

Site 11b ITT Evaluation Criteria

1.0. Evaluation

The evaluation process outlined above will determine the most economically advantageous tender (MEAT) by means of applying the following criteria and weightings:

Financial Offer	55%
Quality	45%

A minimum threshold has been set for each of the questions within the Design Quality section of the Quality element of the evaluation. This Design Quality threshold has been set at **3 out of 5**. **If bidders fail to meet this threshold for one or more of the questions, they may not be selected and their Response may not be considered further.**

1.1. Evaluation Methodology Criteria

1.1.1. Standard Submission Requirements

The Standard Submission Requirements will all be marked Pass or Fail. **Failure to submit the documents required in any one of these sections (with the exception of the registered provider requirement where the bidder is not entering into a partnership) will result in the bidder being award a ‘Fail’ mark for this section, and may result in the bidder being excluded from the tender process.**

Council Requirement	Submission Requirement
Development Agreement	Bidders should confirm that they agree to the terms of the Development Agreement.
Governance	Bidders should provide a letter from their board, indicating initial internal approval for the project, along with a statement outlining the internal governance process for obtaining full permission.
Funding	Bidders should confirm their proposed funding strategy for the Scheme, including the split of funding between internal funding and bank borrowing. In addition, bidders must provide a letter of intent confirming availability of funding and a method statement for securing final funder approval for the Scheme. In the case of a Special Purpose Vehicle, bidders should provide confirmation that a parent company guarantee in the form set out in the development agreement and lease can be provided. If a bidder is unable to provide a parent company guarantee in this form then an equivalent form of security should be provided.

Registered Provider	<p>If required it may be necessary for the Delivery Partner to partner with a registered provider in order to provide the affordable homes in accordance with the terms set out in the Development Agreement. If applicable, bidders should complete the Confirmation of Registered Provider, confirming the name of the selected Registered Provider, and their ability to provide the 28 affordable units in accordance with the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 15 years' nominations rights; 2. The Council's Target Rents; and 3. Subject to the Council retaining 15 years' nomination rights from completion of the units
Financial Standing	Bidders should sign the Form of Bid declaration to indicate that their financial position has not materially changed since their PQQ submission.
Development Appraisal	Bidders should submit a development appraisal and cash flow to support their proposal for the Scheme. This may be presented in a format of the Bidder's choosing, but must include an appraisal summary which clearly shows the breakdown of GDV, development costs, finance and profit. This will be reviewed to ensure consistency with the completed Construction Cost and Sales and Revenue Schedules referred to below.
Construction Cost Schedule	Bidders should complete the Construction Cost Schedule
Sales and Revenue Schedule	Bidders should complete the Sales and Revenue Schedule

1.1.2. Quality

The Council will assess quality using the requirements set out below. A minimum threshold has been set for each of the questions within the Design Quality section of the Quality element of the evaluation. This Design Quality threshold has been set at **3 out of 5**. **If bidders fail to meet this threshold for one or more of the questions, they may not be selected and their Response may not be considered further.**

Each requirement will be marked out of 5 using the following scale:

Confidence Score	Numeric Score	Commentary
Excellent Confidence	5	The bidder has addressed the requirements in their entirety and demonstrated with strong supporting evidence that its Solution fully meets the requirement(s).
Good Confidence	4	The bidder has demonstrated with good supporting evidence that its Solution meets most of the requirement(s).

Basic Confidence	3	The bidder has demonstrated, with some supporting evidence, basic confidence that its Solution might meet most of the requirement(s).
Concerns	2	The bidder has provided little or no evidence to show that its Solutions meets the requirement(s).
Major Concerns	1	The bidder has either failed to respond or its Solution only addresses minimal aspects of the requirement(s) with no evidence.

Each requirement will then be allocated a weight adjusted score. The requirements and weightings are as follows:

Evaluation Area	Council Requirement	Assessment Points	Weighting
Design Quality	Design Method Statement	To what extent does the Statement of Design Intent demonstrate that the bidder will overcome the site's constraints to deliver a high quality development, which aligns with the Council's aspirations for exemplar, award winning high quality developments in South Kilburn?	5%
		To what extent does the proposed design respond to the location of Site 11b as a gateway for South Kilburn and demonstrate that the bidder's design will create a high quality, sustainable sense of place? This should extend to the relationship between the development, the streetscape and the existing and proposed buildings in the surrounding neighbourhood.	8%
	Design Code	To what extent does the completed Design Code illustrate that the bidder will deliver a building of high architectural quality and make a positive contribution to the streetscape, with a strong and positive presence on Salusbury Road and Albert Road?	8%
	Planning Method Statement	To what extent does the bidder's Planning Method Statement demonstrate a thorough and reasoned methodology for achieving approval of all reserved planning matters and meeting all planning conditions within 6 months of exchange of the Development Agreement?	5%

Project Delivery	Development Programme	To what extent is the Development Programme realistic and appropriate and demonstrates how the Council's requirement, for the completion of the 28 affordable units by 1 st November 2016, will be achieved?	2%
	Site Management and Construction Method Statement	To what extent does the bidder's Site Management and Construction Method Statement demonstrate a high quality and thorough approach to construction and site management and an appropriate approach to managing the risks associated with the proximity of Network Rail controlled infrastructure?	2%
	Quality Assurance Statement	To what extent does the bidder's Quality Assurance Statement demonstrate that their proposed management structure for the Scheme, their governance process, and approach to working in partnership with the registered provider (if applicable) and other key stakeholders lead to the delivery of a high quality development inline with the proposed Development Programme and achieve the delivery of the 28 affordable units by 1 November 2016?	4%
	Risk Register	To what extent is the bidder's risk register realistic and appropriate for the lifecycle of the Scheme, identifying major risks and appropriate mitigating actions?	2%
Housing Management	Housing Management Strategy and Decant Method Statement	Bidders will be required to specify if they have partnered with a registered provider, and if so, who they have partnered with. The bidder, or if applicable, the selected registered provider will be required to submit a Housing Management Strategy and a Decant Method Statement.	5%
Community Engagement	Community Engagement Strategy	To what extent does the bidder's Community Engagement Strategy demonstrate a targeted and meaningful approach to consulting and engaging the diverse local community, and indicate that the requirements of the Council's Statement of Community Involvement will be met?	4%
Total			45%

1.1.3. Financial Offer

The financial offer will be assessed in accordance with the following table.

Council Requirement	Assessment Points	Maximum Weighted Score
Purchase Price	<p>The bidder who submits the highest bona fide tender will receive the maximum weighted score of 50%. Scores for other bidders will be calculated using the following formula:</p> <p>(bidder's Total Price/Highest bidder's Total Price) x 50%</p> <p>The resulting weighted score will be rounded up to one decimal place</p>	50%
Overage	<p>5% - ((bidder's overage threshold / lowest overage threshold) x5%)</p>	5%
Total		55%