

CABINET

8 June 2016

STATION APPROACH – REPORT ON DESIGN COMPETITION

REPORT OF STATION APPROACH PROJECT TEAM

Contact Officer: Antonia Perkins Tel No: 01962 848 314  
[aperkins@winchester.gov.uk](mailto:aperkins@winchester.gov.uk)

RECENT REFERENCES:

CAB 2702 – Station Approach, Winchester – 6 July 2015

CAB 2716 – Station Approach Design Brief – 17 September 2015

CAB 2759 – Station Approach Project Update – 13 January 2016

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The report provides Cabinet with details of the outcome of the design competition conducted for the proposed development of part of the Station Approach area and surrounding public realm. Members are asked to consider the contents of the report and to determine what the next steps in the project should be.

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1 That Cabinet considers the outcome of the design competition for Station Approach and determines how it wishes to proceed.

## CABINET

8 June 2016

### STATION APPROACH – RESULT OF DESIGN COMPETITION

#### REPORT OF STATION APPROACH PROJECT TEAM

##### 1 Introduction

1.1 The City Council has set out a policy intention to improve and revitalise the area of Winchester between the Cattlemarket and the railway station, referred to as 'Station Approach'. The project to develop this area forms a part of the Council's vision for how it will develop the town's economy and make the best use of key sites for sustainable development. The Winchester Town Forum's 'Vision for Winchester' and the emerging Local Plan both recognise the potential for new development in the Station Approach area to play a key role in the future of Winchester.

1.2 As agreed by Cabinet at its meeting of 6 July 2015 (CAB2702 refers), a procurement exercise in compliance with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 has been undertaken against a design brief to explore the options for the development of the Carfax site opposite the railway station and for the preparation of proposals for the public realm in the area as a whole. The submitted schemes have now been evaluated and the scores awarded to each bidder have been determined. The details of the scores are set out in Appendix 1. This process has identified the highest scoring bidder and it is now for Cabinet to decide whether to accept that bid and appoint that team to undertake the next stages of the development process.

##### 2 Public consultation and Station Approach Design Brief

2.1 The objective of diversifying Winchester's employment base and creating office space of a type not available elsewhere in the city was identified in the Winchester Town Forum's Vision for Winchester. The Cattlemarket and Carfax sites, which consist principally of surface car parking, were identified as a potentially suitable location for commercial and residential development by local groups such as Winchester 20/20, which urged the Council to look at their potential for creating a more productive and attractive gateway along the Andover Road and improving the public realm around the station. The City Council agreed to take this forward by way of a design competition.

2.2 A number of formal and informal community and stakeholder organisations took the opportunity to comment on and shape the design brief once it had been drafted - individually and via meetings of the Station Approach Panel, which was formed in the summer of 2015. The brief was subject to significant redrafting as part of this process, which clarified the vision and the requirements for the area with the benefit of comments from a number of external consultees. CAB2716 set out further detail on the areas of the brief which were altered in response to this stage of engagement.

### 3 Overview of Design Competition process

- 3.1 The planning and development process for Silver Hill demonstrated the importance of considering design and commercial considerations simultaneously so as to best understand the relationship between the two. There is no point in having proposals which are commercially viable but unacceptable in planning terms, or universally welcomed on aesthetic grounds but which can never be built. The Council has also been mindful of the requirements of EU procurement regulations (the Public Contracts Regulations 2015) and the demonstration of good commercial practice. Independent legal advice was therefore commissioned from Trowers and Hamlins LLP to clarify the most suitable procurement route which could be used to identify a concept design and design team, whilst ensuring that their proposals met with minimum commercial requirements. The Council was advised that the most appropriate route would be the competitive dialogue process under the Regulations, linked with a design contest as set out in the Regulations. This would allow discussion with teams about their emerging proposals during the process to ensure that they understood the need to meet certain essential criteria in order for their bid to go forward. It is a process considered suitable for situations where there are many possible creative solutions to the client's requirements and the point of the exercise is to allow bidders to use their creativity and skill in their tender submission.
- 3.2 Following Cabinet's approval on 6 July 2015, design teams were invited to submit expressions of interest with a pre-qualification questionnaire (PQQ). A total of twenty two PQQs were received by the Council and assessed by senior officers, a representative from Hampshire County Council and by Tina Frost, a Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Client Adviser who was appointed by the Council on the advice of the RIBA to assist the Council with the competition process. A shortlist of five firms were invited to tender for the contract to create an overarching allocation of uses for the Station Approach area, a Public Realm Strategy and a detailed design proposal for the Carfax site in the first instance.
- 3.3 Five firms were invited to tender because this strikes a balance for bidders between having a reasonable chance of winning the competition (firms are less likely to incur significant resources in a bid if they believe there has been no attempt at shortlisting) and the expectation that some participants would drop out during the process.
- 3.4 The process required the shortlisted teams to submit an outline solution for discussion during the subsequent competitive dialogue stage, which was undertaken to encourage the bidders to develop proposals that met the Council's requirements in terms of viability and design as set out in the brief and other supporting documentation. Following the dialogue, bidders were invited to submit their Best and Final Offers (BAFOs). Formal design submissions were subsequently received by the Council from two bidders.

