

This is not the time, and place to dwell on my particular views on what has gone before, but it is the time although very limited, to highlight some very positive aspects of our proposal.

1. A classical approach in keeping with the building and it's setting.
2. A rear extension that utilises the existing features of the established built form to provide a new gallery and lift enclosure.
3. Views of Sydney Gardens at all levels from the building are maintained, and the views of the museum from Sydney Gardens similar to those currently presented.
4. Preservation of major internal features such as the staircases.
5. Creation of a new gallery for touring and special exhibitions at garden level with direct visual and physical connection to the garden providing enhanced opportunities for exhibitions and functions. Also, external access allows exhibitions to be mounted in the new gallery without affecting the rest of the museum in its daily operation.
6. Creation of a basement gallery of a size far greater than that currently envisaged to display the 70% of the collection we are told is in permanent store.
7. Direct linkage from the basement stores to the permanent exhibition space reducing the need to take exhibits all the way up to the upper floors as is necessary under the multi-storey proposals.
8. Less demand on the lift from the public as the basement gallery is only one flight down from the ground floor.
9. Toilet accommodation is closer to the new gallery areas that are currently intended, for the convenience of the viewing public.
10. This proposal is entirely compatible with fire precautions regulations as several alternative means of escape are available from the new ground floor gallery and the basement. As a result this proposal does not suffer occupancy restraints associated with multiple storeys served by a single staircase such that limits will have to be imposed on numbers on the upper floors, as is currently the case.

I can summarise our approach as prudent in that no money is wasted on a tea room that in the modernist scheme occupies 25% of the new floor space for something that already exists. Prudent in that the building materials and techniques have proven longevity, and are well tried and tested reducing the chance for escalating costs associated with innovation like we saw at the spa. The scheme is more respectful of the money available from the museum's fund raising efforts, for example, not wasting money on moving an entire staircase. In addition our proposal offers opportunities for local suppliers and tradesmen to become engaged in the building process, to the benefit of the local economy, without any need to import ceramics, steel and glass of such speciality as to preclude local suppliers being involved.

Our proposal provides more gallery space yet includes for all the ancillary activities included in the currently envisaged scheme.

To conclude, I would say that this proposal gives Bath a choice that I sincerely hope that museum can be persuaded to make even at this late hour. It also gives members the chances to prove to Bath that you do care about the classic built environment and that your approval of the modernist scheme was given because you felt that you had no choice if the museum's future was to be secured.

By giving this alternative scheme your approval you will be reinforcing the museum's future. If for any reason the Parry proposal fails, from funding shortfalls, fire precaution reasons or any other, then it will be known that you gave the museum a life-line and another chance.