

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 29/7/03	<b>MEETING NAME</b> Executive
<b>Report title:</b>		Canada Water – Selection of Preferred Developer Partner	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		Surrey Docks & Rotherhithe Ward	
<b>From:</b>		Strategic Director of Regeneration	

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Executive consider the information contained within this report and support the appointment of Team A as the preferred Master Development Partner.
2. That the Executive note the efforts made by Community representatives, Officers and Professional team in carrying out this consultation and assessment process.
3. That the Executive approve the following process to take the project forward in the short term.
  - 3.1. Stage 1  
The Council will set out in writing to the preferred team some high level principles under which the Council wishes to proceed. These principles are not negotiable and the preferred team will have 2 weeks to either accept or reject the principles, these are set identified in the Closed Report.
  - 3.2. Stage 2  
Should the preferred team accept the principles set out in Stage 1, the Council will then enter into a 3 month period of negotiation to agree a set of key points. The proposed set of key points are identified in the Closed Report.
  - 3.3. A further report will be brought to the Executive at the end of this 3 month period, to inform the Executive of progress regarding the negotiations and to propose an agreed schedule for delivery of a masterplan and development on the first sites.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4. Report to Executive in July 2002 received approval for release of the Development Brief for Canada Water and competition process.
5. Report to Executive in January 2003 received approval for a short-listed three teams to prepare masterplans for consultation.
6. The following is a chronology of actions that have been carried out during the assessment process.

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.1. Advertising in Canada Water underground station from 1<sup>st</sup> March 2003</li> <li>6.2. Newsletter to all households 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2003</li> </ol> |
|---|

- 6.3. Masterplan submissions received 6<sup>th</sup> May 2003.
- 6.4. Copies of Masterplans issued to Quality Panel and Professional Team 8<sup>th</sup> May in order to commence assessment. Masterplans also made available to all Official Consultees, 8<sup>th</sup> May 2003.
- 6.5. MORI and Outreach work 8<sup>th</sup> May – 20<sup>th</sup> June 2003.
- 6.6. Newsletter to all Households 27<sup>th</sup> May 2003
- 6.7. Advertising Exhibition in 12 bus shelters in the area 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2003
- 6.8. Advertising Exhibition in local press 19<sup>th</sup> & 26<sup>th</sup> June 2003
- 6.9. Public Exhibition 20 – 29<sup>th</sup> June 2003.
- 6.10. Quality Panel Interviews 25<sup>th</sup> June 2003.
- 6.11. Canada Water Consultative Forum meeting to select preferred team 8<sup>th</sup> July 2003.
- 6.12. MORI debriefing 14<sup>th</sup> July 2003.

## 7. The Development Brief

The adopted Development Brief (the Brief) contains 2 parts, a Master Developer Brief and the Planning Design Principles and Technical Appendices. Section 4 is quoted below and sets out the following :-

8. The Council's objectives for the comprehensive redevelopment of the area are geared towards securing benefits that are appropriate to the area's current and perceived future context. The objectives are designed to balance commercial requirements with those of existing and future residents, community groups, visitors and others. The objectives are summarised as follows:-
  - To create a "focus of activity" within the Rotherhithe Peninsula balancing commercial and local community aspirations as listed in the executive summary.
  - To encourage high quality design & sustainable development in social, environmental and economic terms.
  - To deliver a comprehensive solution for the whole area.
  - To deliver a project that meets the objectives of the Government's Urban Policies (including the Urban White Paper) both now and through the development of each phase.
  - To deliver a project that meets the objectives of the London Plan.
  - To create a mixed use project that complements and enhances the Peninsula and wider region.
  - To provide a community focus for the Rotherhithe Peninsula.

- To create a project that maximises benefits to neighbouring communities, land and buildings and to the area.
- To make the best use of the areas transport connections to create a development that is truly integrated with its surroundings, both in terms of the Rotherhithe Peninsula and the wider London Conurbation.
- To work with the community to deliver comprehensive sustainable regeneration.
- To retain the water features and wildlife which add to the attractiveness of the area.

9. It is important to note that The Brief also contains the vision for Canada Water proposed by the Canada Water Campaign and adopted by the Canada Water Consultative Forum.