- 3.5 The BAFOs were first assessed by a team including officers and external cost consultants (Mace) and valuers (Vail Williams) to ensure that the schemes met certain mandatory requirements of the design brief as well as the viability criteria (20% return on cost) which acts as a benchmark to ensure that the winning design is likely to be capable of being delivered, whether by the Council or another developer. The submissions were also scored on criteria including floorspace and parking provision, the suitability of the office accommodation for letting to tenants and sustainability factors. It should be stressed that bidders could not achieve a higher score for exceeding the viability criteria, although they were able to achieve higher marks with their floorspace and private parking proposals if they were able to demonstrate achieving optimal use of the sites which exceeded the requirements of the design brief through creative and innovative design solutions.
- 3.6 In accordance with the Regulations the results of the design competition element were assessed by a Design Jury appointed by, but independent of, the Council and officers engaged in the competitive dialogue process. As set out in CAB2759, the Jury consisted of 9 members, including three architects, three councillors, a representative of the City of Winchester Trust, an urban designer and an officer from the County Council specialising in transport.
- 3.7 Both of the two submissions passed the initial assessment as described above and were subsequently scored under the 40% quantitative aspects of the evaluation criteria. They were then assessed against a further 60% of criteria relating to quality of the design by the Jury during the week commencing 25 April 2016.
- 3.8 The scores from both these stages were added together to determine the overall highest scoring bid.

#### 4 Design competition display and further consultation on the winning scheme

- 4.1 Legal advice was sought at an early stage as to whether public consultation could feature in the procurement process whilst remaining fully compliant with the PCR.
- 4.2 The Council was advised that the inclusion of any form of scoring by the public, or even reporting of public opinion to the Jury, could conflict with the Council's obligations to conduct a fully compliant process as reported in CAB2716. Those involved in the evaluation and the Jury were required by the PCR to make their recommendation in accordance only with the criteria stated in the tender documents at the start of the procurement process. Members of the public could not be expected to do this, nor could the credentials of individual members of the public be checked to ensure that they were objective and unconnected to any of the bidders. All criteria (which can be viewed at Appendix 1) needed to be objective and measurable, and had to be clear enough to allow the Council to explain to bidders the reasons for a particular decision.

4.3 However, it was agreed that an anonymous display of the submissions received in a form provided by the bidders could take place. This exhibition took place in the Guildhall between 9 and 13 May and was very well attended with around 500 visitors throughout the course of the week. The display boards were also made available electronically on the Council's website. Many visitors chose to leave comments or talk to officers staffing the display, and provided useful feedback on aspects of the project as a whole.

## 5 Design Competition participants

5.1 The following firms were shortlisted to participate in the Design Competition:

- Aedas RHWL, London
- Design Engine Architects Ltd, Winchester
- Feilden Clegg Bradley Studios LLP, Bath
- Grimshaw Architects LLP, London
- Hopkins Architects Partnership LLP, London

5.2 Subsequent to these firms being shortlisted, Feilden Clegg Bradley Studios withdrew their bid in December, stating that they had been successful in securing another project within their group and were therefore unable to resource the Winchester project at the level required to complete the competition scheme design to a level of quality that it deserved. In January Grimshaw also withdrew due to concerns regarding the Form of Appointment and their insurers not being able to provide Professional Indemnity cover under a number of fundamental clauses in the Appointment.

5.3 Three Outline Solutions were received before the start of the competitive dialogue process, however following their submission Aedas RHWL withdrew in February, due to the scope of information required and the commitment of resources and costs required for the competition which they felt had become too substantial.

5.4 The competitive dialogue process then continued with Design Engine and Hopkins Architects Partnership, and BAFOs were received from both teams.

5.5 This hybrid approach of the Competitive Dialogue procedure and Design Contest rules under the PCR2015 allowed the Council to fully test the participants for commitment, suitability and adherence to the Council's aims throughout the process, and it has also allowed for the introduction of a Design Jury as part of the final evaluation rather than a closed evaluation by the Competitive Dialogue team. The RIBA Client Advisor has been supportive of the process undertaken by the Council and was of the opinion that it has been very effective in relation to the selection of a suitable architectural team to support the development of the Station Approach area.

