

Review of proposed retail, leisure and library development including a public square and public realm improvements, Kendray St/ May Day Green/ Cheapside, Barnsley town centre, (pre-application).

Attendees

Tom Lonsdale	- CABE Enabler and Landscape Architect (Chair)
Robin Machell	- Architect
Robert Powell	- Placemaker/ Public Arts
Chris Wyatt	- Barnsley Civic Trust
Richard King	- Arts, Museums and Archives, BMBC
Councillor Miller	- Cabinet Spokesperson for Place, BMBC

Two members of the panel declared an expression of interest in the proposals- Chris was the former head of regeneration for the council and was involved in the former Barnsley markets scheme and Richard King was part of the Remaking Barnsley Team which dealt with the former markets scheme.

Presentation (Introduced by Marcus Wilshere of IBI Taylor Young & Lloyd Carp of NPS)

The presenters are producing a feasibility study for Barnsley Town Centre, the brief for which is to take a fresh look at the town centre and its markets area. This area includes The Metropolitan Centre, Central Offices, May Day Green, the multi-storey car park, the TEC building, the CEAG site and the Carpet World building.

They are producing a prospectus containing ideas and vision for the public and for prospective developers. This will not be a masterplan but it will include a framework on how the cutting and carving up of this part of the town centre will occur. This will include the demolition of central offices and the markets building, the provision of a new library, a new car park on the CEAG site, and a possible replacement of the Jumble Lane railway crossing with a footbridge link.

They will be publishing the prospectus in July. Nothing is cast in stone yet. In parallel they are looking at the brief for the new library and the design of car parking areas. A drop in shop for public consultation will open soon. They have done a series of workshops with stakeholders in order to inform the prospectus.

Historically the market was in a highly visible and central location in the town centre, in May Day Green. However in the 1960's with the building of the Metropolitan Centre connecting routes were truncated and the markets were located behind retail uses and underneath a multi-storey car park. In terms of pedestrians moving through this area became 'dead'. The recent Barnsley Town Centre Public Spaces Strategy contains a footfall map for the town centre showing that Cheapside goes 'cold'. There is not much pedestrian penetration into the site generally and connection to the nearest residential hinterland is severed by the railway crossing.

They have carried out a building structure survey, which included investigating the undercroft basement used for service vehicles. There are expansion joints in the buildings and these are the logical cut off points for 'carving' the buildings. It is

intended to retain the undercroft but demolish the multi-storey car park above it. Options looked at include refurbishing the Metropolitan Centre, demolishing Central Offices and the TEC building, extending the Metropolitan Centre on its north side, bringing the markets forward to the face of the building and redeveloping the May Day Green buildings. With the potential closure of the Jumble Lane railway crossing, (facilitated by the proposed new footbridge over the railway), there is the potential for development to the east.

Two major constraints on the site are Sough Dyke, (a culverted river), and changes in levels, (there is a two storey drop between Cheapside and the railway line).

The vision for the town centre states that it needs to be more than just retail- it needs to incorporate leisure and civic functions (including the new library), employment, events and activities, the transport interchange, education (including college activities), and residential, (in the longer term). There needs to be a development of the evening economy.

Feedback gained from library users was that they wanted their new library to collate with other services. The IBI Group have experience of mixed use buildings through designing the St Peter's integrated health and leisure centre in Burnley, (a combined leisure and primary care centre).

They are creating new pedestrian routes and spaces to help improve connectivity. These include a footbridge from a new car park, (on the former CEAG site), linking through towards Queen Street and Cheapside, and the creation of a new public square adjacent to Kendray Street, where routes converge, with a connection through to Lambra Road, (to the south), to help maximise footfall. For the plan of the new public space the presenters superimposed the market place in Ashton and Millennium Square in Leeds to show its relative scale. It would be big enough to hold an outside market.

Design Panel comments/ discussion

The panel noted that the proposed route from Lambra Rd will be providing a main service access and will also provide a pedestrian route to the scheme. The panel asked how will the conflict between heavy goods vehicles and pedestrians be minimised? It was responded that deliveries will be peel off to the undercroft quickly and it is not anticipated that there will be huge numbers of pedestrians using this route. The panel thought that although this new route will help bypass the current block of the Alhambra Shopping Centre to help increase pedestrian connectivity from the south, (especially after 5pm), it needs to be asked if what is being created is a road with pedestrians on it or a pedestrian space.

The panel asked if there a demand from retailers and developers for this scheme? The presenters responded that this is a market testing option. In terms of the viability of the market the council's Town Centre Services Manager responded that the current market is 97% let.

The panel stated that there was a need to look at wider traffic management issues in the town centre and connections to this site, especially to the square. How flexible can changes to Kendray Street be? Could the adjacent taxi rank, (on Midland Street), and taxi movements, (either along Kendray street or through Jumble Lane level crossing), be changed? Could the public space south of the Transport Interchange

be extended further south? The panel commented that Kendray Street currently feels like neither one space nor another

Although Barnsley has a compact town centre there is a major spatial variation in pedestrian footfall. There is a need to be look at what might be located here, where are the gaps in current uses and facilities? Where are current services located? To further help with footfall there is a need to look at adjacent entrances and connections to the adjacent Alhambra shopping Centre.

The proposed site for the new library is just off Eldon Street, with its main front elevation forming a backdrop to the new public square. It is proposed to integrate family and adult learning facilities within the library building which will help to bring in further evening activity to the library. The panel asked if there was the opportunity to lever more services into this building and to look at what can be done around the library. It was noted that in Wakefield, Doncaster and York they have brought services and offices together, offering customers and staff efficiencies. Wakefield Library has 40% more footfall now it is located in a new, mixed use building housing a museum, council offices and business support services.

The panel noted that although residential uses were talked about as potentially being located by the square there appeared to be no sense of commitment to it. The panel thought that the setting of the square itself would be a 'good offer' in terms of delivering homes that people would want to purchase. Town centre living is lacking in Barnsley and this would help to make this a completely 'rounded' square. There were also opportunities to look at health care/ extra care facilities and restaurants facing the square.

The presenters responded that at this feasibility stage they were trying to be unprescriptive for the end uses around the square. However the panel felt that there needed to be a bit of certainty. There is a need to create a civic square with responsive buildings and uses framing it, rather than asking developers 'what can you do for us' and then forming the setting for the square from the responses.

On the former CEAG site the car park environment and the bridge itself have got to be great- the latter needs to be a genuine, high quality link to the refreshed market and new square. Certainly if you want restaurants locating in the scheme links to car parking are critical. The panel stated that a lot of car parks are not lit and this does not help encourage an evening economy in town centres.

The presenters stated that the current budget for the scheme does not include the building of the bridge, it is more of a long term aspiration and would involve a lot of further negotiation with Network Rail- the bridge proposal is a long way off realisation. The panel noted that the Advanced Learning Centres at Penistone and Wombwell both budgeted for and built pedestrian bridges as an integral part of their developments.

The panel noted that the existing undercoft is huge. Certainly providing parking below ground level is well precedented in mainland Europe and Canada. Usually this is expensive to dig but here is already exists.

For the square there needs to be more investigation as to what it might it look like- for example in terms of its gradient and orientation. It is a south facing square south sheltered from south westerly winds. Kendray Street is on a steep rake. Whilst the square looks convincing in 2D it could be challenging in 3D due to this fall.

There is a need to answer more questions about the square- there needs to be more clarity on the diagram to ensure it becomes a dramatic space otherwise it will become a piecemeal design process and it may not happen. There needs to be more clarity regarding the location of solids and voids around the square.

If music and events are to be held in the public square the panel would recommend putting all the technical support gear underground, as designed at Millennium Square in Leeds.

There are big questions to be asked about the relationship of the proposed development and the adjacent railway.

For the creation of the square there are three fundamental questions- how do you deal with or alter the traffic on Kendray Street?, what is the outline of the basement underneath the square?, (can it be retained?), and how do you resolve the fall on Kendray Street, (are you creating a plateau with two sloping sides?). Furthermore there is the constraint of Sough Dyke.

