

Agenda Item 4.b.

CC information on Capital Costs – Context to the Advice

“The capital costs have always been an estimate and will remain at a high level until we have a detailed design, better understanding of the ground conditions and ultimately have gone out to tender.

The revised costings that MJWV produced before Christmas included some items that had been omitted from the earlier work undertaken by Arcadis and the original ISO Spaces quote. This includes for example security fencing, external lighting and a contingency budget. We have talked through the scheme in more detail with the project’s cost consultant to address some assumptions that had been made in this cost exercise and identify possible opportunities for savings and we will have a revised cost estimate by early next week.

The suggested increase cost is not associated with the proposed location, which may well contribute to a reduction in groundworks costs. We’re working closely with the design team to keep the project to budget whilst delivering a scheme that meets the expectations of the CLLD programme and LTC as the future lease holder.”

Planning Officers Advice

The planning officer has confirmed that we can request that the Devon and Cornwall Police Architectural Liaison Officer is a consultee to the full planning application to provide a professional opinion on the ability of the proposal to design out crime”.

Adam Birchalls Advice – Locational and Layout Factors

In summary:

- if the location is to the west it prejudices future collective decisions about other uses in that area
- if the location is to the south (into the Workshed car park) it is of course physically possible BUT it will involve getting architects to re-design the Workshed scheme (there will inevitably be further detailed issues and options that flow), the engineers would then have to redesign services and utilities, the cost consultants would have to recalculate, and all of that professional work will cost sums well in excess of £10,000, probably more. More critically it would also involve delay and risk to the programme for the Workshed and unwinding a set of planning consents and funding agreements and renegotiating them. That will put the funding for the Workspace (which is far more significant than the CLLD project) at risk, and erode delivery of a scheme which has been a consistent part of various masterplans and the Neighbourhood plan and for which funding is currently stable and safe.

In more detail ... (based on conversations with the external professional team) ...the location we have collectively got to now is believed to be the most suitable location for the following reasons:

- It’s integration with the forthcoming Workshed spaces, Market Canopy and public realm works to the east
- It will dovetail with the Work Shed planning consent extents and therefore not require any alteration to their proposals
- The scheme will have visibility from the approach from Fairpark Rd to the north

- The reuse of the existing building base is expected to represent a cost saving for the overall scheme of c.£18k, avoiding the need for additional excavations and programme saving of c.2 weeks once construction starts.

Reduction of ground risk - Omitting the need to remove material and add foundations would reduce risk of insufficient ground stability and ground contamination.

Environmental and H&S benefits – reuse of the existing slab would reduce requirements for new material and reduction of works required onsite.

Reduction of need to undertake additional surveys - it is expected that the majority of information collated for the Workshed can be used thereby reducing the need for further surveys to be undertaken.

Location leaves the western half of the site free for future development of the Community uses building, Integrated Services Hub and wider parking and landscaping.

If/when the use of the CLLD hub ends and it is removed/relocated, the site then becomes an opportunity area for future built development or open space use

Opportunity to safely secure the parking areas out of hours to mitigate concerns over security.

Cons related to moving the location 25m west

- Constrains the future area available for the community uses building, giving a potentially cramped footprint and isolation from adjacent parking opportunities in the future
- Notwithstanding that the CLLD units are modular and movable, it would not be good business to put them in a location where it is entirely likely that there will be another use in a relatively short period – whatever, that other use turns out to be. In other words keep the west of the site unconstrained keeps options open.

Queries arose around the proximity and potential clash of two adjacent contractor compounds, however, due to the phasing of the Work Shed and CLLD projects, the CLLD compound would operate neatly on available land to the immediate west of the preferred location, which would then potentially become future car parking. Meanwhile, the compound for the Workshed project will be located to the south, becoming designated parking on completion of the works. The programme for the CLLD units is shorter than the Workshed, so although there would be some cross over, this would not cause any issues for the site operability.

In terms of security need to remember that CLLD is not a single building block – it is more open than that.

In terms of parking availability associated with the Workshed I would note that although inescapably the Workshed has a set of spaces allocated to it, they can be seen as alleviating pressure on the remaining public spaces – it just means users of the Workshed have reserved spaces and don't have to overlap with the public.