

SOUTHWARK COUNCIL

WALWORTH TOWN HALL AND NEWINGTON LIBRARY

Lead Designer, Architectural Services, and
BIM Manager Tender Recommendation
Report Summary

Revision 2

13 January 2015

Document status						
Revision	Date	Status comment	or	Prepared by	Checked by	Authorised by
	13.01.15	First Draft		Jane Foulkes	K Williams	K Williams
1	09.02.15	Second draft after comments	LBS	Jane Foulkes	K Williams	K Williams
2	11.02.15	Table amended	1.5	Jane Foulkes	K Williams	K Williams

DISCLAIMER

This document and its contents have been prepared and are intended solely for the Client's information and use in relation to Walworth Town Hall and Newington Library.

Faithful+Gould assumes no responsibility to any other party in respect of or arising out of or in connection with this document and/or its contents.

COPYRIGHT

The copyright of this document is vested in Faithful+Gould. This document may not be reproduced in whole or in part without their express written permission.

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
2.0 INTRODUCTION	7
3.0 EXPRESSION OF INTEREST ENQUIRY (EOIE) STAGE	8
4.0 ITT STAGE 2a	11
5.0 ITT STAGE 2b	15
6.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	19

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This tender recommendation report has been prepared by Faithful+Gould (F+G) for The London Borough of Southwark (LBS) to review the tender submissions for the appointment of Architectural Services, Lead Designer and BIM Manager for the Walworth Town Hall and Newington Library Project.
- 1.2 The project involves the design and conversion of the fire damaged, grade 2 listed, Walworth Town Hall and Newington Library in Elephant and Castle, to provide a new, world class civic centre for Walworth, with a high level estimated value for the construction element of the project of £20,000,000.
- 1.3 LBS has made the decision to appoint Faithful+Gould, utilising the Scape framework to provide the vehicle through which a full design team with appropriate previous experience and performance can be appointed, in order to drive the best value and solution to the project brief.

In addition to tendering to Faithful+Gould's Tier 1 and 2 supply chain, there was an express requirement from Southwark Council for other notable architectural practices to join the SCAPE framework supply chain and be to be invited to tender. To meet Council requirements for a mini design competition and community input it was necessary to run a three stage competition to ensure maximum value for money is achieved, including an initial first stage Expression of Interest enquiry and response, a Stage 2a tender competition and a final stage 2b tender mini design competition. At the first stage of the competition, fourteen practices were invited to participate. As a result of several practices withdrawing, and one practice being deemed too small to successfully cope with the scale of the project, the number of practices was reduced to seven practices to proceed to stage 2a of the competition, of whom three practices were shortlisted through their stage 2a response to carry through to the final stage 2b. Stage 2b resulted in a clear winner, both in terms of quality and cost. The dates for these stages, the architects involved and the results of each stage are shown on the table below.

Stage	Date sent out	Architects invited	Date returned	Architects who withdrew	Architects shortlisted
EOI	10/07/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donald Insall Associates • John McAslan & Partners • Witherford Watson Mann Architects • Stanton Williams Ltd • Rick Mather Architects • David Chipperfield Architects • Haworth Tompkins • Glenn Howells • Sheppard Robson • Avanti Architects • Wilkinson Eyre Architects • Burns Guthrie • NRAP Architects • Purcell 	28/07/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Witherford Watson Mann Architects • Stanton Williams Ltd • David Chipperfield Architects • Glenn Howells • Wilkinson Eyre Architects • Burns Guthrie • NRAP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donald Insall Associates • John McAslan & Partners • Rick Mather Architects • Haworth Tompkins • Sheppard Robson • Avanti Architects • Purcell
ITT Stage 2a	09/09/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donald Insall Associates • John McAslan & Partners • Rick Mather Architects • Haworth Tompkins • Sheppard Robson • Avanti Architects • Purcell 	02/10/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sheppard Robson 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rick Mather Architects • Avanti Architects • Purcell

ITT Stage 2b	22/10/2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rick Mather Architects • Avanti Architects • Purcell 	09/12/2014		Avanti Architects
--------------	------------	--	------------	--	-------------------

1.4 A thorough review and analysis of the tender submissions has been undertaken and evaluated at each of the three stages in accordance with the Tender Evaluation and Scoring criteria set out in the Scoring Matrices for each stage, and in association with Southwark Council's appointed Project Manager, Southwark's wider project stakeholders, and with advice from Southwark's procurement and legal team.

