

Appendix E

| CWR Open Forum - Comments from the website 18 - 23 February | | |
|---|----------|---|
| Response ID | Date | Comment |
| ANON-9SMT-Y7CX-R | 20/02/20 | <p>I think the covered market is essential in the new proposal.</p> <p>I would also like to see an archaeological museum to reflect Winchester's heritage. 250k doesn't seem much to ensure a comprehensive archaeological survey etc. Perhaps apply to English heritage for extra funds or some other body to help explore this more. It would be sacrilege to concrete over any foundations where there are important findings.</p> <p>I didn't see anything about the type of architectural style being proposed. I would like to think that we could harness the red brick and flint style of buildings that pepper Winchester. Bath has it absolutely right by following their traditional heritage of Bath stone. We need to follow their lead and create a Winchester style that is in future prevalent in all new buildings to make the town gel.</p> <p>I would support getting rid of coitbury house. It's nothing special.</p> <p>For goodness sake buy the brooks centre and knock it down. Why ever the council didn't buy it when it came up in the last few years. Sack the people in the council who hadn't the vision to see this was a real opportunity for Winchester</p> |
| ANON-9SMT-Y7C2-J | 20/02/20 | <p>JLL has a strap line of Achieving Ambitions - they didn't at the open forum. Other than the welcome news that the archaeological survey is going out to tender (a 3 month process?), all we seemed to have, despite many power point slides, is a less good rehash of the SPD, and the excellent work of JTP. We do not need endless consultant reports, using up scarce resources which takes away funds for actually doing something on the ground. Most of us in the audience went through a rather exhausting of options with JTP, which produced a viable way forward seemingly. Why cannot the Council move forward, rather than sheltering behind endless consultant reports?</p> <p>Also, the chairing of the meeting was not what the audience expected - it was clumsy, did not offer much time for discussion, and seemingly will rely on a scanty amount of postits.</p> <p>Please, please can we not have some real action with joined-up thinking, or do we have to wait for the Local Plan Part 2 to point the way ahead.</p> |
| ANON-9SMT-Y7C5-N | 20/02/20 | <p>Whilst option 3 seems to do the most in terms of valuing Winchester's intrinsic value and unique selling point - a city full of heritage there seems to be no correlation between the options presented and your carbon neutrality action plan.</p> <p>You yourselves state that you wish to see the "creation of green open spaces, and the inclusion of green roofs and green corridors" in order to "contribute to the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change."</p> <p>And you further state that in the future new schemes should be used "as an opportunity to deploy environmental technology and green design as exemplars in the market place and attract investment."</p> <p>None of the options seem to be creating these green corridors, and in fact the waterways which make Winchester so special appear to have been hidden.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that steel and concrete alone account for over 8% of carbon emissions globally. so surely if 'carbon neutral' developments are your priority it is essential the regeneration plan needs to include a proper assessment of the benefits of refurbishment.</p> |
| ANON-9SMT-Y7C9-S | 20/02/20 | <p>Destination Max would provide town centre interest for all and considerable scope for inclusive use. This would support the whole community and also bring trade to the town centre as everyone now just goes to larger cities to enjoy their covered markets, community projects, creative installations etc. The success of the hat fair would also be supported.</p> |
| ANON-9SMT-Y7CZ-T | 22/02/20 | <p>The Central Winchester Regeneration, and choosing a clear and bold direction of travel for it, is a one time only opportunity.</p> <p>Its location and its critical importance to creating a desirable destination to visit and to compete in a distinctive way with other places adds to the significance of this decision.</p> <p>It does feel that this decision is being made without a clear and ambitious place making vision for the city.</p> <p>However during every consultation across the last three years the following key drivers have risen to the surface:</p> <p>Creativity Young People and their retention in the City A desirable and distinctive destination to visit and stop over in as well as to live and work near.</p> <p>If these are indeed the key drivers then you must take the brave decision and go for option 3 - Destination Max.</p> <p>Yes it is the most challenging in investment return terms, particularly over the medium term - but long term it will pay you back in spades.</p> <p>It is the right long term decision for the future of Winchester and its young people including those yet to be born.</p> <p>Play to the Crowd.</p> |