## 6 Evaluation of submissions

- 6.1 The design brief was the starting point for the Design Competition, and sets out the quantum of development that the City Council believed to be deliverable based on its own site appraisals which are :
- office accommodation – approximately 13,000 sq m with a suggested split of 5,575 sq m on the Carfax site and 7,425 on the Cattlemarket site
  - residential accommodation – between 5,300 sq m and 8,180 sq m across both sites
  - small scale retail/residential/café uses – 465 sq m
- 6.2 At the outline solutions stage, the design teams undertook their own individual reviews, carried out site analysis and put together their first thoughts on the potential of the sites and the masterplan. The outline solutions submitted in January explored the quantum of development on each site and put forward ideas for alternative development approaches. These outline ideas formed the basis for the competitive dialogue.
- 6.3 During the dialogue, the participating design teams carried out further investigation and analysis of the development sites. They tested different design ideas in architectural and urban design terms, as well as in relation to planning-use mix and development economics. The design teams were mindful of the requirement that all proposals should aim to be compliant with local planning policy and deliverable within land owned by the City Council, as well as achieving the required return on cost.
- 6.4 Both participants concluded that parking for the development should be located underground. The teams demonstrated during the design testing process that in their view both the Carfax and the Cattlemarket sites could support a higher quantum of development than initially anticipated by the City Council without a detrimental impact on design quality.
- 6.5 The viability assessment for both final submissions was evaluated by external cost consultants and valuers to ensure that each achieved a 20% return on cost. Having demonstrated that the schemes were able to pass this threshold, they were eligible to be considered by the Jury
- 6.6 Both schemes were then evaluated by officers for conformity with the design brief which formed 40% of the overall assessment. The Jury then convened between 25 and 29 April 2016 to score the remaining 60% of the evaluation criteria. Following the third Jury meeting on 29 April, it became apparent that the Jury required further time to finalise their report and so this was undertaken at a follow up meeting held on 23 May.
- 6.7 The overall outcome of the Design Competition is that Bidder 'B' is the highest scorer. They have achieved a weighted score of 35.83 out of 40 for the

commercial aspects and conformity with the Design Brief and a weighted score of 24.81 out of 60 from the Design Jury. The full breakdown of the scores achieved by Bidder B is set out in Appendix 1. The full weighted score achieved by Bidder B was 60.64 and the full weighted score achieved by Bidder C was 56.35.

- 6.8 The Jury has made the general comment in its report that both schemes would require some further work to evolve and reach the standard of design which is required by design brief. In its detailed comments it has given an indication of the specific areas where it considers that further work is necessary and also where each scheme has been successful. This provides a positive basis for the next stages of the design process. The Jury was aware in its deliberations that the process has been designed to secure the appointment of a design team and a design response rather than expecting the production of a 'ready to build' scheme. Cabinet will wish to reflect on the Jury's observations as to whether it is satisfied that the highest scoring scheme, with such refinement as may be necessary, will be able to achieve the outcome anticipated in the Brief.

## 7 Decision Making

- 7.1 The Council has received two high quality and thoughtfully considered proposals which were scored extremely closely by the Design Jury. One of the schemes scored more highly in relation to conformity with the Design Brief and therefore is the highest scoring of the proposals overall and this is the team which must be appointed to take forward their proposals if Cabinet decides that an appointment is to be made.
- 7.2 Cabinet will wish to note that although the proposal from the highest scoring team reflects the Council's brief and therefore must form the substantial basis of the scheme which is taken forward, some further refinement of the design response is possible and it is highly likely that the officers or external advisors acting on behalf of the Local Planning Authority (LPA) would wish to address similar issues to those identified by the Jury in the normal course of the dialogue between an applicant and the Council as LPA. Only a scheme which is considered acceptable to the LPA could be granted planning permission and this remains an important further requirement for the design process.
- 7.3 Grant Thornton has been appointed to provide the Council with financial modelling work to assess options for proceeding with the development if Cabinet agrees to continue on its current timescale by appointing the bidder with the highest score. A further report will be presented to Cabinet in July setting out this financial work and the potential options for the Council going forward with the scheme.
- 7.4 If Cabinet decides to decline to appoint at this stage then the options are as follows:
- commence a new procurement process
  - consider options for the disposal of the site

- consider entering into a development partnership

7.5 Cabinet could consider entering into a development partnership of some form. There is the likelihood that it would take some considerable time to secure a development partner delaying considerably the economic benefits which may flow to the City following the successful implementation of a scheme. Delaying the development of the site would have the potential to cause local businesses to seek to move away from the District to meet their business development needs.

## 8 Further information to support the development of Station Approach

8.1 As set out in previous reports, an expression of interest bid for £5million has been submitted to the Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) for public realm and accessibility improvements across both the Carfax and Cattlemarket sites. A further Expression of Interest bid has also been submitted to the LEP for £2.7million which will seek to improve the viability of the Carfax site by funding archaeological investigations and utility service upgrades required in order to be able to develop the site.

