

## **Decisions taken by the Cabinet on Wednesday, 24 June 2020**

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | Decision | Reasons | Alternative Options |
|-------------------|-------|----------|---------|---------------------|
|-------------------|-------|----------|---------|---------------------|

| <b>A8</b> | River Park Leisure Centre | 1.                       | That RPLC ceases to   | River Park Leisure Centre                    | qО                             | tion 3: decommission, soft           |
|-----------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|           | decommissioning           |                          | provide sports and  | (RPLC) is due to close when                  |                                | ip and retain is being               |
|           |                           |                          | leisure facilities and is                                   | the new Winchester Sports                    | rec                            | commended.                           |
|           |                           |                          | closed to the public  | and Leisure Park (WS&LP)                     | Th                             | ree other options were               |
|           |                           |                          | following the opening of the WS&LP at Bar End               | opens in the early part of 2021.             |                                | entified, considered and             |
|           |                           |                          | in the early part of 2021.                                  | Cabinet were updated in                      |                                | ected with regard to                 |
|           |                           |                          | in the early part of 2021.                                  | October 2019 on the                          | •                              | commissioning RPLC and               |
|           |                           | 2.                       | That RPLC be  | complexities and constraints                 | are                            | e as follows;                        |
|           |                           |                          | of the site, as well as the                                 | 4.   | Butala di alla di Pira a anti- |                                      |
|           |                           |                          | of an internal soft strip                                   | results of the North Walls                   | 1)                             | Retain the building and              |
|           |                           | the tim<br>with th       | and part demolition, with                                   | recreation area consultation,                |                                | keep open to allow use of facilities |
|           |                           |                          | the timetable to be linked with the build schedule          | and the proposed next steps.                 |                                | racinities .                         |
|           |                           |                          | on the Winchester Sport                                     | As part of that work report                  | 2)                             | Decommission the                     |
|           |                           | and Leisure Park.        | CAB3242 outlines options for                                |  | building but close and         |                                      |
|           |                           |                          |   | securing and                                 |                                | secure while the future of           |
|           | 3.                        | That capital expenditure | decommissioning the RPLC                                    |  | the site is determined.        |                                      |
|           |                           | in 2020/21 of up to      | site and recommends the                                     | 4)   | Demolish the building          |                                      |
|           |                           | £410,000 is approved to: | preferred approach in                                       | ,  | and leave a clear site         |                                      |
|           |                           |                          | <ul> <li>decommission the<br/>River Park Leisure</li> </ul> | advance of site redevelopment. There is also |                                | once RPLC has closed.                |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | Decision  | Reasons  | Alternative Options  |
|-------------------|-------|---|--|--|
|                   |       | Centre building soft stripping a securing;  undertake wore ensure continuatility and serve supplies to clure remaining on and provide temportoilet facilities a future use for site is determined or other facilities become available.  That an annual reverse budget from 2021/22 £40,000 be approved CCTV hire and monitoring, building inspections, and cleaning the temportoilets. | for the bowls clubs, tennis courts, astro turf pitches (ATP) and skate and play parks and an option to provide temporary toilet facilities, and consider use of the current car park.  Report CAB3242 does not cover the future use of the site but includes the proposed approach to develop a programme of work to explore options for the future development of the site. | WS&LP opens has been considered. This would enable continued use of the changing rooms, toilets and café, while the future of the site is identified and the park plan being undertaken by the WTF is implemented. |
|                   |       | 5. That authority be  |  | should fall to the council or  |

