



NINE ELMS TO PIMLICO PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE BRIDGE MINUTES

Strategy Group Meeting

16.00, 14 October 2014 at Wandsworth Town Hall

ATTENDEES

Councillor Govindia, Leader, L B Wandsworth
Paul Martin, Chief Executive, LB Wandsworth
Councillor Heather Acton, Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Parking, LB Westminster
Tim Rettler, GLA
Laura Corr, Ballymore
Billy Parr, TfL.

Supported by

Helen Fisher, Programme Director, Nine Elms Delivery Team
Keith Trotter, Programme Coordinator, Nine Elms Delivery Team
Hilary Skinner, Principal Planning
Caroline Cole, Director, Colander
Louise Harrison, Associate, Colander
Sandy Wassef, Colander

Apologies

Michele Dix, TfL
Debbie Jackson and Stewart Murray, GLA
David Twohig, BPSDC
Simon Wigzell, CLS
Peter Halpenny, Ballymore
Graham King, LB Westminster
Alex Williams, TfL

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

The second meeting of the Bridge Strategy Group to follow up on items discussed at the first meeting and to progress plans to launch the bridge competition.

ACTIONS BY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Councillor Govindia welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made around the table, with a number of individuals delegating for colleagues.

2.0 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Minutes of the last meeting were approved.

3.0 UPDATE ON GOVERNANCE AND PROCUREMENT ARRANGEMENTS

3.1 Proposed structure

Helen Fisher tabled a paper entitled Thames Bridge Project Governance and explained the proposed structure, clearly identifying FCROSC & Executive as the decision makers with Nine Elms Strategy Group under the chairmanship of Councillor Govindia, providing overall governance. Advice and recommendations would be the responsibility of the Jury Panel supported by the Technical and Local Residents Panel and feeding through the Bridge Project Team to the Strategy Group. The paper clearly illustrated the information flows and relationships between the groups.



It was agreed that this was a sensible working arrangement for the competition and that the paper clearly conveyed this methodology.

3.2 Stage approvals and ratification

HF went on to explain the process of assessing compliance at Stage 1 of the competition.

It was agreed that Stage 1a (review of PQQ's) would be led by Wandsworth BC procurement team supported by Colander and agreed with TfL. The selected shortlist would then be signed off by Chris Buss, Director of Finance, Wandsworth BC.

It was agreed that at Stage 1b (selection of teams following review of A2 design boards) the Jury's recommendation would also be signed off by Chris Buss.

It was agreed that the Stage 2 winner, as identified by the Jury Panel, would be ratified via an SO83A, or by an appropriate Committee.

Councillor Govindia clarified that Chris Buss had an important role in assessing financial capability of teams and their robustness to take on a major project but that his was not a design remit, and this skill would be sourced from within the Technical and Jury Panels.

It was agreed that when the Stage 1b teams are identified and agreed, their names will be shared with the Strategy Group, for information.

4.0 PROGRAMME

4.1 Revision 04

Caroline Cole referred the Group to the revised programme which, as requested at the last meeting, had been revisited in the light of Purdah and the restrictions that Purdah would impose on the programme; also the timing of the Garden Bridge Planning Application.

Caroline explained that an additional month had been added to the programme and that a winner would now be announced during the week commencing 20th July.

As advised by Wandsworth BC, the key restrictions on work during Purdah are:

- A requirement to avoid making press announcements
- A requirement that public consultation be halted

So that the timetable did not suffer significantly Colander had made an amendment to the Stage 2 design process. Rather than holding workshops with the general public during the Stage 2 design phase, which would be prohibited under Purdah conditions, these reviews are now being held with the Residents Review Panel instead.

Public exhibitions have been timed to take place before the onset of Purdah and after Purdah has ended. Similarly material for public consumption and comment will not be up-loaded onto the competition website during Purdah.



ACTIONS BY

4.2 Garden Bridge

Billy Parr alerted the Group to the possibility of a delay (to early December) in the Garden Bridge being presented to members of Westminster BC.

