



North Somerset Council

Wyndham Way Area Framework Portishead

Delivery Testing Report

July 2024

Contents

- 1. Introduction.....3
- 2. Site Delivery and Business Case Readiness templates.....7
- 3. Funding routes for the Framework Area projects.....22
- 4. Landowner discussions.....24
- 5. Members Meetings notes.....27
- 6. Opportunities for the Leisure Centre Site31
- 7. Opportunities for the Station Site32

Report title: North Somerset Council
Prepared by: Ian Thompson, Lara Boyd
Status: Draft V3
Draft date: July 2024

For and on behalf of Avison Young (UK) Limited

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This section of the Wyndham Way Delivery Testing report contains commercially sensitive information on site viability and notes of landowner and Member discussions which are for NSCs internal use. It also sets out the recommended approach to preparing business cases and interventions for the Council to consider.
- 1.2 This section is supplemental to that in the AY Delivery Testing Report (public section) and Allies and Morrison Site Studies Report (public section).
- 1.3 Allies and Morrison have also provided NSC-only site studies for the Station site and Leisure Centre sites, which have been set out in this report.

Baseline Report

- 1.4 This has been circulated and sets out baseline information on the Portishead economy and property market to inform the Framework's delivery. In particular, the baseline report has help to shape the development proposals across the sites and provided a benchmark understanding of the value sets across different uses to inform the viability inputs. Note however, as we have moved through the commission, viability inputs have been refined to reflect the optioneering.

Additional Site Delivery Detail and Business Case 'readiness' templates

- 1.5 Further to the site summaries in the public section of the report , additional detail has been provided below on site viability and delivery models.
- 1.6 A business case template has been prepared for each site showing a range of potential interventions – from light touch public realm to larger economic and housing viability support. The templates outline the key information needed for a standard 5 Case model for a strategic outline and/or outline business case. They are intended to guide the Council to consider and prioritise interventions, support negotiations on partnership projects and for preparing business cases for funding bids. The rationale for public interventions can include:
- To correct a market failure and support viability – to deal with imperfect market conditions, landowner complexity and to incentivise landowners to follow the Framework strategy.
 - To provide catalyst projects which will set the tone for the Framework area and lead the market.
 - To accelerate the pace of development of economic growth and houses – and to ensure jobs remain balanced with housing.
 - To achieve high quality development, for instance new types of employment space, which the market is unwilling to provide.
 - To achieve high quality public realm and other infrastructure which individual sites may be unable to provide, and which will achieve the overall connectivity objectives in the Framework.
- 1.7 As has been noted there are limited opportunities for the Council to intervene with its own land and assets (Somerset Hall, potentially the Station Site once infrastructure built) and therefore targeted public-private projects could be considered which will best achieve Framework vision and objectives and act as catalyst projects for the market to continue the regeneration in the long term.

- 1.8 The templates show possible types of intervention and their cost range. The costs are necessarily high level as they are based on the limited design in the capacity options and corresponding development appraisals, but they provide a guide for the level and type of investment needed to be taken to the next stage for a business case.
- 1.9 There are two important caveats. Firstly there is no information on the current leases and the cost of tenant relocation/compensation where applicable on sites like Old Mill Road. For the purposes of testing deliverability it has been assumed that the sites have vacant possession. In practice some form of relocation costs are likely to be payable. Secondly, ground conditions of the sites are unknown, as are abnormal remediation and infrastructure costs, and this would form part of the next stage due diligence.
- 1.10 Priorities for intervention – the business case templates highlight a number of early and quick win project opportunities. These would need decisions from the Council to prioritise these as ways of creating momentum for the longer term delivery of the Framework. Choices will be informed by community preferences, budget availability, and the catalytic impact the project would have. These include:
1. Public realm improvements (using CIL and other available budgets) to show early intentions for the area.
 2. Somerset Hall refurbishment – decision on how to secure the future of the hall and its operation.
 3. Workspace – bringing forward small flexible workspace/innovation centre schemes as a direct development or in partnership with landowners.
 4. Station land – development for employment of residential. This has been included as a long term option for the site once the station infrastructure has been completed. It is not currently appropriate given the ongoing land acquisition process for the station development.
 5. Potential land acquisition to protect employment base e.g. Gordano Gate.
- 1.11 In addition to site specific business cases, the Council could consider a bid to Homes England, and to the West of England Joint Committee and perhaps Government for further capacity and due diligence funding to support the Project Team and take the Framework forward. Next stage workstreams could include:
- Refine the Framework as SPD type planning guidance including public consultation
 - Consultant support for project team capacity, project definition and business case and technical work.
 - Developing governance structure and stakeholder management
 - Technical due diligence and surveys on individual sites
 - Business case and bid preparation
 - Design and planning on individual sites
 - Negotiations to progress delivery models with landowners

Viability and delivery model templates

- 1.12 These templates provide additional detail on the site summaries in the public report. They consider key aspects on the viability of each site and options for how they can be delivered by landowners/ developers, and public-private partnerships.

Sites' Land Values and Viability Gaps Summary

- 1.13 This table summarises the residual land values and viability gaps where relevant on each site option. These figures inform the 'gap funding' and public investment ranges set out in the business case templates below.

Table 1: Residual Land Value Summary – Framework Sites

Scheme	Scheme Description	Outcome (positive- residual land value or negative - viability gap)	Notes
Based on AMUP site option plans			
Somerset Hall Option 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refurb Somerset Hall Retained Retail (Iceland) New Retail New Resi (40 units) Surface Parking 	- £414k	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suboptimal return due to refurb of Somerset Hall Block B (resi and retail) – delivers an optimal return Block C supports improving the overall viability position
Somerset Hall Option 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refurb Somerset Hall Retained Retail (Iceland) New Retail New Resi (40 units) Surface Parking 	- £362k	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suboptimal return due to refurb of Somerset Hall Block B (resi and retail) – delivers an optimal return Block C supports improving the overall viability position
Somerset Hall Option 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refurb Somerset Hall Retained Retail (Iceland) New Retail New Resi (22 units) Surface Parking 	- £1.1mn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suboptimal return due to refurb of Somerset Hall Block B (resi and retail) – delivers an optimal return Potential to improve with maximised resi in option 1 and 2
Waitrose Option 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retained Waitrose New Resi (145 units) Decked Car Parking 	£3.4mn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Block A- not viable – dragged down by the decked car parking Block B – viable Block C – viable Merged – viable
Waitrose Option 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retained Waitrose New Resi (166 units) Decked Car Parking (larger) 	£3.8mn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Block A- not viable – dragged down by the decked car parking Block B – viable Block C – viable Merged – viable
Gordano Gate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Workspace (Office) New Workspace (Inds) 	- £3.7mn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office element & Stacked Inds combined, creating sub-optimal returns Conservative rent profile
Sainsbury Option 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Retail New Resi (88 units) Decked Car Parking 	£2.4mn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Optimal return due to residential component Decked car parking cross-subsidised by residential Block C (retail only) generates negative return

