

**RUNNYMEDE REGENERATION PROGRAMME
INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN COMPETITIVE DIALOGUE
("ITPD")**

VOLUME 4: BID DELIVERABLES AND EVALUATION

CONTRACT REFERENCE: RBC/RRP/2015/101

NOVEMBER 2015

Table of Contents

1.0 VOLUME 4 - PURPOSE	3
1.1 Submissions Required at ITPD, ITCD and Final Tender Stages.....	3
Submission A: Quality Submission.....	5
Submission B: Commercial Submission.....	5
Appendix 3 – Certificates.....	5
2.0 GUIDANCE NOTES TO BIDDERS.....	6
Invitation to Participate in Dialogue Submission (ITPD).....	6
The ITPD Submission.....	6
Bidder's Responsibility	6
Completeness of Information.....	7
Right to Copy.....	7
Withdrawing from the Tender Process	7
Bidder Selection	7
What is the Council seeking to be demonstrated by the Bidders response?	7
3.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA & SCORING.....	9
Evaluation methodology	9
Evaluation Criteria and Weightings	9
Compliance.....	9
Scoring	9
Table 1: Scoring methodology.....	9
Scoring each question and weightings.....	10
Scoring each sub-criterion.....	10
Quality Submission standard at ITPD Submission stage	10
Commercial Submission standard at ITPD Submission stage	10
Evaluation Team.....	11
Table 2: Evaluation Criteria and Weightings	12
Table 3: Questions Bidders are required to answer at the ITPD Submission stage.....	17
1. Quality Submission.....	18
2. Commercial Submission.....	39
Appendix 1 – Financial Model.....	54
Financial Model	54
Professional Fees Template.....	54
Appendix 2 Certificates for completion by Bidders	55
CERTIFICATE OF NON - CANVASSING	56
CERTIFICATE OF NON- COLLUSION	57
Appendix 3 Form of Tender Template	58

1.0 VOLUME 4 - PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to provide Bidders with sufficient information to enable the Bidders to collate and submit the proposals and information required by Runnymede Borough Council to review and evaluate at this stage of the procurement.

This Volume should be read in conjunction with Volume 1 (*Introduction and Overview*), Volume 2 (*Technical Specification*) and Volume 3 (*Legal Documentation*). Please also refer to the Glossary of Terms in Appendix 4 (*Glossary of Terms*) of Volume 1 (*Introduction and Overview*).

The purpose of this ITPD Submission stage is to provide Bidders the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of and approach to some of the key issues related to the delivery of the Council's objectives and programme. The Council will use the responses to the questions raised in this ITPD to establish those approaches and proposed solutions of the Bidders that score highest and to select those Bidders to whom the ITCD will be issued.

It is the Council's intention to issue the ITCD to a **maximum of three Bidders**.

The ITPD Submission stage will last approximately nine weeks. Bidders will be required to submit written responses to the ITPD Submission requirements for consideration by the evaluation panel against a scoring matrix. The ITPD Submission requirements are set out in this document and will require Bidders to provide responses to questions relating to the following areas:

1.0 Quality Submission:

- 1a. Development Business Plan and Operational Capability.
- 1b. Understanding the opportunity and approach to deliver maximum regeneration potential in the context of the objectives of the programme.
- 1c. Approach to deliverability of design quality, innovation & sustainable development.
- 1d. Community engagement and consultation.

2.0 Commercial Submission:

- 2a. Bidder's Commercial Structure;
- 2b. Acceptability of consortium structure, guarantees and supply chain relationships
- 2c. Acceptability of legal documentation and approach to risk transfer.
- 2d. Ability of the Bidder to demonstrate best value including through supply chain procurement.
- 2e. Expected internal rate of return and profit expectation.
- 2f. Acceptability of the financial offer including fee structure and returns to the Council.
- 2g. Financial Model for the Initial Sites / Initial wrapper of sites.

In order to support the responses made to the ITPD Submission requirements, Bidders should make full use of the information contained in Volumes 1- 3 of this ITPD.

The ITPD Submission requires concise, honest and factual responses which clearly reflect the Bidder's position. The ITPD Submission, therefore, provide Bidders with the opportunity to present their case for being selected for the shortlist of Bidders to whom the ITCD will be issued.

1.1 Submissions Required at ITPD, ITCD and Final Tender Stages

Bidders invited to submit the ITPD Submission are required to respond in writing to all of the ITPD Submission requirements set out below. These answers should be self-contained and should not rely upon any information submitted at the PQQ stage of the procurement. For the ITCD Submission and Final Tender the same approach is required.

To ensure a fair and even-handed assessment, please answer the ITPD Submission/ITCD Submission/Final Tender Submission requirements in the correct order, using the same numbering scheme, and using no smaller than Arial font, point 11 size.

Any financial references should be in Pounds Sterling.

Answers should not exceed the written page limits indicated of 80 x A4 pages. Bidders should be aware that the page limit is a maximum and Bidders are encouraged to be concise and efficient in their responses whilst fully addressing the questions.

The page limit does not prevent the inclusion of A4, A3, A2, A1 or A0 building designs, plans, financial spreadsheets or similar information and excludes annexes containing reference material. Neither does the page limit include the return of marked up responses to the legal documents in Volume 3 (*Legal Documentation*).

Other than the exception described above, any additional information provided for example brochures, marketing materials, etc. and not requested by the ITPD Submission/ITCD Submission/Final Tender Submission, or submissions in excess of the maximum space allowed will be removed prior to distribution to the Evaluation Team.

Completed responses should be signed by a partner or director of the Bidder and, in the case of a consortium, by a partner or director of each member.

Bidders must submit 4 hard copies and 1 copy in electronic format on a memory stick submitted with the hard copies. Memory sticks should be virus scanned and correctly formatted with a contents page and list of all files to provide ease of navigation through the files.

In the event of discrepancy, the hard copy will take precedence.

Submissions **must be contained in a plain sealed envelope or box** bearing the following words:

“CONFIDENTIAL – [ITPD/ITCD/FINAL TENDER]¹ Submission for the Runnymede Regeneration Programme

OJEU REFERENCE NUMBER: [Please insert the reference number]”

The envelope must not bear any name or mark (including a franking mark) indicating who the sender or Bidder is.

Hard copy responses should be sent to:

**Democratic Services
Runnymede Borough Council
Station Road
Addlestone.
Surrey KT15 2AH**

ITPD Submission Responses by:

13:00 hours on 1st April 2016

ITCD Submission Responses by:

13:00 hours on 24th June 2016

Final Tender Responses by:

13:00 hours on 5th August 2016

The Council reserves the right, at its discretion, to reject bids delivered after the date and time specified. Please see Volume 1: Appendix 1 (*Important Notices*).

The Council reserves the right, at its discretion, to request clarifications in writing or further relevant information from any Bidder after the submission of responses.

The Council reserves the right, at its discretion, to amend the dates of when submissions are required. In which case affected Bidders will be given at least 28 days notice of the change.

¹ Please delete as appropriate

Submission A: Quality Submission

An outline submission is required to respond to the requirements of this ITPD in relation to Quality. This is:

1.0 Quality Submission

- 1a. Development Business Plan and Operational Capability.
- 1b. Understanding of the opportunity and approach to deliver maximum regeneration potential in the context of the programme objectives.
- 1c. Approach to deliverability of design quality, innovation & sustainable development.
- 1d. Community engagement and consultation.

This response will be evaluated and reference shall be made to adequacy thresholds.

Submission B: Commercial Submission

An outline submission is required to respond to the requirements of the [programme and the] Development Agreement in relation to the following commercial areas:

2.0 Commercial Submission:

- 2a. Acceptability of the Council's Objectives.
- 2b. Acceptability of consortium structure, guarantees and supply chain relationships.
- 2c. Acceptability of legal documentation and approach to risk transfer.
- 2d. Commercial Strategy
- 2e. Ability of the Bidder to demonstrate best value including through supply chain procurement.
- 2f. Expected internal rate of return and profit expectation.
- 2g. Acceptability of the financial offer including fee structure and returns to the Council.
- 2h. Financial Model for the Initial Sites / Initial wrapper of sites.

Please note, Financial Template in Appendix 2 (as an Excel File) should be used by the Bidder without alteration of the formatting, The Form of Tender Template in Appendix 3 should be fully completed and returned as part of the ITPD Commercial Submission.

Appendix 3 – Certificates

The Certificates in Appendix 3 (*Certificates for completion by bidder*) should be completed in accordance with the instructions and returned with the each Submission.

2.0 GUIDANCE NOTES TO BIDDERS

The Bidder is required to provide two submissions – Quality and Commercial. Each of these is intended to lever best value for money by aligning the Council's Objectives as set out in Paragraph 3.1 (*The Council's Regeneration Objectives*) of The Template Development Business Plan in Volume 3 (*Legal Documentation*) with the objectives, capacity and capabilities of the supplier market, through the Competitive Dialogue process.

Further details of the requirements are presented in Volume 1 (*Introduction and Overview*).

Invitation to Participate in Dialogue Submission (ITPD)

The ITPD Submission

The ITPD Submission should, in its entirety, comprise:

- Submission A: Quality Submission;
- Submission B: Commercial Submission and Appendices 1 - 2.

Bidders should note that in order to demonstrate the options for both the Egham Leisure Centre and Egham Gateway Phase 1, further versions of the financial model are provided. These should be completed at the ITPD Submission stage and the data used to inform the Programme Business Plan, but with the preferred option used in the main financial model. For the ITCD Submission and Final Tender Stages, the Council will have agreed its preferred option and so only the main financial model will require completing.

