



<b>Meeting</b>	Cabinet (Central Winchester Regeneration) Committee
<b>Date and Time</b>	Tuesday, 27th November, 2018 at 4.30 pm.
<b>Venue</b>	King Charles Hall, Guildhall, Winchester

## AGENDA

### PROCEDURAL ITEMS

- 1. Apologies**  
To record the names of apologies given.
- 2. Disclosure of Interests**  
To receive any disclosure of interests from Members and Officers in matters to be discussed.  
*Note: Councillors are reminded of their obligations to declare disclosable pecuniary interests, personal and/or prejudicial interests in accordance with legislation and the Council's Code of Conduct.*
- 3. To note any request from Councillors to make representations on an agenda item under Council Procedure Rule 35.**  
*Note: Councillors wishing to speak about a particular agenda item are requested to advise the Democratic Services Officer before the meeting. Councillors will normally be invited by the Chairman to speak immediately prior to the appropriate item.*
- 4. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 25 September 2018 (Pages 5 - 8)**
- 5. Public Participation**  
– to receive and note questions asked and statements made from members of the public on issues relating to the responsibility of this Committee (see note overleaf).

### BUSINESS ITEMS

- 6. The Nutshell - Presentation**



7. Central Winchester Regeneration Progress CAB3106(CWR) (Pages 9 - 40)

L Hall  
Head of Legal Services (Interim)

Members of the public are able to easily access all of the papers for this meeting by opening the QR Code reader on your phone or tablet. Hold your device over the QR Code below so that it's clearly visible within your screen and you will be redirected to the agenda pack.



16 November 2018

Agenda Contact: Dave Shaw, Principal Democratic Services Officer  
Tel: 01962 848221 Email: [dshaw@winchester.gov.uk](mailto:dshaw@winchester.gov.uk)

### **Membership 2018/19**

**Chairman:** Horrill (The Leader with Portfolio for Housing)  
Brook  
Ashton

Deputy:

#### Non-Voting Invited representatives

Councillors Burns, Hutchison, Mather and Murphy

Councillors Berry (Non-voting Deputy) and Weir (Non-voting Deputy)

In the event of any of the standing or deputy or deputy member not being available for a particular meeting, another member of Cabinet will be selected in alphabetical rotation by the Legal Services Manager to substitute for the standing member.

**Quorum** = 3 members

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Public Participation is at the Chairman's discretion. If your question relates to an item on the agenda, you will normally be asked to speak at the time of the relevant item. Representations will be limited to a maximum of 3 minutes, subject to a maximum 15 minutes set aside for all questions and answers. If several people wish to speak on the same subject, the Chairman may ask for one person to speak on everyone's behalf. As time is limited, a "first come first served" basis will be operated.

To reserve your place to speak, you are asked to arrive no later than 10 minutes before the start of the meeting to register your intention to speak. Please contact the Democratic Services Officer in advance for further details.

The names of members of the public etc who have registered to address committee meetings will appear in the minutes as part of the public record, which will include on the Council's website. Those wishing to address a committee meeting who object to their names being made available in this way must notify the Democratic Services Officer either when registering to speak, or within 10 days of this meeting.

**DISABLED ACCESS:**

Disabled access is normally available, but please phone Democratic Services on 01962 848 264 or email [democracy@winchester.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@winchester.gov.uk) to ensure that the necessary arrangements are in place.

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Included within the Council's Constitution (Part 3, Section 2) which is available [here](#)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **CABINET (CENTRAL WINCHESTER REGENERATION) COMMITTEE**

**25 September 2018**

Attendance:

Councillors:

Horrill (Chairman)

Ashton

Brook

Other invited Councillors:

Burns

Hutchison

Mather

Murphy

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Bell and Gottlieb

---

### 1. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

There were no disclosures of interests from Members of the Committee.

Councillor Gottlieb declared a personal and pecuniary interest in matters relating to the St Clements Surgery and also that he was a member of the Winchester Deserves Better campaign group.

Following conferring with the Corporate Head of Resources over his declaration of interest, Councillor Gottlieb left the meeting and did not address the Committee.

### 2. **MINUTES**

Councillor Hutchison stated that her comments made under Minute 3 – Council Procedure Rule 35, had not been reflected fully in the Minute. She reiterated her concerns that the spirit of cooperation present under the Informal Policy Group had been lost and that the Urban Delivery Report had not been discussed. She added that the Advisory Panels had not been developed as was wanted.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee held on 10 July 2018 be approved and adopted.

## 5. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Richard Baker, speaking on behalf of the City of Winchester Trust, stated that for the Outline Delivery Strategy the appointment of the Strategic Advisor would be key to its success. Those appointed to be the Strategic Advisor would require sensitivity, understanding and importantly have experience with regeneration 'in the heart' of historic cities, in order to brief and commission the Master Plan. The Master Plan would consider land uses in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), including pedestrian access, car parking, cultural, retail and a bus hub. The masterplan should consider the Winchester Movement Strategy and the wider integration of the scheme into the town. The masterplan should also involve public consultation for its adoption in 2020, with planning applications received by 2021.

Tim Fell, in summary, spoke of the need to seek public engagement and to harness the expertise and talents of local people and external advisors. The standing Advisory Panels should be appointed at the earliest opportunity and would reassure the public, considering subjects such as archaeology and town planning. Of benefit would be the commencing of major public realm projects, for example a pocket park at Riverside, city walks, a piazza at the Antiques Market and improving the appearance of the former Friarsgate Surgery. The provision of small retail units at affordable rents should also be sought and also to integrate Woolstaplers Hall into the proposals.

Patrick Davies, in summary, mentioned meanwhile uses, for example tidying up the former Friarsgate Surgery and use of the land behind the bus station, whilst not losing sight of long term expectations. He also asked about the situation with the introduction of car parking charges in the Marks and Spencer Car park in St Clement Street.

Arthur Morgan, in summary, commented that it was open to interpretation on the skills required and in identifying who would lead the project; would it be led by the Council and/or a developer? Winchester Deserves Better had produced their own scheme based on the Central Winchester Regeneration (CWR) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), they were not the developer but wished to show this to take the scheme forward. The scheme needed to be civic minded rather than commercial with a lot of public realm, museums, and performance space, residential and to open up the brooks. Archaeology also needed to be resolved. It was an opportunity not to be missed. A key was architecture. The project should be controlled to be financially viable, but not to 'sweat the asset', as the scheme radiated into the whole city and also provided an opportunity to revitalise it.

The Chairman replied to the points raised, in particular to Mr Davies by saying that the car park in question was leased to Marks and Spencer and therefore the monetary collection was in their domain.

The Chairman thanked the public speakers for their contributions.

6. **CENTRAL WINCHESTER REGENERATION UPDATE AND ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY PANELS**  
(Report CAB3077(CWR) refers)

The Committee received an introduction from Councillor Horrill which provided an update on the Central Winchester Regeneration Project, including the establishment of the Advisory Panels which would help inform the project streams. Councillor Horrill stated that the three month period for legal challenge for the SPD had now expired and no challenges had been received, and that this was a material consideration moving forward.

