

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK DESIGN REVIEW PANEL**

Date of meeting:	18/4/2017
Site:	Arundel Lido, Queen Street, Arundel, West Sussex, BN18 9JG
Proposal:	New building, comprising Gym, Multi-function Hall, Heated Changing Rooms & Indoor Café
Planning reference:	SDNP/17/00804/PRE
Panel members sitting:	Graham Morrison CHAIR Kay Brown Luke Engelback Paul Fender Kim Wilkie
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Genevieve Hayes (Design Officer) Paul Slade (Support Services Officer) Richard Ferguson (Case Officer) Ruth Childs (Landscape Officer)
Observers:	Lisa Rues
Item presented by:	Adam Richards
Declarations of interest:	Adam Richards is a member of the Design Review Panel; therefore, he is known to all panel members present in a professional capacity.

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
<b>1.0 Discussion/Questions with applicants</b>	<p><b>1. The Panel asked whether the trees shown in the rendering were existing trees.</b> The Applicant said that the trees were presently aspirational, but an idea they wished to encourage. The applicant said that he appreciates that landscape advice is needed. <b>The Panel noted that the trees appear to be Pines, which don't tend to do well in wet environments like this.</b></p> <p><b>2. The Panel asked what the car park surface material would be.</b> The Applicant said that, unless additional funding is secured, it is likely that the existing car park surface will remain.</p> <p><b>3. The Panel asked if in their opinion the site would be able to sustain further development; they cited a recent Lido scheme in Richmond that is struggling to maintain its finances.</b> The Applicant said that a business plan is in place which does not indicate any financial issues. However, while they would be concerned about losing space, believe there is scope to develop further if needed.</p> <p><b>4. The Panel asked whether there might be an opportunity to reconsider the perimeter fences as the existing perimeter fence shuts off views into and out of the site. For example, if a reed bed was planted on the Lido side of the levy, with an iron rail fence or similar construction concealed amongst the reeds, it would help bring in views of the river. It would also provide for a more attractive natural environment at the perimeter and could even benefit some of the local fauna.</b> The Applicant agreed that this could be an extremely positive addition to the design and said that they would encourage their client to consider it. <b>The Panel suggested that the Applicant could look at ideas from 'natural swimming pools', which might help create a unique look.</b></p> <p><b>5. The Panel noted that the gym looks to be fairly small and questioned whether it would be large enough to support Arundel and whether there were any other gyms in Arundel.</b> The Applicant said that they did not know whether there were other gyms in Arundel and said that this needed further exploration. They noted that the planned move of the gym up to the first floor would give it some more space, which might be enough, but there were not many other options, and finances are limited.</p> <p><b>6. The Panel asked about the roof design, noting they didn't see any signs of guttering in images.</b> The Applicant explained that they were planning to use a combination of sloping rooves with hidden/internal</p>

	<p>downpipes to allow the roof to drain to the south end.</p> <p><b>7. The Panel asked about the relationship of the roof to the lower buildings.</b></p> <p>The Applicant said that they wanted to use parapet walls and keep the roof below the parapets to provide some flexibility in the roof. Additionally, the building is far enough away from any overlooking views that, by hiding it below the parapets, they'd be able to use a more cost effective material without having to worry too much about the aesthetic.</p>
<b>2.0 Panel Summary</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Panel started by saying that the scheme has their whole-hearted support, but there are still several points that need emphasis or further consideration.</li> <li>2. The Panel noted that a huge part of the landscape of the Lido is the car park. In particular, the car park is clearly visible when looking across the river from Arundel castle; during the summer, sunlight glinting off windscreens while the carpark is full could be a massive detriment to the view. The proposed tree planting will help screen that somewhat, but a more comprehensive plan of tree planting across the whole car park would be even better.</li> <li>3. The Panel feels that there is a general need for a more comprehensive landscape strategy across the whole site.</li> <li>4. More interaction with the river would benefit the proposal, with the suggestion of reed beds containing hidden fences being encouraged.</li> <li>5. The Panel encouraged the Applicant to consider a SUDS or similar system in order to effectively recycle water, as water should be a key element of the scheme.</li> <li>6. Creation of a masterplan was recommended, not necessarily because the Lido should aspire to further development, but as a demonstration of long term viability and sustainability.</li> <li>7. The Panel noted that the surfacing of the car park is not reflected in the graphics provided, which could be misleading if there's no plan to change the surfacing.</li> <li>8. The Panel recommended consideration of the possibility of the car park being used as a market area and/or other alternative uses for the car park.</li> <li>9. The Panel noted that there was very little mention of the lane/route on the west side of the car park which leads to the town centre.</li> <li>10. The Panel asked whether the question about the size of the gym could be resolved by including an external, open air gym area. A further development of that would be the possibility that the tow path could be brought into use for jogging and similar activities.</li> <li>11. The Panel noted that the scalloped wall helps to make it look like a single wall from either side, cleverly concealing the building between the walls.</li> <li>12. The Panel noted how the horizontal gutter slopes towards the ridge and inclines towards the castle, which they appreciate is not accidental and feel is a well-considered move.</li> <li>13. The Panel said that they liked the image of a "Heavy" building, with thick walls, as it provides a sense of gravity to the building, but noted that there was some friction between</li> </ol>

	<p>that look and the thin, fragile looking windows.</p> <p>14. The 'sloppy mortar' that can be seen on the building in the graphics feels like it could be an element of fashion; The Panel feel that although it might seem like a good idea now, they might come to regret it down the line, and should therefore look at alternatives such as a Roman brick course.</p> <p>15. The Panel think that the Zinc roof and rain pipes could work, especially if they are done as well as the roof at Ditchling Museum.</p> <p>16. The Panel suggested considering other recreational activities, like fishing or boating.</p> <p>17. Finally, the Panel welcomed the planned massing of the proposal, as they felt that a two story building worked well on that site.</p>
--	--