



Assessment of Options for the Future Use of the Sites known as 16-17 Sidney Street, 18-19 Sidney Street and 21 Hobson Street

SITES AT SIDNEY STREET AND HOBSON STREET, CAMBRIDGE

September 2021

Our Ref: RMSP/20-01751

Contents

Quality Assurance 1

1 Background..... 2

2 Objectives..... 3

3 The Options 4

4 High level pros and cons assessment of options 7

5 Methodology 9

6 Results and analysis..... 13

7 Conclusion..... 15

Appendices

Appendix 1 Assessment matrix

QUALITY ASSURANCE

This report has been prepared within the quality system operated at Rapleys LLP according to British Standard ISO 9001:2008.

Created by:	Richard Sykes-Popham MRICS richard.sykes-popham@rapleys.com
Signature:	
Checked by:	CONSULTATION DRAFT ONLY
Signature:	

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The public consultation held by the owners of 16 - 17 Sidney Street, 18 - 19 Sidney Street and 21 Hobson Street in May this year explained that they were exploring the future of these three sites.
- 1.2 The owners first discussed the idea of exploring the future of all three sites together in 2020 and, before forming any views about how the sites might be used in the future, and what they might be used for, they engaged with ward members of Cambridge City Council and officers of the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning service. The May 2021 consultation followed this engagement and was a very early stage baseline and 'visioning' consultation aimed at understanding what the local community and stakeholders felt about the status quo and what role the sites might play in the future of Cambridge city centre.
- 1.3 The responses from the consultation were analysed and summarised before being reported to officers and ward members. Since then the owners' project team has prepared a handful of possible options for the future of the three sites ranging from doing nothing to comprehensive redevelopment. The intention is to appraise these options to help identify the optimum future use for the sites. It is hoped that this exercise will inform a detailed pre-application advice request, and together with the advice received, a planning application for any changes of use or development that the chosen route may require.
- 1.4 This report details and explains the options assessment work carried out, and its findings.

2 OBJECTIVES

2.1 There are a number of key objectives driving the owners' assessment of options for the future of the sites. They are as follows.

1. To maximise the sites' contribution and value to Cambridge city centre through:
 - Addressing underutilisation and obvious voids in the existing built form
 - Refurbishment and/or redevelopment of the existing built form
 - Protection and enhancement of heritage assets
 - Improving accessibility, connectivity and permeability
2. To help the local community, e.g. by:
 - Improving their local environment
 - Creating a place or places to meet and/or hold events
3. To help address known local issues, e.g.:
 - the state of Hobson's Passage
 - the deficiencies of Hobson Street
4. To futureproof the sites with respect to:
 - energy performance/energy efficiency
 - water usage
 - climate change
 - renewable energy generation
 - servicing and maintenance
5. To enable the sites to generate a return which reflects their city centre location and potential

3 THE OPTIONS

3.1 In seeking to address their objectives the owners have considered a number of different options. The range of options considered comprises a number of scenarios that represent what may be feasible and reasonable as far as the future of the sites is concerned. Using this approach the aim has been to consider all reasonable possibilities. The options are as follows.

Option 1 - do nothing

3.2 While it is acknowledged that this is not really an available option, as it doesn't meet the objectives identified, it reflects what would happen in the short term if a suitable solution could not be found, or could not be delivered, or if the owners could not agree on a solution. In reality it would only ever be a temporary state as the status quo is not a feasible or viable option in the long term.

3.3 The inclusion of Option 1 is helpful in that it provides a control for the other options and thereby exposes the cost (or possibly benefit) of doing nothing.

Option 2 - Refurbishment and infill

3.4 Option 2 comprises the retention and refurbishment of almost all of the current built form on the sites. The only exception would be the rear of 16 - 17 Sidney Street which comprises a jumbled built form and provides access to the rear of 16 - 17 Sidney Street, a loading bay/service area and bin storage. It is identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal as a negative view. Under Option 2 the rear half of 16 - 17 Sidney Street would be demolished and replaced with an office building which makes use of the significant void above the existing built form but leaves the existing retail premises on the front half of the site intact.

Option 3 - Comprehensive redevelopment (pared back) with Sidney Street and 21 Hobson Street facades retained

3.5 Option 3 is the first of the options that involves comprehensive redevelopment. It would involve demolishing all of the existing built form apart from the facades of 16 - 17 and 18 - 19 Sidney Street and 21 Hobson Street. This option preserves 21 Hobson Street's façade as an acknowledged feature of local interest but involves the removal of the rest of the building on the basis that it is heavily altered (and therefore of little historical or architectural merit) and that recent history would suggest that there is no apparent viable use for it.