The Head of Programme outlined the work streams to the meeting, as set out in the Report. These were to develop a strategy to deliver the vision and aspirations outlined in the SPD; the establishment of advisory panels; the refurbishment and re-letting of Coitbury House; implementing a meanwhile use strategy for the vacant space in the bus station (a mural had now been displayed); the drive to let vacant property on a short-term basis within the regeneration area; deliver the repaving of lower High Street and revisit plans for Broadway; identify and deliver short term improvements to the public realm in the Central Winchester Regeneration area and to agree and deliver the archaeology event (on 11 December 2018).

In summary, the following matters were raised by Members and the Chairman and Head of Programme responded as set out below:

The Advisory Panels would help to inform projects and would include a wide range of participants, including the public and interested groups. The Chairman added that there might be other Advisory Panels appointed as the project moved forward.

The SPD assisted in defining the short, medium and long-term options. For example, as the area was contained, the Broadway gateway could be improved by landscaping, including providing wider pavements and removing car parking by the King Alfred statue. The repaving of the lower part of the High Street and Middle Brook Street were longer term objectives and it was noted that issues such as the re-opening up of water ways and the archaeology would need to be addressed before the Lower High Street and Middle Brook Street were repaved.

There was also parallel work to be undertaken in balancing strategic direction with short-term uses. Some of the short-term uses could then be judged on their success as to whether they became long-term features within the regeneration scheme.

The Meanwhile Use Advisory Panel would consider the provision of pop up shops.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Terms of Reference and membership for the Advisory Panels as outlined in the Report be approved.

7. **CENTRAL WINCHESTER OUTLINE DELIVERY STRATEGY**

(Report CAB3080(CWR) refers)

The Strategic Director: Place introduced the Report stating that the SPD showed the overall approach and was comprised of many interlocking aspects, and he would be pleased to take questions and hear views on the approach.

In answer to Members' questions, the Strategic Director: Place stated that he would be working with Members to appoint the most appropriate Strategic Advisor to assist in the development of the delivery strategy. The successful Strategic Advisor would be appointed through a procurement exercise and the brief for the Strategic Advisor would be consulted on with Members. The Strategic Advisor's role would be multi disciplinary, looking all aspects of the delivery strategy.

Members also commented that the Master Plan was required to define different sections of the project, leading to dialogue on each. For example, whether the public transport bus requirement was for a bus station, bus hub or a bus stop.

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

RESOLVED:

That outline delivery strategy as detailed in the Report, including the development of a scope for procurement of a Strategic Advisor, be approved.

The meeting commenced at 4.30pm and concluded at 5.50pm



CAB3106(CWR)

CABINET (CENTRAL WINCHESTER REGENERATION) COMMITTEE

REPORT TITLE: CENTRAL WINCHESTER REGENERATION PROGRESS

27 NOVEMBER 2018

REPORT OF LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER: Cllr Caroline Horrill

Contact Officer: Vervan Lyons Tel No: 01962 8484596 Email  
vlyons@winchester.gov.uk

WARD(S): TOWN WARDS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to update members on the progress to date of the central Winchester regeneration project and to seek approval for the next steps.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

That the Cabinet (Central Winchester Regeneration) Committee:

1. Notes the progress with the project and the comments of the advisory panels.
2. Approves work to complete business case for meanwhile use work stream as outlined in paragraphs 11.12 to 11.30 and to delegate authority to the Head of Programme to finalise the brief in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.
3. Approves further design work around public realm in lower High Street and Broadway as set out in paragraphs 11.31 to 11.41 and to delegate authority to the Head of Programme to make minor amendments to the brief in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.
4. Comments on the brief for a Strategic Advisor as at appendix A.

IMPLICATIONS:1 COUNCIL STRATEGY OUTCOME

- 1.1 The Central Winchester Regeneration (CWR) area has potential to contribute to the Council Strategy objectives by enhancing the environment of the area, improving the local economy and providing important community benefits.
- 1.2 Progress made to date aims to support activity in the area in the short to medium term while the long term delivery strategy is agreed and implemented.

2 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 2.1 The current revenue budget is £335,000 of which £278,993 has been spent to date.
- 2.2 There is therefore scope to commission further technical work within the existing budget but it will be necessary to seek further budget as this project work progresses.
- 2.3 At this stage, there is a potential budget requirement of £25,000 for the initial phase of work on the meanwhile use work stream which can be met from the existing revenue budget.
- 2.4 There is further potential budget requirement for the meanwhile use workstream of up to £550,000 but this would be subject to approval through to Council. The following tables detail the estimated revenue implications of undertaking an investment of £550,000 over a period of both 3 and 5 years if no other funding sources are identified.
- 2.5 A core principle is that the ongoing revenue costs and the cost of capital are covered by the income stream from these options.

Capital								
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Works	0	550	0	0	0	0	0	550
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>550</b>
<b>Financed by:</b>								
Prudential borrowing	0	550	0	0	0	0	0	550
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>550</b>

Revenue Consequences (3 years)								
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Net income (assumed breakeven)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Financing costs</b>								
Interest payments	0	0	(8)	(6)	(3)	0	0	(17)
Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP)*	0	0	(181)	(183)	(186)	0	0	(550)
<b>Net impact on the General Fund balance</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(188)</b>	<b>(189)</b>	<b>(189)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(567)</b>

Revenue Consequences (5 years)								
	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	Total
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
<b>Net income (assumed breakeven)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Financing costs</b>								
Interest payments	0	0	(8)	(7)	(5)	(3)	(2)	(25)
Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP)*	0	0	(108)	(108)	(110)	(112)	(113)	(551)
<b>Net impact on the General Fund balance</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(115)</b>	<b>(115)</b>	<b>(115)</b>	<b>(115)</b>	<b>(115)</b>	<b>(576)</b>

\*Borrowing need is reduced over the life of the asset by applying MRP annually from revenue

### 3 LEGAL AND PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 Procurement of design work for the public realm improvements would be carried out in accordance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules 9.2.
- 3.2 Other works, meanwhile uses, delivery of public realm and appointment of a strategic advisor, as outlined in this report, if approved by Cabinet and Council, will require procurement in accordance with the Councils' Contract Procedure Rules 9.2.

### 4 WORKFORCE IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The advisory panels and potential work involved if recommendations are approved in this report can be supported by the existing project team, however if work is carried out internally, for example for the meanwhile use consultations and engagement, it may be necessary to review resources.

### 5 PROPERTY AND ASSET IMPLICATIONS (to be reviewed by Assistant Director (Estates & Regeneration) - If none, state "None")

- 5.1 Proposals for the refurbishment of Coitbury House for continued use as offices are to be developed. In this respect advice has been sought from an RIBA Adviser and the City Of Winchester Trust as to Architects who would be able to undertake this commission. Quotations are being sought for the commission and the responses will be discussed with members of the Advisory Panel before an appointment is made.

