

GARDINER & THEOBALD

COURTAULD CONNECTS

*Selection Questionnaire (SQ) for
Construction Manager (CM) Services –
Information and Instructions*

KEY INFORMATION

| | |
|--------------|----------------------------|
| Issued by | Courtauld Institute of Art |
| Issued on | January 2026 |
| Revision No. | 1 |

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 3 |
| 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND INFORMATION..... | 3 |
| 2.1. The Project..... | 3 |
| 2.2. Design Team..... | 5 |
| 2.3. Contract..... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| 2.4. Programme | 6 |
| 3. INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE | 7 |
| 3.1. Marking Criteria & Weightings..... | 8 |

APPENDICES

| | |
|------------|----------------------------------|
| APPENDIX A | Standard Selection Questionnaire |
| APPENDIX B | CM Appointment Contract (Draft) |
| APPENDIX C | RIBA Stage 3 Design |
| APPENDIX D | High Level Programme |

1. INTRODUCTION

This document provides supplemental information that will aid you in completing the enclosed selection questionnaire (SQ) relating to the FTS notice dated 12 January 2026 for a construction manager (CM) for Courtauld Campus.

The Deadline for submission of responses is 11 February 2026 12:00.

This document comprises of the following:

- Project Description and Information
- Instructions for Completion of the Questionnaire, Marking Criteria & Weightings.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND INFORMATION

2.1. The Project

The Courtauld Institute of Art (The Courtauld) is one of the world's leading centres for the study of the history and conservation of art and architecture, and its Gallery houses one of Britain's most significant and best-loved collections. The Courtauld has also developed one of the world's most extensive collections of photographs of works of art and architecture which are a major heritage resource. Based at Somerset House, it is a self-governing college of the University of London. Its charitable objects, as laid out in the Memorandum of Association, are to advance education and in particular to advance the study of the history of art and; the study and practice of the conservation of works of art. The principal activities of The Courtauld are running the university, The Gallery and conservation studios.

Somerset House was the UK's first and largest purpose-built set of government offices and is now Grade I listed. It is situated on the south side of the Strand in central London and within the Strand Conservation Area. The buildings, originally the site of a Tudor palace, were designed in 1776 by Sir William Chambers (1776-1835) and further extended with Victorian wings to the east and west. For the past 25 years, The Courtauld has occupied the North Block (also known as the Strand Block) on the site. The building, comprising an East and a West Wing, is configured over 7 storeys. The North Block was the original home of the Royal Academy. Within it is the Great Room, described by Joseph Baretta (1719-89) as 'undoubtedly at that date, the finest gallery for displaying pictures so far built'.

The Courtauld Institute of Art (the 'Client') is seeking to combine the East Wing of Somerset House with the adjoining 152-158 The Strand building (owned by Kings College London). The aim of the project is to consolidate all of the Courtauld's operations under one building (teaching, gallery and workplace).

Further to the original Courtauld Connects scheme, which saw Phase 1 completed in 2021, the Courtauld Campus Scheme is a major redevelopment of the Courtauld Institute of Art's historic home at Somerset House, London, delivering a transformation of its teaching, research and public facilities. The project will consolidate the Courtauld's previously fragmented academic, curatorial and administrative functions into a single, coherent campus, integrating Somerset House with a series of adjoining Grade I and Grade II* listed townhouses on the Strand. The scheme seeks to sensitively

restore and adapt this significant heritage estate while introducing high-quality contemporary interventions that support modern pedagogical, research and public engagement needs.

The redevelopment will provide new and upgraded teaching spaces, lecture theatres, study areas, library and research facilities, alongside improved staff accommodation and back-of-house functions. A key objective is to enhance accessibility and circulation across the campus, including the creation of a clear, welcoming and fully accessible entrance from the Strand, strengthening physical and visual connections between the Institute, Somerset House and the wider public realm. The project also aims to enhance the visitor experience by improving gallery support spaces and facilities that enable wider access to the Courtauld's world-class art collection and public programmes.

Overall, the Courtauld Campus Scheme represents a complex, high-value heritage and education project that must balance conservation of historic fabric with the delivery of flexible, sustainable and future-proofed accommodation. The successful delivery of the scheme will create a unified, world-leading campus that supports the Courtauld's long-term academic ambitions, enriches public engagement with art and culture, and reinforces Somerset House's role as a major cultural destination in central London.

