New Brewery Arts

Building Strategy Sub group.

**Scope, Design Brief,** **Sketch schemes and appraisal.**

Draft 5, April 20th 2017

**1. SCOPE:**

1. To consider ways of maximizing the use of all the buildings and land leased by NBA. To look at adjoining land and buildings to direct their development to benefit NBA, especially with the demise of the cinema project.
2. To analyze the present use of the buildings and external spaces through setting out the problems, constraints and limitations.
3. Future proofing: considering the proposed business plan, the strategic objectives and strategic plan and the needs of NBA over the next five years.
4. To enable the organization to become more economically sustainable and to expand the quantity and quality of its artistic offering. Look at other art centres for ideas.
5. Prepare a broad design brief.
6. Consider a number of alternative sketch ideas exploring how the buildings could be adapted and its uses rearranged to work more efficiently.
7. Consider how these ideas could be implemented incrementally, minimizing any disruption to its trading.
8. Consider the cost benefit analysis of each proposal with the help of specialist advisers, looking at cost, income and artistic benefit.
9. To consider how a series of phased projects could be financed and programmed.

**2: TIMETABLE**:

To meet once a month and to start to report to the Board from early 2017 with frequent reporting and feed back and to have completed the study by October 2017.

**3. DESIGN BRIEF (including needs, constrains and opportunities)**

 **1. Building condition, connectivity and accessibility**

1. The building is inflexible making out of hours, weekend and evening use difficult and/or expensive. Need to enable parts to work independently of each other, particularly the lift and WC’s separated from the shop.
2. Wheelchair use for evening classes can be difficult.
3. The rear external courtyard has great potential, but is difficult to use, as it is not secure. Can it be secured from its service access? We believe that it has planning consent to be covered from the elements. Would this have any benefits?
4. The WC, s on the ground floor are in poor condition but also attract inappropriate use by being too accessible by the public. They also use space which has high commercial value. Where could they be relocated?
5. The present building does not maximize the use of its very valuable proximity to Brewery Court, especially the location of some critical functions set away from public accessibility. There are level difficulties between Brewery Court and the shop.
6. External signage is not strong; and needs a greater signal to the passing public as to what is on offer.
7. Some of the structural walls have no damp proof course. Damp is appearing in the shop spine wall.

 **2. Environmental issues**

1. Much of the building has poor insulation and external doors without draught excluders.
2. Heating problems: The only gas central heating is on the ground floor in the shop, in the WC’s and 2 radiators in the cafe. The first floor has air source electric heating. Electric and heating control system needs to be simplified.
3. The volume of the shop and gallery is very large making it very expensive and inefficient to heat as well as causing overheating problems in the café and the shop in summer.
4. **Café**
5. A review of the Café was in the process of being carried out and its findings will be incorporated into this study. Tracey to report.
6. Specific areas mentioned would be extending its use in the mornings, evenings and weekends to support residential courses and the Barrel Store.
7. It is a non-artistic activity in support of the creative activity, could it become more of an arts café?
8. Should it remain on the first floor providing a draw to the gallery exhibitions.
9. But being on the first floor it has very little visibility from the street. Would moving all or part of its activities to the ground floor increase its commercial performance?
10. Serving the ground floor external spaces in summer is difficult from the first floor servery and kitchen.
11. The café provides around 45 covers, should this be increased? Similarly does the kitchen need to be expanded/relocated?

 **4, Shop**

1. Despite having an excellent retail location within the town, the shop windows are very small and not suitable for showing the products to those passing in the street and drawing them in. John Thompson advises that this will increase rental income by 5%.
2. Would the trading and profitability of the shop increase if it had a greater floor area? Could this be extended to the ground floor only making a better link to the rear courtyard, or to the first floor to help draw customers to the gallery?
3. The shop storage is located in the most valuable retail location within the building, but has limitations for retail use and has a damp floor. What uses could this space have? Could basement areas be used for storage? But Stephen Perkins uses all the space here.
4. Noise from the Café can be disruptive within the shop.
5. Security is a problem with too may exits for the shop.
6. There is limited hanging wall space.
7. This is a non artistic activity in support of the creative activities within the building. Can the creative activities be incorporated into the shop?