8.2 These bids will be considered by the LEP after the Autumn Statement once they receive confirmation of Local Growth funding from Government and have attracted strong support from Hampshire County Council who view the Station Approach Regeneration Scheme as a key part of the economic strategy for Hampshire.

8.3 There is increasing consensus amongst commercial property agents operating within the M3 and South Coast markets that there is a growing supply and demand imbalance of quality, Grade A office space. A number of development sites that were once allocated for offices have now either been converted to alternative uses or are subject to planning applications for change of use and this trend is predicted continue in 2016<sup>1</sup>. In Winchester alone, approximately 9,000 sq m of office space has already been lost through conversion to residential use through permitted development rights over which the Council has very limited control.

8.4 The Council has been approached by a number of existing businesses looking for larger Grade A office space within the city centre. Should their needs not be met, Winchester could see the potential loss of a number of significant existing private sector employers from the City due to the lack of suitable premises. Preventing this outflow of employment was identified as a priority during a recent meeting of local businesses organised by the Winchester Business Improvement District. The lack of suitable premises in Winchester city centre was also evidenced in the Winchester Workspace study 2013, which highlighted that 71% of businesses that took part in the survey stated that they were constrained by a lack of available office space in the city.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lambert Smith Hampton, South Coast Office Market Report November 2015.



- 8.5 The scheme will provide new office space which will allow other office space in the area to be freed up and utilised by other businesses. There is also interest from several other businesses not currently located in Winchester looking to move to the City should suitable accommodation become available. This interest will be lost if suitable sites cannot be found.
- 8.6 New sustainable employment will also bring additional spend in the City which will help maintain other businesses, shops, hotels and restaurants in the City which has wide spread benefits.
- 8.7 As part of its bid to the Enterprise M3 LEP, the County Council worked with officers to draw together the evidence behind the need for the commercial development at Station Approach and to highlight how it supports the four inter-related themes in the Local Growth Fund Prospectus:
- The provision of purpose built office accommodation in this well connected, highly desirable and sustainable location together with public realm and accessibility improvements will provide space of the right quality for existing businesses to grow and for high growth businesses looking to move into the city. It will also support those businesses that are driving demand for grade A office space across the Enterprise M3 LEP area, such as financial and professional services companies, as well as ICT and Digital.
  - Across both the Carfax and Cattlemarket sites, the proposed office, retail and housing development is anticipated to accommodate up to 1,400 new employment opportunities. This will facilitate Enterprise M3 LEP in their ambition to create 52,000 new jobs by 2020. The redevelopment of the Carfax site alone has the potential to provide up to 800 permanent new jobs through the provision of new commercial space.
  - The Enterprise M3 Strategic Economic Plan sets out the ambition for the area to be “the premier location for enterprise and economic growth, balanced with an excellent environment and quality way of life”. The delivery of quality employment space to meet the needs of the market plays a key part in delivering this vision and in enabling Enterprise M3 LEP to create the foundations on which businesses can flourish in order to improve business productivity, increase jobs and maximise the number of businesses operating across the LEP area. The redevelopment of Station Approach plays a vital part in the delivery of quality employment space within the Enterprise M3 LEP area and in helping Winchester to maintain its position as a force for economic prosperity.

#### OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

#### 9 COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND PORTFOLIO PLANS (RELEVANCE TO):

- 9.1 The Station Approach Regeneration Scheme is a key action in the Leader's Portfolio Plan 2016/17, and will directly contribute to the Council's aim to support the local economy.

## 10 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 10.1 If an appointment is made then the Council will be committed to moving the scheme forwards towards a planning application and incurring the fees required by the highest scoring team. This will require expenditure as set out in Appendix 3 (exempt) which will be funded from reserves. Any funding that is agreed will therefore reduce the amount available for any future projects.
- 10.2 The architect's fee proposal was part of their Best and Final Offer submission and formed part of the overall commercial evaluation as to whether or not the development achieved the required 20% return on cost. The fee quoted is for the development of the scheme into a detailed set of proposals for a Planning Application for the Carfax site and for the preparation of a public realm strategy and is in line with a development of this size and nature.
- 10.3 In parallel with this there will be further work required in order to prepare other strategies to support the Planning Application i.e. a detailed Transport Assessment.
- 10.4 Dependent on the mechanism for delivery of the development after planning permission is granted, the fees will be recovered via any commercial return from the development i.e. capital receipt, ongoing revenue, etc.
- 10.5 The estimated cost of developing the Carfax site is circa £58 million. As previously set out in paragraph 7.3, a further report will be presented to Cabinet in July setting out the financial appraisal and the potential options for the Council going forward with the scheme. The Council may be asked to commit further funding, at that stage, depending on the options being presented.