| Agenda            | Topic | Decision  | Reasons | Alternative Options  |
|-------------------|-------|---|---------|--|
| Item No           |       |   |         |  |
| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | delegated to the Strategic Director: Place to determine and undertake the procurement process, appoint the relevant contractors to enable the decommissioning of RPLC (including security and continuity of utility services) and the provision of temporary toilets; and to negotiate and agree contractual heads of terms with the appointed contractors.  6. That authority be delegated to Service Lead Legal to enter in to contracts to carry out works to enable | Reasons | be contracted out. Retaining and keeping the building open would result in significant ongoing revenue costs to cover services such as cleaning, staffing, supplies and utilities. Insurance costs and considerable business rates would also become payable.  In addition to these ongoing costs, there will be an ongoing maintenance cost. The RPLC site is coming to the end of its life and the structure of the building currently requires regular inspection and maintenance works. It is estimated maintenance could cost up to £100,000 per annum if the |
|                   |       | and agree contractual heads of terms with the appointed contractors.  6. That authority be delegated to Service Lead Legal to enter in to contracts to carry out  |         | ongoing maintenance con<br>The RPLC site is coming<br>the end of its life and the<br>structure of the building<br>currently requires regular<br>inspection and maintenant<br>works. It is estimated<br>maintenance could cost to   |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | Decision  | Reasons | Alternative Options   |
|-------------------|-------|---|---------|---|
| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | 7. That work to determine options for the future use of the site is delayed until the current budget position relating to the COVID-19 emergency is finalised and the emerging development market is better understood and to bring a report back to cabinet in Q2/Q3 2021. | Reasons | and out of the site this would minimise the identified planning risk, but this option has been rejected due to the uncertainty around ongoing costs to keep RPLC open and concerns around the structural integrity of the building.  Option 2: Decommission and secure  Decommissioning, securing and monitoring the RPLC |
|                   |       |   |         |   |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Торіс | Decision | Reasons | Alternative Options  |
|-------------------|-------|----------|---------|--|
|                   |       |          |         |  |
|                   |       |          |         | be secured and monitored while the future of the site is explored. As with the recommended approach outlined beginning with paragraph 11.23, installation costs of necessary measures highlighted in paragraph 11.31 is estimated to be £52,000 with ongoing hire and monitoring costs for the CCTV of £18,000 per annum.  Utilities will need to be separated for the clubs remaining on site as in the recommended approach, with the same estimated cost of up to £75k.  Temporary toilets would also need to be provided until the |
|                   |       |          |         | permanent solution has been agreed and delivered by the WTF. As in the recommended approach, the   |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | Decision | Reasons | Alternative Options   |
|-------------------|-------|----------|---------|---|
|                   |       |          |         |   |
|                   |       |          |         | estimated cost is £22,500 including installation.  The car park would remain open to service visitors to North Walls recreation ground and remaining clubs. It would be necessary to maintain access, car park maintenance and lighting.  If the building were to remain in place, albeit secured and monitored, business rates will become payable. There is a 3 month exemption period from when the building is vacated before business rates are payable. The council will be responsible for payment once this period has ended. The business rates liability for the year 2020/2021 is £170,000 (£136,000 net after allowing for 20% retention by |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | Decision | Reasons | Alternative Options   |
|-------------------|-------|----------|---------|---|
|                   |       |          |         |   |
|                   |       |          |         | the council) and will increase annually in line with the business rate multiplier. While the council continues to retain 20% of business rates, the net cost to the council is circa £136,000.  This approach would mitigate the identified planning risk, but factors such as ongoing revenue costs and the condition of the building would remain. The building would require continued regular inspections and if the structure becomes unsafe, it will be necessary to demolish and clear the site.  This option has been |
|                   |       |          |         | rejected due to uncertainty<br>on the future of the site and<br>the cost of ongoing business<br>rates liability while the future<br>plans are determined. The   |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | Decision | Reasons | Alternative Options  |
|-------------------|-------|----------|---------|--|
|                   |       |          |         |  |
|                   |       |          |         | business rate and maintenance liability will fall to the council and it is estimated that the total cumulative cost will exceed the soft-strip option by the end of year 2.  Option 4: Demolish and clear site  The final option available is full demolition of RPLC once closed.  Once Places Leisure vacates the building, an asbestos survey would be carried out. Prior to demolition, all asbestos would need to be safely removed. The survey cannot be carried out while |
|                   |       |          |         | RPLC remains open because of health and safety concerns around the intrusive nature of the work.   |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | Decision | Reasons | Alternative Options   |
|-------------------|-------|----------|---------|---|
|                   |       |          |         |   |
|                   |       |          |         | Once the extent and type of asbestos is identified, removal would be included in any demolition contract. This would provide certainty with regard to timing and costs. The contract could be let ahead of the asbestos report, but a large contingency would have to be included to cover removal.  Cost estimates for demolition have been sought to demolish RPLC and leave a clear site, the estimated cost (not including asbestos removal) is just under £1,000,000 including preliminaries and contingency. While the cost of asbestos removal is unknown until the survey is carried out, it is estimated that costs could amount to up |
|                   |       |          |         | to £100,000 in a worst case   |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | Decision | Reasons | Alternative Options   |
|-------------------|-------|----------|---------|---|
|                   |       |          |         |   |
|                   |       |          |         | given the age and nature of the building.  Provision for providing temporary toilets and securing utilities to clubs remaining on site would need to be carried out prior to closure and demolition. A procurement process in line with PRC2015 and the Council's Contract Procedure Rules would be carried out.  If this route was followed and a demolition contractor was not in place before RPLC |
|                   |       |          |         | closes, it is estimated that the procurement process, demolition and site clearance would take at least 12 - 15 months. Time could be reduced if the demolition contractor was procured prior to RPLC closing, but the asbestos would be unknown  |