In addition to the two main submissions, the following are required:

- Form of Tender – complete the template in Appendix 3 (*Form of Tender Template*);
- A statement confirming the Bidder's submission remains open for acceptance by the Council for a period of not less than nine (9) months from the submission date;
- A statement acknowledging and accepting that the information contained in the bidder's submission may be disclosed under FOIA without consulting the Bidder, or following consultation with the Bidder and having considered its views.

It is anticipated that the ITCD Submission and Final Tender submission will follow the same format but bidders will be advised further at the submission stage for these further stages.

Bidder's Responsibility

It is the Bidder's responsibility to ensure its response:

- Observes the numerical sequence of the questions and correctly correlated to the questions in this Volume;
- Responds to all the questions in English and using British Pounds Sterling;
- Provides the best response to the questions, financial model, etc.;
- Observes the page number limits for the submission;
- Observes the labelling and delivery requirements;
- Observes the advice and requirements presented in Volume 1 (*Introduction and Overview*) and this Volume 4 (*Bid Deliverables and Evaluation*) in relation to document formats and formatting;
- Is received by the Council on time;
- Confirms acceptance of the tender validity period to be nine (9) months and the Council's obligations to comply with the FOIA.

Completeness of Information

The Bidder shall note when preparing its response that the Council cannot assess the submission using any information not supplied by the Bidder in response to this process.

The Bidder shall not assume that the Council will be supplementing the content of the Bidder's submission with any information that may already be in the Council's possession, except where the Council have stated they will be using information in the public domain.

Each Bidder should note when preparing its response that the Council shall not evaluate the Tender submissions using any information supplied by the Bidder outside of this Tender Process.

Right to Copy

The Council shall have the right to reproduce copies of any Tenders for the purposes of Tender evaluation.

Withdrawing from the Tender Process

If on consideration of any Tender invitation documents, a Bidder decides that it cannot submit a Tender, for whatever reason, the Bidder shall write to the Project Director, Mr J N Rice via e-mail to RRP@runnymede.gov.uk in accordance with the letter of invitation to participate in this stage of the procurement process. In their response, the Bidder must provide a clear statement that all electronic and hardcopy versions of Tender documentation have been deleted and/or destroyed as applicable.

Bidder Selection

Following the Tender assessments, the evaluation panel shall consider which Bidder's offer provides the most satisfactory submission based on achieving the minimum threshold scores and total scores achieved in the Evaluation process.

Up to three Bidders will be invited to go through to the ITCD stage of the Tender Process.

What is the Council seeking to be demonstrated by the Bidders response?

Volume 2 (*Technical Specification*) sets out requirements concerning the Bidder's technical compliance. Typically, the Council would seek to identify the Bidder's approach to meeting or exceeding the specified standard for the Development Agreement. Bidders are actively encouraged to be innovative both with their designs and commercial offer.

In evaluating the Bidder's Submission, the Council will seek evidential material and/or a credible management commitment to identify that the Bidder, amongst other things:

- Seeks to optimise the commercial benefits of projects to the Council both in terms of revenue generation and growth in the capital value of the asset;
- Operates an open and collaborative style of working reflective of a partnering culture built around openness, honesty, and a high level of trust;
- Demonstrates an appreciation/understanding of the Council's requirements and the needs of a partner who operates in a political and public service environment;
- Is commercially astute with strong but equitable financial returns to both the Council and the Bidder;
- Maintains suitably qualified and/or experienced employees at all levels and relevant to the requirements of the Development Business Plan (Volume 3);
- Complies with or betters the technical specification (Volume 2) and approaches used in the legal documentation (Volume 3);

- Operates a strategy to drive continuous improvement through the elimination of duplication, waste and inefficiencies together with the adoption of new technology and work practices that improve reliability and reduces whole life costs;
- Operates a clear and well thought out contract/project management structure;
- Manages a well-structured supply chain that is fully committed to the objectives of the programme;
- Maintains sufficient resource from inception through to complete delivery of the Development Agreement;
- Can meet the indemnity, insurance, and parent company backing requirements necessary to undertake the Development Agreement;
- Operates using clear and well thought out Method Statement(s), Health and Safety plan(s), Quality plan(s), and Quality procedures adapted to reflect the Development Agreement's requirements at various stages through its life cycle; and
- Seeks to maximise the benefit of regeneration for communities and for growth in the economy in Runnymede.

3.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA & SCORING

Evaluation methodology

Following compliance checks, each Bid will be evaluated according to its quality and deliverability. “Deliverability” refers to the likelihood that all aspects of a particular submission (including time, specification and cost) could in fact be delivered by the Bidder concerned.

The ITPD Submission will be measured from Bidders’ responses to the questions in Table 3 and related information in Appendix 1 (*Professional Fees Template*) and Appendix 2 (*Cost Templates*) using quantitative and qualitative criteria.

Evaluation Criteria and Weightings

The evaluation criteria and weightings that will be applied by the Council when evaluating the ITPD Submission and final tenders are shown in Table 2 (*Evaluation Criteria and Weightings*). Bidders should note that different weightings will be applied at ITPD Submission and final tender stage as shown in the Table 2 (*Evaluation Criteria and Weightings*).

Compliance

Prior to carrying out the detailed scoring of bids, an assessment of the Bidders’ responses to the bid deliverables at each stage of the procurement will be made to ensure that sufficient information at the required standard has been provided as requested. Bids which are substantially incomplete or which are non-compliant with the requirements set out in this ITPD may be rejected.

The Council reserves the right to call for additional information from Bidders to clarify their Bid responses.

Scoring

The OJEU contract notice confirmed that bids will be assessed on the basis of the most economically advantageous tender. Within this, the Council will need to demonstrate the receipt of Best Value for any disposal of land or other property assets in accordance with Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 and Circular 06/03: Local Government Act 1972 and general disposal consent (England) 2003 disposal of land for less than the best consideration that can reasonably be obtained.

The scoring of Bids will be based on a detailed analysis of the responses for each question in accordance with Table 1 below.

Table 1: Scoring methodology

Quality & Commercial Submission		
Score	Rating	Basis for Awarding Score
0	Unacceptable	The information is omitted/no relevant details provided.
1-2	Poor	The response addresses some parts of the question but contains insufficient detail or explanation to evidence the Bidder’s achievements and technical capability in this market and relevance to the Council’s requirements.
3-4	Fair	The response addresses most parts of the question and lacks details in some aspects but provides some evidence of the Bidder’s achievements and technical capability in this market and relevance to the Council’s requirements.

5 - 6	Satisfactory	The response addresses all aspects of the question in sufficient detail and shows relevant evidence of the Bidder's achievements and technical capability in this market and relevance to the Council's requirements.
7 - 8	Good	The response addresses all aspects of the question very well and shows considerable relevant evidence of the Bidder's achievements and technical capability in this market and relevance to the Council's requirements.
9 - 10	Excellent	The response addresses all aspects of the question extremely well and in detail and shows extensive relevant evidence of the Bidder's achievements and technical capability in this market and relevance to the Council's requirements.

Scoring each question and weightings

Each question has been allocated a weighting. The weighting used varies from 1 (baseline) to 5 (high significance). Table 2 provides full information on the weightings being applied to each question at ITPD and Final Tender Submission stage.

Each question is scored using the scoring methodology in Table 1 above, the score awarded is then multiplied by the weighting to provide the actual weighted score.

Scoring each sub-criterion

Scoring each sub-criterion will be undertaken by taking the total of the actual weighed scores for each question (within the sub-criterion section), and then dividing the total by the total available (Maximum Score) to create a weighted average score for each sub-criterion. This score is used to determine if the minimum score threshold of 40% has been achieved and recorded as a pass/fail.

The weighted average score for each sub-criterion is then converted to create the actual percentage for the sub-criterion.

This process will create a percentage score for each of the Quality and Commercial Submissions, which together will provide the total percentage score achieved by the Bidder.

Bidders will then be ranked in line with their scores and the highest bidders who are offering the most economically advantageous tender will be invited to continue dialogue.

Quality Submission standard at ITPD Submission stage

It is expected that Bidders shall achieve a score equating to at least **"FAIR" (>40%) for each sub-criterion** in the Quality Submission for their submission to be considered compliant.

Commercial Submission standard at ITPD Submission stage

It is expected that Bidders shall achieve a score equating to at least **"FAIR" (>40%) for each sub-criterion** in each of Parts 2a, 2b and 2c. of the Commercial for their submission to be considered compliant.

The Council reserves the right to reject any ITPD, ITCD or Final Tender submission and exclude a Bidder from any further dialogue in the event a Bidder fails to achieve a score of more than 2 in response to any question or 40% for each sub-criterion.

Bidders are further reminded that any qualifications made by them to the terms forming part of this complete submission may lead to their submission being rejected.

Evaluation Team

Evaluation and selection will be undertaken by the Evaluation Team which shall comprise of:

- The Project Director – Head of Commercial Services RBC;
- The Project Manager – Housing Enabling & Regeneration Manager, RBC
- Corporate Head of Finance, RBC;
- Assistant Solicitor, RBC;
- Legal Advisors from Sharpe Pritchard LLP;
- Property & Valuation Advisors from Colliers International LLP;
- Chief Executive, Achieve Lifestyle Leisure Trust.

The Council reserves the right to reduce or increase the size and individuals in the Evaluation Team and to seek further specialist advice where required. However, the Council will ensure that the Evaluation Team is consistent for all bidders.

