

**WHITBY MARINA ONSHORE FACILITIES**  
**NOTES OF FOCUS GROUP 1 MEETING NO. 3**

**29<sup>th</sup> MAY 2008, 18.30 AT WHITBY HARBOUR OFFICE**

**Present:**

Ms Diana Jeuda (DJ)	Whitby Boating Association (Chair)
Mr E Firth (EF)	Whitby Cruising Association
Mr M Coates (MC)	Whitby Yacht Club
Cllr Herbert Tindall	Scarborough Borough Council
Cllr Dorothy Clegg (DC)	Scarborough Borough Council
John Riby (JR)	Scarborough Borough Council
Bill Estill (BE)	Scarborough Borough Council
Alex Richards (AR)	Scarborough Borough Council

**Also in attendance to observe proceedings:**

Cllr Jim Preston (JP)

**Apologies:**

David Archer Scarborough Borough Council

**Action**

**1.0 Welcome and Introductions**

1.1 The chair welcomed members to the meeting.

**2.0 Notes of Last Meeting**

2.1 The notes of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> May 2008 were agreed as an accurate record.

**3.0 Matters Arising Not Covered Elsewhere**

3.1 Actions of previous meeting had all been addressed or covered in the agenda.

**4.0 Procurement of Project Team**

4.1 JR explained the tender process stating that:  
3 compliant tenders for a consultant team to develop and deliver the facility had been received. All scored very closely on a 60% quality 40% cost basis. Therefore the decision had been made to undertake interviews.

## Action

4.2 The interview panel consisted of AR, DC, HT and JR. DJ had been invited but was unable to attend.

4.3 All 3 tenderers attended the interview and gave presentations and answered questions on their tender submissions.

4.4 The interview questions and criteria for scoring were based on 4 key headings including: proposed methodology, resources, previous experience and recognition of risk.

4.5 The tenderers were all scored independently by each panel member and the results would be entered into a scoring matrix over the coming days to determine the winning bid.

AR

4.6 DJ asked if the public could be informed of the consultant and a description of the process of selection. AR to provide Info

AR

### **5.0 Facility Layout Plan- Version 3 (Previously Issues)**

5.1 AR had commissioned SBC architects to undertake all of the amendments to the facility layout which were brought up at the previous meeting. The revised layout had been circulated and further discussion led to the following points

- 5.2
- Sluice sink to be bigger and perhaps a “mop sink” at low level to wash out receptacles etc.
  - There was discussion about whether the door to the disabled toilet should open outwards but it was agreed to leave it as designed to facilitate wheelchair access.
  - Shower cubicles to be redesigned to ensure the shielding of clothing within the facility (interior design of the shower cubicles should be turned round so that clothes are not in the same plane as the opening).
  - A standpipe should be included in each washroom for ease of wash down.
  - Vanity shelving to be placed above sinks and below mirrors
  - One way vision panels should be included in the washroom doors but the laundry facility should have a clear glass panel that allowed people to see both in and out.
  - Further investigation to be made as to whether the waste

	<b>Action</b>
oil store a fire risk and needs a separate building.	
5.3 Subject to consideration of the above points the group approved the facility layout drawing as the basis for detailed design.	
5.4 AR qualified this approval with the fact that some minor amendments may be necessary once detailed design had commenced. i.e. construction of the oil store but if these occurred the group would be kept informed.	
5.5 DJ once again noted how successful the process had been in reaching a satisfactory outcome and thanked all concerned.	
<b>6.0 AOB.</b>	
6.1 None	
<b>7.0 Focus Group 2 – The Way Forward</b>	
7.1 Following selection of a consultant to deliver the project the second Focus Group would be established to consider the external appearance of the building.	
7.2 DJ would represent Focus Group 1 on this group and would report back as necessary. If she were not able to attend any meeting, she should arrange a substitute from the group	<b>DJ</b>

### **Summary of Actions:**

1. The tenderers were all scored independently by each panel member and the results would be entered into a scoring matrix over the coming days to determine the winning bid. – **AR**
2. DJ asked if the public could be informed of the consultant and a description of the process of selection. AR to provide Info – **AR**
3. DJ would represent Focus Group 1 on this group and would report back to the group. - **DJ**

### **Note on consultant selection:**

Subject to contract Salt Architects of Beverley, East Yorkshire, have now been selected as preferred consultant for the Onshore Facilities development.

Borough Council representatives will be meeting with them on Friday 27<sup>th</sup> June to finalise contract details and prepare a programme of work.

They will then be initiating the next round of consultation with Focus Group 2 to determine the outer appearance of the building with the Architect.

With regard to the selection process, as with all public sector procurement, best practice requires that "best value" is established for the local authority area through the selection process. Predefined and weighted tender evaluation criteria were issued to the applicants based on Quality (60%) and Cost (40%).

10 companies were invited to tender and 3 tenders were received: Turner & Townsend, Salts Architects and Derrik Kershaw Partnership.

Each tenderer was required to submit a written tender document in the 1<sup>st</sup> instance and subsequently attend an interview where they were required to give a presentation on their proposed methodology, resources and project management / supervision proposals and risk considerations.

Following this process Turner & Townsend were the consultants providing "best value" in accordance with this test, with Salts Architects 2nd and Derrik Kershaw Partnership 3rd.

However, Turner & Townsend had included 16 contractual qualifications to their tender submission which they were unwilling to withdraw. Instead they withdrew their tender submission.

Consequently Salt Architects were made preferred consultant for this contract (they came second overall in the selection process).

Salts Architects have the, experience, expertise and resources to deliver this project effectively and in accordance with the brief and stakeholder expectations. They have worked in a number of historical and heritage settings and have undertaken the delivery of similar facilities throughout the region. Above all they showed great enthusiasm and flexibility with regard to working with the stakeholder groups and delivering this high profile project.

25<sup>th</sup> June 2008