Scheme	Scheme Description	Outcome (positive- residual land value or negative - viability gap)	Notes
Based on AMUP site option plans			
Sainsbury Option 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Retail New Resi (100 units) Decked Car Parking 	£2.6mn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Optimal return due to residential component Decked car parking cross-subsidised by residential Block C (retail only) generates negative return
Sainsbury Option 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Retail New Resi (98 units) Decked Car Parking x 2 	£1.8mn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Optimal return due to residential component Decked car parking (both) cross-subsidised by residential Block C (retail only) generates negative return
Old Mill Road Option 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Retail New workspace (office and Inds) Resi (567 units) 	£13.1mn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decked car parking Workspace Inds dragging down viability 20 year timeframe Assumes vacant possession of site
Old Mill Road Option 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Retail New workspace (office and Inds) Resi (477 units) 	£9.2mn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decked car parking Workspace Inds dragging down viability Greater residential cross-subsidising core employment uses 20 year timeframe Assumes vacant possession of site

1.14 In the business case templates the indicative level of gap funding has been calculated as follows:

- Where a project is showing negative viability, the gap funding amount to make the project profitable has been used. This should be treated as a minimum level to attract private funding. In practice the public sector may want or need to invest more e.g. land acquisition, direct development.
- Where a project has notionally positive viability, in practice the risks associated with schemes may also require public support to accelerate delivery, boost quality and fund loss making infrastructure like decked car parks and enhanced employment formats.

1.15 The development appraisal assumptions note is set out in Appendix 1. Development appraisals have been used to establish site viability.

2. Site Delivery and Business Case Readiness templates

Gordano Gate

Table 2: Viability and Market Commentary, Gordano Gate

Site/Option	Mix (Size, Scale, Form)	Market Demand	Viability
Gordano Gate Enhanced workspace scheme	<p>Stacked Industrial warehousing at ground and first floors. Industrial floorspace, repositioned to attract higher value activities, which require 'studio' type floorspaces.</p> <p>Flexible (co-working/ small suites) workspace at first and second floors for SMEs.</p>	<p>Industrial warehousing for small to mid-sized units for local servicing activities remains strong in Portishead. However, the core town centre location is not necessarily the most appropriate. These industrial uses may be better suited to be relocated to town centre fringe sites with better connectivity to the strategic road network. Stacked industrial remains largely an unproven market in the region, but the flexible nature of the units does allow for a range of businesses to be accommodated.</p> <p>The market is seeing a shift from mid-large floorplates to demand for flexible co-working, small studio space for SMEs.</p>	<p>Positive for standard industrial/warehouse</p> <p>Enhanced workspace format (if desired) may require investment support - stacked nature of the scheme commanding higher build costs, innovation space/co-working typologies</p>

Table 3: Delivery Model, Gordano Gate

Planning strategy	Delivery Model Options	Quick Win Intervention
<p>Allocated employment site. Expectation that this use will continue but potential to broaden the mix introducing flexible workspace alongside industrial and studio/maker spaces.</p> <p>To create high quality mixed employment space aimed at SMEs and relocating businesses from elsewhere in Framework Area.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Developer proceeds with own employment led scheme (details awaited). NSC supports developer to make high quality workspace mix viable. Partnership Agreement. Internal NSC funding and/or external government grants. 	None. Dependent on current landowner/developer intentions
Delivery Model Option - Advantages and Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages
1. Market-led	<p>Existing private landowner and developer partner.</p> <p>Bring forward allocated scheme without dependency on other sites in Framework.</p> <p>Possibility of working with Sainsburys on comprehensive development of landholdings for employment led mixed use.</p>	
2. Private-public partnership	<p>Could achieve higher quality workspace and jobs on site (compared to low density warehouse uses for example).</p> <p>Public funding could be tailored to workspace product Council wants to target.</p>	Adds complexity for developer and Council would need to secure internal and/or external finance.

Table 4: Project Business Case 'readiness' template - scope to prepare business case and funding bids for public sector interventions, Gordano Gate

Project(s) description	Strategic Case and rationale for intervention	Economic and Financial Case	Deliverability Issues and Programme
<p>Public sector gap funding and acceleration of flexible workspace/maker space studios for start-ups and homeworkers. Scale – c.1,000-2,000 m2.</p> <p>Alongside private sector industrial units for light industry/warehouse.</p> <p>Public sector intervention can also support viability for full development of the site asap which will support employment land strategy in Framework Area.</p>	<p>Key employment site to help delivery of the WW Framework area by creating new jobs to balance new homes, and supporting relocation of businesses from the other sites.</p> <p>Public sector support needed to overcome market failure – high quality workspace will not be viable and could be accelerated with funding support.</p>	<p>Outputs –</p> <p>210 jobs</p> <p>8,000 m2 workspace</p> <p>Total investment c. £10.7mn</p> <p>Public funding intervention from c. £3.8mn (gap funding)</p> <p>The scheme could generate high value jobs and support innovation sectors if appropriate accommodation developed</p> <p>Financial - Viability gap would need funding to create this high quality workspace and accelerate delivery.</p>	<p>Business case may be challenging to progress unless NSC and existing landowner/developer can agree strategy for the site and partnership.</p> <p>Potentially a quick win scheme as allocated and serviced plot - may have ground condition abnormal costs from previous use as oil storage which will increase viability gap.</p>

Precinct and Somerset Hall

Table 5: Viability and Market Commentary, Precinct and Somerset Hall

Site/Option	Mix (Size, Scale, Form)	Market Demand	Viability
Somerset Hall Op 1	<p>Delivery of new retail to replace the parade, and create a longer parade with dual facing units a new central walkway.</p> <p>Refurbishment of Somerset Hall to modernise and repair the existing structure.</p> <p>Reprovision of the existing retail units – Iceland.</p> <p>New flatted residential (40 units) above retail ground floor.</p> <p>Block on northern car park would remove some parking spaces</p>	<p>Demand for retail / F&B is relatively strong in Portishead.</p> <p>Flatted residential is desirable, with evidence that town centre locations are relatively attractive to first time buyers.</p>	<p>Negative at this point in time, due to cost of major refurbishment to Somerset Hall (if this was a Council priority/decision)</p>
Somerset Hall Op 2	Same as above, with greater provision of new retail.		<p>Negative at this point in time, due to cost of refurbishing Somerset Hall. Marginally more positive due to the addition of more retail which is market-facing, and able to contribute to the cost of Somerset Hall's refurbishment.</p>
Somerset Hall Op 3	Same as above, with a lower number of residential flats delivered (22 units) and retail – no block C.		<p>Negative due to the lower proportion of residential delivered, and its ability to contribute to the refurbishment costs for Somerset Hall.</p>

