



ACT
Government

Environment, Planning and
Sustainable Development

**ADDENDUM
FOR
DEMONSTRATION HOUSING PROJECT
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL WITH SITES
ISSUED IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLAUSE 16.3 OF THE REQUEST FOR
PROPOSAL WITH SITES**

Addendum 2

Questions and Formal responses

Q1. What is the status of the Collaboration Hub, and will it be involved in the evaluation of Stage 2 Proposals?

A1. The Collaboration Hub provided input in to the development of the Stage 2 Request for Proposal. The Collaboration Hub process is now complete and it will not have a role in evaluating Stage 2 Proposals.

Q2. What support will be provided for community engagement, and if the community shows strong support will this ensure that the project proceeds past stage 2?

A2. Community support for a project is not sufficient for a project to make it viable to proceed past Stage 2. Projects will be assessed according to the Evaluation Criteria in the RFP.

In relation to support provided by the Australian Capital Territory represented by the Environment, Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD) in relation to community engagement, a template for a Stakeholder and Community Engagement Plan has been provided in the RFP documentation. Page 11 of the RFP outlines assistance EPSDD will provide which includes direct support assisting with planning, and attending consultation sessions with Proponents to provide information about the Demonstration Housing Project. At the Information Session, it was also outlined that EPSDD will assist Proponents by hosting a Demonstration Housing Project website (likely to be on YourSay) for projects for the purposes of community engagement.

EPSDD will meet with Proponents individually to discuss the timing of community engagement. For some projects, it may be beneficial to commence community engagement during the RFP phase. This will be determined on a case by case basis with Proponents.

Q3. Who makes the decision about projects that are successful in the stage 2 RFP, and is there scope for negotiation if projects are deemed unsuccessful?

A3. The Evaluation Team for the Demonstration Housing Project evaluates the Proposals received in Stage 2. The Chair of the Evaluation Team makes recommendations on behalf of the Evaluation Team to the Delegate, the Executive Director of Urban Renewal. This is then provided to the Deputy Director General, Sustainability and the Built Environment for approval. The National Capital Design Review Panel (NCDRP) is not involved in the evaluation process. There is no scope for negotiation if projects are deemed unsuccessful through this process.

Q4. When will the NCDRP Guidelines be available?

A4. The NCDRP guidelines and principles are currently with the National Capital Authority for final approval. These should be available in early November.

Q5. Are Proponents able to collaborate on their Projects?

A5. Provided they do not breach the collusive bidding provisions as set out in clause 16.4 of the RFP, it is open for Proponents to collaborate with other proposed proponents. If a Proponent is unclear as to what this may permit they should present their proposed collaborative activity to EPSDD for consideration.

Q6. Will EPSDD meet with Proponents to discuss Proposals?

A6. Whilst this process is not a competitive one, EPSDD requires that all Proponents are treated equally and fairly. EPSDD offers Proponents two meetings during the RFP period, with one of these meetings to assist with planning for community engagement, and the other for the purpose of raising project specific issues if required. General questions about the process should be emailed to demonstrationhousing@act.gov.au. In determining a response EPSDD will, in its discretion, consider whether it is appropriate that all Proponents receive the same information or whether a response may only be supplied to the Proponent raising the query, given the specific nature of that query to the Proponent.

Q7. Will there be an exemption from Third Party Appeals?

A7. As indicated in the RFP, EPSDD is still investigating the option to waive third party appeals for successful Demonstration Housing Projects. Proponents will be advised when a decision is made on this, however an exemption should not be assumed at this stage.

Q8. Can the Territory Plan Variation process be shortened, and how will Demonstration Housing Projects be treated differently from other development proposals?

A8. Territory Plan Variations are a statutory process and EPSDD must comply with legislative requirements. This was outlined on page 8 of the Expression of Interest document. EPSDD acknowledges the Territory Plan Variation process can be timely, and will make every effort to streamline the process. Proponents will be able to submit Development Applications concurrently with Territory Plan Variations.

Demonstration Housing Projects will have the benefit of site specific Territory Plan Variations, if they are required. This process is not usually available for individual development proposals.

Q9. Can the documentation required in relation to Preliminary Sketch Plans be reduced?

A9. The evaluation criteria has been developed to ensure that the Evaluation Team are able to evaluate design quality and build quality, and to ensure Proponents intend to deliver what they have outlined in the stage 1 Expression of Interest. A wide range of Proposals have been received for the Demonstration Housing Project, with very different typologies and scale (3-100+ dwellings).

The RFP has been drafted to reflect this wide range of Proposals. EPSDD understands that projects are at different stages of development and does not expect drawings to be of Development Application standard. The requirements of the RFP need to be interpreted appropriately for individual projects. The following drawings may be provided at 'concept' stage, but must be more advanced than the concepts provided for the stage 1 EOI:

- Site plan
- Floor plan
- Area plan
- Sections
- Elevations
- Shadow diagram
- Composite streetscape elevation
- Solar plan
- Driveway plan
- Landscape plan

A written commentary may be provided instead of the following plans, addressing how the issue has been considered, what the project

intentions are, and if there are unresolved issues at this stage, these also need to be identified:

- Water sensitive urban design
- Access and mobility plan and report
- Waste management plan
- Bill of quantities/summary of costs.

