

Peninsula Community Council
May 14th, 2012

TO: Chair and Members of Peninsula Community Council



SUBMITTED BY: _____
Peter Stickings Acting Director, Planning & Infrastructure

DATE: May 4th, 2012

SUBJECT: Update - Bloomfield Redevelopment Project

INFORMATION REPORT

ORIGIN

April 29, 2012, e-mail correspondence from Councillor Watts requesting an update report be added to the May 14th 2012 Peninsula Community Council agenda regarding the Bloomfield implementation strategy

January 9, 2012, staff presentation to Peninsula Community Council on the Implementation strategy for the Bloomfield redevelopment project

August 11, 2009, Regional Council's acknowledgement of the property being surplus to direct municipal requirements and subsequent approval in principle of the Bloomfield Master Plan for the redevelopment of the HRM-owned Bloomfield property, Halifax Peninsula

BACKGROUND

Since Regional Council's approval of the Bloomfield Master Plan in 2009 staff has been considering an implementation strategy that can best achieve the Master Plan objectives and HRM's broader policy and investment priorities. When staff reported to the Peninsula Community Council (PCC) in January 2012 on the implementation approach for the redevelopment of the site questions were raised as to why recommendations under the 2010 Bloomfield Redevelopment Project Implementation Plan report prepared by David Harrison and Anne Muecke consultants were not being implemented.

Two consultant recommendations were identified for further clarification including – a recommendation to form the Bloomfield Development Partnership (BDP) which would have HRM, the developer and Imagine Bloomfield (community group) as the joint decision-making body throughout the development process, and a recommendation for a two-phased EOI/RFP and evaluation process to select a future developer for the site and to select community and cultural tenants. A third question has been raised by Councillor Watts with respect to the proposed approach for the RFP evaluation and scoring framework.

DISCUSSION

The implementation approach for the development of the Bloomfield site must consider the need to carefully balance HRM's objectives for a mixed-use community cultural hub on the site with other economic and planning concerns. The approach for the Bloomfield project continues to focus on maximizing the development of the site as a positive catalyst for growth and development in the North-end of Halifax. This includes appropriate timing for putting the property on the market and an RFP with a strong selection process that achieves the best end result for the site. All of these factors have influenced the proposed implementation process.

Project Management Structure:

The consultant report completed in 2010 by the Muecke Harrison team was commissioned to provide some guidance with respect to how the development could be managed by considering various approaches, processes and procedures that have been used in other cities. The report recommended a partnership-based project management structure where HRM, a developer, and Imagine Bloomfield would equally share decision-making across all aspects of the development. This project management team, called the Bloomfield Development Partnership (BDP) would also have additional input from the community through a community Steering Committee. This model was carefully considered; however, based on a number of factors, including HRM's desire to facilitate a good development rather than directly manage it, staff felt that the BDP model was not the best approach for the Bloomfield site. The question of unequal financial risk (and equal decision-making) among the three partners was also a contributing factor in why this model was not explored further. Arguably, the BDP model would take significantly longer to deliver and

could deter quality developers who might otherwise be interested in developing the site. Discussions have taken place with Imagine Bloomfield which indicates that they are comfortable with not using the BDP model. In fact, the ability of the group to liaise and work with potential developers and community partners would not have been possible under this model.

Collaboration with Imagine Bloomfield as a key community stakeholder remains important. In order to benefit from the insights of the group and their ongoing work staff has been liaising regularly with the group to better understand the community's issues and opportunities with respect to the future of the Bloomfield property. Imagine Bloomfield has provided input to staff to help shape the objectives under the RFP document and has also provided valuable information through their 2012 needs assessment survey which provides insight into the level of interest from community groups, social enterprise and creative sector in renting future space on the site. The results of this survey will help HRM make future recommendations to Council on a sustainable model of community-cultural space and the level of municipal contribution needed to help facilitate its development.

Request for Proposal Process & Selection of Development Team:

Staff is recommending a development model that uses a two-part RFP process with strong emphasis on built form and programming and a commitment to design excellence and sustainability. This process can be completed in a shorter period of time and would achieve the same results as the two-phase (separate) EOI and RFP recommended by the consultant.

The two-part RFP would have a qualifying component as step one. Evaluation and scoring of proponents would be based on overall capability to achieve the development objectives and would be measured through experience, quality of the team, and quality of the development concept. Part one of the process would result in a short-list of proponents who would be required to further demonstrate their capability in part two based on their financial and project management capacity and the quality and depth of their detailed development proposal.