Table 6: Delivery Model, Precinct and Somerset Hall

Planning strategy	Delivery Model Options	Quick Win Intervention
<p>Established retail precinct. Adjoining free car park (owned by Aldi operated by Town Council) and service yards</p> <p>Options to refurbish Somerset Hall block and new build on remaining precinct and part of car park/service yard.</p> <p>Framework would become guidance for new denser development scheme including residential</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Landowner(or developer successor) undertakes refurbishment-redevelopment scheme in partnership with NSC as Somerset Hall owner (or successor community body) and Aldi/TC as car park owner-operator. Hall continues in community use 2. As above but Somerset Hall converted to commercial uses e.g. workspace by Council or successor tenant. Or Hall lease surrendered to redevelop for commercial uses. <p>All of these options remain hypothetical until the Council decides on the future operation, financing and use of Somerset Hall and agrees any changes with freeholder. Also set against strong local feelings that the Hall community uses should continue.</p>	<p>NSC control the public realm in the Precinct and with agreement of car park owner and funding from developers could undertake some enhancements to paving, pedestrian links</p>
Delivery Model Option - Advantages and Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages
1. Freeholder-NSC co-ordination to refurbish/redevelop precinct	<p>Precinct gets comprehensive regeneration</p> <p>Existing tenant base protected and given new premises</p> <p>Deals with problems of ageing building condition</p>	<p>Not priority for current owner to develop site</p> <p>Would disrupt tenants while new development happening</p>
2. Freeholder/Community Organisation partnership and Hall changed to full or part commercial use	<p>As above plus –</p> <p>Community owner of Hall could be proactive in raising finance</p> <p>Part or full commercial use of Hall is more financially sustainable</p>	<p>Local resistance to changes of operation to Hall</p> <p>Finding Community Group with resources</p> <p>Getting freeholder to agree new arrangements</p>

Planning strategy	Delivery Model Options	Quick Win Intervention
	Freeholder would probably turn Hall into commercial use e.g. workspace	

Table 7: Project Business Case 'readiness' template - scope to prepare business case and funding bids for public sector interventions, Precinct and Somerset Hall

Project(s) description	Strategic Case and rationale for intervention	Economic and Financial Case	Deliverability Issues and Programme
<p>Public sector funding for public realm infrastructure from CIL/S106 pots generated by other Framework Area projects</p> <p><u>And/or</u></p> <p>Partnership project with NSC (and/or community groups) funding Somerset Hall improvements and LCP/developer refurbishing/redeveloping Precinct shops.</p> <p>Potential public sector supported flexible workspace scheme alongside new retail units - or in part of refurbished Somerset Hall</p>	<p>Limited scale and impact on the Framework area for new housing and jobs, but an important site which links the high street to the Framework area</p> <p>Somerset Hall community use requires subsidy from public sector to enable a comprehensive mixed use scheme in partnership with precinct owner</p> <p>Community Hall use important to Portishead residents</p> <p>Potential quick win interim scheme to improve the public realm areas of the precinct and links to the Framework Area pending long term redevelopment</p>	<p>Outputs –</p> <p>c.170 jobs</p> <p>20 – 40 homes depending on extent of new development</p> <p>Total investment £11.4 -18.3mn</p> <p>Public funding intervention from £363k to £1.1 mn</p> <p>Financial – depends on delivery model taken forward by LCP and NSC or their successors. If ownership structure remains the status quo, NSC would have to raise funding for Somerset Hall refurbishment ranging from light touch internal improvements to full scale rebuild alongside LCP as freeholder. Other parts of the precinct could be developed on commercial terms for existing tenant base</p>	<p>LCP is comfortable with status quo so Framework-led regeneration project is a long term position for them.</p> <p>NSC has short term problem with Somerset Hall costs and operation, and they will look for solutions irrespective of the wider regeneration project being progressed.</p> <p>A quick win public realm scheme (potentially funded by S106/CIL elsewhere in Framework area) could help bring partners together to collaborate on the regeneration project but this is likely to have a 5 year + horizon.</p> <p>Any redevelopment of part of the car park will also require agreement with Aldi and TC.</p>

Waitrose – Persimmon*Table 8: Viability and Market Commentary, Waitrose - Persimmon*

Site/Option	Mix (Size, Scale, Form)	Market Demand	Viability
Waitrose Op 1	<p>Delivery of mid density residential across three blocks, up to 6 storeys.</p> <p>Residential is proposed to wrap around a car parking deck.</p>	Demand is strong for residential in Marina/town centre location- particularly for first time buyers.	<p>Positive, and able to cross-subsidise the delivery of a decked car park in Block A.</p> <p>Note – block A on its own is not viable due to cost of decked car park.</p> <p>Blocks B and C as a standalone development is viable.</p>
Waitrose Op 2	Viability points same as above	Viability points same as above	Option 2 has a higher number of homes (167 units) than Option 1, which create a positive viability position similar to Option 1.

Table 9: Delivery Model, Waitrose - Persimmon

Planning strategy	Delivery Model Options	Quick Win Intervention
Established retail store and car parks. Change of use to develop housing and consolidate customer parking per the Area Framework options.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Waitrose and Persimmon progress joint housing scheme directly with subsidy for decked car park infrastructure. Waitrose sell land to developer and retain store site and car parking rights in new scheme. Subsidy required for car park infrastructure. 	Public sector intervention - North-South Public Realm improvements across site linking Marina to town centre.
Delivery Model Option - Advantages and Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages
1. Waitrose – Persimmon direct development	<p>Keep control of scheme quality adjoining store and maximise return.</p> <p>Delivery fast-tracked to minimise store disruption.</p>	Carries full developer risk.
2. Waitrose sell/partner with developer	Share return / development risk.	<p>Less control.</p> <p>Agreement needed to manage new car park.</p>

Table 10: Project Business Case 'readiness' template - scope to prepare business case and funding bids for public sector interventions, Waitrose - Persimmon