3.6 The facades would be shored up while the development took place and would be tied into the new built form as it was erected. Because of its unusual design and fenestration, 21 Hobson Street is likely to be harder to incorporate into the new built form than the Sidney Street facades and may limit what can be achieved behind it. Further, because the whole of the sites' Sidney Street frontage would be retained, and because Hobson's Passage is so narrow, comprehensive redevelopment works would need to be serviced from the rear. Working around the retained 21 Hobson Street frontage is likely to constrain and complicate the construction work.

3.7 Despite this incumbrance Option 3 would involve the creation of a single new building with the potential to provide purpose-built retail space behind the sites' historic Sidney Street frontages, leisure or community space and a significant amount of high quality office space.

Option 4 - Comprehensive redevelopment (pared back) with Sidney Street facades retained

3.8 Option 4 would also involve comprehensive redevelopment but would only retain the facades of 16 - 17 and 18 - 19 Sidney Street. The whole of 21 Hobson Street would be demolished. 21

Hobson Street is a Building of Local Interest which means that its loss would have to be justified by other material considerations having regard to its significance. The demolition of 21 Hobson Street in its entirety would allow the greatest freedom for redevelopment of the three sites.

3.9 In a similar way to Option 3, Option 4 would involve the creation of a single new building with the potential to provide purpose-built retail space behind the sites' historic Sidney Street frontages, leisure or community space and a significant amount of high quality office space. The new building would afford the opportunity for a fresh look this part of the Hobson Street western frontage and a change to the street scene. It would also allow a fully purpose built office building which would allow the opportunity to optimise the accommodation provided and the building's interaction with its surroundings.

Option 5 - Comprehensive redevelopment with Sidney Street facades retained

3.10 Option 5 is identical to Option 4 except that it would involve an additional storey which could provide high quality, high value office space. This option maximises the sites' development potential with a view to maximising the sites' contribution to the city centre's economy.

3.11 Figure 1 below provides a site by site (and part site where appropriate) analysis of the options.

	Option 1 Do nothing	Option 2 Refurbishment and infill	Option 3 Comprehensive redevelopment (pared back) with Sidney Street and 21 Hobson Street facades retained	Option 4 Comprehensive redevelopment (pared back) with Sidney Street facades retained	Option 5 Comprehensive redevelopment with Sidney Street facades retained
16-17 Sidney Street (front)	Remains as is	Refurbished for retail use with secondary uses above	Façade retained, remainder demolished and redeveloped to provide retail space with office space above	Façade retained, remainder demolished and redeveloped to provide retail space with office space above	Façade retained, remainder demolished and redeveloped to provide retail space with office space above
16-17 Sidney Street (rear)	Remains as is	Demolished and redeveloped to provide office space	Demolished and redeveloped to provide office space	Demolished and redeveloped to provide office space	Demolished and redeveloped to provide office space
18-19 Sidney Street	Remains as is	Refurbished for retail use with secondary uses above	Façade retained, remainder demolished and redeveloped to provide retail space with office space above	Façade retained, remainder demolished and redeveloped to provide retail space with office space above	Façade retained, remainder demolished and redeveloped to provide retail space with office space above

21 Hobson Street	Remains as is	Refurbished for leisure/ community use (assumed for purposes of assessment)	Façade retained, remainder demolished and redeveloped to provide office space	Demolished and redeveloped to provide office space	Demolished and redeveloped to provide office space
------------------------	---------------	--	---	---	---

Figure 1: Tabular analysis and summary of options assessed

4 HIGH LEVEL PROS AND CONS ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

4.1 This section provides an initial look at the main advantages and disadvantages of each option.

OPTION 1

Pros

- No capital costs

Cons

- No benefits for city centre economy
- No improvement of Hobson Street/conservation area/townscape
- No improvement of Hobson's Passage
- Worsening state of 21 Hobson Street
- Basic maintenance costs for all buildings likely to increase
- Significant wasted potential

OPTION 2

Pros

- Scope for better utilisation of 16-17 and 18-19 Sidney Street
- Improvement of Hobson Street/conservation area/townscape
- Limited benefits for city centre economy (some new office development)
- Refurbishment of 21 Hobson Street

Cons

- No marriage value - sites can just as easily be considered in isolation (redevelopment of one site does not justify/necessitate works to any other site); comprehensive works unlikely therefore and only those aspects which yield a sufficient return would be pursued
- No improvement to Hobson's Passage
- Significant wasted potential

OPTION 3

Pros

- Majority of sites' potential realised
- Significant benefits for city centre economy (significant amount of new office development)
- Improvement of Hobson Street/conservation area/townscape
- Improvement of Hobson's Passage
- Provision of leisure/community space
- Primarily modern structures with lower maintenance costs
- Good/excellent energy performance and lower running costs

Cons

- Lower quality of new office space compared to Options 4 & 5 because of more constrained format and possibly lower light levels (resulting from 21 Hobson Street façade retention)
- Reduced office space compared to Options 4 & 5 (resulting from 21 Hobson Street façade retention)

