**Cargo Fleet, Middlesbrough**

|  |
| --- |
| Response to invitation to participate in a mini competition |
| **Panel Name**: |
| **Project Name**: *Cargo Fleet Sites – Feasibility Study* **Date:** *03/06/2015***Reference Number**: |
| **To**: *(Redacted)*  |
| **From:** *AECOM**(Redacted)* *Bridgewater House**Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 6LT*  |
| ProposalAECOM is pleased to submit this proposal with respect to the provision of services for the assessment of feasibility for the development of Plot A and Plot B at Cargo Fleet, Middlesbrough. AECOM has an award-winning reputation in providing a range of in-house services to assess feasibility of complex projects and also in proceeding to secure planning consent and site delivery. We work for a multitude of clients in both the private and the public sector and have the proven ability to deliver outline and detailed development advice.**Area Appreciation** AECOM understands that this HCA commission will comprise conducting a feasibility study of two plots (Plot A and Plot B) located at Cargo Fleet, Middlebsorough. The two plots are located at National Grid Reference (NGR) 450730, 520325 and 450659, 520145 and cover 0.88 Hectares (Ha) and 2.64 Ha, respectively that are located 1 mile east of Middleborough Town centre and Middlehaven regeneration project.Based on aerial photography, the plots are currently occupied by vacant land separated by ‘Shepherdson Way’ dual carriageway which is orientated north – south with the Ormesby Beck located along the northern site boundary of Plot A and eastern site boundary of Plot B. The Ormesby Beck is understood to flow broadly south to north and discharges in to the River Tees located approximately 893m north of Plot A.A review of online historical mapping information notes that the Plots A and B were originally marsh land until 1929 when areas were occupied by either a Bridge & Engineering Works (Plot A) or a Chemical Works (Plot B) with above ground creosote storage tanks until 1983 – 1990. The Ormesby Beck was noted to bisect Plot A until 1953 when it was realigned and noted as a navigable channel with dock. Both Plots A and B were cleared of all engineering and chemical manufacturing activities by 1993 and have remained unchanged to present.AECOM understands from client provided information that Plot A underwent a degree of decontamination and servicing works (extent of works unknown) in order to facilitate the redevelopment of the site as a public house. The proposed redevelopment was cancelled when the interested party (Whitbread Ltd) withdrawn their interest in the site. No investigation or remediation works are known to have been undertaken by the HCA or other parties and is considered to be potentially contaminated.From the development of the food store on the immediately adjacent site Gateway Middlehaven (application ref: M/FP/0773/13/P) we can identify not only commercial potential for the sites, but the importance of certain issues that are likely to affect this site. Although the exact issues relevant to this site can only be identified fully by detailed analysis, issues that affect the area include: site remediation requirements, water runoff and pollution measures, flood risk, and a HSE Hazard Zone due to the Chemoxy Factory located nearby. **Undertaking of Commission** AECOM will undertake to deliver feasibility studies to maximise development potential and capital receipts and de-risk the development of Site A and Site B at Cargo Fleet that fall within the boundary of Middlesbrough Council. Whilst each site must be considered uniquely and will be considered separately financially as set out in the brief, the adjacent location and similar nature to both sites means that a common methodology can be set out for both the sites. AECOM has assembled a specialist team equipped with the relevant skills to assess the feasibility of these sites. In responding to this tender we are supported by DTZ in order to ensure that we respond fully to the brief. DTZ provide property market advice and have extensive experience providing strategic and site specific advice to public and private sector clients. Team members have also co-ordinated the HCA’s 2015 Asset Valuation in the North East and have previously advised the HCA on Middlehaven.**Schedule of Services**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Discipline** | **Services Provided** |
| **Town Planning** | * Project Management
* Policy Appraisal
* Option Generation
* Constraints and Opportunities Review
* Desk Based Assessment Report Coordination and Assembly
* Advice on Disposal
 |
| **Property Market**  | * Property market review to establish development potential and optimum viable use(s)
* Advice on options for a disposal strategy
* Development appraisal to establish costs and land value (max 3 options)
 |
| **Masterplanning** | * Defining opportunities and constraints to understand the extent of developable area and potential implications to development.
* Production of high level masterplan to establish indicative capacity, layout and potential use mix.
 |
| **Civil Engineering**  | * Perform initial technical reviews of the sites’ infrastructure and environmental factors to include:
* Infrastructure
* Utilities
* Flood Risk Assessment
* Drainage Strategy
 |
| **Ground Investigation**  | * Stage 1 – Phase 1 Geo-environmental & Geotechnical Desk Based Assessment
* Stage 2 – Definition of ground investigation specification
* Management of tender process to appoint GI Contractor
* Review of GI findings and development of remediation strategy, production of Geo-environmental Interpretative Report
 |
| **Highways** | * Traffic and Transport Stage 1 Feasibility Assessment
 |
| **Ecology** | * Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
 |
| **Arboriculture** | * Arboricultural Survey to BS5837:2012
 |