Project(s) description	Strategic Case and rationale for intervention	Economic and Financial Case	Deliverability Issues and Programme
To support main market led scheme - public funded and led N-S public realm infrastructure linking through site to OMR and Marina.	<p>Key site for the Framework area as it is the link between the Marina and town centre.</p> <p>Can deliver housing at scale.</p> <p>Potential opportunity for Waitrose/JLP internal build to rent programme.</p> <p>Comprehensive scheme by Waitrose-Persimmon to develop and reconfigure car parks</p>	<p>Outputs –</p> <p>145-167 houses</p> <p>Jobs safeguarded in store</p> <p>Total investment range:</p> <p>Option 1, 145 homes, £46.5mn to</p> <p>Option 2, 167 homes, £52.6mn</p> <p>Potential public intervention for major infrastructure c. £3mn to £3.85mn (car park infrastructure)</p> <p>Financial – largely market-led but may need some public sector support for infrastructure to persuade Waitrose to change status quo.</p>	<p>Waitrose is comfortable with status quo and would need major commercial incentive to develop the site directly /or with partners. Surface car parking is 'gold standard' for their operation.</p> <p>Waitrose-Persimmon partnership needed to bring forward a comprehensive scheme on all 3 blocks of housing, and to reconcile ownerships and consolidate parking and subsidise new decked car park.</p> <p>If OMR developed but not Waitrose -Persimmon site, lost opportunity of new north-south street with commercial uses through route to Marina.</p>

Sainsburys

Table 11: Viability and Market Commentary, Sainsburys

Site/Option	Mix (Size, Scale, Form)	Market Demand	Viability
Sainsburys Option 1	New retail unit strip, with mid density residential (88 units) across 2 blocks (max. 4 storeys), and decked car parking.	Demand for retail / F&B is relatively strong in Portishead. Flatted residential is desirable, with evidence that town centre locations are relatively attractive to first time buyers.	Positive , due to the residential component. This is able to cross subsidise the delivery of the decked car park.
Sainsburys Option 2	Same as above with greater number of units (100).		Same as above, albeit more Positive due to the increase of residential units.
Sainsburys Option 3	Same as above with c. 98 units and decked car parks.		

Table 12: Delivery Model, Sainsburys

Planning strategy	Delivery Model Options	Quick Win Intervention
Established retail store, car and petrol station. Change of use to develop housing and consolidate customer parking into decked car park per the Area Framework options. New retail and store entrance fronting new square and facilitating link from station to OMR.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Sainsbury partner with developer/fund to progress housing scheme Sainsburys sell land to developer and retain store and car parking rights in new scheme. <p>Petrol station site could be sold/developed separately with Gordano Gate scheme if this was not needed with store.</p>	Public realm links and new square/landscaping with landowner agreement.
Delivery Model Option - Advantages and Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages
1. Sainsburys- Partner /direct development	<p>Keep control of scheme adjoining store and maximise return.</p> <p>Reassures shoppers that Sainsbury leading development.</p> <p>Delivery fast-tracked to minimise store disruption.</p>	Carries all development risk depending on partner role.
2. Sainsburys sell land to developer	<p>Sainsbury share return</p> <p>Transfer some development risk.</p> <p>Retain car park rights.</p> <p>Use of new public square, supporting retail.</p>	<p>Less control of new scheme quality and programme.</p> <p>Agreement needed to manage new car park.</p> <p>Need to generate sufficient financial return to achieve land uses changes.</p>

Table 13: Project Business Case 'readiness' template - scope to prepare business case and funding bids for public sector interventions, Sainsburys

Project(s) description	Strategic Case and rationale for intervention	Economic and Financial Case	Deliverability Issues and Programme
Support main market led scheme through public funded and led E-W public realm infrastructure linking through site to station and OMR/Waitrose.	<p>Key site for the Framework area as it the E-W link between the station, OMR and town centre.</p> <p>Prominent site next to new station</p>	<p>Outputs –</p> <p>88-100 houses</p> <p>65 jobs in new retail space</p> <p>Jobs safeguarded in store</p> <p>Total investment range:</p> <p>Option 1, 88 homes, £30.5mn –</p> <p>Option 2, 100 homes £34.6mn</p> <p>Financial – largely market led but may need some public sector support for infrastructure to persuade Sainsburys to change status quo store trading model.</p> <p>Potential major intervention cost from Option 1, £1.6mn (single decked car park) – Option 3 £2.8mn (two deck car parks)</p>	<p>Sainsburys is comfortable with status quo and would need major commercial incentive to develop the site directly or with partners.</p> <p>Public intervention support for infrastructure could be an incentive.</p> <p>Potentially deliverable under 5 year timescale.</p> <p>If OMR and station developed but not Sainsburys, opportunity lost for part of new east west link.</p>

Old Mill Road

Option 2 has been preferred for site analysis below on the basis that it provides a potentially stronger strategic fit and community benefit by retaining interim employment spaces, however the viability position and delivery model for both options is similar. Note that the assessment assumes vacant possession. In practice some levels of tenant relocation/ compensation are likely to be incurred.

Table 14: Viability and Market Commentary, Old Mill Road

Site/Option	Mix (Size, Scale, Form)	Market Demand	Viability
Option 2	<p>Delivery of new mid density residential across 11 blocks with active ground floors which include a mix of retail (convenience, F&B), community and workspace (office, industrial). Delivery of a higher density industrial scheme, and decked car parking.</p> <p>This option includes a commercial quarter at the heart of the development.</p>	<p>Demand for retail / food and beverage (F&B) is relatively strong in Portishead.</p> <p>Flatted residential is desirable, with evidence that town centre locations are relatively attractive to first time buyers.</p> <p>Industrial warehousing for small to mid-sized units for local servicing activities remains strong in Portishead. However, the core town centre location is not necessarily the most appropriate. Stacked industrial units remains largely an unproven market, but the flexible nature of the units does allow for a range of businesses to be accommodated.</p>	<p>Positive, due to the quantum of residential coming forward to cross subsidise the workspace element, community block and decked car parking provision.</p>
Option 1	<p>Delivery of mid density residential across 11 blocks with active ground floors which include a mix of retail (convenience, F&B), community and workspace (office, industrial). Delivery of a stacked industrial scheme, and decked car parking.</p> <p>This option focuses the commercial activity to the south of the site.</p>	<p>Seeing a shift from mid-large floorplates to demand for flexible co-working, small studio space for SMEs.</p>	<p>Positive, due to the quantum of residential coming forward to cross subsidise the workspace element and decked car parking provision.</p>

Table 15: Delivery Model, Old Mill Road

Planning strategy	Delivery Model Options	Quick Win Intervention
Existing employment area. Change of use to mixed use residential and employment quarter. Phasing strategy to protect and relocate industrial tenants.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abrdn (and minor landowners) develop the sites themselves and in partnership with developer/housebuilder. 2. Disposal of land to developers. 	Public Sector intervention - Public realm and landscaping enhancement along OMR corridor from station to town centre.
Delivery Model Option - Advantages and Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages
Retain development with new partners	<p>Majority in Abrdn ownership which makes delivery simpler.</p> <p>Keep control of scheme quality and ability to relocate tenants.</p> <p>Maximise financial return.</p>	<p>Higher risk.</p> <p>Complicated management and long term commitment.</p>
Disposal of land	<p>Simpler return and lower risk.</p> <p>Less direct management.</p> <p>Land could be sold in phases to suit tenant relocation.</p>	<p>Less control over quality and relocation of tenant base.</p> <p>Lower financial return.</p>