5.2 Consideration is being given to how use might be made of the land behind the Bus Station offices pending the redevelopment of the site.

5.3 Terms have been provisionally agreed for the letting of the former Post Office on Middle Brook Street. Pending the completion of the legal documentation a number of works will be undertaken to the property to comply with DDA requirements.

## 6 CONSULTATION AND COMMUNICATION

6.1 The advisory panels have been fully involved in arriving at the recommendations being made to the Cabinet (CWR) Committee for consideration. The CWR working group has been updated on progress and received all of the notes from the advisory panels and the Portfolio Holder, The Leader, is kept up to date.

## 7 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 None at this stage.

## 8 EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSEMENT

8.1 None

## 9 DATA PROTECTION IMPACT ASSESSMENT

9.1 Members of the advisory panels have been informed that their names may appear in Council papers on the website. The members have all responded that they are happy for this to be the case.

## 10 RISK MANAGEMENT

10.1 Risks at this stage of the project are outlined below.

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Opportunities</b>
Failure to agree and implement a delivery strategy could lead to fragmented design and conflicting uses across the site.	Engage an external, experienced strategic advisor to assist the Council in developing a delivery strategy to deliver the vision established in the SPD.	Opportunity to further develop the Winchesterness concept and continue stakeholder and public engagement.
If Coitbury House is not refurbished and re-let, the building could fall in to disrepair and the Council will continue to fund its upkeep.	Agreement on architect and designs to bring the building into use.	The refurbishment will send a message that things are happening in the CWR area and contribute to economic activity in the city.
Funding required to carry	Market the property to	

out the works is not recovered through rental income.	potential tenants at an early stage in the refurbishment process to secure a tenant.	
Failure to implement a meanwhile use strategy would see vacant space and empty units remain inactive and unattractive and continue to cost the Council regarding maintenance and business rates.  Funds may not be available to deliver.	Agree short term lettings on flexible arrangements and find a meanwhile use to bring activity to vacant space – initially at the bus station.  Carry out research into likely costs and look at options for external grants or funding opportunities.	Allowing flexible lettings and uses across the site sends a message that things are happening and provides the opportunity to try new things in the city centre. Could provide affordable space for start ups and creative activities.  Gives the Council an opportunity to go out to the market at an early stage to highlight present and future opportunities to potential funding and investment organisations.
Not carrying out improvement works to lower High Street and Broadway leaves the Council open to criticism that nothing is being done to enhance the image of Winchester.  Funds may not be available to support the works.	Carry out the works as recommended.  Research options for funding such as CIL and LEP.	Opportunity to contact partners regarding funding and get the word out that work is starting in the city.
Failure to hold an archaeology event as promised by the Leader will result in reputational damage.	Arrange the event as planned and ensure sufficient prior engagement.	An opportunity to engage with those expressing concern around the approach of “preserve in situ” identified in the SPD (as dictated by NPPF).

## 11 SUPPORTING INFORMATION:

### 11.1 Background

11.2 The CWR Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted on 20 June 2018 and successfully completed the statutory three month challenge period.

- 11.3 At the meeting of the Cabinet (CWR) Committee on 10 July, Members approved the initial outlined work streams and stressed how important it was to make progress.
- 11.4 At the meeting of the Cabinet (CWR) Committee on 25 September, Members approved the Terms of Reference and membership for the three advisory panels; Coitbury House, Meanwhile Uses and Lower High Street and Broadway. Each advisory panel has had its initial meeting and their recommendations are outlined in this report for consideration.
- 11.5 At the same meeting in September, Members approved the outline delivery strategy which includes scoping out the procurement of a strategic advisor. A draft brief has been written which scopes out the services a strategic advisor would provide and this is attached at appendix A. Further details are outlined in this report.
- 11.6 Appointment of a strategic advisor
- 11.7 As approved by the Cabinet (CWR) Committee in September, a brief has been drafted to specify the role of a strategic advisor and the scope of services that they will be expected to provide.
- 11.8 The brief has been informally shared with the Cabinet (CWR) Committee members and comments received and considered.
- 11.9 The brief has been drafted to focus initially on the CWR project but provides for advice and support to be given to all current and potential projects and development opportunities that the Council is undertaking.
- 11.10 Due to the wider scope of the draft brief, approval to proceed will be sought from the Council's Cabinet on 12 December 2018. The report to Cabinet will include the brief and information on timescales, potential budget and procurement process.
- 11.11 It is recommended that the Cabinet (CWR) Committee comments on the brief prior to the more detailed report to Cabinet for approval.
- 11.12 Meanwhile uses
- 11.13 The meanwhile use advisory panel met on the 16 October.
- 11.14 The panel members discussed options for the bus station site and, following some initial research by the project team, were shown examples of other sites where pop ups have been successfully installed and run. These can be seen at appendix B.
- 11.15 Panel members were given information on possible time scales for installation of a pop up site and also given an indication of potential costs and management options and timescales, not only for set up but for the life of the project.

- 11.16 Some providers in the market take time to research the local market and engage with local communities to identify the type of uses that would be successful and then proceed to design and full costs. It is understood that initial work for this approach would be in the region of £25,000. Funding for this initial feasibility phase of work could be covered from the existing CWR revenue budget.
- 11.17 If this approach is agreed, a further quote for installation would be prepared so it is not possible to say at this stage what funding might be required. There is however an example below as a benchmark.
- 11.18 The example shared with the panel was Blue House Yard in London <https://www.bluehouseyard.com/>
- 11.19 For guidance, from start to finish, creation of Blue House Yard took 13 months and the value of the contract was £210,000. To create a similar site on the bus station space is likely to exceed this figure as the space is larger than Blue House Yard and there are currently no existing facilities available on site such as kitchens, water, toilets etc. At Blue House Yard, there was a vacant building on site which provided for these services, which reduced the set up costs and made the site viable.
- 11.20 Day to day operation of the site and maintenance needs to be factored in separately but the aim would be that, once the site is installed, the costs of running the site will be covered by the income received, therefore paying its way. Management options need to be considered and are detailed in paragraph 11.26.
- 11.21 An alternative approach is for a provider to install a pop up site based on the requirements given to them by the client. This would involve the Council carrying out the market research and engagement to identify suitable uses and then procuring a provider to install the site.
- 11.22 The example shared with the panel was Creative Spaces based in Waterlooville <http://wecreatespaces.co.uk/>
- 11.23 Creative Spaces carried out some initial scoping work around the bus station site and provided some initial thoughts for consideration. Some of these images are attached at appendix C.
- 11.24 If a Creative Spaces approach is adopted, the Council would need to resource the research at the outset and once a provider is chosen, installation could begin almost immediately. Creative Spaces provided a top of the range quote for installation of a pop up site using refurbished and re-designed shipping containers and this was in the region of £550,000.
- 11.25 Once installed, the pop up site will need managing both with regard to letting the spaces and also the day to day management function, such as cleaning, maintenance, security etc. Providers tend not to both install and run the site so a management structure is required. Options would be for an agreement

between the Council and a local partnership or for a management contract with a dedicated provider. Alternatively, the Council could manage the site, but internal resources would have to be identified for this.