The existing ribbed concrete structures make the town centre feel quite cluttered and the spaces lack a sense of pride. This is seen as an opportunity to de-clutter the town centre. In terms of the proposal for glazing buildings the panel admired the examples shown of glazing in Copenhagen. It was noted that glass is rooted in history of the town. The panel noted that the council had commissioned a public arts strategy for the town centre which should help further in creating distinctive public spaces and structures.

The panel stated that Barnsley town centre lacks trees and that there is a need for a green vision and plan.

To summarise, the timing of this presentation, at such an early design stage, is much appreciated, enabling the panel to help fine tune the projection of a design trajectory. The presentation demonstrated a very good and sound analysis, a proper urban analysis with lots of good content. In making a framework for the site the 'big strokes' of creating the square and improving the permeability of the scheme were along the right track and the panel like the idea of retaining the undercroft.

Whilst the panel have been presented with a persuasive 2-D diagram there are two other dimensions still to be looked at- the third dimension of topography etc. and the fourth dimension of time. In terms of time there needs to be a series of short to medium term big aspirations. If you start delivering but not there is not an aspiration then this can be very dangerous. Big aspirations need to be pursued with real determination and build deliverability around the 'do-able', saying to all stakeholders- these are the big moves, please confirm that they are laudable. However, it is appreciated that this is not in the immediate gift of the council.

If the CEAG site car parking feeder and the bridge don't happen the scheme is in trouble.

Whilst there is great support for the principle of the urban square and its public space its accessibility and orientation etc. appears untested.

The visibility of the market is critical.

Concerning the duality of access from the south for pedestrians and heavy goods vehicles along Lambra Road it is very poor at the moment if it remains poor it will drag the development down.

The proposals for residential development appear to be a pipe dream in the background and look timid as presented. If this use is desirable to the town centre then the sooner these proposals are firmed up the more likely they can be successfully integrated into the scheme.

There is a need for a broader bringing together of all contextual issues. There is a need to broker a deal with the owners of the adjacent Alhambra Shopping Centre sooner rather than later.

There needs to be more analysis of how the pedestrian connections and vehicular connections will work and connect to other civic uses.

The panel endorse civic de-cluttering and would like to see a green vision for the town centre. They endorse the use of glass, helping to celebrate the glassmaking history within the borough.

Design Panel recommendations:

- **Look at wider traffic management issues in the town centre and connections to this site, especially with regards to the proposed square.**
- **Develop a series of short and medium term big aspirations. This is vital to the success and robustness of the scheme. Big aspirations need to be pursued with real determination and build deliverability around the 'do-able'.**
- **Look at the opportunity to lever more services into, or adjacent to, the proposed new library.**
- **Provide more firmness to the proposals for residential uses facing the square. Look at the potential for extra care / health facilities.**
- **Ensure that the proposed car park and bridge environment offer a high quality, welcoming impression, as this is critical to the success of the scheme.**
- **Investigate the gradient and orientation of the square and the impact of: the traffic on Kendray Street, the basement underneath the square and the fall of Kendray Street. Provide more clarity regarding uses and the in the location of solids and voids around the square. There needs to be more clarity on the diagrams to ensure the square becomes a dramatic space.**
- **Look into the quality of the pedestrian environment for the southern access route, (also proposed to be used by heavy goods vehicles).**
- **Develop a green vision for the town centre**

Second review of proposed retail, leisure and library development including a public square and public realm improvements, Kendray St/ May Day Green/ Cheapside, Barnsley town centre, (pre-application). (First reviewed on 9th June 2014).

Attendees

Tom Lonsdale	- CABE Enabler and Landscape Architect (Chair)
Robin Machell	- Architect
Robert Powell	- Placemaker/ Public Arts
Paul Testa	- Architect
Simon Chadwick	- Architect
Allen Parks	- Barnsley Civic Trust
Graham Roberts	- Placemaker/ Public Arts
Chris Wyatt	- Former Regeneration Manager at BMBC
Richard King	- Arts, Museums and Archives, BMBC

Two members of the panel declared an expression of interest in the proposals- Chris was the former head of regeneration for the council and was involved in the former Barnsley markets scheme and Richard was part of the Remaking Barnsley Team which dealt with the former markets scheme.

The format of the notes for this second review is as follows:

topic heading

- **recommendation(s) from the first review (NB: none if a new topic)**

the presentation

discussion and views of the panel

and at the end of the notes:

- **recommendations from the second review**

The presentation for this second review was by Seamus Lennon of IBI Taylor Young.

Latest stage/ future reviews

Due to external pressures there has been a need to accelerate the initial design stage as an outline planning application is due to be submitted in May 2015. In terms of the RIBA 'plan of work' they are currently at stage 2- concept design.

The outline planning application will be with all matters reserved and will enable some flexibility of land uses. One of the aims of the application is to help to attract external investment. A retail investment study has been completed and the general feedback is that this is a more appropriate scheme than the previous proposals for the redevelopment of Barnsley Markets.

The red line boundary for the outline planning application includes the TEC building, the bridge link over the railway, central offices, May Day Green shops, the Met centre, the multi-storey car park and carpet world building. It does not include the

adjacent CEAG site, which has now been granted planning permission for a use as a car park to serve the wider scheme. In terms of phasing the first tasks will be demolishing central offices and decanting the semi-covered market. The new library building is the first bit of the masterplan to be committed.

The previous prospectus contained a series of projects and hand drawn sketches for general community consultation. The current masterplan contains more defined plot sizes but doesn't stipulate fixed end uses; instead it gives a flexible framework. The fundamentals of the layout and massing will be fixed by the outline approval. Whilst the architecture can still be 'massaged' there will be limited room to alter the fundamentals of the layout. The budget won't extend to across the northern edge of Kendray Street.

The panel asked what percentage of the scheme has funding? Is there a danger that as occurred at Bradford there will just be a hole in the ground for a long time? It was responded that there is £50 million of council funding which is 50% of the total cost of the scheme. At Bradford Council signed up to Westfield early on but here, with the collapse of 1249, Barnsley Council is getting on with schemes and doing all it can to de-risk it.

The panel requested that any future review of the scheme has a tighter agenda of looking at how public realm comes together, (including the railway crossing), and then, as a different part of agenda looking at the overall massing and architecture, (as appropriate to the stage of each of the buildings).

Movement patterns (including pedestrian)

- **Look at wider traffic management issues in the town centre and connections to this site, especially with regards to the proposed square.**

The site is really the whole town centre, bounded by the railway and ring road.

Historically this site has always been a single use. Maps from the 1950's show it as one site for industry with no routes through. In the late 60's/70's/80's the town centre focused on Cheapside and turned its back on the railway. The Metropolitan Centre and its car park cut off connections to the east and the Alhambra centre cut off connections to the south. With a separation of uses into zones with clear separation of offices and retail, and a pedestrianised zone where everything stops south and east, the town centre has suffered as a result.

There is a strong desire from Network Rail to close Jumble Lane crossing and the council really want to close it. The proposed bridge replacing the crossing will be 4m wide. (More details of the bridge are given in the later section 'car park and bridge')

The architects are aiming to change the 'heat map' of pedestrian activity in the town centre, focussing more footfall into the site and encouraging the natural movement of people into the square, with several routes converging here. To help encourage people movement from the Alhambra Shopping Centre an extension of New Street has been created leading into the site. There is future development potential on the Doncaster Road cul-de-sac which is located south of the proposed pedestrian linking to Lambra Road.

The panel stated they were heartened by new return leg of New Street and the great ambition for the new square. However there was concern that Kendray Street cuts

the public square off from Interchange and also that the new pedestrian link to the south, to Lambra Road, peters out at its end- there appears to be just an assumption that something will happen here.