 **5. Offices**

1. The office is very isolated, inaccessible to the public, which hinders creating a ‘joined up’ organization. Beth’s idea of hospitality team incorporating the café with the Barrel Store has been proposed.
2. Would bringing the office into a more central location increase the homogeneity and coordination of the administration? How many permanent desk spaces are required?
3. Staff connection to the arriving customers and the ground floor activities is poor. Should there be a welcome information desk especially to promote the gallery and education programme?. Could this be combined with other activities to avoid duplicating staff?
4. Need for space to be provided for staff to eat lunch. At the moment staff numbers are 3 to 4 in the office and 2 to 3 in the shop. Café staff who would take their lunch before or after the busy lunch time period amounts to 6 on average

 **6. Education**

1. The number and scope of education courses are increasing but in the short term it does not need extra space. Will education areas need to increase over the next 10 years?
2. Any future expansion, particularly courses not requiring equipment, could be located off site, but this would incur rental charges.
3. There is a need to encourage younger/working customers by increase evening and weekend courses, particularly when the shop, café and makers studios are shut.
4. To what extent could increasing the residential courses, by creating a wider catchment area, help to build the national presence of the organization. How can design changes help this process?
5. The location of the pottery kiln makes it difficult to use the pottery teaching space to its maximum. The kilns need to be relocated away from the teaching space without taking space from other activities.
6. The second floor studio spaces are restricted by the height of the beams especially using large easels. How can this be addressed?
7. The sculpture studio can be difficult to use for stone and woodcarving and clay work because of dust issues.
8. Some courses like glass and pottery can only be on the ground floor for access and fire reasons.
9. Other courses do not need proximity to the ground floor and can be positioned in isolated locations.
10. Need for Information/service /demonstration room with ground floor Brewery court frontage to give a flavour/taster.
11. Groups on all day courses have nowhere to eat the lunches they have brought. This can be up to 36 people. Is there any space which becomes available at lunch time. Ideally they could buy their lunch at the café but this would displace regular customers.

 **7. Makers**

The maker’s studios are regarded by the group as a very important part of the organization and have been reviewed by Chris Smith. These are ideas from our discussions with him at the January meeting:

1. Makers all have different needs. Some makers want a private studio away from customers, using websites to sell. Others need access to the public for demonstrations and sales, and ground floor access due to the heavy nature of their craft. Other makers need to be away from their studios at craft fairs and do not need the passing trade which NBA can offer. Is it wasteful for them to be at NBA.
2. Should NBA provide a 5 year pathway for makers from:

A.Starting off on their careers in an incubator shared studio, with the opportunity of business and marketing support.

B. Then moving to a subsidized private studio within the building which has better access to the public for sales and can benefit from the central location of the building and its brand. Perhaps a ‘Fab Lab’ (managed/serviced studios)

C. Then the business may grow to a point that it is economically sustainable and does not require subsidy.

D. Finally it can leave New Brewery Arts, making room for newer craft businesses to replace it.

1. The maker’s studios on the top floor are very inefficiently arranged with high amounts of unusable circulation areas. How can this be used more efficiently?
2. Would a communal selling area facing Brewery Court help to reinforce the artistic performance and brand of NBA?
3. Add CPD craft business course for residents and outside makers.

**8. Gallery/exhibitions/pop up**

1. What other artistic uses could the space be used for, should the gallery area increase?
2. There is insufficient storage for exhibitions, how and where could this be provided?
3. Should the popup gallery continue, and if so where should it be located?
4. The gallery has too many door and window openings; can these be reduced or screened?