10. The brief contains a set of 9 Topic Papers covering local issues. Topic Papers were prepared by local stakeholders with the assistance of Council Officers and other professionals. Papers headings are:

- Built Environment
- Housing
- Transport
- Green Spaces
- Community Facilities
- Education & Lifelong Learning
- Health
- Social Inclusion
- Enterprise & Employment

### **Roles & Involvement in the assessment process**

11. Canada Water Consultative Forum

The Forum has been established as the main community stakeholder group since its formation April 2001. The Forum has been involved heavily in the drafting of the Development Brief and Topic Papers. The Forum hold regular meetings to discuss issues affecting the Canada Water area, these meetings are open to the public and are attended by Council Officers and Ward Members. Over the period May 2002 – May 2003 the Forum held 8 meetings, with 87 people in attendance. Some people attended more than one meeting.

12. Quality Panel

The Quality Panel is a small working group chaired by a CAFE enabler and consisting of: 3 local stakeholders, elected from the Canada Water Consultative Forum, and 3 Council Officers representing Property, Housing and Planning Policy & Research.

13. The Quality Panel was heavily involved in the process from selection of the Short-list. Having requested further information from the teams, the Panel underwent an interview process to discuss and clarify the approach each team intended to take regarding the site and the issues. The focus of this group is quality of design, in masterplanning terms and urban design.

#### 14. GVA Grimley

Property Consultants to the Council, GVA have been involved with the project since the first Development Framework document produced in May 2000. GVA's role in the assessment of the masterplans has been to assist with Quality, Financial & Legal assessments and to co-ordinate the professional team.

#### 15. Urban Initiatives

Urban design consultants to the Council, Urban Initiatives have also been involved from production of the first Development Framework in May 2000. Urban Initiatives have carried out a technical assessment of the three masterplans against the Development Brief and Topic Papers. Through a series of meetings Urban Initiatives have engaged with Council Officers (meetings held 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> May 2003) and other professionals to do their assessment, their findings are detailed in Key Factors For Consideration.

#### 16. ABROS Financial Services

Having prepared the financial model under which the teams have submitted bids to the Council for its land, ABROS have carried out the purely financial assessment of the proposals with a focus on commercial realism and deliverability.

#### 17. Wragge & Co

Having prepared the Legal Framework suggesting to the teams a method of joint working with the adjoining land owners, Wragge & Co have carried out their assessment of the proposed Legal structures. This assessment has been done in conjunction with Council Legal Services and has again focussed on the commercial reality and deliverability of the project under the various suggested structures.

#### 18. GLA

Having supported the Development Brief in July 2002, the GLA has carried out its own assessment of the Masterplans against the objectives in the Mayor's Spatial Development Strategy. There is substantial support within the GLA for the development of Canada Water, their feedback is included later in the report.

#### 19. Adjoining Land Owners

Two major adjoining land owners, Shopping Centres Limited and Conrad Phoenix Properties Ltd, have been reserved about getting involved with the selection process and assessment. The position of the adjoining landowners regarding the process is set out in Key Factors for Consideration.

#### 20. Official Consultees

The masterplan submissions have been made available to every Executive Member and Ward Councillor, as well as every division/unit Manager and above across the Council from 7<sup>th</sup> May – 30<sup>th</sup> June 2003. Further to this, the Official Consultee List covers local Police and other major government agencies such as the GLA / TfL. The offer to view the proposals and comment upon them was extended on two occasions, firstly in early May and then early June. There has been minimal feedback through this process other than the GLA comments which are separately reported.

21. The Professional Team consists of GVA Grimley, Urban Initiatives, Turner & Townsend, ABROS Financial Services and Wragge & Co.

### **Masterplan Assessment**

22. The adopted Development Brief contains within it the Planning Design Principles & Technical Appendices Document along with a set of 9 Topic Papers covering local issues, as outlined above. The principles within these documents have guided the assessment process in many ways. Broadly the assessment has been split into four equally weighted streams:

**Quality**  
**Financial**  
**Legal**  
**Consultation**

### **23. Quality**

In any masterplanning exercise the Quality of design is critical, with several groups involved in this assessment. The Quality Panel with the assistance of a CABE enabler has focussed completely on quality of design and how well the teams have responded to the issues in the Topic Papers and the Development Brief. This process was an interview based interaction with the teams. The interview contained a section of set questions to all the teams followed by open discussion with the Panel regarding any clarification of approach or concept. In both the short-listing and the selection contained within, the Quality Panel has been a very successful and worthwhile process.