Table 2: Evaluation Criteria and Weightings

ITPD / Final Tender Evaluation Criteria and weightings				
		Weighting ITPD		Weighting Final Tender
1.	Quality Submission	60%	Applicable Questions	40%
	Sub-Criteria			
	1a. Development Business Plan and Operational Capability	30%	1.1 - 1.7	25%
	1b. Understanding of the opportunity and approach to deliver maximum regeneration potential in the context of the programme objectives	35%	1.8 - 1.16	30%
	1c. Approach to deliverability of design quality, innovation & sustainable development	25%	1.17 – 1.21	40%
	1d. Community engagement and consultation	10%	1.22	5%
		100%		100%
		Weighting ITPD		Weighting Final Tender
2.	Commercial Submission	40%	Applicable Questions	60%
	Criteria Sub Criteria			
	2a. Acceptability of the Council’s objectives	5%	2.1	5%
	2b. Acceptability of consortium structure, guarantees and supply chain relationships	5%	2.2 – 2.4	5%
	2c. Acceptability of legal documentation and approach to risk transfer	20%	2.5	25%
	2d. Commercial Strategy	15%	2.6 – 2. 8	15%
	2e. Ability of the Bidder to demonstrate best value including through supply chain procurement	15%	2.9 - 2.15	10%
	2f. Expected internal rate of return and profit expectation	10%	2.16 - 2.17	10%
	2g. Acceptability of the financial offer including fee structure and returns to the Council	10%	2.18	15%
	2h. Financial Model for the Initial Sites / Initial wrapper of sites	20%	2.19	15%
			100%	

Analysis of weightings			
ITPD		Final Tender	
% of Quality Criteria	% of Total Score	% of Quality Criteria Score	% of Total Score
30%	18%	25%	10%
35%	21%	30%	12%
25%	15%	40%	16%
10%	6%	5%	2%
100%	60%	100%	40%
ITPD		Final Tender	
% of Commercial Criteria	% of Total Score	% of Commercial Criteria	% of Total Score
5%	2%	5%	3%
5%	2%	5%	3%
20%	8%	25%	15%
15%	6%	15%	9%
15%	6%	10%	6%
10%	4%	10%	6%
10%	4%	15%	9%
20%	8%	15%	9%
100%	40%	100%	60%

ITPD Score Weightings			ITPD									
		ITPD Sub Criterion Weighting	Actual Score (illustrative)	Score weighting	Maximum Weighted Score	% of sub Criterion	Actual weighted score	Total Sub-Criterion	Weighted Sub-criterion	Sub Criterion actual %	Pass/Fail	
1. Quality Submission	60%											
	1a. Development Business Plan and Operational Capability		30%									
		1.1		10	2	20	8.70%	20				
		1.2		10	2	20	8.70%	20				
		1.3		10	5	50	21.74%	50				
		1.4		10	5	50	21.74%	50				
		1.5		10	3	30	13.04%	30				
		1.6		10	3	30	13.04%	30				
		1.7		10	3	30	13.04%	30				
						230	100.00%		230	100	30.00	100
	1b. Understanding of the opportunity and approach to deliver maximum regeneration potential in the context of the programme objectives		35%									
		1.8		10	5	50	16.67%	50				
		1.9		10	5	50	16.67%	50				
	✔	1.10		10	3	30	10.00%	30				
	✔	1.11		10	4	40	13.33%	40				
	✔	1.12		10	5	50	16.67%	50				
	✔	1.13		10	4	40	13.33%	40				
	✔	1.14		10	2	20	6.67%	20				
	✔	1.15		10	1	10	3.33%	10				
	✔	1.16		10	1	10	3.33%	10				
						300	100%		300	100	35.00	100
	1c. Understanding of the opportunity to deliver quality, innovation & sustainable development		25%									
	✔	1.17		10	2	20	13.33%	20				
	✔	1.18		10	5	50	33.33%	50				
	✔	1.19		10	3	30	20.00%	30				
✔	1.20		10	2	20	13.33%	20					
	1.21		10	3	30	20.00%	30					
					150	100%		150	100	25.00	100	
consultation												
✔	1.22	10%	10	3	30	100.0%	30					
					30	100%		30	100	10.00	100	
Quality Submission total score (%) =										100.00		

2. Commercial Submission			40%	ITPD								
			ITPD Sub Criterion Weighting	Actual Score (illustrative)	Score weighting	Maximum Weighted Score	% of sub Criterion	Actual weighted score	Total Sub-Criterion Scores	Weighted Subcriterion Score	Sub Criterion actual %	Pass/Fail
2a. Acceptability of the Council's objectives			5%									
	2.1			10	3	30	100.00%	30	30	100	5.00	100
						30	100%					
2b. Acceptability of consortium structure, guarantees and supply chain relationships			5%									
	2.2			10	3	30	30.00%	30	100	100	5.00	100
	2.3			10	3	30	30.00%	30				
	2.4			10	4	40	40.00%	40				
						100	100%					
2c. Acceptability of legal documentation and approach to risk transfer			20%									
	2.5			10	5	50	100.00%	50	50	100	20.00	100
						50	100.00%					
2d. Commercial Strategy			15%									
	2.6			10	1	10	10.00%	10	100	100	15.00	100
	2.7			10	5	50	50.00%	50				
	2.8			10	4	40	40.00%	40				
						100	100.00%					
2e. Ability of the Bidder to demonstrate best value including through supply chain procurement			15%									
	2.9	✔		10	4	40	20.00%	40	200	100	15.00	100
	2.10	✔		10	3	30	15.00%	30				
	2.11	✔		10	3	30	15.00%	30				
	2.12	✔		10	1	10	5.00%	10				
	2.13	✔		10	3	30	15.00%	30				
	2.14	✔		10	3	30	15.00%	30				
	2.15	✔		10	3	30	15.00%	30				
						200	100.00%					
2f. Expected internal rate of return and profit expectation			10%									
	2.16	✔		10	2	20	40.00%	20	50	100	10.00	100
	2.17	✔		10	3	30	60.00%	30				
						50	100.00%					
2g. Acceptability of the financial offer including fee structure and returns to the Council			10%									
	2.18	✔		10	5	50	100.00%	50	50	100	10.00	100
						50	100.00%					
2h. Financial Model for the Initial Sites / Initial wrapper of sites			20%									
	2.19	✔		10	5	50	100.00%	50	50	100	20.00	100
						50	100.00%					
Commercial Submission total score (%) =											100.00	
Total Score (60% Quality/40% Commercial) = 100.00												

Final Tender Score Weightings			Final Tender								
		Final Tender Sub Criterion Weighting	Actual Score (illustrative)	Score weighting	Maximum Weighted Score	% of sub Criterion	Actual weighted score	Total Sub- Criterion Scores	Weighted Subcriterion Score	Sub Criterion actual %	Pass/Fail
1. Quality Submission	1a. Development Business Plan and Operational Capability	25%									
		1.1	10	2	20	8.70%	20				
		1.2	10	2	20	8.70%	20				
		1.3	10	5	50	21.74%	50				
		1.4	10	5	50	21.74%	50				
		1.5	10	3	30	13.04%	30				
		1.6	10	3	30	13.04%	30				
		1.7	10	3	30	13.04%	30				
					230	100.00%		230	100	25.00	100
		1b. Understanding of the opportunity and approach to deliver maximum regeneration potential in the context of the programme objectives	30%								
		1.8	10	5	50	18.52%	50				
		1.9	10	5	50	18.52%	50				
	✓	1.10	10	0	0	0.00%	0				
	✓	1.11	10	4	40	14.81%	40				
	✓	1.12	10	5	50	18.52%	50				
	✓	1.13	10	4	40	14.81%	40				
	✓	1.14	10	2	20	7.41%	20				
	✓	1.15	10	1	10	3.70%	10				
	✓	1.16	10	1	10	3.70%	10				
					270	100.00%		270	100	30.00	100
		1c. Approach to deliverability of design quality, innovation & sustainable development	40%								
	✓	1.17	10	2	20	13.33%	20				
	✓	1.18	10	5	50	33.33%	50				
	✓	1.19	10	3	30	20.00%	30				
	✓	1.20	10	2	20	13.33%	20				
		1.21	10	3	30	20.00%	30				
				150	100.00%		150	100	40.00	100	
	1d. Community engagement and consultation										
✓	1.22	5%	10	3	30	100.00%	30				
				30	1.00		30	100	5.00	100	
Quality Submission total score (%) = 100.00											

2.	Commercial Submission	60%	Final Tender Sub Criterion	Final Tender							Sub Criterion actual %	Pass/Fail
				Actual Score (illustrative)	Score weighting	Maximum Weighted Score	% of sub Criterion	Actual weighted score	Total Sub-Criterion Scores	Weighted Subcriterion Score		
	2a. Acceptability of the Council's objectives	5%		10	3	30	100.00%	30	30	100	5.00	100
	2b. Acceptability of consortium structure, guarantees and supply chain relationships	5%				30	100.00%					
	2.2			10	3	30	30.00%	30				
	2.3			10	3	30	30.00%	30				
	2.4			10	4	40	40.00%	40	100	100	5.00	100
	2c. Acceptability of legal documentation and approach to risk transfer	25%				100	100.00%					
	2.5			10	5	50	100.00%	50	50	100	25.00	100
	2d. Commercial Strategy	15%										
	2.6			10	1	10	10.00%	10				
	2.7			10	5	50	50.00%	50				
	2.8			10	4	40	40.00%	40	100	100	15.00	100
	2e. Ability of the Bidder to demonstrate best value including through supply chain procurement	10%										
	2.9			10	4	40	20.00%	40				
	2.10			10	3	30	15.00%	30				
	2.11			10	3	30	15.00%	30				
	2.12			10	1	10	5.00%	10				
	2.13			10	3	30	15.00%	30				
	2.14			10	3	30	15.00%	30				
	2.15			10	3	30	15.00%	30	200	100	10.00	100
	2f. Expected internal rate of return and profit expectation	10%										
	2.16			10	2	20	40.00%	20				
	2.17			10	3	30	60.00%	30	50	100	10.00	100
	2g. Acceptability of the financial offer including fee structure and returns to the Council	15%										
	2.18			10	5	50	100.00%	50	50	100	15.00	100
	2h. Financial Model for the Initial Sites / Initial wrapper of sites	15%										
	2.19			10	5	50	100.00%	50	50	100	15.00	100
Commercial Submission total score (%) =											100.00	
Total Score (40% Quality/60% Commercial) =											100.00	