**Methodology – Services to be Delivered****Integrated Project Management**AECOM Town Planning team will undertake the project management function coordinating the range of disciplines deployed on this project and ensuring that the key outstanding items and deliverables are brought forward in a timely and efficient manner to ensure that the project is a success. The Project Management Team will liaise directly with the client and all the consultants leading each constituent technical study. Specifically we will emphasise the key technical leads of Civil Engineering and Ground Investigation.For further project management and client relationship details please see Management Arrangements in this document, particularly communication with the client.**Town Planning** AECOM Town Planning team will coordinate and assemble the desk-based assessment as a key deliverable of Stage 1 in the project. In specific planning terms we will begin by conducting a planning policy and planning history review. This will provide an information baseline for the project and will also feed directly into the property market analysis of the site and the high level masterplan. This data will then inform the development options that will emerge from the commission and provide a reasoned and balanced feasibility study. We will review the likely contents of Validation Checklist to inform feasibility and due diligence work. We will also input into disposal advice. Also, bringing into a single document of constraints and opportunities to form a Due Diligence Report. The feasibility study will then allow the further marketing and development of the site and procedure through the planning process. This will provide a planning strategy to inform the planning permission process, conscious of the Screening and Scoping required for Environmental Impact Assessment. **Property Market** Working in conjunction with AECOM, DTZ will provide property market input to the project and have specific responsibility for preparing a property market review to establish the development potential of the site. This review will consider the optimum viable uses based on current demand within Middlesbrough and assess the supply of other development opportunities in the immediate surrounding area. This review will then ascertain those sectors that are currently most active within the Middlesbrough market, and take into consideration how demand for accommodation will be affected by both potential upturn in market conditions over the short to medium term and as a result of wider development ongoing on land adjacent to the HCA’s ownership including the Middlehaven project. At this stage it is clear that retail uses will likely form a key component of any development however at this stage we will not dismiss potential alternative uses relating to leisure and other commercial sectors. Once optimum viable use or uses are identified DTZ will then prepare a development appraisal of the optimum scheme(s) to assess development viability and establish the potential land return available to the HCA. The development appraisal will adopt a residual valuation approach and take into consideration realistic rents, yields and capital values for the optimum uses, current build costs and the anticipated abnormal development costs to be incurred in bringing forward development on this site. A series of sensitivities will then also be prepared to illustrate potential fluctuations in value caused by changes in the assumption base and reflect the potential changes in market conditions over time. Our proposal allows for the production of a maximum of three development appraisals. Should additional appraisals be required we would be happy to assist subject to agreement of an additional fee.Finally, DTZ will also provide input into the optimum disposal strategy for the HCA to maximise the value attainable for the site while also delivering on the optimum viable use. Our advice on disposal strategy will seek to balance the need to maximise value while also recognise the implications for public sector procurement and the possibility of OJEU.**High Level Masterplanning** Building upon the planning and market review work; a high level masterplanning study will be carried out in order to fully comprehend the implications of site constraints and provide an understanding of how these issues may be overcome.Defining Opportunities and ConstraintsA high level desktop constraints and opportunities study will be produced in the form of illustrative diagrams and associated text. It will cover the following issues:* Site red line including gross area (developable and un-developable) cross referenced to legal boundaries;
* Urban design drivers – Connectivity, permeability and linkages; Relationships between land uses; Adjacent scale/architectural form, local landmarks and listed buildings; Existing natural features, open space / green infrastructure network; Plot layout, character and potential phasing; Key views and sensitive visual receptors; Key frontages/entry points; Underground services and associated easements; and
* Concluding opportunities and constraints and related commentary.