- 11.26 The panel members discussed the pros and cons of each approach and noted the fact that internal resource to install and run a site is limited. They also discussed the priorities for providing a pop up site and agreed that the financial investment might not be recovered, but that the site would attract different uses, a new creative hub and bring activity and footfall to the city centre.
- 11.27 The panel agree and recommend the following for consideration;
- a) That a pop up site on the bus station should be progressed to activate the area and to test out uses and a potential different “look and feel” to the area.
  - b) That a maximum period of 12 months for delivery of the site would be acceptable. The aim would be to have the site operational by next Christmas. It is anticipated that the site will remain in situ for 3 to 5 years.
  - c) That a budget of between £350,000 and £425,000 would be acceptable to deliver the site and that financial return on that investment should not be the only consideration. The aim is that there are no ongoing costs as the site will pay for itself once set up.
  - d) A provider should potentially carry out initial research, design and install the pop up units and facilitate an ongoing management structure as part of the contract.
  - e) That a brief be drafted to reflect the recommendations of the panel that could go out to the market if this approach is approved by the Cabinet (CWR) Committee and Council. The first draft of a potential brief is attached at appendix D.
- 11.28 The notes from the meanwhile uses panel meeting can be seen at appendix E.
- 11.29 Due to the potential funding required and impact on Council finances, the feasibility phase should be carried out to provide detailed information to inform a decision as to how to proceed.
- 11.30 Approval is therefore sought from the Cabinet (CWR) Committee to commission the feasibility phase and to delegate authority to the Head of Programme to finalise the brief in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.
- 11.31 Public Realm – lower High Street and Broadway
- 11.32 The Lower High Street and Broadway advisory panel met on 9 October.



- 11.33 The panel members were shown existing designs, previously viewed by Cabinet (CWR) Committee in report CAB3061, for improvements to the lower High Street and Broadway. The designs were produced to inform work done for the SPD in 2017. These can be seen at appendix F.
- 11.34 The project team have been in consultation with officers at Hampshire County Council (HCC) in relation to the existing designs and will continue to work closely with them as the works progress. It is anticipated that there will be representation from HCC on the advisory panel throughout the process.
- 11.35 After lengthy discussion, the panel members agreed that the existing designs did not reflect the aspirations of the SPD and should not be delivered.
- 11.36 It was agreed that the panel's aspiration for the improvement work to lower High Street and Broadway could be implemented without compromising the long term vision for the site as a whole.
- 11.37 The members of the panel agreed that there should be some design work carried out that considers the lower High Street, the Broadway and the area to King Alfred's statue as one cohesive project that reflects the long term aspirations and vision laid out in the CWR SPD.
- 11.38 They did agree though that the works could be delivered in sections as funding allowed, as long as the overall design was produced with the "one project" as the priority.
- 11.39 The panel agree and recommend the following;
- a) Improvements to the public realm along lower High Street and Broadway could be carried out without compromising the long term vision for the CWR area.
  - b) The existing plans are not representative of these aspirations and therefore should not be delivered.
  - c) A cohesive design should be developed that considers the stretch of High Street from its junction with Middle Brook Street along Broadway and up to and around King Alfred's Statue.
  - d) The design must be able to be delivered in sections so that works can be phased as funding allows.
  - e) The design should reflect the aspirations and vision laid out in the SPD.
  - f) A brief should be drafted to reflect the recommendations of the panel. A scope for this piece of work is attached at appendix G.
- 11.40 The notes from the Lower High Street and Broadway advisory panel meeting can be seen at appendix H.

- 11.41 Approval is therefore sought from the Cabinet (CWR) Committee to carry out the design work in line with the scope attached at appendix G and to delegate authority to the Head of Programme to make minor amendments to the brief in consultation with the Portfolio Holder.
- 11.42 Coitbury House refurbishment
- 11.43 The Coitbury House advisory panel met on 17 October.
- 11.44 The panel members discussed the vision for Coitbury House and the importance of message that the refurbishment would send out to the community around the central Winchester regeneration.
- 11.45 It is the firm intention that once the refurbishment is complete and the building let, there will be a rental income providing a funding stream.
- 11.46 The panel members were shown a draft brief which would be sent out to architects and a discussion was had as to content, timing, budget, procurement and potential architects.
- 11.47 The panel agreed a way forward and some amendments to the brief and discussed architects to approach.
- 11.48 It was agreed that due to the importance of starting the process, the brief should be approved by Cabinet on the 31 October rather than wait for the Cabinet (CWR) Committee in November.
- 11.49 It was also agreed that the panel members would be sent a list of potential architects for them to suggest and the final list of those to approach would be compiled from those suggestions.
- 11.50 A report was presented to Cabinet on 31 October seeking approval to proceed as laid out in report CAB3100 and a verbal update was given to Cabinet on the architects that would be approached.
- 11.51 Notes from the Coitbury House advisory panel can be seen at appendix I
- 11.52 Cabinet on 31 October approved the brief and list of architects to approach; as approved by the Coitbury House advisory panel and outlined in report CAB3100. The approved brief is attached at appendix K.
- 11.53 Ongoing dialogue around the approach to Archaeology
- 11.54 As Members are aware, there is a commitment to continue the dialogue around the approach to archaeology laid out in the SPD.
- 11.55 An all day event has been arranged to be held on 11<sup>th</sup> December which allows for sessions with the independent archaeology panel to meet Members, those respondents to the archaeology issues raised during the SPD consultation and members of the public.

11.56 The schedule for the event can be seen at appendix J.

## 12 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

12.1 That the Council does not undertake the works outlined in this report but this would not inject activity and vitality into the area so is not recommended.

### BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:-

#### Previous Committee Reports:-

CAB2969 (CWR) – 17 October 2017 Central Winchester Regeneration Area Short Term 'Meanwhile' Measures and Uses

CAB2995 (CWR) – 6 December 2017 Draft Supplementary Planning Document

CAB3034 (CWR) – 20 June 2018 Adoption of Supplementary Planning Document

CAB3061 (CWR) – 10 July 2018 Central Winchester Regeneration Update

CAB3077 (CWR) – 25 September 2018 Central Winchester Regeneration Update and Establishment of Advisory Panels

CAB3100 (CWR) – 31 October 2018 Coitbury House Refurbishment

#### Other Background Documents:-

CWR SPD: <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents-spds/central-winchester-regeneration-spd>

### APPENDICES:

#### **Appendix A: Brief for a Strategic Advisor.**

##### **Strategic Development Advisor – draft scope of services**

Winchester City Council (“the Council”) is looking to procure the services of a strategic development advisor (SDA) to provide a multi disciplinary set of services to support with the implementation of its major projects and place strategy.