Hilary Skinner agreed to chase this internally and to advise Colander as soon as possible.

Hilary Skinner

On receipt of this information, Colander agreed to review the programme in consultation with Helen Fisher and Keith Trotter.

Colander

4.3 Community involvement

A debate ensued regarding the pros and cons of moving the launch date of the competition to avoid any conflict with the announcement of the Garden Bridge.

Councillor Action noted that the date could not be any earlier as this would not allow sufficient time for community alignment. She also observed that the current date of a launch on 01 December did not allow much time for this activity.

A discussion ensued about the sensitivities of selecting the appropriate people to be involved in the Residents Review Group (RRG) and the time this was likely to take. It was reconfirmed that this process should start with meetings with Ward Members on both sides of the river. It is unlikely that these will now take place before early November.

It was felt that, realistically, the composition of the RRG would not be agreed before the competition launch but that this should not hold up the launch date.

It was agreed that the Jury Panel members should be identified before the launch of the competition and that while the composition of the Residents' Review Panel should also be agreed, the individuals selected to take part in this panel could be agreed post launch.

ACTION: Wandsworth and Westminster to confirm meeting dates with Ward Members so that these can be revised in the programme

Wandsworth
/ Westminster

Councillor Govindia stressed the need to avoid announcing a winner in August as this was a holiday period and not a good time to make significant press statements. With this in mind it would be pertinent to avoid any further slippage/postponements to the timetable.

5.0 SELECTION OF THE JURY, TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL AND RESIDENTS REVIEW PANEL MEMBERS

5.1 The Jury

CC reiterated that the role of the Jury Panel will be to select a winner, for ratification by Wandsworth.

At the last meeting, members of this Group had been asked to give Councillor Govindia the names of the organisations that should be included on the Jury Panel.



ACTIONS BY

A discussion ensued on the correct representation on this panel. Councillor Govindia said that he did not want too many Stakeholders to be involved in the Jury, particularly when their skills might be better represented on the Technical Panel. He also felt that it would be a good move to include representatives from the Mayor's Design Advisory Group (MDAG) on the panel, and that in doing so the GLA 'family' would be well represented.

It was agreed that Wandsworth, Westminster and TfL should nominate representatives to sit on the Jury Panel.

It was agreed that the GLA would be represented by one, or possibly two, members of MDAG.

It was agreed that other stakeholders would not be included on the Jury Panel but that their comments on the proposals should be garnered through the Technical Panel or by other means

Colander suggested that the Jury Panel should comprise no more than eight people. As well as the stakeholder organisations already discussed, it was suggested that the panel should include a number of independent and highly respected individuals from the world of design: for example, a prominent architect and / or engineer; a respected commentator (or a celebrity, whichever best fits the bill). The purpose of adding these people being: to raise the profile of the competition, attract the right calibre of competitor and add knowledge and expertise to the proceedings.

It may be that members of MDAG can fulfil this role as well as representing the GLA.

An open conversation ensued where a number of possible people were suggested for these independent roles on the panel.

It was agreed that it would be prudent to agree deputies for each member of the Jury Panel

Councillor Govindia felt it was important not to rule people either in or out at this stage but that careful consideration should be given to who might best contribute to this Panel.

ACTION: It was agreed that everyone would continue to give consideration to this matter and send Colander any suggested names to add to the list.

ACTIONS BY

All

As part of the discussion about the make-up of the Jury Panel the matter of video conferencing was raised. In acknowledging that many of the people likely to make up this Panel would have very full diaries and limited availability would it be feasible to include a Juror that contributed via a conference link? CC suggested that this would not be ideal as a key component of the second stage design process was an interview with the shortlisted teams to assess not only design quality but to begin to understand how a team/client relationship would evolve. To assess this level of interaction would be difficult via a conference link.



5.2 Technical Panel

CC explained that at Stage 1 of the competition, the Technical Panel would be taking an overview of some very basic design ideas and that its role would be to ensure that the teams shortlisted to Stage 2 were capable of addressing the technical issues highlighted in the brief.