-
- Much more complicated build and significantly higher build costs as a result of 21 Hobson Street façade retention
 - Loss of 21 Hobson Street (except façade)

OPTION 4

Pros

- Most of sites' potential realised
- Significant benefits for city centre economy (significant amount of new office development)
- High quality office space throughout (better than Option 3)
- More office space than Option 3
- Improvement of Hobson Street/conservation area/townscape
- Improvement of Hobson's Passage
- Provision of leisure/community space
- Modern structures with lower maintenance costs
- Good/excellent energy performance and lower running costs
- Simplest build and lowest build cost of all options (together with Option 5)

Cons

- Loss of 21 Hobson Street

OPTION 5

Pros

- Sites' potential maximised
- Significant benefits for city centre economy (significant amount of new office development)
- High quality office space throughout (better than Option 3, and extra floor, which Options 3 and 4 don't have, would likely provide highest value floorspace)
- More office space than Options 3 & 4
- Improvement of Hobson Street/conservation area/townscape
- Improvement of Hobson's Passage
- Provision of leisure/community space
- Modern structures with lower maintenance costs
- Good/excellent energy performance and lower running costs
- Simplest build and lowest build cost of all options

Cons

- Loss of 21 Hobson Street

5 METHODOLOGY

SCORING

- 5.1 In order to ascertain the relative value of each of the options they need to be considered against the owners' objectives (set out in section 2 above). For this to happen the objectives need to be translated into a series of discrete criteria. This has been done and the criteria are set out at paragraph 5.7 below; there are 11 of them.
- 5.2 The number of options to assess and the number of criteria to assess them against means that a matrix-type methodology is most practical. This allows all of the options to be assessed side-by-side at the same time.
- 5.3 In order to aid in comparative assessment of the options a scoring system has been adopted. This affords each option a score against each criterion. The scoring system has the range +2 to -2. The table below shows what the scores equate to.

Score	Meaning
+2	Significant positive effect or situation
+1	Positive effect or situation
0	Neutral situation or no effect
-1	Negative effect or situation
-2	Significant negative effect or situation
?	Effect or situation uncertain / unclear

- 5.4 Each option's scores across all 11 criteria are tallied to give a single score for that option. The performance or value of each option relative to the others can then be seen. The inclusion of Option 1 (see paragraph 3.2 above) enables the remaining four options to be assessed against the status quo.
- 5.5 The magnitude of an option's score equates to how well it meets the project objectives. The higher the score, the better the option is considered to meet the objectives, and therefore the better the solution it is considered to provide.
- 5.6 In view of the wide variance of factors across the range of options assessed, a fixed scoring system could not be set for each criteria (i.e. one which equates a certain circumstance or attainment to a certain score, e.g. with respect to viability, a profit of $x\%$ equals a +1 score and a profit of $2x\%$ equals a +2 score). Such a system would be very difficult, if not impossible to apply for the purposes of this assessment. Instead, scores were awarded using a more flexible, relative system which is better suited to this assessment exercise. In order to ensure rigour and transparency with this relative system a brief commentary has been provided with each score to explain the decision making process (see assessment matrix at Appendix 1).

CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING OPTIONS

- 5.7 As explained at paragraph 5.1 above, the owners' objectives for the future use of the sites have been translated into a series of discrete criteria against which to assess the options. The criteria are as follows.

Social

- Leisure / community space

Factors to consider when scoring:

- Amount of leisure/community space
- Quality of leisure/community space (inc. amount of natural light, floor space format, flexibility/ease of division, floor heights)

- Accessibility

Factors to consider when scoring:

- Disabled access
- Connectivity
- Permeability

Environmental

- Built heritage (Building of Local Interest and other non-designated heritage assets (buildings))

Factors to consider when scoring:

- Impact on built heritage on site (fabric and setting)
- Impact on built heritage off site (setting)

- Improvement of Hobson's Passage

Factors to consider when scoring:

- Daylight/sunlight levels
- Bin storage
- Ground floor frontage (active vs inactive)
- Elevation design/appearance
- Footfall/activity levels
- Passive surveillance

- Improvement of Hobson Street (and Conservation Area)

Factors to consider when scoring:

- Ground floor frontage (active vs inactive)
- Elevation design/appearance
- Activity levels
- Passive surveillance

- Environmental credentials / energy performance / energy efficiency

Factors to consider when scoring:

- energy performance of existing structures
- energy performance of new structures
- scope for incorporation of renewable energy generation technology
- Heating, cooling, water provision and requirements

Economic

- Viability (factoring in GDV and build cost)

Factors to consider when scoring:

- Amount of leisure/community space
- Quality of leisure/community space (inc. format, ceiling heights, ease/quality of servicing, facilities, daylight)
- Amount of retail floorspace
- Quality of retail floorspace (inc. window area, floor plate format, ceiling heights, ease/quality of servicing, facilities, daylight)
- Amount of office floorspace
- Quality of office floorspace (inc. floor space format, flexibility/ease of division, ceiling heights, facilities, daylight)
- Amount of roof terrace space
- Quality of roof terrace space
- Size of basement
- Design/appearance of buildings
- Specification
- Conversion vs new build cost differential
- Refurbishment/renovation costs
- Complexity of build
- Restrictiveness of site
- Ease of access
- Impact of leisure/community floorspace (esp. if reduced or nil rent proposed)

- Ongoing / maintenance costs

Factors to consider when scoring:

- Cost of maintaining built fabric (esp. retained historic fabric and facades)
- Number and type of different structures and fabrics
- Ease of maintenance (ease of access, maintenance measures/plant built in?)

- Impact on local / city centre economy

Factors to consider when scoring:

- Amount of retail space
- Quality/attractiveness of retail space
- Amount of office space (and therefore how many people it can accommodate, and bring into the city centre as a result)
- Quality/attractiveness of office space
- Effect of improvements to Hobson's Passage
- Effect of improvements to Hobson Street
- Tax receipts (business rates)

Other

- Marriage value / synergies

Factors to consider when scoring:

- Potential for both owners to benefit

-
- Site specific benefits or burdens (which only apply to one site and/or one owner)
 - Cost savings and efficiencies derived from combined proposals

- Quality of accommodation

NB While this has a bearing on value and is therefore partially considered under 'Viability' above it is also important from other aspects, e.g. occupier wellbeing, attracting the best companies and people. These are what this criterion assesses.

Factors to consider when scoring:

- Quality of accommodation
- Attractiveness of accommodation
- 'Healthiness' of accommodation
- Facilities provided with accommodation
- Connectivity/permeability

ASSESSMENT

- 5.8 The side-by-side assessment of the options against the criteria (referred to at paragraph 5.2 above) is set out in the assessment matrix at Appendix 1.

6 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

6.1 The below table sets out the results of the assessment of the options against the criteria.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
	Do nothing	Refurbishment and infill	Comprehensive redevelopment (pared back) with Sidney Street and 21 Hobson Street facades retained	Comprehensive redevelopment (pared back) with Sidney Street facades retained	Comprehensive redevelopment with Sidney Street facades retained
Social					
Leisure / community space	-2	+2	+2	+2	+2
Accessibility	-2	-1	+2	+2	+2
Environmental					
Built heritage (Building of Local Interest and other non-designated heritage assets (buildings))	-1	+2	+1	-1	-1
Improvement of Hobson's Passage	-2	-2	+2	+2	+2
Improvement of Hobson Street (and Conservation Area)	-2	+1	+2	+2	+2
Environmental credentials / energy performance / energy efficiency	-2	0	+1	+2	+2
Economic					
Viability (inc. GDV and build cost)	0	-2	-1	+1	+2
Ongoing / maintenance costs	0	-1	0	+1	+1
Impact on local / city centre economy	-2	-1	+2	+2	+2
Other					
Marriage value / synergies	0	0	+1	+2	+2
Quality of accommodation	-2	0	+1	+2	+2
TOTAL:	-15	-1	+13	+17	+18

Figure 2: Table showing results of assessment of options against all 11 criteria

6.2 As can be seen from Figure 2, Option 5 (comprehensive redevelopment with Sidney Street facades retained) was the best performing of the five options with a score of +18. It was most closely followed by Option 4 (comprehensive redevelopment (pared back) with Sidney Street facades retained) which scored only one point less (+17).

6.2 The scores for all five options ranged from -15 to +18, thus the relative margin between Options 5 and 4 is, on the face of it at least, relatively small. However, Option 1 was already known not to be a realistic long-term option (see paragraph 3.2) and Option 2 has been shown through the assessment to perform poorly against the project objectives. Further, and perhaps more critically, its very poor 'Viability' and 'Marriage value / synergies' scores point

to it too being an unrealistic option. In this context the single point difference between Options 4 and 5 is more significant than it may at first appear.

6.3 Option 3 (comprehensive redevelopment (pared back) with Sidney Street and 21 Hobson Street facades retained) performed relatively well but still scored five points (28%) less than Option 5. This five point difference is significant in the context of Options 1 and 2 not proving to be realistic comparisons. Of the more realistic options, Options 4 and 5 therefore perform significantly better than Option 3 against the project objectives.

6.5 Looking in more detail at Options 4 and 5 it can be seen that the only difference is viability. Option 5 scores more highly because of the extra value (likely significant extra value) generated by the additional floor which it provides.

