

## New HQ Offices – Town Centre Sites Option Assessment

Assumptions: 25,000 sq. ft. net internal floor area; 2-3 storey building (if new); HQ offices are the site of the Leamington One Stop Shop; HQ offices incorporate member meeting rooms allowing the governance functions to be withdrawn from the Town Hall; minimal on-site car parking (if necessary); required to be completed by the end of 2016; development to be broadly capital cost neutral; required to deliver minimum £300k revenue savings to MTFS

Site	Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>Court Street car park and adjacent land holdings</b> (Old Tyre Depot, Dovecote area etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WDC landholdings could potentially accommodate the required 'footprint' of the new HQ offices.</li> <li>Could potentially 'kick-start' a commercial/office led regeneration of the wider area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Size of WDC landholdings (complicated by covenant/rights of access issues) frustrates the ability to create a 'clean' development footprint of adequate size for new HQ offices.</li> <li>Potential impact of a new large office on adjacent residential and buildings might become a planning constraint</li> <li>Proximity to an operational railway may become a planning constraint and/or add cost to the project if a non-standard design required due to the configuration of the site</li> <li>Wider office led regeneration now unlikely, due to lack of current market demand.</li> <li>Office development likely to require full redevelopment of the car park (as opposed to partial redevelopment under current project proposal for housing development at this location) with adverse impact on Court Street Creative Arches and Clemens Street shopping area.</li> <li>Loss of £11,200 per annum car park income.</li> </ul> <p><u>Note:</u> The current option for housing development at this site (approved by Executive on 26 March) would enable 20</p>

		public parking spaces to remain in operation; resulting in a lower car park income loss of £7,600 per annum.
<b>Bath Place car park</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location would support the regeneration of this part of the Old Town area.</li> <li>• Good footfall generator for this location.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WDC landholding not of sufficient size to accommodate a new build HQ office building.</li> <li>• Site still not big enough even if joined with the County Council's adjacent former Bath Place school building.</li> <li>• Adjacent former Bath Place school building is not currently available and if made available WCC are unlikely to 'gift' the site adding land acquisition costs to the scheme</li> <li>• Underground flood alleviation infrastructure prevents comprehensive development of our site.</li> <li>• Substantial design and planning constraints in integrating any new building with the remaining parts of the adjacent fire damaged former school building, in this conservation area.</li> <li>• Loss of 53 parking spaces, with adverse impact on both local businesses in this part of Old Town and the Council's Spencer Yard regeneration ambitions, plus loss of £13,300 per annum car park income.</li> <li>• Limited and remote public car parking for visitors.</li> <li>• Unlikely to be a viable site for a Leamington One Stop Shop, adding additional cost if a second operational site is maintained.</li> </ul>
<b>Spencer Yard</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could pump-prime and 'anchor' the regeneration of this area.</li> <li>• Closer to town centre than Court Street</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WDC landholdings not of sufficient size to accommodate a new build HQ office building.</li> <li>• Land assembly required with the key site occupied by the Loft Theatre.</li> <li>• Loft Theatre has no plans to relocate, no alternative site and no funding to do so.</li> <li>• Land assembly and acquisition costs would adversely impact on scheme viability</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-new build option (use of existing buildings – URC, North Hall, West Wing, Old Dole Office) cost prohibitive due to additional costs of converting buildings (URC also has listed status) and unlikely to realise the required revenue savings .</li> <li>• Site has poor access from highway, and is landlocked by existing (principally private) property.</li> <li>• ‘Backland’ site has no visibility from Parade/Bath Street (without land assembly)</li> <li>• Cost of providing a new bridge to link the area to the Pump Rooms/Pump Room Gardens cost prohibitive</li> <li>• Limited public car parking in the area for visitors. (Access difficult for public parking at St. Peters without a bridge or direct access from the privately owned Colonnade)</li> <li>• LLP have discounted this option as not being commercially deliverable.</li> </ul>
<b>Pump Rooms</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good attractive town centre location.</li> <li>• High profile building.</li> <li>• Good public transport access for visitors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building’s design, internal layout and listed status would create substantial planning constraints in converting it into modern offices.</li> <li>• Any such conversion would be prohibitively expensive to undertake, and create operationally flawed and inefficient office spaces.</li> <li>• Running costs of any new offices likely to be more, rather than substantially less, than the existing Riverside House HQ offices. Therefore the targeted £300k p.a. savings would not be not deliverable here.</li> <li>• Building currently occupied (by way of ‘protected’ commercial leases) by the County Council’s Central Library, and a private sector café operator.</li> <li>• Council’s Art Gallery and Museum also occupies part of the building.</li> <li>• No guaranteed deliverable alternative relocation options</li> </ul>