| | | |
|------------------|----------|--|
| ANON-9SMT-Y7C7-Q | 22/02/20 | <p>I think the 'must haves' from the SPD are still right, and JLL has hit on the right 'city gaps'. In particular, the lack of an offering for children/families, teens and young adults in the city centre is very striking. Winchester lacks many of the facilities and services that you find for these cohorts in other small cities and market towns (including many far smaller than Winchester). CWR seems an ideal opportunity to redress this imbalance.</p> <p>In addition, Winchester doesn't really play to its key strength – its heritage. The Cathedral and Winchester College dominate, while many other interesting features of the city's heritage remain neglected. More could be made of the city's rich history (including by exposing some of the archaeological remains and artefacts in the CWR area) and this would enhance the city as a destination for tourists as well as a source of local pride and identity for residents. I believe there is a way to make the most of this heritage while at the same time bringing the city 'up to date' in terms of its cultural, leisure, retail and employment offer.</p> <p>Option 3 seems a good starting point for this. It contains many elements that people in Winchester have been asking for, for years, if not decades - e.g. a cinema that doesn't cost nearly £15 a ticket, a music venue / performance space - as well as some elements that play to the heritage of the area (e.g. the 'museum'/ history attraction and cultural centre). However, I can see that the residential element, in particular, will need to be enhanced to make the scheme viable from a developer's perspective (even if that developer is the City Council itself). I honestly don't think the CWR area is the place for affordable housing (if by that you mean social rent). The site isn't large enough to make a dent in the need for this type of housing (or, indeed, for 'extra care' or 'warden assisted' housing for the elderly). It would be better to be honest about why residential is part of this scheme - to make it viable - and then concentrate on offering lots of small 1 bed apartments that are suitable for first-time buyers, as well as some larger, high-end penthouse apartments that can command a higher price tag. Include a few live/work spaces that can be rented by local artists and creatives - perhaps one or two could be offered on a reduced rent for 'artists in residence' who commit to producing art/sculpture for Winchester's public spaces?</p> <p>On this basis, my overall suggestion would be to start with Option 3; extend some of the residential plots you have on your plan (e.g. C1, E1 and F1); create public spaces that encourage play (e.g. sculpture that can be climbed on or skated on, fountains that can be jumped in (like those in Granary Square near Kings Cross in London and many other places, including the New York square in the image you included), paths and seating areas with skateable elements alongside the river, etc); incorporate F&B outlets with outdoor seating opportunities linked to the public realm; use the roofscape - e.g. a public green-roof garden on top of one of the buildings, roof terraces for penthouse flats and a rooftop bar and terrace as part of the hotel (this creates additional public space and unique leisure opportunities that make the most of this site and its potential views over the city centre towards the cathedral - not all public space has to be at ground level). The heights of the office/workspace buildings should be slightly lower to allow for these views from the hotel, residential and cultural/leisure buildings.</p> <p>In other words, increase the density of Option 3 and make the most of the roofscape to generate more 'bang for the buck'.</p> <p>I do feel that the overall scheme should be assessed according to three dimensions in terms of its viability - its potential to generate a capital receipt to the developer (and the City Council, given it owns many of the buildings), its potential to generate some ongoing revenue to the City Council (from rent of its own buildings, rates, car parks etc), and its potential to generate wider economic and social benefits (including secondary and tertiary expenditure by those coming into the CWR area as a 'destination' and then doing other things). So more of a 'value for money' analysis than just a 'viability' assessment from a</p> |