| Agenda  |                               | Decision  | Reasons  | Alternative Options  |
|---------|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Item No |                               |   |  | and the costs associated with its removal would be uncertain.  This option has been rejected due to the uncertainty around the asbestos and costs to safely remove it. It has also been rejected due to the total estimated cost of demolition of just under £1,000,000 and total overall costs estimated at just under £1.2m The COVID-19 situation has changed the financial position for the council in the |
|         |                               |   |  | short to medium term and this needs to be a key consideration.   |
| A9      | Vaultex Park & Ride extension | That a supplementary capital estimate and expenditure of £230,000 for the surface car park be approved. | Report CAB3239 provides an update to Cabinet on the Vaultex Park & Ride (P&R) proposals and seeks approval of additional Capital | Another option considered and rejected was to delay delivery of the surface car park until 2021.   |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | Decision  | Reasons   | Alternative Options   |
|-------------------|-------|---|---|---|
| _                 |       | <ol> <li>That Cabinet approve the advertisement of the Parking Places Order, consider responses and make the Order for the management and enforcement required for the car park.</li> <li>That the Vaultex car park will be run as part of the overall park and ride provision, ie users will pay to park and use the bus, but with encouragement of walking and cycling into the City for those who are able to do so.</li> <li>That authority is delegated to the Head of Programme in</li> </ol> | funding required to deliver the surface car park, which adds 135 spaces to park and ride capacity for the city.  A planning application for the surface car park was submitted in March 2020 and has been approved. The additional spaces which will be provided initially as a surface car park will be in an excellent location to encourage walking into the City centre utilising improved links being provided through the Winchester Movement Strategy and the Sport and Leisure Park development.  The report provides an update on the delivery timescales, risks and costs of the project to date for both | Forward funding the design of the decked car park, at an approximate cost of £150,000 was considered. This would be at risk initially pending receipt of LEP funding; this cost could then be reclaimed from the LEP allocation. Depending on when funding becomes available, this approach would accelerate the implementation time by about 6 – 9 months. This option was rejected in the light of the current adverse financial impacts of COVID–19 on council finances. |
|                   |       | consultation with the<br>Cabinet Member for   | the surface car park and the longer term objective of a   |   |

| Agenda     | Topic | Decision   | Reasons   | Alternative Options |
|------------|-------|--|---|---------------------|
| Item No    |       |  |   |                     |
| ILCIII INO |       | Service Quality and Transformation to negotiate and agree parking arrangements within the car park for residents of 67 to 89 Bar End Road.  5. That authority is delegated to the Head of Programme to enter into and award the works contract for the surface car park.  6. That authority is delegated to the Strategic Director of Place to prepare and enter into the EM3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) funding agreement pending award of Government funding for a grant from the LEP and to further | decked car park.  A Business Case was submitted to the EM3 Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to request funding to deliver a decked P&R at Vaultex, as part of recommendations of the City of Winchester Movement Strategy. The LEP Board has agreed to provisionally enter into a legal agreement with the Council to deliver a decked Vaultex Park & Ride facility and allocate £5,647,676 for this project, in the form of a grant. This however is subject to sufficient additional funding being allocated to the LEP from Central Government. The LEP has requested that a funding agreement is drafted in preparedness for future |                     |
|            |       | progress that project,   | funding allocations. A further  |                     |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic                             | Decision  | Reasons  | Alternative Options  |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                   |                                   |   | non out will be brought to   |  |
|                   |                                   | subject to funding and detailed approval.  7. That expenditure of £35,000 be approved for signing and lining for the Coach Park at the appropriate time.  | report will be brought to Cabinet once more certainty over funding is provided to agree the next steps required in order to progress a decked car park.  |  |
| A10               | Fire Safety in Council<br>Housing | <ol> <li>That the updated Fire Safety Policy be approved.</li> <li>That, subject to obtaining any necessary building regulation and listed building consent, fire safety works recommended with the Fire Safety policy be implemented which includes the fitting of fire rated front doors.</li> <li>That it be noted that provision has been made</li> </ol> | Following the Grenfell Tragedy of June 2017 the Housing Service set up a Project Group to consider its approach to fire safety within the district but especially as regards Housing Revenue Account (HRA) stock.  The Project Group had the brief to:  Review existing policies and processes that had a fire safety element Assess against regulations and good practice | Throughout the project options for existing and enhanced service have been debated.  Higher level elements were discussed with the Strategic Director (Services), Corporate Head of Housing, Service Leads and the Cabinet Member for Housing and Asset Management at a special meeting on 18 October 2019 and detailed records made of discussion outcomes along with justification for acceptance, |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic                   | Decision  | Reasons   | Alternative Options  |
|-------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|
| ILEIII NO         |                         | within the HRA budget for £2m for expenditure on capital fire related works (£1m 2019/20and £1m 2020/21).  4. That delegated authority be given to the Corporate Head of Housing to make minor amendments to the Policy in consultation with Cabinet Member for Housing and Asset Management. | Bring together all elements into one place     Be ready to respond to recommendations and changes coming from the Grenfell investigations.  Report CAB3221 presents the outcomes from that review and provides an update for members on Housing Service Fire Safety Policy and management arrangements. | rejection and held pending.  |
| A11               | Energy Supply Contracts | <ol> <li>That procurement of electricity and gas via Hampshire County Council and the LASER framework be approved.</li> <li>That authority is delegated to the Strategic Director - Place and Service Lead - Legal to negotiate terms and to</li> </ol>                                       | In April 2020 a Green Tariff was negotiated for the supply of electricity under the Council's existing contract. This energy contract for the supply of electricity and gas is due to expire on 30 <sup>th</sup> September 2020.  Report CAB3238 explains how the contract has been                     | Option 1 – Do nothing The consequence are unattractive because once out of our current agreement with LASER, the council is likely to find itself paying higher off-contract prices for the energy for its buildings after October 2020.  Option 2 – Procure our |