		<p>identifiable for all of the above occupiers at the present time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The substantial relocation costs (if they could be agreed) for the above occupiers would make any office scheme financially unviable.</li> <li>• Members have expressed concerns about public access throughout this building.</li> <li>• Limited options for creating disabled parking on site without encroaching onto the Pump Room Gardens.</li> </ul>
<b>Town Hall</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good town centre location.</li> <li>• High profile building.</li> <li>• Perhaps the most natural location for WDC HQ offices.</li> <li>• Good 'anchor' and footfall generator for the lower Parade area.</li> <li>• Good public transport access for visitors.</li> <li>• Potential long term solution for future use of this high (maintenance) cost asset.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building too small. (It has c. 15,000 sq. ft. of usable space, rather than the 25,000 sq. ft. is required).</li> <li>• Building's design, internal layout and listed status would create substantial planning constraints to converting it into modern offices.</li> <li>• Running costs of any new offices likely to be more, rather than substantially less, than the existing Riverside House HQ offices. Therefore the targeted £300k p.a. savings would not be not deliverable here.</li> <li>• Any such conversion would be prohibitively expensive to undertake, and create an operationally flawed and inefficient office spaces.</li> <li>• A number of the present tenants have security of tenure. Vacant possession for any scheme could not therefore be guaranteed.</li> </ul>
<b>Bedford Street car park</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good central location</li> <li>• Close to St. Peters car park</li> <li>• Good footfall generator for the lower Parade area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WDC landholdings not of sufficient size to accommodate a new build HQ office building. Site too long and thin to accommodate the scale of office building we require.</li> <li>• Any new development would therefore require additional site assembly (i.e. Broadribbs Cycles and Pure Health Club) with attendant land acquisition costs and adverse impact on financial viability of the scheme.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjacent Real Tennis club's rights of light would create significant planning constraints.</li> <li>• 'Backland' site, with poor public 'presence'</li> <li>• Could strategically frustrate a wider planned regeneration proposal for this, and the declining lower Parade area.</li> <li>• Any scheme would incur the loss of 49 car parking spaces in this location, with the adverse impact on the currently challenged lower Parade retail area,</li> <li>• Loss of £117,800 p.a. car parking income.</li> </ul>
<b>Spa Centre site</b>  <b>(Option agreed by Executive on 26 March 2014).</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good high profile location.</li> <li>• Near to other public services and facilities.</li> <li>• New HQ offices would fit on site.</li> <li>• Synergy with the adjacent Spa Centre, to further drive down operational costs, and boost the Spa Centre's profile, footfall and use (e.g. shared back office cost savings, shared meeting space, integrated box office/reception function etc.)</li> <li>• Design of new building envisages an atrium link to Spa Centre providing for the synergies highlighted above but allowing future flexible use of both the new asset and the Spa Centre site to be considered independently at a future date if required.</li> <li>• Proposal is financially viable.</li> <li>• Proposal can be linked to separate proposals for additional investment in Spa Centre to create 'added value', if considered desirable.</li> <li>• Ability to create on-site disabled parking</li> <li>• Ability to accommodate staff and visitor car parking in existing town centre car parks.</li> <li>• Ability to create a 'landmark' building to enhance the 'gateway' into the town centre for visitors to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of open space and amenity,</li> <li>• Potential adverse impact on Spa Centre from loss of drop-off and parking spaces (c.30 informal spaces) unless new provision created in adjacent Rosefield Street car park.</li> <li>• Design challenges to successfully integrate a new building into a diverse local environment.</li> <li>• Likely loss of up to 45 car parking spaces in Rosefield Street car park if required for visitor and/or priority staff parking.</li> <li>• Loss of up to £53,600 p.a. car parking income, depending on whether or not any public parking is retained at this site.</li> </ul>