Significant challenges face the public sector and the Council needs to adopt an entrepreneurial approach to deliver the outcomes outlined in its adopted strategy:-

<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/about/strategies>

The overarching vision of Winchester City Council is to combine a blend of innovation, aspiration and pragmatism and to look beyond the traditional ways of doing things.

The Council is committed to;

- Making the District a premier business location
- Developing quality housing with a balanced range of tenures
- Protecting and enhancing our unique environment
- Delivering services that encourage residents to lead healthy and fulfilling lives

The outcome will be a district where everyone enjoys the opportunities and quality of life that come from living in the Winchester district.

Guided by the Council Strategy, the Council has an ambitious programme of major projects in place which deliver the key priorities throughout the Winchester District.

These include;

- Sports and leisure park (and the site of the existing River Park Leisure Centre when closed)  
<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/projects/5740/replacement-leisure-centre-project>
- Station Approach  
<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/projects/5741/station-approach>
- Central Winchester Regeneration  
<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/projects/5744/central-winchester-regeneration>

The Council has an active programme of homebuilding, as well as having the potential of some further development sites not directly in our ownership, such as Bushfield Camp and Sir John Moore Barracks. There is also the strong desire to think strategically about the future of the city and district and the Council's assets, and to act in partnership or otherwise to shape the area for the benefit of future generations. The Council is also working with Hampshire County Council on a jointly funded movement strategy for the city.

The SDA will be expected to work across Council projects, strategy and development opportunities as needed but with the initial focus on Central Winchester Regeneration.

Services sought are:

#### **Client Advisor**

The SDA will provide the Council with advice in respect of emerging market trends, funder requirements and best practice in respect of delivery of complex, city centre regeneration projects. Services will include, but not be exclusive to, master planning, viability modelling, site assembly, compulsory purchase, business planning and partnership structuring.

The SDA will also be expected to support the Council's officers in reporting to various Council committees. This role is anticipated to include contributing to committee reports and attending / presenting at committee meetings as necessary.

**Commercial Structures** – to review the optimal commercial structures for project delivery, beginning with the Central Winchester regeneration scheme. This will require the SDA to have regard to the following:

- The Council's phasing requirements;
- The Council's aspirations for the CWR project to be delivered as a series of parcels, on an incremental basis and incorporating multiple architectural practices and potentially multiple developers;
- The Council's requirements to comply with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015; and
- The Council's obligations to demonstrate that it is achieving Best Consideration for any land it disposes of.
- Advise on the Council's options for retaining appropriate control, legacy planning and participation in the development

In addition, the SDA will be required to support the Council's in house legal team and external legal advisors in formulating appropriate legal agreements for the projects. This could take a number of forms, including but not limited to a:

- Conditional Land Sale Agreement
- Development Agreement
- Corporate Joint Venture
- Land Owner Collaboration Agreement

The SDA may be required to provide the following services to support the formulation of the commercial structures:

- VAT and SDLT advice
- Business Case Advice (in accordance with HM Treasury 'Green Book' requirements)
- Funding advice

**Land Use Planning and Site Masterplans** – to provide reasoned, research-backed advice on land uses for individual sites to ensure best value and complement the Council's ambitions for Winchester. This will be backed up by block massing and indicative designs, uses, area schedules, costs, sales values and viability appraisals.

**Development Viability and Phasing** – to undertake periodic reviews of the viability of the projects. The SDA will have regard to the outputs sought within the Central

Winchester regeneration SPD; the proposed commercial arrangements; and market informed sales value and cost assumptions.

In reviewing development viability, the SDA will be required to advise on the optimal approach to phasing the development, having regard to the Business Case and overall project cash flow.

**Developer Procurement** – the SDA will be expected to take the lead role, under the direction of the Council, for procuring one or potentially multiple development partners. This role will include:

- Soft market testing
- Advising on the most appropriate marketing route (for example land sale, framework panel or full OJEU process);
- Undertaking structure market engagement with prospective developers;
- Preparing relevant marketing collateral and procurement documentation;
- Project managing the procurement process, including managing enquiries, chairing meetings with prospective developers and ensuring that the process runs to programme;
- Supporting with the evaluation of bids;
- Preparing a report with recommendations as to which developer to select.

**Land Assembly Advice** – the SDA will be required to provide strategic advice in respect of acquiring third party land interests. The working, and preferred, assumption should be that third party interests will be acquired by agreement. The Council may however opt to use its powers of Appropriation and Compulsory Purchase if negotiations are unsuccessful.

This role will include the following:

- Supporting the Council's estates team in formulating a strategy for acquiring third party interests in the site.
- Preparing a Property Cost Estimate, to inform the potential costs of acquiring third party interests.

Should a CPO be pursued, the role would also include:

- Managing land referencing agents on behalf of the Council
- Supporting the Council's in house legal team and external legal advisors in preparing documents required for a CPO, including the Statement of Case and Statement of Reasons
- Supporting the Council at the CPO Public Inquiry, including provision of evidence as may be required
- Acting as the Council's lead agent in respect of negotiating third party land acquisitions, whether by agreement or pursuant to a CPO

**Best Consideration Advice** – the SDA will be required to prepare Best Consideration advice in respect of any Council disposal of land.

The SDA will be expected to advise the Council as to whether Best Consideration is to be determined under Section 123 of the Local Government Act or Section 233 of the Town and Country Planning Act.

**Development Monitoring** – following the appointment of a development partner, the SDA will be required to:

- Support the Council in monitoring the development partner's satisfaction of any pre-conditions
- Supporting the Council in any disputes which arise – for example in respect of viability
- Monitoring and reviewing the project development account, to establish the extent the developer's obligations to pay overage and any other consideration due have been properly satisfied.

### **Consultant Team**

The SDA is expected to be a lead consultant with access to a trusted and expert team of suitable sub-contractors to deliver the services outlined.

### **Appendix B: Image examples of existing meanwhile use/pop-up spaces found in the UK.**

Mixed-use purpose built sheds, Blue House Yard, Wood Green, London



Mixed-use cladded shipping containers, Spark:York, York



Draper's Yard Market and Studios, Chichester





Double decker coffee shop, Asheville, North Carolina



Appendix C: Creative Space initial images, which the Meanwhile Use advisory panel considered.





#### **Appendix D: Indicative proposed draft meanwhile use brief.**

##### **Meanwhile Uses**

Indicative proposed draft Meanwhile Uses brief

*This proposed draft brief has been created following initial research conducted by the project team, recommendations from the first meeting of the CWR meanwhile use advisory panel, consultation with Winchester City Council officers and relevant members.*

Winchester City Council (WCC) is committed to improving its existing estate in and around the Central Winchester Regeneration (CWR) area. This commitment includes short to medium term improvements before a wider redevelopment scheme for the CWR area is developed.