## 11 RISK MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- 11.1 Appendix 2 sets out the significant risks associated with this stage of the Station Approach Regeneration Scheme.
- 11.2 The principal risk arising from the project itself is that the Council contracts with the highest scoring design team and pays for the necessary design work but then does not proceed with development. This would mean that fees incurred could not be recovered from the financial return on the development. This is a standard commercial risk for projects of this nature and the Council should not incur those costs unless it is clear that it intends to make all reasonable efforts proceed with the development.
- 11.3 The next most serious risk is considered to be the impact of not proceeding with a project at all and the delay (and associated cost of delay) that will be incurred.
- 11.4 The City Council assembled the Carfax site by purchasing the County Council's land interest at market value. While the site is currently let for

temporary uses a failure to redevelop the land in a timely way will result in the loss of economic opportunity for residents, increased costs, loss of income as a result of the failure to utilise the site to its economic capacity, loss of rates income, and the potential loss of spending in the local economy if local firms leave the city as a result of the lack of suitable accommodation.

**BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:**

<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning/major-sites/station-approach/>

**APPENDICES:**

Appendix 1 – Evaluation Report

Appendix 2 – Station Approach Key Risks Assessment

Appendix 3 (Exempt) – Fee Proposal

## Appendix 1 – Evaluation Report on highest scoring bidder.

**Financial Viability – Pass/Fail**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score obtained by successful tenderer</b>	<b>Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)</b>
The proposal needed to generate a Return on Capital Employed (ROCE) of at least 20%	Pass	The proposal generates a Return on Capital Employed (ROCE) of at least 20%

**Commercial Viability – Pass/Fail**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score obtained by successful tenderer</b>	<b>Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)</b>
The proposal needed to be contained within the Council's land ownership (as per the Land Ownership plan which was supplied as a supplementary document to the Design Brief)	Pass	The proposal is contained with the Council's land ownership (as per the Land Ownership plan which was supplied as a supplementary document to the Design Brief)
The proposal needed to be capable of delivery without creating any 'ransom' situations (submissions needed to confine themselves to the land in the Council's ownership with access or services provided through publicly owned highway land, or on land provided by partners such as Network Rail, at no additional cost)	Pass	The proposal is capable of delivery without creating any 'ransom' situations (the submission is confined to the land in the Council's ownership with access or services provided through publicly owned highway land, or on land provided by partners such as Network Rail, at no additional cost)

The proposal needed to provide the new commercial and residential usages with at least the level of parking that would be worked up via the 'application of standards' method identified in the Winchester Station Quarter Parking Access Review Final Report 2015	Pass	The proposal provides the new commercial and residential usages with at least the level of parking that would be worked up via the 'application of standards' method identified in the Winchester Station Quarter Parking Access Review Final Report 2015
--	------	---

**Quality – 40% of overall score**

Item no.	Criteria/Sub-criteria	Weight	Score obtained by successful tenderer	Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)
1	<p><b>Provision of appropriate private car parking for the new commercial and residential usages (up to 3 marks available):</b></p> <p>fail - provides the new commercial and residential usages with less than the level of parking that would be worked up via the 'application of standards' method identified in the Winchester Station Quarter Parking Access Review Final Report July 2015</p> <p>1 - provides the new commercial and residential usages with the level of parking that would be worked up via the 'application of standards' method identified in the Winchester Station Quarter Parking Access Review</p>	7.5%	2 from a possible 3	The proposal provides the new commercial and residential usages with the level of parking that would be worked up via the 'composite' method identified in the Winchester Station Quarter Parking Access Review Final Report July 2015

Item no.	Criteria/Sub-criteria	Weight	Score obtained by successful tenderer	Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)
	<p>Final Report July 2015</p> <p>2 - provides the new commercial and residential usages with the level of parking that would be worked up via the 'composite' method identified in the Winchester Station Quarter Parking Access Review Final Report July 2015</p> <p>3 - provides the new commercial and residential usages with the level of parking that would be worked up via the 'first principles' method identified in the Winchester Station Quarter Parking Access Review Final Report July 2015</p>			
2	<p><b>Floorspace requirements (up to 3 marks available):</b></p> <p>0 - does not meet any of the floorspace requirements specified in the brief</p> <p>1 - incorporates the office floorspace requirements specified in the brief but does not meet any of the other floorspace requirements specified in the brief</p> <p>2 - incorporates the office floorspace requirements specified in the brief and one other element of the</p>	7.5%	3 from a possible 3	The proposal incorporates three (all) elements of the floorspace requirements specified in the brief