1.5 Based on the assessment criteria the following percentage scores were awarded to the tenderers at the final stage 2b of the competition as follows:-

Section	Avanti Architects	Purcell architects	Rick Mather Architects
Quality 70%	53.5%	46.5%	37.5%
Price 30%	17.5%	12.3%	15.1%
Overall %	71%	58.8%	52.6%
Overall ranking	1	2	3

1.5.1 Avanti Architects were the most advantageous in terms of price.

1.5.2 Avanti Architects were the most advantageous in terms of quality.

1.5.3 Overall Avanti Architects were the most advantageous in terms of value for money.

1.6 Avanti Architects were asked to attend a tender clarification meeting at Southwark Council on 8th January 2015. Following the meeting, Avanti Architects provided further substantiation to their tender submission and in an email issued on 09/01/15.

1.7 Following the quality and price evaluation of the stage 2b tenders, the clarification interview and subsequent information provided, we make the recommendation that Avanti Architects are appointed to provide Architectural, Lead consultancy and BIM Manager roles to the Walworth Town Hall and Newington Library redevelopment project under direct appointment to Faithful+Gould under the Scape framework.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 This report has been prepared by F+G at the request of Southwark Council to provide a detailed overview of the tender process for appointing the Architectural Services, Lead Consultant and BIM Manager roles for the Walworth Town Hall and Newington Library redevelopment project.
- 2.2 Throughout the competition, the tendering architects were requested to provide fully compliant bids based upon all project information supplied to them at each stage; they were also required to submit a bid for all consultancy fees in respect of the Architectural Services, Lead consultancy and BIM Manager roles related to the proposed works.
- 2.3 This report covers aspects of quality assessment and financial compliance and in relation to the submissions received at each of the competition stages.

3.0 EXPRESSION OF INTEREST ENQUIRY (EOIE) STAGE

3.1 Architectural practices on Faithful+Gould's Scape Framework Tier 1 or Tier 2 supply chain lists were reviewed and shortlisted based on whether they had similar previous project experience and whether they had offices in London. The following shortlists were arrived at:

ARCHITECTS ON TIER 1 SCAPE LIST	
1	Glenn Howells
2	Sheppard Robson

ARCHITECTS ON TIER 2 SCAPE LIST	
3	Avanti Architects
4	Wilkinson Eyre Architects
5	Burns Guthrie
6	NRAP Architects
7	Purcell

3.2 In addition, Southwark Council requested that the following practices be included in the tender competition:

ARCHITECTS NOT ON SCAPE SUPPLIER LIST	
8	Donald Insall Associates
9	John McAslan & Partners
10	Wetherford Watson Mann Architects (WWM)
11	Stanton Williams Ltd
12	Rick Mather Architects
13	David Chipperfield Architects
14	Haworth Tompkins

- 3.3 F+G contacted all fourteen practices by telephone to see if they would be interested in receiving the Expression of Interest Enquiry documents.
- 3.4 All fourteen practices confirmed their interest.
- 3.5 EOIE questionnaires were sent out to the list of architects on Friday 18/07/14.
- 3.6 The EOIE selection criteria were designed to assess the Tenderers' eligibility, based on similar previous project experience in terms of type and scale, experience with Listed Buildings, experience of building civic and cultural facilities, key project personnel suitability, and their understanding and use of Building Information Modelling and three dimensional modelling.
- 3.7 Tenderers were made aware that each EOIE response would be checked for completeness and compliance. Any EOIE response which was found incomplete or non-compliant could be rejected and the applicant disqualified from further participation in the tender process.
- Complete and compliant EOIE responses would then be assessed in respect of all pass / fail questions. Any EOIE response which failed one or more pass / fail question would be rejected and the applicant disqualified from further participation in the evaluation and tender process.
- Those EOIE responses remaining would then be assessed in respect of the responses to scored questions.
- 3.8 A summary of the selection criteria and weightings and pass/fail was included in the EOIE as shown on the table below:

Section	Criterion	Maximum score	EOIE
6.3	Similar Project Experience Number of projects undertaken on inner city sites of similar scale, complexity and value to Walworth Town hall (Scored question) with appended project detail sheets	5 marks	
6.4	Listed Buildings experience		
a	Previous listed buildings experience	Pass/Fail	
b	Listed Buildings project detail sheets	10 marks	
6.5	Modern facility within listed building		
a	Number of projects	5 marks	

