

**LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES**

**CABINET**

**DATE: 25 FEBRUARY 2003**

**REPORT OF: CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**SUBJECT: TWICKENHAM RIVERSIDE**

**WARDS: TWICKENHAM RIVERSIDE**

**KEY DECISION? Y**

**Agenda Item No.**

**19**

**1. Summary**

This report:-

- Summarises responses to the December 2002 Cabinet Resolutions.
- Considers a number of factors pertinent to the implementation of the long term scheme.
- Provides enhanced designs for the short term scheme for Twickenham Riverside.
- Makes a number of recommendations relating to the short-term scheme, long-term scheme and Twickenham Challenge.

**2. Recommendations**

**That Cabinet:**

- 2.1 Approve the submission of a planning application for the short-term scheme agreed 10 December 2002 (section 3.4).**
- 2.2 Request a report on proposal T1 of the UDP and/or the planning brief for the site for the 25 March 2003 meeting of Cabinet (section 3.5).**
- 2.3 Agree that the principal commercial enabling uses for the long-term scheme will be:**
  - Residential
  - A3 (e.g. restaurant/café uses)
  - A1 – retail**(section 3.7).**
- 2.4 Agree the following further features for inclusion in the long-term scheme to be funded by enabling development:**
  - Piazza and/or square – to differentiate the public open space and promote a viable scheme (section 3.7.3 and 3.2.24)

- **Other “public benefit” within the scheme (e.g. architectural or other features). ( section 3.9.4. refers).**

**2.5 Proceed to a wider competition for a public asset via the Twickenham Challenge, on the terms identified in section 3.9 below.**

**2.6 Agree, in principle, to the reappointment of the Council’s existing external advisors for Twickenham Riverside, with a further report to the 25 March 2003 meeting of Cabinet (section 5.1).**

### **3. Details**

3.1 At its 10 December 2002 meeting Cabinet resolved as follows:-

3.1.1 To pursue long-term scheme which will be lower in scale, designed to satisfy the Council’s wider obligations and which will seek to address the pertinent planning difficulties of previous schemes proposed for the Twickenham Pool Site be pursued.

3.1.2 The fundamental parameters for the long-term scheme be those set by the relevant UDP and other planning policies. The long term scheme will:

- (a) provide commercial enabling development and public open space – with land clearance and landscaping of the site paid for by enabling development; and
- (b) consider the potential / necessity for the implementation of further aspects of the UDP policy T1.

3.1.3 Option B as identified in section 4.25 of the report submitted be pursued in the short term, and the funding of the estimated costs of approximately £505,000 be considered as part of the 2003/4 budget setting exercise, with further details (including any clarifications of revenue costs) being reported to the next appropriate meeting of Cabinet in the context of the overall capital programme.

3.1.4 In order to implement the resolutions, the Council’s existing development brief for Twickenham Riverside (Final Revised B agreed February 2001) will no longer apply.

3.1.5 In accordance with section 3.6 of the report submitted, a further report on taking forward the short and long term schemes be submitted no later than this meeting of Cabinet - including:

- a) detailed designs for the short term scheme;
- b) (for the long term scheme) consideration of mass, scale, uses, risk, procurement method, Council costs, timetable, viability and deliverability, public assets and the points in 3.1.2 (b) above; and
- c) responses from third parties to the “Twickenham Challenge concept

3.1.6 To note that for the avoidance of doubt, and to prevent any potential wasted costs being incurred by third parties, the Cabinet is not seeking further design or scheme proposals for the Twickenham Pool Site (either modifications of previous designs / schemes or new suggestions).

- 3.1.7 A streamlined approach to consultation be adopted and, henceforth, where matters fall within the town planning process, that will be the forum for public feedback. On other matters, as appropriate, Cabinet will identify a time-limited period for comments by interested parties on a particular Cabinet decision.
- 3.1.8 A “Twickenham Challenge” for the potential provision of a public asset within the longer term scheme be pursued. This would be a competitive process to identify and prioritise between the various public asset uses proposed for the site. Initially, Cabinet sought to test public interest in using this approach.
- 3.1.9 Any third party comments on any aspect of the above resolutions be submitted in writing to the Joint Development Manager (PFI & PPP) no later than Friday 17 January 2003. Any comments received to be notified to the next available Cabinet meeting following the closing date.

### **3.2 Submissions received in response to December Cabinet resolutions**

- 3.2.1 By the closing date of 17 January 2003, numerous responses were received. These are at **APPENDIX A**. A summary of key points is provided below and, for each submission, Cabinet is requested to note and consider the material at **APPENDIX A** in the context of any further resolutions on Twickenham Riverside.

#### **3.2.2 Twickenham Riverside Terrace Group (TRTG)**

Following the December 2002 resolutions, TRTG welcomed the Cabinet's proposals to create public access to the site (modelled on its own proposals). Initial (local) press reports also included quotes to the same effect. The TRTG web site was subsequently modified to provide a somewhat bleak artists impression of the TRTG interpretation of the short-term scheme. This appears to be coupled with a belief that TRTG has (by virtue of the proposals considered by the December 2002 meeting of Cabinet) “complied with” or “succeeded” in the matter of the Twickenham Challenge. TRTG made two separate written submissions. Worthy of note is that TRTG has expressed forceful support for the principles of the Council's long-term scheme for Twickenham Riverside. The written submissions also contain a number of points relating to the scheme appraised in the December 2002 report (mostly linked to the appraisal of capital costs) and the Council's proposed short-term scheme.

- 3.2.3 It is understood that TRTG has recently suggested that the proposals rejected by Cabinet in December 2002 should now be implemented as the “final solution” for Twickenham Riverside (although this would preclude the development of the type of long-term scheme envisaged by Cabinet at the same meeting and, significantly, might “prejudice” the fuller implementation of T1). TRTG has also asserted that demolishing the whole pool structure would be more expensive than partial demolition (this assertion is also a feature of other written submissions in response to the December 2002 resolutions). Therefore, to address the key TRTG points as well as other respondents raising these issues, Members are advised:

- That the professional advice (from Council officers at the December 2002 meeting) on the potential capital costs of the proposals still stands. This puts the estimate of the scheme capital costs at least

£302,000 greater than those advised by TRTG and £471,000 more than the current estimated costs of the Council's short-term scheme.