The site of interest is located on the current Winchester Bus Station, situated off of the Broadway in Winchester's city centre (see attached map). The bus station site was formerly owned by Stagecoach and purchased by WCC in April 2017. Interim works were carried out in the summer months to improve bus flow and pedestrian safety. In the longer-term, the site will be regenerated.

The bus station site is situated within the CWR area and subject to the adopted CWR Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

The aspiration within the CWR SPD for the current bus station site is as follows;

- Public space with view to Guildhall Winchester
- Shared surface and opened waterway along Riverside Walk
- Proposed residential / public open space

The SPD envisages the brooks waterways underneath the site being exposed and the buses relocated elsewhere within the CWR area and scheme.

In the mean time, WCC Cabinet (Central Winchester Regeneration) Committee and the meanwhile use advisory panel wish to see active use on the identified portion of the bus station site. The activation of this site should create a new offer, separate to and without detracting from the successful existing market(s).

The proposal will need to address the following three areas of work needed to be completed in order to deliver an active, mixed-use, short term scheme on the underutilised bus station site;

1. Feasibility
2. Implementation
3. Ongoing management

### **Feasibility**

An initial feasibility study would need to be carried out to help inform and determine next steps.

### **Implementation**

The implementation aspect of the proposal should give consideration to the output of the feasibility and research study. The bidder will be expected to complete the planning application process in conjunction with and on behalf of WCC, liaise with Hampshire County Council as highways authority and the bus companies, due to close proximity of the active bus station area.

The proposal submitted must consider how the implementation of the scheme will be delivered. The proposal should consider the costs, resources and time needed to implement a successful delivery, which includes flexible spaces, movement and accessibility across and to the site, creating a new offer and considerate design in relation to the Almshouses.

### **Ongoing management**

The meanwhile uses will be in place to bring activation and use to the area, in the short to medium term. The site will require external management of the day to day activities, acquisition of tenants and communicating with the estates team at WCC. The proposal should demonstrate how this management need has been considered and resolved. WCC understand that this skill may not be available in the primary winner of this bid and contracted out but in conjunction with this bid.

### **Fees**



	- Innovation hub,	
	The panel agreed they would not want the offer to compete with the existing market, but compliment it and increase footfall.	<b>COMMENT</b>
	Agreed there was possibility for members of the market to relocate to the new site, but not move the whole market as to create a new offer within the city centre.	<b>COMMENT</b>
	Agreement that access via Busket Lane is appropriate. Project team to investigate current usage and access.	<b>COMMENT</b> <b>ACTION</b>
	Panel agree that soft-market testing conducted by WCC engagement team is useful and should feed into the bus station scheme. The panel will be invited to an event in December.	<b>COMMENT</b>  <b>ACTION</b>
	The panel requested that the project team investigate whether the river running alongside the site could be exposed at this stage for this project.	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
	Archaeology is discussed, with some panel members suggesting ground penetrating radar survey be conducted on site.	<b>COMMENT</b>
	The panel acknowledge that a wider archaeology approach, in line with the Central Winchester Regeneration (CWR) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) may be more appropriate.	<b>COMMENT</b>
	Project team to investigate whether an archaeology study / investigation was conducted when the bus station site underwent improvements in 2017.	<b>ACTION</b>
	The panel discuss the current placement of the market and aspirations for where they could be placed in the future; the option of moving some of the market onto the bus station site is discussed.	<b>COMMENT</b>
	Cllr Brook advises that during the engagement process the market could have their own session.	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
	The panel agree a bus should be involved in the design of the site.	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
	The panel understand the pop up uses will not be there permanently but agree revitalising and drawing people to the area with a meanwhile use is worth doing.	<b>COMMENT</b>
	The panel discuss the amount they believe is appropriate to spend based on initial estimates provided by the project team, £300k - £425k sounded reasonable.	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
	The panel agreed that Friarsgate could be considered within the proposals.	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>

## Appendix F: Drawings presented to the Cabinet (CWR) Committee on 10 July

**2018 and the first meeting of the Lower High Street and Broadway advisory panel.**

See CAB3061 (CWR) Appendix C, D 302a, D 303, D 304, D 403

**Appendix G: Scoping document to reflect recommendations of the Lower High Street and Broadway advisory panel.**

Scope for works to the Lower High Street and Broadway  
Background

Winchester City Council is committed to improving its existing estate in and around the Central Winchester Regeneration (CWR) area.

The lower High Street and Broadway have been identified as potential areas for improvement. This will complement ongoing work to support meanwhile uses and build confidence that the Council is committed to improving the quality of the CWR area.

Plans have previously been drawn up for improvements to the area which included repaving the lower High Street to ensure continuity with the remainder of the High Street, widening of the footways in the Broadway and removal of car parking spaces to increase pedestrian areas.

However, after consideration, it has been agreed that it is not appropriate to consider these areas in isolation and it is recommended that these improvements are considered as one cohesive project.

Requirements

A piece of design work now is required to cover the area from the lower High Street at its junction with Middle Brook Street along the Broadway up to and around the King Alfred statue. This will need to include surveys and initial research to inform the design, looking at the history of the area and the existing street pattern.

The design needs to be deliverable in sections to enable phasing of works as funding allows. The sections should comprise:

- Middle Brook Street
- Lower High Street
- Broadway
- Area surrounding the King Alfred statue

The improvement works need to be complementary and have regard for the CWR Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

The SPD was produced following 18 months of consultation with local residents and businesses. It represents their aspirations for the area. Any designs that come forward will need to reflect these aspirations with particular reference to the 'Winchester' principles and the SPD vision:

*The vision for the Central Winchester Regeneration Area is for the delivery of a mixed-use, pedestrian friendly quarter that is distinctly Winchester and supports a vibrant retail and cultural / heritage offer which is set within an exceptional public realm and incorporates the imaginative re-use of existing buildings.*

### Costs and Timescales

#### RIBA Stages 0/1:

Costs for an initial feasibility study (RIBA stages 0/1) will be determined once a brief has been produced, but having consulted JTP who produced the CWR SPD, they have estimated a cost of £60,000 for research and design. We can estimate costs in the region of £5,000 to complete this stage of the work.

In terms of timescales the estimated time required to complete RIBA stages 0/1, once the brief has been agreed, is approximately 5 – 6 months, this includes the surveys and research to inform the design (s), and procurement of the designer.

#### RIBA Stages 2-7:

It is recommended that an estimated cost for the works is included in the brief to the designer as a guideline. Accurate costs and timescales for stages 2 -7 will be determined once RIBA stages 0/1 have been completed.

Costs for works to the lower High Street repaving based existing plans are estimated at £500,000 and the works are likely to take 11 – 13 months to complete; this includes the procurement of the contractor.

In terms of the Broadway and the area surrounding the King Alfred statue, the existing plan to widen the footway along its length from Colebrook Street to the zebra crossing is likely to cost in the region of £150,000 and take approximately 21 months to complete including procurement of the contractor. Removal of the car parking spaces outside the King Alfred statue is likely to cost in the region of £50,000 and take approximately 12 months to complete including procurement of the contractor.