High Level Draft MasterplanWe will develop an indicative masterplan which provides a more detailed understanding of development parameters and potential design principles. The masterplan will comprise:* A two dimension, full colour, site capacity plan illustrating: Block layout addressing entrances and active frontages; Quantum of development and mix Roads, access, servicing and parking arrangements; and Areas of open space (if appropriate).

Our analysis will include current best practice such as: Urban Design Compendium (UDC) 1 and 2 (Homes and Communities Agency); Manual for Streets and Manual for Streets (MfS) 2 (Department for Transport); Car Parking: What works where (Homes and Communities Agency formerly English Partnerships); and Building for Life 12 (BfL12)(Building for Life Partnership of: CABE at the Design Council, the Home Builders Federation and Design for Homes with the assistance of Nottingham Trent University).Thoughts will also be given as to the location of primary frontages/gateways, potential route hierarchy/access points and connections to adjacent amenity areas; broad requirements for onsite social infrastructure/community uses (larger sites only). The indicative masterplan will take into account local context and planning requirements. In addition, we will provide associated written commentary confirming the design rationale, summary of alternative options (if required) and recommended preferred option.High Level Final MasterplanFollowing review of the draft masterplan (Task 1.2), we will refine and finalise the masterplan and written commentary to capture any suggested amendments required.**Utilities/Services Strategy**Our experience in the assessment and design of utility infrastructure has taught us the value of engaging utility company providers and statutory bodies at an early stage and gaining their trust and confidence by demonstrating our extensive experience and knowledge of similar projects. Experience has also shown us that access to utility records invariably proves problematic in terms of the time taken. Our proposal allows for using a search provider called Groundwise Searches Ltd. Our utility assessment will: * Review records of existing infrastructure;
* Carry out a walk-over survey of the site and immediate surroundings;
* Open discussions with the utility providers regarding the capacity of existing networks. Where information regarding infrastructure capacity is unknown we find that consideration of the former use of the site enables us to determine the likely local infrastructure capacity;
* Complete assessment of infrastructure capacity. We will base our assessment on information available or our experience of similar sites;
* Assess appropriateness of proposed development in terms of utility demand and loads against capacity. Consider reinforcement or upgrading requirements and associated costs, if necessary; and
* Carry out site drainage strategy
* Identify Sustainable Drainage requirements, which may include carrying out a preliminary assessment of the drainage infrastructure which will be required to enable development of the site, to meet the current planning policy regulations (PPS25). This will include: Technical review of available baseline data and any factual evidence identifying development constraints and issues; Assessment of the existing services within the vicinity of the site to determine their suitability, including watercourses, United Utilities apparatus and existing water bodies; Review the suitability of SUDS; Assessment and summary of the topographical survey data and surface water catchment areas including sizing the anticipated storm water attenuation volumes using Windes Microdrainage Software; and Assessment of suitable outfall locations.

Although it should be noted that the existing site has been previously developed so it is probable that some form of both foul and surface water drainage, or possibly a combined system still exists. Our engineers will review the options to use existing connections wherever possible and discuss with the adopting authorities, who we assume will be Northumbrian Water and possibly Middleborough Council.**Flood Risk Assessment**AECOM will aim to produce a FRA, to meet the requirements of National Planning Policy Framework.  The following tasks will be undertaken:Task 1 – Consultation and Data ReviewConsultation with all relevant statutory authorities for relevant information on flood risk at the site, details of drainage infrastructure, and to confirm the requirements of the Consultees with respect to flood risk mitigation and surface water management.  Task 2 – Identification of Current Flood RiskUsing the available data, we will assess flood risk to the site from all sources, including:* Tidal sources
* Fluvial Sources
* Groundwater sources;
* Overland flow; and
* Drainage and sewer systems.