- That full demolition of the pool building facility is less economical than the partial demolition as proposed by TRTG – due to the need to undertake a much more controlled approach to partial demolition (this having recently been confirmed following further expert demolition advice relating to detailed design work for the short-term scheme).
- The partial demolition of the pool building is estimated to cost approximately 50% more than full demolition as proposed by the Council short-term scheme.
- Overall, when comparing the *demolition costs* of the two proposals, the TRTG proposals (as submitted to December 2002 Cabinet) would be in the region of £50,000 more costly than those for the Council's short-term scheme.
- Leaving aside capital cost estimates, in all other respects, the very high levels of risk and uncertainty identified in the December 2002 appraisal of the scheme still stand – as well as the fact that the facilities, which TRTG proposed for the “Lower Embankment”, would be prone to flooding.
- The proposals made no capital allowance for flood defences – presumably with an expectation that the community groups (cited as “potential tenants” of that part of the scheme) would finance this aspect – along with other works to fit out the proposed “shell” structures.

3.2.4 Another suggestion from TRTG is that alternative funding be pursued for a short term scheme (for example, Single Regeneration Budget - SRB) or that the TRTG should be allowed to join with others to reformulate a “viable scheme”. The probability of the site attracting any regeneration funds is so low that this could not, sensibly, be pursued. On the strength of the material submitted by TRTG for the December 2002 Cabinet meeting and the extremely high level of risk and uncertainty within the proposals, Cabinet is once more advised that the pursuit of this scheme cannot be recommended. This advice applies both to “full” or “partial” implementation of the proposals, as the context requires – and in line with the TRTG proposals considered by Cabinet at the December 2002 meeting.

3.2.5 To avoid unnecessary repetition, for each of the submissions made by other interested third parties, where there are similar assertions relating to the previous proposals submitted by TRTG, Cabinet should refer to the advice at section 3.2.3 of this report.

#### 3.2.6 **Strawberry Hill Residents Association (SHRA)**

The Strawberry Hill Residents Association's response is very positive on the long-term scheme and makes several observations linking to explicit features of the planning policy T1 or the site brief for the proposal (notably a desire that the breakthrough from King Street will no longer be pursued and that a long-term scheme could involve the relocation of parking from the embankment and its pedestrianisation. This is a key requirement of the current (planning) site brief for the planning proposal T1.

#### 3.2.7 **Clive Wren**

Mr Wren indicates that he was involved with the TRTG proposals at the outset – but has since had no involvement. His personal submission is highly supportive of the Council's approach to the long-term scheme and the

potential for a reconsideration of the necessity and desirability of pursuing a scheme against the requirements of proposal T1. A number of comments are made relating to the previous TRTG proposal.

#### **3.2.8 Mr Landolt**

Mr Landolt (an ex-Council employee) submitted several landscape architects drawings relating to previous considerations by the Council for the redevelopment of Twickenham Riverside and noted that he would be willing to provide landscape architects services to the Council.

#### **3.2.9 Dawnay Day**

The Dawnay Day response reaffirms the company's interest in pursuing a scheme with the Council and makes a number of suggestions as to how this might happen. The response is significant as it states that the company "has no intention of pursuing an appeal". In general, the letter appears to demonstrate a constructive willingness to reconsider the potential for a joint redevelopment of the Dawnay Day and Council land holdings. Affordable housing and the interests of local residents are identified as being prominent issues. (Members will recall that the absence of affordable housing issue was one of the reasons for the "call-in" of the previous planning application by the Secretary of State).

3.2.10 However, whilst the constructive and forward looking tone of the letter is to be welcomed, Cabinet is advised (and other sections of this report refer), that at this stage it is premature for the Council to interact with any developer until further consideration has been given to a number of fundamental issues which will influence the final form and nature of a long-term scheme (and some of these issues are also identified throughout this report).

#### **3.2.11 Laura Sevenus Swimming School (LSSS)**

LSSS roundly welcomed the December 2002 Cabinet resolutions as demonstrating a strong managerial grip on the challenge of Twickenham Riverside. The school also welcomed the potential for wider participation in the provision of a potential public asset – and has registered an interest in partaking in the Twickenham Challenge. Subsequent to the initial submission, the school was approached by members of TRTG (with TRTG proposing that the school might wish to consider partaking in the TRTG scheme which was not selected by Cabinet at its last meeting). LSSS has notified the Council that it is not associated with TRTG, and that its interest in Twickenham Riverside is solely as a participant in its own right in the Twickenham Challenge - in the context of the Council's long-term scheme. On the face of it, LSSS appears to be considering a proposal which would take responsibility for capital and revenue risks – on the understanding that the Council would be prepared to grant a lease which would support this approach.

#### **3.2.12 Richmond Upon Thames Environment Trust**

Richmond upon Thames Environment Trust has registered a strong interest in participating in the Twickenham Challenge - with a proposed "River Centre". This concept has run through several years of public consultation relating to potential uses of the site. The Trust is proposing that it would take responsibility for capital and revenue risks relating to the establishment of a Centre if the Council in return was prepared to consider the grant of a nominal lease (within the context of a long term scheme).

### 3.2.13 **York House Society**

The submission by the York House Society underscores the previous contribution (in August 2002) made by all of the Twickenham amenity societies (under the auspices of the Twickenham Society Group). The submission emphasises the desire for a long-term scheme to be low in scale, with very high quality architecture and public open space. The Society registers an interest in participating in the Twickenham Challenge (with an initial proposal for a fountain). Importantly, the Society notes that consideration of the “public benefit” in the Twickenham Challenge will need to be tightly integrated with the development of the long-term scheme. On a more cautionary note, the Society asserts that the “public benefit issue” must not, (as happened previously in its view) be allowed to distort or cause the long-term scheme to falter.

### 3.2.14 **Twickenham Society Group (TSG)**

In line with its previous contributions to the debate, the Twickenham Society Group’s (TSG) submissions are largely constructive and usefully analytical. Members will recall that the TSG acted on behalf of all the Twickenham Amenity Societies (as well as a number of individuals) to represent key interest on the matter of Twickenham Riverside.

3.2.15 Whilst making a number of points in relation to the previous TRTG proposals and the short-term scheme, overall, TSG welcomes the abandonment of the previous development brief and strongly endorses the principles adopted by the Council for the long term scheme.

3.2.16 The TSG response on the Twickenham Challenge is particularly constructive, with a number of points identifying risks and interfaces to be managed in the implementation of such a competition. Much of this is broadly in line with the approach to be commended to cabinet for the pursuit of such a competition. However, the Council would also need to consider matters from alternative angles and provide much further detail to prospective participants.