Table 16: Project Business Case 'readiness' template - scope to prepare business case and funding bids for public sector intervention, Old Mill Road

Project(s) description	Strategic Case and rationale for intervention	Economic and Financial Case	Deliverability Issues and Programme
<p>Public funded and led N-S and E-W public realm infrastructure linking through site to Waitrose and Marina, and town centre to station</p> <p><u>And/or</u></p> <p>Partnership Project - Public funding support for infrastructure (decked car park) to enable new houses and employment space to boost viability</p>	<p>The most strategic site in Framework area. Without regeneration of OMR the Framework transformation is difficult to achieve</p> <p>Significant new house numbers and new employment space which would be more effective use of land than existing industrial/retail layout -by retaining and increasing quality of employment space/jobs plus adding new houses</p> <p>Phasing strategy possible to protect existing tenant employment base and relocate into new buildings and off-site e.g. to Gordano Gate</p> <p>Potential Market failure – support for public realm and employment infrastructure to improve viability and make regeneration of site more attractive to landowners than retaining existing industrial uses.</p>	<p>Outputs – 477 houses</p> <p>420 jobs</p> <p>Total investment – Option 2: £175m</p> <p>Public intervention to support public realm.</p>	<p>This is a large and complex project and relies on Abridn as the main landowner driving it forward.</p> <p>The leasing structures on the sites are unknown. In practice some levels of tenant relocation/compensation will be needed to unlock phases of development.</p> <p>The development strategy to protect and relocate employment space and integrated within new housing led mixed use is complex and commercially challenging.</p> <p>Public sector incentives – should consider substantial support for infrastructure to incentivise landowners and create public-private partnership to lead project.</p> <p>This is the pivotal site in the Framework and has a greater scale than the others – if this doesn't happen other benefits may not be achievable e.g. housing numbers, employment space.</p> <p>15 year + horizon needed to regenerate the whole site</p>

3. Funding routes for the Framework Area projects

- 3.1 If the Council is seeking to work proactively with partners to achieve high quality and wide ranging benefits from the Framework there will be a requirement for public sector support and funding. The schedule below identifies public sources of funding for regeneration and economic growth and assesses suitability for the Framework programme.

Table 17: Funding Routes

Funding Source	Type of project in Framework area and suitability	Availability
North Somerset Council core spending and potential borrowing for regeneration and housing projects and revenue funding for planning and design stages	Infrastructure - Public realm and employment space, enabling housing sites <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct delivery of employment space/housing • Revenue funding for planning, feasibility • Shared Prosperity Funding allocation • Support for community assets 	This will be a matter for the Council to prioritise spending and borrowing against competing demands
Homes England	Infrastructure for housing and regeneration to support viability and delivery	HE are already engaged and supporting the Framework and are working proactively on regeneration in the district They have potential revenue funding for the next stages of site delivery Various gap funding and other infrastructure funding for regeneration sites Sites need to be 'oven ready' to access capital funding bids
DLUHC (now Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government)	Infrastructure funding to enable and unlock housing and regeneration sites, public realm, and cultural and community facilities	Various bidding rounds including Levelling Up Fund Housing Infrastructure Fund, Towns Fund, Future High Street Fund, Brownfield Land Release Fund No current rounds available and may be limited until post general election
Government science and innovation funding and low carbon and other infrastructure – Department for Science and Technology, Department for Business and Trade, DFT, Department of Health, UK Research and Innovation and other agencies	Employment and infrastructure projects e.g. innovation workspace for SMEs	Often allocated through bidding round so projects need to have business cases ready and deliverable projects

Funding Source	Type of project in Framework area and suitability	Availability
Specialist government agencies heritage, environment, health, sport including Lottery bodies	Specialist social and low carbon infrastructure and community assets (e.g. Somerset Hall)	Regular bidding rounds and funding programmes
West of England Joint Committee – regional funding allocations	Revenue funding for project development Capital funding for infrastructure unlocking housing, jobs and skills Workspace and public realm projects	NSC has established relationship with regional funders and can access various funding streams

- 3.2 Most of the land in the Framework is privately owned and the majority of funding for projects would be market led. However there could be a facilitating role for the public sector, spearheaded by the Council, to work with partnerships to ensure the best regeneration outcomes. This means the Council would need to prioritise its resources and capacity on delivering the Framework and work up project business cases to be 'oven ready' to bid into the funders above.
- 3.3 **Private Sector Funding** – as mentioned in the Site Templates some landowners may be interested in direct delivery and financing schemes. There may be opportunities to introduce both traditional developers and housebuilders (like the Marina area) and more specialist developers and funds interested in more innovative elements – innovation centres, Build To Rent, new leisure and retail formats, health, and wellbeing. Some developers will want to proceed independently while others will be keen to use public-private partnerships to get the best outcomes.

4. Landowner discussions

- 4.1 Meetings have been held with the owners of the major Framework sites to gauge their interest in supporting ideas and options developed for their sites in this technical study, and to obtain their support, if possible, for transformations to support the new local plan process. This is so the Council can emphasise the deliverability of sites by landowners for new houses and employment where they are potentially viable, and where not viable show a willingness to work with the public sector to deliver them.
- 4.2 Site options have been shared with landowners for their feedback on the understanding it is confidential at this stage and not in the public domain.