As part of the assessment, we will calculate the existing surface water runoff likely to be generated on the existing site and report in general on how it is currently managed.Task 3 –Impacts of the Proposed Development AECOM will identify how, if at all, the risks will change as a result of development of the site (including taking climate change into account). Where appropriate, URS will make recommendations to manage flood risks so that the development remains safe throughout its lifetime and does not adversely impact on surrounding areas. Task 4 – ReportingA draft electronic report will be produced and presented for review and comment prior to the issue of a final report.  After receipt of one set of consolidated comments from the relevant parties, any necessary changes will be made and an electronic copy of the final report will be issued. **Ground Investigation** Where sites are proposed for development, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places a responsibility on the land owner to demonstrate that the site is suitable for its intended use. Local Authorities can assign planning conditions to a development requiring the land owner and/or developer to demonstrate through phased investigation, assessment, and if required remediation and validation, that there is either an absence of significant risk from contamination or that any risk from significant contamination has been remediated or mitigated.  Current industry guidance (BS10175, EA CLR 11 and CIRIA 552) supports the preparation of a development specific desk based assessment as a necessary precursor to any intrusive works. This preliminary risk assessment (PRA) defines the viable risks that may be present on a site, and hence the need for either further mitigation or investigation. By undertaking a desk based assessment in the first instance, the need for further work is clearly defined. Where further work is deemed to be necessary the desk based assessment justifies that these works are proportionate, cost effective and designed specifically for the ground conditions expected and development proposals anticipated. The scope of any additional ground investigation can only really be formalised upon completion of a detailed review of available ground investigation information and completion of the desk study (Phase I).In line within the requirements of the NPPF above and the requirements of HCA; AECOM has developed a scope of works for the provision of a Phase I geo-environmental and geotechnical desk based assessment for the site. Detailed descriptions of the scope of works covered by this proposal for the production of a Phase I geo-environmental and geotechnical desk based assessment for the site is presented in the following sections.Phase I Geo-environmental & Geotechnical Desk Based AssessmentThe desk study report will be prepared in accordance with CLR 11 ‘Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination’ (2004) and BS10175 ‘Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites – Code of Practice’ (2011) as well as a number of other key industry guidance documents. In accordance with the above the objectives of the desk based assessment will include the following:* Procure a Landmark Envirocheck report or similar and review other publicly available pertinent information (EA ‘what’s in my backyard’ website) to assess the site with respect to current and historical operational activities (on-site and off-site), permitting, abstraction and discharge consent information. This information will be reviewed and assessed to understand the context of the site and its wider environs (1km radius of the Site) with respect to environmental setting;
* Procure a Coal Authority Brine Compensation report to assess the potential for ground instability associated with historical underground brine extraction activities and whether these may present a potential geotechnical constraints;
* A review of published geological and hydrogeological mapping information and public domain geo-environmental information including BGS borehole records to assess the two plots environmental and geotechnical setting and sensitivity;
* Technical review and appraise all third party information and data reported for Plot A and undertake an initial data analysis to assess whether further information may be needed with respect to the client noted remediation and clean-up. *AECOM has inferred that reliance on this information will be provided by HCA, if appointed as a preferred consultant;*
* A walkover assessment by a suitably qualified member of AECOM’s ground engineering services team to identify any current potential contamination sources as well as possible indicators of contamination to identify/verify environmental constraints and opportunities;
* An appraisal of the historical development and land use of the site and surrounds, with a particular emphasis on identifying potential on-site and off-site contamination sources and geotechnical constraints;
* Compile a preliminary conceptual site model (pCSM) depicting any significant source-pathway-receptor linkages followed by a qualitative preliminary risk assessment to industry standards; and,
* Produce a preliminary geotechnical risk register based upon the information provided and any constraints identified.

