

Appendix Two

New HQ Offices – Analysis of long-list site options considered:

Assumptions: 25,000 – 30,000 sq. ft. net internal floor area; 2-3 storey building (if new); offices to incorporate a new Council Chamber and member meeting rooms, allowing the governance functions to be withdrawn from the Town Hall; and suitable to deliver a minimum £300k revenue savings to the MTFS.

Site	Advantages	Disadvantages	Officer commentary
1. Leamington Spa town centre			
Court Street car park, and adjacent land holdings (Old Tyre Depot, Dovecote area etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Originally identified outline relocation site. WDC landholdings could potentially accommodate the required 'footprint' of the new HQ offices (and potentially a new Library). Could potentially 'kick-start' a regeneration of the wider area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some possible planning and design challenges in making new building 'fit' on site. E.g. impact of a new large office on adjacent buildings. No local parking solution for WDC staff; and therefore scheme's adverse impact on existing local shopper, business and resident car parking. Wider office led commercial regeneration now unlikely, due to lack of current market demand. Probably not a suitable location for relocated Library. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended for short-list. <p><u>Note:</u> Whilst this site is recommended to go forward to the next stage, Officers have strong reservations that a wider residential regeneration of the remainder of this area would be prejudiced. Without the Court St car park becoming residential the residential critical mass of the remainder would be reduced, and not have the housing led entrance from High St. This could be unattractive to housing investors.</p>
Bath Place car park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location would support the regeneration of this part of the Old Town area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WDC landholding not of sufficient size to accommodate a new build HQ office building. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discounted

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good footfall generator for this location. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underground flood alleviation infrastructure prevents comprehensive development of our site. • Site still not big enough even if joined with the County Council's adjacent former Bath Place school building. • Adjacent former Bath Place school building is not currently available as WCC have now formally agreed a disposal to another party. • Loss of 53 parking spaces, with adverse impact on both local businesses in this part of Old Town and the Council's Spencer Yard regeneration ambitions, plus loss of £13,300 per annum car park income. • Unlikely to be a viable site for a Leamington One Stop Shop, adding additional cost if a second operational site is maintained. 	
Spencer Yard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could pump-prime and 'anchor' the regeneration of this area. • Closer to town centre than Court Street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WDC landholdings not of sufficient size to accommodate a new build HQ office building. • Land assembly required with the key site occupied by the Loft Theatre. • Loft Theatre does not wish to relocate. • Land assembly and acquisition costs would adversely impact on scheme viability and timing • Non-new build option (use of existing buildings – URC, North Hall, West Wing, Old Dole Office) cost prohibitive due to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted. <p>Not a practical or economic option. An alternative proposition for this area is on Executive's agenda today.</p>

		<p>additional costs of converting buildings (URC also has listed status) and unlikely to realise the required revenue savings. Site has poor access from highway, and is landlocked by existing (principally private) property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Backland' site has no visibility from Parade/Bath Street (without land assembly) • LLP have discounted this option as not being commercially deliverable. 	
Pump Rooms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attractive town centre location. • High profile building. • Good public transport access for visitors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building's design, internal layout and listed status would create substantial planning constraints in converting it into modern offices. • Any such conversion would be prohibitively expensive to undertake, and create operationally flawed and inefficient office spaces. • Running costs of any new offices likely to be more, rather than substantially less, than the existing Riverside House HQ offices. Therefore the targeted £300k p.a. savings would not be not deliverable here. • Building currently occupied by the County Council's Central Library, and a private sector café operator. • Council's Art Gallery and Museum also occupies part of the building. • No guaranteed deliverable alternative relocation options identifiable for all of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted <p>Building completely unsuitable for modern and efficient office needs. An alternative proposition for this building is on Executive's agenda today.</p>