Section	Criterion	Maximum score	EOIE
b	Modern facility within listed building project detail sheets	10 marks	
6.6 a and b	Civic/Cultural Building experience	15 marks	
6.7	Public Consultation experience	15 marks	
6.8	Building Information Modelling	10 marks	
6.9	3 Dimensional Modelling	10 marks	
6.10	Project staff	20 Marks	
7.0	Declaration	Pass/Fail	

- 3.8 It was stated that the top 8 (eight) ranking Tenderers based on the top 8 highest EOIE response weighted scores out of 100 would be invited to the ITT stage 2a. This was on the proviso that at least 8 Tenderers submitted a complete and compliant EOIE response and passed all pass/fail questions. If there were less than 8 F+G would only invite to submit a PQQ those Tenderers that had submitted complete and compliant EOIE response which had passed all pass/fail questions.
- 3.9 During the response period, five practices withdrew from the competition, and completed EOIE responses were received from the remaining 9 practices on 28/07/2014.
- 3.10 The Project Manager at Southwark Council and the Faithful+Gould Project Manager individually assessed the responses and awarded marks based on the evaluation criteria, weighting and scoring mechanism.
- 3.11 A meeting was held on 01 August 2014 to reach consensus scoring on the EOI. As a result of this meeting it was agreed that eight of the nine practices had passed the EOI stage of the competition, but one practice was considered too small to manage this scale of project, and it was agreed in a subsequent telephone conversation with their director that they should withdraw on that basis.
- 3.12 Successful practices were notified on 7th August 2014, and were asked to attend site to view the building and extent of work on 20th and 21st August 2014.

4.0 ITT Stage 2a

4.1 The IIT Stage 2a questions were broken down into a quality submission and a commercial submission. Quality scores were weighted at 70% overall, and commercial scores were weighted at 30% overall.

4.2 A summary of the quality questions asked, scores and weightings was included in the ITT Stage 2a as shown on the table below

Question	Criterion	Maximum ITT Stage 2a score	Weighting
1	Your vision for Walworth	10 points	25%
2	Listed and contemporary building experience and expertise (architectural challenges in delivering a contemporary development within the context and constraints of the Listed Walworth Town Hall building)	10 points	15%
3	Design approach to multiple use functions. Describe approach to the design of Walworth Town Hall to include multiple functions, specifically libraries, museums, civil ceremony space, café function and flexible multi-use spaces, and commercially lettable space (with proposed uses).	10 points	15%
4	Consultation. Describe rationale for comprehensive consultation exercise involving communities and stakeholders. Include a community engagement plan and outline agenda for initial stakeholder workshop.	10 points	20%
5	Leadership: description of approach to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing the project; • Managing the BIM process; • Coordinating the project team; • Ensuring consistency throughout delivery; • Working with local government; • Client and stakeholder communication; • Ensuring the project is delivered on time and within budget. 	10 points	25%

- 4.3 With regard to the commercial selection criteria the tenderers were asked to state their percentage fees for each RIBA stage of the project based on a scope of work document appended for both architectural, lead consultancy and BIM Manager's roles, and based on an overall construction value of £20 million. The fee percentage for architectural / lead consultant role was added to the fee percentage for the BIM Manager role. The total fee percentage was compared with the average fee over all the tenderers in order to produce a score which was added to the Quality Evaluation score in order to produce an overall score.
- 4.4 Sheppard Robson withdrew from the competition and so seven ITT Stage 2a responses were received by Faithful+Gould by midday on 2 October 2014.
- 4.5 The Project Manager at Southwark Council and the Faithful+Gould Project Manager individually assessed the responses and awarded marks based on the evaluation criteria, weighting and scoring mechanism.
- 4.6 A meeting was held between The Project Manager at Southwark Council and the Faithful+Gould Project Manager on 08 October 2014 to reach consensus scoring on the ITT Stage 2a. As a result of this meeting consensus scores were reached on the quality answers.
- 4.7 As a result of the quality evaluation representing 70% of the overall marks available, the following percentage scores from highest to lowest was obtained:

Quality: 70% scores	
McAslan	60.9
Avanti	54.1
Rick Mather	51.8
Haworth Tomkins	51.8
Insall	51.3
Purcell	48.8

4.8 As a result of the commercial evaluation representing 30% of the overall marks available, the following weighted scores from lowest price to highest price was obtained:

Commercial: 30% scores	
Avanti	24.5
Rick Mather	19.6
Purcell	18.1
Haworth Tomkins	12.5
Insall	9.8
McAslan	5.6

4.9 As a result of the combined quality and commercial scores being added together with the applied weightings, the final overall Stage 2a ITT results are shown on the table below from highest score to lowest:

ITT Stage 2a overall competition scores:100 %	
Avanti	78.5%
Rick Mather	71.4%
Purcell	66.9%
McAslan	66.5%
Haworth Tomkins	64.3%
Insall	61.0%

4.10 As all architects submitted good quality responses without much deviation in resultant scores, the commercial submissions had a significant effect on the tender outcome.