 **9. Barrel Store**

1. This is a non artistic activity in support of the creative activities. Can it become more linked to the core activities by increasing residential education and having exhibitions in its central areas?
2. Should its communal space be used more for education purposes?
3. How can the external space in front of the Barrel store be designed to maximize its use for customers and linked to the rest of the organization. Could it be used for external exhibitions and the café.
4. The Barrel store is the only part of the organization open 24 hours per day and 7 days per week. How can this be managed efficiently and its catering requirements linked to the café?
5. Who are our customers, where have they come from, will they come back and what would they like improved?

**4. EXISTING BUILDINGS VALUATION ANALYSIS**

John Thompson and Partners current rental advice is as follows:

Ground floor Zone A : first 3m metres facing Brewery Court: £32 per sqm.

Ground floor Zone B : 4 to 6 metres facing Brewery Court: £16 per sqm.

All other ground floor space: £10 per sqm.

First Floor: front building: £8 per sqm.

First Floor rear building: £7-8 per sqm.

Second floor: £6-7 per sqm

In summary there is around a five fold difference in value between the most and least valuable areas of the building.

**5. SKETCH DESIGN STAGE** January to March 2017

Four sketch schemes were proposed for the ground, three for the first floors and one for the second floor, which are included within Appendix A.

This is a summary of our conclusions:

**Ground Floor**

1. All the sketch schemes have relocated the **WC’s and storage** from this floor , schemes A,B and D to the 2nd floor and scheme C to the first floor.
2. Scheme C keeps the **shop** in its present location. Schemes A and D extends the shop to the rear courtyard, and reduces its frontage to Brewery Court. Scheme B extends the shop into the pop up gallery and relocates the staircase to the rear, and partially extends to the rear courtyard.
3. Schemes A, C and D relocates the **café** to the ground floor, A and C to the west side and D to the east side. Scheme B retains the café on the first floor with an extension to the ground floor.
4. Schemes A,B and D relocate the **office** to the ground floor. B and D to the rear west and A to the east.
5. All schemes retains, one **makers studio** on the ground, D in the pop up, B and C off the rear yard and A on the front east side. The pottery kilns are relocated to the bicycle store/basement fire exit location.
6. All the schemes propose widening the windows to Brewery Court to increase public visibility.

**First Floor**

1. All sketch schemes retained the **gallery** in its present location, with Scheme C extending the gallery in the café location and relocating the WC’s in the kitchen servery location.
2. Schemes A,B and D floored over the shop to create **makers studios**. A and D extended this over the café area to create a makers floor. The shop ceiling height must be more than the existing pop up gallery.
3. Scheme B retained the café in its present location but relocated the staircase to the rear.

**Second Floor**

1. Sketch schemes A,B and D proposed a makers incubator studio, and two of the makers relocated to the first floor replaced by storage near the lift and WC to the north east corner.

We then narrowed down the options to two sketch schemes being schemes E and F which are included within Appendix B.

**6, Consultations (April 2017)**

**Quantity Surveyor:** Consultations have taken place with Simon Large of Magna. He has prepared a schedule of areas for schemes E and F. See Appendix C. This compares the existing floor areas of the front building to the two schemes. The existing front building has a net floor area of 486 sqm. Both schemes E and F increase the net floor are by 185 sqm to 671 sqm, an increase of 38%. This is due to a combination of extra floor over the shop, the extension opposite the Barrel Store and reducing circulation area.

Simon was generally supportive of these proposals and advised that the works could be phased in such a way to avoid closing any activities during the works, due to the extra floor area being provided. He suggested that the works could be carried out in a series of small building contracts. He would favour scheme E with the café on the ground floor to enable it to run with the Barrel Store and to increase café trading and footfall into the building.

**Commercial Surveyor:** Consultations have taken place with former Trustee John Thomson of John Thomson Partnership. John welcomed the proposals in general, due to the more efficient use of the site. He favoured Scheme E pointing out that it would double the turnover within the café.

Note that consultations with hospitality specialists and the engineer and more detailed discussions with the QS are now required before we can finalise our appraisal.

