

Minute Extract from The Scrutiny Committee held 6th December 2021 – item 6. Central Winchester Regeneration (CWR) Outline Business Case.

RESOLVED:

The committee agreed the following comments be passed to Cabinet.

1. regarding the section relating to technical questions, that the questions be reviewed to ensure they are focused on the people who delivered the relevant example rather than the company.
2. “Design” is imperative, and it was requested that the 1,000-word count limit be reviewed to enable demonstration of this.
3. capital - the evaluation of financial standing will be assessed elsewhere, the committee requested that clarification of this be provided.
4. how would the Council ensure that local people are involved in the development?
5. could further clarification be provided regarding the arguments of freehold vs leasehold?
6. could the adherence to carbon neutrality plans be firmed up in some of the descriptions?
7. within appendix G where it refers to the sources in the business case - what are the assumptions and sources as referenced in the economic business case?
8. the impact of an archaeology challenge had not been referenced and should be acknowledged in the risks
9. consider that the project removes the use of compulsory purchase order powers.
10. could the naming of the phases be reviewed to void confusion?
11. page 129, suggested to use the names of posts rather than names of officers
12. reference of archaeology statement and whether the wording could be improved to make it clearer.
13. regarding repayment costs, could confirmation be given that there is no borrowing requirement to fund the project?
14. additional narrative required i.e., to demonstrate the bigger picture, how did we get here and where are we going?
15. could clarity be provided on how we would engage as part of the procurement process?
16. suggested that the archaeology report be appended to the Cabinet report
17. within the economic case, could the background sources be listed?
18. could clarification be provided regarding financial phasing?
19. could clarification be provided regarding phases for the whole site and phasing in defined site financials?
20. suggested that a review of the risk register be undertaken and the risks around: the developer going “bust”, partial development and legal challenge
21. requested that CWR be brought back to Scrutiny committee as an interim update item – i.e., early new municipal year.

DRAFT