These costs and timescales are estimates only. Without a brief, a design and the relevant surveys it is impossible to provide an accurate cost and timescale. Costs associated with ongoing maintenance will be additional, we cannot begin to estimate these until a brief has been produced and only once a design has been approved can a more accurate cost be provided.

Costs and timescales for similar works elsewhere

Examples have been included below to help provide members with an idea of what has been achieved in other locations with similar requirements and the associated costs and timescales.

Romsey Town Centre:

Hampshire County Council is working with Test Valley Borough Council to make Romsey town centre more accessible to pedestrians and cyclists, reduce traffic speeds and make the area more attractive for those who live, work and shop there, bringing a boost to the local economy while retaining the town's historic character. The total investment is estimated at £3.1M.

Place	Cost	Timeframe	Works
Phase one: Church Street	£1.5M	2015/16	Traffic slowing measurements, bollards and street furniture
Phase two: Bell Street and		September 2017 – April/May 2018	Level road and footway, repave footway with York stone in keeping with Church Street, resurface and narrowing road, remove on-street parking and improve crossings.
Market Place, centre of Romsey	£1.6M	January 2019 – July 2019	New York stone paving to match Bell & Church Street, road narrowing and resurfacing, new bike racks, benches and trees, crossing points.

Guildford Town Centre:

Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council are undertaking works to improve the public realm in Guildford town centre. A budget of £2M has been set aside for the scheme covering Castle Street, Tunsgate and Chapel Street.

Tunsgate is phase one of the wider scheme. Tunsgate is an important route between the High Street and the Castle and Museum but it currently lacks connectivity with these areas. The key issues to be addressed include narrow footways, poor paving and limited materials, and car dominance.

Place	Cost	Timeframe	Works



Phase one: Tungate	£835K	July 2018 - ongoing	Installation of high quality stone paving to extend the continuity of the High Street, widening footways, removal of vehicles during core hours, improving safety and level access for all.
-----------------------	-------	------------------------	---

Based on the costs incurred for similar schemes as set out above, the conversations had to date with members regarding expectations for this area, the aspirations set out in the SPD associated with the Winchesterness principles which include high quality materials and architectural design, and taking into consideration the estimated costs for existing plans for the lower High Street and the Broadway, it is recommended that an approximate cost of £2M for the works to the whole area is included in the brief as guideline for the designer.

#### **Appendix H: Notes from the first meeting of the Lower High Street and Broadway advisory panel.**

Agenda item:	Comment/Action:	
2	The panel discussed the brief and agreed that it is difficult to consider current proposals in isolation as any short term works may impact long term proposals. The panel agreed to remove “confidential” from the papers following guidance from the Chair as to what the panel should be aware of when discussing the meeting contents outside the room.	<b>COMMENT</b>  <b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
2	Following extensive discussion, the panel agreed that improvements to the High Street and Broadway should be considered as one cohesive project and designs should reflect this approach. The panel agreed that current proposals are not consistent with this approach.  The panel discussed implications of designing and delivering this project ahead of the main site and it was agreed that this could be carried out as a stand alone project without compromising the wider CWR scheme.  It was agreed that further research and design work is required with particular attention paid to the historical lay out of the area.  It was also agreed and accepted by the panel that work should be deliverable in sections to enable the phasing of the scheme to be delivered as funds allowed. The sections should comprise; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lower High Street</li> <li>- Broadway</li> </ul>	<b>COMMENT</b>  <b>RECOMMENDATION</b>  <b>RECOMMENDATION</b>  <b>RECOMMENDATION</b>

	- King Alfred's statue	
3 + 4	The panel requested that the project team would look at scoping out the work involved in developing a cohesive design for the area	<b>ACTION</b>
5	The panel requested another panel meeting before the one scheduled for 7 January 2018.	<b>ACTION</b>
5	Cllr Hutchison extended to the panel members (and Station Approach team in a recent email) an invite for the CWR trip to Southampton.	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>

### Appendix I: Notes from the first meeting of the Coitbury House advisory panel.

Agenda item:	Comment/Action	
	RW and NA will put a 'marker' in the budget setting for the capital strategy that funds for the refurbishment will be necessary.	<b>ACTION</b>
	Project team to attach Coitbury House land registry details (to replace the 'red line map') to the notes and actions.	<b>ACTION</b>
	The land registry document will also be sent to the architects.	<b>ACTION</b>
	Agreement that the architects proposals should consider the two following scenarios; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. One tenant across three or four floor plates,</li> <li>2. Up to four tenants (multi-let), which would require common areas and management of these areas.</li> </ol> The brief should clarify that WCC expect to see the architect's proposals have considered both scenarios (one tenant, or multi-let).	<b>COMMENT</b>
	The panel agree that the architects brief should explain that proposals should include options for improving the roof.	<b>ACTION</b>
	There is extensive discussion surrounding tenants, the panel are informed that having four tenants instead of one reduces the risk of lost rent, but both options have advantages and disadvantages.	<b>COMMENT</b>
	The panel agree that both scenarios should remain an option.	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
	The panel agree that the architects invited to submit a bid should consider the Central Winchester Regeneration (CWR) <a href="#">Supplementary Planning Document</a> (SPD) when creating their proposal. The project team and RW inform the panel that the SPD is hyperlinked within the brief.	<b>COMMENT</b>
	The panel agree the main entrance will create a first impression for the rest of the building, this should be made clear in the brief and 're-design main entrance' should be changed to 're-model'.	<b>ACTION</b>

	The panel agree it is acceptable that the approval of the Architects brief be reported to Cabinet on 31 <sup>st</sup> October, instead of Cabinet (CWR) Committee on 27 <sup>th</sup> November to enable WCC to procure an architect sooner. Non-voting members will be invited.	<b>ACTION</b>
	The panel agree the architect's proposals should consider how the Coitbury House building interacts with the rest of the site and immediate surroundings and that this should be incorporated into the brief.	<b>ACTION</b>
	Extensive discussion surrounding car parking, some panel members believe a small number of spaces is necessary to achieve higher rental rates, another member believes the vision in the SPD to remove inner-city car parking should be carefully considered.	<b>COMMENT</b>
	Panel agreement that both options should be reviewed as part of the brief.	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
	It is agreed that the project team will investigate the planning regulations around parking ratios.	<b>ACTION</b>
	The project team will recirculate the updated documents to the panel once the amendments have been made.	<b>ACTION</b>
	VL explains the procurement process; the existing timeline is based on fees of up to £100k. In these circumstances WCC can directly approach a minimum of three architects to request proposals. If the fees are over £100k, WCC will go out to tender, this procurement method is much longer and will impact on the existing timeline. VL suggests that this should be considered when deciding which architects to approach.	<b>COMMENT</b>
	There is discussion surrounding architects; both large and medium sized firms, who may be interested in the project, particularly if the Coitbury House refurbishment is viewed as an initial gateway into the wider CWR scheme.	<b>COMMENT</b>
	It is agreed that Keith Leaman will provide a list of suggestions to project team, who will circulate with other panel members and officers for comment and the advisory panel come to an agreement on a list of 5/6.	<b>ACTION</b>
	RR flags that the existing timeline is based on approaching up to 6 architects, anymore than this will require more officer time to evaluate the submissions.	<b>COMMENT</b>
	Cllr Horrill said the advisory panel members should have an opportunity to meet the architects and ask any questions regarding their submissions prior to appointment.	<b>COMMENT</b>
	The project team will consider how this could be done and revisit the timeline accordingly.	<b>ACTION</b>