The panel asked how will the new bridge cope on football match days with thousands of people pouring into the town centre after a match through this route? There is an intense use of the current level crossing for half an hour every two weeks. The panel were seriously nervous about decanting people through a car park, people congregating at the base of the stairs and bottlenecks occurring on the proposed stairway and bridge deck. It was noted that the bridge deck will be one quarter the width of the current level crossing. Sarah McHale stated that the police had been consulted about the proposed bridge crossing.

The panel stated that there is an urgent need to get the fundamentals of this crossing resolved- this is pivotal to the whole scheme. Whilst there is talk of a desire of closure/ a probable closure the layouts being presented are as if the crossing will still be active in the future. Someone has got to bite the bullet- the crossing either remains or it closes and changes are made to the public realm so it doesn't read as a blocked route/ a barrier. There needs to be discussions at the highest level between the Council's Chief Executive and their equivalent at Network Rail.

A comprehensive analytical appraisal of all movement implications is the most urgent task of all [the](#) scheme. It's more than just the bridge- it's everything. A design exercise for the wider area is needed. This will impact on, for example, the behaviour and trafficking of Kendray Street, pedestrian use to the north of Kendray Street and the Interchange and the floor plane treatment of Kendray Street.

Aspirations

- **Develop a series of short and medium term big aspirations. This is vital to the success and robustness of the scheme. Big aspirations need to be pursued with real determination and build deliverability around the 'do-able'.**

No aspirations were presented further to that given in the first review.

Mix of uses

- **Look at the opportunity to lever more services into, or adjacent to, the proposed new library.**
- **Provide more firmness to the proposals for residential uses facing the square. Look at the potential for extra care / health facilities.**

Adjoining the library building to the south will be retail; current discussions are being held with WH Smith- their store would have a good synergy with the library. Sites framing the north and east of the square are also set aside for retail. Framing the southern side of the square will be the Market Hall. One of the influences of the library in terms of its content and design are the [Ideas Store](#) located in Tower Hamlets, London. (The ideas stores put a library, cafe, adult education classes and computer access all under one roof.)

The proposals include a new multiplex cinema and associated restaurants, located along the new north-south pedestrian link. Although planning permission has been granted for a cinema complex to be located on top of the Alhambra Shopping Centre (at the edge of the town centre) this new site will be better linked to the town centre.

Whilst there are no proposals for residential or extra care/ health facilities within the site there were potential future opportunities outside the immediate site boundary. David Shepherd, The Assistant Director for Economic Regeneration & Development, stated that he did not think this site was suitable for residential use.

Better Barnsley has been billed as more than retailing but this scheme has only got a library and a cinema. It was asked if these by themselves will generate enough activity after 5/5:30pm?, (the time when the town centre currently becomes deserted). How can we encourage more users in the evening to bring the benefits of a night time economy? What if the cinema doesn't even go ahead, is there a need for a wider range of use classes?

The panel expressed a 'real yearning' for a residential scheme or extra care/ health care in the immediate vicinity for footfall and vitality. A new residential element would give the advantages of added footfall for the town centre, provide natural surveillance and a 24/7 use. It was pointed out that putting back residential uses into central Bradford has been a roaring success. There are also precedents in Copenhagen which have six storeys of residential use above retail. Residential use needs pushing.

Whilst there is talk of future 'potential' residential uses in the wider area we have got to grasp the real issue now, otherwise it won't happen. We have got to ask 'how do we link to potential residential sites, how would they fit into the rest of the jigsaw?' We do not want to miss opportunities at this early stage.

Regarding the library the panel stated that the ideas store concept is now 15 years old, so the architects can afford to be a little more intuitive.

Car park and bridge

- **Ensure that the proposed car park and bridge environment offer a high quality, welcoming impression, as this is critical to the success of the scheme.**

Further to the previous review the full planning application for the car park (on the neighbouring former CEAG site) has now been approved by the Council.

Regarding the bridge link over the railway, connecting to the square, only the landing area for the bridge was shown in the application, with no further details of the bridge. The bridge will be 4m wide bridge- a generous width giving a sign that you have 'arrived.' Stairs and a lift will be based on the CEAG site, whilst the bridge lands at grade level to the square. The bridge enables the closure of the level crossing which is ranked by Network Rail as the 17th/19th most dangerous in the country.

The existing brick wall and railings facing Jumble Lane will be replaced with concrete walls in two places, by the main vehicular entrance to the car park and by a secondary pedestrian access. The concrete walling will contain text.

More details of the proposed lighting of the huge retaining wall were presented, (located on the site's eastern boundary). Downlighting will be inset into the concrete

grooves of the wall, connected to sensors to move the lighting scheme in time with traffic movement at the top of the wall along Harborough Hill Road. This will give an optimistic impression of the town for railway users at night.

The use of the site as a car park may be a temporary measure with the potential of built development on the site at a later date.

The panel expressed concerns about decanting people through a car park and the capacity of the bridge. (These have been classed under the topic heading 'movement patterns' above.)

Public realm and responsiveness of buildings to the public realm

- **Investigate the gradient and orientation of the square and the impact of: the traffic on Kendray Street, the basement underneath the square and the fall of Kendray Street. Provide more clarity regarding uses and the in the location of solids and voids around the square. There needs to be more clarity on the diagrams to ensure the square becomes a dramatic space.**

The panel were shown a historical photo of the former market square which was a strongly framed urban space with good spatial and architectural qualities. The architects are looking to create a new public square, a civic space for meeting. The existing basement determines the levels of the new square.

They have done a spatial comparison with other squares such as Ashton, Nottingham and Hereford. From these reference projects they have taken the need for inherent internal flexibility within the square and the importance of how the edges of the square are dealt with.

They have shown strong edges onto the square. The public realm budget won't stretch to the far northern edge of Kendray Street.

The drawings show the beginnings of the idea of a square with landscape elements of trees and benches shown. The topography falls away to Jumble Lane and they have created a flattish plateau with generous steps, the steps have been modelled on [those connecting](#) the ICA to the Mall in London, (they are slow and gentle steps).

The space created is big for a town of this size. They have 'closed in' the square more as it the previous proposal was too open. Buildings are aligned with the structures below. The market stalls have been pulled up north in the square, to try to reflect the natural movement of people. The market stalls will be similar to the ones currently in Queen Street. They are intending to make reference in the design to Sough Dike, (a culvert river running under the square).

The panel expressed concern that whilst the public realm is the lifeblood of this scheme and Barnsley the details were being left until later- 'the public realm is not going to work by leaving until later for details'.

Fundamentally town centres are where people choose to do things. The relationship of indoor and outdoor realms influences the edges of space. The public realm has a major role to play in helping to move pedestrian activity from Cheapside to the square. Whilst the north east side of Cheapside gets very good sunlight, Kendray Street is draughty and faces the wrong way. Having the outdoor market located in the

square will substantially change this space. The indoor market will spill out onto shade and there is a need to question if pushing the stalls to the north is right. There needs to be much more explanation of the whole square and how it works in terms of people behaviour, comfort and microclimate.

In terms of public realm expertise the panel stated that they didn't sense that the [Architect's in-house](#) landscape designers' input was strong in the presentation.

The end product of Kendray Street will influence the square but Kendray Street as shown is a lost cause. It was suggested that maybe there needs to be something [between](#) the street and square, like the pavilion at Manchester's Piccadilly Gardens, which services the outdoor space. The nature of the ground floor use on Cheapside will determine what can be done on Cheapside. Regarding the Lambra road link the southern end is pretty dire and now is the time to ask can it be done in another way.

There are tremendous opportunities for placemaking. The council has already adopted a public art strategy and the introduction of suitably qualified artists at this stage could bring creativity to the designs of the spaces and buildings and further enhance the idea of movement through the spaces. Lighting could feed strongly into the design. It was pointed out that for the Ashford shared space scheme, (which combines art, environment and engineering), one person did the whole lighting.

