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Part 1: Presentation

The existing lifeboat station at St David’s is a listed building of typical traditional design. A second, older listed building sits behind this larger boathouse. The RNLI is deploying a new generation of Tamar Class lifeboats, which require larger buildings to accommodate them. This coincides with many of the older buildings reaching the end of their life, together with a need to provide better facilities for crews.

The site for the new lifeboat station is located in a small cove just south of the existing station at St Justinian’s. The cliff face is designated and is unsuitable for fixing to. A triangular plan form has been developed for the building to fit the shape of the cove. Access will be via a stair tower from the top of the cliff. A copper finish is proposed for the barrel vaulted roof and ‘Trespa’ wood composite panels for the walls.

Local Authority officers were unable to attend the review, but have worked with the design team throughout the design development process. They are satisfied that the design of the tower structure minimises disturbance to the cliff face and foreshore, and that the building footprint works with the shape of the cove. Discussions with the LPA have led to a more pronounced curve for the roof form, and a more restrained fenestration on the south east elevation. The rake of the slipway has also been expressed on the side of the building.

Summary of key points arising from discussion, to be read in conjunction with Part 2 of this report.

The Panel was pleased to review this proposal for an important function in a sensitive location. We think this is a good design response, although some minor issues remain to be resolved. In summary:
• We understand and accept the rationale for the chosen site, and we appreciate the historical sequence of the three boathouse buildings.
• We welcome the team’s approach to innovative green technologies and suggest further investigation into PV’s, which could bring sound financial returns.
• We encourage the target of a bespoke BREEAM rating of Excellent and the seeking of a new BREEAM category for lifeboat stations is commendable.
• We would like the team to test an alternative design solution for the roof form, which separates the extension roof from the main roof.
• The tower needs a simple and elegant form to avoid becoming a dominant feature. We accept that this is the best access solution, but quality of materials and detailing will be of paramount importance.

**Part 2: Discussion and Panel Response in Full**

It was agreed that the three main items for discussion should be: the site location, the dominant tower feature and the massing of the building.

The Panel was assured that all location options have been considered, and the client is satisfied that there is no better location for a new building in the vicinity.

An extension to the existing listed building would not be impossible but has certain disadvantages, including rights of way issues and the current use of the existing slipway by companies operating pleasure boats. The Local Authority has confirmed that they would not expect the reuse of the existing building to be addressed in this application. We noted that the former Tenby Lifeboat station has been converted into a holiday let and there is the potential for a similar reuse here. We thought that the view of all three lifeboat stations taken from the water, showing different stages of the RNLI’s history, was a particularly powerful argument in favour of retaining the old and building new nearby.

The tower, with a spiral access stair wrapped round a central hoist, is a bold statement which we think will work well, provided that the structure is kept light and minimal. The Panel accepted that this was the best access solution to protect the cliff face, but emphasised the importance of a lightweight, elegant design solution. The drawings need to give an accurate representation of the tower’s appearance including the lift mechanism – in this case an open mesh ‘cage’ attached to one of the pillars. We queried whether three pillars were the best structural solution and were assured that the engineering team had considered 1 and 2 pillar solutions. The immediate impact of the balustrade, when approaching from the land, should be addressed with good quality design and finishes.

The Panel was encouraged by refinements to the design as a result of input from the LPA, including the more pronounced curve to the roof and the more restrained fenestration. The quality of materials and detailing will need to be protected, such as the verge detailing on the roof which should be seen as a smooth simple profile.

We discussed whether the triangular extension should have a separate roof, which would serve to enhance the simplicity of the main roof form, and we asked the team to test this alternative. A roofscape which respected the main boathouse element as dominant and the extension as subservient, might avoid the apparent bulkiness of the scheme when viewed
from the south east.

If a panel solution is chosen for the cladding, care should be taken to line up joints and align them with window and door openings.

The Panel was very encouraged that the design team is seriously considering innovative technology and green energy solutions, such as water source heat pumps. We understand that the energy demand is relatively small and thought that if PVs were used [with the additional financial incentive of feed-in tariffs] this building could be self-sufficient in energy. RNLI is discussing with BRE the possibility of a standard BREEAM assessment for lifeboat stations.

**The Design Commission for Wales Design Review Panel and staff welcome further consultation and will be happy to provide further feedback on this report and/or where appropriate, to receive further presentations. Thank you for consulting the Commission and please keep in touch with us about the progress of your project.**

*A Welsh language copy of this report is available upon request.*
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