

CABINET (STATION APPROACH) COMMITTEE**28 November 2017**Attendance:

Councillors:

Miller (Chairman) (P)

Humby (P)

Godfrey (P)

Other invited Councillors:

Bell (P)

Pearson (P)

Hutchison (P)

Tait (P)

1. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There were no questions asked or statements made.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held 14 August 2017, less exempt minute, be approved and adopted.

3. **STATION APPROACH – UPDATE (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**

(Report CAB3001(SA) refers)

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Nikolai Metherell from Lifschutz Davidson Sandilands (LDS), the Council's appointed architects for the scheme.

The Corporate Head of Asset Management introduced the Report as set out. He highlighted that in November 2016, full Council agreed to make budget provision of £1.5m for the design work and other professional services to progress the scheme (Report CAB2852 refers). However, no decisions on how the scheme would be delivered or funded had been taken and paragraph 2.5 of the Report summarised headline capital and revenue budgets.

On 20 March 2017, Cabinet agreed that the requirements of RIBA Plan of Work Stages 0 and 1 had been met and that the Station Approach Business Justification Case and supporting Evidence of Need be approved and the project to develop an outline business case be authorised and proceed to the next RIBA stage (RIBA Stage 2) (Report CAB2864 refers).

The Corporate Head emphasised that the BREEAM method of assessing the building design and impacts would be used to measure and test the designs as they evolve. LDS were developing provisional massing models to model potential dispositions and these would have to be ultimately tested for viability.

A number of Members highlighted that environmental considerations should be wider than just relating to the building design and quality and should include, for example, consideration of traffic and public realm matters.

The Corporate Head of Asset Management advised that the BREEAM method used a very specific framework which included such matters. He confirmed that highways issues were under consideration and various concepts were being tested with the highways authority.

In response to questions about the ability of any scheme to adapt to changing market conditions, the Corporate Head of Asset Management confirmed that the architects had produced some conceptual ideas which would be tested. The market had changed since the scheme was originally proposed and the design would take account of this. He mentioned that the Council had received approaches from potential partners interested in undertaking the development themselves. There were a number of different options available to the Council to deliver the scheme and these were being investigated further. A report would be brought back to Members at the appropriate point.

With regard to the proposed governance structure (Appendix 1 of the Report), one Member queried why there was no reference to Urban Design, Transport or Planning officers in the membership of the Project Team. The Corporate Head of Asset Management advised that the architects had been appointed to cover a wide range of services and the relevant Council officers would be engaged at appropriate times. In addition, it was agreed that the Project Team should include a Housing Officer.

Members also emphasised the importance of addressing the requirements of those travelling on foot or bike in the Transport, Public Realm and Parking working group. The Committee noted that cycling and walking group representatives had participated in recent scheme workshops.

The Corporate Head of Asset Management advised that work on the draft Public Realm Strategy had recently been completed. He confirmed that the concepts in this Strategy would form part of the public engagement workshops. The Chairman requested that as soon as practical, all relevant documents be circulated to Committee Members, including invited representatives.

During discussion, Members welcomed the consultation and work undertaken to date by LDS the appointed architects.

Cabinet confirmed that they had fully considered the information contained within Exempt Appendix 5 of the Report in reaching the decision set out below.

The Committee agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the Report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the update be noted the current programme timetable and next steps be agreed.
2. That the governance structure set out in Appendix 1 be agreed, and the Corporate Head of Asset Management be authorised to ask those persons previously forming the Advisory Panel whether they would like to continue to assist the Council with the implementation of this project.
3. That the retention of the RIBA Client Adviser be approved on the terms as set out in the Exempt Appendix 5 of the Report.

4. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

RESOLVED:

1. That in all the circumstances, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.
2. That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business because it is likely that, if members of the public were present, there would be disclosure to them of 'exempt information' as defined by Section 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

<u>Minute Number</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
##	Station Approach – Update (exempt appendix)) Information relating to the) financial or business affairs of) any particular person (including) the authority holding that) information). (Para 3 Schedule) 12A refers)

5. **EXEMPT MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minute of the previous meeting held 14 August 2017 be approved and adopted.

6. **STATION APPROACH – UPDATE (EXEMPT APPENDIX)**
(Report CAB3001(SA) refers)

The Committee considered the content of Exempt Appendix 5 to the Report which contained the fee proposals for RIBA Client Advisor.

The meeting commenced at 4.30pm and concluded at 5.25pm.

Chairman