**7. Appraisal of design in relation to Design Brief**

This could be discussed at our next meeting. This is a draft appraisal of both schemes in relation to our design brief, to help with these discussions:

**1. Building condition , connectivity and accessibility.**

1. Scheme E is more flexible that F as it as the café has direct access to Brewery Court.
2. Wheelchair access will be easier with scheme E as the café is directly accessed from Brewery Court. Wheelchair to workshops above shop could be difficult for both schemes.
3. Scheme E rear courtyard easier to use for café.
4. Both schemes relocate WC’s to second floor.
5. Scheme E both schemes provide better access for office and teaching demonstration room. Scheme E provides better access for café and scheme F better access for teaching space/makers studio.
6. Both schemes entail better signage.
7. Both schemes deal with damp

**2, Environmental issues**

1, It is very difficult to provide insulation to the walls. Both schemes could improve door insulation

2, Central heating could be extended with both schemes and have simpler control systems.

3, Both schemes reduce the volume of the shop and café making them more efficient to heat and cool.

**3. Café**

1, Café review awaited.

2, Both schemes enable the café to be open at different hours to the shop.

3, Both schemes could enable a more Arts Café style.

4, Scheme F provides a better draw of the public to the gallery but little visibility from the street.

5, Scheme E provides a better draw of the public into the building due to proximity to Brewery Court.

6, Scheme E ground floor café is easier to serve the external areas.

7, Both schemes could increase the café floor area and covers if so required.

**4. Shop**

1, Both schemes include increasing the size of the windows to Brewery Court.

2, Both schemes keep the shop floor area the same.

3, Both schemes relocate the existing shop storage to the the second floor enabling the existing store room to have more valuable uses.

4, Both schemes could isolate the shop from the café , minimizing noise disturbance.

5, The number of shop exits is to be resolved at the detailed design stage.

6, Both schemes have the same hanging space limitations.

**5. Offices**

1 and 2 Both schemes bring the offices to the ground floor. Scheme E enables the café to be adjacent to the Barrel store and perhaps run together.

3, Both schemes provide for a welcome/information desk on the ground floor to promote the gallery and education at the front.

4. Both schemes increase the net floor area. This issue to be resolved at the next stage.

**6. Education**

1 to 4 Both schemes substantially increase the useable net floor area of the front building from 486sq.m to 671sq.m a 38% increase. They also enable courses to be run independently from the shop and café.

5, Both schemes enable the kilns to be relocated externally to the existing teaching pottery area. This substantially increases the teaching spaces and available hours.

6, Neither scheme has a solution to the low truss heights within the top floor teaching spaces.

7,to 9 These issues to be dealt with at the detail stage.

10, Both schemes provide a reception area to Brewery Court, scheme E to the east and F to the west.

11, Both schemes increase the net floor area. This to be considered at the detailed stage.

**7. Makers**

2 and 3 Both schemes provide an incubator shared studio for craft graduates on the second floor. They also both relocate the makers studios from the second floor to the first floor to create more accessible public face.

4. Both schemes could provide a communal selling area on the ground floor.

**8. Gallery**

2. The gallery storage could be located on the second floor.

3. Both schemes could provide space for a pop up gallery, Scheme F on the ground floor and E on the first floor.

4. The gallery can be adapted to reduce the number of door/window openings. At the design stage

In summary these are the differences between Schemes E and F

**Sketch scheme E.**

Advantages:

1. Café in a better commercial location. Easier to sublet if required.
2. Café close link to Barrel store and can act as accommodation reception.
3. Café able to more easily service outside spaces.
4. Ground floor kitchen easier to service.

Disangantages:

1. Smaller floor area unless extended into Barrel Store Court.
2. Extra cost of new café and kitchen.
3. Less of a draw/destination to help the first floor gallery.

**Sketch scheme F.**

Advantages:

1. Café remains as a draw to first floor gallery.
2. Kitchen and café do not need to be moved.
3. Able to create a substantial ground floor teaching/makers room off Brewery Court.
4. Office in a more central location.

Disadvantages:

1. Café not such a good commercial location. (the kitchen could serve a ground floor café if required in the future).
2. Café not linked to Barrel Store.
3. Kitchen servicing more difficult.
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