4.11 On the 8th October an internal meeting was held at Southwark Council offices. The ITT Stage 2a tender process, evaluation and outcomes were presented, and the shortlisted submissions were circulated to the attendees for review. No issues were raised and the stakeholders were happy with the initial recommendation.

- 4.12 The tender evaluation raised some queries with regard to how the architects had worked out their fees and resource for the project. On 8th October the Faithful+Gould Project Manager asked Avanti Architects, Rick Mather Architects and Purcell Architects for a resource against programme schedule for each grade of architect to be working on the project. The clarifications were addressed by all practices by 10th October. From the responses it was apparent that Avanti Architects were allocating more junior resource to the project than the other two practices, but their methodology was clear: they resource the job with a full time experienced project architect throughout, with part time, but adequate directors' time input at the front end of the project, and an assistant architect does most of the day to day tasks for the duration. This response raised no concerns.
- 4.13 As part of the ITT Stage 2a competitions, the Architects were told that references would be required References in order to validate written responses. On the 8th of October the Faithful+Gould Project Manager was asked by Southwark Council to obtain references for each of the shortlisted architects. Two references were obtained from the proposed referees for each practice, all of them excellent.
- 4.14 On the basis of the internal stakeholder team being happy with the recommendation, that the resource queries had been resolved, and that the reference checks had raised no issues, it was agreed that the shortlisted architects should be notified. On 15th October 2014 Avanti Architects, Rick Mather Architects and Purcell Architects were invited to proceed to the final stage of the competition stage 2b. McAslan, Haworth Tomkins and Insall Architects were notified the same day that they had been unsuccessful in stage 2a and would not be asked to proceed to stage 2b.

5.0 ITT Stage 2b

- 5.1 On 15th October 2014, Avanti Architects, Rick Mather Architects and Purcell Architects were invited to take part in internal and external stakeholder events organised by Southwark Councils Project Manager as part of the Stage 2b tender process. It was made clear to the architects that these events were not going to be assessed, but that they were an information gathering exercise. All architects agreed to attend and also to generate lists of questions they would like to ask internal and external stakeholders.
- 5.2 The Internal stakeholder meeting and the external stakeholder meeting were held on 27 October. All three architectural practices sent representatives. The Architects were asked to note the meeting for their own purposes.
- 5.3 ITT stage 2b documents were issued to Avanti Architects, Rick Mather Architects and Purcell Architects on the 22nd October 2014.
- 5.4 The IIT Stage 2b questions were broken down into a quality submission and a commercial submission. Quality scores were weighted at 70% overall, and commercial scores were weighted at 30% overall.
- 5.5 Tenderers were made aware that each question is marked out of 10 by the assessors, and the scores awarded are moderated and a consensus score is reached.
- This score is the multiplied by the criteria weight and these figures are added to give an overall quality score out of 100.
- 5.6 A summary of the quality questions asked, scores and weightings was included in the ITT Stage 2b as shown on the table below:

Please submit your sketch design proposals for the Walworth Town Hall and Newington Library project to accord with the outline brief supplied. These proposals can take whatever form you think most appropriate, but the outputs must be shown across twelve sheets of A3 paper (single sided) and we would expect these to include plans, elevations, and sections, annotated appropriately. Massing diagrams, three dimensional sketches, photomontages, and photographs could also be included, or any other presentation medium you feel best conveys your ideas. We require that the tender stage 2b response is sent back as 2 hard copies, we also require an electronic copy of drawn submission so that your proposals can be uploaded to a project portal for public consultation feedback. The drawn proposals, supported by written statements where noted, will then be used as a basis for the evaluation of the following criteria:

	CRITERIA	ADDITIONAL WRITTEN STATEMENT	WEIGHTING
1	How closely do the design proposals meet the brief?	None	30%