3.2.17 As identified in the December 2002 report, the TSG submission “Rethink on the Riverside” reflected the experience of a number of key stakeholders on this issue.

3.2.18 Taken together, the TSG submissions appear to identify three different roles for TSG (although the membership has not been precisely defined to the Council and certain of its “members” have made independent submissions). These would appear to be:-

- that TSG acts as an “independent body” to advise both participants in the Twickenham Challenge and potential developers (or manages public consultation events etc)
- the TSG acts itself as a developer/scheme sponsor (by referring to the fact that should the Council wish to proceed to a developer competition it would approach a developer to submit a proposal for its own Twickenham Waterfront scheme – as presented to the December 2002 meeting of Cabinet)
- TSG (or certain of its members) may themselves be entrants in the Twickenham Challenge.

3.2.19 Clearly, the expression of strong interest is to be welcomed. However, given the nature of the competitive process envisaged by Cabinet in the

Twickenham Challenge, the strong likelihood that some form of developer competition will occur for implementation of the long-term scheme, and that public feedback will need to be a significant feature of the Twickenham Challenge, it seems improbable that the three roles will be compatible. It is particularly important in the context of competitive processes, that competition is (and is also seen to be) fair and transparent. Equally, it will be of paramount importance to other participants in any competition (whether the Twickenham Challenge or some form of developer competition) that there can be no perception of a “conflict of interest”. The risks appear to be that:

- If TSG acts as an “independent advisory body” (or were to manage public consultation events etc) - other participants in the Twickenham Challenge might perceive that TSG could exert undue influence on the challenge process (itself being a potential participant).
- There is also the question of “independence” itself, and the extent to which members of a “collective” which has had a significant input to the public debate on Twickenham Riverside (for example by forming a group which obtained “Rule 6” status for the purposes of a planning inquiry) might be perceived (by other stakeholders) to be “independent”. This has little to do with espoused views and more to do with perceptions. It may be particularly important if, as seems likely, there is wider interest in the Twickenham Challenge concept.
- Likewise, if TSG itself proposes that it might sponsor a scheme with a developer, other developers in any eventual developer competition might claim that such an advisory role could have provided TSG with unfair advantage.
- Since the TSG appears to be a collective representing both organisations and individuals, there could be the potential for a perception that in either a sponsor/developer role, mediator of consultation or (various) Twickenham Challenge submissions, that the level of role conflict might undermine both the Twickenham Challenge or any developer competition.
- Clearly, there is the potential for all of these issues to overlap.

3.2.20 By introducing the possibility of direct community participation in the development of a public asset, it will be critical to regulate the process in such a way that no party is seen to have any undue advantage or proposed roles which might, in any way, complicate or detract from the process. Additionally, given the potential value of the Council’s contribution in a “Twickenham Challenge” (possibly a long-term lease with a high value for alternative use), the Council will need to be seen to be scrupulously independent in its management and control of the process. Members will appreciate that in these matters, perceptions are frequently as important as the underlying reality.

### 3.2.21 **Mr Sarhage**

Mr Sarhage proposes (if it is not too late in the light of recent Cabinet decisions) the retention of the existing building and its conversion to a hotel. This is certainly novel. However, Cabinet was previously advised that it is virtually inconceivable that the existing building would be retained in the context of a long-term scheme. This is particularly so given apparent public aspirations for the site, the expressed will of the administration to pursue a long-term scheme as defined by the December 2002 resolutions and the thrust of the planning policies for the site. In addition, the hotel concept was rejected by the working parties as previously reported to Cabinet.

### 3.2.22 Mrs Descours/Triber and Co

Mrs Descours expresses interest in running a café at the Riverside. This note can be kept on file and the correspondent appraised of developments. Triber and Co. identifies that its client (Octagon Developments) maintains an interest in potential developments.

3.2.23 Overall, the responses received to the December 2002 resolutions are highly positive. There has been a favourable response to the concept of a Twickenham Challenge – and there have also been a number of “informal” expressions of interest.

3.2.24 A significant number of the responses appear to underscore an emerging consensus that:

- For a lower scale scheme, the provision of a public asset within the long-term scheme will, sensibly, need to rely on external funding other than that which might be provided by the Council or generated within the scheme.
- The overall tone expected of any long-term development is one where quality should predominate.
- The differing features & uses proposed as public benefits or public assets for a long-term scheme lends support to the view that there would be public support for the long-term scheme to include a variety of features or types of open space (as opposed to only open space with soft-landscaping).

### 3.3 Cancellation of Public Inquiry

3.3.1 The public inquiry scheduled for the Dawnay Day scheme was cancelled by the Planning Inspectorate on 16 December 2002. Dawnay Day was notified that this was due to the Inspectorate not having received an Environmental Statement as requested in its letter of 29 November 2002. The Council's decision to terminate negotiations with Dawnay Day may have been a material factor in the company's decision not to proceed with the inquiry.

### 3.4 Enhanced Designs for Short Term Option B

3.4.1 At its December 2002 meeting, Cabinet selected a schematic design for a short term scheme. In summary, the option will provide for the removal of the pool building and its replacement by a hard landscaped garden area, the creation of access through the site from Wharf Lane to the Embankment and a range of soft and hard landscaping features throughout.

3.4.2 Cabinet requested that more detailed designs be submitted to this meeting and these are attached at **APPENDIX B**.

3.4.3 The enhancements to the design since December 2002 include:-

- a raised pathway on the embankment area with seating, soft landscaping and hard landscaping
- the provision of hard landscaped steps linking the embankment with a leisure garden at the Wharf Lane end of the site
- renovation and soft landscaping to the pool footprint
- introduction of children's play areas to Wharf Lane