AECOM will prepare standalone Phase I geotechnical and a geo-environmental desktop reports for each Plot that clearly identifies the environmental baseline for each Plot and highlight any key constraints associated with the proposed future development related to potential ground contamination and geotechnical considerations.The tender brief asks the consultant in Stage 1 to establish costs and identify land values. The ground conditions and land contamination will have a potentially significant bearing on abnormal development costs. Following the desk study and based on the publication *English Partnerships Best Practice Note 27 (Feb 2008) ‘Contamination and Dereliction Remediation Costs* an estimate of potential remedial costs will be made to assist in the preliminary land value assessments*.*In addition, provision to attend a four client meetings at the HCA Gateshead office to discuss the findings of the Phase I desktop study and feasibility assessment in order to facilitate an all parties agreement and conclusion for a way forward for Plots A and B.Outline Investigation DesignBased on the findings of the Phase I desktop study, preliminary CSM and risk assessment, the recommendation for further works is considered likely given the historical chemical manufacturing and engineering works that occupied both Plot A and Plot B between c. 1929 – c. 1993 and the potential for infilling at the site from diversion of water courses.Based on the information reviewed to date a preliminary scope of works based has been prepared for the two Plots based on an arbitrary on a 50m x 50m sampling grid (based on best practice for a commercial development on a brownfield site) which will likely comprise the following, however it should be noted that this scope is indicative and should in accordance with guidance and British Standards be refined following the desk study:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Plot A** | **Plot B** |
| 3 cable percussive boreholes to a depth of 30m bgl to assess the deep siltstone bedrock; | 3 cable percussive boreholes to a depth of 30m bgl to assess the deep siltstone bedrock; |
| 4 Mechanically excavated trial pits to a depth of 4m bgl to assess shallow made ground deposits | 9 Mechanically excavated trial pits to a depth of 4m bgl to assess shallow made ground deposits |
| In-situ geotechnical and environmental field analysis and testing | In-situ geotechnical and environmental field analysis and testing |
| Laboratory environmental (soil, groundwater and surface water) and geotechnical analysis | Laboratory environmental (soil, groundwater and surface water) and geotechnical analysis |
| A programme of ground gas and groundwater monitoring and sampling (frequency and nature defined by the desk study) | A programme of ground gas and groundwater monitoring and sampling (frequency and nature defined by the desk study) |

Upon completion of the ground investigations a standalone report for each Plot comprising a factual report presenting the information from the ground investigation (borehole logs, laboratory data) and an interpretative geo-environmental and geotechnical report including the development of the ground model, generic quantitative risk assessment for human health and controlled waters risks (GQRA), revision of the preliminary CSM and development of preliminary geotechnical recommendations related to foundations, pavements and earthworks. Where required, recommendations for further works will be made if residual risk items are identified.An outline indicative cost to undertake further investigation for both Plot A and Plot B may potentially be in the region of £40,000 – £45,000, however this based on the absence of any review of third party information or the preparation of the standalone Phase I desktop study reports. This cost is justified by the presence of deep superficial deposits and peat which require deep boreholes just allow parameters for geotechnical design to be selected given the likely high structural loadings of a proposed commercial/ industrial development at the site.Subject to the outcome of the preliminary risk assessment and development of a conceptual site model, the outline indicative costs and the rationale for further investigation will be reviewed and revised accordingly. It is considered likely that at this time, the total cost of any ground investigation at Plot A and Plot B Cargo Fleet, Middleborough may be less than the indicative preliminary range of costs stated above. Remediation Strategy and VerificationAs the HCA have specified the requirement for fully remediated plots if risks are identified during Phase 2 and outline remediation strategy and remediation options appraisal will be prepared. At this stage our costs are indicative for reporting and exclude any supervision of remedial works as the scope is entirely undefined.The outline remediation strategy will typically comprise the following key stages:* A brief site background review and summary of the Conceptual Site Model (CSM) and assessment criteria (controlled waters and human health) developed for the site;
* A discussion of remedial objectives and likely remedial criteria for the works, including consideration of the principals of sustainable remediation in accordance with NICOLE Sustainability Road Map and in-house derived AECOM sustainability action plan (SAP);
* Identification of an initial list of potential remedial options through a comprehensive optioneering assessment in accordance with CLR11 guidance;
* Screening of each of these options to assess applicability and sustainability at each site and development of a preferred sustainable remediation short-list;
* Evaluation of the alternative short-listed options and selection of the recommended approach (potentially using a combination of remedial options);
* Provision of a conceptual outline of the proposed remedial approach and associated timescales and management of the preferred sustainable remediation strategy through the adoption of the in-house derived AECOM SUSIT selection tool.
* Provision of estimated remedial cost estimates.