| Agenda  | Topic | Decision | Reasons | Alternative Options |
|---------|-------|----------|---------|---------------------|
| Item No |       |          |         |                     |
|         |       |          |         |                     |

enter into and to execute third party deeds of agreements with supplier terms and conditions under the LASER framework providers for gas and electricity for the period 01 October 2020 – 30 September 2024.

- 3. That energy is purchased in a flexible manner through the method known as "Purchase In Advance".
- 4. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director Place the option to procure water in addition to gas and electricity through the same framework and

re-tendered and seeks Cabinet approval to enter into a new energy contract for four years under a Laser framework agreement.

This new contract will enable the Council to continue using the Renewable Energy Guarantees Origin (REGO) backed renewable electricity tariff maintaining current benefits.

Coupled with carbon offsetting by the supplier, this will enable the Council to reduce its net carbon emissions by approximately 19%<sup>1</sup>. This report provides information on how the Council can procure its gas and electricity from October

# own energy by direct tender

This option is possible, but it would involve the Council undertaking a standalone OJEU tender to secure its own energy independent of a Central Purchasing Body (CPB) such as LASER or any other intermediary.<sup>2</sup>

With this option, the Council would be contracting directly with the selected energy provider(s). This approach is unlikely to produce the best results due to the small scale of our portfolio compared to a large purchasing organisation and is unlikely to offer value for money. In addition a direct tender would require the Council to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Figures are based on the draft 2018/19 Carbon Footprint report

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> A Central Purchasing Body is an organisation within the public sector whose primary purpose is to buy goods and services, or put in place commercial arrangements, on behalf of or for use by other organisations.

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | Decision                                      | Reasons  | Alternative Options   |
|-------------------|-------|---|--|---|
| nom no            |       |   |  |   |
|                   |       | enter into relevant contractual arrangements. | 2020 in accordance with Public Contract Regulations 2015 and the Councils own Contract Procurement Rules. Evidence is given to support how a new contract delivers best value by obtaining competitive energy prices with the least financial risk and an approach that supports the Council's carbon neutrality plan. | engage additional resources (skilled energy traders and potentially additional staff for contract management) and provides greater risk of exposure to energy price fluctuations.  The Council could look to procure collaboratively with other Councils. However, Central Purchasing bodies are already realising the maximum benefits of joint procurement.  Option 3 – Other Frameworks There are a number of other organisations that have set up OJEU compliant tendered frameworks. Some frameworks are restricted to authorities in specific parts of the public sector such as higher and further education |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | Decision | Reasons | Alternative Options   |
|-------------------|-------|----------|---------|---|
|                   |       |          |         | or specific geographical  |
|                   |       |          |         | areas which are not available for the Council's use.  |
|                   |       |          |         | These OJEU frameworks have been reviewed in more detail and offer a full range of brokerage, consultancy, and energy management services which are provided by a separate organisation who partners the framework providers. <sup>3</sup> The suppliers listed on the framework are invited to partake in a reverse e auction process and submit pricing based on WCC's portfolio and requirements on an agreed day. The costs are then fixed for a set period, typically two three years. The framework's partners would |

<sup>3</sup> OJEU – stands for Official Journal of the European Union. This is the publication in which all tenders from the public sector which are valued above a certain financial threshold according to EU legislation, must be published.