- fencing, gates and appropriate lighting throughout
  - the introduction of access to the site for people with mobility difficulties
  - where applicable, the retention of existing trees and appropriate planting.
- 3.4.4 The chief feature of the scheme on the embankment is the removal of the existing pool building. Members will recall that even the partial removal of this building has been previously identified in a planning report as a significant improvement to the area. The design allows for a seating area to provide much improved views across the river and to Eel Pie Island. In the context of the Twickenham Festival and other seasonal events, the newly created garden area could significantly improve amenity and functionality. A number of possibilities in this regard could be pursued. The dereliction of the existing building will be replaced by a well lit, landscaped and highly accessible public space. The screening to be provided above the retaining wall on the Embankment will have climbing plants trained on it to provide a “green” screen.
- 3.4.5 The pool building has, for many years, been a focus of vandalism and the redeveloped Embankment will provide a major improvement to the ambience of the Riverside. The area currently attracts significant numbers of informal users (for example, visitors to the draw dock and parents with young children feeding the ducks). The scheme, by virtue of the improved ambience and attractiveness of the area, is intended not only to reinforce but also to increase such informal uses. In particular, during the warmer months, the area is likely to be very well used by those who currently make use of the small open space at the junction of Water Land and the Embankment.
- 3.4.6 The key benefits of the design as it relates to the garden at the Wharf Lane end of the site are that:-
- there will be public access to the site from the corner of Wharf Lane and the service road (including pushchair/wheelchair access at the Wharf Lane/service road junction)
  - as far as practicable, existing trees will be retained with planting designed to compliment that which exists
  - a high level view of the river and Eel Pie Island will be created at the embankment perimeter of the garden
  - there will be 2 new children’s play areas (older children and toddlers) – designed to reinforce existing informal use of the river by parents and children.
- 3.4.7 The scheme also results in a major improvement to the Wharf Lane approach to the river with a range of soft and hard landscaping to replace the currently derelict and rubbish strewn garden area adjacent to the pedestrian walkway.
- 3.4.8 The children’s play areas will include robust play structures using wood, rope and metal as the key materials.
- 3.4.9 The December 2002 Cabinet report noted that for any public open space scheme there might be a degree of security risk (and the higher the quantum of public space created, the greater the probable risk). However, the proposal is designed to provide very well defined open spaces and to restrict access to the Wharf Lane park aspect of the site using robust gating arrangements out of hours. This area will also be securely fenced to a height of 2.4 metres on the perimeter.

- 3.4.10 Distinct from detailed work on this scheme, a separate exercise is recommended to check the security of the existing arrangements at the site (meaning those areas which will not be affected by these proposals). The adequacy of the current arrangements will be reported to Cabinet at a later date and this is considered to be a rational and coherent approach to optimising security of the area overall.
- 3.4.11 There may well be the possibility of introducing further temporary amenities to the site (for example, a café or other temporary facilities). Although there has as yet been no expression of commercial demand for the provision of such facilities, a number of potential options are being explored. However, the scheme does not rely on any assumed income from such facilities and the mention of these options is not intended to raise expectations which might not be met.
- 3.4.12 In December, preliminary consultations had already taken place with the Planning Authority – which expressed the view that the proposals would not appear to prejudice the future implementation of T1. Prior to December 2002, there was also preliminary consultation with the Environment Agency on matters relating to the flood plain – with the Environment Agency indicating that it would give sympathetic consideration to a short-term scheme in this area in relation to a minor temporary increase in the floodplain. More detailed liaison is now underway between the Planning Authority and the Environment Agency – and this will continue if the formal planning application is pursued. In addition, the proposal has been scrutinised by the Planning Authority’s Landscape Architect – with a number of minor recommendations made to enhance the design.
- 3.4.13 Specific security features include:
- Robust gating and fencing to be secured out of hours (to the children’s park area)
  - The play area creates a pre-determined usage designed for particular users
  - Lower areas are designed to minimise the potential for concealment and will also feature low/dense planting
  - The intermediate levels (at either side of the pool footprint) are proposed to provide soft landscaped features only – with dense planting to dissuade unauthorised entry
  - The Embankment area (which will remain open to the public at all times) is designed to:
    - Strike a balance between hard and soft features
    - Provide appropriate lighting.
- 3.4.14 Estimated maintenance costs were previously stated as between £6K - £7.5K per annum and these are still in the process of being clarified. It will be necessary to provide the following for the lifetime of the scheme (expected to be no more than five years):-
- physical cleaning of the site
  - a programme of planned and seasonal maintenance for the soft landscaping
  - planned and reactive maintenance to fencing and hard landscaping.

These will be reported to the March meeting of Cabinet once more detailed work on soft landscaping arrangements is undertaken as well as any necessary liaison with various Council Departments/functions.

- 3.4.15 As the designs stand, there is sufficient detail for the submission of planning applications (both for the scheme itself and a conservation area consent relating to the demolition). Cabinet is recommended to approve the submission of a planning application. As identified in previous reports, and in line with previous planning applications for the site, the application is likely, in the first instance to be referred to the Government Office for London. The fees for submitting an application were identified to Cabinet in the December 2002 report as part of the overall costs. Confidential **APPENDIX C** provides (for Members only) a summary of revised predicted costs (this is confidential since it is not appropriate to reveal commercially sensitive information where a competitive tendering exercise is intended as the procurement method for the works).
- 3.4.16 A capital bid has been submitted to provide the necessary budget for the scheme. Following more detailed design work, the estimated costs of pursuing the scheme are now £480,000 (inclusive).

### **3.5 Necessity and/or desirability of including further aspects of policy T1 in a long-term scheme**

- 3.5.1 Since July 2002, Cabinet has received reports which successively explored deeper levels of the policy framework and commercial process as these related to the redevelopment of Twickenham Riverside. The July 2002 report examined the Dawnay Day scheme in detail. The report also touched on the Council's (landowner) development brief as well as the main planning policy for the site, proposal T1 of the UDP. The December 2002 report examined the development brief in more detail and further considered its links with the T1 planning policy. Ultimately, in resolving to pursue a lower scale scheme, Members resolved to abandon the Council's development brief for the site and to pursue a scheme in line with the planning framework for the site.
- 3.5.2 In the course of the current (landowner) exercise and considering the history of efforts to redevelop the site, a number of issues have been raised which are relevant to the current planning policies for the site, which it would not be appropriate to consider in this report. Members will be aware that the UDP is about to undergo its second review, with an inquiry scheduled for July 2003. Should Members wish to consider the current position regarding T1 (and/or the site brief), Cabinet is recommended to seek a separate report from the Planning Policy Section. To maintain momentum, it is recommended that this report should be submitted to the March 2003 meeting of Cabinet.

### **3.6 Development Issues**

- 3.6.1 Cabinet requested that the following issues be considered in relation to the long-term scheme, mass, scale, procurement method, risks, Council costs. These have been addressed (as the context required) in other sections of the report and sections 3.6 to 3.8 of this report provide further consideration of a number of factors which will influence some (or all) of these variables.