2	How innovative is the sketch design?	On 2 A3 pages (sides) please explain your design philosophy and methodology for bringing design innovation to this project.	20%
3	Does the design approach respect and enhance the heritage of the existing buildings?	On 2 A3 pages (sides) please explain your how your design respects and enhances the heritage of the existing buildings.	15%
4	Has the architect incorporated ideas from the stakeholder consultation sessions	On 3 A3 pages (sides) please explain the main themes you have incorporated into your design from the stakeholder consultation sessions.	15%
5	How operationally efficient is the design?	On 2 A3 pages (sides) please explain your methodology for achieving maximum operational efficiency for this building.	8%
ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS NOT RELATING TO DRAWN PROPOSAL:			
	CRITERIA	FORMAT FOR RESPONSE	WEIGHTING
6	Design Programme	Please provide a Gantt chart showing the anticipated design stages for this project. Please indicate meetings required, stakeholder interfaces, planning and statutory approval periods, key stage gates, and all design team outputs for each stage.	6%
7	Design Risk Assessment	Please complete the spreadsheet in appendix 2 to include the top ten risks you see allied to this project from an architectural perspective and in relation to the design you are putting forward, and ways in which these risks might be mitigated.	6%

5.7 With regard to the commercial selection criteria the tenderers were asked to complete a resource schedule allied to a draft programme to show their resources and personnel per project stage, to ally with the percentage fees they submitted in stage 2a. However, they could also refine their fee offering, in which case the revised figures would be used in the evaluation. If any changes were made to the fees since stage 2a, the architects were asked to submit an explanation of the reason for the change.

5.8 Tenderers were given the following explanation of the scoring of the commercial section of the tender:

The fee percentages are added together for each tenderer giving a total fee percentage.

All the fee percentages are averaged over all the tenderers to give an average fee percentage.

The score for pricing for each tenderer is calculated as follows:

1. The tenderer's total fee is divided by the average fee percentage which gives what percentage the fee is of the average fee.
2. That figure is multiplied by 100
3. That figure is deducted from 100
4. 50 (the mid-point of 100) is added to that figure, which effectively converts their percentage fee to a score out of 100

5.9 Tenderers were told that the Quality score is multiplied by 70% and the Price score is multiplied by 30%. These are then added together to get a total score out of 100. They were also given a tender evaluation matrix so that they could understand the scoring principles given.

5.10 All three tendering practices returned a fully compliant tender submission to the deadlines given.

5.11 The Project Manager at Southwark Council met internally with the project stakeholder user groups and as a group they assessed the assessed the responses and awarded marks based on the evaluation criteria, weighting and scoring mechanism. During the same period, the Faithful+Gould Project Manager individually assessed the submissions and awarded marks based on the evaluation criteria, weighting and scoring mechanism.

5.12 A meeting was held between The Project Manager at Southwark Council and the Faithful+Gould Project Manager on 17 December 2014 to reach consensus scoring on the ITT Stage 2b. As a result of this meeting consensus scores were reached on the quality answers.

5.13 As a result of the quality evaluation representing 70% of the overall marks available, the following percentage scores from highest to lowest was obtained:

Quality scores (highest to lowest quality): 70%	
Avanti	53.5
Purcell	46.5
Rick Mather	37.5

- 5.14 As a result of the commercial evaluation representing 30% of the overall marks available, the following percentage scores from lowest price to highest price, were obtained:

Commercial score (lowest to highest price):30%	
Avanti	17.5
Rick Mather	15.1
Purcell	12.3

- 5.15 As a result of the combined quality and commercial scores being added together with the applied weightings, the final overall Stage 2b ITT results are shown on the table below from highest percentage scores to lowest out of 100%:

ITT Stage 2a overall competition results :100%	
Avanti	71%
Purcell	58.8%
Rick Mather	52.6%

- 5.16 The wider project team within Southwark Council decided that they would like to hold a tender clarification interview with Avanti Architects. The interview was held at Southwark Council's offices on 8th January 2015

- 5.17 As a result of the interview Avanti Architects were asked to provide the following additional information:

- A CV for the proposed project Architect which was missing from the Stage 2a submission;
- Confirmation of projects the company had worked on from start to finish of a similar nature

This information was provided by email on 9th January 2015 and Southwark Council confirmed acceptance of this information and that the Council had no further queries or issues with the agreed conclusion to the tender outcome

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 A thorough review and analysis of the submissions has been undertaken and evaluated at each stage of the three stage competition and consensus scoring has been reached with Southwark's stakeholders, all in accordance with the Tender Evaluation and Scoring criteria outlined in this report.

- 6.2 To conclude, Faithful+Gould confirms that the outcome of the three stage design competition for the appointment of an architect, a lead consultant and a BIM Manager for the Walworth Town Hall and Newington Library refurbishment project is that Avanti Architects should be appointed to these roles by Faithful+Gould under the Scape Framework.