Precinct and Somerset Hall - LCP Group

- 4.3 LCP are freeholder of the Precinct and the Somerset Hall which is long leased to NSC. NSC hold a lease for 125 years from 1971 at a £1 notional rent. Aldi is the freeholder of the north car park adjoining the Precinct under a management agreement with the Town council.
- 4.4 LCP repairs the fabric of the Precinct and Hall and recovers cost from the tenants via a service charge. There have been ongoing issues with roof repair and leaks in the Hall which NSC is resolving with LCP. NSC is also obliged to maintain the Precinct public square which was recently refurbished.
- 4.5 The Somerset Hall provides a valued community space but is not profitable to run. NSC is considering future operating options like transferring the lease to a community organisation.
- 4.6 The Consultant Team met with Adam Martin, Director of LCP with NSC property and library colleagues. Key points to note:
- LCP are a retail investor, and the Precinct performs well, it is fully let and new leases average 5 years. Iceland is about to renew their lease. The new bar and outside seating is very popular
 - LCP think the north (Aldi) car park is important for customers and that it stays free. They were unaware that TC have management rights. LCP have service bay and small area of parking next to the main car park
 - The majority of community halls in North Somerset are now owned/run by Town and Parish Councils and/or other community groups; it is hoped that a similar arrangement can be reached for Somerset Hall.
 - A church has shown interest but could need landlord approval, and possibly planning, to change use if not carrying on community functions.
 - LCP interested in development options but said they were unlikely to take forward a development themselves or in near term. They were keen on lighter touch public realm improvements. They are also generally interested in any Council initiatives to improve high street as much as the WW framework. Council may not have funding to refurbish the Somerset Hall element and would prefer new community partners to do this, however, acknowledge that regeneration grants etc could be used in an LCP (or new developer) and NSC partnership. Somerset Hall is a resident priority in the town and there would be much resistance to losing it
- 4.7 Summary – the contact with LCP is useful because of the Council's ongoing landlord relationship on Somerset Hal and looking at new operational models.

- 4.8 As far as Framework concerned, development is not LCPs core business, and they are happy to maintain the Precinct as it is - despite challenges with ageing buildings- while there is good demand for the retail units. They are not against the long term redevelopment ideas but don't see a role for themselves at the moment.

Waitrose – Persimmon Site

- 4.9 The Consultant team met with Simon Gregory, Real Estate Manager at Waitrose/John Lewis Partnership.
- 4.10 Waitrose have a long lease of the store and car parks. The freeholder is Persimmon/Crest. Waitrose have a separate long lease on the petrol station and operate it with a management agreement with Shell. The southern car park adjoining Waitrose store's car park is owned by Persimmon.
- The 'gold standard' for them is to have a surface car park next to store and decked parking is sub optimal and there would have to be an exceptional redevelopment rationale to change it.
 - Potential interest to develop the site themselves per the study options for their in-house BTR team which is undertaking development next to stores mainly in the London area.
 - If not that route, it is unlikely that Waitrose group would want to develop or have a partnership with Council as they are currently being ultra cautious on any capital projects not relating to core store business.
 - We said a long term letter of support for Framework redevelopment would be helpful, but he said they could give the Waitrose Group's commitment to supporting towns future but unlikely to be very positive about developing the car park next to store
- 4.11 Summary – difficult to currently envisage sufficient business justification to release core car park for development.
- 4.12 Persimmon's southern car parks are underused and may have potential for a Framework based scheme.

Gordano Gate

- 4.13 It is understood the site is owned by the Arthur Llewellyn Jenkins company who made a planning application some years ago for a furniture store. We spoke to Loc8 Developments (Mark Kennedy) a Bristol based developer who developed the Ibis/Lidl in Portishead, who we understand have a development agreement with the landowner. Although interested in the new site options for the Framework they are bringing forward their own employment-led scheme which they said would comply with current allocation. There was no further detail on their scheme.
- 4.14 Summary - seemingly limited interest in the Framework or joint working with the Council at the moment. Depending on the nature of any scheme they bring forward it may align with the Framework including potential relocation of business tenants from other sites.

Old Mill Road

- 4.15 Abdn own Old Mill Road trading estate and the Homebase sites. Rowe Group own the Retail Park. Waitrose has the lease of the Petrol station.

- 4.16 22 March 2024 - met with Giulia Bunting, planning consultant for Abdn. Not a priority to redevelop for foreseeable future given current asset value but they are interested in protecting the long term position for redevelopment, and the planning policy for this.
- 4.17 Views on site options – would want to avoid ‘compartmentalising’ blocks and want integrated links/public realm. They acknowledge need to protect employment but said flexibility needed to phase developments and build up job numbers – can’t expect to have same number of jobs (as existing estate) up front before any houses built.
- 4.18 Further comments were received from Giulia Bunting and Craig Thomson (Abdn portfolio manager) on the AMUP site options –
- 4.19 *As currently presented it raises serious questions about how in practice it will be possible to deliver individual or groups of parcels of land for redevelopment within the regeneration area but at the same time make provision for decanting existing employment and retail businesses across the site (assuming this is the right approach), which is made up of different ownerships and tenancies. Further we are also concerned about the proposed provision of common infrastructure, such as car parking in specific locations, to serve a wider area when there is no overall land ownership control...*
- 4.20 *However we query how this is going to be used as evidence for the emerging Local Plan and we are concerned about how this will influence emerging policy given it contains very specific land use and locational proposals which may ultimately hinder the bringing forward of redevelopment proposals in the area, rather than encourage regeneration...*
- 4.21 *We suggested that at the very least it would be preferable to separate out the Abdn assets from those owned by Rowe Estates and adjust some of the delivery options...*
- 4.22 *They also agreed that there is a need to ensure the specific assumptions around delivery including decanting of uses and common infrastructure provision are carefully illustrated/worded to avoid undue restrictions and other provisions being placed on achieving wider regeneration objectives...*
- 4.23 *They (NSC) did express the need however to ensure that sufficient jobs can be created through redevelopment of the area and we assured them that Abdn supports the principle of a mixed use regeneration to provide new employment opportunities as well as housing...*

Sainsburys

- 4.24 2nd April 2024 - we met with Bruno Moore and Megan Somerville from the Planning Team. They developed the store 10 years ago. Trades very well and surface car parking essential. Not looking to open new petrol stations and converting some sites to EVs stations. They are redeveloping some stores with mixed use but mainly in London where high density and values supports this.
- 4.25 In the regions, like Portishead, likely to retain traditional store layout and car parking for foreseeable future, redevelopment would not be viable and be disruptive to trade. decked car parking would not be as convenient.
- 4.26 They were aware of the Stage 2 report/consultation. Interested in the options and impact of the station but no prospect of redevelopment in local plan period. We pointed out development could be viable even with new decked car park. They would like to engage with Council on new public realm links/spaces.
- 4.27 Neutral about development of Gordano Gate site. Wondered whether that might be hampered by BNG regulations given habitat on site.

4.28 Further feedback was received from Megan Sommerville on 8 May 2024 –

Thank you for discussing your proposals and ideas in Portishead and we are happy to engage with the station proposals its relationship with our store.

As we discussed, as a company we do invest in mixed-use developments on our store and carpark sites, however, this is largely confined to London due to high land values that justify the disruption to sales. Unfortunately, this value and density just does not exist in Portishead.

We do acknowledge our corporate commitments around climate change; however, we need a usable car park due to current trends and it should be emphasised that our site is not a brownfield site, it is a working store with 29,179 transactions per week. Furthermore, a mixed-use project on our carpark in Portishead is just not viable currently.

Again, thank you for reaching out to us.

