

SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

Date of meeting:	18/04/2016
Site:	The Petersfield Museum
Proposal:	Development of police station and courthouse into an expanded museum, to include conversion of existing buildings, link building and archive store
Planning reference:	SDNP/15/04456/PRE
Panel members sitting:	David Hares (Chair) Graham Morrison Kim Wilkie Steven Johnson Paul Fender David Edwards Adam Richards
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes Hayley Stevenson Paul Slade Natalie Fellows (Link Officer) Luke Turner (EHDC Planning Officer)
Item presented by:	Giles Pritchard Bethan Nights Hampshire County Council Architects
Declarations of interest:	None

The Panel's response to your scheme will be placed on the Planning Authority's website where it can be viewed by the public.

The SDNPA operate a transparent service, whereby pre-application and application details, although not actively publicised will be placed on the online planning register. This is unless the applicant gives reasons why the enquiry is commercially sensitive.

COMMENTS

	Notes
I.0 Discussion/Questions with applicants	<p>The Panel asked how servicing and deliveries would be handled. The applicants said they will keep an access to the left of the building for deliveries and access to the archive.</p> <p>The Panel asked if there would be courtyard access to the court rooms. The applicant said that it was unlikely, as there was a raised dais on the courtyard-side wall of the court rooms, meaning that the ground levels were different, complicating access.</p> <p>The Panel felt that this was a brilliant place for the museum, but wondered whether any thought had been put to expansion, most likely in to the adjacent schoolhouse. The applicant said that this was possible and a sensible piece of advice, but at this stage they haven't planned for it.</p> <p>The Panel questioned how much parking would be in place at the front of the station, saying that the forecourt would be a good place for people to congregate before entering and that the station's frontage was an important feature to preserve and display. They suggested that parking in front of the station should be kept to a minimum as a result. The applicant agreed that the frontage should be kept clear and on display, but said that there was still a need for some parking near the entrance for accessible parking.</p> <p>The Panel asked whether there would be any call to make space for cycle parking. The applicant said that it is likely, but not yet confirmed, that they'll have to have some provision for cycles.</p> <p>The Panel asked about the energy demands of the facility, and whether any consideration has been given to renewable energy or heat sinks. It suggested that the courtyard would be a very good place for a heat sink. The Applicants said that the highest energy demand will come from the archive building, which requires climate control systems to preserve the items it contains. They went on to say that the archive will be constructed with the highest standards of insulation to help reduce its consumption, but that there hasn't yet been any planning to introduce any alternate power sources. However, it is under consideration.</p> <p>The Panel asked if they'd be removing brickwork and using a light touch construction. The applicant said that they did intend to remove the brickwork from the back wall in order to let light in to the alleyway, putting</p>

	<p>in glazing, as well as putting consideration in to what they would do with the café roof – However, they’re conscious of overlooking the building on the other side of the alleyway.</p> <p>The Panel asked how the applicant would approach converting the stable block.</p> <p>The applicants said that they would convert the stable block in to a reading room, looking at putting glazing and timber shutters in to the front but keeping the broad design of the stables.</p> <p>The Panel asked if the shower block at the back is original, before following in to suggesting that removing it would open up a good additional space in the courtyard, particularly as a seating area.</p> <p>The applicants said that they’ve had a lot of thoughts about what to do with the shower block, but they’re not sure how far they should go with it, as they want to retain as much as they can of the building.</p> <p>The Panel asked whether the café and education facility might be used out of hours, which they felt would be key in managing the finances of the museum properly.</p> <p>The applicants confirmed that they had designed the community spaces to be open out of hours.</p>
2.0 Panel Summary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel started by acknowledging the irony of change in use of the building; from preventing people from entering to encouraging people to visit. 2. The Panel felt that the applicants had chosen the best of the four options they presented in their initial presentation, but they think that it could be of benefit to add an additional entrance somewhere. 3. It was observed that the bubble diagram needs to be updated, as it refers to an older design option that is no longer relevant. 4. An important point that was established was the need to construct any new buildings as standalone buildings that are excellent in their own right, not just as an addition to the existing buildings. The Panel was concerned that the Archive building, which will be a new build, might be done to a lower standard than the rest of the site. The concern was that, if this is the case, the building would not age well and future generations of architects might opt to take it down and replace it. In order to be a valuable addition, the archive building will need to be a superb piece of work in its own right, rather than a necessary addition for the sake of the Museum. 5. The applicants were advised, in light of the hope that this development will be successful and improve the fortunes of the museum, to look at future opportunities for expansion, particularly the adjacent schoolhouse. 6. The Panel noted that the precedents that the applicants highlighted were all of extremely high quality, and the applicants would be expected to match that quality. 7. It was noted that the courtyard area is going to be vital to

	<p>the success of the site, and will need to be really high quality to form a worthwhile centrepiece.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. The Panel made a suggestion that it might be worth breaking the alley-side wall along the café in order to provide windows, or perhaps even an alternate entrance, to help draw customers in, as the alleyway is heavily trafficked. 9. The Panel congratulated the applicants on having a very sound strategic position, but said that what they need to do now is work out the finer details – They expressed their interest in this applicant and invited the applicants to return again at a later date, with a more detailed plan, to discuss it again.
	<p>Subsequent comments from meeting on 22nd April with Panel Member Adam Richards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Museums have conceptual affinities with surrealism: by taking objects out of their original situations and placing them in new ones, their meanings can be revealed and re-contextualised. This creates interesting opportunities and challenges for this site: the existing buildings already have distinct characters, Courthouse and Police Station so displaying the objects will need to be given a great deal of thought to work well. How the exhibits are set out/ presented will be critically important in such a small space with an increasingly large collection. Where each collection is shown will have an influence on the design of the building. The costumes will need more room and shouldn't necessarily be put upstairs to encourage movement through the building. It may be preferable to display the most dramatic & popular pieces at the start. 11. The courtyard is a strong element in the overall design concept. The quality of this space is particularly important and materials will have to be well considered. 12. The café building could be made more of and might 'read' as a building in its own right. 13. Introducing some sort of cloister or colonnade might help to tie the courtyard together 14. The entrances require more consideration, attention should be given to spacing and spatial character. There may be some security issues with the rear entrance off the alleyway. 15. Thoughts on temporary exhibition space need to consider re-hang time, so using the café might not work in practical terms. 16. The 'non-collection areas' of the museum seem somewhat baggy, whilst the galleries need more careful consideration-they are the most important part of the museum! 17. Although landscape/landscaping on the site does not appear to be a key component of the scheme at first glance, the opportunity should be taken to incorporate the South Downs National Park identity into the scheme. This could be done creatively and root the Museum firmly

	<p>in its wider NP landscape context.</p> <p>18. The visual link across the courtyard space between the cafe and the Edward Thomas archive is key. As a poet of landscape, the presence of his archive offers an opportunity to design a courtyard garden in a way that makes reference to the wider landscape of the South Downs.</p>
--	--