	Jephson Gardens	
<p><b>Riverside House site:</b></p> <p><u><b>Option 1:</b></u>  <b>Visitor (top) car park;</b></p> <p>Note: Assumes demolition of existing offices and redevelopment of the site for new housing</p> <p><u><b>Option 2:</b></u>  <b>Refurbish existing offices</b></p> <p><u>Note:</u> Assumes Council</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New HQ offices would fit on site.</li> <li>• Building design could be made to blend in with the local environment.</li> <li>• Building sufficiently large to allow consolidation into a smaller area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not address current issue of lack of availability of public transport for visitors</li> <li>• Not an ideal location for a One Stop Shop. Creating a separate site for a One Stop Shop would increase revenue expenditure rather than create savings.</li> <li>• Provides no stimulus for regeneration (part of the original relocation brief).</li> <li>• Although technically feasible the need to 'lift and shift' existing drainage culverts would increase building costs.</li> <li>• Proposal would not be capital cost neutral due to reduction in housing numbers that could be provided on site (assuming existing building is redeveloped for housing) with estimated c£1m shortfall.</li> <li>• Present on-site car parking would be substantially required by the new housing. Therefore significantly reduced staff and visitor parking on site, requiring alternative options.</li> <li>• Visitor car parking likely to only be available on the lower levels of the existing car park, with attendant flood risk, or at Adelaide Road (43 spaces), with attendant loss in car parking revenue (unless charges imposed).</li> <li>• Likely adverse public reaction to Council building new offices yards away from existing ones with no attendant regeneration or other benefits</li> <li>• Does not address current issue of lack of availability of public transport for visitors</li> <li>• Not an ideal location for a One Stop Shop. Creating a</li> </ul>

<p>leases/sells off surplus half of the building for conversion to offices or residential uses and redevelopment of existing visitor car park for new housing, to finance the conversion costs</p> <p><b>Option 3:</b>  <b>Demolish existing offices and rebuild on site</b>  <u>Note:</u> Assumes redevelopment of existing visitor car park for new housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site of sufficient size to accommodate new offices</li> <li>• Relatively few planning constraints for the office redevelopment as land use would remain the same</li> </ul>	<p>separate site for a One Stop Shop would increase revenue expenditure rather than create savings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides no stimulus for regeneration (part of the original relocation brief).</li> <li>• Proposal would not be capital cost neutral due to reduction in housing numbers that could be provided on site.</li> <li>• Present on-site car parking would be substantially required by the new housing. Therefore significantly reduced staff and visitor parking on site, requiring alternative options.</li> <li>• Visitor car parking likely to only be available on part of the lower levels, with attendant flood risk, or at Adelaide Road (43 spaces), with attendant loss in car parking revenue (unless charges imposed).</li> <li>• Significant disruption to service provision while refurbishment undertaken with additional cost of temporary accommodation</li> <li>• Surplus space has already been subject to an unsuccessful lettings exercise</li> <li>• Uncertain demand for remainder of building with attendant financial risks if not let.</li> <li>• Difficult to stimulate 'Different Ways of Working' without a move to another site</li> <li>• Future funding of overhanging maintenance liabilities of c£1m would not be addressed</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not address current issue of lack of availability of public transport for visitors</li> <li>• Not an ideal location for a One Stop Shop. Creating a separate site for a One Stop Shop would increase revenue expenditure rather than create savings.</li> <li>• Council would have to decant during works, with disruption and adverse impact on delivery of council services and</li> </ul>
---	--	--