6.6 The differences between Options 3 and 5 are:

- **Built heritage:** Option 3 scored two points higher
- **Environmental credentials / energy performance / energy efficiency:** Option 3 scored one point lower
- **Viability:** Option 3 scored three points less
- **Ongoing / maintenance cost:** Option 3 scored one point lower
- **Marriage value / synergies:** Option 3 scored one point lower
- **Quality of accommodation:** Option 3 scored one point lower

6.7 As has been alluded to above, viability and marriage value are of particular importance as these two factors are likely to be the key determinants of whether an option is delivered if it is acceptable in other respects. A significantly lower score across these two criteria raises questions about the deliverability of Option 3.

6.8 The assessment exercise was designed to identify the best option for meeting the project objectives. Given that it scored highest, the assessment shows that Option 5 (or something similar to it) is likely to represent the optimal future use of the sites.

7 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 Taking into account all of the matters discussed in section 6 above the project team consider Option 5 (or something similar to it) to be the optimal future use of the sites.

APPENDIX 1 - ASSESSMENT MATRIX

	Option 1 Do nothing	Option 2 Refurbishment and infill	Option 3 Comprehensive redevelopment (pared back) with Sidney Street and 21 Hobson Street facades retained	Option 4 Comprehensive redevelopment (pared back) with Sidney Street facades retained	Option 5 Comprehensive redevelopment with Sidney Street facades retained
Social					
Leisure / community space	-2 Existing situation does not provide any usable leisure or community space.	+2 Refurbishment of 21 Hobson Street would provide a large space (1000m ² , albeit of an auditorium type format) which could be used for leisure or community purposes	+2 Option 3 would likely provide in excess 400m ² of new, purpose built community space across basement and first floor levels.	+2 Option 4 would likely provide in excess 400m ² of new, purpose built community space across basement and first floor levels.	+2 Option 5 would likely provide in excess 400m ² of new, purpose built community space across basement and first floor levels.
Accessibility	-2 Existing situation has poor levels of accessibility (only ground floors of 16-17 Sidney Street (front) and 18-19 Sidney Street allow wheelchair access. All other parts of site are inaccessible to wheelchairs.	-1 Refurbishment may allow accessibility improvements in retained buildings but options will be limited by existing structures and layouts. Accessibility still likely to be poor in retained buildings by comparison with new build even after refurbishment. Latest accessibility standards would be met or exceeded within new build elements.	+2 Latest accessibility standards will be met or exceeded within new build elements (i.e. most if not all of the resulting development).	+2 Latest accessibility standards will be met or exceeded within new build elements (i.e. all of the resulting development).	+2 Latest accessibility standards will be met or exceeded within new build elements (i.e. all of the resulting development).
Environmental					
Built heritage (Building of Local Interest and other non-designated heritage assets (buildings))	-1 21 Hobson Street (Building of Local Interest) would be retained but would continue to deteriorate in the 'do nothing scenario'. 16 - 17 & 18 - 19 Sidney Street (non-designated heritage assets) would be retained.	+2 21 Hobson Street (Building of Local Interest) would be retained and refurbished. 16 - 17 & 18 - 19 Sidney Street (non-designated heritage assets) would be retained and renovated.	+1 Façade of 21 Hobson Street (Building of Local Interest) would be retained and refurbished. The rest of 21 Hobson Street would be lost but English Heritage have previously determined that externally it is very utilitarian and has been heavily altered internally (so as to preclude listing). The façades of 16 - 17 & 18 - 19 Sidney Street (non-designated heritage assets) would be retained and renovated.	-1 21 Hobson Street (Building of Local Interest) would be lost but English Heritage have previously determined that it is not of high enough quality and is too altered to be listed. The façades of 16 - 17 & 18 - 19 Sidney Street (non-designated heritage assets) would be retained and renovated.	-1 21 Hobson Street (Building of Local Interest) would be lost but English Heritage have previously determined that it is not of high enough quality and is too altered to be listed. The façades of 16 - 17 & 18 - 19 Sidney Street (non-designated heritage assets) would be retained and renovated.