Proposed capital works of Courtauld Campus will:

- Combine existing Somerset House strand block east wing with the old law buildings at 152-158 to consolidate all of CIA's operations into one building (teaching, gallery and workplace);
- Relocate the Research Forum to a fit-for-purpose, new space, thereby greatly enhancing the presence of this important public offer;
- Refurbish academic areas;
- Provide new main entrance, lecture theatre, and faculty offices through the strip out, demolition and façade retention of the existing 152-158 buildings;
- Convert existing second floor lecture theatre into a Contemporary gallery;
- Install a new central staircase to a current light well in order to improve movement through the building and improve the quality of spaces;
- Improve access overall, particularly for disabled visitors through the provision of new lifts and the rationalisation of floor levels;
- Create a new student hub at the centre of the building bringing the community together; and,
- Remodel and refurbish libraries and archives;

Areas (GIA):

- East Wing plus Library = 4,073m²
- 152- 158 = 2,611m²
- Existing ground floor café = 100m²

The key requirements that CIA is looking for in a Construction Manager for this project are as follows:

1. Working on Grade I and Grade II* listed buildings;

2. Working with gallery and university facilities;
3. Experience of extensions and reconfiguration of historic buildings;
4. Experience of working in existing buildings with high interest from stakeholders and the public;
5. Experience of optimisation of project and client resources;
6. Experience of working in sites with constrained compound space and access;
7. Experience of working in sites which interface public event spaces; and,
8. Experience of working on projects with an organisation that maintains business-as-usual (BAU) activities on site during the works.

Refer to *Appendix C* for the RIBA Stage 3 design information.

Planning Approvals

Town Planning and Listed Building Consent applications for the scheme were issued 21/11/25. Determination is anticipated for March 2026. References are:

- **152-158 Strand** refs: PP-14429916 (LBC) and PP-14429808 (s73)
- **East Wing, Somerset House** refs: PP-14443347 (LBC) and PP-14427375 (s73)

2.2. Design Team

The core consultant team consists of:

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Gardiner & Theobald LLP | Project Managers |
| AECOM Limited | Quantity Surveyors |
| Currie & Brown | Principal Designer |
| Witherford Watson Mann | East Wing / Masterplanning Architect and Lead Designer |
| Purcell & Lawson Ward Studios | 152-158 Architect |
| Max Fordham | MEP Engineers |
| Price & Myers | Structural and Civil Engineers |

2.3. Construction Management Agreement (CMA)

This contract will be let under a bespoke CMA contract. A draft of the proposed contract and services is included within Appendix B.

Approximate construction value:

- £43,500,000 excluding Construction Manager's fee and direct costs

2.4. Programme

Target milestone dates:

SQ Period 16 January 2026 to 15 February 2026

SQ Return 16 February 2026

Tender Period 30 February 2026 to 17 April 2026

Tender Return 17 April 2026

Letters issued 01 May 2026

Award Contract 11 May 2026



Figure 1: Rendering of the new Courtauld Institute entrance



Figure 2: Rendering of the Blavatnik Reading Room in the Courtauld Institute Library

3. INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The instructions for completion are as follows:

1. Submissions to be made by e-mail to o.stebbing@gardiner.com, John.Burgess@aecom.com; sion.yao@aecom.com; and A.Leigh@Gardiner.com by the deadline.
2. This SQ is being provided on the same basis to all prospective tenderers. If The Courtauld considers any question or request for clarification to be of material significance, both the query and the response will be communicated, in a suitably anonymous form, to all prospective tenderers who have responded.
3. Each SQ will be evaluated in the same manner. The objective of the selection process is to assess responses to the SQ and select candidates to proceed to the next stage of procurement. All responses will be evaluated as outlined below.

The majority of questions in the SQ require a pass.

Where stated, responses to questions are scored 0-5. Score questions are then multiplied by the weighting indicated at the side of each question.

The evaluation panel will comprise of members of the Project Team and The Courtauld.

It is intended that a maximum of four Construction Managers will be proposed for inclusion in the tender process. The number of tenderers may be reduced if insufficient numbers of suitable responses are received.

3.1. Marking Criteria & Weightings

Responses submitted by the stated deadline will be checked for completeness and compliance.