Item no.	Criteria/Sub-criteria	Weight	Score obtained by successful tenderer	Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)
	<p>floorspace requirements specified in the brief</p> <p>3 - incorporates three (all) elements of the floorspace requirements specified in the brief</p>			
3	<p><b>Provision of the same level of current public car parking across the area (up to 5 marks available):</b></p> <p>0 - provides less than 80% of the current level of public car parking across the area</p> <p>1 - provides 80-84% of the current level of public car parking across the area</p> <p>2 - provides 85-89% of the current level of public car parking across the area</p> <p>3 - provides 90-94% of the current level of public car parking across the area</p> <p>4 - provides 95-99% of the current level of public car parking across the area</p> <p>5 - provides 100% of the current level of public car parking across the area</p>	7.5%	5 from a possible 5	The proposal provides 100% of the current level of public car parking across the area

Item no.	Criteria/Sub-criteria	Weight	Score obtained by successful tenderer	Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)
4	<p><b>Exceeding the floorspace requirements (up to 5 marks available):</b></p> <p>0 - does not exceed the floorspace requirements in the brief</p> <p>1 - exceeds the minimum floorspace requirements by 1-5%</p> <p>2 - exceeds the minimum floorspace requirements by 6-10%</p> <p>3 - exceeds the minimum floorspace requirements by 11-15%</p> <p>4 - exceeds the minimum floorspace requirements by 16-20%</p> <p>5 - exceeds the minimum floorspace requirements by 21+%</p>	7.5%	5 from a possible 5	The proposal exceeds the minimum floorspace requirements by 21+%
5	<p><b>Delivers commercial buildings attractive for long term institutional investment that meet the needs of typical occupiers (up to 2 marks available):</b></p>	5.0%	2 from a possible 2	The proposal meets BCO standards and supplies evidence of subdivision of flooring into commercially appropriate sizes



Item no.	Criteria/Sub-criteria	Weight	Score obtained by successful tenderer	Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)
	<p>0 – Proposal does not meet BCO standards</p> <p>1 – Proposal meets BCO standards</p> <p>2 – Proposal meets BCO standards and supplies evidence of subdivision of flooring into commercially appropriate sizes</p>			
6	<p><b>Contributes to a lower carbon Winchester District (up to 3 marks available):</b></p> <p>0 - Proposal does not demonstrate the following standards as a minimum:  Commercial element = BREEAM excellent  Residential element = Code 4  All elements = Energy Efficiency Rating B</p> <p>1 - Proposal demonstrates the following standards:  Commercial element = BREEAM excellent  Residential element = Code 4  All elements = Energy Efficiency Rating B</p> <p>2 - Proposal demonstrates the following standards:</p>	5.0%	2 from a possible 3	<p>The proposal has targeted a BREEAM 'outstanding' score in it's pre assessment estimate for the non-residential element and has targeted 8 out of an available 12 Ene 01 energy credits. The proposal has also committed to meeting the Winchester City Council policy requirement of Code 4 standards for energy and water for the residential elements. No reference or commitment has been made to any Energy Efficiency Rating for Energy Performance Certificates.</p>

Item no.	Criteria/Sub-criteria	Weight	Score obtained by successful tenderer	Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)
	Commercial element = BREEAM excellent Residential element = Code 4 All elements = Energy Efficiency Rating A  3 – Proposal demonstrates the following standards: Commercial element = BREEAM outstanding Residential element = Code 4 All elements = Energy Efficiency Rating A			
<b>TOTAL SCORE OBTAINED BY SUCCESSFUL TENDERER FOR QUALITY</b>			<b>19 from a possible 21</b>	

**Design Contest Jury – 60% of overall score**

Item no.	Criteria/Sub-criteria	Weight	Score obtained by successful tenderer	Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)
1	<b>Innovative, high quality and attractive design proposals,</b>	10%	0.89 from a	The character of the scheme by Bidder B reflected the local character to almost a satisfactory standard primarily because of the

Item no.	Criteria/Sub-criteria	Weight	Score obtained by successful tenderer	Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)
	<p><b>including a gateway arrival point, of suitable scale for the area as a whole (up to 3 marks available):</b></p> <p>0 – proposals have addressed this item to an unsatisfactory standard</p> <p>1 – proposals have addressed this item to a satisfactory standard</p> <p>2 – proposals have addressed this item to a good standard</p> <p>3 – proposals have addressed this item to an excellent standard</p>		possible 3	<p>pitched roofs, gables and eaves, which provides a unity in character within the whole area.</p> <p>With regard to the creation of a high quality and welcoming arrival ‘gateway’ point and improved wayfinding and legibility some of the more intimate routes proposed by Bidder B were satisfactory. Bidder B’s proposals for surface treatment could be satisfactory but does require further thought on the organisation of the separation of buses, taxis, car drop off, cycles and pedestrians.</p> <p>Jurors generally welcomed Bidder B’s proposal to locate kiosks on the north side of the arrival space as a welcoming element, but these would need to be of a high design quality to be successful..</p> <p>For the Carfax site in particular, the retail/café unit proposed by Bidder B on the corner could add to the ‘welcome’, but there needs to be a response in the massing or elevational treatment that recognises better the potential significance of this space.</p> <p>With regard to the retention of the former Register Office building, this had been considered by Bidder with a satisfactory explanation given regarding this. Given the amount of accommodation proposed by the development, the Design Jury recognised why it</p>