Table 3: Questions Bidders are required to answer at the ITPD Submission stage

Instructions: In formulating the response, bidders should use the main criteria headings (Quality Submission / Commercial Submission) and the number and heading of each sub-criterion. However, if the question is included then the question plus the headings will NOT count toward the number of pages or word limit.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
Quality Submission	1a. Development Business Plan and deliverability of the Bidders development programme	1.1	<p>Development Business Plan</p> <p>At ITPD Submission, Bidders should propose their criteria to be used for the prioritisation and phasing of site developments and timescales for the <u>completion of the programme of Initial Sites and longer term sites</u>. Bidders are requested to present in the form of a phased plan broken down into the short term, medium term and long term with timescales clearly stated.</p> <p><i>For the purpose of the response to Question 1.1, Bidders are to assume that so long as Planning Guidelines have been taken into account, Planning Permission will be granted within the statutory timescales for determination. N.B. All Council sponsored site development has to be determined by the Planning Committee.</i></p> <p>In the ITCD Submission and then the Final Tender, Bidders will be required to propose a phased Development Business Plan (Volume 3 provides the Template Development Business Plan) broken down into the short term, medium term and long term <u>completion of the programme of sites</u>. This will include the quarterly funding required throughout the Programme (monthly for the Initial Sites at ITCD and Final Tender stages).</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
		1.2	<p>Resourcing the Plan</p> <p>Bidders should explain their proposals for how the Development Business Plan will be resourced, for example, the level and type of staff employed directly, the professional team and consultants.</p> <p>Where a consortium arrangement is proposed Bidders are requested to submit as part of their response an organisational structure diagram which demonstrates the role of each bidder but also how the following key roles will be delivered and by who overall and where relevant for each site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Creation and delivery of the Development Business Plan; ii. Robustness of the whole professional team and the resources to handle multiple projects and uses; iii. Team-working experience of the professional team and a team work statement; iv. Development Management Practice statement; v. Construction Management Practice statement; vi. The site development role and relationship to the construction delivery role; vii. Client Assurance/CDM Principle Designer role (Initially the Council or its appointee will provide the Principle Designer role, but on appointment the Preferred Bidder will be expected to deliver the Principle Designer Role on behalf of the Council) and details of the organisation and arrangements for health and safety both across the professional team and on site construction; viii. Construction provider.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
		1.3	<p>Egham Gateway Phase 1</p> <p>The Egham Gateway Phase 1 site forms part of the Egham Master Plan described in Volume 2 (<i>Technical Specification</i>). Furthermore, the Council has aspirations for more students from the nearby Royal Holloway University to live in the Town, preferably in bespoke student accommodation. However, the Council is also seeking to optimise the commercial value of the Egham Gateway Phase 1 site development together with the benefits for place shaping the Town and supporting the local economy.</p> <p>Bidders are required to provide a high level options appraisal for the potential redevelopment of the Egham Gateway Phase 1 site and to recommend the preferred solution with the evidence to support the choice. The appraisal should consider the life expectancy of each option together with full life costs.</p> <p>Bidders should provide early design ideas for the development together with Bidder's early proposals for the redevelopment of the site by preparing an Indicative Site Development Plan and outline design to RIBA Stage 2. Designs will need to specify the outline site layout, the number and layout of units.</p> <p>At the ITCD Submission stage and then the Final tender stage, an Initial Site Development Plan for the agreed option will need to be fully developed into an Initial Site Development Plan with design towards RIBA Stage 3 and an associated financial model. Please note, the Initial SDP will incorporate proposals for 168, High Street and 8 Station Road North and 10 to 18 Station Road North as relevant.</p> <p>Volume 3 (<i>Legal Documentation</i>) provides the Site Development Plan Template for use at each stage of the dialogue process.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
		1.4	<p>Egham Leisure Centre</p> <p>The Council need to either develop a new leisure centre or fully refurbish the existing Egham Leisure Centre. However, the Council wants to provide at least a 25m, 8 lane swimming pool and a learner's pool in either the refurbished or new facility. The current preference is for a new purpose built building.</p> <p>Bidders are invited to prepare an options appraisal for refurbishment compared to a new build facility and to recommend their preferred solution with the evidence to support the choice. The Appraisal should consider the projected annual revenue income and the capital value of the site, life expectancy of each option together with full-life costs.</p> <p>If a new build solution is proposed, the preferred option is to develop the new facility on the same site whilst keeping the current Leisure Centre fully operational. Refurbishment would also need to maintain the operational use of the site so far as this would be reasonable having regard to the work required. If a full or partial closure is required, Bidders should propose how temporary arrangements will be provided to ensure continued operation of the facilities.</p> <p>Bidders should provide early design ideas for the suggested options together with Bidder's early proposals for the redevelopment of the site by preparing an Indicative Site Development Plan and outline design to RIBA Stage 2. Designs must specify specify the outline site layout, the location of the facilities together with how the existing land occupied by the Leisure Centre will be redeveloped. Furthermore, bidders shall provide each option with the essential facilities only and a further option with all of the desirable facilities also.</p> <p>At the ITCD Submission and then the Final Tender stage, an Initial Site Development Plan will need to be developed for the chosen option (new build or refurbishment and essential only or with desirable facilities) into an Interim Site Development Plan with design towards RIBA Stage 3 and an associated financial model.</p> <p>Volume 3 (<i>Legal Documentation</i>) provides the Site Development Plan Template for use at each stage of the dialogue process.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
		1.5	<p>Egham Gateway Phase 2</p> <p>In the medium term, the Council want to either develop Egham Gateway Phase 2 site (1-39 The Precinct, and Tudor Court, High Street, Egham) or to refurbish the existing Precinct. But a number of competing factors require careful consideration when formulating development plans. For example, these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Commercial & residential units provide substantial rental income for the Council; b. Commercial Tenants have leases with a range of expiry and review dates; c. The commercial units are generally too small to attract strong covenant commercial operators; d. The building forms a gateway entrance to Egham High Street; e. The external appearance of the Precinct is dated and has a generally unattractive concrete frame design; f. The Council has ambitions to improve the retail and cultural offer of Egham Town Centre, but cannot allow both ends of the High Street to be developed at the same time. <p>Refer to Volume 2 (<i>Technical Specification</i>) / Data Room for more information.</p> <p>Bidders are invited to prepare an Indicative SDP and outline designs to RIBA Stage 2 with an options appraisal for a partial or complete refurbishment and a partial or complete redevelopment of 1-39 The Precinct, and Tudor Court, High Street, Egham and to recommend their preferred solution with the evidence to support the choice.</p> <p>The appraisal should consider the annual revenue income (current, during works and future), the current and future capital value of the site, life expectancy of each option, together with full-life costs. Bidders should explain how existing tenants will be managed during the redevelopment/refurbishment. Bidders should also explain the potential for linking Egham Gateway Phase 1 with Egham Gateway Phase 2 together with any added value or savings associated with redeveloping both sites in a phased but linked arrangement.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
			At the ITCD Submission and then the Final Tender stage, the Indicative Site Development Plan will need to be fully developed for the chosen option and an associated financial model.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
		1.6	<p>Addlestone TWO</p> <p>The Council want to capitalise on the regeneration benefits created by Addlestone ONE through the redevelopment of the site on the opposite site of Station Road (Addlestone TWO). Volume 2 describes the layout and ownership of this site, but of special relevant is that the NHS have a number of primary care activities located on the site. A further issue will be to effectively manage any response to the closure of the Eileen Toser Day Centre and relocation of services nearby.</p> <p>Bidders are invited to prepare proposals for redeveloping the site, which take into account the planning and general community benefit requirements to maintain the NHS services in the immediate locality. Options should include considering relocating the NHS services into the Civic Centre and any other suitable nearby buildings as well as re-provision on the site. The NHS and voluntary sector services will need to remain fully operational during the redevelopment of the site. Bidders are requested to explain how service provision and continuity will be maintained throughout the redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>Bidders should provide early design ideas for the suggested options together with early proposals for the redevelopment of the site by preparing an Indicative Site Development Plan and outline design to RIBA Stage 2. Designs will need to specify the outline site layout, the number and layout of units.</p> <p>At the ITCD Submission stage and then the Final Tender stage, the Indicative Site Development Plan will need to be developed into an Interim Site Development Plan with design towards RIBA Stage 3 and an associated financial model.</p> <p>Volume 3 (<i>Legal Documentation</i>) provides the Site Development Plan Template for use at each stage of the dialogue process.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
		1.7	<p>Addlestone THREE</p> <p>Addlestone THREE will be the redevelopment of the social housing site located off Garfield Road and behind the Addlestone ONE Development. As the majority of the residential units provide good levels of amenity and repair (all meeting the Decent Homes Standard) the Council wants to redevelop the garage sites and bungalows whilst improving the external appearance of the remaining units and the recreational amenities of the estate. Where practical, the cost of Addlestone THREE should be self financing through incorporating residential units for sale or rent either at full market or affordable rent levels. The Council will not provide any subsidy to create affordable units.</p> <p>Bidders should provide early design ideas for the redevelopment of the site by preparing an Indicative Site Development Plan and outline design to RIBA Stage 2. Designs will need to specify the outline site layout, the number and layout of units.</p> <p>At the ITCD Submission and then the Final Tender submission, the Indicative Site Development Plan will need to be developed into an Interim Site Development Plan with design towards RIBA Stage 3 and an associated financial model.</p> <p>Volume 3 (<i>Legal Documentation</i>) provides the Site Development Plan Template for use at each stage of the dialogue process.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
	1b. Understanding of the opportunity and approach to deliver maximum regeneration potential in the context of the programme objectives.	1.8	<p>Addlestone Town Centre and Egham Town Centre Regeneration</p> <p>Bidders should provide proposals to take forward the regeneration of Addlestone and Egham Egham Town Centres within the context of the proposed Development Agreement.</p> <p>In particular, Bidders should provide a vision for the regeneration of both the Addlestone and Egham Town Centres.</p> <p>The vision for each Town should be supported by evidence for how the vision can be realised having regard to the current land/property owned by the Council, opportunities to extend ownership through voluntary and compulsory acquisition, relevant legislation, and financial viability. Bidders should also explain their proposed role and contribution to achieving each vision. The response should contain timescales for both Bidders actions and overall delivery of the regeneration.</p> <p>When responding to this question at ITPD Submission stage, Bidders are encouraged to supply concept drawings and high level project plans which explain phasing.</p> <p>When responding to this question at ITCD Submission stage and Final Tender, Bidders are encouraged to supply concept drawings and high level project plans which explain phasing, appropriately updated from the ITPD Submission stage to reflect dialogue and the responses to other questions in this Volume 4.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