24. Urban Initiatives with the assistance of various Council departments and external consultants carried out an in depth analysis of the submissions from a design quality perspective, also taking into account the issues raised in the Development Brief and Topic Papers. This report informed the Quality Panel of broader issues with the submissions prior to the interview process and was included in their analysis.

25. The GLA received copies of the submissions, their planning department have commented directly to the Council.

### **26. Financial**

The financial assessment has been carried out by ABROS Financial Services. Their findings are reported in Key Issues for Consideration.

### **27. Legal**

The legal assessment has been carried out by Wragge & Co. Their findings are reported in Key Issues for Consideration.

### **28. Consultation**

The Canada Water project has been widely consulted on throughout, as pointed out in the previous reports to Executive of July 2002 and January 2003. The Canada Water Consultative Forum, the main stakeholder body, supported the adoption of the Development Brief and the Short-list of three teams. They have been heavily involved in every step of the process.

29. Consultation at this critical stage has been carried out in a much more comprehensive manner than the earlier stages of the project, with every household in the Rotherhithe and Surrey Docks wards receiving two newsletters informing them of the various opportunities to engage and comment on the plans. The newsletters have further informed the public regarding the exhibition, election processes, how to get more

involved and general information on other planning applications affecting the masterplan area.

30. The website for Canada Water, replicating information in the newsletters has also made publicly available the Development Brief, minutes of all Forum meetings and Committee Reports, as well as background and other documents. The website has provided a mechanism to comment on the plans, the process, the concepts, and has been very successful in doing so, with a mass of comments being made through the website.
31. A MORI survey has been carried out, interviewing a random sample of over 500 people about the proposals. Their findings are reported in Key Issues for Consideration.
32. Outreach Work has been carried out to raise awareness and involvement in the exhibition, this has involved a schools project involving some 70 children from schools on the peninsula, the children also had a day to view the exhibition and talk with the teams.

### **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

33. This section of the report will seek to highlight the results of the assessment and consultation process that has been carried out over the period from the submission date to the present. There have been many local people and professional consultants involved in the process, all with different objectives and opinions.
34. The Conclusion seeks to rationalise and present the information in a clear and concise manner, to enable the Executive to consider the recommendations contained in this report from a position of full information.

### **RESULT FROM QUALITY PANEL**

35. The Quality Panel held interviews on 25<sup>th</sup> June at the Exhibition venue.
36. The interview process was in the form of 20 – 25 min presentation by the team of their proposals for Canada Water. There were 5 set questions prepared by CABA and then open discussion to cover the issues of concern to the panel members. Responses to the 5 set questions were scored by panel members and through open discussion the Panel arrived at a conclusion.
37. This process took the full day and inspired quite detailed discussions with the teams and amongst the panel members. The result of this process was a recommendation to proceed with Team A.
38. In summary the Panel lacked confidence in Team C and were not inspired by their approach to the site. While Team B had made the most effort to approach the community and other Council departments it was felt on the whole that comments and feedback had not been incorporated into their designs, which left the panel feeling they would not be listened to in the process of finalising their masterplan, and further to this the roles within the team did not seem clear and would potentially lead to conflict later in the process.
39. The Panel acknowledged that whilst none of the submissions complied fully with the brief, it was decided that Team A would be the best team to work with in finalising the masterplan. From the outset it has been very clear with this team what the roles are and who is responsible, providing confidence and much needed clarity to the complex process of achieving a quality environment for Canada Water.

## RESULT FROM CANADA WATER CONSULTATIVE FORUM

40. The Canada Water Consultative Forum met on the 8<sup>th</sup> July to discuss the results of the Exhibition, recommendation from the Quality Panel, the feedback from MORI and their own personal views about the proposals on offer.
41. The Quality Panel recommendation, as tabled at the Forum meeting, suggested that while the Team A proposal did not fully meet their aspirations, they felt that the team was one they could work with and were comfortable that they would be properly engaged and consulted throughout the process of finalising the masterplan.
42. The Forum voted to support the Quality Panel recommendation and therefore is supporting the appointment of Team A as the preferred team.
43. The Canada Water Campaign who are represented on the Forum have directly expressed their preference for Team A as the preferred team to work with.

