

## **CITY CENTRE REGENERATION BOARD**

**10 FEBRUARY 2014**

### **CITY CENTRE MASTERPLAN AND DELIVERY PROGRAMME – UPDATE (EP1/14/034)**

1. The Board had before it a report by Sandy Beattie which provided an update on the procurement options and programme for a Masterplan and Delivery Programme to secure the future of Aberdeen city centre.

Mr Beattie explained that there were three options for the preparation and delivery of the Programme, namely public procurement, private procurement, and the Council appointment of an internal masterplanning and delivery team dedicated to the city centre. He advised that the private procurement approach was not recommended, due to the risks in relation to control, funding and the legality of whether the Council could be involved in such a process. While an internal team could be assembled for the project, it was felt that there were risks in relation to salary structures, recruitment and the availability of the necessary skills to carry out the various work packages, and therefore this approach was also not recommended.

There were four main options for public procurement – open, restricted, framework and competitive dialogue. Mr Beattie talked the Board through the four options and the advantages and disadvantages of each. He advised that the restricted procurement process was recommended in order to appoint a team with the best chance of developing an appropriate masterplan and delivery programme, and referred to the procurement timetable set out in the report. He highlighted the tight timescale but advised that this would allow officers to report back to the Board prior to the Council meeting in June. Mr Beattie added that two representatives from the Board would be asked to join the Evaluation Team to assess the submissions from the pre qualification questionnaires and invitation to tender stages of the process. He advised that this would require a large time commitment from the two representatives, as they had to participate in the entire process and no substitutes could be allowed. Mr Beattie added that the report before the Board would be referred to the Council meeting of 5 March for approval.

At this juncture, it was proposed that an Urgent Business Committee be called for later in the week to allow the report to be considered at an earlier date and it was agreed that in terms of Standing Order 28(5)(iv), Councillor Crockett and the Chief Executive would meet separately outwith the meeting to discuss the arrangements.

Bob Collier referred to the agreed timescale of projects recommended by the Board being reported to the June meeting of Council, and asked how the timetable set out in the masterplan report would affect that decision. Mr Beattie explained that the report before the Board for consideration would not have an impact, as there would be two strands of work reported to Council in

June, namely the finalisation of the procurement for the masterplan, and the statement of recommended projects from the Board. Professor Von Prondynski asked how the two strands would be co-ordinated, and Mr Beattie advised that the two key drivers for the masterplan were the Strategic Infrastructure Plan (SIP) and its consistency with the masterplanning process, and the City Centre Development Framework and the supplementary guidance for the Local Development Plan. He added that the masterplan would involve short, medium and longer term projects; however none of the projects mentioned to date contradicted any ongoing work. The Chairperson noted that Andrew Win, the new City Centre Programme Manager, would have a major role to play in co-ordinating the project proposals from Board members.

Mr Collier referred to the procurement brief which had been prepared following workshops held in June and August, and asked if the revised version of this could be circulated to members of the Board. Mr Beattie advised that this would be included as part of the invitation to tender, and added that he would be happy to receive any further comments from the Board on the brief.

Mr Collier asked for an explanation of the differing roles of the Evaluation Team and the Project Team and Mr Beattie advised that the Project Team would provide support and expertise throughout the process, but the Evaluation Team was specifically in place to evaluate any bids which were submitted. It was noted that the Evaluation Team would report to both the Board and Council. Mr Collier suggested that the scope of the programme was so large that it might be advantageous to look at the brief in terms of key city centre regeneration components. Once these were agreed, the focus could be placed on issues where no agreement had been reached. Mr Beattie stated that this was a useful suggestion but that it was important to keep the holistic nature of the masterplan in mind. Mr Collier further suggested that it would be helpful for an away day to be arranged to allow the Board to comment on the detail of the procurement brief. Mr Beattie agreed that this would be useful, and suggested that it could be arranged through the Masterplanning team prior to the invitation to tender. Derek McCrindle asked if the Board would sign off on the criteria and weightings for the procurement process and Mr Beattie proposed that the away day could be structured to allow discussion of these.

The Chief Executive referred to the procurement timetable, and requested that Board members take the opportunity to explain the timetable to their networks where possible in order to communicate the procurement regulations to which the Council had to adhere.

There was a short discussion around the two Board representatives for the Evaluation Team, and Mr Collier advised that he would take up one of the places, adding that he was also happy to serve on the Project Team.

Richard Noble referred to the industry day to be held on 10 March and the process to be followed for notifying companies, and Mr Beattie explained that the Council's procurement team would ensure that this was done.

Andrew Win advised that he would be looking into the governance of the process and the role of the Board in relation to the invitation to tender. Mr Collier explained that he had spoken to Sir Ian Diamond prior to the meeting, and he had been in agreement with the points he had raised today to the Board, and had highlighted that it would be necessary to have a plan in place for the next six months. An early meeting would be arranged between Andrew Win and Sir Ian Diamond to discuss matters.

**The report recommended –**

that the Board –

- (a) note the proposed restricted procurement approach outlined in sections 5.13-5.17 of the report;
- (b) agree to contribute as appropriate to a project team and evaluation team; and
- (c) note that the report would be referred to Council on 5 March 2014 for approval.

**The Board resolved:-**

- (i) to request that an Urgent Business Committee be convened to allow the procurement process set out in the report to be approved at an earlier date than the Council meeting of 5 March, and to note that the Chief Executive and Councillor Crockett would meet separately to discuss arrangements for the meeting;
- (ii) to note that the Masterplanning team would arrange an away day for Board members as soon as possible to allow them to comment on the detail of the procurement brief;
- (iii) to agree that Board members would share and explain the procurement timetable within their networks;
- (iv) to note that Bob Collier would take up one of the two places available to the Board on the Evaluation Team; and
- (v) to note that Andrew Win would arrange an early meeting with Sir Ian Diamond.