		1.9	<p>Egham Gateway Phase 1 - construction</p> <p>Bidders should state their proposed method of construction, the proposed height(s) of the development and the construction footprint for the Egham Gateway Phase 1 development.</p> <p>Bidders should provide early design ideas for the suggested options together with Bidder's early proposals for the redevelopment of the site by preparing an Indicative Site Development Plan and outline design to RIBA Stage 2. Designs will need to specify the outline site layout, the number and layout of units.</p> <p>The design work should incorporate the second site to the West of Station Road North comprising 8 and 10-18, Station Road North both with and without the use of the road, but also providing for the construction of the development in two phases.</p> <p>At the ITCD Submission and then the Final Tender stage, the Indicative Site Development Plan will need to be fully developed into an Interim Site Development Plan with design towards RIBA Stage 3 and an associated financial model.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
		1.10	<p>Egham Gateway Phase 1: Added Value of 168, High Street Egham</p> <p>Bidders are required to explain the benefit of including 168, High Street Egham in the Egham Gateway Phase 1 development compared to retaining and refurbishing the existing building for the continued commercial use on the ground floor with eight residential apartments above (in accordance with the existing planning permission). For the purpose of responding to this question, Bidders should assume that the Council will complete the refurbishment and the units be available for letting by 31/12/2016.</p> <p>In responding to the question, Bidders should demonstrate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The commercial benefit to the Council from including 168, High Street in the Egham Gateway Phase 1 Development, compared with retaining and refurbishing the existing building over 15, 20, 25 and 40 year periods both in terms of annual revenue income and the capital value of the site; ii. The additional place shaping benefit secured through including 168, High Street in the overall development, compared with retaining and refurbishing the existing building; iii. The benefit to the local economy in Egham through including 168, High Street in the overall development, compared with retaining and refurbishing the existing building. <p>Bidders should note, that subject to dialogue and responses to this question from Bidders, the Council will determine at the ITPD Submission evaluation stage if 168, High Street, Egham will form part of the Development or withdrawn.</p> <p>As the inclusion of this site will be resolved following the ITPD Submission stage, this question will not be scored at the Final Tender stage.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
		1.11	<p>Egham Gateway Phase 1: Added Value of 8 and 10-18 Station Road North</p> <p>The Council has secured the agreement to acquire the following two properties:</p> <p>8, Station Road North, Egham – this is a two storey double fronted Victorian property with a single storey rear extension. The building previously had a retail unit at the front facing onto Station Road North with residential above and to the rear. The building is Grade II listed and in the Egham Town Centre Conservation Area, but currently due to its state of disrepair and being out of use distracts from the visual amenity of the Area. The building is therefore in need of refurbishment and improvement to make it available for modern use. The property currently generates no income and has an empty property NNDR liability of £6,532.25 per year but with a listed building exemption.</p> <p>10-18, Station Road North, Egham – this is a two storey detached property with commercial units on the ground floor and the first floor. The building is in a generally good condition and occupies a strategically located corner plot adjacent to Church Road in Egham. The property has an ERV of £114,000 and a passing rent of £80,650.</p> <p>The purpose of acquiring both properties is to secure additional land that will substantially improve the place shaping opportunity created by redevelopment but also to add capital and revenue value to the development. To optimise these benefits, the Station Road North tributary road between the properties should preferably be closed and included in the development of the r/o 8 (the garden area) and 10-18, and if possible including crossing Station Road North to join with the eastern site across the road. If one or both sections of road are included, then the pedestrian access routes to the Town will be maintained.</p> <p>The tributary of Station Road North has largely unregistered title but with a small strip of land adjacent to 10-18 owned by Surrey County Council (SCC). Once the ownership of this land has been achieved the Council intent to secure confirmation of the ownership of the Road from the Land Registry. Then the Council will need to seek a stopping up order from SCC.</p> <p>If discussions with SCC fail to reveal the owner of the land, the Council has agreed to consider using its compulsory purchase powers. Case law determines that to</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
			<p>progress a CPO the Council must have a current planning permission, the resources to develop the site and demonstrable commitment to proceed without unnecessary delay. So at this stage, progressing a CPO is not possible but to help prepare for a CPO and provide confidence of the Council's intent to Bidders during the Runnymede Regeneration Programme procurement, it would be helpful for the Council to have determined in principle its willingness to use CPO powers as necessary. The outcome of the procurement will then produce designs towards RIBA Stage 3, which will be used in the planning application and so, after due process and confirming the resources, if required the Council will have the evidence required to support CPO action.</p> <p>Obtaining the road is not critical for redevelopment but the symbiotic benefits are clear. As an alternative, either 10-18 could remain and operated commercially or redeveloped as a site to secure a higher density of development and associated improved capital and revenue value. As with the main Egham Gateway site, the initial preference for redevelopment would be to provide commercial units at ground level with bespoke student accommodation over the higher three storeys.</p> <p>Whilst 8 Station Road North cannot easily be demolished and redeveloped due to its listing, pre-application advice from Planning officers with the previous owner was sympathetic towards refurbishing the existing building with potentially some rear extension to support residential units. The Council will proceed to initially secure Listed Building Consent and planning permission for a commercial unit at ground level and residential accommodation at first floor level. The construction work will be excluded from the Runnymede Regeneration Procurement.</p> <p>Whilst the property ownership is secured, resolving the ownership of the road and securing a stopping up order to close the road introduce some uncertainty to the timescale to progress this element of the site. So Bidders are encouraged to develop the vision for the combined site and then consider two design and construction approaches – with the land currently forming the road and without.</p> <p>When responding to this question at ITPD Submission stage, Bidders are required to supply an Indicative Site Development Plan with concept drawings at RIBA Stage 2. The response should explain how this additional site would add value to the main Egham Gateway Phase 1 site, both with the land currently forming the</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
			<p>road and without the road. Plans should allow for the construction of the development in two phases to allow for the time required to obtain the road and so bidders should explain how the site will be phased.</p> <p>When responding to this question at ITCD Submission stage and Final tender stage, bidders are required to supply an Interim Site Development Plan for the Egham Gateway 1 site with designs approaching RIBA Stage 3 drawings and the project plan to take forward both elements of the development (the main site and this added site).</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
		1.12	<p>Egham Leisure Centre - construction</p> <p>Bidders should state the suggested method of construction, the proposed height(s) of the development and the construction footprint for the Egham Leisure Centre (refurbishment or new building).</p> <p>Bidders should provide early design ideas for the suggested options together with Bidder's early proposals for the redevelopment of the site by preparing an Indicative Site Development Plan and outline design to RIBA Stage 2. Designs will need to specify the outline site layout, the number and layout of units.</p> <p>At the ITCD Submission stage and then the Final Tender stage, the Indicative Site Development Plan will need to be fully developed into an Initial Site Development Plan with design towards RIBA Stage 3 and an associated financial model.</p>
		1.13	<p>Egham Leisure Centre: Operational Costs</p> <p>Bidders should state how their design is cost effective to operate and in particular, how they have assessed "costs in use" of the completed Egham Leisure Centre building.</p> <p>Bidders are asked to provide costed options for how operational costs can be minimised.</p> <p>The Council is especially interested to consider heating and cooling systems that minimise the use of energy and operational costs.</p> <p>At the ITPD Submission stage, bidders are asked to provide the costings for both the essential and desirable amenities and just for the essential amenities.</p> <p>At ITCD Submission and Final Tender stages, bidders are asked to present the information for the preferred option agreed with the Council.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
		1.14	<p>Egham Gateway Phase 2 - construction</p> <p>Bidders should state the suggested method of construction, the proposed height(s) of the development and the construction footprint for the Egham Gateway Phase 2 regeneration project in the context of the options created in response to 1.5 above.</p> <p>At ITPD Bidders should provide early construction design ideas for the options for the redevelopment of the site by preparing an Indicative Site Development Plan and outline design to RIBA Stage 2. Designs will need to specify the outline site layout, the number and layout of units.</p> <p>At the ITCD Submission stage and then the Final Tender stage, the Indicative Site Development Plan and the associated financial model will need to be further developed to reflect the outcome of the competitive dialogue and the Council's preferred option.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
		1.15	<p>Addlestone TWO - construction</p> <p>Bidders should state the suggested method of construction, the proposed height(s) of the development and the construction footprint for the Addlestone TWO regeneration project.</p> <p>Bidders should provide early design ideas for the suggested options together with early proposals for the redevelopment of the site by preparing an Indicative Site Development Plan and outline design to RIBA Stage 2. Designs will need to specify the outline site layout, the number and layout of units.</p> <p>At the ITCD Submission stage and then the Final Tender stage, the Indicative Site Development Plan and the associated financial model will need to be further developed to reflect the outcome of the competitive dialogue.</p>
		1.16	<p>Addlestone THREE - construction</p> <p>Bidders should state the suggested method of construction, the proposed height(s) of the development and the construction footprint for the Addlestone THREE regeneration project.</p> <p>Bidders should provide early design ideas for the suggested options together with Bidder's early proposals for the redevelopment of the site by preparing an Indicative Site Development Plan and outline design to RIBA Stage 2. Designs will need to specify the outline site layout, the number and layout of units.</p> <p>At the ITCD Submission stage and then the Final Tender stage, the Indicative Site Development Plan and the associated financial model will need to be further developed to reflect the outcome of the competitive dialogue.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
	1c. Approach to deliverability of design quality, innovation & sustainable development.	1.17	<p>Design Approach</p> <p>How will you as the development partner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Adopt innovative design techniques both to enhance the appearance of buildings together with the construction methods used? b. Use innovative design and / or construction methods reduce the construction cost and/or the time to construct the development? c. Balance the competing interests of environmentally sustainable development versus optimising the level of financial return for each Project? <p>What will be your approach to including the Council in Reviewing Design Data during the construction of developments?</p>
		1.18	<p>Building Information Modelling</p> <p>Bidders should state if they are planning to use Building Information Modelling (BIM) for the construction of the Initial Sites and if so what additional value it will bring to the project?</p> <p>If BIM is not used, please explain why not and the alternative method(s) adopted?</p>
		1.19	<p>Design Quality</p> <p>Bidders should explain their approach to design standards and quality and how Bidders will ensure they meet and indeed exceed the relevant Council objectives.</p> <p>The Council would prefer the Developer to provide zero tolerances on the GIA and NIA of commercial developments, the number of seats in a cinema, the number of rooms in a hotel and the number and size of rooms in residential units. Bidders should propose their design standards and tolerances which must not exceed a maximum of +/- 3%.</p> <p>Proposals should also contain the remedies for not achieving the agreed level of tolerance in a completed construction.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
		1.20	Achieving Quality Standards Bidders should demonstrate how they define and meet minimum quality standards in the construction of buildings by type: housing and affordable homes; commercial, student accommodation, and leisure centres.
		1.21	Fire Safety Strategy: Sprinklers and Mist Systems At ITPD Submission stage, Bidders should explain their approach to fire safety. In particular Bidders should explain how they have integrated sprinklers or mist systems into building design and construction together with any innovation they have used to reduce the cost of sprinkler / mist installations. At the ITCD Submission and Final Tender Stages Bidders will need to provide RIBA Stage 3 detailed design, systems and costed proposals for sprinkler or mist system installations in the two Initial Sites (Egham Gateway Phase 1 and the Egham Leisure Centre).

