

Invitation to Tender (ITT) Torpoint Lower Fore Street Community Building Feasibility Study
Questions 12th October 2023 (midday)

1 – We noted that the outcomes of the feasibility study are link to the RIBA Stage 2 of work. I wanted to check alongside the 'design feasibility' will there be separate economic feasibility study (in effect a business plan for the project, which can be used along with the design feasibility study to support a funding application)?

The likelihood of this is yes. However, this does not influence the design of the building.

2 – Or is the economic feasibility study an element which is expected to be completed as part of this commission?

No.

3 – Please can you confirm the scope of the feasibility study, whether this is to include structural, M&E and cost services?

Yes, standard applications of cost per m² should be included.

4 – Can you clarify whether any further consultants or areas are to be covered within this feasibility study please?

None to be covered.

5 – It is not clear where the site area is on Figure 1. The text says it is 'the blue area'. Can you please clarify?



Figure 1: Torpoint Development Site

It is area marked by the bold 'purple' line on Figure 1.

6 - Can you also confirm the site area/extents for the accommodation and car park (noted under item J, page 5)?

No, this cannot be confirmed, the feasibility study is an opportunity to demonstrate the potential of the site.

7 – Can you clarify question 6.2, three relevant examples of work. It asks for 'completed' examples. Is this completed Stage 2 feasibility studies or completed projects (i.e., completed buildings?)

Examples of work are completed Stage 2 feasibility studies. It would add value if completed as a project.

8 – For the avoidance of doubt, can you confirm: -

- i) Is a structural engineer required? No
- ii) Is an M&E engineer required? No

9 – Do you have other information on the planned community building? Such as detailed brief with room sizes, previous feasibility study, layout diagrams. No detailed information currently.

10 - In 2.7 and 2.8 it mentions 'a clear understanding of potential costs'. Should we be appointing a QS as part of our services or will this be procured by the client?

The client (Torpoint Town Council) will not currently be appointing a QS.

11 - As well as a QS – Is it expected that we directly engage sub-consultants (MEP and Structural) and include information as part of our bid? Or will m2 rates from a QS suffice for this phase of work.

See point 3.2 in the Invitation to Tender for full details of RIBA 2 Feasibility Study for this area of land and the detail requested to be included in the Feasibility Study.

12 - Is a site survey available following appointment? If not are we required to engage a surveyor (and include as part of our bid)?

See point 4.0 Budget, the total maximum budget available for this commission is £65,000 (exc VAT), but inclusive of all expenses.

13 - Do you require only architectural design services?

See point 3.2 in the Invitation to Tender for full details of RIBA 2 Feasibility Study for this area of land and the detail requested to be included in the Feasibility Study.

14 - Or do you wish for other complimentary services such as cost consultancy, MEP engineering, C&S engineering, landscape, planning consultancy, project management, ecology etc. Please confirm?

As per the answer to question 13.

15 - Within the responses to queries – 'RIBA stage 2 Feasibility' is referred to. Can you please confirm if the work is for RIBA Stage 1 – Preparation and Briefing (which includes feasibility studies), or RIBA Stage 2 Concept Design?

We wish to complete RIBA 2. You will note the request for costs, delivery strategy, design concept and programme within the tender.

16 - For the avoidance of doubt, please clearly identify the consultants we (The lead designer) should be appointing as part of the submission?

No idea what the makeup of your company is and its resources.

17 - Can you please confirm - A previous Architects Scheme has already been developed for the site. Is this to be used as a reference / developed upon, or is this Tender a completely separate commission?

This tender is a completely separate commission, the previous scheme was for a much wider area and whilst it provided ideas we are now looking to focus on this site specifically.

18 - Is there is an opportunity for a site visit with someone from the project team during the tender?

Unfortunately a site visit with the project team would not be appropriate during the tender process, as questions/enquiries on the ITT have been received from around the globe and a site visit could therefore benefit those contactors who would be available to attend, which would be render the ITT process unfair.

Bearing in mind the questions and answers already published, please clarify:

19 - We note from previous Q&As that an economic appraisal of the proposed "feasibility study" is not to be included in the scope of this study. This rather goes against the statement that (Cl 2.7) "The focus must be on the ability to deliver a development with the community building at its centre with a clear understanding of potential cost." How can the statement that "the design and feasibility must reflect this" stand without doing a financial appraisal to arrive at a scheme?? Is this really what is intended? Perhaps you could expand on how the Council will get what it needs from this study without a proper financial appraisal of options?

The council is looking for a RICS cost appraisal of the options that are conceived by the architect £/sqm works sufficiently as long as it is adjusted for the location, supply issues and provides an indication of quality of finish. Keeping the cost appraisal to construction only would be insufficient as the appraisal should take account of Fixtures Furnishings & Equipment as well as ICT etc. The council needs to understand the options and potential costs in order to inform their decision making and understand the potential magnitude of costs for the schemes that they may need to fund or apply for funding for, this should include relevant contingencies for this work at this stage. The reason for stopping the design process at this point is to enable bids to be created based on the quality of the information being provided by the successful tender.

20 - The previous answers re financial feasibility are very confusing when read in the context of Clause 2.8 of the ITT – please clarify. Will a simple area schedule and high level potential £ / sqm cost be sufficient?

See above

21 - Clause 3.2 requires "preliminary cost information" as a deliverable – again – will a simple £/sqm range be adequate?

See above

22 - Clause 3.2(F) " *NCE Contract*" Is this a typo? (NEC?)

Correct

23 - Clause 2.4 lists various uses/ functions: Will the client be providing a schedule of areas or numbers of people to be accommodated etc for these requirements? (EG what size is the library? How many desk spaces etc??)

No, the council expects the successful tenderer to engage with us and help us create the possible combinations to support the design using your professional knowledge and experience.

24 - You did not answer the previous question about topographical survey....your response implied that the Council was not planning to commission a survey. We take it from this that we should allow for the cost of a topographical survey within the scope / fee of the feasibility study. Please confirm that our assumption is / is not correct. In our opinion an accurate topographical survey (with ownership limits confirmed) is essential for a feasibility study.

Yes, correct

25 - Is there an estimated construction value?

No

26 - Is there a target building size / Gross Internal Area?

No

27 - The tender is to be awarded to the most economic offer – yet the cost is only 20% of the total points allocation... Please clarify.

The allocation of points is awarded according to the ITT. The 'most economic offer' refers to how the overall marks are 'scored' against the budget, with the lowest bid awarded the full 20 marks. Other bids will be awarded a mark that is proportionate to the level of their bid in comparison to the lowest bid i.e. Marks awarded = $20 \times \text{lowest bid} / \text{bid}$.