



Meeting	Full Council
Date	Wednesday 3 September 2025
Report Title	FC.25.075: To RECEIVE working party recommendation on successful contractor for the feasibility study for the proposed village centre and AGREE actions
Author:	Projects Officer, Johanna Hutcheson

Officer's Recommendations:

- To appoint Company A (Corstorphine & Wright) to conduct the feasibility study for Cam Parish Council, as recommended by the Working Party.**

BACKGROUND

Councillors have each received a copy of the request for quotations for the feasibility study, published on Thursday, 10 July 2025, titled 'Build Cam's Future – A New Destination Village Centre'.

The request for quotations outlined the scope of the project, and requested the following outputs to be quoted for (in summary):

Purpose:	Commission a feasibility study for a new destination village centre in Cam, Gloucestershire, focused on health, wellbeing, recreation, and community facilities.
Scope of Study:	Analyse the proposed 4.4-hectare site (Draycott / Middle Mill area) – environmental, transport, planning, and policy context. Prepare a concept masterplan showing buildings, open spaces, access, and circulation. Assess traffic, parking, public transport, walking/cycling routes, and safety. Develop a landscape and public realm strategy (green spaces, drainage, event use). Provide planning policy review and identify required changes/alignments. Prepare a development viability overview (funding models, costs, phasing, deliverability).
Proposed Facilities to be Considered:	Community Hub – fitness studio, meeting rooms, youth hub, community café. Start-up/local enterprise units – to support small businesses. Recreational spaces – bike pump track, landscaped public realm, 3G pitch. Police presence – small unit or shared office. NHS Dental facility – six surgeries, 250m ² . Commercial health/wellbeing uses – e.g. pharmacy, optician.
Deliverables Required:	Site analysis report. Masterplan with land use zones and layouts. Schedule of proposed uses with indicative floor areas. Design & Access Statement. Transport/parking appraisal.



	Viability assessment with funding/delivery options.
Contract Details:	Budget: £30,000 (inc. VAT). Start date: 5 September 2025. Duration: 8 weeks. Submission deadline: 5pm, Friday 15 August 2025. Evaluation split: 40% price, 60% quality.

The invitation for quotes was issued on Thursday 10 July and promoted through multiple channels: it was circulated directly to potential local organisations, published on the CPC website and social media, announced in the local press, and listed on the government's Contracts Finder portal as required. Interested parties were able to submit clarification questions up until the submission deadline of Friday 15 August 2025, with all responses published on the CPC website.

Notice type

Any

Search

Request for Quotation: Build Cam's Future!

UK4: Tender notice

Publication reference: 2025/S 000-038918

Cam Parish Council is inviting suitably qualified consultants to submit quotations for undertaking a detailed feasibility study for the development of a new destination village centre with a focus on health and wellbeing, recreation and community facilities for Cam, Gloucestershire.

Published
10 July 2025, 12:40pm

Published by
projects@camparishcouncil.gov.uk

Views
1374

[View notice](#)

Cam Parish Council received four high-quality submissions in response to the request for quotations. On Wednesday 27 August, the Working Party met to carry out a blind scoring of each submission against the weighted criteria set out in the RFQ:



Criteria	Weighting	Break Down
Price (Cost Breakdown)	40%	
Quality (Qualitative Submission) If required	60%	Methodology & Approach 25%, Relevant Experience 15%, Project Team and Resources 10%, Risk Management Approach 10%
Total	100%	

The Working party scored the following weighted criteria:

Criteria D	Weight
1. Price (cost breakdown clarity and value for money)	40%
2. Quality , subdivided as follows:	
Methodology & Approach (approach to feasibility study, understanding of brief)	20%
Relevant Experience (experience with similar council or healthcare-led projects)	15%
Stakeholder Engagement (approach to engagement, examples of past consultations)	10%
Team & Resources (skills, qualifications, structure of delivery team)	10%
Risk Management (identification of risks and proposed mitigation strategies)	5%
TOTAL	100%

Please note: there was a discrepancy between the revised weightings and the original documentation, which had not been updated due to human error. To address this, the scoring was carried out strictly in line with the weighted criteria set out in the RFQ, rather than the template used during the meeting. This ensured that the process remained standardised, fair, and transparent, in full accordance with the submission requirements.

