



CABINET

14TH FEBRUARY 2019

AGENDA ITEM (12)

DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE WATERLOO CAR PARK, CIRENCESTER

Accountable Member	Councillor MGE MacKenzie-Charrington Cabinet Member for Planning and Licencing Services and Cirencester Car Park Project
Accountable Officer	Claire Locke Group Manager - Council Advisory Services 01285 623427 Claire.locke@publica.uk

Purpose of Report	To seek agreement for key design considerations to inform the architect's design of the Waterloo Car Park, Cirencester.
Recommendation(s)	<p>That the design brief for the Waterloo Car Park, Cirencester should include:-</p> <p>(a) the following as essential elements:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• an increased parking bay width of 2.5 metres;• 15 free bicycle racks;• spaces for motorcycles;• public toilets, including 'Changing Places' and baby changing facility;• a roof to maximise opportunities for environmentally-beneficial systems and technologies;• Vehicle Movement Option A as set out in the Appendices to this report;• electronic signs at appropriate locations on the route(s) to the car park to enable the display of 'Car Park Full' information; <p>(b) the following as optional elements:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• shower and changing facilities;• a drop-off waiting area;• a small office/welfare facilities;• space for a parcel collection point.
Reason(s) for Recommendation(s)	To ensure Members are in agreement with general design principles so that the Architect's brief is appropriate, and acceptable designs are subsequently produced.

Ward(s) Affected	All Cirencester Wards
Key Decision	No
Recommendation to Council	No

Financial Implications	<p>(i) The financial implications of the options cannot be costed at this stage as the impact on the number of parking spaces, design and therefore construction costs cannot be calculated until the designs are produced, construction materials known etc.</p> <p>(ii) The increase in parking space size from 2.4 metres to 2.5 metres means one space will be lost for every 24 provided - so, as an example, a 600 space car park would lose 25 spaces and become a 575 space car park. Based on current charges and income, a space in Cirencester receives an average income of £1,250 per year so the loss in income would be £31,250/year.</p> <p>(iii) The estimated additional build cost for the roof is £256,125. However, the reduction in maintenance costs and the mitigation against lost income when an open top deck is used cannot be calculated at this stage.</p> <p>(iv) The provision of a parcel collection point would provide an opportunity for supplementary income generation.</p> <p>(v) The provision of a welfare facility potentially reduces lease costs elsewhere and/or reduces parking enforcement contract costs.</p>
Legal and Human Rights Implications	The Council own the freehold interest in the site. A planning application will be submitted once scheme designs have been drawn up and agreed.
Environmental and Sustainability Implications	<p>(i) The decision to include a roof, rather than an exposed top parking deck, provides the option for a Green roof (as detailed within the report).</p> <p>(ii) Provision of cycle racks and showers and lockers for cyclists would promote sustainable transport.</p> <p>(iii) Provision of some of the additional facilities could increase traffic volumes to/from the site for non-parking purposes, with a consequent increase in carbon emissions, and congestion potential.</p>
Human Resource Implications	Delivery of the project is being managed by existing Officers with specialist consultancy support.
Key Risks	<p>(i) Failure to agree design principles now may mean the appointed architect produces designs which the Council is then not happy with, resulting in altered designs, delays and additional cost.</p> <p>(ii) The financial risks will be covered in the Business Case that will be brought before Council when a decision is sought to agree to allocate funding and construct the car park.</p> <p>(iii) The alternative options for vehicle movement may increase highway congestion and impact on residents or may significantly reduce available space for parking if vehicles have to queue within the car park, which could affect the business case and, consequently, scheme viability.</p>

	(iv) If a roof is not installed, the top deck will deteriorate more rapidly and require higher maintenance costs. It is also likely that during periods of ice and snow it may not be safely accessible. It would also limit the opportunity for green technologies.
Equalities Analysis	Not applicable to this report. Delivery of disabled parking spaces will be incorporated into the design.

Related Decisions	Cabinet 16 th February 2017 - Development of Waterloo Car Park, Cirencester for decked parking - Minute CAB.76 refers
Background Documents	None
Appendices	Appendix 'A' - Design options Appendix 'B' - Pros and Cons of Vehicle Movement Options

Performance Management Follow Up	(i) Implement Cabinet decision(s). (ii) This project is part of a Council key task, and will be reported through the performance management framework.
Options for Joint Working	Not relevant

Background Information

1. In July 2018, Stripe Consulting were appointed as specialist design consultants for the proposed Multi Storey Car Park in the Waterloo car park, Cirencester. They have been charged with developing the internal core design, including detailed foundation designs. A RIBA competition will result in the appointment of an architect to design the external wrap.

2. Core design work has progressed and, in December 2018, Stripe provided an Initial Analysis and Options document (**Appendix 'A'**) setting out a context and analysis of the Waterloo site. This document contains a number of design options to be considered and agreed in order to further develop design detail and to enable the launch of the RIBA competition.

3. The Council wishes to build a car park that offers users a very positive parking experience, and a high quality facility that enables motorists to park quickly and easily and encourages them to return. The Parking Demand Project Board considered the design options, in this context, at its December 2018 Meeting and made the following recommendations for Cabinet to consider:-

(i) Parking Bay Width

- Provision of 2.5m bays (standard bays 2.4m). Whilst this will impact slightly on the overall number of bays provided, it will increase the ease with which users can park and access/exit their vehicle.

(ii) Other Modes of Transport

- Provision of 15 free bicycle racks.
- Provision of spaces for motorcycles - numbers to be confirmed.
- Provision of a drop-off waiting area.

(iii) Ancillary Spaces

- Small office space to accommodate 1-2 people. This would provide a 'welfare' space for Parking Enforcement Officers or other 'field' employees.
- Public toilets - up to five units, including 'Changing Places' and baby changing facility.
- Parcel collection point, e.g. Amazon parcel lockers.
- Changing facilities - to comprise a shower and changing area that would be useful for commuting cyclists.

(iv) Roof

- The provision of a roof. This has many advantages over an open-top structure - it enables the upper deck to be used throughout the year; provides protection of the structure and finishes, which reduces maintenance costs; provides the space for solar PV panels to serve the building's on-going energy requirements (e.g. lighting); offers the option of a blue or green roof to provide rainwater attenuation and habitat; and also minimises the potential risk of falling from the building. The estimated additional cost of roof provision over a 50-year period is £256,125 at today's prices.

(v) Vehicle Movement Options - See **Appendix 'A'** (pp.15-18) and **Appendix 'B'**

- Of the four options provided, Option A is the preferred option - this is the most compatible with the proposed indicative plan and is similar to the existing vehicle movement entering and exiting the car park.

4. Arising out of an informal discussion, Cabinet Members considered that the brief should incorporate a number of essential items, and a number of optional items. In so doing, Members wished to try to separate the critical car parking elements from others, some of which could increase traffic volumes to and from the site for non-parking purposes, with a consequent increase in carbon emissions and potential for congestion. Cabinet Members also considered that the provision of electronic signs on the route(s) to the car park would enable the display of 'Car Park Full' information, thereby deterring motorists from seeking to enter the car park when full, giving rise to an increased chance of queueing, congestion, and carbon emissions. The thoughts of Cabinet Members in this regard are reflected in the recommendation.

5. Subject to agreement of the preferred options, Stripe will be instructed to incorporate these elements into the design which is provided to RIBA. Once designs have been produced, a full business case will be submitted to Council seeking approval for funding of the car park construction.

(END)