

**Project Title:**

CWR – Coitbury House Advisory Panel – notes and actions

**Author:**

Sophie Kitson

**Meeting Information**

---

**Date, Time & Location:**

Wednesday 17 October 2018. 13:00pm, St Giles, City Offices

**Attendees:**

Cllr Caroline Horrill (Chair)  
 Cllr Eileen Berry  
 Cllr Dominic Hiscock  
 Keith Leaman (City of Winchester Trust)

Veryan Lyons  
 Rachel Robinson  
 Sophie Kitson  
 Neil Aitken  
 Richard Wadman

**Apologies:**

N/A

**Agenda**

---

Topics:			
1.	- Advisory Panel Terms of Reference and Membership - Red line map*	For information For information	VL/RR
2.	- Coitbury House Draft Brief - Architect Draft Brief - Procurement Route - Estimated Timescales - Possible Architects	For discussion For discussion For information For information For discussion	VL/RR RW RW RW/RR RW
3.	- AOB		All

\*Land registry freehold title plan replaces this, see Appendix A at the end of this document.

**Notes and actions from the meeting**

---

Agenda item:		
--------------	--	--

## Appendix C

	Richard and Neil 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 Richard 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>
	It is agreed that the project team will investigate the planning	<b>ACTION</b>

## Appendix C

	regulations around parking ratios.	
	The project team will recirculate the updated documents to the panel once the amendments have been made.	<b>ACTION</b>
	<p>Veryan Lyons 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Veryan Lyons suggests that this should be considered when deciding which architects to approach.</p>	<b>COMMENT</b>
	<p>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.</p> <p>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 agreement on a list of 5/6.</p> <p>Rachel Robinson 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.</p>	<p><b>COMMENT</b></p> <p><b>ACTION</b></p> <p><b>COMMENT</b></p>
	<p>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.</p> <p>The project team will consider how this could be done and revisit the timeline accordingly.</p>	<p><b>COMMENT</b></p> <p><b>ACTION</b></p>
	<p>The panel recommend that the evaluation should be 60% quality and 40% price.</p> <p>Neil 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).</p>	<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b></p> <p><b>ACTION</b></p>

### Appendix:

Appendix A: Land registry freehold title plan for Coitbury House:

HM Land Registry  
Official copy of  
title plan

Title number **HP654264**  
Ordnance Survey map reference **SU4829SW**  
Scale **1:1250**  
Administrative area **Hampshire : Winchester**

