

## **PLANNING APPLICATION**

### **CAR PARK DESIGN**

#### **1.1 Preliminary design considerations:**

- 1.1.1 The fixed internal core design as set out later in this report has been developed on an iterative basis and is based upon a fundamental principle, integral to the design, to build a car park that offers users a positive parking experience, is a high quality facility that enables motorists to park quickly and easily and encourages them to return.
- 1.1.2 Stripe provided an initial 'Analysis and Options' document in December 2018. This set out a number of key design options that required a decision at an early stage (some of which were prerequisites for the external façade design). These options were discussed at the December 2018 meeting of the Car Parking Demand Project Board (Project Board).
- 1.1.3 Following a Project Board recommendation, Cabinet agreed in February 2019 to incorporate the following features into the design:
- Parking bays of 2.5m x 5m (compared to standard bays of 2.4m x 4.8m)
  - 5 x WCs, including a disabled toilet
  - A 'Changing Places' facility
  - Shower facilities
  - Sheltered cycle store
  - A roof (rather than an open upper level)
  - Small office space for 2 people
  - Entrance; to the north west – as current
  - Exit; to the south east – as current

#### **1.2 Internal Core Design Development:**

- 1.2.1 Annex A; pages 1-3, sets out the various design iterations presented by Stripe. It shows that the initial concepts explored a number of variations in height, footprint and internal circulation, as well as making use of staggered levels, 'notched' bodies and angled plans.
- 1.2.2 These early concepts were subject to internal consultation with Project Board, Planning, Conservation & Design (as part of pre-app advice) and Forward Planning (to link with the Masterplan and to ensure that the car park meets strategic objectives for the Town). This led to further design refinements, which seek to reconcile the need to minimise impact on residents, maximise spatial efficiency, maximise numbers of spaces permissible as well as provide a high quality design.
- 1.3.3 Maximising spatial efficiency resulted in an 'orthogonal' layout, requiring a box shaped internal core, which can emphasise massing (shape, form and

size of a structure). It was agreed that the massing issue would be addressed via imaginative façade design.

### **1.3 Number of Levels/Decks:**

- 1.3.1 At the December 2019 meeting, Project Board agreed that the recommended number of levels for the MSCP to go forward for Planning submission should be Ground floor plus 4 levels (G+4).
- 1.3.2 This decision was taken on the basis that this provides the necessary number of spaces to overcome the c.350 shortfall in parking spaces identified in the Local Plan. It also provides the best value for cost per space. The cost per space reduces significantly as the number of levels increases, due to the fixed costs associated with foundations, drainage, roof, external works (landscaping, paving etc), irrespective of the number of levels.
- 1.3.3 The MSCP requires a reduced footprint of the parking area to maintain a reasonable separation distance from nearby residential properties and to reduce daylight/sunlight and shading effects. Note that due to the reduced footprint of the MSCP compared to the current surface level car park, the ground floor of the proposed MSCP provides 121 fewer spaces than the existing car park. Two levels (G+1) are therefore required before there is any net gain in spaces from the current 233 spaces. Annex A; page 4, sets out the number of spaces per level.

Annex A; page 5, sets out the ground floor layout and vehicular access and egress.

- 1.3.4 The fixed core design delivers a total of 639 parking spaces and increase of 404 spaces including:

- 35 Disabled
- 8 Parent and Child
- 10 EVCPs (Infrastructure will be included to enable this number to be scaled up)

### **1.4 External Façade Design Competition:**

- 1.4.1 In September 2017, Council approved funding to allow a design competition for the external facade of the car park. It had been anticipated that the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) would run this competition but due to statutory procurement constraints, it was decided to run this phase with the Preferred Main Contractor, Willmott Dixon. (See details under Preferred Main Contractor para 11).
- 1.4.2 The design competition was launched in April 2019. Expressions of interest were invited from approximately 30 architectural practices that were identified by Willmott Dixon (selected from the “Architects’ Journal” top 100 list of Architects), as having:
- Experience of MSCP-related design

- Presence in the South West region.

Additionally, all local architectural practices were contacted and invited to express an interest.

- 1.4.3 Seventeen architects responded by completing a pre-qualification questionnaire (PQQ). Each was assessed against set criteria (including; added value that the architect expected to bring to the project, fee proposal, case studies of previous experience and office set-up) and assigned a weighted score as part of the shortlisting process.
- 1.4.4 Three architects were shortlisted and invited to prepare concept designs (to a design brief) and to present their designs to the Project Board. In addition, the 3 concept designs (including a computer generated 'fly through' animation of each design in situ) went on public display at the Fleece hotel in Cirencester in July 2019, and in the Council offices for a further 2 weeks in August 2019. The public was invited to complete a voting card to help assess the relative popularity of the designs. The 3 designs were also published on CDC's website along with an online survey, which replicated the voting card.
- 1.4.5 In total, c.1,200 responses were received and the design with fewest votes was eliminated from the competition.
- 1.4.6 The two remaining architects were invited to the Council offices to attend a design 'Charrette', which comprised workshops and interviews. This helped to establish a detailed understanding of their respective design proposals such as, choice of materials, technical considerations, budget implications, building regulations compliance etc. The architects were assessed against specific criteria and PCH-a was awarded the façade design contract in September 2019.

