public for the public. They are to select what is for value and why they want is supposed to be used for. But in today’s rapidly changing and growing society it becomes challenging when a developer is interested with a different vision is interested as well. What power does the public really have when someone with financial backup are interested? It is not sustainable long term to depend of the engagement of the public to care for the historic environment. It is necessary to create an approach where all the stakeholders meet in a more equal way with a gathered socio-economic sustainable goal. It is necessary for the developers to see past the singular profit and the bigger picture. It is necessary for the public to understand why certain decision are made as well as being heard and valued for their opinions. The conservation field and planners should be there to mitigate and participate to enable a more satisfying result for all.
Future research

A suggestion for future research would be a comparative study between different stakeholders, involved in a variety of vacant historic buildings or sites. There is needed for more research where the conservation sector is collaborating with other sectors. There is definitely room for improvement to ensure the survival of the past, in the present, for the future. Decision making should include the voice of many, what should be preserved should not only be selected by those who are experts, but for whom it is for in a modern society. A suggestion would be to interview as many as possible and to find one, or several, framework approaches in line with sustainability. It is necessary for a vision that balance the integrity of a city without halting the organic growth of progression and development.

Something that this research discusses in the framework is the concept of heritage. It is important that the future conservation of intangible and tangible heritage does not become a product to sell but preserved for its intrinsic value and value for the surrounding community as well. It is a fine balance, and it is of most importance that it is constantly questioned, researched and discussed.

In regard to the results from the specific case study, Brighton Hippodrome, a suggestion would be to investigate different options of suitable adaptive and how to best achieve it. A success story should not be the exception but the rule in every case, it is usually achieved through thoughtful planning with the inclusion of many in an early stage. Research within conservation-led development approaches are needed, it is of great value that decisions constantly being questioned to ensure understand what to manage and who for (Chitty and Baker 1999, p. 6). There is a need for further research in the challenges and solutions which recognise the historic environment as a resource.
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Appendix

Introduction
When contacting the sectors to be interviewed the intentions and purpose of research was explained. When the interview was recorded permission was obtained. In regard to ethics, the author chose not to publish any names.

Interview questions
The questions are adapted and slightly altered to suit each individual sector. The questions below have been the foundation for each interview. However, it is necessary to point out that the different interview techniques will present different results, such as face to face and response by email.

- What are your sector’s interests and resources? By resources meaning e.g. financial, legal, humanitarian (such as; specialist competence, networks, number of employees, experience from similar cases, local knowledge, etc.)

- How is the sector’s relation to other sectors? Is there a network or strategy where all sectors meet?

- In the case of the Hippodrome, how is the relationship with other sectors?

- Are there any additional comments you would like to add?