| ANON-9SMT-Y7CP-G | 23/02/20 | <p>Is this an "online survey"...? It is merely a comments page.</p> <p>I was rather baffled by the Open Forum on Feb 17th - and more than a little weary of the seemingly never-ending CWR discussions. When "post-it" notes were presented at the interval I had had enough! Many of us spent an entire weekend a couple of years back discussing the CWR site with the JTP team after which the SPD was produced - which is now adopted policy. How much more can this site be discussed?</p> <p>I did feel that the JLL presentation disregarded the SPD somewhat - potentially excluding some of the key features of the SPD - and I hope this isn't a fast track to a lesser scheme. Culture and Heritage must remain at the core of the proposal and I did feel that this was being sidelined, which would be a huge error. Winchester's USP is its heritage, and this must be front and centre of any scheme in this part of the city.</p> |
| ANON-9SMT-Y7CU-N | 23/02/20 | <p>Social enterprises and start ups need office space that can be accessed on short term leases, including for just a few hours a week. This type of space is currently provided by the Incubive/ Action Hampshire partnership in Staple Gardens.</p> <p>Some also need affordable kitchen space - ideally with direct access to customers, others need studio/ demonstration space.</p> |
| ANON-9SMT-Y7CE-5 | 23/02/20 | <p>I think Winchester needs a vibrant arts/ artisan sector that will attract people from far and wide. We do not more bland high street shops and chain restaurants. We need to attract the independents and the innovative. We could also do with some space given over to food halls (see https://www.timeout.com/london/restaurants/londons-best-street-food-markets-and-food-halls , https://wales247.co.uk/a-new-6000-ft%C2%B2-street-food-venue-will-open-in-pembroke-dock-this-summer/ and https://www.ygegin.com/)</p> |

| | | |
|------------------|----------|--|
| ANON-9SMT-Y7CS-K | 23/02/20 | <p>This 'consultation' period, lasting a mere five days after a meeting which those who work found it impossible to attend, is inadequate. Does the Council really want to hear the views of the public, and will they affect the current process in any material way?</p> <p>The consultation document is extraordinary. It criticises the SPD, which was formulated over two years with extensive public consultation and many cross-party committee meetings, and with the expert assistance of JTP. The SPD was formally adopted as WCC policy on 20th June 2018. The mix of uses, the opening up of the waterways, the shape of the proposed development, the preservation of existing buildings like Coitbury House, the old Antiques Market and Woolstaplers' Hall, were all agreed. Viability studies were conducted and desktop surveys were prepared and taken into account - such as the CWR Flood Risk Assessment [Wallingford HydroSolutions 2017], which the Environment Agency approved ("Opening up of watercourses is in accordance with EA policy and may enhance the amenity value").</p> <p>The final SPD was informed by the joint HCC/WCC Winchester Movement Strategy. Meanwhile uses were actively being discussed, with three sub-committees nearing final decisions over revenue-achieving temporary/semi-permanent uses for the Bus Station, the Broadway and Coitbury House.</p> <p>We were well on the way to discussing delivery options. It was with this aspect of the regeneration of central Winchester that we considered a Strategic Development Adviser should be engaged.</p> <p>It now appears that we have gone backwards, with a wholesale (and no doubt expensive) revision of the SPD, a reassessment of priorities (omitting the opening up of the waterways in all three possible scenarios), the realignment of building 'plots' and uses and making use of land which isn't even part of the current land assembly. Why is this exercise happening? What purpose does it hope to achieve? Will we ever see the centre of our lovely, historic City brought to life with excellently designed and appropriate buildings, desirable homes, walkways/cycle routes along open waterways and a thriving economy arising out of an imaginative business and cultural offer?</p> |
| ANON-9SMT-Y7CK-B | 23/02/20 | It would be great to bring Winchester up to date with some sort of meeting place/social hub for all generations within this plan. Food stalls, affordable retail space for independent/small businesses - something fun and vibrant. The high street is rapidly losing its charm :(|
| ANON-9SMT-Y7CA-1 | 23/02/20 | This is a total farce and waste of taxpayers money. The SPD was agreed. The mixed use agreed. The opening up of waterways agreed. The opening up of archaeology agreed. The public spoke. These three plans bear no resemblance to what was agreed over a long consultation. Worse still nothing here refers to the Climate Emergency. Have you been in a time warp? |
| ANON-9SMT-Y7CD-4 | 23/02/20 | The project needs more trees and green space to help combat global warming. The waterways should be opened up not least as a safety valve for the main river. To stop flooding. There needs to be more art space too. |