Item no.	Criteria/Sub-criteria	Weight	Score obtained by successful tenderer	Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)
				was not retained.
2	<p><b>Insightful analysis and high quality public realm strategy and creation of attractive and vibrant public spaces and enhanced wayfinding (up to 3 marks available):</b></p> <p>0 – proposals have addressed this item to an unsatisfactory standard</p> <p>1 – proposals have addressed this item to a satisfactory standard</p> <p>2 – proposals have addressed this item to a good standard</p> <p>3 – proposals have addressed this item to an excellent standard</p>	10%	0.89 from a possible 3	<p>The Jury felt that Bidder B had set out their vision clearly. The proposals from Bidder B were satisfactory. Bidder B has created more intimate spaces for the housing part of the Carfax site.</p> <p>With regard to the retention of existing mature trees where possible, Bidder B appeared to be able to retain the existing street trees on Worthy Lane because their proposals set the houses sufficiently far back from the road.</p> <p>For the Carfax site, Bidder B had achieved a satisfactory proposal for retaining a pedestrian route through the site linking the station forecourt and Sussex Street, improving its quality and accessibility. The secondary routes with little alleyways presented a more intimate and residential grain for pedestrians, like some alleyways elsewhere in Winchester.</p>
3	<p><b>Creative use of appropriate massing and configuration of built form for sites to repair the</b></p>	10%	1.33 from a possible 3	Bidder B has safeguarded the view of the station frontage from the Carfax junction.

Item no.	Criteria/Sub-criteria	Weight	Score obtained by successful tenderer	Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)
	<p><b>existing urban fabric and character (up to 3 marks available):</b></p> <p>0 – proposals have addressed this item to an unsatisfactory standard</p> <p>1 – proposals have addressed this item to a satisfactory standard</p> <p>2 – proposals have addressed this item to a good standard</p> <p>3 – proposals have addressed this item to an excellent standard</p>			<p>Bidder B was applauded for addressing views from Andover Road, although the view they have proposed is very narrow and would need to be wider to carry sufficient significance to make it worthwhile achieving.</p> <p>The Jury liked the way in which the scheme by Bidder B starts with a lower roof line higher up the site and has positioned the higher roof lines at the lower end of the site, which reflects the transition from suburbia to the City centre.</p> <p>Views of both sites from a distance are important. In this regard Bidder B has a slightly lower height profile on the Carfax site with a more acceptable silhouette of pitched roofs.</p> <p>Bidder B's proposals have considered their impact on existing residential accommodation satisfactorily.</p> <p>The massing and bulk of Bidder B's buildings as currently proposed on Station Hill is less than satisfactory.</p> <p>With regard to the existing domestic dwellings on Worthy Lane Bidder B has proposed a satisfactory response with lower height development set further back from the road.</p>

Item no.	Criteria/Sub-criteria	Weight	Score obtained by successful tenderer	Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)
4	<p><b>Demonstrable good judgement in the design proposals for an appropriate mix and good balance of uses across the proposed sites and wider area (up to 3 marks available):</b></p> <p>0 – proposals have addressed this item to an unsatisfactory standard</p> <p>1 – proposals have addressed this item to a satisfactory standard</p> <p>2 – proposals have addressed this item to a good standard</p> <p>3 – proposals have addressed this item to an excellent standard</p>	10%	1.67 from a possible 3	<p>Bidder B has met the office accommodation requirements in the Brief and created the potential to develop a commercial office hub.</p> <p>Bidder B has more than generous accommodation for private parking spaces.</p> <p>Bidder B has satisfactorily strengthened the retail offer.</p> <p>Bidder B was applauded for their ‘blind-mixing’ of tenure or ‘pepper-potting’ on the Cattlemarket site which the jury considered to be good. Some housing on the Cattlemarket site proposed by Bidder B appeared to be an unacceptable distance apart and some internal apartment layouts appeared to be inadequately lit.</p>
5	<p><b>High quality materials, external appearance and articulation of facades and roofscapes (up to 3 marks available):</b></p>	10%	1.56 from a possible 3	<p>Bidder B’s proposal was satisfactorily in harmony with the character of Winchester in some respects. Bidder B’s cladding was satisfactory but the Jury questioned why so much of the residential buildings in Bidder B’s scheme were clad in timber.</p>