In addition, the outline remediation strategy will outline the necessary geotechnical preparatory works including ‘grubbing out’ of former below ground foundations, structures and hardstanding. Once the chemical characteristics of the site are understood further, the report will present any recommendations for the proposed final development masterplan including any potential cover systems that may need to be employed.A remediation implementation and verification plan will also be required post completion to demonstrate to the regulator that risks have been mitigated. It is at this stage that the prospective purchaser/ developer can have confidence that the site has been remediated and the plot is suitable for the intended development.Management ArrangementsAECOM will procure the professional services of its approved suppliers and subcontractors through its approved suppliers list. The AECOM approved supplier list is a mechanism adopted to ensure that quality and standard of professional services procured are to the standards by AECOM and its clients. The AECOM ASL is reviewed and updated on a regular basis to ensure that all high quality standards.At this stage, it is envisaged that all professional services and products required to complete the feasibility assessment will be procured through the AECOM ASL however upon commissioning further investigation, AECOM will procure all services through ICE specification and Bill of Quantities (BOQ) and will be managed in accordance with ICE guidelines.The project will be directed by a certified AECOM Project Director Dr. Lawrence Bowden with the day to day responsibility of the project and the selected teams given to Mr. Phillip Parker, both are certified project managers within AECOM's Environmental, Health & Safety and Remediation Services. AssumptionsAECOM has made a provision for £493.80 for the procurement of third party environmental database information and travel and expense disbursements.**Traffic and Transport** * Desktop review of other adjacent developments (Riverside Stadium) / planning applications (Sainsbury’s etc.)
* Desktop appraisal of access /highway constraints  / existing sustainable travel facilities (bus services, cycle facilities etc.)
* High level consideration of traffic generation for any proposed site uses and likely traffic impact.
* Prepare short Traffic and Transport section for Feasibility Report

**Ecology** As part of the first stage of the feasibility study AECOM would carry out a preliminary ecological appraisal of the area. This would: * Identify and categorise the habitats present within the site and any areas immediately outside of the site where there may be potential for direct or indirect effects from future development within the site (the “zone of influence”);
* carry out an appraisal of the potential of the habitats recorded to support protected or notable species of fauna and flora;
* provide advice on any potential ecological constraints and opportunities in the zone of influence, including the identification (where relevant) of any requirements for follow-up habitat and species surveys and/or requirements for ecological mitigation; and
* provide a map showing the location of the identified ecological receptors of relevance.

The work would involve a desk study to identify designated sites in the vicinity and existing records of protected and notable species, plus a habitat survey of the site. The method used would be Phase 1 habitat survey, (as per Nature Conservancy Council, 1990) plus appraisal of the potential for protected species. This would include recording of any signs of species seen on site, although further botanical or faunal surveys may be required prior to development of the site and these would be identified. We are aware, for example that the site being developed for Sainsbury had an ecological survey and evidence of otter was found in Ormesby Beck, which is adjacent to the sites. The survey and reporting would be in accordance with best practice for preliminary ecological appraisal (CIEEM guidance, 2013, 2015). **Arboriculture**To undertake a tree survey at the Cargo Fleet Sites, Middlesbrough in line with BS5837:2012:* Visit site to assess the opportunities and constraints of the site and the surrounding local context;
* Undertake tree survey fieldwork (to include collection of measurements/ photographic and observational data on site);
* Production of a photographic report (to include schedule of existing trees – with the following data: Common tree name, age classification, life expectancy, current and mature height, crown spread at the four cardinal points, stem diameter, condition category, retention category and management recommendations);
* Production of arboricultural constraints plan(s) (showing above and below ground spatial constraints affecting construction operations within the site - Root Protection Area/s (where possible), tree numbers, reflective crown radii and where necessary and possible shade patterns);
* Provide comments relating to the tree constraints, opportunities for development and advice on site layout to minimise the impact upon existing trees and to maximise the development potential;
* Arboricultural Impact Assessment outlining the impact of the proposed development on existing trees;
* Provide advice on mitigation recommendations (e.g. minor re-design of proposed developments to avoid root protection zones or construction techniques to ensure least impact on the tree root structure, and other factors which may have direct or in-direct effects on existing / proposed trees).
* Issue draft drawing and report to project manager for review;
* Allowance for two minor iterations of the above report and drawings following client comments, and
* Attendance at meetings with client and design team on site or within the local vicinity.

