

**CENTRAL WINCHESTER REGENERATION INFORMAL POLICY GROUP**

**19 March 2018**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Vice Chairman Izard in the Chair (P)

Ashton (P)

Burns (P)

Elks (P)

Horrill

Hutchison

Read (P)

Officer: Veryan Lyons – Head of Programme (P)

Others in attendance:

Councillors: Bell, Cook, Gottlieb and Mather.

Officers in Attendance:

Laura Taylor – Chief Executive

Tracy Matthews - Archaeologist

Apologies:

Martin Biddle: Chairman of the Archaeology Independent Panel.

---

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That subject to the addition of Councillor Mather as being included as 'others in attendance', the minutes of the previous meeting held on 30 October 2017 (Report CAB3000 refers) be approved and adopted.

2. **VICE CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Vice Chairman welcomed to the meeting Rebecca Taylor of John Thompson and Partners (JTP), architects and master planners, Veryan Lyons, the Council's Head of Programme for the regeneration project and approximately 100 members of the public.

Members of the public were informed that a Broadsheet giving an update on the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the process and timescale

for its future adoption, was available for collection at the end of the meeting and was available to view on the City Council's website.

### 3. **FORMAT OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)**

The Vice Chairman thanked those involved in the process of producing the SPD to date including Councillor Weston, JTP and the members of the Independent Archaeology Panel which had been chaired by Professor Biddle. All members of the public and organisations that had participated in the consultation process (which had closed on 5 February 2018) were also thanked for their contribution.

The conclusions of the Independent Archaeology Panel would be made publicly available on 20 March 2018, and its findings would be progressed in conjunction with the Hampshire Cultural Trust.

RESOLVED:

That the comments of the Vice Chairman be noted.

### 4. **OVERVIEW OF THE CONSULTATION AND RESPONSES**

Rebecca Taylor of John Thompson and Partners (JTP), architects and master planners provided an overview of the consultation process and the responses received.

#### **January Exhibitions**

The exhibitions had been held between November 2017 and January 2018 at various locations including in central Winchester, Bishops Waltham and Alresford. Locations and timings of exhibitions had been varied to encourage a high level of attendance and generate a broad range of views.

#### **Overview of responses**

Between 6 December 2017 and 5 February 2018, 210 responses had been received including 32 from key organisations.

There was general support for the approach towards the site's regeneration. The comments received would now be reviewed to draw out key themes to address and these could lead to modifications and amendments to the SPD, where relevant, to be reported to the 14 May 2018 meeting of the Informal Policy Group.

#### **Key themes**

Key themes arising from the consultation included:

The Winchester Movement and Access Strategy which would be aligned to the SPD and would address issues including buses (including where bus stops would be located), cycling and car parking.

Retail would consider the volume of provision, implications for the High Street, and also its flexibility and future fit so that there would be a range of small and large provision.

'Winchesterness' would be defined at a high level to help inform design detail.

Housing provision would be mixed and affordable (40% provision) with a diverse range provided to give "homes for all".

Public realm would provide design guidance on matters such as waterways, trees and materials.

Museums and a cultural centre was a matter of ongoing discussion and there would be guidance on where it may be located to provide a statement of intent.

Archaeology had been addressed and an update is provided in the minute below.

### **Timeline for adoption**

The timeline for adoption was set out in the Broadsheet and was summarised as follows:

Spring 2018 – consultation feedback reviewed and incorporated, where relevant, into the final SPD.

14 May 2018 – public meeting of the Central Winchester Regeneration Informal Policy Group to consider the proposed amendments to the SPD.

21 May 2018 – The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had opportunity to review the final draft SPD.

6 June 2018 – Cabinet to consider the final SPD.

Summer 2018 – if adopted the SPD finalised and published on the website.

### **RESOLVED:**

That the overview of the consultation process and responses received be noted.

## **5. ARCHAEOLOGY**

The Chairman introduced to the meeting Tracy Matthews, the Council's Archaeologist.

Mrs Matthews provided an overview of the findings and conclusions of the Archaeology Independent Panel on behalf of Professor Biddle, who could not be in attendance at the meeting.

The Panel was comprised of eminent archaeologists: Professor Biddle (Chair) and Paul Bennett (who had worked on the Canterbury regeneration); Patrick Ottaway (a freelance archaeologist); Nick Thorpe (from The University of Winchester) and Tracy Matthews.

The Panel had a brief to report back on the known archaeology and its history; the policies and guidance that were relevant to the sector; ground conditions; the depth and thickness of deposits; the strategy for the archaeology; the techniques to be used and public engagement. These strands would be used to form an overarching strategy.

In summary, Mrs Matthews stated that the archaeology encompassed a long time depth and was rich and diverse; with the presence of waterlogged ground conditions. The report did not propose a large scale excavation, as the scale of this work would be too destructive. It set out a strategy and approach to carefully manage development to preserve the area in-situ as far as possible, with excavation where needed. This approach was in line with national policy, and should ensure the preservation of a large part of the historic city's archaeology for future generations, when techniques and approaches will likely have advanced.

There was a good understanding of the broad sequence of the archaeology, which will include palaeoenvironmental remains, Roman, Late Saxon and medieval and later remains. However there was very little detailed information on these remains, what they consist and also how well it had survived. The cost of any large scale excavation would be high as had been demonstrated on the previous archaeological excavation of the Brooks shopping centre.

The report makes clear that all archaeological investigations are the responsibility of developers in line with national policy (since 1990). Early investigations, both intrusive and non-intrusive, would be undertaken early on by the developers as part of their proposals. Developers would be required to provide sufficient information on the archaeology below their site, to inform appropriate mitigation strategies, with all investigation work carried out to the highest standards.

