

CENTRAL WINCHESTER REGENERATION INFORMAL POLICY GROUP

30 October 2017

Attendance:

Councillors:

Chairman: Horrill (P)

Ashton (P)

Burns (P)

Elks (P)

Hutchison

Izard (P)

Read (P)

Officer: Andy Hickman - Assistant Director (Policy & Planning).

Others in attendance:

Councillors: Bell, Godfrey, Jeffs and Weston.

Officers in Attendance:

Laura Taylor – Chief Executive

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 25 September 2017 (Report CAB2982 refers) be approved and adopted.

2. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Charles Campion and Marcus Adams and other representatives of John Thompson and Partners (JTP), architects and master planners 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.

The Chairman thanked all Members for working collaboratively across political parties to reach this point in having a draft SPD.

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

The Chairman explained the format of the draft SPD to the meeting. The Chairman made reference to the necessity to take into account planning policies and legal requirements. The document now made links to the

Council's policies but was not prescriptive and was evidence based. The draft SPD gave a look and feel of possible types of land use and development mix on the site and set up a framework that was not detailed site by site. It was required to be written in a way that would be deliverable.

The Council did not own the entire site and the draft SPD would be helpful to landowners in giving guidance to develop the site incrementally over time.

The Chairman thanked JTP for their contribution in producing the draft SPD.

RESOLVED:

That the comments of the Chairman be noted.

4. **PRESENTATION BY THE JTP TEAM ON THE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)**

Mr Adams gave a presentation on the draft SPD.

Mr Adams referred to the need to keep to the vision and to have clarity within the document.

The regeneration site was in multiple land ownership, of which the City Council owned a large part. The site had constraints but also presented opportunities. It had no listed buildings, but the Antiques Market and Woolstaplers Hall were of merit. There was the opportunity to open up views, including those of the Guildhall building, and to improve green and blue infrastructure.

The draft SPD was available for public comment.

In terms of the document's layout, the majority of the research had been contained in appendices towards the rear of the document and these included details of history, constraints and opportunities, the engagement process, Winchesterness, views and skyline study and mandatory limitations.

The front of the document contained the introduction, context and planning and urban design framework. Considerations in this section were planning policies (including policy DM8 relating to the primary shopping area) and vision and the eight objectives: Vibrant mixed-use quarter; Winchesterness, exceptional public realm, city experience, sustainable transport, incremental delivery, housing for all and community. The section on context included reference to engagement, Winchesterness principles and views and skyline and to have a roofscape with interest.

The Public Realm Framework Plan included an improved setting to King Alfred statue; bus movements restricted to turning at Busket Lane; the Broadway transformed into a key public space; use of Woolstaplers Hall; shared surface and open water way along Riverside Walk; Almhouse meadow/ public pocket park; new and improved crossings; bus hub located on

the Middle Brook Street Car Park and/or Friarsgate; the Brooks shopping centre; improved public realm and view of the Cathedral along Middle Brook Street including removal of four trees; retained and refurbished Antiques Market; Tanner Street – shared surface; service zone along Silver Hill and public space with view to Guildhall. A new proposal related to the possibility of relocating the proposed Middle Brook Street bus station to the south and re-routing traffic to the north so that the bus station was better connected to the regeneration area.

Mr Adams further explained how the enclosure analysis had influenced the framework for the Riverside Walk and the Lower High Street area and also Friarsgate Passage. Tanner Street would be redeveloped as a shared surface street and the Antiques Market would be retained and refurbished with a new public space around it to create a place similar to the Meeting House Square in Temple Bar, Dublin. Friarsgate Passage would be a new east to west connection between Tanner Street and the Riverside Walk and would be a narrow pedestrianised lane. In Silver Hill the Woolstaplers Hall would be retained and converted for alternative uses.

The land use was aimed to create a new a mixed use quarter. The three key public-use anchors of the redevelopment would be the Antiques Market, Woolstaplers Hall and a point on Riverside Walk, which would be the potential locations for cultural, heritage and community uses. Heights were also important and the maximum height of the development within the site would be limited to a maximum datum height of 55.7 metres, which was the height of the existing building on the corner of Friarsgate and Middle Brook Street.