Improvement of Hobson's Passage	-2 No improvement of Hobson's Passage.	-2 Refurbishment of buildings would not result in any significant improvements to Hobson's Passage.	+2 Redevelopment excluding façades (particularly redevelopment of 18 - 19 Sidney Street and 21 Hobson Street sites) would result in significant improvements to Hobson's Passage; i.e. shop and office windows to activate southern boundary and provide active surveillance, a bin store so that bins could be completely removed from the passage, and access to community space which would increase activity and footfall.	+2 Redevelopment excluding façades (particularly redevelopment of 18 - 19 Sidney Street and 21 Hobson Street sites) would result in significant improvements to Hobson's Passage; i.e. shop and office windows to activate southern boundary and provide active surveillance, a bin store so that bins could be completely removed from the passage, and access to community space which would increase activity and footfall.	+2 Redevelopment excluding façades (particularly redevelopment of 18 - 19 Sidney Street and 21 Hobson Street sites) would result in significant improvements to Hobson's Passage; i.e. shop and office windows to activate southern boundary and provide active surveillance, a bin store so that bins could be completely removed from the passage, and access to community space which would increase activity and footfall.
Improvement of Hobson Street (and Conservation Area)	-2 The 'negative view' presented by the rear of 16 - 17 Sidney Street, and the poor state of 21 Hobson Street would continue to impact negatively on the character and quality of the conservation area.	+2 The 'negative view' presented by the rear of 16 - 17 Sidney Street would be replaced with a new building which the planning process would ensure had a positive impact on the character and quality of the conservation area. Refurbishment of 21 Hobson Street would further improve the quality/condition of the conservation area. However, it should be noted that the façade of 21 Hobson Street may limit the degree to which the sites' Sidney Street frontage could be made active and the amount of passive surveillance it could provide. A new-	+2 The 'negative view' presented by the rear of 16 - 17 Sidney Street would be replaced with a new building which the planning process would ensure had a positive impact on the character and quality of the conservation area. Refurbishment of the 21 Hobson Street façade would further improve the quality/condition of the conservation area. However, it should be noted that retaining the façade of 21 Hobson Street may limit the degree to which the sites' Hobson Street frontage could be made active and the amount of passive surveillance it could	+2 The 'negative view' presented by the rear of 16 - 17 Sidney Street would be replaced by a new Hobson Street facade which the planning process would ensure had a positive impact on the character and quality of the conservation area. New Hobson Street façade could reflect the location, character and presence of the current 21 Hobson Street façade. It would be modern and high quality and the planning process would ensure it had a positive impact on the character and quality of the conservation area.	+2 The 'negative view' presented by the rear of 16 - 17 Sidney Street would be replaced by a new Hobson Street facade which the planning process would ensure had a positive impact on the character and quality of the conservation area. New Hobson Street façade could reflect the location, character and presence of the current 21 Hobson Street façade. It would be modern and high quality and the planning process would ensure it had a positive impact on the character and quality of the conservation area.