Community & Cultural Space Objectives:

The RFP will outline minimum requirements for developing affordable community and cultural space on the site and scoring incentives for producing more than the minimum. HRM will not be the developer or operator of community space on the Bloomfield site but rather the objective is to "enable" "facilitate" and "support" community capacity-building (as opposed to providing direct, more controlled service delivery). The concept, design and the operation of community space must be driven by the community itself. HRM can help facilitate this kind of model through an appropriate level of financial and/or other contribution based on Council's policy objectives and priorities. Developers must demonstrate that viable partnership opportunities are being explored to develop and deliver the necessary community and cultural facility space on the site. The information provided through the Imagine Bloomfield Community Needs Assessment

will help to define the objectives and any specific requirements for community and cultural space under the RFP document.

PROPOSED EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Selection of a developer will be through a predetermined evaluation criteria and rating system. The strength of proposals will be evaluated using measurable criteria (based on the principles and objectives for the site) and a scoring system which will determine a ranking of respondents. Developer interviews and proposal presentations will also be used to make a final decision on the top-rated and best proponent for the development of the site. The goal is to have a selection process that is fair and transparent and which results in the best possible outcome for the re-development of the Bloomfield site.

A measurable evaluation system will be used for both part one and part two of the RFP process. The following approach is proposed:

Part One – Qualifications, Experience & Capability

Evaluation Criteria:

Capacity of the development team to undertake the project: 60%

Measured through:

Background experience, team structure, past projects, performance working with multi-sector partnerships, etc.

Quality of the development concept: 40%

Measured through:

Understanding of vision, principles, & core objectives, built form concept, urban design elements, quality of mixed-use concept, quality and depth of community and cultural program concept, quality of environmental sustainability elements, affordable housing concept, etc.

Part Two – Financial, Development Concept & Technical Proposal

Evaluation Criteria:

Financial: 50%

Measured through:

Purchase price, terms & conditions of offer, guaranteed performance to implement the work, creativity and feasibility of financing approach, viable governance models for ownership and operation of community and cultural space, closing date, etc.

Experience and team structure: 5%

Measured through:

Strong design, developer, and operating team, development of multi-faceted mixed-use projects, successful financing and construction of similar scope projects, experience working in partnership with community, public, and/or private parties, etc.

Quality of proposed development plan and program: 35%

Measured through:

Consistency with the Bloomfield vision, mix and balance of uses across the site emphasizing creative convergence, quality of community and cultural space, a variety of housing types and densities, commitment to incorporating quality affordable housing, viable mix of commercial space, creativity in design and exceptional focus on quality urban design and built form, time-frame for initiating and completing the plan, etc.

Attention to value-added components: 10%

Measured through:

Development of multi-functional community and cultural space, commercial rental space for creative sector, heritage conservation including adaptive re-use of building(s), more than 20% affordable housing, incorporation of green-building elements across the site, etc.

Project Plan & Schedule:

The strategy is to release the RFP by the end of May 2012. This schedule would allow for a twelve week review process and a recommendation to Regional Council by September. Leading up to the RFP release are various project management and communications efforts which will need to happen including:

Communication with Bloomfield Centre tenants and user groups mid-May

Community and cultural sector awareness & communication	May-June
PSA and media relations prior to (and after) the RFP release	late May
Project Charter for coordination of departmental roles	mid-May
Coordination with Centre Plan (Corridor Strategy) initiative	May-June

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

There are no budget implications associated with this information report. This phase of the project has been resourced under current capital and operating budget sources. Any additional implementation resources for the project that might be necessary will be brought forward to Regional Council for consideration under future budget deliberations.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT POLICIES / BUSINESS PLAN

This report complies with the Municipality's Multi-Year Financial Strategy, the approved Operating, Project and Reserve budgets, policies and procedures regarding withdrawals from the utilization of Project and Operating reserves, as well as any relevant legislation.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Extensive community engagement has taken place through the work of the Bloomfield Master Plan. Ongoing community engagement relative to the development of the site will happen through appropriate communications and web-based information to raise awareness of the RFP process. Staff will continue to liaise with community and cultural sector interests as appropriate through Imagine Bloomfield and through other networking opportunities to help facilitate the development of community and cultural space on the site.

ATTACHMENTS

None

A copy of this report can be obtained online at <http://www.halifax.ca/commcoun/cc.html> then choose the appropriate Community Council and meeting date, or by contacting the Office of the Municipal Clerk at 490-4210, or Fax 490-4208.

Report Prepared by: Holly Richardson, Coordinator Real Property Policy, Real Estate 490-6889



Report Approved by: _____
Peter Bigelow, Manager Real Property Planning, Real Estate 490-6047