- 3.6.1.1 The fundamentals for a successful long-term scheme include:

- The need for the planning framework to outline clear development principles but not be overly prescriptive, stifling developer design and commercial flair and innovation. Planning obligations should be realistic and clearly defined
- The aspirations of the Council as land owner should be realistic in terms of land value and other benefits derived from the scheme – and Cabinet is advised to take an incremental approach to the development of any requirements in this regard
- The mix of uses and quantum of development will be critical. In particular the balance of uses between those which maximise value (residential, A3/A1) and those which are low/of no value (open spaces, environmental improvements around the site, river related uses which generate no development value, affordable housing)
- The need to build in sufficient contingency – there is a huge range of potential risks to scheme viability, which can be partly reduced by building in appropriate initial contingency levels. Main areas of risk include – planning, occupier market, development cost, inflation, finance.

3.6.2 The most fundamental issue of all is the need to ensure scheme financial viability. Assuming that Cabinet will want to adopt some form of competitive procurement process to implement a long-term scheme, this in turn is linked to development profit.

3.6.3 A lack of profitability is often a major factor preventing investment and the consequent viability problems which results in much urban stagnation. Given that the scheme will be founded on *commercial enabling development*, in the absence of profit, there will be no scheme viability.

3.6.4 For a long-term permanent scheme, the nature of the challenge at Twickenham riverside, even to undertake a relatively modest demolition, site clearance and basic open space landscaping exercise is such that the Council is unlikely ever to be in a position in the future to provide the required capital finance (since, in addition to the minimum works identified above, any planning application for the site might carry a number of planning conditions which might also incur a significant development costs with no consequent development value e.g. s106 schools contribution, general improvements to roads, pavements & embankment in the area etc). These constraints, coupled with the observation that the private sector does not operate from philanthropic motives means that the redevelopment of Twickenham riverside will rely on private sector profitability acting to implement community benefits.

3.6.5 Obviously, it is the role of a developer to incur risks in return for receiving profit. However a clear understanding of these risks and the commercial context in which they are taken is essential to securing the wider community and regenerative benefits underlying the redevelopment of Twickenham Riverside.

### **3.7 Enabling and other Uses**

3.7.1 The Cabinet's resolution to pursue a lower scale scheme and public open space supported by commercial enabling development leads to consideration of those potential uses (as the most basic elements of the scheme) which lend themselves to the most profitable uses at the location at a (relatively) low density.

3.7.2 However, in considering potential land uses within the long-term scheme there are a number of factors which apply. At a high level, these can be summarised as:

Factor	Issues
Planning Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All proposed land uses must be acceptable in planning policy terms UDP proposal T1 sets out the proposed uses for this site</li> </ul>
Legal restrictions on title	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council does not own the whole of the T1 site. If the long term scheme is to include land outside of the Council's ownership then this will require agreement with the adjoining owner or the Council will need to acquire its interest</li> <li>• The Council's title to its own land ownership contains no restrictions on use</li> </ul>
Physical constraints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no physical factors which severely constrain use of the Council owned site although the following will need to be taken into account</li> <li>• The site is relatively small</li> <li>• Access to the site is currently quite restricted (from Embankment &amp; service road).</li> <li>• Site slopes towards river</li> <li>• The site is liable to flood</li> <li>• The site contains trees which may need to be retained in any development</li> <li>• The site backs onto a service yard and service road at the rear of King street</li> </ul>
Market factors/viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A developer will seek to develop land for its most viable and profitable uses.</li> <li>• In the context of this site, there is a need for profitable enabling development to support other uses on the site.</li> <li>• For this site the most profitable and viable uses are private residential and A3 (restaurant/café)</li> </ul>

<p>Political/Public expectations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be clear public and political expectations from any development which will be reflected in a preference/requirement for certain uses and which clearly exist in this case i.e.</li> <li>• Public benefit principally to be public open space – but a fairly bland aspiration</li> <li>• Good interest in Twickenham Challenge - &amp; likely to result in good show of competition</li> </ul>
<p>Synergy of uses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses cannot be considered in isolation. If a mix of uses is proposed then these need to be synergistic i.e.</li> <li>• Housing can provide natural surveillance and significantly revitalise the area – highly profitable use</li> <li>• A3 uses (which may be as profitable as residential) can have a triple benefit – increase usage of area, provide security &amp; “ownership” &amp; if appropriately designed, can optimise use of open space (e.g. with locations next to piazza/market square etc)</li> <li>• A1 – provides balance to a housing/A3 scheme &amp; increases likely footfall.</li> <li>• Taken together, the above 3 combinations provide a mix of enabling uses which (at appropriate levels) can be highly supportive to scheme success</li> </ul>
<p>Lessons from previous schemes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous schemes can provide some useful indicators as to unsuitable uses – cinema, office use, large retail units, health and fitness and hotels have all previously been considered and now rejected (for various reasons).</li> <li>• Careful balance of A3/A1 uses required – integration with overall design/functionality</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open space must be perceived as accessible &amp; significant – and there is long-held public support for a solution which integrates some public space with (e.g.) A3 uses</li> </ul>
--	--

3.7.3 There are limited choices available to secure enabling development of the required value. Therefore, Cabinet is recommended to identify the commercial/enabling land uses for the long-term scheme as being:

- Residential (with flats being the most likely option)
- A3/A1 retail – with a number of restaurant/cafes and a small level of pure retail at locations which will both enhance scheme viability and enable differentiation of public open space within the scheme (e.g. through A3 uses making use of hard landscaped areas to promote year round use)
- Open space – to pursue public open space – and a piazza and/or market square within the scheme to differentiate, provide a variety of architectural textures, to promote the proper use of A3 within the scheme and support the use of these areas for seasonal entertainments or meeting places
- To pursue car parking within the footprint of the development as an aid to viable and successful marketing of the housing within the scheme.

### 3.8 Procurement method

3.8.1 Consideration of the procurement method for the long-term scheme captures a number of variables including:

- The nature of any developer involvement in the process (since the Council could, if it so wished, pursue a scheme acting as the developer)
- The form and scope of any process to select a developer
- The definition of any specification or brief for the scheme (including any mandatory/optional features)
- The nature of any legal transaction to transfer an interest in the council's land – whether by freehold or leasehold and whether applying to the whole of the council's land ownership or only part
- The timing of any such disposal
- The allocation of key scheme risks (or the retention of these by the Council).

3.8.2 In summary, the procurement methods range from:

- Council develops scheme itself – very high degree of control over scheme but very high level of retained risk (planning, exposure to external factors which can impact on viability). This requires the Council to be able to access appropriate levels of finance.
- Council disposes of Freehold interest – development to be controlled by planning policy – simplest option. Minimises commercial risks to Council. Likely to be politically controversial.