Item no.	Criteria/Sub-criteria	Weight	Score obtained by successful tenderer	Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)
	<p>0 – proposals have addressed this item to an unsatisfactory standard</p> <p>1 – proposals have addressed this item to a satisfactory standard</p> <p>2 – proposals have addressed this item to a good standard</p> <p>3 – proposals have addressed this item to an excellent standard</p>			<p>Bidder B's proposals presented a good insightful analysis which informed their approach to external appearance and roof form, though less successfully for the office buildings.</p> <p>The Jury felt more work was required for setting a new standard for the quality of design where it is currently poor.</p>
6	<p><b>Active and varied street frontages and permeability into and through the proposed sites (up to 3 marks available):</b></p> <p>0 – proposals have addressed this item to an unsatisfactory standard</p> <p>1 – proposals have addressed this item to a satisfactory standard</p>	10%	1.11 from a possible 3	<p>With regard to the creation of mixed use buildings with active frontages that provide a variety of active uses along key routes, Bidder B addressed this satisfactorily.</p> <p>Bidder B provided good routes for pedestrians with intimate (although less direct) routes.</p> <p>The Jury could not see how the overall Air Quality of the area was improved.</p>

Item no.	Criteria/Sub-criteria	Weight	Score obtained by successful tenderer	Reasons for award of score (relative characteristics/advantages of successful tenderer)
	<p>2 – proposals have addressed this item to a good standard</p> <p>3 – proposals have addressed this item to an excellent standard</p>			
<b>TOTAL SCORE/WEIGHTED SCORE OBTAINED BY SUCCESSFUL TENDERER FROM DESIGN CONTEST JURY</b>			7.45 from a possible 18	

<b>TOTAL OVERALL SCORE OBTAINED BY SUCCESSFUL TENDERER</b>	<b>26.45 from a possible 39</b>
--	---------------------------------



## Appendix 2 Station Approach – key risk assessment

Risk number	Description of risk	Likelihood	Impact	How will the risk be managed?	Assigned to
1	Cabinet do not appoint design team to commence design work on Carfax and prepare public realm strategy	Unlikely	Significant	Work with bidders during competitive dialogue process to ensure Best and Final Offers received reflect the themes and principles of the Design Brief.	Head of Estates
2	Design team is appointed and fees incurred but development process is halted by the Council leaving fees as unrecoverable expenditure	Unlikely	Moderate	Ensure that non-recovery of fees is affordable without serious consequential impacts.  Members should not proceed with scheme unless fully committed to development process.	Head of Estates
3	Local residents and members of the public feel dissatisfied with the project, campaigns against the development which may cause delay and additional costs	Likely	Moderate	Following appointment of design team, undertake full public consultation as part of design development to explain and seek support to planning stage.  Continue engaging with the Station Approach Panel	Head of Policy & Projects
4	Availability of specialist skills and advice for decision If these resources are not available there could be a	Unlikely	Major	Ensure the appropriate expertise is brought together at the appropriate time to support the project.	Head of Estates/ Assistant Director (Policy & Planning)

<b>Risk number</b>	<b>Description of risk</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>How will the risk be managed?</b>	<b>Assigned to</b>
	delay in the development.				
5	Bid for Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) funding is unsuccessful	Unlikely	Moderate	Failure to obtain funding for public realm improvements from LEP would not prevent other funding being sought although timescales may be stretched. Engage with EM3 LEP and ensure Members are heavily engaged to support the bid; identify other resources which could be considered to assist in delivering the Public Realm Strategy. Both bids have been developed and strongly supported by HCC.	Assistant Director (Policy & Planning)
6	Project business case does not achieve financial viability	Unlikely	Major	Undertake Financial Due Diligence and develop financial model to assess and identify mitigation of financial risks. External financial expertise has been commissioned.	Head of Finance
7	Demand for office uses does not translate into pre-let	Unlikely	Moderate	Construction will not start without agreed level of pre-let. Difficult decision therefore only materialises if Council has choice to proceed or not based on pre-lets marginally short of target.  If insufficient market exists at a point in time, project could be reactivated at later date.	Head of Estates
8	Current buoyant housing	Unlikely	Moderate	Ensure project timetable is adhered to.	Head of Estates

Risk number	Description of risk	Likelihood	Impact	How will the risk be managed?	Assigned to
	market declines affecting viability				
9	Costs of construction rise meaning development does not achieve the financial return required	Unlikely	Moderate	Ensure project timetable is adhered to	Head of Estates
10	Legal challenges raised causing a delay in the development and subsequently an additional cost to the project	Highly Unlikely	Significant	Ensure any legal challenges can be defended by obtaining expert advice to guide and inform processes.	Head of Legal and Democratic Services
11	Planning permission is refused	Unlikely	Significant	Ensure that the design principles are in accordance with the themes of the Local Plan. Seek pre application advice prior to submission of the Planning Application.	Head of Estates