		<p>the above occupiers at the present time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The substantial relocation costs (if they could be agreed) for the above occupiers would make any office scheme financially unviable. • Members have expressed concerns about maintaining public access throughout this building. • Limited options for creating disabled parking on site without encroaching onto the Pump Room Gardens. 	
Town Hall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good town centre location. • High profile building. • Perhaps the most natural location for WDC HQ offices. • Good 'anchor' and footfall generator for the lower Parade area. • Good public transport access for visitors. • Potential long term solution for future use of this high (maintenance) cost asset. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building too small. (It has c. 15,000 sq. ft. of usable space, rather than the 25,000 sq. ft. required). • Building's design, internal layout and listed status would create substantial planning constraints to converting it into modern offices. • Running costs of any new offices likely to be more, rather than substantially less, than the existing Riverside House HQ offices. Therefore the targeted £300k p.a. savings would not be not deliverable here. • Any such conversion would be prohibitively expensive to undertake, and create an operationally flawed and inefficient office spaces. • A number of the present tenants have security of tenure. Vacant possession for could not therefore be guaranteed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted. <p>Building not large enough, and completely unsuitable for modern, cost effective, and efficient office needs. Could be a potential option for any relocated Library.</p>

<p>Bedford Street car park</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good central location • Close to St. Peters car park • Good footfall generator for the lower Parade area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WDC landholdings not of sufficient size to accommodate a new build HQ office building. Site too long and thin to accommodate the scale of office building we require. • Any new development would therefore require additional site assembly (i.e. Broadribbs Cycles and Pure Health Club) with attendant land acquisition costs and adverse impact on financial viability of the scheme. • Adjacent Real Tennis club's rights of light would create significant planning constraints. • 'Backland' site, with poor public 'presence' • Could strategically frustrate a wider planned regeneration proposal for this, and the declining lower Parade area. • Any scheme would incur the loss of 49 car parking spaces in this location, with the adverse impact on the currently challenged lower Parade retail area, • Loss of £117,800 p.a. car parking income. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted <p>Site not large enough for a cost effective and, planning/design solution</p>
<p>Spa Centre site</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good high profile location. • Near to other public services and facilities. • Site could accommodate new HQ offices; and potentially a new Library. • Synergy with the adjacent Spa 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of open space and amenity, • Potential adverse impact on Spa Centre from loss of drop-off and parking spaces (c.30 informal spaces) unless new provision created in adjacent Rosefield Street car park. • Design challenges to successfully 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended for short-list <p>Substantial public objections to this site being developed, but this option still best meets the Council's criteria</p>

	<p>Centre, to further drive down operational costs, and boost the Spa Centre's profile, footfall and use (e.g. shared back office cost savings, shared meeting space, integrated box office/reception function etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design of new building could include an atrium link to Spa Centre providing for the synergies highlighted above but allowing future flexible use of both the new asset and the Spa Centre site to be considered independently at a future date if required. • Proposal is financially viable. • Proposal can be linked to separate proposals for additional investment in Spa Centre to create 'added value', if considered desirable. • Ability to accommodate staff and visitor car parking in existing town centre car parks. • Ability to create a 'landmark' building to enhance the 'gateway' into the town centre for visitors to Jephson Gardens 	<p>integrate a new building into a diverse local environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial public objections and opposition in principle to date regarding this option. • Likely loss of up to 45 car parking spaces in Rosefield Street car park if required for visitor and/or priority staff parking. • Loss of up to £53,600 p.a. car parking income, depending on whether or not any public parking is retained at this site. 	
Riverside House site:			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All options recommended for short-list