The developable area ranged between 30,000 and 36,000 square metres and it was proposed to be apportioned as follows:

Retail: 3,500 to 8,700 square metres
Residential 12,900 to 26,000 square metres
Mixed uses (including leisure, commercial, community, cultural and heritage)
4,000 to 13,000 square metres.

Delivery of the scheme would be through multiple developers and architectural practices. There were challenges to delivery and proposals needed to be formulated to create sufficient value, for example to seek to provide affordable housing across the development and to pay for the opening of water ways and other infrastructure. Landowners would be involved in seeking delivery.

The regeneration site could be put to meanwhile use in the short term, and already changes to the bus station had taken place and parts of the site could be used for pop-up events. The Antiques Market could also be used for an art based usage which would bring culture into the quarter.

The Chairman thanked Mr Adams for the presentation and also City Council's Project Management Team and Communications Team for their contribution towards the draft SPD.

RESOLVED:

1. That the draft SPD be recommended to Cabinet on 6 December 2017 for formal consultation (11 December 2017 to 5 February 2018).

2. That the Central Winchester Regeneration Informal Policy Group reviews the comments received during the formal consultation and considers proposed changes to the draft SPD prior to recommending it to Cabinet for formal adoption.

5. **ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION PLAN**

The Chairman reminded the meeting that copies of the draft SPD would be available on the Council's website from 31 October 2017 and that hard copies would be available to collect from the City Council's Reception. Copies would also be available to inspect at local libraries from December.

The formal consultation period would be open until 5 February 2018. There would be a formal form for comments. Representation could still be made on the draft SPD up to 6 December 2017, and after this date comments would be rolled forward to be part of the formal consultation process. One form would be available to make comments during both consultation periods.

There was the opportunity to provide feedback online through the Council's website and written comments would be also received.

There would be an exhibition with visual displays and this would be held on 14 November 2017 in the Walton Suite, Guildhall, Winchester between 4:00 pm – 8:00pm. Representatives of JTP would be present in order that questions could be asked and comments could be received.

The formal launch of the consultation period would take place on Monday 11 December 2017 in the Wintonian Room, Guildhall, Winchester between 2:00pm and 9:00pm.

In addition, there would be opportunities to talk to businesses and residents through a touring Exhibition during the period 10 – 16 January 2018 and the location and times of these events would be notified in due course.

The draft SPD would be considered by the City Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 27 November 2017 and by Cabinet on 6 December 2017 for final approval for formal consultation. Following the closure of formal consultation on 5 February 2018 the final SPD would be considered by Cabinet in the spring/summer of 2018.

Further details of the engagement and consultation proposals were contained within the Project Update Broadsheet provided at the meeting and available on the Council's website.

In reply to a Member's question, it was agreed that copies of the draft SPD would also be made available in libraries that neighboured the City Council's area and that also served local City Council residents.

RESOLVED:

That the engagement and consultation plan be noted.

6. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

During public participation the following points were made, which are summarised below:

Mixed Uses

Martin Willey: As a retired Town Planner he commended the vision but questioned the appeal of mixed uses to developers. In his view there was little demand for retail (due to the rise of Internet shopping), nor was there demand for large office space (but there may be demand for smaller offices in Winchester). Housing would be the primary use, unless an 'address' was created to generate a demand for offices, for example as had happened at Bridgewater Hall in Manchester (which he had worked upon). A wider range of mixed use to include leisure, health, culture, arts and education would have appeal and the inclusion of a music centre (as proposed by Richard York) or a museum (as proposed by Alan Lovell) would, in his view, increase the value of the development. He added that the scheme could appeal to smaller/local investors rather than investment funds.

The Chairman stated that the concept of an address as demonstrated by the Manchester example would be given consideration.