Assumptions All information required to undertake the survey work will be available at the time of receiving an instruction to proceed;Development limits will be as per the site plan KJR17351\_Rev A dated 28th April 2015;Includes trees within the defined development limits and immediately adjacent in line with the British Standard;Does not include for planning fees, andAssumes the survey of 4 trees/ groups on Plot 1 and 11 trees/ vegetation groups on Plot 2.We will produce one report for the two sites together.Data RequirementsAutoCAD (dwg. format) drawing illustrating the existing site layout including the full extent of the existing roads, buildings and vegetation within the site boundaries; andTopographical survey showing the accurate locations of all existing trees over 75mm in girth measured at 1.5m above ground level within the defined survey area.  Spot levels at the base of trees; together with areas of vegetation, shrub masses, hedges, landscape features and artefacts such as streams, buildings and other structures, boundary features and means of enclosure should be surveyed.  In addition overhead and underground utility apparatus, including drainage runs, manholes and invert levels, will all be available in AutoCAD format.  Where possible for individual trees the crown spread should be surveyed at the 4 cardinal points (north, south, east and west) and for the woodland areas and substantial tree groups the overall extent of their canopy should be shown.  The survey should also cover all trees over 75mm in girth (as above) which overhang the site or are located beyond the site boundaries within a distance of up to 12 times their estimated stem diameters.We would also suggest that the following services may be required by the local authority to satisfy their requirements during the planning process, and subject to the detail within the application that is submitted and would be happy to provide such services if required with a separate quotation. Some of these elements may be conditioned as part of the planning approval.Arboricultural Method Statement*Production of an Arboricultural Method Statement for protecting trees through appropriate construction methodology and practice;*Tree Protection Fencing Drawing*Production of a tree protection plan(s) - illustrating how retained trees will be spatially protected during construction, including where temporary protective fencing will be placed and details of Tree protection fencing;*Schedule of tree surgery works*Produce a schedule of tree surgery works to BS3998:2010 based on recommendations within the tree survey report and in the context of proposed development on site, suitable for submission to the local authority and to enable an arboricultural contractor to price for the tree surgery and removal works.***Expenses** Expenses would be added at cost.Site Visits: These are expected to include *(Redacted)* travel costs to siteData Costs: Costs of obtaining data from the biological records centres - these vary, but unlikely to be more than *(Redacted)*. Meeting Attendance: If specialists attend meetings the costs would be increased at the day rates given, plus expenses if incurred (travel costs).**Additional Scope of Services** AECOM believes that the team we have assembled addresses the issues that affect this site. We recognise that there are issues affecting the site such as flood risk, HSE PADHI Hazard Zone, and also potential issues such as Ecology and Biodiversity impacts. This is also reflected in the initial analysis and investigation undertaken by AECOM to support this bid. |
| **Proposed Staff** *Set out below is a chart featuring the staff proposed to undertake the commission along with their roles and their time allocation. For further detail including task breakdown and fee allocation please see Resource Schedule at Appendix D.* **Table 1.1 Staff Chart**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Discipline** | **Staff**  | **Grade/Job Title** | **Time Allocated (Days)** |
| **Town Planning** | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
|  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
|  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
| **Property Market**  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
| (DTZ) | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
| **Masterplanning** | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
|  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
|  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
| **Civil Engineering**  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
|  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
|  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
|  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
| **Flood Risk/Drainage** | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
| **Ground Investigation** | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
|  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
|  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
|  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
|  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
| **Highways** | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
| **Ecology** | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
|  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
| **Arboriculture** | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
|  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |
|  | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* | *(Redacted)* |

Management ArrangementsTrack record of working together as a multi-disciplinary teamAECOM recognises the importance of working together as a team to achieve the project objectives and meet the expectations of the client. AECOM realises that results are achieved when every member, irrespective of grade or experience, feels valued and understands the importance of his/her contribution to the project as a whole. This is achieved by using the following techniques to promote, and encourage, team working:* Using a determined and focussed Project Manager with excellent inter-personal skills, who regularly engages with all team members and encourages open discussion to address any potential issues.
* Hosting an inception meeting with the client and key team members to discuss deliverables, project expectations, client objectives, programme and key dates for delivery. This encourages key team members to ‘buy into’ the project, promotes a better understanding of the client’s requirements and helps improve relationships.
* Disseminating information to the project team via the Project Execution Plan (PXP). The PXP will confirm: client objectives; deliverables; key dates; lines of communication; and Quality Assurance procedures.
 |
| * Using suitably qualified and experienced staff who have worked together previously in providing complementary services to support an outline planning application. For this commission, we have assembled a team that have worked together effectively on commissions undertaken by AECOM.
* Providing opportunities for key staff to openly review and discuss delivery of the project, and dissemination of information, by holding internal meetings or by video conference facilities.