3.8.3 Between these 2 extremes there is a very wide range of procurement options with different levels of risk and control for the Council. The key factors are;

- Responsibility for obtaining planning permission

- Point at which Council transfers and receives consideration for land interest
- Level of control required over implementation of development
- Level of control required over future use of development

3.8.4 Each of the above factors is considered in the table below.

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Observations</b>
Responsibility for obtaining planning permission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council could obtain planning permission for a long-term scheme</li> <li>• Marketing a scheme with the benefit of a planning consent to developers could be attractive &amp; perceived to reduce developer risk &amp; therefore, developer profit</li> <li>• However, the Council would be exposed to considerable costs in procuring a consent, which a developer may subsequently wish to substantially amend or may not be able to implement.</li> <li>• The Council could leave it to a developer to obtain planning permission, saving on direct costs, but the developer would reflect these costs and planning risks in its profit requirements. The Council would also (relatively) lose control over the detailed content of the planning application</li> <li>• Planning risk is one generally taken by developers – but uncertainty over planning obligations can put pressure on scheme viability</li> </ul>
Point at which the Council transfers receives consideration for land interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not possible to pursue a commercially enabled scheme without disposing of the Council's land interest – either freehold or long leasehold. With the key issue being timing of the disposal.</li> <li>• The Council will be able to exercise a relatively high degree of control over development prior to disposal of a land interest. Once a</li> </ul>

	<p>land interest has been transferred to a developer, consideration will be received but a level of control will be lost. A developer will not be prepared to commit significant funds to a development without a land interest or certainty that it will receive a land interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are various stages at which the land interest can be transferred (and these can affect the calculation of the consideration received) – at an early unconditional point, on satisfaction of conditions (e.g. grant of planning permission), during development or on completion of development.</li> </ul>
<p>Level of control required over implementation of development and future use</p>	<p>The Cabinet may wish to leave control over development implementation and future use to its planning powers and dispose of its freehold interest in the site at an early stage in the process</p> <p>Alternatively it may wish to exercise greater control over the development by granting a building licence or lease and greater control over future use by granting a lease. In this case the costs to the Council are likely to be greater.</p>

3.8.5 Generally, the issue is one of control contrasted with risk. The more the Council seeks to exercise control of a scheme, the higher the potential risks to be retained by the Council or the higher the costs (potentially abortive) which might be incurred.

3.8.6 Cabinet is advised that it should not seek to pursue a scheme which retains total control. The reasons are:

- The Council will incur heavy costs to procure a scheme – with no guarantee that these can be recovered (e.g. if a planning application fails)
- If there continues to be a measure of developer interest in the site, the benefits of such additional costs probably do not outweigh the risks

3.8.7 Instead, the suggested approach is to:

- (aside from any decisions taken at this meeting), to defer more detailed consideration of the long-term scheme until the Twickenham Challenge is

established – and whilst the short-term scheme is the subject of a planning application

- This does not preclude work “in-house” to consider a number of fundamental issues which may influence further work
- Thereafter, to use the Cabinet reporting mechanism to identify successive options which will build towards the scheme requirements – which would include more detailed consideration of the procurement options alongside further design, uses, locations etc
- Once Cabinet resolves to pursue these (or other) options, to invite comments on the decisions reached within a fixed timescale
- Where applicable, to use the planning process as the key means of consultation
- Ultimately, to pursue some form of developer competition – but to leave the Council’s options open so that the decision can be taken in the light of:
  - The proposals which will go forward to the second stage of the Twickenham Challenge (and their interdependence with more detailed consideration of design issues)
  - An approach to competition which will seek an optimum balance of control, costs and benefits and which has been market-tested with developers in advance to assess its attractiveness/feasibility
  - Prevailing market conditions & other relevant factors.

3.8.8 The Twickenham Society Group (TSG) appears to have withdrawn its scheme (Twickenham Waterfront). However, TSG advises that it would be willing to promote that scheme in a subsequent developer competition. Subject to the concept being compatible with the requirements ultimately agreed by Cabinet, there is no reason that TSG should be excluded from consideration by virtue of TSG representing local people. However, section 3.2.19 refers to potential conflicts of interest which might arise for the group should it wish to proceed on this basis.

3.8.9 The pursuit of a design competition (on its own) is not recommended – since these can result in proposals which are not (from the outset) fully formed against all factors to support a viable and deliverable scheme. This is not to say that the appraisal of design should not be a critical feature of the evaluation of any eventual proposals.

### **3.9 The Twickenham Challenge**

3.9.1 There have been three firm expressions of interest in the Challenge:

- The Environment Trust for Richmond – River Centre
- Laura Sevenus Swim School – baby aqua training. Possibility of wider pool related services to the public.
- York House Society – Fountain.

3.9.2 Additionally, the Twickenham Society Group has indicated that certain of its members are likely to come forward with further proposals. There have also been several “informal” expressions of interest made to elected Members and the PFI office (from community and other organisations who have not yet been involved with Twickenham Riverside). Together, these indicate a significant level of interest and Cabinet is recommended to take the process forward to the next stage – wider competition.

3.9.3 Given the developing debate in the last six months, there are a number of factors which lend weight to transferring the risks for capital and revenue funding for a public asset to the successful proponents of such a scheme. These are:

- Analysis in this report of the issues likely to affect scheme viability and the nature of the relationship between “high cost/low value” elements – broadly the higher the number of such items, the greater the potential risks to the scheme. By definition, a public asset facility is one which will be high cost/low (financial) value.
- The risks identified (by all the Twickenham Amenity Societies in August 2002 and most recently by the York House Society) of the “public asset” issue distorting the overall scheme. Essentially, this appears to be an argument that it is in the best public interest for the site to be appropriately developed – even if this results in only public open space as the most significant “public benefit”.
- Given the potential requirements of a long-term scheme for “softer” public benefits (landscaping, high quality architecture, improvements to the immediate environment, social housing) as well as any planning conditions/section 106 type agreements which might carry a significant cost over and above these – there is a high probability that these features, along with public open space(s) and appropriate enabling development will form the “core” elements of the scheme. As such, the Council would need to ensure that these will be delivered – and if funding responsibility for a “public asset” building is transferred elsewhere, this will (all other things being equal) allocate risks to the parties best placed to manage them.
- On the revenue costs of a public asset – the low probability that the Council would ever (rationally) be in a financial position to make an open-ended commitment to support the running costs.
- Expressions of confidence that it will be possible for participants to raise the necessary capital funds (for example, various proposed funding methods identified in the TSG “Rethink on the Riverside” document).
- The advice provided in the “Rethink on the Riverside” document that, if the Council were prepared to provide a clear indication of its willingness to consider a nominal lease, that this would act as a “lever” for independent funding.
- A rare (and innovative) opportunity to support and encourage social enterprise within the local community – with the prospect of an enduring and well regarded public asset facility within the long-term scheme.

