

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

Date of meeting:	23/01/2020
Site:	Glyndebourne, The Opera House, New Road, Ringmer BN8 5UU
Proposal:	Erection of a new dining pavilion on the croquet lawn.
Planning reference:	SDNP/19/06165/FUL
Panel members sitting:	Mark Penfold (Chair) Robyn Butcher Luke Engleback Paul Fender Nicholas Pople
SDNPA officers in attendance:	Ben Terry (Design Officer) Jessica Riches (Case Officer) Nikki Allen (Support Services Officer) Tania Hunt (Support Services Officer)
SDNPA Planning Committee in attendance:	None
Item presented by:	Duncan Baker-Brown (Architect) Donna Marsh (Director of Customer Experience, Glyndebourne) Kevin Martin (Head Gardener, Glyndebourne)
Declarations of interest:	None

**The South Downs National Park Design Review Panel is an independent assessment of development proposals by a panel of multidisciplinary professionals and experts, who aim to inform and improve design quality in new development. It is not intended to replace advice from the planning authority or statutory consultees and advisory bodies, or be a substitute for local authority design and landscape skills or community engagement**

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.

Case Officer requests to the panel:

1. Although a living roof is not possible could a living wall at the rear elevation be considered?
2. Can an improved drainage strategy be incorporated into the design?
3. Pergola roof – would like to see if this could be addressed as it encloses space\*

Panel questions to case officer:

1. Confirmation of where Listed Building is, in relation to the site?
2. Will the windows will be looking on to a (bare) hedge?

Questions from Panel

1. Does the building need to conform to building regulations?  
Yes, the design and its construction will conform to Building Regulations
2. What will the roof be made of?  
The roof is single ply membrane with oyster concrete for the copings and cornices.
3. Where will the materials be sourced from?  
All materials will be from site e.g. grass for growing the Mycelium and Lobster shells for the aggregate, all made on site. A wind turbine on site will provide a sustainable energy source for the new building.
4. Do you still have the 'sloping' ceiling? How will the glue laminated timber work with that, do the timbers taper?  
Yes, we will incorporate a sloping ceiling. The glulam beams are horizontal, but a secondary ceiling, with textile will be used to create a false perspective when entering the room; the glue laminated timber will be visible between the fabric.
5. If the roof followed the line of the ceiling wouldn't it make the structure easier?  
Not necessarily – Stretched fabric lower where you come in. Primary structure is straightforward, secondary structure with the textile – its all about the interior architecture.
6. Can the roof be a living roof?  
The oyster shells could become colonised by plants and become biodiverse but it's not what the client wants. Due to proximity of trees it's not possible for the roof to be a living roof without a lot of maintenance.  
  
Also the white roof is needed to reflect the sun to stop the pavilion overheating. Shells are sitting on top of the membrane so will need to be careful to ensure the membrane roof does not get punctured.
7. Can the pavilion be seen from anywhere nearby?  
Basically, no. Non-public area of house windows would overlook but nothing else.
8. Will the Yew hedges that are currently bare grow back?  
The hedges were cut back for rejuvenation purposes and should grow back, south facing hedges will grow back the quickest.
9. Is there storage for the tables and chairs if using the pavilion for a different purpose?  
Yes, storage is already provided in existing buildings.

\*Pergola omitted from design

## Summary

1. Your proposal is supported by the Design Review Panel
2. Panel suggested changing the orientation of the entrance to the pavilion to be on the diagonal and glaze the corner and recess the door to improve the relationship with the 'gathering area'. It will create a better environment and circulation of people from the garden to the pavilion. It also gives the opportunity to expand in the future. Setting up the route for the future
3. Panel suggested incorporating water at the rear of the pavilion, maybe through a trough design, which will be considered by the applicant. Possibly made with the Oyster shells. (Need to consider possible trip hazard over a water feature)
4. The Panel suggested including a masterplan (for the wider site) with the application, to illustrate how the development links to existing and future proposals