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
1. QUALITY SUBMISSION			
	1d. Community engagement consultation and benefit	1.22	<p>Community engagement consultation and benefit</p> <p>Bidders should demonstrate with examples how they engage with wider stakeholders and the community (specifically to deliver the requirements of this Programme) in order to take into account their views, the acceptability of the development schemes and how they are delivered?</p> <p>Bidders should also explain how they will contribute towards employment, skills development and training.</p> <p>At the ITCD Submission stage and Final Tender stage Bidders will need to provide a detailed programme for community engagement, consultation and delivering community benefit from developing the two Initial Sites (Egham Gateway Phase 1 and the Egham Leisure Centre).</p>

This page is intentionally blank

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION			
Commercial Submission	2a. Acceptability of the Council's Objectives	2.1	<p>Acceptance of the Council's Objectives</p> <p>Please confirm that you accept the Council's Objectives as set out in Paragraph 3.1 (<i>The Council's Regeneration Objectives</i>) of The Template Development Business Plan in Volume 3 (<i>Legal Documentation</i>) and that you will accept a legally binding obligation in the Development Agreement that you and any person to whom you delegate service provision to deliver these objectives.</p> <p>Bidders to highlight any matters not accepted and why.</p> <p>Note: Bidders to note that in confirming acceptance, this will be scored as meeting the Council's expectations (score 10) and this is a maximum score available for this question.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION			
	2b. Acceptability of consortium structure, guarantees and supply chain relationships	2.2	<p>Structure for delivering the Development Business Plan</p> <p>Please set out your constitutional structure about how your organisation is able to work together efficiently and effectively to fully deliver the Development Business Plan over the 8-year period and any extension of that period. In particular, if a special purpose vehicle is to be created, please provide details of the company type (LLP, Limited company by shares, etc.) ownership, governance, funding and how parent company guarantees will be structured.</p> <p>In the case of a Consortium arrangement, please confirm how the consortium will achieve the Council's Regeneration Objectives (as set out in Paragraph 3.1 (<i>The Council's Regeneration Objectives</i>) of The Template Development Business Plan in Volume 3 (<i>Legal Documentation</i>)). In the ITPD Submission this can be in the form of a structure chart and agreed Heads of Terms. For the ITCD Submission and Final Tender a copy of the binding legal arrangements between the consortium members is required.</p> <p>Where Bidders are proposing a supply chain as part of their consortium/team, they should give details of the individual members of that supply chain and the proposed roles and responsibilities of each member, their capacity, how appointments will be made and over what period.</p>
		2.3	<p>Third Party developers / contractors</p> <p>Where the intention is to engage third party developers or contractors, please provide details on how the supply chain will be managed, best value secured and integrated with the Bidding organisation to ensure the efficient and effective delivery of the Development Business Plan.</p> <p>The cost of overheads and profit should be provided for all parties both individually and collectively as a percentage of the overall project cost.</p> <p>In the ITPD Submission an overview of the arrangement and proposals is required. For the ITCD Submission and Final Tender a procurement policy and process is required and Bidders should also indicate, for each project site, the anticipated percentage of construction work that will be completed by the bidder itself and the percentage of construction work that will be completed by third parties.</p> <p>It is not the number of sub-contractors to be used which will be evaluated but, for example, the way the supply chain is created and then managed.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION			
		2.4	<p>Parent company guarantees / Collateral Warranties</p> <p>Bidders must confirm the availability of appropriate parent company guarantees (or other guarantors – please specify) and should clearly identify which entity will provide such guarantees and the covenant strength of such entity.</p> <p>Please confirm that as a minimum collateral warranties will be provided from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal construction company; • Architect; • Employer's Agent; • Quantity Surveyor; • Subcontract packages; • EIA disciplines; • Structural Engineer; • Steelwork designer (where relevant); • Building Services Engineers; • Independent Certifier; • Any other sub-consultant Bidders or the Council consider to be relevant. <p>Bidders should confirm their acceptance of the template collateral warranty document or detail any proposed changes with an explanation of why the changes are necessary.</p> <p>Responses will be scored by considering the completeness of collateral warranty arrangements, the timing for having the warranties in place and how the bidder makes arrangements to provide the warranties for secondary purchasers like affordable housing providers.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION			
	2c. Acceptability of legal documentation and approach to risk transfer.	2.5	<p>Accepting the Development Agreement</p> <p>Bidders should confirm their acceptance of the principles and approach that the model framework seeks to establish as set out in the Development Agreement included in Volume 3 (<i>Legal Documentation</i>).</p> <p>At ITPD Submission stage, Bidders need to identify any comments they have on the key commercial elements of the Development Agreement. These comments can be provided either by way of a mark-up of the actual specific clauses in the Development Agreement or by way of a separate legal commentary but must explain the rationale for seeking any amendments.</p> <p>A revised Development Agreement MAY be issued at the ITCD stage but the overall structure of the framework set out in the draft Development Agreement included in Volume 3 (<i>Legal Documentation</i>) will be retained.</p> <p>During the ITCD stage each of the remaining Bidders will be required to provide a detailed mark-up of the Development Agreement which will be the subject of dialogue to achieve an “agreed” version by the closure of the ITCD stage. Bidders will be expected to include this agreed version of the Development Agreement as part of their Final Tender submission which upon a Bidder being awarded Preferred Bidder status, will represent the legally binding version of the Development Agreement.</p> <p>The evaluation of Bidders’ comments on the Development Agreement at ITPD, ITCD and Final Tender stage will be assessed against the following key areas all of which will carry equal weight:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ the extent to which any proposed changes impact on timings for the delivery of the Development Business Plan including satisfaction of any conditions precedent or the bringing forward of sites for development; ➤ the extent to which any proposed changes introduce additional risk for the Council or seek to transfer the risk profile as set out in the Development Agreement;