		<p>increased financial costs consequential 'double-move'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides no stimulus for regeneration (part of the original relocation brief).</li> <li>• Proposal would not be capital cost neutral due to reduction in housing numbers that could be provided on site</li> <li>• Present on-site car parking would be substantially required by the new housing. Therefore significantly reduced staff and visitor parking on site, requiring alternative options.</li> <li>• Visitor car parking likely to only be available on part of the lower levels, with attendant flood risk, or at Adelaide Road (43 spaces), with attendant loss in car parking revenue (unless charges imposed).</li> <li>• Likely adverse public reaction to Council building new offices on same site with no attendant regeneration or other benefits</li> </ul>
<b>Adelaide Road car park</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would free up the whole of the Riverside House site for residential development.</li> <li>• Likely to stack-up financially.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very unlikely that the scale and mass of a new 2-3 storey HQ office building could be successfully accommodated on this site.</li> <li>• Substantial design challenges and planning constraints: e.g. mature trees, impact on adjacent residential properties and the riverside leisure/cultural and religious buildings.</li> <li>• Majority of site within flood plain requiring additional design and building costs to place the building on 'stilts' (assuming Environment Agency consent obtained)</li> <li>• Not much better than present HQ location for public access.</li> <li>• Does not address current issue of lack of availability of public transport for visitors</li> <li>• Not an ideal location for a One Stop Shop. Creating a separate site for a One Stop Shop would increase revenue expenditure rather than create savings.</li> <li>• On-site car parking at current Riverside House site would be</li> </ul>





	<p>of this part of the town centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No loss of car parking income if remainder of development scheme proposals delivered (equivalent income currently factored into the Development Agreement for the retail led scheme)</li> <li>• Re-provision of town centre car parking as part of wider scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council may have to compromise on freehold ownership for proposal to be viable</li> </ul>
<p><b>Covent Garden surface car park.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good central location.</li> <li>• New HQ offices would fit on site.</li> <li>• No known technical site constraints at this stage.</li> <li>• Adjacent to Covent Garden multi-storey car park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant timing issue in relation to the proposed Chandos Street redevelopment. Capacity at Covent Garden will be required during the development phase when the existing Chandos Street car parking provision lost but the new car parking associated with the retail led scheme is not yet available. Unavailability of spare capacity at Covent Garden would have an adverse impact on town centre businesses.</li> <li>• Delaying the scheme to counteract the above would have an adverse impact on the MTFS</li> <li>• Aside from the above a stand-alone development is unlikely to provide a stimulus for regeneration and would, in fact, frustrate a wider, strategically planned, future retail/commercial/leisure or other development plan for this north western sector of the town centre and pre-empt consideration of an Area Action Plan for the town centre as set out in the Submission Draft Local Plan.</li> <li>• The adjacent Covent Garden multi-storey car park has a finite life and its replacement needs to be planned as, and integrated into, any new overall scheme in this location.</li> <li>• Loss of 80 short-stay car parking spaces.</li> <li>• Loss of c£130k p.a. car parking income.</li> </ul>
<p>-----</p> <p><u>Note:</u> Assumed scenario for re-provision of lost car</p>	<p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good demand for long-stay spaces in this location.</li> </ul>	<p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site could potentially accommodate 80 car parking spaces.</li> </ul> <p><u>Note:</u> This 'like for like' space new car park would however</p>

parking capacity at the Spa Centre site		<p>produce a lower income, due to its principally long-stay (rather than the existing short-stay) designation of c. £95,350 (i.e. a loss of c. £34,650 per annum from the existing Covent Garden income.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional capital cost of c£170k.</li> <li>• Site unsuitable for (replacement) short-stay parking. Therefore overall loss of c.80 'shoppers' car parking spaces in the town centre with attendant impact on town centre businesses.</li> <li>• Loss of open space and amenity</li> <li>• Design challenges for a new surface car park in this location.</li> </ul>
<b>Public Parks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jephson Gardens.</li> <li>• Pump Room Gardens.</li> <li>• Victoria Park.</li> <li>• Christchurch Gardens.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All of the public parks have been discounted from this options appraisal due to fundamental environmental, political and planning constraints.</li> </ul>
<b>Multi-storey car parks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covent Garden</li> <li>• St Peter's</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good central location.</li> <li>• New HQ offices would fit on the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sites discounted from this options appraisal due fundamental adverse financial impacts (additional capital costs from demolition and significant revenue losses from car park income), adverse impact on the vitality of the town centre and the viability of town centre businesses due to the loss of car parking spaces and the attendant political and reputational impact on the Council</li> </ul>