Elizabeth Thorn: Following the workshops held in March, and her participation within the Heritage Group, she was of the opinion that culture and heritage had only been acknowledged in passing and that too large an area had been allocated for retail shopping and cafes. It was her view that the whole area was not required for retail and cafes and that a museum, the English Project and a cinema (showing films to the interest of the Winchester public) was required to provide more emphasis on heritage and culture.

The Chairman stated that page 40 of the draft SPD allowed for a broad range of space, with 3,500 to 8,700 square metres allocated for retail and between 4,000 and 13,000 square metres allocated for mixed uses including heritage. The area allocated for mixed uses was higher than retail and the aspiration was for a mixed use development.

Michael Carden: The City of Winchester Trust commented that Winchester had a variety (of land uses) and asked how the City could promote the use of its land (with multiple developers).

The Chairman commented that the previous scheme from one developer had not found favour and now an incremental approach was being considered to bring the scheme to fruition. The Informal Policy Group had been involved in considering an approach that would embrace the scheme's totality including the public realm.

Consultation

Brian Collin: Would the formal consultation exercise provide the opportunity to comment (as well as ask questions) so that dialogue could be entered into? Mr Collin also commented that the pedestrian flow in Winchester varied throughout the day, for example with public sector workers coming into the town centre from the west between 11:30 and 14:30 and tourists being predominantly present in the afternoons.

The Chairman stated that the drop-in public events and the exhibitions would provide the opportunity for conversation and dialogue. JTP had been extensive in their engagement with many age groups and many different groups of people to try to take in all views.

John Hearn: Reference was made to the questionnaire used by The City Council (on the Leisure Centre Project) at Bar End and that there was no opportunity to make comment, but only to ask questions. He asked whether there would be the opportunity to write about other things that were not included in the questionnaire and how emails and written papers would be taken into account (during the formal consultation period).

The Chairman replied that there would be a form with questions that also included a blank sheet in order to make comments and give feedback. The form would be used in order that it would be easier to assimilate comments, but emails and other representation would also be taken on board so that the process was efficient and also open.

Abdul Kayum: The Muslim community had not been originally engaged by JTP, but following dialogue with the City Council's Mayor and others they had now been engaged. For an inclusive society, matters of culture, social inclusion and equality should not just be buzzwords but should be an aspiration to be included into the design and how a community was expressed going forward.

The Chairman stated that time should be taken to look at the revised draft SPD.

Delivery

Patrick Davies: Asked who would take matters forward during the implementation period from spring 2018; would it be JTP or the Council?

The Chairman replied that JTP had no commitment beyond their present task.

Judith Martin: Reference had been made that Compulsory Purchase Orders would not be made but how would the various landowners, such as

Henderson's, the surgery and Marks and Spencer's co-operate and what would the City Council do if they did not co-operate.

The Chairman stated that the City Council would be undertaking engagement with landowners and was hopeful that they would want to work collaboratively. However, if this did not materialise then the matter would be reconsidered.

Jonathan Searle: There were concerns as to how a comprehensive scheme could be ensured going forward when multiple architects and developers would be engaged.

The Chairman stated that the SPD had an aspiration that this be achieved.

Tim Fell: The SPD did not contain a method of delivery.

The Chairman replied that consultation and then approval of the SPD was required first.

Tommy Geddes: There was benefit in having multiple developers, so that a monolithic development was avoided, but would this affect timescales towards a finished scheme.

The Chairman replied that the Council wished to progress the scheme and in the interim uses would be made (of land within the site), for example as was now agreed for the Antiques Market. The Council would bring forward change as effectively as it could do and would make good use of the site in the short term until the final solutions were agreed.

Height of buildings

Caroline Scott: consideration had to be given to the height of buildings to avoid certain buildings from dominating the development.

The Chairman stated that the draft SPD contained considerable detail on views and skyline as this was recognised as an area of sensitivity. Feedback from the public was welcomed if it was considered that the draft SPD had not addressed these points.

The Chairman thanked the public speakers for their contribution.

The meeting commenced at 6:00pm and concluded at 7:40pm.

Chairman