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION			
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ the extent to which any proposed changes impact on the degree of involvement and levels of control the Council are seeking at all stages in the delivery of the Development Business Plan; ➤ the extent to which any proposed changes would be detrimental to the achievement of the Council's Regeneration Objectives (as set out in Paragraph 3.1 (<i>The Council's Regeneration Objectives</i>) of The Template Development Business Plan in Volume 3 (<i>Legal Documentation</i>)); ➤ the extent to which any changes impact on termination or step-in rights for the Council; ➤ the extent to which any proposed changes seek to alter the overall structure and framework for delivery of the Development Business Plan as set out in the Development Agreement.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION			
	2d. Commercial Strategy	2.6	<p>Acceptance of key documents</p> <p>Bidders are required to confirm acceptance of the following templates contained at Volume 3 (<i>Legal Documentation</i>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Business Plan Template; • Site Development Plan Template. <p>Bidders must highlight any omissions or additions they would wish to make to these documents with an accompanying explanatory memorandum of any matters not accepted and any drafting changes.</p>
		2.7	<p>Development Business Plan</p> <p>Bidders are asked to complete the Development Business Plan (DBP) for all sites but with greater detail for the initial sites (Egham Leisure Centre and Egham Gateway Phase 1. The DBP should integrate fully with the Financial Model.</p> <p>For the ITPD Submission the DBP will be indicative but for the ITCD Submission and Final Tender the final DBP should be prepared. In addition to the financial information and associated site feasibility, other key components for the Council in evaluating the Development Business Plan will be the phasing / timing of developing out the five sites and any policies / procedures identified by the Developer for securing and optimising value for money.</p> <p>Bidders' Development Business Plans will be assessed at each stage of the dialogue. Whilst the final Development Business Plan will be a contractually binding document, the Development Agreement will provide for the Development Business Plan to be reviewed annually and adjusted by mutual agreement.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION			
		2.8	<p>Site Development Plans (SDPs)</p> <p>Site Development Plans must be provided as follows:</p> <p>ITPD Submission</p> <p><i>Indicative SDPs:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Egham Leisure Centre; • Egham Gateway Phase 1; • Egham Gateway Phase 2; • Addlestone TWO; • Addlestone THREE. <p>ITCD Submission/Final Tender</p> <p><i>Interim SDPs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Egham Leisure Centre; • Egham Gateway Phase 1; <p><i>Indicative SDPs:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Egham Gateway Phase 2; • Addlestone TWO; • Addlestone THREE. <p>As with the DBP, each SDP should directly correlate with the information used in the Financial Model and link into the DBP.</p> <p>Bidders will be scored on the competence and robustness of their SDPs but also having regard to innovation and the level and accuracy of information, analysis and proposals.</p> <p>The Interim and Indicative SDPs will be contractually binding documents, but the Council recognises that each SDP will require finalisation and further development to secure planning permission, Section 106 / CIL requirements, etc.</p> <p>Bidders are expected to use reasonable endeavours to ensure their SDPs are accurate and truly reflect site conditions and development requirements.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION			
	2e. Ability of the Bidder to demonstrate best value including through supply chain procurement	2.9	<p>Demonstrating Value for Money</p> <p>With reference to the Initial Sites and future pipeline opportunities, demonstrate Bidders should demonstrate how they will achieve initial and on-going value for money for the duration of the Development Agreement through:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The supply chain and procurement processes; 2. Fixing the percentage structure and quantum of professional fees; 3. Materials procurement and economy of scale; 4. Fixed percentage overheads and profit. <p>A key consideration of the Programme will be to contain both development and construction cost inflation. Bidders are asked to propose how this will be achieved throughout the delivery of the Initial Sites and the Development Business Plan.</p>
		2.10	<p>Professional Fees</p> <p>Please complete the template provided in the Financial Model which sets out professional fees for each type of development.</p> <p>Caveats and other relevant assumptions (for example, annual uplifts) should be clearly stated. It is proposed that this worksheet will represent the mechanism for benchmarking professional fees throughout the period of the Development Business Plan and as such Bidders should set out the proposals in response to this question for how this containment of costs will work in practice.</p> <p>Bidders should populate the table in the Financial Model for both Egham Gateway and Egham Leisure Complex and add where appropriate professional disciplines that have been or will be used that have not already been identified.</p> <p>In addition to the cost of professional fees, Bidders should also explain in response to this question how their professional team has been selected having regard to the specialist types of developments being proposed, for example building a leisure centre and mixed use commercial and student accommodation.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION			
		2.11	<p>Value Engineering</p> <p>With reference to both the Egham Gateway Phase 1, and Egham Leisure Centre projects, please set out options, supporting assumptions and caveats to value engineer the developments in terms of total costs versus the quality of the final building.</p> <p>Present a cost plan to support the analysis and provide a menu of options for consideration during the Competitive Dialogue process. Of direct relevance is the essential and desirable list of facilities required at the Egham Leisure Centre. Clearly the Council would prefer to have all of the facilities listed in Volume 2 (Technical Specification) but both the initial cost of construction and then on-going maintenance and operation costs are important factors.</p> <p>The Council will work with each bidder during the dialogue period to optimise and agree the specification for inclusion in the financial model.</p>
		2.12	<p>Tax Liabilities</p> <p>Bidders are requested to outline their proposals for the mitigation of any tax liabilities for the Council which may arise, but in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stamp Duty Land Tax liabilities; b. VAT liabilities.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION			
		2.13	<p>Funding Options</p> <p>The Council will fund the development of the Initial Sites and all other sites included in the procurement. The Council as a public body seeks to avoid forward funding where possible, (in any case for such funding to be secured against tangible assets, bonds or financial guarantees), but where required to do so the payment profile should be based upon the completion and independent certification (by an independent certifier employed by both parties) of work milestones. This creates two main funding options to be available:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Council agreeing a payment profile with payments made as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Payment 1: 10% of Project cost - achievement of the Project pre-conditions relating to securing and satisfying the conditions of the Planning Permission, where relevant, securing Agreements for Lease with anchor tenants, etc.; b. Payment 2: 5% of Project cost – for example, securing a minimum 70% pre-letting of the commercial units on the development; c. Payment 3: 65% of Project cost - monthly payments against a pre-agreed payment profile and with construction milestones assessed for quality of construction and financial valuation by an independent certifier; d. Payment 4: 20% of Project cost – on practical completion (PC). e. 5% of all of the above payments retained until PC when 50% of the retention will be released with the remainder released at the end of the latent defects period. ii. The issue of a Funding Coupon (a loan provided by the Council to fund working capital, developer profit, etc. during development and construction) at an OJEU compliant commercial interest rate for the development partner to draw down funding in accordance with a pre-agreed methodology and against the achievement of key milestones with each development. The Interest rate charged will comply with the “<i>Commission notice on the method for setting the reference and discount rates (97/C 273/03)</i>” to ensure a commercial rate is charged without the Council providing state aid. <p>Bidders are asked to express their preferred method of funding projects having regard to the two options presented above and suggest any variations for how payment should be made or their alternative preferred method of funding development projects. The funding methods will be considered during the Competitive Dialogue process. At the ITCD Submission and Final Tender stages, each remaining Bidders funding model will be confirmed.</p>

		2.14	<p>Construction cost inflation</p> <p>The Council is seeking to secure a guaranteed fixed price for the development of the Egham Gateway Phase 1 site, and Egham Leisure Centre Site. It is however understood that some variation may be required in order to secure planning permission, to deal with any exceptional development or construction cost inflation prior to agreeing the Final SDP.</p> <p>However, this section will be scored at all stages of the procurement based upon the way the Bidder can guarantee the price of each development and secondly where assumptions or exemptions made, the reasonableness of why these are used and the extent the fixed price is varied.</p> <p>Bidders should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Propose a guaranteed fixed price for Egham Gateway Phase 1 site and Egham Leisure Centre Site; 2. Set out assumptions or exemptions with justification regarding construction cost inflation for the Egham Gateway Phase 1 site and Egham Leisure Centre Site. <p>The fixed cost for each site should relate back to the information provided in the Financial Model.</p>
--	--	------	--

		2.15	<p>On-going Value for Money</p> <p>Bidders are required to propose how the cost of projects outside the Initial Sites can be controlled in order to provide on-going best value and some price certainty for the Council. In particular, for construction cost, bidders are required to explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The preferred choice of building contract JCT or NEC and their reasoning to support their choice; ii. What role they would require the Council's lead officer to deliver either directly or through specialist providers; iii. The role of the independent certifier to agree stage payments based on valuation / achievement of milestones / a combination of both; iv. The percentage of construction undertaken by the internal company / organisation and the percentage subject to market testing – for example 80% market tested. v. The proposed market-testing methodology / procurement policy; vi. How the internal company / organisation costs will be controlled?
--	--	------	--