Connections from/ to the south

- **Look into the quality of the pedestrian environment for the southern access route, (also proposed to be used by heavy goods vehicles).**

The road that runs adjacent to the railway line will just be used by service vehicles- it connects to the basement level servicing.

The panel stated that whilst there starts to be a connection to the south, giving a vista down Lambra Road, it leads to a bit of a no man's land.

Green Vision

- **Develop a green vision for the town centre**

Regarding trees, those currently in front of the library will be lost due to the demolition of existing buildings on the site. However, the general aim is to try to keep as many existing trees in the town centre as possible. Once the stalls are moved out of their temporary locations in the town centre, (on Queen Street, Cheapside/ New Street and Peel Square), there will be an opportunity to plant new trees.

The panel stated that there needs to be an objective assessment of existing vegetation and why some retained and why some go. They were not looking for sentiments of 'keeping a tree' but rather a more qualitative assessment. This assessment needs to be done sooner rather than later. The development doesn't want to look like an alien development that has just landed.

Massing

In terms of massing generally the buildings will be between two and three storeys, based on an analysis of requirements from potential occupiers. For example for Cheapside the requirement from retailers is for three storeys with ground and first floors for sales and second floors for storage. This would result in more enclosed structures than at present, (with reference to the existing external walkways).

The panel asked how fixed is the massing at this stage; will the massing be included in the outline planning application? It was responded that the application will contain a parameter plan which will describe the height with a variation of plus/ minus 3m. One panel member stated that from this the massing proposals appeared quite fixed.

The panel expressed a desire to see the massing of the scheme at this stage of the design; 'the massing is an early door fundamental'. The panel asked for a simple sketch up model, so they could get a proper sense of how the massing and scale of the proposals knit into the existing urban context of the town centre. The concept plan as presented also needs to include the number of storeys for each proposal.

Architecture

The architects want to fundamentally transform the appearance of the town centre.

In terms of materials currently ribbed concrete is ubiquitous to the site with four large buildings clad in it. Modelling gives some variation within the large building forms, with cantilevered canopies, terraces and stairways.

Reference projects for the new market building include: Torvehallerne market in Copenhagen, which has an optimistic character where the architecture is downplayed and the focus is on the produce, similar to Borough Market in London (which is a three storey glass structure which gives a public space to the street) ; [Milwaukee](#) public market, which has managed to [attract higher](#) income earners and has overcome the snobbishness sometimes preventing their use; and a market in Munich which gives retail presence but at the same time is not overbearing. They are looking to use concrete in a contemporary way in the market building.

Reference projects for the new library were those using expansive glass for openness and transparency, for example the [Ideas Store](#) in Tower Hamlets. The library will be a three and a half storey building with a usable roof. They are looking to have a hierarchy within the architecture with large planes on ground level, with smaller planes as [they](#) go private on top. Barnsley's sandstone buildings similarly have a vertical hierarchy with distinct bottoms, middles and tops. The use of extensive glass is contextual to Barnsley due to its glassmaking industry roots. The library is seen as a lantern, as a key building of the redevelopment proposals.

In the use of reconstituted stone on other buildings they are trying to match the tone of the terracotta to existing buildings in the town centre.

Regarding the library building the panel stated that glass is 70% reflective; whilst glass look great externally at night when illuminated from within, it looks much darker during the daytime. The panel [referred to](#) the example of the glass building next to Manchester's Central Library. It was responded that the library would not be a minimal glass box but with its bronze anodised vertical fins it will be a building of substance and mass.

The panel stated that with the images presented of the proposed buildings they didn't feel that the 'flavour' of Barnsley and the uniqueness of Barnsley have been captured. 'There are some fantastic honeycomb coloured buildings in Barnsley'.

*The panel asked what the view from the railway will be like- the design needs to address the passengers of **the** railway- it's the frontage of the town from Leeds and Sheffield. If it's all yards and bins it's going to give a poor impression. This view has got to give an optimistic impression of the town centre.*

Once the public realm and massing are right, this will then be the appropriate time to 'chew' on the architecture. The panel stated a need to make the architecture as Barnsley as possible.

Design Panel recommendations:

- **Identify more clearly the short, medium and long term aspirations for the town centre. This is vital to the success and robustness of the scheme. Big aspirations need to be pursued with real determination and build deliverability around the 'do able'**
- **Carry out a comprehensive analytical appraisal of all movement implications. Make a decision on the railway crossing staying/ going.**
- **Investigate to a greater extent the potential residential uses or extra care/ health facilities within the scheme/ the wider area bounding the scheme.**
- **Explain much more the whole square and how it works in terms of people behaviour, comfort and microclimate and the vehicle access remaining.**
- **Look at opportunities for enhancing placemaking and people movement through the design of the public realm. Develop the details of the public realm now rather than later.**
- **Develop a 'green vision' for the town centre. Provide a more qualitative assessment of existing/ previously existing planting and trees and future opportunities as part of a strategic plan.**
- **Develop a simple sketch up model of the massing of the scheme and how it will fit into its surroundings.**
- **Show how the proposed design for the library will look during the day. Show realistically in this image how transparent the glass will look in real life.**
- **Look at what the proposed view from the railway will be like to ensure it gives a positive impression.**
- **Ensure that the architecture, whilst being contemporary, reflects much more the existing positive qualities of architecture in Barnsley Town Centre.**

Third review of proposed retail, leisure and library development including a public square and public realm improvements, Kendray St/ May Day Green/ Cheapside, Barnsley town centre, (pre-reserved matters application). (First review 9th June 2014, second review 21st April 2015).

Attendees

Tom Lonsdale	- CABE Enabler and Landscape Architect (Chair)
Robin Machell	- Architect
Robert Powell	- Placemaker/ Public Arts
Paul Testa	- Architect
Simon Chadwick	- Architect
Allen Parks	- Barnsley Civic Trust
Councillor Miller	- BMBC
Richard King	- Arts, Museums and Archives, BMBC

One member of the panel had an expression of interest in the proposals- Richard was part of the Remaking Barnsley Team in the Council which dealt with the former markets scheme.

Design Panel recommendations from the second review:

- **Identify more clearly the short, medium and long term aspirations for the town centre. This is vital to the success and robustness of the scheme. Big aspirations need to be pursued with real determination and build deliverability around the 'do able'**
- **Carry out a comprehensive analytical appraisal of all movement implications. Make a decision on the railway crossing staying/ going.**
- **Investigate to a greater extent the potential residential uses or extra care/ health facilities within the scheme/ the wider area bounding the scheme.**
- **Explain much more the whole square and how it works in terms of people behaviour, comfort and microclimate and the vehicle access remaining.**
- **Look at opportunities for enhancing placemaking and people movement through the design of the public realm. Develop the details of the public realm now rather than later.**
- **Develop a 'green vision' for the town centre. Provide a more qualitative assessment of existing/ previously existing planting and trees and future opportunities as part of a strategic plan.**
- **Develop a simple sketch up model of the massing of the scheme and how it will fit into its surroundings.**

- **Show how the proposed design for the library will look during the day. Show realistically in this image how transparent the glass will look in real life.**
- **Look at what the proposed view from the railway will be like to ensure it gives a positive impression.**
- **Ensure that the architecture, whilst being contemporary, reflects much more the existing positive qualities of architecture in Barnsley Town Centre.**

Introduction *(presented by Seamus Lennon of IBI Taylor Young and Jeremy Sykes of BMBC (client representative)).*

This presentation focusses on what the council has direct control over; once a development partner is appointed the rest of the scheme will be fleshed out. The council is keen to press ahead with the elements of the scheme it can quickly progress and is working closely with leisure and retail operators. For example for site DS5 the council looking for development partner for the cinema, sites DS6 and 7 are potential extensions to the Alhambra shopping mall, helping to create a retail circuit.