5. Members Meetings notes

5.1 **Meeting # 1.** An initial briefing was held with NSC and Town Council Members on 9th February 2024. The notes are below:

Key Discussion Points	
1.0	Wyndham Way Study Area background – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide-ranging consultation and engagement during 2022. • Driven by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old Mill Road planning application. • Forthcoming railway and likely increase in investor/developer interest. • Placemaking agenda. • Aim: to prepare a positive framework in anticipation of speculative planning applications. • Report drafted but not approved. • Local Plan draft allocation of up to 350 homes plus employment.
2.0	Purpose of current AY/AMUP delivery testing work- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To understand and where possible resolve concerns about previous work, including the balance of employment and housing • Being pro-active in the Framework area to shape this as a high quality place – better connectivity and integrated uses, efficient land use, enhancing key facilities, retaining employment base • Testing deliverability - what will the market deliver. How should the public sector intervene to deliver priorities • Providing evidence to inform the new local plan

Key Discussion Points	
3.0	<p>Connectivity and routes from proposed station to town centre and across framework area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connectivity between Station and Town Centre presented as an important issue to the community. Currently no connection proposal beyond new station. It was raised that the land on which a potential route through could be made is owned by Sainsbury's and/or Waitrose Footpath links should be prioritised as an affordable investment within developments AMUP raised the realistic approach phasing wise of each development parcel giving some land towards public space/ park - which also creates green connections through wider area. Important to look at transformation of Old Mill Road with key connections through site at all phases and with different uses proposed. Recognised that this is an opportunity to create a 'proper' pedestrian / cycling route Desire lines need to be more greatly brought out and emphasised from the masterplanning work to this delivery stage, to support greater wayfinding and permeability in general. Consensus that this is currently one of Portishead's biggest weaknesses with the current built form and road network. Councillors raised that Environment Agency should be involved to advise on options as key routes are also a waterway maintenance routes. It was discussed whether it might be possible to create short term connectivity improvements based on individual lease lengths before long term preferred connectivity routes becomes deliverable. Recognised that this work could form part of the Neighbourhood Plan, to 'amplify' its importance and demonstrates joined-up thinking
4.0	<p>Housing and infrastructure and employment across priority sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure needs to be considered at the same time as new housing delivery – employment land, public amenities, open space, pedestrian routes, parking. Councillors were clear this has to be delivered first with new houses. On Old Mill Road look at an option to keep the industrial estate on one side of the road and have new development on the other side. This could help retain employment as well as create new mixed used development and allow for a new boulevard/public realm route for pedestrians Housing delivery is proportionate and should not detract from delivering employment Councillors expressed concern over loss of industrial/ employment land - AAM/AY raised that this piece of work was looking to retain and enhance employment land either as employment developments (e.g. Gordano Gate) or as part of mixed use schemes with workspace balanced with new residential. This should be made clear as a principle within the work. Employment needs to be reshaped to suit future demand – shift to smaller flexible workspaces spaces, light industrial studios with higher value jobs and business activity Need to consider business relocation strategy / opportunities for decanting as part of the wider thinking Precinct / Iceland – back of house servicing issues need rethinking as part of the new site options
5.0	<p>Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key question – how do we shift parking mindsets / habits to suit new development? Councillors were keen to see examples of town centre stacked car park arrangements in similar sized towns
6.0	<p>Landowners and project viability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AY advised that new lease lengths for light industrial sheds on Abrdn land at Old Mill Rd could be 5-10 years. This will be a factor for redevelopment timetable given current strength of industrial market and local demand

Key Discussion Points	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of land in the framework area is private sector so vital to engage with landowners to obtain their insight and gain support for regeneration plans both on their sites and for the wider area Generally residential schemes can be viable and pure employment schemes may struggle with viability due to construction cost. Solutions include more mixed use so residential can subsidise employment and public sector interventions to provide funding and support for high quality employment schemes
7.0	<p>Presentation of work</p> <p>The team noted that how the framework is introduced and presented is important. It's important to convey the message that change will happen and that this framework will help that change be delivered in a meaningful way that aligns with key objectives in terms of land use and connectivity.</p>

5.2 **Meeting #2.** A further briefing for Members was held on the 19th April 2024. The notes are below:

Key Discussion Points	
1.0	<p>Wyndham Way Study Area background –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wide-ranging consultation and engagement during 2022. Driven by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Old Mill Road planning application. Forthcoming railway and likely increase in investor/developer interest. Placemaking agenda. Aim: to prepare a positive framework in anticipation of speculative planning applications. Report drafted but not approved. Local Plan draft allocation of up to 350 homes plus employment.
2.0	<p>Presentation of site option plans and delivery testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Somerset Hall relatively high deliverability prospect - age and condition of asset may require the building to be developed in the mid term. Cost of the community space is the drag and public funding could be needed. Waitrose and Sainsbury - medium deliverability prospects. Established stores which are trading well. Both operators have a preferred approach of surface parking. Any switch would need to be very attractive. Neither are immediate prospects. Gordano Gate - relatively high prospect. Positive viability. High quality workspace/innovation centre to attract higher value jobs would probably need some public subsidy Old Mill Road - Not a high prospect. As far as owner Abridn are concerned this performs well No early prospect for change.

Key Discussion Points	
3.0	<p>Discussion and feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear vision for an awkward and politically sensitive site. • Logical approach to growth and to protect the areas around the town and green spaces. • Plans could be well received if not universally agreed. • Slow timeline helps to get station embedded before new growth. • Some good ideas but housing number remain a key issue. Important how these numbers are presented in relation to current 350 number in draft plan. • Connectivity with station of major importance and current routes poor. • Focus should be the new local plan period. After that becomes too long term. • Good that the framework links housing and jobs growth and green infrastructure. • Some concerns over use of decked car parks next to new flats/houses. A&M gave assurance that design of building cores/corridors can make sure this does affect attractiveness to residents. • Social housing modelled at 20% which is draft local plan standard. • Would like to see social houses mixed fully with market not separate blocks. Noted some RSLs resistant as they like separate asserts. • Houses could include flats, town houses/duplex, and specialist social needs housing like extra care and key worker which is being investigated at regional level with NHS. • Concern that Wyndham Way itself needs improvements with better crossings, green areas etc. Minor improvements could come from site developments but not larger infrastructure improvements. • School places – have to allow for long term change in the town population and school places needed.
4.0	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalise reports. • Agree comms and presentation of findings particularly around house numbers and current 350 number in draft local plan. • Consider how to turn work into planning policy guidance. Need to have positive framework to argue for what we need (including funding) and support decisions if they go to appeal. • Consider further presentation to Town Council. • Continue involvement with Homes England as strategic partner.

