

BRIEFING NOTE		
SUBJECT:	West Riverside, Balloch	
	Briefing Note for SG MACCS Case	
DATE:	26.10.2015	
FROM:	, Project Manager	
TO:		
ATTACHMENTS:	Appendix 1 – Ltd Appendix 2 – Letter Appendix 3 – SE Response Letter	
STATUS:	COMMERCIALLY CONFIDENTIAL	

## 1.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

- 1.1 SE have been marketing it's 44 acre site. West Riverside and the undeveloped sites within Loch Lomond Shores for tourism and leisure-based developments with the aim of creating a quality-led destination that improves connectivity between the popular tourist destination of Loch Lomond Shores and the centre of Balloch. A development brief was issued seeking outline proposals with a closing date set for all submissions. The development brief sought proposals for mixed use leisure based development including:
  - Hotel, hostel, lodge or holiday accommodation
  - Specialist or tourism related retail
  - Family orientated, active leisure activities.

## 2.0 BACKGROUND TO SCORING OF DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

- 2.1 In response to the invitation for development proposals for West Riverside five proposals were received.
- 2.2 Proposals were scored by a panel comprising SE, LLTNPA and Property Advisors (GVA) in accordance with the issued evaluation criteria and methodology outlined in the development brief. Proposals were then ranked 1 5 in terms of quality. Two submissions scored considerably higher than the others allowing for a preferred proposal (and first alternative) to be identified. The proposal ranked 3<sup>rd</sup>.
- 2.3 The three proposals ranking 3 5 (including Ltd) were notified, in writing, that their proposals had been unsuccessful and reasons given.



3.0	BACKGROUND TO LTD ENQUIRY
3.1	The Submission was strong in terms of its design concept & vision and potential ability to meet the economic objectives stated in the brief. However there are considered to be significant areas of weakness in the submission including and capacity to deliver such an ambitious project.
	Specifically:
	<ul> <li>estimated a public sector funding requirement with a further unspecified sum required to grant fund the provision of a roof over the proposed surfing lake. Furthermore these estimates exclude allowance for acquisition of the site with any payment increasing the funding gap.</li> <li>The source of the circa 1 of private sector funding was not specified.</li> <li>are property consultants with no direct development track record.</li> </ul> In addition, based on experience of visitor attractions elsewhere in Scotland, the panel had concerns over the viability and sustainability of 'visitor attractions.
	Following the evalution process SE wrote to notifying them that their proposal had been unsuccessful ( <b>Appendix 1</b> ).
3.2	then wrote to SE outlining their dissatisfaction with our decision ( <b>Appendix 2</b> ) outlining examples of a and a (an outdoor attraction which utilises different technology than that proposed at ') to address our concerns over their proposal. also sought assurances that this was not merely an invitation for financial bids.
3.3	SE replied to (Appendix 3) to once again outline the evaluation criteria and methodology in scoring proposals confirming that at no stage were financial bids for the site given any weighting in the evaluation process. The preferred proposal was put forward by a developer with a proven track record for delivery of mixed use leisure developments and met our objectives for West Riverside.
4.0	PROPOSED NEXT STEPS

It is proposed that the developer that submitted the highest ranked bid – Flamingo Land – will

be offered a period of exclusivity to work up their proposals and secure planning consent. The

[Type text]

4.1



identity of the preferred developer will remain confidential until such time as Heads of Terms have been agreed. It is anticipated that these Heads of Terms will be in place by January 16.