Design work on the Met Centre/ Markets and the Library is currently at concept design stage, (RIBA plan of work stage 2). There are huge constraints on redeveloping the Met Centre/ markets building as it uses heavily reinforced concrete. Design work on the public realm is currently lagging behind as we are still mapping the underground constraints, (basements and old ground slabs). This constraint is proving to be a huge issue and is currently limiting the scope of design work, however more information is being gained as the demolition of central offices continues. For the design of the new square we can only currently look at best practice examples.

Current key dates are the bringing in of high cranes for the demolition of central offices in November and the start of the redevelopment of the CEAG site into a car park, the latter being the first 'set piece'. The rest of the redevelopment will follow between two and four years, with elements dependent on each other time wise.

The panel were presented with a large scale card model and 1:25 sections and elevations of the proposed redeveloped Met Centre/ Markets, which all showed the massing of the building.

It is very important to the council to bringing back a sense of pride through its market and several principles are guiding the Met.Centre/ Market redevelopment:

1. Ensuring that the market is at its heart and is highly visible from the street.
2. Activating the building on all 4 sides, (currently only 2 sides are activated).
3. Ensuring transparency, (currently it is closed in its architecture; there is a need to strip it back both inside and outside).
4. Having a strong architectural presence. Removing the very dated brush hammered concrete finish and having a more contextual design.
5. Having a development that is unique to Barnsley; the council want a development that is reflection of town rather than a retail led/ market solution.
6. Reaching a high standard of sustainability by gaining a rating of 'BREEAM very good'.

The panel were shown the CGI's used in the outline planning application, (although it was noted that these were only illustrative images). Looking down Cheapside and the market they illustrate how they are trying to identify the entrances, modulate the façade and create areas to sit out into. Cheapside has a 3 storey frontage with plant and storage contained on the top floor.

The image and plan of the square shows a representation of the outdoor market and how the different levels of Kendray street are traversed with wide steps. They are looking to 'green' wherever they can- the constraint of the basement under the square will likely determine whether trees will be planted in the ground or in pots.

The market will have a generous entrance. Meat and fish stalls have been shifted from the back lands to the highly visible corner of Cheapside so stallholders can take pride in the displays and in order to help attract a new demographic to the markets. They are looking to reveal the true quality of the internal space, creating galleries and double height spaces. On top of the market will be a food court. Externally the expanse of glass on the ground floor is taken back to the frame. Above this level there is looseness in the way the windows are arranged. When the market is shut it will still have a welcoming entrance.

On the facade of the market they are looking to use Portland stone as a sign of its importance to the town. This would tie in with its use on the town hall and the new sixth form college building. The cladding of the retail component will differentiate it from the market. This could include the use of terracotta panels- the Halifax bank in the town centre uses beautiful white terracotta tiles which look relatively light. The proposed new boulevard to the cinema could also use terracotta tiles.

There is more of a tightness to the new proposed boulevard (leading to the 'Renoir type' cinema) - they are trying to create different characters to proposed streets which will be enhanced with street furniture and nice landscape.

They have looked at how to redesign the façade of the Alhambra centre to help better terminate Cheapside and to make the centre appear more open and transparent.

Further pedestrian connections may be provided with escalators (such as the 24 hour escalator in Angel, London), a colonnade at first floor level and a potential bridge link to the cinema. Kendray Street will be retained as way from A to B, but it will have relatively subtle kerbs.

The panel were presented with the latest images of the library building. Architecturally it is not lightweight, its mullions and transitions are deep. The spacing of the external vertical fins changes on each floor, reflecting that the building gets more private the more you go up. The building includes a flexible open space at the front, a café and a revenue generating events space.

They are busy with the detailed design and construction of the temporary market building (which will be located on the footprint of central offices). This structure will have a parallel portal frame with pitched roofs and have its primary entrance off May Day Green. It will have a classical type plan inside for which they can test ideas such as the size of stalls (25% bigger than present stalls in the markets), the closeness of the gangways, internal signage, colour schemes (racing green), the wideness of entrances (4m) and types of support facilities (such as baby changing). This

temporary structure could be as exciting as the Boxpark in Shoreditch, London, (a 'pop up' mall of shops).

The public realm is at stage 1 of design. They are identifying what's good and what constraints there are. For the new square they are mapping where Sough Dike is, looking at the changes in levels, sun paths, desire lines and spaces for events in order to help encourage movement into and through the spaces.

Design Panel's comments.

It was noted that the design has changed since the last presentation. However the 1:25 sections and main general arrangement plans are being shown out of context as to where they sit- they have been presented in isolation to their surroundings making it difficult to assess how the proposals will integrate into the town. For example how will Cheapside feel? Will this proposal be higher or lower than the other side of the street? To help answer this a section through the street itself would be beneficial.

Similarly the panel have been presented with a big physical model of the markets building model but where is it? – it needs to be put on a base plan. The model without its context looks blocky monolithic and doesn't do the proposal justice.

The panel stated that 'Barnsley' was lost in the presentation- the context of the proposals was lost quite quickly.

At the previous presentation the panel asked for the public realm to be looked at now rather than later. The response has been that there are technical reasons why this hasn't been progressed yet (due to mapping of the basement below). The panel therefore don't know enough to start talking about the public realm yet.

The panel stated that what they had been presented was interesting, for example they liked a lot of the principles for the market building. However, they were keen to see the further development of the proposals in response to the recommendations from the last review. The panel stated that there remained lots of unanswered questions in relation to 'what we haven't seen'. Some of the concerns raised haven't been touched on in the presentation. 'We can't talk about what has not been mentioned'.

For example, the panel previously expressed concerns about the proposal for a bridge over the railway line proposal- it is now noted that it is now being phrased as the 'potential' for a bridge. It was responded that Network Rail have not confirmed that the level crossing will close and therefore the council have had to work around this as an option rather than a certainty. Regarding the panel's previous recommendation to consider views from the railway of the scheme it was responded that this area could potentially be used as a nursery. They didn't want to see a repeat of what happened at Bradford where views from the railway were closed off.

The presenter stated that of the six remaining sites, the council will market these when their financial aspects are more worked up. The council has had a strong dialogue with the owners of the adjoining Alhambra Shopping Centre and the owners are excited about reconnecting with the markets development.

The panel supported the location of the butchers and fishmongers at front of the market building and the cafes located outside the upper floor, the latter like at Trinity Leeds (a shopping and leisure development).

One panel member asked if the illustrations of the markets buildings were 'too cool for school' as they didn't show any retail signage or lighting applied to the building. It was asked if once these are added would the building look considerably different? It was responded that all signage will be behind windows in bulkheads, with only limited projecting signage.

The panel asked what matters of the outline planning consent the presenters were focussing on- what were they bringing forward as reserved matters? It was responded that in 3 to 6 months they are looking to submit reserved matters for the square. Part of the problem with progressing the public realm has been a pure resource issue in their not being enough hands. However they have embedded the landscape team more and are looking again at the management of commissions.

The model shows a long interrupted façade- there is no modelling- the panel asked could, for example, there be a colonnade to give it some depth? Currently the model feels like a hulking mass and looks monolithic. This is the impression of the way the model sits on the table. A 1:100 model is too big, modelling at 1:200 / 1:500 in its context may work better. The proposal looks more successful on visual images than on the model. We could have done with sketches of the street – cross sections.

It was noted that the outline consent allowed some adjustment in street widths and heights in subsequent applications- for example the flexibility for a one and a half increase in storeys was permitted.

The panel discussed whether it looked like a market and was this important. Descriptions from panel members included 'classy', 'aspirational' and 'a 21st Century market'. It was responded that the market is famous in the whole region and that the architects are aiming to set it out as special, for example by displaying the meat and fish at the front. They are not trying to recreate Bolton or Bury market for example but something special for Barnsley.

There is a desire to differentiate through materials to say that 'this bit is the market' They are looking to stone clad the market, (using Portland stone as a sign of investment in the town), and use terracotta or reconstituted stone to the retail. The panel stated that the retail would look quite 'slick'- the presenters stated their influences included the old library building within the Liverpool One development and Holland House in London. The panel felt that there needs to be a certain finesse in describing what the building is. This had been developed on the inside of the building, for example through it opening up into a series of large spaces- this now needed to be developed on the exterior of the building too. The panel felt that the finesse of identity would be a key to getting it 'bang on'. This would give added richness to the exterior of the building.