<p>Option 1: New build offices on Visitor (top) car park;</p> <p>Note: Also assumes demolition of existing offices and redevelopment of this and the remainder of the site for new housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New HQ offices would fit on site. • Building design could be made to blend in with the local environment. • WDC staff could use the current spare capacity parking in Covent Garden multi-storey car park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not address current issue of lack of availability of public transport for visitors • Not an ideal location for a One Stop Shop. Creating a separate site for a One Stop Shop would increase revenue expenditure rather than create savings. • Proposal would reduce the numbers of housing units that could otherwise be accommodated on the whole is site; thereby reducing the capital receipt from such a disposal, required to fund the new offices . 	<p>All are still realistic and deliverable options, albeit not as an attractive location as other options.</p>
<p>-----</p> <p>Option 2: Refurbish existing offices</p> <p>Note: Assumes Council occupies half of the building, and leases/sells off the remainder for conversion to offices or residential uses and redevelopment. Also, the development of the existing visitor car park for new</p>	<p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building sufficiently large to allow WDC to consolidate into a smaller area. • Remainder of building could be refurbished and probably let to commercial or public sector occupiers. • WDC staff could use the current spare capacity parking in Covent Garden 	<p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not address current issue of lack of availability of public transport for visitors • Not an ideal location for a One Stop Shop. Creating a separate site for a One Stop Shop would increase revenue expenditure rather than create savings. • Proposal would reduce the numbers of housing units that could otherwise be accommodated on the whole is site; 	

<p>housing. All to finance the refurbishment costs.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Option 3: Demolish existing offices and rebuild new HQ offices on part of site.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> Assumes redevelopment of remainder of site for new housing</p>	<p>multi-storey car park.</p> <p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site of sufficient size to accommodate new offices • Relatively few planning constraints for the office redevelopment as land use would remain the same. • WDC staff could use the current spare capacity parking in Covent Garden multi-storey car park. 	<p>thereby reducing the capital receipt from such a disposal, required to fund the new offices .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant disruption to service provision while refurbishment undertaken with additional cost of double move within the building or temporary accommodation. <p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not address current issue of lack of availability of public transport for visitors • Not an ideal location for a One Stop Shop. Creating a separate site for a One Stop Shop would increase revenue expenditure rather than create savings. • Proposal would reduce the numbers of housing units that could otherwise be accommodated on the whole is site; thereby reducing the capital receipt from such a disposal, required to fund the new offices . 	
<p>Adelaide Road car park</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would free up the whole of the Riverside House site for residential development. • Likely to stack-up financially. • WDC staff could use the current spare capacity parking in Covent Garden multi-storey car park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very unlikely that the scale and mass of a new 2-3 storey HQ office building could be successfully accommodated on this site. • Substantial design challenges and planning constraints: e.g. mature trees, impact on adjacent residential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted <p>New HQ building not practically developable on this site.</p>

		<p>properties and the riverside leisure/cultural and religious buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of site within flood plain requiring additional design and building costs to place the building on 'stilts' (assuming Environment Agency consent obtained) • Not much better than present HQ location for public access. • Does not address current issue of lack of availability of public transport for visitors • Not an ideal location for a One Stop Shop. Creating a separate site for a One Stop Shop would increase revenue expenditure rather than create savings. • Loss of 43 car park spaces with attendant impact on Clubland • Loss of £9,100 p.a. car parking income. 	
<p>Chandos Street car park</p> <p><u>Option 1:</u> Build on existing car park</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good central location. • Site could accommodate new HQ offices; and potentially a new Library. • No known technical site constraints. • WDC staff could use the current spare capacity parking in Covent Garden multi-storey car park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Local Plan commits allocation of the site for a principally retail led scheme • Policy commitment reflects Council's ambitions to maintain the vibrancy and vitality of the town centre and protect the retail area from further out of town developments. • Entire site already legally committed, via a formal Development Agreement, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted <p>This option would require the Council to break its current development agreement with Wilson Bowden, and would frustrate a major retail scheme on this site.</p>

<p>-----</p> <p>Option 2: Incorporate Offices into new retail-led development scheme</p>	<p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above plus: • Could be used to ‘anchor’ a retail led development scheme, compliant with Policy TC4 • Would stimulate regeneration and redevelopment of this part of the town centre • Re-provision of town centre car parking as part of wider scheme. • WDC staff could use the current spare capacity parking in Covent Garden multi-storey car park. 	<p>for a new town centre retail led scheme with our development partners Wilson Bowden.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site therefore not available solely for the office relocation although it would potentially be possible to incorporate the offices into the planned wider development scheme • Unlikely to stimulate regeneration (part of the original design brief) • Loss of 152 car parking spaces • Loss of £374,500 p.a. car parking income. <p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occupation of new offices unlikely to be possible before late 2020 at the earliest (delaying the realisation of full year revenue savings for a minimum of 5 years from 16/17 to 20/21) • Council may have to compromise on freehold ownership for proposal to be viable. • Too many external commercial factors related to the complexity of this scheme (e.g. retailer take-up; external funding; market forces etc.) that are out of this Council’s control. • New HQ delivery would take far longer than other current site options. • Potential legal procurement issues if 	<p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted <p>Substantial risk to WDC of the developers not being able to guaranteeing the delivery of new offices by a specific date. Too many external commercial and legal factors that are out of this Council’s control.</p>
---	---	---	---