| ANON-9SMT-Y7CR- | 23/02/20 | More time would very useful |
| ANON-9SMT-Y7C4-M | 23/02/20 | We need to have green spaces and trees. It is not clear from the plans how the climate crisis is being addressed. In earlier plans the water ways were going to be exposed- these are a unique feature of Winchester and could bring nature into the heart of the city. Also there has been inadequate time for responses from the public. |
| ANON-9SMT-Y7CQ-H | 23/02/20 | <p>What do u have planned with this with regards to the climate emergency?</p> <p>How will this project improve the local environment?</p> <p>Where are the green spaces for community use?</p> <p>What is the plan for the waterway?</p> |
| Email | 24/02/20 | <p>I object to the latest Silver Hill development plan, on the basis that there are no green spaces, no opening up of the waterways, no sign that WCC has factored in climate change/emergency - just as in the case of the new leisure centre at Bar End where, I understand, gas boilers are being installed rather than using renewable energy.</p> <p>Silver Hill must be a development for the 21st century and beyond, reflecting changing retail demands with online shopping, and with a strong a social/cultural/community hub.</p> <p>Surely the Council has learned a lesson from the architectural eyesore that is the Brooks Centre and the retail disaster it has been, totally devoid of vibrancy, ambience, character and local appeal. Surely the Council see from the success of the markets, independent shops, pop ups, etc that these are all far preferable to big characterless brands, many of which are struggling: Debenhams, John Lewis, M&S, etc.</p> <p>Winchester does NOT need another shopping centre, with people being encouraged to drive here - with that I include Park and Ride. That is an irresponsible, and anachronistic approach, especially as WCC has acknowledged the existence of a climate emergency.</p> <p>Unless public transport, the traffic and pollution problems are addressed first, Silver Hill will just be another predictable, out of date development. This is a huge opportunity for Winchester to do something brave, different and outstanding, reflecting the urgent need to fully embrace climate change.</p> <p>There are so many examples all over the country of beautiful town centres ruined over decades by appalling developments granted planning by local councils.</p> <p>WCC need to listen to the experts: master planners, environmentalists, independent architects and the people, not to developers or the political groups within the Council. Otherwise Silver Hill will just become another Brooks Centre.</p> |

| | | |
|-------|----------|---|
| Email | 25/02/20 | <p>The CWR open forum last week was, in my opinion, a very poor attempt at participation with an audience of committed residents who had spent considerable time in the excellent participation exercises done by JTP, resulting at an agreed SDP. What we were given, again in my opinion, was a less good rehash by JLL of ground that had been rather thoroughly gone over several times before. The result was very little progress, except for the welcome news that the archaeology survey work has gone out to tender, and that the somewhat grandiose proposal for revamping Coitbury House has been shelved as being too expensive. And, thus, as often has been the case, no forward progress towards development has been achieved, after some 20-odd years. Is the Council shy about getting its feet wet, and starting some real work?</p> <p>Three suggestions for getting really started:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clear weeds, scrub, unwanted trees along the Lower Brook - a volunteer work party supervised by the Wildlife Trust could do this for free. Then plant interesting trees to form a shady walk eventually along the Lower Brook (as shown in the SDP). Then, bite the bullet, and have the old decrepit Friarsgate Surgery demolished, and that section of the Lower Brook cleaned up and improved - helping flooding relief in times of need, too.2. Actually get to work on improving and putting in pedestrian-friendly paving on the Broadway and Lower High Street, and linking up King Alfred's statue with the rest of the city. His grave may be lost, but that is no excuse for not treating his very visible statue properly.3. Fulfill a promise made by the former Leader of the Council at the time of the completing the SDP, and that is to seriously consider a better location of the much used, much valued bus station. That is, I suggest yet again, on the site of the rather poorly refurbished Friarsgate car park. Why make people cross a busy Friarsgate to catch the bus, when they could have the bus station close to where they shop, and close to where any activity in the CWR would eventually be? |
|-------|----------|---|