## **1.5 Façade Design Development:**

- 1.5.1 Formal Planning pre-application advice was sought on the 'Aluminium on Stone' concept design. Following input from the Planning service and Conservation & Design, several refinements were requested.
- 1.5.2 Key refinements included:
- Significant 'greening' to the design
  - Stone cladding to the south eastern corner
  - Bronze/corten steel finish to the metal façade
  - Tighter weave pattern in the metal façade
  - Recessions and projections to the elevations to help 'break-up' the massing
- 1.5.3 Annex A; pages 6-12, shows the design iterations resulting from Planning pre-app and input from Conservation & Design.

## **1.6 Fixed Design Incorporating Internal Core and External Façade:**

1.6.1 Annex A; pages 13-16, shows Computer Generated Images (CGIs) of the fixed design elevations.

1.6.2 Annex A; page 17, shows the key dimensions of the MSCP.

## **2. Archaeology and Scheduled Monument Consent**

2.1 The Waterloo is a designated Scheduled Ancient Monument requiring Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) from the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, under the expert guidance of Historic England (HE).

2.2 In order to obtain SMC, HE needs to be satisfied that the development proposals do not result in substantial harm to any archaeology. This has resulted in HE requesting several archaeological evaluations including; 3 excavated test pits in March 2019, a ground penetrating radar (GPR) survey in June 2019 and 4 trial trench excavations in October 2019.

2.3 The results of these evaluations were submitted to HE by November 2019.

2.4 Based upon its assessment of these evaluations, HE will indicate whether it intends to support a SMC application, which will result in a submission alongside the Planning Application for determination in parallel to the Planning Application process. It is likely that the SMC will include a condition to carry out a full excavation of the Waterloo prior to construction works commencing; the anticipated costs of this have been built into the capital costs for the build.

## **3. Environmental Impact Assessment:**

3.1 The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) examines the environmental consequences for proposals. It usually applies to urban developments in excess of 1 hectare. The Waterloo falls below this, at 0.77 of a hectare, but in October 2018, the Council as Local Planning Authority (LPA) requested an EIA due to the Waterloo being a 'sensitive area', falling within a Scheduled Monument. Project Board had separately recommended that an EIA be undertaken due to the local sensitivities regarding the project.

3.2 TEP submitted a scoping report to the LPA in November 2018, setting out the areas considered appropriate for inclusion in the EIA, given the location and type of development.

3.3 The scope of the EIA was agreed as follows:

- Archaeology and Historic Environment
- Townscape and Visual Assessment
- Noise and Vibration
- Air Quality
- Traffic and Transport
- Flooding and Drainage
- Land Contamination

3.4 The following section sets out the significance of impact of the proposed development on the key areas as set out in the scope of the EIA. The significance of impact (following mitigation) is described as High, Moderate, Minor or Negligible and takes into consideration the impact of the effect of e.g. noise, and the sensitivity of the receiving environment e.g. a residential property, commercial premises etc.

### **3.5 Summary of Impacts:**

#### **3.5.1 Archaeology and Historic Environment Impact:**

*Construction phase: Minor*

*Operational phase: Negligible*

#### **3.5.2 Townscape and Visual Impact:**

*Immediate vicinity: High*

#### **3.5.3 Noise and Vibration Impact:**

*Construction phase: Moderate/minor*

*Operational phase: Negligible*

#### **3.5.4 Air Quality:**

*Construction phase: Minor*

*Operational phase: Negligible*

#### **3.5.6 Transport and Traffic Impact: (The Waterloo, London Road, Victoria Road, Lewis Lane, Dyer Street and Market Place)**

*Construction Phase: Moderate for The Waterloo and London Road due to increased heavy vehicle traffic flow; Negligible elsewhere.*

*Operational Phase: Moderate for The Waterloo; Negligible elsewhere*

#### **3.5.7 Flooding and Drainage Impact:**

*Negligible*

#### **3.5.8 Land Contamination Impact:**

*Negligible*

#### **3.5.9 Daylight/Sunlight and Shadow Analysis**

The Daylight and Sunlight Report assesses the potential impact of the proposed development on available on and sunlight to existing, neighbouring residential dwellings close to the site.

Key Findings: Daylight/Sunlight

The daylight and sunlight assessments have indicated that the daylight criteria (known as Vertical Sky Component - VSC) is passed for all receptor windows, with the exception of No. 33 The Waterloo and No. 25 Corinium Gate, with the proposed car park development in place. In the case of No. 25 Corinium Gate the calculated VSC, with the development in place, is only marginally below the recommended daylight VSC value.

The development is calculated to have a marginal adverse impact on available sunlight (known as Annual Probable Sunlight Hours - APSH) at the first floor balcony windows serving Woolrich House and at the ground floor windows serving No. 33 The Waterloo. However, the receptor windows at Woolrich House do not currently meet the sunlight criteria under existing conditions, and are only marginally met at No.33 The Waterloo, due to the orientation of the receptor windows at those properties.