## RESULT FROM MORI SURVEY

44. The MORI survey canvassed the views of over 500 local people representing a sample of the demographic profile in the area. This was in the form of a questionnaire, and the results are outlined in this insert from their report to the Council (Please note, the Plan A refers to Team A in this report)
45. In the final stage of the questionnaire, the main points of each of the three proposed development plans was read out to respondents, with an accompanying graphic. These were agreed in consultation with the developers, and are included in the appendices. It is not possible to get all details of the plans across in this description, so results need to be interpreted in the light of the support for the more detailed elements of each plan discussed above.
46. Each plan received more support than opposition, though as the table below illustrates support was highest for Plan B (with 64% supporting and 13% opposing), and lowest for Plan A (44% support, 24% oppose). Plan B came in the middle with 53% supporting and 20% opposing. Opposition to all the plans tends to be highest among owner-occupiers and those living in Surrey Docks

<b>Q2 4- 26</b>	<b><i>After hearing this information, and seeing the illustration, how strongly do you support or oppose this development plan for the Canada Water area?</i></b>		
	<b>Plan A</b>	<b>Plan B</b>	<b>Plan C</b>
<i>Base: All respondents</i>	<i>(477)</i>	<i>(477)</i>	<i>(477)</i>
	%	%	%
Strongly support	17	30	21
Tend to support	27	34	32
Neither support nor oppose	27	18	23
Tend to oppose	14	8	12
Strongly oppose	10	5	8
No opinion	5	6	4

Support	44	64	53
Oppose	24	13	20
Net support (±)	+20	+51	+33

Source: MORI

47. This pattern is repeated when respondents are asked which plan they like the most, and which plan they like the least. Forty-four percent say they support Plan B the most (compared with 19% choosing Plan C and 17% choosing Plan A) – with 10% saying “none of these” and another 10% unable to give a view (especially those aged over 55). Plan B is the most preferred option for all sub-groups.
48. Similarly, a third (34%) say they support Plan A the least, compared with 16% for Plan C and 12% for Plan B. Nineteen per cent say “none of these”, and another 19% answer “don’t know”.
49. There are many reasons why people said they supported one plan over another, and it should be noted again at this point that these represent top of mind responses; respondents were not given a great deal of time to study the plans in depth.
50. Nonetheless, these reasons do mirror issues already picked up in this survey, in particular opposition to high-rise buildings, desire for more facilities and services for local people, and concern for the environment.

## RESULT FROM PUBLIC EXHIBITION

51. The public exhibition for Canada Water was a great success. Having been advertised widely in local papers such as Southwark News and South London Press, together with occasional advertising in professional journals. The key, however, were the newsletters to every household on the peninsula, providing updates and information to those interested. Further to this the website has been critical in making information available.
52. All three teams attended the exhibition and were available to the public, so those who filled in a feedback form did so from a position of full information.
53. The Exhibition was held 21 – 29<sup>th</sup> June on one of the Council owned sites. Attendance was as follows.

Day	Attendance	Feedback Forms collected
Saturday 21 <sup>st</sup>	180	68
Sunday 22 <sup>nd</sup>	141	33
Tuesday 24 <sup>th</sup>	81	40
Thursday 26 <sup>th</sup>	189	74
Friday 27 <sup>th</sup>	173	83
Saturday 28 <sup>th</sup> / Sunday 29 <sup>th</sup>	368	200
POSTAL (as at 10 <sup>th</sup> July 2003)		26
TOTAL	1,132	524



54. Of the 524 feedback forms collected from the exhibition there were a total of :

<b>No.</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Status</b>
356	68%	Owner Occupiers
63	12%	Private Renters
36	7%	Council Tenants
26	5%	Other
17	3%	Housing Association Tenants
17	3%	Council Leaseholders
8	2%	Local Employees
1	-	Local Business

55. In essence the feedback forms asked attendees to nominate the 6 most important issues to them, and then to approach each team display and decide which team provides the best solution. A very simple assessment of the feedback forms produces the table below.