6. Opportunities for the Leisure Centre Site

- 6.1 The leisure centre site forms part of the Framework area. The main landowner is NSC with minor landholdings by the Town Council with their buildings let to community groups. The site occupies a prominent location next to the marina.
- 6.2 For completeness, the study has considered redevelopment in the event that the Council at some point wants to relocate and re-provide a new leisure centre. It is acknowledged that this could be several years away given the current operational standard and the fact that the Council has higher priorities to re-provide leisure facilities.
- 6.3 Nevertheless, site options have been produced which show the capacity for the site for residential and community uses and the site values that could be generated. This is an attractive location and if developed in the same style and density as other marina sites could generate a positive return to the landowners. It is impractical to include a large leisure centre alongside new housing, but community halls and buildings could be incorporated which would potentially mean the smaller community organisations can be relocated.
- 6.4 The Site options would create the following range of outputs:
- Homes: 147-191.
 - Retail: c. 1,000 m2. Equating to 57 jobs.
 - Workspace : c. 1,100 m2. Equating to 47 jobs.
 - Community Space: 820 – 1,369 m2. Note, Town Council community tenants currently occupy 1,100 m2 plus outdoor play areas.
 - Combination of surface car parking and deck/podium parking for residents and commercial tenants.
- 6.5 The development could generate land values ranging from £2.3m to £5.7mn. Higher land values are generated where there is less employment and community use and more housing in the mix. The land values indicates a viable scheme which the Council could directly develop or partner with developers. The scale and quality of the residential development, while being a good outcome in its own right, would also be used to cross subsidise the non-profitable elements of the commercial and community spaces.

7. Opportunities for the Station Site

- 7.1 The development potential of the station car park area has been assessed for internal NSC purposes on the basis that once the station infrastructure has been established it may offer a longer term opportunity for residential or employment development on the western end next to the proposed car parking– see the site layouts and capacity options.
- 7.2 The development could generate land values of up to £2.2mn, depending on the mix of uses coming forward. Higher land values are associated with the delivery of pure residential (policy compliant), however the opportunity for workspace to be delivered here to meet employment needs could be considered. The main drawback is that stacked workspace is not viable at this point in time (accrues a sub optimal land value of -£2.3mn), and would require public sector intervention.
- 7.3 This would only be possible once the land acquisition process has been completed and station infrastructure built and operational. An important caveat is there may be also restrictions on how land is used and developed as a result of the ongoing CPO process. Nevertheless the template below sets out a longer term scenario for some development on the site which could be undertaken by the Council itself or with partners to maximise the benefits of the new station.

Table 18: Project Summary, Station

Project Summary								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market sentiment – unknown development potential until infrastructure and car parking for new station in place. Surrounding area has housing and workspace. • Ownership – NSC partly owned , remaining areas being acquired from Persimmon as part of new station infrastructure. Needs decision on residual land uses once station infrastructure operational. • Framework Opportunity and Impact – potentially a small development site, but could be a catalytic project to show potential of station and the rest of the Framework area. Opportunity for flexible workspace next to the station which could set the tone for other Framework employment sites. • Deliverability – prospects good but needs NSC commitment to deliver alongside new station infrastructure. Flexible workspace could require direct delivery by Council and subsidy. 								
Site/Option	Viability Gap	Timescale /Phases	Landowner	Market led project	Public Sector Intervention		Economic Impact on housing and jobs	Wider Community Benefits
					Light touch	Major		
Land next to parking area for new station	Employment use has viability gap Residential use viable	Commence < 5 years Single phase, best to align with station.	NSC Decision needed to develop land to complement new station and sacrifice small parking area		Public realm enhancements for Station-Sainsburys-Old Mill Road corridor to town centre	Direct development by NSC or partner with developer	3,681 m2 of workspace <u>Or</u> 59 houses	Potential to improve the built context for the new rail station and to provide passive surveillance on the walking and cycling connections between the station and the town centre. Create employment or residential development next to station.

Table 19: Viability and Market Commentary, Station

Site/Option	Mix (Size, Scale, Form)	Market Demand	Viability
Station Op 1	Industrial warehousing on the ground floor, stacked with co-working / small office suites above.	Strong demand for small to mid-sized Industrial warehousing for local servicing, with co-working provision to meet the needs of SMEs. Station location is advantageous and proximate to the existing employment uses along Harbour Road.	Negative due to the relatively higher building cost associated with stacked industrial and co-working space typology.
Station Op 2	Flatted residential (59 units), up to 7 storeys.	Demand is strong for flatted residential – particularly for first time buyers. The station location could be particularly attractive for those who may be required to commute to Bristol.	Positive , with the residential component able to cross-subsidise the decked car parking coming forward.

Table 20: Project Business Case 'readiness' template - scope to prepare business case and funding bids for public sector interventions, Station

Planning strategy	Delivery Model Options	Quick Win Intervention
Bare land would need planning permission for new uses and remove part of protected parking area for station	1. NSC direct delivery of employment scheme and possibly residential 2. NSC partners with developer 3. NSC sell land	Public realm links and new landscaping to enhance part of new route(s) from station to town centre NSC could provide this – using external funding – in any of the delivery model options
Delivery Model Option - Advantages and Disadvantages	Advantages	Disadvantages
1. Direct Delivery	Control of programme, quality, and growth outcomes (only significant NSC site in Framework area) Seek external grants for employment space Keep financial return/asset	All risk with NSC Capacity to lead development Funding challenge if external funding not secured May require operator for workspace
2. NSC partner developer	Transfer some risk to partner Partner has expertise/capacity to accelerate Partner specialist in employment or residential products and operation	Less control for NSC -particularly with proximity of station infrastructure Cost/complication of partner procurement Partner would require grants for viability gap NSC may still need to contribute finance
3. NSC land disposal	Transfer all risk All funding, management, operation by purchaser Land receipt (higher for residential)	No control by NSC – quality compromised next to station Purchaser may need grants to cover viability gap Risk of non-delivery of key site

Appendix I

Development Assumptions Report

Appendix II

Allies and Morrison studies on Leisure Centre site and station site

Contact details

Enquiries

Lara Boyd

lara.boyd@avisonyoung.com

Visit us online

avisonyoung.com

Avison Young

65 Gresham Street, London EC2V 7NQ

Copyright © 2024. Avison Young. Information contained in this report was obtained from sources deemed reliable and, while thought to be correct, have not been verified. Avison Young does not guarantee the accuracy or completeness of the information presented, nor assumes any responsibility or liability for any errors or omissions therein. All opinions expressed and data provided herein are subject to change without notice. This report cannot be reproduced, in part or in full, in any format, without the prior written consent of Avison Young.