3.9.4 Therefore, Cabinet is recommended to proceed to competition. The key features of the competition should be:

- The potential entrants are those who want to provide a public asset building (with a clearly defined service) within the long-term scheme to redevelop Twickenham Riverside
- “Public asset” means a built structure providing one (or more) defined services to the public (or a specific section of the public)
- The formal competition would (subject to a satisfactory long-term scheme) result in:
  - The grant of a long lease (at a peppercorn) to the successful entrant for the provision of its defined service, within an agreed

- facility, in the long-term scheme (subject to the consent of the Secretary of State and any other necessary consents)
- The obligation on the entrant to raise all capital and revenue funds for the procurement and maintenance of the asset and the service
  - Compliance with a requirement that the proposed facility should occupy no more than 15-20% of the developable footprint owned by the Council (gross measurement). The precise gross measurement is a matter which would be resolved in the light of proposals actually received
  - The location of the proposed facility would need to be compatible with the viability and deliverability of the wider scheme.
- The acceptance by those participating that they will enter into legal agreements with any relevant owners/occupiers in the long-term scheme as deemed necessary to protect the integrity and interests of the wider scheme.
  - Proposals for specific architectural/landscape or amenity features within the scheme (the fountain is an example of one) should be **excluded** from the competition. Instead, this kind of public benefit should be considered at a later date for inclusion in the longer term scheme – and paid for by enabling development. Clearly, there is a degree of public interest in such features.
  - Entry to the competition should be limited to participants with a clear geographical link to the borough as a whole (either resident or working in Richmond).
  - The competition will exclude wholly commercial organisations providing services which are generally widely commercially available.
  - The competition will also exclude the participation of commercial organisations wishing to propose the formation of not for profit entities (whether or not these would be proposed to provide services which are generally widely commercially available).
  - Organisations which are small enterprises (or semi-commercial in nature) and providing a defined public service will be able to participate. Generally, the public service provided should be one which is not widely available (the Laura Sevenus Swimming School is an example).
  - Proposals for services/facilities which will replicate those already available as statutory services in the statutory sectors within the borough will be excluded – to prevent providers of such services seeking to use the competition as a “cheap lease” scheme.
  - In the first instance, the competition should be advertised widely (e.g. local press, notified directly to other community groups etc). This is to elicit wider interest and ensure a wide opportunity for participation.
  - Additionally, there are a number of sections of the community for whom little has been proposed at Twickenham Riverside (youth, sports, the elder community, wider cultural issues). The advertisements will provide concise information considered sufficient to elicit interest from potential participants.
  - Whilst acting in good faith, the Council would not be able to guarantee that it will pursue any of the proposals submitted (one reason being that the transaction would require the approval of the Secretary of State – which, itself, cannot be guaranteed)

- A cut off date for formal expressions of interest should be set (recommended as one month) – after which no further proposals would be considered.
- Following this date, a briefing pack would be sent to all interested parties. The briefing pack will expand on the principles identified in this section of the report and will explain the process to participants. Participants who wish to proceed further will need to provide the Council with basic information about themselves and their proposal.
- A briefing event would also be held for participants to provide further information – to supplement the briefing pack, identify initial queries and assist only serious entrants to remain as participants.
- A key feature of the briefing event will be to begin building a relationship between the Council and participants. Whilst the process will be competitive, it should also be supportive and designed to promote real partnership working (in anticipation of a successful long-term partner providing the public asset).
- There will be a range of further briefing events and detailed dialogue with participants – both to fully finalise the competition procedures in the light of the proposals actually proposed and to ensure that all participants have the opportunity to acquire knowledge, information and skills which will assist in the effective formulation of their proposal.

3.9.5 The methods by which submissions should be evaluated are:

- The successive refinement and application of the appraisal criteria (as used in the December 2002 report) to the proposals as they move from initial concepts through to more worked up schemes.
- Peer review (i.e. entrants to consider each others proposals).
- The selection of a long list of potential schemes to occur no later than 10 December 2003 – with a suggested maximum of no more than 4 schemes to be taken forward to the next stage of the competition – which will occur alongside the managed development of the long-term scheme design.
- (Particularly following December 10 2003) the quality of supporting research and the business plan for the proposal. A number of previous proposals for the site have been highly optimistic.
- Robustness of all assumptions and forecasts linked to the proposal
- Public opinion (with the Council using a range of methods to gather balanced feedback on the proposals).
- The selection of a shortlist of schemes no later than the point at which the Council appoints a developer to procure the long-term scheme. The likely shortlist will be no more than 2 schemes.

3.9.6 Clearly, whilst the proposed approach is innovative (and responsive to community suggestions), an effective outcome will require that serious participants in the process acquire (or have equal access to) a range of knowledge, information and skills to support the development of their proposals. It is also probable that there will be a range of participants with varying levels of expertise and skills.

3.9.7 Therefore, to support participants and to increase the probability of a successful outcome, it is recommended that participants in the process receive expert support from the Council in the following (minimum) areas:

- The application of the appraisal criteria – and other appraisal measures
- The development of “rounded” proposals
- The economics of service delivery