56. Shaded squares represent the highest team score for each point, however you will notice the amount of those who were unable to choose a team for their issues is often the highest number. The issues are ranked according to how often they were selected as a key issue for those who filled in the forms. A brief analysis of this information shows how close the public opinion in the exhibition was. Different assessments will produce different teams as being the 'front runners'. Whilst the information contained in the forms will be of vital importance to the final masterplan preparation, it does not provide clear local support for one of the three teams.

<b>Issues ranked most important from Exhibition Feedback</b>	<b>Team A</b>	<b>Team B</b>	<b>Team C</b>	<b>No selection</b>
Protection of ecology	84	41	69	105
Creating night time Economy with bars and restaurants	53	74	61	84
Creating a waterside village focus for the area	77	45	49	68
Wider range of shopping	50	57	33	71
Appropriate heights of buildings	36	24	62	58
Improved community facilities	35	52	22	58
Improvements to Lower Road	64	35	17	46
Enhancement of the Canada Water basin	27	40	33	61
Appropriate density of housing	37	11	68	35
General Safety	29	28	26	64
Preserving the area's existing character	42	19	19	52
Improved opportunities to walk and cycle on the peninsula	48	1	27	55
Size and type of new housing	29	14	32	55
Easing local congestion	16	23	19	49
Improvements to public realm	27	19	16	56
Improved maintenance of the dock	18	25	9	49
Improved youth specific facilities	30	16	13	46
Better connections around the area	9	22	20	38
Involving the community in the long-term future	13	17	6	40
Improvements to Albion Street	7	7	15	50
Other issues	11	6	7	28
Improved access to jobs and training	2	4	3	20
Provision of start-up business units	7	1	3	13
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>751 (24%)</b>	<b>581 (19%)</b>	<b>629 (20%)</b>	<b>1174 (37%)</b>

57. The qualitative 'comments' sections of the form are very difficult to represent in an easy and understandable format, therefore we have not endeavoured to do that at this stage. A direct transcript of all comments on the feedback forms is available through the Projects Team within the Development and Regeneration Division of the Council. However the information will be made available to the Preferred Developer in order to assist in shaping the proposals to address as many local issues as possible.

## **GENERAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER BODIES**

58. This section of the report covers general comments from the GLA, the adjoining land owners and the professional team. It is important to note that these comments did not form part of the official assessment and scoring process, but are more to inform the Executive and will be used to inform the preferred team of changes that will need to be made in their approach to the masterplanning of the area.

## **PROFESSIONAL TEAM**

59. We have a confidence in the location that suggests it will become a highly successful new urban area within London. The infrastructure, principally in the form of public transport, is in place and operational. The land lies between the West End and Docklands and development activity is spreading east along the route of the Jubilee Line Extension, providing new levels of confidence in the sustainable development potential of land south of the River.

60. The decision is therefore, which prospective Master Developer Partner could take the best advantage of the opportunity? Team C has unfortunately shown good strengths too late in the process. They let themselves down with the original submission material and did not fully recognise the requirements of the selection process in responding to the Briefs in a competitive situation. Team A however does recognise the requirements of the competition. It offers the Council an approach that should deliver a high quality development on the Council and Conrad Phoenix land and possibly some form of enhanced development over and above that which is being promoted by Shopping Centres Limited on its land. Team B have responded most closely to the Briefs and provide the opportunity to create a diverse and truly mixed-use urban area. Their approach though is more risky than that of Team A.

61. In our view, having weighed up the different approaches, we believe it is right to remain faithful to the original objectives of the Briefs and seek to create a robust and diverse new urban area for London. In our view, the TeamA approach is more likely to be delivered in the short to medium term, with Team A very much in control. The Team B approach is potentially more inclusive and will potentially create a more diverse urban area. In view of the strengths of the location and potential that exists, it would seem inappropriate to deliver a 'safe' approach. We prefer the more inclusive and diverse approach and therefore recommend Team B.

