

OPTIONS	Advantages	Disadvantages	Stakeholder views	Key risks
<p><b>Minimal refurbishment of existing facilities</b></p> <p><b>(OPTION 1)</b></p> <p>Provisional cost estimate – circa £212,000</p> <p>(plus £50,000 if sewer diversion necessary).</p> <p>All + VAT</p>	<p>Comparatively low costs;</p> <p>Little change to, or impact upon, existing street scene in locale;</p> <p>Opportunity to add canopy to staircase to deter water ingress;</p> <p>Likely no requirement for Planning or Listed Building Consents.</p>	<p>Deteriorating asset, which will become increasingly costly to maintain;</p> <p>Prone to temporary closure, particularly from flooding;</p> <p>Poor equality offer, with very limited accessibility;</p> <p>Unattractive and security concerns;</p> <p>Limited potential to generate revenue;</p> <p>Inability to consider alternative uses for the existing space;</p> <p>Anglia Water may require realignment of access steps above existing sewer, or sewer diversion.</p>	<p>Council Urban Design and Conservation team favour option due to little interruption to existing street scene;</p> <p>Historic England has stated that they would not wish to see this option pursued.</p>	<p>Solution fails to deal with the core deficiencies of the existing facilities, including poor accessibility and equalities offer, damage and periodic closure due to flooding, and potential increasing operational costs;</p> <p>Consequent poor value for money.</p>

<b>OPTIONS</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>	<b>Stakeholder views</b>	<b>Key risks</b>
<p><b>Street level on existing site</b></p> <p><b>(OPTION 2)</b></p> <p>Provisional cost estimate – circa £442,000 – (Architectural version)</p> <p>Circa £365,000 – (Modular version)</p> <p>(plus £50,000 if sewer diversion necessary).</p> <p>All + VAT</p>	<p>Fully addresses accessibility and equality issues;</p> <p>Overcomes ‘underground’ effect;</p> <p>Overcomes existing operational difficulties;</p> <p>Varying capacity and choice of finishing;</p> <p>Potential commercial income from existing basement reuse, and/or above ground facility;</p> <p>Addresses existing asset issues in terms of flooding;</p> <p>Opportunity to incorporate kiosk facilities, and to consider a holistic approach to commercial trading activity on the bridge.</p>	<p>Subject to Planning and potential Listed Building approvals;</p> <p>Significant impact on existing street scene.</p>	<p>Urban Design and Conservation team, and Historic England, favour a ‘context sympathetic’ building in terms of scale and scope, especially to preserve views across bridge.</p>	<p>A suitable solution cannot be developed that sufficiently blends in with the locale to achieve the necessary consents;</p> <p>Potential additional sewer diversion costs.</p>

OPTIONS	Advantages	Disadvantages	Stakeholder views	Key risks
<p><b>Partly below street level on existing site</b></p> <p><b>(OPTION 3)</b></p> <p>Provisional cost estimate – circa £438,000</p> <p>(plus £50,000 if sewer diversion necessary).</p> <p>All + VAT</p>	<p>Improved accessibility, and addresses equality issues;</p> <p>Reduced ‘underground’ effect;</p> <p>Addresses existing asset issues in terms of flooding;</p> <p>Reduced impact upon street scene with opportunity to enhance public realm;</p> <p>Opportunity to consider holistic approach to commercial trading activity on the bridge, e.g. kiosk and café/information area;</p> <p>New stairs orientation integrates streetscape with separate toilet/kiosk.</p>	<p>Subject to Planning and potential Listed Building approvals;</p> <p>Some impact on existing street scene;</p> <p>Significant structural changes costly and subject to the necessary consents;</p> <p>Inability to consider alternative uses for the existing space.</p>	<p>Urban Design and Conservation team, and Historic England, favour a ‘context sympathetic’ building in terms of scale and scope, especially to preserve views across bridge.</p>	<p>A suitable solution cannot be developed that sufficiently blends in with the locale to achieve the necessary consents;</p> <p>Significant structural changes costly;</p> <p>Potential additional sewer diversion costs.</p>

<b>OPTIONS</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>	<b>Stakeholder views</b>	<b>Key risks</b>
<p><b>Off Site e.g. Queens' Green</b></p> <p><b>(OPTION 4)</b></p> <p>Provisional cost estimate – circa £239,000.</p> <p>All + VAT</p>	<p>Fully addresses accessibility and equality issues;</p> <p>Overcomes 'underground' effect;</p> <p>Overcomes existing operational difficulties;</p> <p>Choice of finishing, to complement locale;</p> <p>Minimal impact on existing Silver Street street scene, with sewer diversion unlikely;</p> <p>Potential commercial income, including incorporation of kiosk facilities;</p> <p>Comparatively non-complex build;</p> <p>Close to bus visitor drop-off position.</p>	<p>Impact on high value open green space;</p> <p>Lack of support from local Ward Councillors;</p> <p>Subject to Planning approval.</p>	<p>Urban Design and Conservation team unsupportive of this option given its potential impact on 'the Backs'.</p>	<p>Lack of support from local Ward Councillors;</p> <p>A suitable solution cannot be developed that sufficiently blends in with the locale to achieve the necessary consents.</p>