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION			
	2f. Expected internal rate of return and profit expectation	2.16	<p>Rate of Return</p> <p>The Council wish to understand the overall Rate of Return required by bidders.</p> <p>By reference to the financial model, bidders are required to state the required IRR for the investment in each project and any further profits you expect to receive through development fees or from the project supply chain for the proposed Initial Sites both individually and for the delivery of the Development Business Plan.</p>
		2.17	<p>Overheads & Profit</p> <p>The benefit to the Council of securing the same developer for a pipeline of site includes providing cost certainty both for the initial sites and future sites. One element of the cost certainty required is the level of overhead and profit required by the Developer.</p> <p>Bidders should confirm the following that they will apply to all projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Overhead costs (as a % of the GDV and if relevant by project); ii. Profit (as a % of the GDV and if relevant by project); iii. The Bidder's required IRR on all projects or if varied, by type of project; iv. Any other costs the Bidder would expect to apply to all projects, outside the net development cost. <p>At the Final Tender stage, Bidders will be required to confirm these rates for the duration of the Development Agreement.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION			
	2g. Acceptability of the financial offer including fee structure and returns to the Council	2.18	<p>Site viability</p> <p>Provide analysis on your approach to achieving viability of the proposed Initial Sites both individually and for the delivery of the Development Business Plan. This analysis should include development appraisals and indicative land values for the Egham Gateway Phase 1 Site and Egham Leisure Centre Site.</p> <p>Bidders should provide this information through completing the requisite fields in the Financial Model for the initial Sites. The appraisal contained in the Financial Model will provide the Council with the viability assessment required and indicative land values for each site.</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Question
2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION			
	2h. Financial Model for the Initial Sites / Initial wrapper of sites	2.19	<p>Financial Model</p> <p>Bidders are requested to submit the Financial Model provided to support the commercial position in the Development Business Plan and the indicative / Initial Site Development Plans. The model should provide a quarterly cash flow and funding statement for each Initial Site and also combined to cover the initial sites. At the ITCD and Final Tender stages the Model will be varied to provide for the insertion of monthly cash flow for the two Initial sites.</p> <p>The model should include all cash flows which will impact upon the Development Business Plan along with comments setting out the assumptions and caveats.</p> <p>The model should show as a minimum for each site:</p> <p>Operating cashflows to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rental revenues and capital values for commercial and residential units based upon market evidence; • Development costs; • Construction costs. <p>Funding cashflows to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payments required to be made by the Council for each project and collectively for the two initial projects with the timescales linked into the Development Business Plan timescales (Quarter 1, Quarter 2 should be used rather than actual quarters in the model, subject to monthly being used for the Initial Sites at ITCD and Final Tender); • How VAT will be treated – zero rated and VAT rated costs clearly shown; • The retention of by the Council of payments until sectional completion, Practical Completion and the end of the Latent And Defects Period. <p>Bidders should note from the weighting applied to this question the importance allocated to the information contained in the Model. It should also be noted that the Bidder's completed Model will form part of the contractual documents for the Development Agreement.</p>

Appendix 1 – Financial Model

FINANCIAL MODEL

The Financial Model contains guidance for how each section should be completed. Bidders should follow the guidance both generally and where required by hovering the cursor over the cell to provide further information on the information required in that cell. Bidders should only complete the cells where a response is required and not change any of the formula or contents of other cells.

At the ITPD Submission stage the Financial Model will have several additional hybrid versions to provide for evaluating the options for both the Egham Leisure Centre, the Egham Gateway 1 and Gateway 2 projects. After the ITPD Submission stage the Council will determine the option to be adopted by the remaining bidders and so at ITCD Submission and Final Tender stage only a single and fully integrated model will be used. Also at ITCD and Final Tender stage, the Financial Model will be varied from quarterly cash flows to provide for monthly cash flows to be used for the two Initial Sites as this will also form the Payment Profile for the sites to be used in the Development Agreement.

PROFESSIONAL FEES TEMPLATE

This is included within the Financial Model for each site. Bidders should ensure the template is fully completed in addition to the rest of the financial model.

Appendix 2 Certificates for completion by Bidders

Bidders are required to complete the following two forms as part of their submission.

- CERTIFICATE OF NON – CANVASSING
- CERTIFICATE OF NON- COLLUSION

CERTIFICATE OF NON - CANVASSING
CONTRACT REFERENCE: RBC/RRP/2015/101

OJEU Notice reference number: [INSERT]

To RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL ("the Council")

I/We hereby certify that I/we have not canvassed any member, employee, agent of the Council in connection with the award of the contract for the project or any other proposed contract for the Runnymede Regeneration Programme and that no person employed by me/us or acting on my/our behalf has done any such act.

I/We further hereby undertake that I/we will not in the future canvass or solicit any member, employee, agent of the Council in connection with the award of the contract for the project or any proposed contract for the supply of the Services and that no person employed by me/us or acting on my/our behalf will do any such act.

1. SIGNED:

POSITION:

2. SIGNED:

POSITION:

On behalf of:

Date:

CERTIFICATE OF NON- COLLUSION

CONTRACT REFERENCE: RBC/RRP/2015/101

OJEU Notice reference number: **[INSERT]**

To RUNNYMEDE BOROUGH COUNCIL ("the Council")

The essence of the public procurement process is that the Council shall receive bona fide competitive Tenders from all Bidders. In recognition of this principle I/We certify that this is a bona fide Tender, intended to be competitive and that I/we have not fixed or adjusted the amount of the Tender or the rates and prices quoted by or under or in accordance with any agreement or arrangement with any other party.

I/We also certify that I/we have not done and undertake that I/we will not do at any time any of the following acts:

- a) Communicate to a party other than the Council the amount or approximate amount of my/our proposed Tender (other than in confidence in order to obtain quotations necessary for the preparation of the Tender); or
- b) Enter into any agreement or arrangement with any other party that he shall refrain from tendering or as to the amount of any Tender to be submitted; or
- c) Offer or agree to pay or give or pay or give any sum of money inducement or valuable consideration directly or indirectly to any person for doing or having done or causing or having caused any act or omission to be done in relation to any other tender or the proposed Tender.

In this Certificate:

- The word "person" includes any person, body or association, corporate or incorporate.
- The phrase "any agreement or arrangement" includes any transaction, formal or informal whether legally binding or not.
- The word "Tender" includes all tender submissions including ITPD Submission, ITCD Submission, Final Tender submission together with associated clarifications provided by the Bidder.

1. SIGNED:

POSITION:

2. SIGNED:

POSITION:

On behalf of:

Date:

Appendix 3 Form of Tender Template

Bidders Name: **[INSERT]**

1. QUALITY SUBMISSION		
Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Response (including Question heading)
1a. Development Business Plan and deliverability of the Bidders development programme	1.1	Development Business Plan <i>[Response]</i>
	1.2	Resourcing the Plan <i>[Response]</i>
	1.3	Egham Gateway Phase 1 <i>[Response]</i>
	1.4	Egham Leisure Centre <i>[Response]</i>
	1.5	Egham Gateway Phase 2 <i>[Response]</i>

1. QUALITY SUBMISSION		
Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Response (including Question heading)
	1.6	Addlestone TWO [Response]
	1.7	Addlestone THREE [Response]
1b. Understanding of the opportunity and approach to deliver maximum regeneration potential in the context of the programme objectives.	1.8	Addlestone Town Centre and Egham Town Centre Regeneration [Response]
	1.9	Egham Gateway Phase 1 - construction [Response]
	1.10	Egham Gateway Phase 1: Added Value of 168, High Street Egham [Response]

1. QUALITY SUBMISSION

Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Response (including Question heading)
	1.11	Egham Gateway Phase 1: Added Value of 8 and 10-18 Station Road North [Response]
	1.12	Egham Gateway Phase 2 [Response]
	1.13	Egham Leisure Centre - construction [Response]
	1.14	Egham Leisure Centre: Operational Costs [Response]
	1.15	Addlestone TWO - construction [Response]
	1.16	Addlestone THREE - construction [Response]

1. QUALITY SUBMISSION		
Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Response (including Question heading)
1c. Approach to deliverability of design quality, innovation & sustainable development.	1.17	Design Approach [Response]
	1.18	Building Information Modelling [Response]
	1.19	Design Quality [Response]
	1.20	Achieving Quality Standards [Response]
	1.21	Fire Safety Strategy: Sprinklers and Mist Systems [Response]

1. QUALITY SUBMISSION		
Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Response (including Question heading)
1d. Community engagement consultation and benefit	1.22	Community engagement consultation and benefit [Response]

2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION		
Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Response (including Question heading)
2a. Acceptability of the legal and commercial principles of the Development Agreement	2.1	Acceptance of the Council's Objectives [Response]
2b. Acceptability of consortium structure, guarantees and supply chain relationships	2.2	Structure for delivering the Development Business Plan [Response]
	2.3	Third Party developers / contractors [Response]

2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION		
Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Response (including Question heading)
	2.4	Parent company guarantees / Collateral Warranties <i>[Response]</i>
2c. Acceptability of legal documentation and approach to risk transfer.	2.5	Accepting the Development Agreement <i>[Response]</i>
2d. Commercial Strategy	2.6	Acceptance of key documents <i>[Response]</i>
	2.7	Development Business Plan
	2.8	Site Development Plans <i>[Response]</i>

2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION		
Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Response (including Question heading)
2e. Ability of the Bidder to demonstrate best value including through supply chain procurement	2.9	Demonstrating Value for Money <i>[Response]</i>
	2.10	Professional Fees <i>[Response]</i>
	2.11	Value Engineering <i>[Response]</i>
	2.12	Tax Liabilities <i>[Response]</i>
	2.13	Funding Options <i>[Response]</i>

2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION		
Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Response (including Question heading)
	2.14	Construction cost inflation <i>[Response]</i>
	2.15	On-going Value for Money <i>[Response]</i>
2e. Expected internal rate of return and profit expectation	2.16	Rate of Return <i>[Response]</i>
	2.17	Overheads & Profit <i>[Response]</i>
2f. Acceptability of the financial offer including fee structure and returns to the Council	2.18	Site viability <i>[Response]</i>

2. COMMERCIAL SUBMISSION

Evaluation Sub-Criteria	Question No.	Response (including Question heading)
2g. Financial Model for the Initial Sites / Initial wrapper of sites	2.19	Financial Model [Response]