		the Council wishes to take space in this retail led joint venture development with current developer partner Wilson Bowden.	
Covent Garden surface car park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good central location. • Site could accommodate new HQ offices; and potentially a new Library. • No known technical site constraints at this stage. • Adjacent to Covent Garden multi-storey car park. • WDC staff could use the current spare capacity parking in Covent Garden multi-storey car park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant timing issue in relation to the proposed Chandos Street redevelopment. Capacity at Covent Garden will be required during the development phase when the existing Chandos Street car parking provision lost but the new car parking associated with the retail led scheme is not yet available. Unavailability of spare capacity at Covent Garden would have an adverse impact on town centre businesses. • Delaying the scheme to counteract the above would have an adverse impact on the MTFs • Aside from the above a stand-alone development is unlikely to provide a stimulus for regeneration and would, in fact, frustrate a wider, strategically planned, future retail/commercial/leisure or other development plan for this north western sector of the town centre and pre-empt consideration of an Area Action Plan for the town centre as set out in the Submission Draft Local Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended for short-list <p>This still a realistic option; albeit that the ability to build a new replacement multi storey car park (whilst the existing one was still in operation) would be lost. A view needs to be taken on the impact and timing of the Chandos Street retail led scheme</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The adjacent Covent Garden multi-storey car park has a finite life and its replacement needs to be planned as, and integrated into, any new overall scheme in this location. • Loss of 80 short-stay car parking spaces. • Loss of c£130k p.a. car parking income. 	
<p>Assumed scenario for re-provision of lost car parking capacity at the Spa Centre site</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good demand for long-stay spaces in this location. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site could potentially accommodate 80 car parking spaces. <u>Note:</u> This 'like for like' space new car park would however produce a lower income, due to its principally long-stay (rather than the existing short-stay) designation of c. £95,350 (i.e. a loss of c. £34,650 per annum from the existing Covent Garden income. • Additional capital cost of c£170k. • Site unsuitable for (replacement) short-stay parking. Therefore overall loss of c.80 'shoppers' car parking spaces in the town centre with attendant impact on town centre businesses. • Loss of open space and amenity • Design challenges for a new surface car park in this location. 	

<p>Public Parks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jephson Gardens. • Pump Room Gardens. • Victoria Park. • Christchurch Gardens. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the public parks have been discounted from this options appraisal given the likely level of public opposition and practical planning and conservation constraints of building in these main formal park areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted <p>None are likely to be realistic and publically accepted solutions.</p>
<p>Multi-storey car parks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covent Garden • St Peter's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good central location. • New HQ offices could fit on these sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both sites discounted from this options appraisal due fundamental adverse financial impacts (additional capital costs from demolition and significant revenue losses from car park income). • Also, adverse impact on the vitality of the town centre and the viability of town centre businesses due to the loss of car parking spaces and the attendant political and reputational impact on the Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted <p>Neither are practical, cost effective or deliverable solutions.</p>
<p>Criminal Justice Centre</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High profile accessible location. • Close proximity to other public services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courts have confirmed that no surplus accommodation is available for WDC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted <p>Not available</p>
<p>Privately owned offices</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted
<p>Private development sites</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted
<p>2. Warwick town centre:</p>			
<p>Linen Street multi-storey car park</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site probably big enough. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would have to be re-developed for a new HQ office. • No solution for funding and replacing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted

		<p>lost parking, or WDC staff parking solution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of car parking income • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. 	
New Street car park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site might just be potentially large enough. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key town centre car park. • Major urban design and conservation Area issues. • No solution for funding and replacing lost parking, or WDC staff parking solution. • Loss of car parking income • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted
Castle Lane car park		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site too small • Loss of car parking income • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted
West Gate car park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site might just be potentially large enough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key town centre car park. • Major urban design and conservation Area issues. • No solution for funding and replacing lost parking, or WDC staff parking solution. • Loss of car parking income • One Stop Shop and other services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted

		would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs.	
Butts car park		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site too small • Loss of car parking income • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted
Priory Road car park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site potentially large enough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huge urban design and Conservation issues. • No solution for funding and replacing lost parking, or WDC staff parking solution. • Loss of car parking income • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted
West Rock car park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site large enough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major urban design and conservation Area issues. • No replacement or WDC staff parking solution. • Loss of car parking income • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted
St. Nicholas park car park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site large enough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major urban design and conservation Area issues. • No solution for funding and replacing lost parking, or WDC staff parking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted

		<p>solution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of car parking income • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. 	
St. Marys Area car parks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two of these car parks could potentially accommodate our new HQ building. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warwick Racecourse have 24 day/year usage rights over these car parks. Therefore not possible to develop them. • Major urban design and conservation Area issues. • No solution for funding and replacing lost parking, or WDC staff parking solution. • Loss of car parking income • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted
Privately owned offices		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted
Private development sites		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted
3. Kenilworth town centre			
Jubilee House site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attractive town centre location, near other public services and public transport. • Site (if WCC land included) might be large enough. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land supply too small to accommodate new HQ offices. • Would require joint venture scheme with WCC, other public sector parties and tenants of buildings concerned. • Complex deals and any scheme could 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted

		<p>take time to fully resolve and deliver, with inherent risk of not materialising.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No solution for WDC staff car parking. • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. 	
WDC Square West car park	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key town centre car park. • Major urban design and conservation Area issues. • No solution for funding and replacing lost parking, or WDC staff parking solution. • Loss of car parking income • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. 	• Discounted
WDC Abbey End car park	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key town centre car park. • Major urban design and conservation Area issues. • No solution for funding and replacing lost parking, or WDC staff parking solution. • Loss of car parking income • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. 	• Discounted
Privately owned offices		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None available 	• Discounted
Privately owned		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None available 	• Discounted

development sites			
4. Out of town sites			
Tournament Fields, Warwick. (Just off M40 J15)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modern, attractive and cost efficient offices. • Would achieve HQ building revenue saving targets. • Suitable design and build option available now. • Suitable on-site car parking. • Freehold or leasehold options on offer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of town location. • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. • Perception that the Council is abandoning the town centre. • Loss of lunchtime/after-work spending power of c.300 WDC staff in the town centre. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted <p>Council would still have to retain several services in Leamington town centre. Council could also be perceived as abandoning the town centre</p>
Wedgenock House, Woodloes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available now. • Might just be large enough if we discount the Leamington town centre service options (e.g. One Stop Shop; CCTV control room; Council Chamber etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower specification than we are seeking. • Poor location (for public and staff). • Inefficient and unattractive compared to modern offices. • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. • Perception that the Council is abandoning the town centre. • Loss of lunchtime/after-work spending power of c.300 WDC staff in the town centre. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted • Whilst available at time of writing, other parties interested. Very unlikely to still be available when WDC is able to commit to one building/site. • Poor specification and quality. • Unlikely to maximise WDC operational savings. • Really too small. • Some services would have to remain in Leamington town centre.
Olympus Two, Tachbrook park.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modern, attractive and cost efficient offices. • Would achieve HQ building revenue saving targets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of town location. • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted. <p>Council would still have to retain several services in Leamington town centre. Council</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable design and build option available now. • Suitable on-site car parking. • Freehold or leasehold options on offer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • occupation costs. • Perception that the Council is abandoning the town centre. • Loss of lunchtime/after-work spending power of c.300 WDC staff in the town centre. 	could also be perceived as abandoning the town centre.
Opus 40 Business Park, Warwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modern, attractive and cost efficient offices. • Would achieve HQ building revenue saving targets. • Suitable design and build option available now. • Suitable on-site car parking. • Freehold or leasehold options on offer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of town location. • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. • Perception that the Council is abandoning the town centre. • Loss of lunchtime/after-work spending power of c.300 WDC staff in the town centre. • Owners almost likely to develop site for alternative residential use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted <p>This site is unlikely to be unavailable in reality; as it is provisionally earmarked for a residential planning use, and development.</p> <p>Also, Council would still have to retain several services in Leamington town centre. Council could also be perceived as abandoning the town centre</p>
Warwick Technology park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although only 18,000 sq. ft. the building has the potential to be extended to our space needs. • Landlord will be gaining possession in July 2015 (improvement works then required). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1980's building; but could be refurbished by landlord to part-modern specification. • Unlikely to yield the same operational savings as a new bespoke building. • Out of town location. • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. • Perception that the Council is abandoning the town centre. • Loss of lunchtime/after-work spending power of c.300 WDC staff in the town 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted. <p>Other 'new build' out-of town options would provide more cost efficient solutions.</p>