62. The masterplanning component of Team B has a growing reputation in urban regeneration and can bring diversity of thinking to create strong urban areas. Developer/contractor in Team B and is involved in major regeneration projects both in the UK, where they have only operated for the past two years, and abroad, predominantly in Australasia. They have a reputation for delivering projects. Both companies have in our view the necessary skills to deliver this exceptional project and create a lasting legacy for the Rotherhithe Peninsula.

## **GLA COMMENTS**

63. The following is a summary provided by GLA planners with TfL input, please note these are officer comments and are provided without prejudice.

64. There are a number of strategic issues that are common to all of the competition entries. These are:

- Deliverability and engagement with Surrey Quays Shopping Centre Ltd. i.e. is redeveloping the existing shopping centre an option or does it have to be retained?
- A significant proportion of the scheme is housing. Targets for affordable housing should be specified at the earliest opportunity. Affordable housing provision should be maximised.
- In order to maximise regeneration potential the identification of employment opportunities and the development of a social inclusion strategy is required – early engagement with the LDA is recommended.
- A fundamental component of the masterplan should be to improve interchange between rail, bus, taxi, cycle and pedestrian movements at strategic locations, while maximising integration and connectivity between development and transport services. Pedestrian/Cycle permeability should be promoted within a high quality public realm. Levels of car parking and associated trip generation to be minimised.
- Opportunity to develop a sustainable development with a full range of green infrastructure – CHP/ ground water abstraction/ passive solar heating/ renewable energy/ recycling and use of grey water.
- There may be a conflict between the ecological aspects of the site and the intensification of the area through redevelopment. A specialist input is required.

### **Team A**

65. This is perhaps the least successful in retail delivery and is relatively uninspiring in urban design terms. The proposal is to maintain the existing shopping centre, delivering a new department store and health club to the north of the scheme and ultimately building on the existing surface car park with a mix of retail units, car parking and residential overlooking a central Galleria, which would include a new canal, to the south. A new residential district is proposed to the north. The location of the public buildings is well considered around Canada Water itself. It is the weakest proposal in terms of linking the proposed development to Canada Water and Surrey Quays stations. Although it covers sustainability in the proposal it is the only scheme that does not propose CHP. The master plan promotes public transport priority and is pedestrian friendly, including a pedestrian access bridge to Southwark Park. The scheme also proposes an additional 2,600 car parking spaces.

### **Team B**

66. This is by far the strongest bid in terms of vision, urban design rationale and wider regeneration potential. The vision is inspiring, proposing a new high street that directly links Canada Water and Surrey Quays station. A second public route running parallel to the high street will accommodate five key community uses. The strategic link from Greenland Dock through Canada Water to Surrey Water and the Thames is also established. The proposal includes replacing Surrey Quays shopping centre with new retail, after decanting existing tenants into new premises along the new high street. A strong link to Southwark Park is also delivered with a new public square. The pedestrian comes first in this scheme and the public transport aspects are fully integrated. The rationale for this scheme is devastatingly simple and the result is a dynamic master plan with a strong and integrated design philosophy. Certain aspects are very vague such as the views of Shopping Centres Ltd., how the community uses will be delivered and where

the car parking will be located. Sustainability is covered in the proposal. Overall the masterplan aims high, is exciting and covers all the bases outlined in Southwark's brief. Deliverability is the big question in terms of redeveloping the existing shopping centre.

### **Team C**

67. This is a strong masterplan that in retail terms is very deliverable. It takes an interventionist approach, keeping the shopping centre, redeveloping its central section to create shops that face onto a new high street that links to Surrey Quays station. Two landmark buildings housing community uses are located around Canada Water. Housing is located in a residential district to the north and is also used to wrap around the multi-storey car parks. However, there are a number of key elements that are unresolved including the location of multi-storey car parking alongside the high street and ecological area, and the lack of a strongly defined route from Canada Water station to the main retail area. The scheme is underpinned by the best sustainable development strategy of all the competition entries, but is weak in terms of transport, employment opportunities, social inclusion and ecology. This scheme does not fully recognise Canada Water's public transport potential and is still very car friendly.

### **LANDOWNER COMMENTS**

68. Adjoining land owners were supplied full copies of the submissions and have formally responded to the Council in writing. Whilst the responses have a different approach, both feel that the appointment of a Master Developer Partner is not the best approach for the combined site, and that a co-operation agreement between the landowners would be the better approach to the delivery of a wider project.