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | Decision | Reasons | Alternative Options   |
|-------------------|-------|----------|---------|---|
|                   |       |          |         |   |
|                   |       |          |         | be procuring for Winchester only and therefore would not have the same buying power as a consortium as they cannot aggregate the Council's volume with other customers in order to achieve further economies of scale. Furthermore, it is considered that such a fixed term model does not offer long term risk management in a volatile market.  Crown Commercial Services were approached. However, at the time of writing insufficient information was available to enable comparison. Further delay would risk securing a seamless renewal of the existing contract on new terms. |
|                   |       |          |         | Option 4 – Third Party  |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic  |    | Decision  | Reasons  | Alternative Options   |
|-------------------|--|----|---|--|---|
| item No           |  |    |   |  | 1   |
|                   |  |    |   |  | Intermediary A third party intermediary is an independent energy consultancy who would procure the Council's energy requirements on its behalf. The consultancy would be procured via a competitive tender based on a fee for their services, or a gain/share arrangement based on the savings made. This does not bring any advantages and is unlikely to be as competitive as the recommendation. |
| A12               | Development Approach -<br>New Doctors' Surgery (less<br>exempt appendix) | 1. | That the freehold or long leasehold disposal of the Upper Brook Street car park to a specialist primary healthcare developer be approved to enable delivery of a new doctors surgery, instead of direct | In July 2019 Cabinet authorised the progression of work on the new surgery scheme, including detailed work on a lease with the St Clements' GP practice, and subsequent to that further design and development work for the project. | Direct Development by WCC remains an option but is considered to have an unacceptable high risk due to the potential for increases in construction costs and further delays in agreeing documentation with multiple parties. The risks have been  |

| Topic | Decision  | Reasons  | Alternative Options  |
|-------|---|--|--|
|       |   |  |  |
|       | development by the Council.   | Joint work with the GP practice, Clinical Commissioning Group  | highlighted above and distil<br>to financial risk and the<br>council not having the  |
|       | detailed in report CAB3247 for the marketing and selectior process for disposal of the Upper Brook Street car park site be  | (CCG), district valuer and professional advisors, and an assessment of the financial   | necessary experience in primary healthcare development.  |
|       | 3. That the Strategic Director – Place be authorised to undertake marketing and the selection process for disposal of the Upper Brook Street car park site, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Asset Management, based or the disposal | the Council and GP Practice, report CAB3247 identifies an alternative delivery method via a sale of the site to a specialist primary healthcare developer. Approval is therefore sought to select a preferred specialist primary healthcare developer and to   |  |
|       |   | development by the Council.  2. That the arrangements detailed in report CAB3247 for the marketing and selection process for disposal of the Upper Brook Street car park site be approved.  3. That the Strategic Director – Place be authorised to undertake marketing and the selection process for disposal of the Upper Brook Street car park site, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Asset Management, based on | development by the Council.  2. That the arrangements detailed in report CAB3247 for the marketing and selection process for disposal of the Upper Brook Street car park site be authorised to undertake marketing and the selection process for disposal of the Upper Brook Street car park site, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and Asset Management, based on the disposal |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | D  | ecision                       | Reasons                | Alternative Options |
|-------------------|-------|--|-------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
|                   |       |  |                               |                        |                     |
|                   |       | primary develop  4. That the Director authoris consulta Cabinet Housing Manage preferre negotiat | Strategic  – Place be         | Brook Street Car Park. |                     |
|                   |       | 5. That the Legal be enter in agreem of the si new doo   | Service Lead<br>authorised to |                        |                     |

| Agenda<br>Item No | Topic | Decision                                | Reasons | Alternative Options |
|-------------------|-------|---|---------|---------------------|
|                   |       |   |         |                     |
|                   |       | 1                                       |         |                     |
|                   |       | appointment of the preferred purchaser. |         |                     |