Conversation in design starts in context however there is no conversation between this proposal and Barnsley. There is a need to express this conversation in three dimensions, for example through scale, massing, permeability, movement and materials.

There is a danger that the whole of the markets complex/ redevelopment is happening piecemeal rather than through a strategic masterplan.

Whilst there are lots of positives, for example the panel have used the adjectives 'ambition', 'classy', 'stylish' and '21st century' in their responses to the proposed Met

Centre/ Markets, until there is a conversation with its surroundings the panel feel uneasy about this. As presented the proposals feel like a 'big lump.'

Until this conversation with surroundings is complete the panel feel uneasy about this 'big lump'; whilst there may be a lot more to it, until a 3d dimension/ conversation with its surroundings is presented it is hard to see how a visitor to the town centre will experience its public spaces and surrounding buildings.

The panel felt that there was a need to get the public realm up to speed. A visual expression of the wider aspiration would also help bring others investors to the table. It appears to be a too open brief- we see you showing us that this sits here in the scheme in location terms, but in 3d visual design terms we are not being shown it in its wider context; it should be a conversation. The presenters pointed out that the Liverpool One development had a 'plots first' approach with the design of the public realm following later.

The presenters said that they could produce more 3D contextual images through their '3d revel model' software but to extract a printout costs thousands of pounds. The panel instead suggested that the architects produce a simple 3D model of the scheme and its surroundings using 'sketch up' software. Another method could be through using aerial images- if you present enough angles of an aerial view you can gain a 'feel' of a space.

There is a need to consider ways of bringing this conversation into every discussion. Don't lose Barnsley early in the conversation.

Regarding the proposal for a roof over the street it was noted that the aim here was to provide a more intimate street setting and that this proposal was still subject to wind modelling. The panel stated that there is a cultural heritage in Yorkshire of arcaded spaces however the proposal shown looks relatively too subtle and restrained- could it be more spirited? Whilst in Spitalfields Market (London) they got it wrong, with it looking too heavy and clunky, here there is the possibility to do something clever and elegant and something that is 'Barnsley'/ unique. The Victorian quarter in Leeds has stained glass on its ceiling.

There are still headline anxieties about the connections to the car park side and the bridge- there are a lot of concerns about that. The presenters clarified that the bridge is not on a critical path and it is not funded- it is currently just aspirational.

The panel responded that there is a need to ensure that by implementing a bridge you are not stymying aspiration for other things. The issue is less about the bridge itself- it's more about the quality of movement of people. This quality of movement should be ample enough for massive volumes, ample enough to prevent people being intimidated by that movement and ample enough to cater for those with less mobility.

It was noted that most of the comments of the panel are about the information provided rather than the points made. There needs to be more testing- for the benefit of Barnsley the panel want the best; this scheme has to be right.

Whilst the presentation focussed on elements that the council can deliver at the current time and there are several external constraints on the scheme, (such as the decision of Network Rail on the closing of the railway crossing), each piece of jigsaw needs to go back to a vision. There is a risk of losing Barnsley/ 'losing the whole' with the current approach.

The presenters confirmed that they would like to have more panel reviews of the scheme and suggested that they could be held at the Better Barnsley shop as it contains a plethora of information and is ideally located to see the surrounding setting for the scheme.

Design Panel Recommendations:

Those carried forward (with some amendments to wording):

- **Identify more clearly the short, medium and long term aspirations for the town centre. This is vital to the success and robustness of the scheme. Each piece of the jigsaw needs to go back to a vision rather than risk pursuing the development on a piecemeal basis.**
- **Carry out a comprehensive analytical appraisal of all movement implications.**
- **Explain much more the whole square and how it works in terms of people behaviour, comfort and microclimate and the vehicle access remaining.**
- **Look at opportunities for enhancing place making and people movement through the design of the public realm. Develop the details of the public realm now rather than later and develop a 'green vision' for the town centre as part of a strategic plan.**
- **Develop a simple sketch up model of the massing of the scheme and how it will fit into its surroundings.**
- **Look at what the proposed view from the railway will be like to ensure it gives a positive impression.**
- **Ensure that the architecture, whilst being contemporary, reflects much more the existing positive qualities of architecture in Barnsley Town Centre.**

Additional:

- **When showing proposals for individual buildings ensure that these include contextual information too, to show how well they integrate into the town.**
- **Express the design 'conversation' between this proposal and Barnsley in three dimensions, for example through scale, massing, permeability, movement and materials.**
- **Progress the proposals for the public realm so that the proposals for the buildings and the public realm can be assessed together and their design can reinforce each other.**

Fourth review of proposed retail, leisure and library development including a public square and public realm improvements, Kendray St/ May Day Green/ Cheapside, Barnsley town centre, (all pre-reserved matters stage except for the library which now has reserved matters approval). (First review 9th June 2014, second review 21st April 2015, third review 13th October 2015.)

Attendees

Tom Lonsdale	- CABE Enabler and Landscape Architect (Chair)
Robin Machell	- Architect
Paul Testa	- Architect
Simon Chadwick	- Architect
Graham Roberts	- Placemaker/ Public Arts
Chris Wyatt	- Former Regeneration Manager BMBC
Allen Parks	- Barnsley Civic Trust
Councillor Miller	- BMBC
Councillor Bruff	- BMBC
Richard King	- Arts, Museums and Archives, BMBC

Design Panel Recommendations from the third review:

- **Identify more clearly the short, medium and long term aspirations for the town centre. This is vital to the success and robustness of the scheme. Each piece of the jigsaw needs to go back to a vision rather than risk pursuing the development on a piecemeal basis.**
- **Carry out a comprehensive analytical appraisal of all movement implications.**
- **Explain much more the whole square and how it works in terms of people behaviour, comfort and microclimate and the vehicle access remaining.**
- **Look at opportunities for enhancing place making and people movement through the design of the public realm. Develop the details of the public realm now rather than later and develop a 'green vision' for the town centre as part of a strategic plan.**
- **Develop a simple sketch up model of the massing of the scheme and how it will fit into its surroundings.**
- **Look at what the proposed view from the railway will be like to ensure it gives a positive impression.**
- **Ensure that the architecture, whilst being contemporary, reflects much more the existing positive qualities of architecture in Barnsley Town Centre.**

- **When showing proposals for individual buildings ensure that these include contextual information too, to show how well they integrate into the town.**
- **Express the design ‘conversation’ between this proposal and Barnsley in three dimensions, for example through scale, massing, permeability, movement and materials.**
- **Progress the proposals for the public realm so that the proposals for the buildings and the public realm can be assessed together and their design can reinforce each other.**

Presentation 1 *(by Seamus Lennon of IBI Taylor Young, concentrating on changes to the overall strategy for the development/ the markets building/ buildings around the square)*

In terms of planning submissions it is anticipated to submit either a reserved matters or a full planning application for the Met Centre in the next few weeks and it is anticipated that a planning application for the public realm will be submitted in March.

The site for the library has now been cleared, ready for its construction on the western edge of the square. The Tech building will be demolished next month and replacing it, on the northern edge of the square, will be ground floor restaurants with pavement café's and first floor leisure, (potentially containing, for example, laser quest and 10 pin bowling). A 13/14 screen multiplex cinema will front the eastern edge of the square.

A covered Arcade running from the square towards the entrance of the Alhambra Centre forms an integral part of the ‘retail circuit’ and will be 9m to 12m in width. This will wrap around the central market. First floor uses include retail, (accessed individually from ground floor units), markets, a food court, a large gym and a continuation of the cinema, (which stretches further south from the square). The top floor contains the management suite, plant and photovoltaics.