		centre.	
<p>WDC owned depot site, Stratford Road. (Opposite Tournament Fields.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council owned site. • Site is big enough for a new and cost efficient HQ office. • Could accommodate on site staff car parking. • Would achieve HQ building revenue saving targets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of town location. • Use of site could compromise the development of a coherent masterplan for the site that is currently out to consultation as a potential Local Plan employment allocation. • Could prevent use of the site for a Gypsy and Traveller allocation, essential for the Local Plan. • Would deprive WDC of a capital receipt were the site to be used for a future employment allocation. • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. • Perception that the Council is abandoning the town centre. • Loss of lunchtime/after-work spending power of c.300 WDC staff in the town centre. • If we consider the <u>whole of the Local Plan employment site allocation</u>, we have to bear in mind that the site is not currently allocated as an employment site as it is still out to consultation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted. <p>WDC has other emerging strategic ambitions and proposals for this site.</p>
5. Rural sites			
Abbey Park, Kenilworth.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remote rural location for public and Council staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. • Perception that the Council is abandoning the town centre. • Loss of lunchtime/after-work spending power of c.300 WDC staff in the town centre. 	<p>Council would still have to retain several services in Leamington town centre. Council could also be perceived as abandoning the town centre.</p>
Stoneleigh Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various sites and design and build, opportunities at present. • Modern and cost efficient offices. • Attractive design. • On site staff car parking. • Good environment. • Would achieve HQ building revenue saving targets. • Short/Long leasehold options on offer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remote rural location for public and Council staff. • Really an agricultural based science park. • One Stop Shop and other services would have to remain in Leamington town centre; increasing operational and occupation costs. • Perception that the Council is abandoning the town centre. <p>Loss of lunchtime/after-work spending power of c.300 WDC staff in the town centre.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted <p>Council would still have to retain several services in Leamington town centre. Council could also be perceived as abandoning the town centre.</p>
6. Warwickshire County Council property			
Saltisford offices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modern office accommodation. • Potential synergy and shared operational costs with WCC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WCC have confirmed that their Saltisford buildings are a key location for them, and that they are increasing their occupation there, and retain all their buildings for their own uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted <p>Office accommodation not available.</p>

<p>Barrack Street offices,</p> <p><u>Note:</u> WCC have confirmed that have no other property available that might be suitable for our new HQ offices.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location next to Shire Hall, and possible synergy with WCC services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WCC have confirmed that this building provides them with office capacity whilst they need it. Though in the next three years is possible that they may no longer require it. At present it is not surplus to their requirements. Whilst it is open plan it is in need of structural maintenance, and WCC would need to retain the 300 car parking spaces beneath, or need to secure an alternative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discounted Accommodation not yet available, and prohibitively expensive in capital and revenue terms. A more expensive option than remaining in Riverside House.