



NINE ELMS TO PIMLICO PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE BRIDGE MINUTES

Strategy Group Meeting

10.00, 23 September 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

Tristan Stout, Ballymore

Gordon Adams, BPSDC

Rachel Broughton, CLS

Alex Williams, TfL.

Supported by

Helen Fisher, Programme Director, Nine Elms Delivery Team

Keith Trotter, Programme Coordinator, Nine Elms Delivery Team

Graham King, Head of Strategic Planning and Transport, LB Westminster

Caroline Cole, Director, Colander

Louise Harrison, Associate, Colander

Apologies

Michele Dix, TfL

Debbie Jackson and Stewart Murray, GLA

David Twohig, BPSDC

Simon Wigzell, CLS

Peter Halpenny, Ballymore

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

To convene the Bridge Strategy Group and agree the parameters for the competition to find designers for the bridge.

TOPICS DISCUSSED

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Welcome

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

1.2 Membership of the Bridge Strategy Group

Helen Fisher stated that Robin Mortimer, PLA Chief Executive had requested to join the group.

This was agreed.

ACTIONS BY



1.3 Purpose of the Nine Elms to Pimlico competition

Councillor Govindia explained the purpose of the Nine Elms to Pimlico Bridge project, stressing that this was not a live project (around 50% funds had yet to be secured) but an initiative that was about vision, about place making and about connectivity – physically connecting the North and the South but importantly connecting with local people and the community.

2.0 COMPETITION METHOD STATEMENT

2.1 Key drivers for the competition methodology

Caroline Cole talked the Group through the tabled Method Statement explaining the role of Colander in this process and explaining the competition methodology. CC identified 4 key factors that were central to this proposal:

1. Engagement with quality designers
2. Complying with OJEU regulations
3. Reaching out and engaging with the community
4. Attracting potential funders

Caroline explained the assessment process, involving a Jury Panel; Technical Panel, and a Residents Review Panel and talked through the proposed timetable.

2.2 Programme

Questions were raised about the proposed competition timetable:

- National elections in May and period of purdah – this would impact on decision making during the later stages of the competition.
- Graham King explained that The Garden Bridge project (Thomas Heatherwick) would be presented to Planning Committees of both Westminster and Lambeth Councils on 11 November and also early approval has very recently been given for the Thames Tideway Tunnel. Therefore it might be sensible to delay the launch of the bridge competition to later in November.
- It is important to avoid public consultation exercises over Christmas and Summer months
- Colander mentioned that the availability of Jury Panel members will need to be factored into the programme, and this may cause slippage on the timetable.

Action: Colander to consider these issues and draft a revised timetable.

Colander

2.3 Knowledge sharing

Paul Martin suggested that it would be useful to find out if anything could be learnt from the Garden Bridge experience.



3.0 THE COMPETITION BRIEF

3.1 Stakeholder involvement

CC explained that contributions from the wider stakeholder/client group would be essential to create an appropriate and effective briefing document. In particular she referred to PLA and to TfL (existing and extensive feasibility study).

Concerns were raised around the table about the landing of the bridge; levels to the bridge; height issues; impact on landscape etc. All these concerns were acknowledged as reason why it was important to gain wider input into the brief.

Action: All those with an input into the brief to start feeding information through to Colander.

All

3.2 Stage briefs

CC explained that at Stage 1 the brief would be 'a light touch' but at Stage 2 it would need to be a detailed document.

A number of issues need to be agreed in the second stage of the competition:

- Is this a pedestrian, cycle, or pedestrian and cycle bridge?
- Issues of height – PLA would need to input
- Impact on the river, on piers etc
- Impact on public realm
- Where will this bridge take off and land?

It was agreed that designers would be asked to design a pedestrian and cycle bridge.

4.0 PREFERRED PROCUREMENT ROUTE

4.1 OJEU Compliance

Louise Harrison explained that an OJEU route had been preferred because it would enable the winning team to be retained should the project become live at a later date.

She explained that she was working closely with the Procurement Team at L B Wandsworth and that, in consultation with them (and their Legal Advisers), it had been agreed to use the Competitive Dialogue route for this competition – as outlined in the tabled document. This enables the inclusion of a design phase at Stage 1b.

This procurement route was agreed.

Louise stated that she would continue to liaise with Procurement in order to ensure compliance.



5.0 SELECTION OF THE JURY PANEL AND OTHER PANEL MEMBERS

5.1 The different panels

CC explained that there would be three panels:

1. Jury Panel
2. Technical Panel
3. Residents Review Panel

Each will have different levels of responsibility.

5.2 The Jury Panel

The Jury Panel will comprise experts (including an eminent Architect and or Engineer) along with representatives of 'the great and the good'. Membership of this group should include a 'design voice'/commentator, possibly from the MDAG. Also someone from the main stakeholder groups.

Action: All members of this group should suggest constituency groups for membership of the Jury Panel to Councillor Govindia by Tuesday 29 September.

All

It was agreed that the Jury Panel should not exceed eight in number.

5.3 The Technical Panel

Questions were raised about the composition of the Technical Panel: in view of the complex and technical nature of the bridge project, it will be necessary to ensure correct design disciplines are involved at this stage and that a QS is integral to assess cost and viability of submissions.

5.4 The Residents Review Panel

Meetings will be set up with Ward Councillors to identify contacts in the community who might be invited to join this panel. This group should include a spread of local knowledge and have a clear role, which is: to act as a source of local expertise and contribute ideas/views for consideration by the Jury Panel.

Helen Fisher confirmed that this group would be by invitation only.

This was agreed.



6.0 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

6.1 The proposed plan

Louise Harrison tabled a paper detailing the proposed community consultation plan. It has four key components:

1. A website (with on-line questionnaires; information; galleries of the design work from Stage 1b and Stage 2)
2. Residents review panel (to facilitate real involvement in the competition by establishing, in liaison with Ward Councillors and the comms teams from both Westminster and Wandsworth, a Panel to review the different stages of the competition)
3. Public exhibitions of both the Stage 1b and Stage 2 submissions (venues to be decided, but likely to be on both sides of the river).
4. A school competition (to design a bridge, aimed at Year 9 students, with the winner of the main design competition acting as the judge and presenting prizes).

This was agreed.

There is the possibility of also having an exhibition at the NLA.

7.0 PRESS AND MEDIA

7.1 Single point of contact

All press and media enquiries will be handled by Wandsworth Council – the single point of contact for all dealings with the press and media.

This was agreed.

Colander has good relationships with the technical press (AJ/BD and others) and would hope to secure a feature at the 2nd stage of the competition.

8.0 GOVERNANCE

8.1 The role of this Bridge Strategy Group

Paul Martin raised the issue of the Group's status and that clarity would be needed on governance and decision making. It was understood and agreed that the design competition is being run by Wandsworth Council and that the Strategy Group were advisors to that process.

Action: Colander to ask the Wandsworth Procurement Team to review the Terms of Reference, to ensure compliance with OJEU requirements.

Colander

8.2 Transparency

The need for public transparency of the competition process was raised.

It was agreed that a statement regarding governance would be included online, as would the agendas and minutes of all formal meetings convened to advance this competition.

Colander



9.0 THE NEXT MEETING

9.1 Date of the next meeting

The next meeting will be held at 16.00 on 14 October, in the Leader's Office, Wandsworth Town Hall

9.2 Agenda items for the next meeting

Agenda items for the next meeting should include:

- Agreeing the Jury Panel and Technical Panel membership
- Agreeing the revised programme
- An update on the Brief
- An update on the Residents Review Panel