The market will have proper street elevations, with more of a shopfront style. Entrances to the market will be from Cheapside, (directly opposite Albert St East), the central square and the covered Arcade. When the market is closed, (after 4:30pm), access to the upper floor food court will be from a separate entrance from the square, leading into a double height atrium with a glass lift.

In terms of movement one of the key drivers was the diagonal relationship between the Transport Interchange and Eldon St. ARUP have done a study which looks at pedestrianising Midland Street; this would help create a better sense of arrival from the Transport Interchange. The main sense of pedestrian movement in the square is diagonally across to each corner and along its four edges. The pedestrianised nature of the public realm is good in Barnsley, it is quite contained. They have sought to maximise ‘active’ frontages in the scheme, created a retail circuit with the Arcade and ensured clear sightlines towards retail frontages from every angle, in response to retailer demands.

Regarding car parking in addition to the existing Market Gate car park it is proposed to have a multi-storey car park towards the south eastern end of the site, located on top of the proposed Next retail unit. Pedestrian access from this car park will come

out right into the heart of the Arcade. Servicing via the enormous existing basement will be accessed off the Alhambra roundabout with a road running parallel to the railway.

The existing Met Centre building is not flat but modulated. In the proposed development they have sought to create areas of height through locating tall, glass lightboxes at strategic points, including at the corner of the market. Where first floor canopies currently occur ground floor glazing will be been pulled out. The panel were shown a 3D modelled axonometric of the whole scheme to illustrate its massing. The panel were also shown a 3D walkthrough animation of the whole scheme, (entitled 'Glassworks'), as well as some day and night images of key views.

They now need to look again at materials for building elevations that are affordable for all phases of the scheme. They have looked back at Will Alsop's proposals and the markets area had a character of its own. They have looked at what are the predominant materials/ colours in the town – for Regent Street and around the Town Hall it is Portland stone, grit stone, honey colour tones, metalwork in the Arcades. Whilst they can't afford grit stone they can provide a strong reference to it. For example they are looking to use honey coloured brick and colour anodised metal. They also can't afford Portland stone- alternatives being looked at include GRC, pre-cast concrete and Spanish import.

To help structure the look of the retail frontages they have looked to use a trabeated system with post, beam and infill, (using 'goalposts' of material similar to Portland stone with infills of glass and brick). They have tried to ensure some variation and richness to these elevations. Looking down the Arcade the feeling of depth to the elevations is seen as very important and the infill on the upper floor elevations has been articulated and configured in different ways so that on one side you will see more brick than stone and vice versa on the other side. Keeping a feeling of design quality through all the retail frontages is proving a challenge. They are looking at developing a design code to help provide some visual control. The panel were shown drawings of single and double height frontages that would fit in with this design code.

Regarding interior strategies for the markets area they are stripping the frame of the former Met centre right back, including stripping the soffit back to concrete. There will be more circulation routes and the spaces around the escalators will be opened up to form an atrium. The open spaces inside will have the potential for things to happen- 'pop up' things. They are looking to provide decadent surfaces including glazed ceramic tilework. They are looking to have a refined and controllable framework for the design of the stalls.

In terms of influences on the operation of the food court the architect was very keen on Altringham market. Here developers Urban Splash had transformed a Victorian Hall into a food court. Different vendors produced different foods, (making beer, hamburgers etc.), with no one selling the same stuff- no one competes. It's got a buzz about it- a bustling atmosphere.

Design Panel Comments

The panel asked what will the view from the railway be like; will it give a positive impression? In terms of materials on this elevation it is likely that Kingspan panels will be used and there is the potential for strips of light on these at night. The Next Store, at the southern end of the site, will have huge picture windows facing the

railway at first floor level. However at ground level Network Rail are likely to require a tall fence as they are concerned about red tail lights of service vehicles confusing train drivers. The architect felt that the impact of this elevation would be felt more from a distance, such as from Harbrough Hill, than from the railway. For example from Harbrough Hill one will be able to see each of the cinema's auditoriums expressed as individual boxes. The panel expressed the importance of this first impression of Barnsley for rail passengers stopping off here or travelling through. The passenger experience of rail travellers entering into Lime Street, Liverpool had been made very interesting through the simple modulation of surfaces and careful thought about design, the end result is fascinating with plenty to look at. The panel would like to be reassured that this first impression of Barnsley for rail users is positive and carefully thought through.

It was asked if the proposed footbridge over the railway had now disappeared from the scheme. Discussions with Network Rail about the bridge are back on. If it does go ahead its location will change so on the site it will 'land' into the square located south of the Interchange.

The panel liked the proposed movement patterns; the circulation seems to have resolved itself. The indication that Midland Street was looking to be pedestrianised with alternative taxi circulation would help prevent the rat-run of taxis on Kendray Street. The panel noted the diagonal pedestrian circulation routes cutting through the square. However, there was a concern that people with mobility issues coming from Interchange square could not travel directly into the closest corner of the square via a ramp and instead would have to take quite a long detour along Kendray Street before cutting back into the square. Due to the extent of the change in levels it is difficult to get ramps to work with diagonal desire lines into the square so they are looking to provide a ramp half way along Kendray Street. It was also pointed out that from the second tree from the east to the entrance of the Arcade there seemed to be lots of space and distance and this was queried. It was responded that the retailers were keen that trees did not block sightlines and were looking to have any provided to have high canopies.

It was asked if the pedestrian link to Pontefract Road is still being provided in this latest layout of the scheme. This link is seen as important; the Alhambra development blocked it and the businesses on Doncaster Road feel 'cut off'. It was confirmed that this link is still proposed although there are some issues to work through. It was confirmed that The Arcade will be a public street, open 24/7.

It was appreciated that the architecture of the scheme was subdued, with clarity and an elegance of proportion. However there was a concern that the face of each elevation has almost become interchangeable; 'has it become slightly banal?' For example you could change the change the elevation of the cinema to the library- they cancel each other out. It was felt worthwhile to invest in slightly more grand moves in terms of differentiating the civic architecture from the retail/ leisure architecture.

This issue was typified by the box on top of the glass entrance tower. It was felt that this tower needed a more robust design. The ways it sits flush with the corner doesn't help to positively create a welcoming gesture or help to orchestrate the space around it. This element could be more of a counterpoint to the square, through more depth, (with recess and reveals to create more shadow), and through the detailing of its proportions and modelling. Existing examples to look at for inspiration include the Campanile of Barnsley town hall, which helps define the square in front of it as a focal point, towers in Stevenage and Coventry and, further afield, towers in the

squares of Venice and Florence. In terms of positive place making and creating reference points for the scheme there is a need to focus on the design of these corner points, (using the architectural advices available in the budget). Don't rely on branding to do this.

The panel asked if there were opportunities for the glazed canopy to be made more distinctive and make the space stand out more, through the use of colour/ etching/ the involvement of an artist. This could build upon the image of the town as a glassworks producer, (with four manufacturers historically and one remaining), and help counterbalance the impression that Barnsley was just a former pit town. It was suggested that with naming the retail development 'Glassworks' people may expect to see something special about the glass. The architect stated concerns that the budget was quite tight and that the addition of colour could affect thermals. Regarding 'what is Barnsley about it' the proposal has 30 to 40% more glass than comparable shopping centres. The panel felt that the issues of budget and thermals could easily be contained within a brief if an artist was commissioned. It was suggested that the architect look at the roof of the Victoria Arcade in Leeds and the work of Ian Gillick at Marsham Street, London.

The panel stated that following the concerns about context stated at the last review it is good to see Barnsley being allowed into the scheme more. It was pointed out that there is some great architecture around the periphery of site; there are some beautiful buildings on Cheapside looking into the square itself, including one in white terracotta. It was asked if these buildings have more significance in the design of the scheme?

Regarding seeing buildings in their context, on Cheapside it would be good to see the whole of the street and the other side of the street, for example, to see how proportions relate and how light changes their appearance.