At Stage 2 of the competition, the submissions would be likely to include more complex information and the Technical Panel would need to have the expertise to review and comment accordingly.

Billy Parr recommended that it would be necessary to include two representatives from each of the Boroughs: Wandsworth and Westminster, along with a competent bridge engineer, representation from the PLA and possibly expertise from GLA to cover urban planning and place making. He added that both Boroughs do have engineers.

It was agreed that the following issues would need to be addressed by the panel:

- **Cost**
- **Structure**
- **Access**
- **Logistics**

It was agreed that cost guides for the bridge would be included in the Stage 1 brief as well as the TfL feasibility study

CC explained that in current proposals for the Stage 1 brief, competitors would submit two A2 boards at Stage 1B – one would be a technical board and the second a photo board on which teams would be asked to place their bridge. This second board would be used for the public consultation, whereas the first would be passed to the Technical Panel for assessment. The Jury Panel would see both boards.

It was agreed that members of the group should give consideration to membership of this panel and supply names to Colander.

ALL

5.3 The Residents Review Group

The matter of membership of this group had been discussed earlier in the meeting but it was reiterated at this point in the meeting how time consuming it was to select and engage with the appropriate individuals.



ACTIONS BY

It was reconfirmed and agreed that the members of this group would be individual residents and not organisations as shown on Colander's tabled paper. The interests of stakeholders will be dealt with elsewhere.

HS asked about the format of the meetings with Ward Members and LH explained that the intention was for an informal meeting with members to introduce them to the project team and to Colander and to enable the project team and Colander to talk to them about the bridge project and about the competition.

ACTION: HS suggested that Ward Members would require a crib sheet before the meetings. Colander agreed to provide these.

Colander

It was noted that new Residents were currently moving into new Ballymore properties as well as others in the Nine Elms project and that these people should also be considered within the mix.

Other groups identified were the Barge community and those in LB of Lambeth, Pascal Street and Waldon Estates.

HF confirmed that Wandsworth had made good progress identifying possible members of the RRG that could represent the communities to the south of the river.

ACTION: Colander requested feedback on progress with resident engagement, as and when further progress was made.

All

5.4 Terms of Engagement

LH talked about the need to have Terms of Engagement in place for the Residents Review Group and the other panels involved in the competition. She referred to her tabled paper and asked for comments.

It was agreed that this was a useful framework to have and it was suggested that any reservations or concerns were sent to Colander.

All

HS asked that the ability to delegate should be allowed within the Terms of Reference and this was agreed.

ACTION: Colander will ensure that this is included in the next iteration

Colander

6.0 UPDATE ON THE BRIEF

6.1 CC explained that the framework for the brief, website, and competition would be completed by the end of this week/beginning of next and circulated to members of the Strategy Group for comment.

ACTION: Comments from the Strategy Group were requested within one week

All

6.2 Approvals and sign offs of the briefing documents

At Councilor Govindia's suggestion it was agreed that the preparation and input into the Stage 1 brief would be done off line



It was agreed that the Project Team would review the brief, make recommendations to the Strategy Group and then seek sign off from other relevant parties. A similar way of working would be set in motion for Stage 2 as well.

Councillor Acton informed the Group that all briefing documents and press releases would need to receive political sign off from Westminster.

7.0 COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROGRAMME, INCLUDING STAKEHOLDER BRIEFINGS

LH referred to the paper that had been circulated with the papers for the meeting and explained that once the timetable had been finalised then activities with regards to community engagement would begin.

Much had already been discussed during the course of this meeting and most matters in relationship to this item had been covered.

LH drew the Group's attention to the plan to issue the Residents Review Group with a Welcome Pack when the competition began, to assist them in understanding their role and to provide them with background information.

8.0 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Strategy Group will be held towards the end of January, after Stage 1a has been completed and the Stage 1b teams identified.

It was **agreed** that following the assessment of Stage 1a the Project Team would be advised of the number of teams applying for the competition along with a note of the teams successfully reaching Stage 1b.

Date and time of next meeting to be advised.
Venue will be Wandsworth Town Hall.