69. Whilst this would achieve the partnering approach the Council was seeking to achieve there will need to be detailed negotiations of how a partnership approach would work and how costs of the public realm would be shared across the various holdings. Removal of the master developer partner places the entire risk of developing out the Council holding back on the Council as well as the burden of costs involved with preparation of a masterplan and the planning process.

70. With issues surrounding the partnership agreement resolved, the process of agreeing the right design team to masterplan the sites will need to commence with a design team ultimately appointed.

71. The opportunity to proceed on this basis was not available to the Council at the beginning of this competitive process, and indeed was the reason a competition approach was adopted. It is Officers view that there is a reasonable expectation on the Council from the Community to see the competitive process through to a logical conclusion, which the recommendation seeks to achieve.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

72. The assessment process has been lengthy with a great deal of involvement from the community and the professional team. It must remain clear that this is the beginning of a long process, and this stage has been about identifying a team to work with rather than a scheme.

73. Quality Assessment – carried out by the Quality Panel with the assistance of CABE, arrived at Team A, primarily due to the feeling that this team could be worked with and a confidence that the final masterplan will reflect community aspirations.

74. Financial Assessment – carried out by ABROS scored Team A as the strongest team offering the most security to the Council in terms of delivery. The Financial scoring of the submissions covered the following areas. Financial Structure and Flexibility, Financial Ability, Financial Model and Financial Bid. The four elements were weighted and the scored accordingly, with an emphasis placed on the Financial Bid section in terms of weighting.
75. Legal Assessment – carried out by Wragge & Co scored Team B highest, due to the way in which this team adopted the partnering approach to the development. The Legal assessment was carried out against the principles of the Legal Framework provided by the Council. The essentials of which were to show commitment to a partnering approach with other land holders and to establish a method of sharing benefit and cost of community facilities and infrastructure across the whole core area. The teams reacted differently to this concept and have all gone some way to fulfilling these aspirations, however there are risks for the project in all the approaches.
76. Consultation – Primarily through the Public Exhibition and MORI survey, local opinion is very balanced across the three proposals. MORI survey produced Team B as clearly preferred, however the exhibition shows a slight preference for Team A, with Team B coming last. Whilst the feedback produced through this consultation will be fundamental to the development of the masterplan, the results from this stream have not been conclusive.

	<b>Team A</b>	<b>Team B</b>	<b>Team C</b>
<b>Quality</b>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>
<b>Financial</b>	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>
<b>Legal</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>
<b>Consultation</b>	No result	No result	No result

77. As the four streams of assessment have been equally weighted, Officers recommendation is to proceed with Team A, on the basis they are superior in 2 of the four streams, with Team B superior in only one of the four.
78. The submissions received have all fallen short of the requirements set out in the Brief. As a result there are a number of commercial and design issues Officers would like to address with the preferred team early in the process, thereby setting the ground rules for engagement with the Council. These critical issues will be dealt with in the initial short negotiation period, which provides the rationale behind the 2 stage approach outlined in the recommendations of this report.
79. The comments from other bodies suggest a stronger masterplan approach from Team B but higher risk attached to the delivery, due to the scale of the scheme and the treatment of the shopping centre land. Team A offers greater certainty for the Council in delivery of the scheme and a simple team structure to work with in addressing the shortfalls in their current approach.
80. In all cases, addressing any design/planning issues will be carried out in consultation with the planning department to ensure the final masterplan remains in line with the emerging Southwark Plan.

## **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

81. The Canada Water masterplanning process has reached the point of selecting a partner to work with in order to finalise and deliver a vision for Canada Water. A development opportunity of this scale has the ability to support all elements of the Community Strategy as well as keeping in line with the emerging UDP and Mayor's SDS.