#### Key Findings: Shadow Analysis

The shadow analysis identifies the extent of shadow across the site and surrounding area throughout the seasons.

At winter solstice (3pm) the site is subject to shadow with or without the development. With the development an increased level of overshadowing towards the north of the development exists. Properties to the west are affected with or without development.

In summer (summer solstice 3pm) shadow with the development is very localised and does not appear to affect neighbouring properties.

### 3.5.10 Transport Assessment

The purpose of the Transport Assessment is to assess the potential transport impacts of the proposed multi-storey car park, and test whether the transport network could accommodate a full car park. This assessment is an additional requirement to the Transport and Traffic analysis carried out as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment.

#### Key Findings:

- The provision of 35 disabled parking bays results in an 89% increase in disabled parking provision within Cirencester.
- A full car park will lead to an increase in traffic flow on adjoining road links, but no significant weekday, peak hour impact.
- A junction capacity analysis to measure anticipated congestion levels at A429/A417 (London Road) roundabout and The Waterloo/London Road/Dyer Street (5-Ways) junction demonstrates that there will be no significant impact on their operation.

Conclusion:

*'It is considered that this Transport Assessment has demonstrated that the proposed car park expansion can be accommodated within the existing highway network, and the expansion can therefore be deemed acceptable in terms of highways and transportation.'*

#### **4. Sustainability and Carbon Minimisation**

4.1 In the Feb 2017 Report to Council requesting funds to develop detailed designs to enable a full Planning application to be progressed, it was stated that the design would, wherever possible, incorporate modern sustainable design features to reduce environmental impact. This has resulted in the following features being included in the design:

- Full Photo Voltaic (PV) coverage on the roof
- 10 EVCPs – to include internal infrastructure to scale-up
- Recycled water system for irrigation and WC flushing
- Natural ventilation for the entire car park instead of mechanical ventilation
- LED lighting with motion sensors
- Low water consumption at sanitary ware/eco flow taps
- Non-toxic paints

4.2 The Council announced a climate emergency in July 2019 and in December 2019 took a decision under *Motion 10* committing the Council to:

- *Ensuring that all new CDC public buildings will be carbon neutral throughout their entire lifespan.*
- *Ensuring the new multi-story carpark in Cirencester is carbon neutral throughout its entire life-span.*

4.3 As a direct result, Project Board recommended that the project be re-scoped to address the Council's carbon neutral commitments. Whilst this has caused some delay to the Planning application submission, it has presented an opportunity to embed carbon reduction within this significant development project.

4.4 Willmott Dixon has been commissioned to carry out a number of outline tasks culminating in a report that sets out the following:

- The estimated Embodied CO2 emissions of the current MSCP design
- The measures identified to minimise the embodied CO2 emissions e.g. use of recycled materials, provenance of materials, construction methods etc
- An estimate of the new, minimised CO2 emissions

4.5 These measures will be fully costed and incorporated into the Business Case.

4.6 The above is not anticipated to have a material effect on the Planning submission as it will not significantly affect the building design; Project Board recommends that this work can progress in parallel to the Planning application process, although it is anticipated that this work will be at an advanced stage, or complete, prior to Planning submission.

## 5. Programme

5.1 The table below sets out the anticipated programme for planning permission and progressing to construction and completion of the car park if the Council took the decision to progress the build (this report is only seeking authority to progress with the planning application submission at this stage)

Phase	Duration (weeks)
Planning and EIA determination process	13 + 3 for EIA
Pre-commencement conditions discharge	18
Construction	c.60
<b>Total</b>	<b>c.94</b>

Table 1

Based on a planning application submission on 1st August 2020 this would lead to a decision in late November 2020.

## 6. Business Case:

6.1 In February 2017 Council agreed to receive a further report *'to approve the principles of a Planning application and the business case for the development'*. The February 2017 report stated under *'Business Case'* that *'One of the next stages to be progressed is consideration of an outline Master Plan for development sites, predominantly existing car parks...Development at the Waterloo car park would provide excess capacity, which may enable development/disposal of other car parking sites in the town, which would have wider strategic benefits. Capital receipts from any such disposals could be used to repay any borrowing for the construction of the MSCP'*.

6.2 At its October 2019 meeting, Project Board agreed to decouple the business case from the Planning submission. This was based on two main points:

- That the Master Plan is not sufficiently developed to understand the detail of what the wider strategic benefits might be, other than the requirements in the adopted Local Plan requiring additional car parking to support the redevelopment of existing sites and meet the current shortfall, therefore funding which may be possible from the development of these sites could not be factored into the business case at this stage;



- That the MSCP detailed design needs to be finalised before it can be more accurately costed and that the design may change as a result of the planning process.

## **10. Public Consultation Exercise**

10.1 The Council has consulted with stakeholders, the public and notably neighbours to the Waterloo site at a number of stages during the development of proposals and feedback has shaped the design and studies that have been carried out.

10.2 As part of the design competition for the selection of the external façade architect, a public survey was conducted, which included the question:

- *'Given the current and future shortfall in parking provision in Cirencester, do you support the principle of decked parking at the Waterloo'.*

A total of 1,169 responses to this question were received, with 83% in favour and 17% not in favour.