AECOM has an exemplary record of working together as a multi-disciplinary and integrated team to provide the range of services to support outline and full planning applications for residential and mixed-use development.Communication with the clientAECOM recognises the importance of maintaining a single point of contact throughout the duration of the project. This strengthens communication channels and reduces the risk of ambiguity particularly considering the requirement to deliver three sites. It will allow the HCA the assurance and certainty required to successfully deliver the project.Communication will be managed principally between the appointed client contact and the AECOMProject Manager (*(Redacted)*). Principal communication tools will be:* Monthly meetings (to be arranged with the client, with core consultant team focusing as required on key deliverables at each stage); and
* Progress reports – Verbal and written updates on a regular update as agreed with HCA. The wider AECOM team will be made up of specialist consultants who will be deployed on their specific tasks. Their attendance at client meetings will relate to the analysis, consultation and execution of their specialist tasks and will be tailored with the agreement of the client.
 |
| **Timescale**Completion of the CommissionIt is anticipated that Stage 1 of the commission will be completed in August 2015. It is further estimated that subject to the results of Stage 1, the initial elements of Stage 2 could potentially be delivered in November 2015. However, the necessary information base that will emerge from Stage 1 and the subsequent use of HCA-appointed contractors means further detailed timescales cannot be defined at this stage but for project planning purposes we have assumed a 6 month period.Key MilestonesUpon receipt of written authorisation to proceed from the client, AECOM anticipate the following key milestones for the programme of works as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Date / Timeline** | **Key Milestones** |
| **Stage 1** |
| Key Milestone 1 | w/s 08 June 2015 | Appointment, Client authorisation  |
| w/s 15 June 2015 | Inception meeting, site visit and procurement of required information |
| w/s 22 June 2015 | Review, assessment of the environmental information and any third party reporting (provided by client with reliance).  |
| Key Milestone 2 | w/s 22 June tow/s 13 July 2015 | Preparation of: * Draft desktop assessment reports
* ‘High Level’ Masterplan
* Land Use & Planning Policy Review
* Property Market Review and Demand Analysis
* Technical site review of Infrastructure, environmental, and social infrastructure
* Geo-Environmental & Geotechnical Desk Based Assessment
* Ground Investigation Study Scope
 |
| w/s 06 July tow/s 13 July 2015 | Preparation of Draft Feasibility Report * Internal AECOM QA/QC and technical review and approval
* AECOM finalization
 |
| Key Milestone 3 | w/s 13 July 2015 | Client review and comment of Draft Feasibility Report |
| Key Milestone 4 | w/s 03 August 2015 | AECOM finalisation of Feasibility Report |
| **Stage 2**  |
| Key Milestone 5  | w/s 03 August 2015 | Ground Investigation Study definition |
| Key Milestone 6 | w/s 17 August tow/s 07 Sept 2015 | Tender Process to Appoint Ground Investigation Contractor |
| Key Milestone 7  | w/s 04 January 2016 to 18 January 2016 | Review Ground Investigation and Remediation Strategy |
| Key Milestone 8 | w/s 18 January tow/s 01 Feb 2016 | Geo-Environmental Interpretation Report |

**Programme of Works**Achievability The programme dates given are considered to be achievable barring any unforeseen events. Set out in the Appendix accompanying this submission is an indicative programme for what we consider to be the appropriate delivery of the Feasibility Studies, including a prospective Second Stage G.I.Seasonally Dependent WorkThe ecology survey can be carried out during late June, allowing time to report the results and incorporate them into the overall recommendations. It is also within the optimal period for Phase 1 habitat survey. The desk study element will include sourcing data from the local biological records centre, which will be obtained in advance of the field survey if feasible. It is therefore considered that there are no seasonally dependent obstacles to the delivery of this programme. |
| Fee Proposal**Phase 1** – AECOM professional lump sum fee estimate for the proposal detailed herein is (GBP) *(Redacted)*. It is proposed to be undertaken on a lump sum basis in accordance with Homes & Communities Agency Framework rates. The prevailing VAT is *(Redacted)* which we are obligated to charge.**Phase 2** – An outline indicative cost to undertake further investigation for both Plot A and Plot B may potentially be in the region of *(Redacted)*, however this based on the absence of any review of third party information or the preparation of the standalone Phase I desktop study reports. This estimate is justified by the presence of deep superficial deposits and peat which require deep boreholes just allow parameters for geotechnical design to be selected given the likely high structural loadings of a proposed commercial/ industrial development at the site. |

*(Redacted)*