82. Through engaging the right mix of internal departments and other organisations (such as the Southwark Alliance, the Primary Care Trust, the Safer Southwark Partnership) to work with the preferred team, the masterplan will be able to incorporate most, if not all, of the initiatives and strategies in place in the north of the borough.
83. We will be insisting on the highest building standards in terms of sustainability and energy efficiency, this can be achieved through benchmarks contained within the masterplan, which will in time become planning guidelines through the SPG.
84. Improvements to the infrastructure of the area with a focus on cycleways and pedestrian routes together with investment into the Bus network will see reductions in car usage and a greater reliance on public transport. Improved home delivery services regarding grocery shopping should also assist in greatly reducing the reliance on the car in this area.
85. Good access to quality health services is a key deliverable in the evolution of a masterplan. The Primary Care Trust have been involved and are fully aware of the opportunity for new facilities. The PCT itself is carrying out feasibility across the north of the borough to decide on the best way to enhance health provision. Their findings will guide the direction of expenditure in this area.
86. Facilities such as a new library will allow Home Work clubs for those kids in school coupled with lifelong learning facilities will provide new opportunities for education in all it's forms, openly available to all sectors of the community. Further to this there is a clear requirement for business start-up units to foster new enterprise and provide more employment opportunities in the area. The Enterprise Strategy will be fundamental in steering this provision to ensure best practice is achieved.
87. A full Section 106 and public realm strategy will be created as part of the masterplan, ensuring improvements to the wider area will result from the development at the core. Such elements as open space improvements, street furniture and lighting, enhancement to existing educational and youth facilities are at the centre of this approach.

## **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

88. The Projects team continues to resource this project in terms of officer time. At the point of selecting a Master Development Partner, the cost of running the project will then be shared with the preferred team on an agreed basis.
89. The project team will be appointing a Legal Consultant to assist with the negotiations and to protect the Council and it's landholdings. Budget provisions have been made within the Regeneration Department's Base Budget.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE**

### **Concurrent Report - Legal Issues**

90. The recommendation to select a preferred developer and seek to agree heads of terms over a 3 month period will lead to a further report to the Executive at the end of this period. The terms negotiated must satisfy the Council's duty to secure the best consideration reasonably obtainable for its land as part of a development agreement covering the whole master plan area.
91. The Council's powers of disposal in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 allow for disposal on terms and conditions which will secure works or buildings appearing to the

Council to be needed for the proper planning of the area and can therefore be based around the delivery of the finally approved master plan.

### Comment - Planning Policy & Research

92. The process for selecting a development and master planning partner and the preparation of a master plan is being carried out with due regard to the Unitary Development Plan. The Canada Water area is designated as a proposal in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (1995) as a site for business, entertainment, housing, shops, ancillary open space and community facilities. In the first deposit draft of the new Unitary Development Plan, the Southwark Plan (2002) the area is designated as an action area.
93. The draft plan notes that: 'Canada Water contains a number of development opportunities of London-wide strategic significance. It has the potential to become an important commercial centre serving the local community and the wider area due to the excellent accessibility it now enjoys through the Jubilee Line. It will also be an important location for new housing.'
94. Draft supplementary planning guidance was prepared to enlarge on the Council's objectives for the area which mainly concerned reconnecting the area with its surroundings to provide an attractive and legible sequence of streets and spaces and a sense of place. the site is also crossed by strategic viewing corridors which protect the view of St. Pauls cathedral from Greenwich Park.
95. Objections have been lodged to the draft Southwark Plan and to the draft supplementary planning guidance and these will be reviewed in the light of these objections. Account will also be taken of the intensive consultation with the local community that has taken place as part of the process to develop the master plan.

### BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Executive Report – Canada Water – Adoption of the Development Brief	Chiltern House	Adam Faulkner
Stage 2 request for further information	Chiltern House	Adam Faulkner
Stage 2 Submissions by Short-list	Chiltern House	Adam Faulkner
Masterplan Submissions	Chiltern House	Adam Faulkner
Canada Water Residents Survey 2003 (MORI)	Chiltern House	Adam Faulkner



## APPENDIX A

### Audit Trail

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Stephen Platts	
<b>Report Author</b>	Adam Faulkner	
<b>Version</b>	FINAL	
<b>Dated</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> July 2003	
<b>Key Decision?</b>	Yes	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Borough Solicitor & Secretary	YES	YES
Planning Policy & Research	YES	YES
<b>Executive Member</b>	YES	YES
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Support Services</b>	21 <sup>st</sup> July 2003	

**APPENDIX B**

**SITE PLAN**