	The panel recommend that the evaluation should be 60% quality and 40% price. NA illustrates that this will require a Portfolio Holder Decision (PHD) notice and that the brief will need to include how the bids will be evaluated. (i.e. 60/40 quality price).	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>  <b>ACTION</b>
--	---	--

### Appendix J: Schedule of events/sessions for the 11 December archaeology day.

Informal discussion (private)  8:30am – 10am	Attendees: - Archaeology panel - Cabinet (CWR) Committee members - Officers
Hampshire Cultural Trust (HCT) presentation and discussion (private)  11am – 12:30pm	Attendees: - HCT - Archaeology panel - WCC officer (note taking)
Lunch break and internal prep for afternoon session	
Seminar (invite only for those who specifically responded re archaeology on the draft SPD consultation)  2pm – 4pm	Attendees: - Archaeology panel - Cabinet (CWR) Committee members - Officers - Members of the public x24
Internal prep for evening session	
Public meeting (open to all)  6pm – 8.30pm	Attendees: - Archaeology panel - Cabinet (CWR) Committee members - Officers - Members of the public

### Appendix K: Brief to architects for Coitbury House refurbishment.

#### Coitbury House, Winchester Strategic Brief

The existing Coitbury House is located off Tanner Street in the Silver Hill area of central Winchester. The building formerly housed the Hampshire Medical Records Department for Winchester NHS Primary care support services but is now vacant. The building is owned by WCC. The property currently has 16/17 parking spaces. The current approx. areas (NIA) are as follows:

Ground Floor: 2326 SF  
First Floor: 2491 SF

Second Floor: 2648 SF

**Total: 7466 SF**

WCC wish to refurbish the building and explore options to create circa 10,000-11000 square feet net office accommodation geared toward current market trends.

For example this could include adding a floor or extending the building out into the car park. Options for improving the roof of the building should also be included. Flexibility should be built into the design to enable the building to be let to one single occupant or multiple occupiers to accommodate market forces. The project needs to provide modern, high quality office accommodation, which reflects the buildings prominent position within the city centre. There is good demand for office accommodation in Winchester and the Council is looking to achieve a realistic market rent and therefore requires a quality refurbishment in order to achieve this.

The Coitbury House site is situated within the Central Winchester Regeneration (CWR) area located in the city centre and is subject to the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

The refurbished building will sit within the redeveloped CWR site for years to come and therefore needs to take account of its potential future surrounding both in design and use. To reflect the vision for the area, the council is looking for imaginative, creative and exciting designs that will set the marker down for the wider site.

SPD vision;

*The vision for the Central Winchester Regeneration Area is for the delivery of a mixed-use, pedestrian friendly quarter that is distinctly Winchester and supports a vibrant retail and cultural / heritage offer which is set within an exceptional public realm and incorporates the imaginative re-use of existing buildings.*

The CWR SPD can be accessed here on the Council's website:

<http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documentsspds/central-winchester-regeneration-spd>

The SPD was produced following 18 months of consultation with local residents and businesses. It represents their aspirations for the area. It is therefore essential that these aspirations are reflected in any designs that come forward.

The SPD builds upon relevant planning policies under the NPPF, the Local Plan Part 1 and Part 2. The principles and objectives within the SPD include:

- Vibrant Mixed use quarter
- Adopting the 'Winchesterness' principles which include high quality materials and architectural detail
- City Experience
- Views and skyline
- Climate change and sustainability

The principles of development acceptable within the CWR will shape any redevelopment of Coitbury house, one of the key issues being the visual impact of any changes or extensions to the building.

It will be important to demonstrate thinking behind how the new development will interact with other parts of the site and in particular the immediate surroundings.

The following issues would need to be explored at the feasibility stage of the project:

- A rationalisation of the interior to reflect modern working practices, ie open plan floor plates.
- The main entrance will create a first impression for the rest of the building, a remodel of the main entrance is therefore required to give it more prominence but within the confines of the ownership boundary
- Review and consideration of the external fabric of building
- New heating and cooling systems
- A rationalisation of all WC's
- Breakout areas/kitchenettes
- A new DDA compliant lift
- Design to meet all current regulations
- Design to meet BREEAM *Very good* and improved energy efficiency to reduce running costs.
- Additional floor space and roof extension
- Provision of lockable bike storage either internally or externally and sufficient
- showers/lockers

The timescale for the development is:

Cab (CWR) Cttee approve budget, architect brief, list of architects and timeline:	31 October 18
Send brief to architects:	1 November 18
Submission of EOI by practices:	15 November 18
Estates officer evaluates submissions by:	22 November 18
Advisory Panel emailed quotes and evaluations:	23 November 18
Advisory Panel comments by:	26 November 18
Cabinet (CWR) Committee approve chosen practice:	27 November 18
Appoint practice for feasibility:	28 November 18
Commence feasibility	29 November 18
Advisory Panel meet the architect practice:	December 18
<b>*Further dates for advisory panel reviews and Cabinet (CWR) Committee approvals are still TBC</b>	
RIBA stage 0/1 complete:	End January 19
Advisory Panel review:	End January 19
Stage 2:	End January 19
Stage 2 Advisory Panel review:	Early March 19
Stage 2 submission stage 2 report for committee	12 March 19
Stage 2 Cabinet (CWR) Committee approve:	19 March 19
Stage 3:	March - May 19
Advisory Panel review:	June 19
Cabinet (CWR) Committee sign off Stage 3 and planning submission:	June / July 19
Submission planning:	July 19

*Subject to project viability/continuation of project*

Stage 4:

Tender for works:

Cabinet (CWR) Committee approve contractor:

Stage 5:

July – Sept 19

Oct - Nov 19

December 19

January 20

We require a fee proposal based on providing the initial feasibility study (RIBA stages 0/1) and then a fee percentage for further stages 2 and 3 to submit for planning approval.

*The client will appoint their own QS who will review the initial appraisal to give an estimate of costs. In terms of M/E and S/E, the client will look for recommendations once the relevant stage is reached.*

Bidders will be expected to present submissions to the Coitbury House Advisory Panel at Winchester City Council Offices on Friday 23 October. The presentation will be 45 minutes made up of a 15 minute presentation and approximately 30 minutes of Q&A.

This page is intentionally left blank