Each submission was assessed individually against the scoring criteria, with the contractors' identities redacted. A summary of each submission was provided to the Working Party ahead of the meeting, a snapshot of part of the document can be seen below:



CONCLUSION:

Following significant analysis, the Working party scored each submission. A snapshot can be seen below. Scores are as follows:

COMPANY	COMPANY	SCORE
A	Corstorphine & Wright	80
B	AHR	75
C	One50Studio	63
D	benjamin+beauchamp architects ltd	39

Image of summary information provided to Working Party:

COMPANY:	A	B	C	D
Price (not inc. VAT)	£ 24,210.00	£ 29,986.00	£ 25,000.00	£ 23,283.00
Understanding of the Brief: Demonstrate strong understanding of vision (health & wellbeing, community focus, complementing NHS facility, policy compliance)	Clear understanding; highlight prior work on Cam's medical centre. Show deep knowledge of site and NHS partner. Good understanding of challenges.	Broad grasp of vision; link to regeneration expertise and relevant council work. Strong emphasis on placemaking and community integration. Clear list of assumptions - helpful at review.	Clear understanding of project brief, overview, objectives and challenges	Clear understanding of project brief, project aims and outcomes required
Scope of Work / Methodology (summary)	Covers site analysis, masterplan, schedule of uses, traffic strategy, viability, funding models, phasing. Doesn't explicitly list all required though implies inclusion. Very strong response, inc. community benefit.	Very systematic 8-week phased plan (site analysis → concept → options → preferred option → Design & Access Statement). Explicitly mentions: dental, police, 3G pitch, pump track, enterprise units, public realm. Includes Design & Access Statement as requested. Some elements noted as "desk-top only" (e.g. ecology, contamination) due to fee/time, so may not fully meet "detailed analysis" expectation.	Clear grasp of community-led vision: highlights social impact, placemaking, and health-wellbeing integration. Strong on design creativity: shows precedent projects with contemporary community centres. Offers a collaborative process with workshops, stakeholder engagement. Focus on sustainability (mentions net-zero design).	Directly lists all RFQ facilities. Very strong sustainability focus. Strong portfolio of community and health projects. Diluted focus on commercial viability analysis
Site Analysis & Constraints (existing conditions, environmental, constraints)	Clear understanding	Clear understanding - desktop studies/research only	details technical/feasibility outputs cl (viability, transport, detailed schedules	Clear understanding
Concept Master Plan	Clear understanding & integration policy.	Clear understanding - included.	strong design/placemaking vision, softer community focus. Offers a collaborative process with workshops, stakeholder engagement	Clear understanding - with stakeholder input in the process.
Traffic & Transport	Movement/access strategy outlined. Clear understanding	High-level transport appraisal included	Demonstrated in staff structure - expertise & clear plan inc. other modes of transport	
Landscape & Public Realm	Clear understanding	Clear understanding	Demonstrated in staff structure - expertise and evidence base gathering	Clear understanding - demonstrated very well
Planning Policy	Clear understanding	Clear understanding & case studies	Clear understanding	
Viability	Clear understanding inc. phasing and different funding models.	Clear understanding inc. phasing and different funding models.	Demonstrated in staff structure - expertise	Clear understanding inc. phasing but no reference to different funding models.



Image of scoring matrix used by Working Party:

D		Weight	Panel Score (0–5)	Weighted Score
1. Price (cost breakdown clarity and value for money)		40%	2	16
2. Quality, subdivided as follows:				
Methodology & Approach (approach to feasibility study, understanding of brief)	✓	20%	2	8
Relevant Experience (experience with similar council or healthcare-led projects)	✓	15%	2	6
Stakeholder Engagement (approach to engagement, examples of past consultations)	✓	10%	0	0
Team & Resources (skills, qualifications, structure of delivery team)	✓	10%	3	6
Risk Management (identification of risks and proposed mitigation strategies)	✓	5%	3	3
TOTAL		100%		39
C		Weight	Panel Score (0–5)	Weighted Score
1. Price (cost breakdown clarity and value for money)		40%	4	32
2. Quality, subdivided as follows:				
Methodology & Approach (approach to feasibility study, understanding of brief)	✓	20%	3	12
Relevant Experience (experience with similar council or healthcare-led projects)	✓	15%	3	9
Stakeholder Engagement (approach to engagement, examples of past consultations)	✓	10%	0	0
Team & Resources (skills, qualifications, structure of delivery team)	✓	10%	3	6
Risk Management (identification of risks and proposed mitigation strategies)	✓	5%	4	4
TOTAL		100%		63
B		Weight	Panel Score (0–5)	Weighted Score
1. Price (cost breakdown clarity and value for money)		40%	4	32
2. Quality, subdivided as follows:				
Methodology & Approach (approach to feasibility	✓			