		build frontage may be able to provide better opportunities in this respect.	provide. A new-build frontage may be able to provide better opportunities in this respect.		
Environmental credentials / energy performance / energy efficiency	-2 Existing structures are old, are in poor condition in some cases, and have poor energy performance/efficiency. Doing nothing precludes installation of renewable energy generation measures.	0 Existing structures are old, are in poor condition in some cases, and have poor energy performance/efficiency. Refurbishment may provide some opportunities for improving energy performance/efficiency but these are likely to be limited. New build (infill) element will meet latest energy performance/efficiency standards and may be able to incorporate some renewable energy generation measures. Refurbishment of existing structures may afford some opportunities for incorporation of renewable energy generation measures.	+1 New build structures (i.e. all of the resulting development) would meet or exceed latest energy performance/efficiency standards and may be able to incorporate renewable energy generation measures. Façade retentions (especially retention of 21 Hobson Street façade) may limit energy performance/energy efficiency standard that new build structures can achieve in some respects.	+2 New build structures (i.e. almost all of the resulting development) would meet or exceed latest energy performance/efficiency standards and may be able to incorporate renewable energy generation measures. Sidney Street façade retentions may limit energy performance/energy efficiency standard that new build structures can achieve in some respects but replacing 21 Hobson Street façade will enable that element to meet or exceed current standards along with the other new build elements.	+2 New build structures (i.e. almost all of the resulting development) would meet or exceed latest energy performance/efficiency standards and may be able to incorporate renewable energy generation measures. Sidney Street façade retentions may limit energy performance/energy efficiency standard that new build structures can achieve in some respects but replacing 21 Hobson Street façade will enable that element to meet or exceed current standards along with the other new build elements.
Economic					
Viability (inc. GDV and build cost)	0 Doing nothing option does not give rise to any development viability considerations as no development would take place. However, in a wider sense doing nothing is not viable because the sites are grossly underutilised and are not producing returns which are in step with their capital cost. Costs of maintenance are also significant and increasing and cannot be justified without a positive end state to work towards.	-2 Refurbishment of the existing buildings would be very costly. The refurbished buildings would be more valuable than as existing but their value would still be limited by their quality of accommodation (format, layout etc) accessibility, energy performance etc. The infill element would create value in the place of the unused parts of 16 - 17 Sidney Street (rear) and the void above it. However, this is likely to come with elevated build costs because of the constrained nature of the site and limited economies of scale. Value created by infill development (taking into account the associated build cost) would not be sufficient to outweigh the significant refurbishment costs associated with the other sites/parts of sites, especially as the value of the refurbished buildings would still be limited.	-1 Comprehensive redevelopment save for façade retentions would involve primarily new build construction and therefore should be relatively cost effective. However, retention of 21 Hobson Street façade would complicate and constrain the construction work significantly and is therefore likely to result in a significant increase in build cost. Resulting development would be higher quality and would meet modern standards and occupier requirements. Amount of floorspace would be increased significantly. Thus there would be significant value created. However, retention of 21 Hobson Street façade would reduce the quantity and quality of the office floorspace which would be created (particularly as a result of reduced daylight levels in adjacent parts of the new development). New community floorspace may limit or have a negative impact on viability if it is to be let at a reduced or nil rent.	+1 Comprehensive redevelopment save for Sidney Street façade retentions would involve primarily new build construction and therefore should be relatively cost effective. Resulting development would be higher quality and would meet modern standards and occupier requirements. Amount of floorspace would be increased significantly and greater than Option 3 because of the additional floorspace which can be achieved if the 21 Hobson Street façade is not retained. Thus there would be significant value created. New leisure/community floorspace may limit or have a negative impact on viability if it is to be let at a reduced or nil rent.	+2 Comprehensive redevelopment save for Sidney Street façade retentions would involve primarily new build construction and therefore should be relatively cost effective. Resulting development would be higher quality and would meet modern standards and occupier requirements. Amount of floorspace would be increased significantly and greater than Option 4 because of the extra floor that Option 5 provides. Thus Option 5 would create the most value. New leisure/community floorspace may limit or have a negative impact on viability if it is to be let at a reduced or nil rent.
Ongoing / maintenance costs	0 The 'do nothing' scenario involves doing the bare minimum to keep the parts of the sites that are in use operational. It should be noted that this is not a long term option however - the condition of most of the sites' buildings is deteriorating which will mean maintenance becomes more costly with time.	-1 Refurbishment of the existing buildings would make an ongoing programme of maintenance necessary in order to ensure their upkeep. Maintenance is likely to be reasonably costly as a result of the mixture of structures and fabrics and their historic nature. Infill element will be new build and therefore should be relatively cost effective to maintain.	0 Comprehensive redevelopment save for Sidney Street and 21 Hobson Street façade retentions would involve primarily new build construction and therefore should be relatively cost effective to maintain. Retained 21 Hobson Street façade would involve an additional type of structure and fabric and an additional maintenance approach/ regime. Maintenance is therefore likely to be more varied, more significant and more costly than if the 21 Hobson Street façade was not retained.	+1 Comprehensive redevelopment save for Sidney Street and 21 Hobson Street façade retentions would involve primarily new build construction of a single type and therefore should be relatively cost effective to maintain.	+1 Comprehensive redevelopment save for Sidney Street and 21 Hobson Street façade retentions would involve primarily new build construction of a single type and therefore should be relatively cost effective to maintain.
Impact on local / city centre economy	-2 In their current states the sites are having a significant negative effect on the city centre economy. The design (rear of 16 - 17 Sidney Street) and condition (21 Hobson Street) is having a significant adverse effect on the character and quality of the city centre and is likely to be off-	-1 Infill development would replace the existing built form at the rear of 16 - 17 Sidney Street. The refurbishment of 21 Hobson Street would improve its contribution to Hobson Street and the conservation area. Together these changes would have a positive effect on Hobson Street and make it more welcoming to users of/visitors to the city centre.	+2 Comprehensive redevelopment would replace the existing built form at the rear of 16 - 17 Sidney Street. The refurbishment of 21 Hobson Street would improve its contribution to Hobson Street and the conservation area. Together these changes would have a positive effect on Hobson Street and make it more welcoming to users of/visitors to the city centre.	+2 Comprehensive redevelopment would replace the existing built form at the rear of 16 - 17 Sidney Street. The replacement of 21 Hobson Street would involve a new high quality façade which should improve Hobson Street. Together these changes would have a positive effect on Hobson Street and make it more welcoming to users of/visitors to the city centre.	+2 Comprehensive redevelopment would replace the existing built form at the rear of 16 - 17 Sidney Street. The replacement of 21 Hobson Street would involve a new high quality façade which should improve Hobson Street. Together these changes would have a positive effect on Hobson Street and make it more welcoming to users of/visitors to the city centre.