The tree management plan and erosion and sediment control plan are not required at this stage.

It is the Proponent's responsibility to ensure their proposal contains enough detail for the Evaluation Team to be confident that the proposal demonstrates excellence in design quality.

Q10. How can Proponents address the Evaluation Criterion on Excellence in Build Quality if they haven't yet appointed a builder?

A10. This Evaluation Criterion was developed with the ACT Government Architect and was identified as a critical consideration by the Collaboration Hub. Consideration should be given to the ongoing suitability of the structure for the next fifty years, as well as the management of life cycle costs.

EPSDD is not requiring a Proponent to go to tender at this stage, however Proponents need to outline how they will ensure build quality, for example how will construction be tendered, and what systems will be in place. Proponents that have not yet appointed a construction team should outline how they will ensure that all team members are suitably qualified and experienced, and address how appropriate site supervision will be ensured.

Q11. Can you please provide more information on Universal Design, and does this relate to ageing in place?

A11. Universal design has been included in the RFP as it was identified as a critical issue by the Collaboration Hub, who recommended it be included as a key consideration in Demonstration Housing Projects. This does relate to ageing in place, but also people who live with permanent or temporary disabilities. EPSDD has referenced the NSW Low Rise Medium Density Guide for Development Applications (2018) as well as provided a link to Livable Housing Australia in the RFP.

Q12. Can you please provide further clarification in relation to the Garden City Principles in the RFP?

A12. As outlined in the Collaboration Hub's report (Annexure A of the RFP), the Collaboration Hub supported increased urban density, however members of the Hub were concerned that any increase in density does not compromise people's access to sufficient private open space, and

that heat island effect is not increased by a reduction in landscaped areas and an increase in hard stand surfaces. They were also concerned that the existing character of suburbs and neighbourhoods be retained. This requirement has been incorporated into the RFP.

Q13. Has the ACT Government considered the risk to Proponents of participating in this project and the cost of the work required for stage 2 RFPs? What advice can be provided on how these risks should be managed?

A14. EPSDD has conducted a two stage process to assist in mitigating the risk of Proponents undertaking abortive work and unnecessary expenditure. Proposals that were successful in the stage 1 EOI were assessed by the Evaluation Team as having a reasonable chance of being successful in the stage 2 RFP. EPSDD acknowledges that, as with all development projects, there is risk involved in planning and delivery. It is up to the individual Proponents to decide whether or not to accept that risk and submit a Proposal for Stage 2. EPSDD has endeavoured to provide as much certainty as is possible at this stage in the project, and will assist Proponents by responding to questions they may have about the process. EPSDD will not provide any guarantees in relation to Proposals.

EPSDD is appropriately conducting a robust process that is designed to ensure that Proponents that are successful are delivering a high quality product that meets the project objectives, and have the financial capacity to do so. If Proponents determine they are not able to undertake the required work without causing financial stress they should not proceed to submit a Proposal in response to the RFP.

Q15. Can additional time be given to the preparation of submissions? And, if our Proposal is ready sooner, can it still be assessed earlier?

A15. In accordance with clause 16.4 of the Demonstration Housing Project Expression of Interest, the EPSDD has extended the period of time to lodge a proposal from 5:00pm Monday 12 November 2018 to 5:00pm Monday 29 January 2019. The closing time for clarification questions is extended from 5:00pm Thursday 18 October 2018 to 5:00pm Friday 30 November 2018. If Proponents wish to submit Proposals on the original closing date of Monday 12 November 2018, this is also permitted.

Q16. How does one make the balance sheet PDF Smart Form work? Please could you give a demonstration?

A16. Double clicking on the PDF smart form works if you open it in Adobe Acrobat Reader or Google Chrome. Please advise if there are troubles with opening it and we will email a separate document to you.

Q17. Has the Lease Variation Charge Remission expired?

A17. A previous environmental sustainability remission expired on 6 March 2018. The current remission can be accessed here:

<https://www.legislation.act.gov.au/View/di/2018-89/current/PDF/2018-89.PDF>

Q18. Have the submissions received so far addressed the notion of the missing middle or do they proposed other housing choices? Can you give us an overview of the submissions now that entries are closed?

A18. Proposals that were successful in the Stage 1 EOI process covered a range of typologies. An overview is now provided on

<https://www.yoursay.act.gov.au/housing-choices/demonstrationhousing>

Clarification for Proponents

The RFP provides at section 2 that in addition to addressing the Evaluation Criteria Proponents have been requested to provide detailed information in relation to:

- Governance model
- Confirmation of Project Team details including qualification and registrations.

The Evaluation Team may consider this information against one or more Evaluation Criteria as it deems applicable (in addition to the responses provided in the relevant Returnable Schedules).

Date: 25 October 2018