With regard to the choice of brick type and finish the panel pointed out how important this was to the overall feel of the development. It is proposed to use a handmade multi-brick which will read as honey toned with, most likely, a stretcher bond.

Presentation 2 *(by Danny Marsh of IBI Taylor Young (concentrating on the design of the square)).*

The landscape design of the square was signed off for RIBA 'Plan of Work' stage 2, (concept design), before Christmas; current work is on stage 3, (developed design).

The brief from the client included the inclusion of 40 market stalls and a flexible event/ performance space, the latter to hold events such as artisan stalls and sandy beach areas. Retailers wanted clear sightlines from across the square and a 6m buffer so people could see their shop fronts.

The big constraint for the square is the existing concrete slab- with the stepped levels how do you create a space on top, what depth of material could it take? It was decided to remove the existing slab and to cast and form a new one on top of the existing columns, (which are on a 6m grid). Other underground constraints include existing utilities, Sough Dike and the retaining walls of the basement.

Movement patterns around and across the square were studied, (details as in the preceding presentation). They are looking to break down the steps with terraces with

two banks of eight steps, with a diagonal ramp leading up from halfway along Kendray Street.

The design concept for the square is to bring the craggy nature of the Pennines in Barnsley into the town centre. This was felt to contrast well with the geometric, linear arrangement proposed for the square and its surrounding new buildings.

Precedents looked at include:

- The Market Square in Nottingham- which also has level issues and includes a major market area, a flexible events space and a water feature.
- Pancras Square, near Kings Cross- which has a craggy nature to the design, water features and is generally a hard landscaped space
- The Peace Gardens, Sheffield- which has raised lawns, cascading water and a flexible events space. Here the design of the gardens encourages dwell time and this has had an important, positive regeneration effect of increasing retail dwell time too.
- Pier Head, Liverpool- which has a craggy nature to its design.

The strong driver from retailers to not disrupt sight lines to the shops has had a major influence on the arrangement of the square. Twenty different locations for the market stalls had been looked at and it is proposed to locate these towards the library end of the square, on rows of diagonal lines which do not interfere with retail sight lines. It is proposed to locate the flexible event space, spatially open in its nature, by the entrance to the retail arcade. Outdoor dining could occur on the edges of the square, their detailing would be influenced by a design code.

For the 40 market stalls rather than have individual stalls with canopies they are looking at providing continuous canopies running the length of the run of stalls. In terms of design influences on the canopy design they are looking at the markets in Catalonia, especially in Barcelona, and also in Slovenia. They want to get creativity into the design of the roof and they are looking at the potential for continuing the craggy design theme of the square in the form and shape of the market stalls. For example the base of the stalls could be fixed concrete benches rather than tables. The market stalls will need to look good and function well at all times of the day.

They are looking to have raised lawns and planters, enclosed with granite walls. Planting could be based on a Pennine theme. In terms of water features they are looking at having a thin line of in ground fountains and a raised pool, the latter cascading into a water rill. This rill could potentially zig-zag along the route of Sough Dike; its width would be small enough to enable someone to step across it.

In terms of paving materials they have been looking at different products. In terms of costs it would be difficult to use Yorkstone extensively. The suggested paving material is a granite coated concrete, with Yorkstone used for highlights such as the walls of the raised planters.

Design Panel Comments

It was asked why market stalls are needed in the square. It was responded that the current 40 stall market is very popular and operates 6 days in week. People like it and asked to keep it as a priority. They can't remain located in the streets as at present as the neighbouring shops only allowed their license on public highway on the understanding that they were on a temporary basis. Locating them in the square

will ensure they have a retail synergy with the adjacent indoor market. It also gives them the advantage of making use of underground servicing with a stair core and waste chute to the basement. It was noted that historically the markets were located very close by, in May Day Green.

It was emphasized that the clustering of the market stalls and the design of its roofscape will have a profound effect on the library façade and that they have to work together. Indeed this goes for all four sides of the square; there shouldn't be disconnect between what's in the middle and on the edge. As currently proposed it feels like there will be a restrained edge with a 'fancy' centre.

It is recognised that the design of the façade of the library is now fixed but the design language of the other three sides of the square could help to differentiate its civic presence. Similarly the arrangement and design of the square could help enhance its civic presence. However as proposed the civic presence of the library and how its entrance relates to the square appears to be restricted to a corridor immediately running at right angles. It was asked what would be the character of this 'corridor' outside the library? When entering the square from the Interchange end how much of the view of the library would be obscured?

The panel stated that for Market Square in Nottingham, which the panel saw as a successful scheme, all the intimacy of events, performances and photographs is with the backdrop of the Town Hall. However here, as proposed, all the intimacy is located away from civic building- all the interest is at other end. In Barnsley the background to events would be retail. Furthermore an open area outside the library would potentially receive more sunlight than the area outside the retail entrance. The whole panel is nervous about this.

The panel asked if there was the potential for more grassed areas, for more green space in the scheme. This was accompanied by a note of caution by the panel that there are lots of case studies showing that where grass is used in urban areas the ones that fail are where there is not enough grass provided. For example the small area of grass close to Victoria Station in Manchester is currently getting 'hammered'. The landscape architect responded that he is exploring the potential use of artificial grass or mixing it in with natural grass. The panel were open to the proposal of using artificial grass. The panel restated the importance, if using grass, of ensuring that there is enough of it and that it is properly detailed.

It was stated that the panel needs to be aware that for future maintenance the council is likely to have less and less money.

There need to be further studies to ensure that the route down the side of the cinema leading to Kendray Street won't be a wind tunnel.

Regarding the potential for concrete market stalls the panel were open to the idea of having their design enabling chess, draughts, and 'play' outside the library. However it was fundamental to get the design of the roof right. 'You don't want it to look like the world's biggest bus shelter.'

The structural loading of paving needs to take account of how the square is serviced- for example it is important to ensure that you don't get cracked pavements from big vehicles servicing events. Don't restrict uses on the paving by economising on the loading it can take.

In terms of seating for the square the panel asked for some changes in the orientation of the steps to ensure that people can experience sun on at least one side of their face.

In terms of lighting the landscape architect confirmed that they are now looking at this, including looking at how it can double up for events.

To summarise regarding the design of the square issues to look at include the lighting, the loading spec of the paving, the viability of grass and the whole way in which market stalls are integrated with everything else. Regarding Kendray Street if the designers can deliver on its pedestrianization and its restaurants can spill out then that's very good. However there is a need to ensure it is not a wind tunnel or a taxi run-through. If all these issues can be worked through then the design of the square will have taken a potential promising direction.

The panel stated that the designers look to have taken simple, rational decisions in the early design process for the square. The circulation pattern looks good subject to the square doing its job.

However, there is a need to excite us more about the different focal points, especially the corner entrance to the markets. The panel are nervous about the design of the square 'lump' as shown located next to the cinema.

There is a need to show that the 'whole thing', (the design and layout of the square and its structures and the architecture of the retail and leisure buildings), works with the library.

It was agreed with the presenters that the square itself warrants a future design review.

Design Panel Recommendations:

- **Look at how to ensure there is a civic presence to the library, through the layout and arrangement of space and in the design of structures in the square. Try to differentiate more the architecture of the retail and leisure from that of the library.**
- **Look to articulate the modelling of the entrance towers more. Look to create them as more exciting focal points. Look to design them to more actively define the spaces around them.**
- **Look at bringing the positive architectural influences of local buildings on the periphery of the site into the scheme more.**
- **Look at the glass canopy of the Arcade and see if there are ways, within budget and technical constraints, to add to its distinctiveness, to reflect the strong heritage of glass making in Barnsley and the proposed name of the new retail district as 'Glassworks'.**
- **Continue to look at first impressions of Barnsley created from the railway, to ensure this is as positive as possible, looking at how other towns and cities have tackled this.**
- **Look at the amount and detailing of grass, the loading spec of the paving, ensure that a wind tunnel is not created on Kendray Street and ensure that Kendray Street does not become a taxi rat run.**