	<p>putting to current and prospective visitors to/users of the city centre.</p> <p>Hobson's Passage would continue to have an adverse impact on the perception of the city centre and would continue to discourage users and visitors from moving freely and efficiently around it and making use of all that it has to offer.</p> <p>The significant underutilisation of all three sites means opportunities to increase city centre activity, footfall, spend and taxation revenue are being missed.</p>	<p>Hobson's Passage would continue to have an adverse impact on the perception of the city centre and would continue to discourage users and visitors from moving freely and efficiently around it and making use of all that it has to offer.</p> <p>Retention and refurbishment of all bar the rear part of 16 - 17 Sidney Street would not realise the sites' true potential meaning that city centre activity, footfall, spend and taxation revenue could be higher.</p>	<p>Hobson's Passage would see significant improvement (shop and office windows to activate southern boundary and provide active surveillance, a bin store so that bins could be completely removed from the passage, and access to leisure/community space which would increase activity and footfall) and would therefore encourage free and efficient movement around the city centre.</p> <p>Comprehensive redevelopment of all three sites would realise their potential, yielding an increase in city centre activity, footfall, spend and taxation revenue (though this would be higher in Option 4 and 5).</p>	<p>Hobson's Passage would see significant improvement (shop and office windows to activate southern boundary and provide active surveillance, a bin store so that bins could be completely removed from the passage, and access to leisure/community space which would increase activity and footfall) and would therefore encourage free and efficient movement around the city centre.</p> <p>Comprehensive redevelopment of all three sites would realise their potential, yielding an increase in city centre activity, footfall, spend and taxation revenue (to a greater extent than Option 3 as a result of the additional office floorspace it would provide, likely circa 350m²).</p>	<p>Hobson's Passage would see significant improvement (shop and office windows to activate southern boundary and provide active surveillance, a bin store so that bins could be completely removed from the passage, and access to leisure/community space which would increase activity and footfall) and would therefore encourage free and efficient movement around the city centre.</p> <p>Comprehensive redevelopment of all three sites would realise their potential, yielding an increase in city centre activity, footfall, spend and taxation revenue (to a greater extent than Option 4 as a result of the additional floor of office space it would provide, amounting to circa 450m²).</p>
Other					
Marriage value / synergies	0	0	+1	+2	+2
	<p>There is no marriage value and there are no synergies or efficiency savings in the current scenario. This means that the site owners are likely to consider their own interests only and there is no incentive to work together to achieve wider objectives and benefits (e.g. community space).</p>	<p>There is no marriage value and there are no synergies or efficiency savings in the Option 2 scenario as refurbishment means retaining what is there and refilling potential only exists for one site (16 - 17 Sidney Street (rear of)). This means that the site owners are likely to consider their own interests only and there is no incentive to work together to achieve wider objectives and benefits (e.g. community space).</p>	<p>Some marriage value, synergies and efficiency savings exist though the burden of the retention of the façade of 21 Hobson Street (elevated build cost and complexity) is far greater for the owner of that site (who is also the owner of 18 - 19 Sidney Street) than it is for the owner of 16 - 17 Sidney Street. This is a disincentive for the parties to work together and may prevent the scheme being delivered.</p>	<p>Significant marriage value, synergies and efficiency savings as both owners stand to benefit to a similar degree. Clear incentive for parties to work together to maximise the potential of all three sites and to meet wider objectives and deliver associated benefits (e.g. provision of leisure/community space, improvement of Hobson's Passage etc).</p>	<p>Significant marriage value, synergies and efficiency savings as both owners stand to benefit to a similar degree. Clear incentive for parties to work together to maximise the potential of all three sites and to meet wider objectives and deliver associated benefits (e.g. provision of leisure/community space, improvement of Hobson's Passage etc).</p>
Quality of accommodation	-2	0	+1	+2	+2
	<p>Retail floorspace is currently at the lower quality end of the spectrum, especially in 18 - 19 Sidney Street.</p> <p>Upper floors of 16 - 17 and 18 - 19 Sidney Street and rear of 16 - 17 Sidney Street are not in a usable condition for retail or office use.</p> <p>21 Hobson Street is in very poor condition and could not be used in its current state for health and safety reasons.</p>	<p>Quality of all floorspace would be improved (in some cases significantly improved) from its current state because of the improvement to its condition yielded by the refurbishment. However, quality of all types of floorspace will still be limited (in some cases severely limited) by its format, layout and suitability.</p> <p>Infill development would provide good quality office floorspace though constrained site would still impose limits (e.g. on daylight, connectivity, facilities etc)</p>	<p>Comprehensive redevelopment would provide good quality accommodation, in mostly optimal formats, for all uses (retail, leisure/community and office). It would also maximise connectivity/permeability and the facilities that the sites/new building(s) can deliver.</p> <p>Quality of office accommodation/floorspace would be limited in places by the retention of the 21 Hobson Street façade and the impact this is likely to have on floorplates and daylight levels.</p>	<p>Comprehensive redevelopment would provide good quality accommodation, in optimal formats, for all uses (retail, leisure, community and office). It would also maximise connectivity/permeability and the facilities that the sites/new building(s) can deliver.</p>	<p>Comprehensive redevelopment would provide good quality accommodation, in optimal formats, for all uses (retail, leisure, community and office). It would also maximise connectivity/permeability and the facilities that the sites/new building(s) can deliver.</p>
TOTAL:	-15	-1	+13	+17	+18