- Fundraising – techniques for developing successful proposals
  - Service management – as applicable to the proposals
  - Basic legal advice as it relates to organisational structures and constitutional arrangements which participants may wish to pursue.
- 3.9.8 The support and advice will be tailored to suit successive stages of the process – with the early stages of advice and guidance likely to be designed to “level up” the knowledge of participants and later stages becoming much more practical. Other topics might also be required.
- 3.9.9 A number of rules and procedures would need to apply to the competition. These can be summarised as:
- Measures to protect the ideas and expertise of the participants to the extent that their disclosure might prejudice their participation
  - Measures and advice to prevent conflicts of interest developing
  - Notification of evaluation procedures at successive stages of the process
  - Communication procedure
  - Confidentiality undertakings – to support the effective development of proposals as these emerge and to protect any commercially sensitive information that needs to be disclosed to participants (this will be a key feature of the process to ensure the compatibility of public asset proposals with the wider scheme in a number of aspects). Also relates to the Council’s ability to release information to the public domain and (e.g.) interaction with the media
  - Relevant indemnities – and the transfer of all appropriate risks for participation to the entrants
  - Disqualification procedures
  - General conduct procedures designed to maintain the integrity of the process and the wider scheme.
- 3.9.10 In conclusion, the Twickenham Challenge will provide the opportunity for members of the community to have a central role in the development of a public asset at Twickenham Riverside. Unlike previous schemes, which were not solicited by the Council, support and guidance can be provided to participants to assist in the formulation of proposals in a regulated manner. Ultimately, the process carries the risk that it may not be possible for any participant to secure the necessary funding. However, this must be balanced with the fact that a number of potential participants have expressed willingness to carry this risk in the interests of securing a lower scale scheme whilst retaining the potential “reward” of a public asset building.
- 3.9.11 Section 3.10 below identifies that the priority before detailed consideration of the design principles for the long-term scheme is to establish the Twickenham Challenge and prioritise the proposals – so that these will be at a sufficiently well developed stage to integrate with those considerations. Until this stage is reached, consideration of the detailed design is premature (save for the basic elements identified elsewhere in this report) – and also runs the risk of incompatibility with the proposals eventually selected to proceed to the next stage of the competition.

### **3.10 Timetable – short-term scheme, long-term schemes and Twickenham Challenge**

3.10.1 A summary spreadsheet at **APPENDIX D (to follow)** provides an overview of the proposed initial timetables for all three elements proposed for Twickenham Riverside.

3.10.2 The two imminent activities are:

- Submission of the planning application for the short-term scheme
- The formal development of the Twickenham Challenge.

3.10.3 Since Cabinet is advised not to make detailed decisions at this stage on the procurement method for the long-term scheme, the timetable for the detailed development of the scheme may be subject to modification.

3.10.4 A significant factor in the structure of the timetable is the potential level of activity which the recommendations in this report could generate for interested third parties. For example, it is conceivable that some organisations (or individuals) might wish to participate in the Twickenham Challenge and make an active contribution to the planning process for the short-term scheme.

## **4. Consultation**

4.1 The following were consulted in the drafting of this report: Director of Finance and Corporate Services, Assistant Head of Legal Services, Planning Policy Manager, Assistant Development Control Manager, and, where applicable, the Council's external advisors (as listed in section 5.3 below)

## **5. Financial Implications**

5.1 The report to Cabinet in December 2002 identified that if Cabinet were to pursue a long-term scheme that costs would be incurred for internal project management and external advice. Internal project management for the long and short term schemes will be undertaken by the Joint Development Manager with an appropriate recharge made for time spent on the projects.

5.2 The Council will continue to need external advice for the development of the long-term scheme.

5.3 For the long-term scheme, the disciplines where advice will continue to be required are:-

- Commercial property advice – market appraisal and assessment, viability assessment, scheme financial appraisal, marketing, commercial negotiations with prospective tenants and / or developers. (Currently provided by Donaldson's).
- Technical advice – scheme technical costs and economics, architectural and other services relating to technical aspects of the scheme and its procurement method. (Currently provided by Dearle and Henderson).

- Legal advice – in relation to the legal aspects of any proposed transaction either with a developer or other parties (and there are a wide number of potential options). (Currently provided by Mayer Brown Rowe and Maw).
- 5.4 The two options open to Cabinet are either to seek new advisors or to re-appoint the existing advisors.
- 5.5 In strict terms, all of the advisors were appointed to work on a scheme other than that which the Council is now seeking. Therefore there is a constitutional case that new appointments should be considered. In addition, a “clean break” with the past will minimise the risk that this issue might be challenged in the future.
- 5.6 Members are well aware of the significance of knowledge of the history of attempts to redevelop the Riverside on the probable success of any future attempt to do so. All of the Council’s external advisors currently have a very high level of experience of the previous attempt to redevelop the site and, as such, are very well placed to advise the Council on future approaches. Additionally, the project team now working on the riverside has formed a close knit working unit and operates very effectively as a multi-disciplinary team. This is amply demonstrated in the cohesion and interdependence shown in the July report to Cabinet analysing the Dawnay Day scheme.
- 5.7 Therefore, it is considered risky and unnecessary to seek new external advisors and, in all probability, any new appointees would have to follow a very steep learning curve to reach the level of tacit knowledge currently held by all of the existing advisors.
- 5.8 Therefore, Cabinet is recommended to agree, in principle, to the re-appointment of the Council’s existing advisors for the procurement of the long-term scheme (and in the case of Dearle & Henderson for the short term scheme). This decision in principle would be subject to full clarification of fee arrangements which will be reported to the March 2003 meeting of Cabinet.
- 5.9 Along with a detailed breakdown of predicted costs, that report will identify measures agreed with each firm to secure value for money in the appointment.
- 5.10 The costs of implementing the short-term scheme were identified at Cabinet on December 10 2002. The scheme is the subject of a capital bid and the current cost estimate for the scheme is £480,000 (inclusive). This is some £25,000 less than the figure identified to the December 2002 Cabinet. The costs for this scheme are being accounted for separately from those that will be incurred for the long-term scheme. The costing assumes that planning consent is received by August 2003 and that works are complete by March 2004.
- 5.11 It is recommended that the Council’s development costs for the long-term scheme should be recovered from the scheme (but detail will be provided in the March Cabinet report). The Director of Finance and Corporate Services suggests that, pending the recovery of costs from a completed long-term scheme, that these be funded from the Local Infrastructure Fund.

## **6. Policy and Equality Implications**

- 6.1 This report builds on the previous policy decisions of Cabinet to procure long and short-term schemes for Twickenham Riverside. In addition, a number of points relating to the policy framework for a scheme have been identified. The pursuit of the Twickenham Challenge on the terms identified is designed to ensure:
- fullest participation
  - partnership working with members of the local community
  - the provision of targeted advice and support to participants to promote equality of access to the competition
  - a fair and transparent approach to the conduct of the process.

## **7. Background Papers**

- Urgency Committee, 13 June 2000
- Resources Committee, 16 October 2000, 4 December 2000, 12 February 2001
- Cabinet, 28 May 2002, 25 June 2002, 30 July 2002, 12 November 2002, 10 December 2002

## **8. Contacts**

Gillian Norton. Chief Executive.  
020 8891 7908. [g.Norton@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:g.Norton@richmond.gov.uk)

Tom McKeivitt. Joint Development Manager PFI & PPP.  
020 8891 7970 [t.mckevitt@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:t.mckevitt@richmond.gov.uk)