Where possible it was encouraged that the approach to archaeology would be inclusive to involve the public and direct engagement with schools and also the use of social media. There would be displays (utilising the latest technological methods) and publication on the web.

Further detail on archaeology was included in the Broadsheet for collection at the meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the presentation on archaeology be noted

6. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

During public participation the following points were made, which are summarised below, and the officers responded accordingly:

Martin Willey: An Outlet Centre, such as those at Bicester, Portsmouth and Clarks Village at Glastonbury would be within the principles of the SPD and could work in this location, as it would appeal to prosperous locals and visitors alike.

Tim Fell: Would the meeting be debating the presentations.

David Morgan: Following publication of the archaeological report he would be asking how the archaeology could be retained if the site was built upon. He also raised concerns over the negative effect of new retail development upon traders in the High Street and the present closure of shops.

Rosemary Walker: There had been cases where archaeology planning conditions had not been implemented fully when the developers had been left in charge of the archaeology (and this situation should be prevented from arising). It was also asked whether universities could be invited to undertake the archaeology as part of student education.

Charlotte Appleby: Reference had been made that one third of the Brooks shopping centre site had been the subject of archaeological investigation at the time of its development, but the Panel had made no recommendation on the percentage of the regeneration site that would be investigated.

Phillip Morgan: The regeneration site would be redeveloped but he questioned whether it would be commercially and financially viable. The proposed bus station could not in his opinion be financed by developers and would require funding from public sources. The retail development was not currently viable and with the large expansion of Internet shopping the situation would be exacerbated in 3 to 5 years time. At this point in time retail was declining everywhere and it would be damaging for Winchester if existing retail (in the town) moved to the new development. Comparisons had been made with other cities; the provision in Canterbury was for higher level shopping and Salisbury had more shops as it served a wider catchment area. It was not the case that Winchester was under provided (for retail space) and the development could cause damage to the High Street's retailers.

Christopher Gordon: The best advice should be taken into consideration when paying attention to archaeology in a living city. The SDP process had not provided detail on the development's visual appearance (following development) and what it might look like should be shared. A previous contemporary approach (to the regeneration of the area) had failed which

might lead to a 'pesudo town' approach (with Poundbury in Dorset cited). A high quality development was required.

Joanna Page: There was a requirement to balance the needs of the future with the past. A definite site for a museum was needed so that tourism could be attracted, as was the case at York and Bath.

Jeff Withe: As a resident of St Giles Hill he was interested in what scheme would look like. In the case of the previous scheme it was known what (the public) did not want, but it was more difficult to know what (the public) did want. Following his discussions with JTP, 'contemporary vernacular' might be a starting point of which examples might be shown following group work.

Councillor Gottlieb: Councillor Gottlieb declared that he had a personal and pecuniary (but non-prejudicial interest) in the St Clement's Surgery. He also had a personal interest as a member of the Winchester Deserves Better campaign group. Councillor Gottlieb stated that what was built on the site was important. Lessons were to be learned from The Brooks redevelopment which had destroyed 3/4 (of the archaeology). Henderson's had ordered a structural assessment which would have destroyed (the archaeology). The archaeology was shallow (1 metre in depth) and could not just be covered over.

A member of the public: The Group should consider examples from abroad where modern architecture and medieval buildings had been successfully incorporated.

A member of the public: In considering 'homes for all' what was deemed to be affordable.

Christine Holloway: The consultation that had been undertaken had been good. The answer to the questions raised should be available on the Council's website in order that it could be seen that the questions raised had been listed and had been considered.

Tim Field: At the conclusion of the consultation exercise, he had worked with Members and officers to edit the draft document and he again offered his services for when the SDP was produced. There was a requirement for an 'address' for the retail units that built on the heritage and culture of the City and he suggested that 'Saxon Brooks' would be a suitable name.

Maggie Snow: Asked when the proposals for the bus hubs, that were part of the Winchester Movement and Access Strategy, would be made public.

Max Wilson: As a resident of St Giles Hill he was of the opinion that Winchester had a lot to offer and clear overall direction was required.

The Chairman thanked the public speakers for their contribution.

At the conclusion of Public Participation, the Group gave consideration to points raised during the meeting and the way forward towards the adoption of the SPD.

A Member commented that there was importance in heritage led regeneration, as had been successfully undertaken at Krakow and Warsaw in Poland, and that the proper recording of finds needed to be safeguarded. The openings of water ways, providing more definitive guidance on design and finding the right balance towards viability were also considerations. These matters were being given consideration by the Informal Policy Group.

It was further commented that a range of financial viability models were being tested. These included scenarios that included a museum, the concept of a quiet to busy area of usage and mixed use development. The appraisals were considering the proportion of retail content and ways to complement the High Street. The SPD needed to be flexible to respond to the changes in retail provision, including the provision of smaller units for independent traders, if this was appropriate. Consultations were continuing, including input from the Winchester Business Improvement District, and findings would be shared with the public in due course.

Work was continuing with the County Council over the Winchester Movement and Access Strategy in order to achieve outcomes. This work included consideration of buses. A Member gave the view that the use of short wheelbase buses that could access outlying transport hubs should be given consideration.

A Member further stated that the experiences of other area's regeneration schemes were being taken into account. The importance of visitors to Winchester was also recognised when considering proposals for the treatment of archaeology.

Members of the Informal Policy Group thanked members of the public for attending the meeting and added that the public's comments were being taken into consideration by the Group.

## 7. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Monday 14 May 2018 at 6:00pm in the Bapsy Hall, Guildhall, Winchester

The meeting commenced at 6:00pm and concluded at 7:45pm.

Chairman