If complete and compliant, selection criteria will be a combination of both financial and non-financial factors and will consider:

| PQQ Section | Available Marks Out of 100% For Information |
|-------------|---|
| 1.0 | Section 1 – Supplier Information |
| 2.0 | Section 2 – Grounds for Mandatory Exclusion |
| 3.0 | Section 3 – Grounds for Discretionary Exclusion |
| 4.0 | Section 4 – Economic and Financial Standing |
| 5.0 | Section 5 – Further Details |
| 6.0 | Section 6 – Technical and Professional Ability |
| | 6.1 (a) Question 1 |
| | 6.1 (b) Question 2 |
| | 6.1 (c) Question 3 |
| | 6.1 (d) Question 4 |
| | 6.1 (e) Question 5 |
| 7.0 | Section 7 – Further Details |
| 8.0 | Section 8 – Additional Questions |

The scoring principals for section 6 are as follows:

| Score | Scoring Principles for Section 6.1 |
|-------|--|
| 0 | <p>Non-compliant – The response does not demonstrate relevance and gives concern in a number of significant areas. There are reservations because of one or all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is at more than one significant area of inexperience; - There is no evidence to demonstrate competence or understanding. |
| 1 | <p>Poor – The response demonstrates some relevance but gives concern in a number of significant areas. There are reservations because of one or all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is at least one significant area of inexperience; - There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate competence or understanding; |

| | |
|----------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The examples are not relevant; - The response is not complete or comprehensive. |
| 2 | <p>Satisfactory – The response demonstrates relevance but there is at least one significant issue of concern, or several smaller issues. The response therefore shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some relevant experience demonstrated/evidenced. - Most issues encountered in example adequately explained; - Some areas of concern that require attention. |
| 3 | <p>Good – The level of experience meets expectations in most material respects. There are no significant areas of concern, although there may be minor issues not explained. The response therefore shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relevant experience demonstrated through relevant evidence. - Issues encountered in example well explained; - Some areas of concern that require attention. |
| 4 | <p>Very Good – The level of experience meets expectations in all material respects. There are no significant areas of concern, although there may be limited minor issues not explained. The response therefore shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very relevant experience demonstrated through relevant evidence. - Issues encountered in example well explained; - Very minor areas of concern that require attention. |
| 5 | <p>Outstanding – The standard of experience fully expectations and leaves no doubt as to the capability to deliver what is required. The response therefore shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outstanding relevant experience that is directly applicable and relevant to all aspects of the project. - Issues encountered in example are thoroughly explored and relevant conclusions drawn; - The experience indicates the possibility of added value. |

ITT Section

The expected award criteria for the ITT, following the SQ process, is set out below:

- Quality 60%
- Cost 30%
- Social Value 10%

Cost to be weighted scoring as below:

The price marks will then be awarded whereby the lowest tender (after analysis by the Quantity Surveyor) will receive 40 marks. The scores will then be adjusted proportionally to the variance from the lowest tender (rounded to two decimal places).

The following calculation will be used:

$$\frac{\text{Lowest total price}}{\text{Bidder's total price}} \times 100$$

The raw score will then be rounded to two decimal places and multiplied by 0.4 (representing 40% price weighting) achieve the total weighting percentage score for the price element of the bid. The tender that then received the highest combined quality plus price score shall be the most economically advantageous Tender.

Example for (illustration only)

| | Quality Score out of 60 | Price £K | Price Score | Price + Quality |
|------------|----------------------------|----------|-------------|-----------------|
| Tenderer A | 60 | 200 | 36.00 | 96.00 |
| Tenderer B | 55 | 250 | 28.80 | 83.80 |
| Tenderer C | 50 | 190 | 37.89 | 87.89 |
| Tenderer D | 40 | 180 | 40.00 | 80.00 |

In this example, Tenderer A has been assessed as having submitted the most economically advantageous Tender

If the Evaluators have any clarification questions relating to any response, these will be issued to Bidders via email with a set period for Bidder response. Failure to respond within the stipulated time period may lead to the Bidder's exclusion from the Procurement Process. Tied scoring: In the event that Bidders for each of the lots have tied / identical total tender percentage scores, the Bidder appointed for the Works Order will be the one with higher quality score.

In the event that both Bidders have the same quality score, the score for Question 1 will be used to differentiate.

The Quality Section is expected to be broken down as follows:

- Team: 20%
- Previous experience of firm: 15%
- Project specific methodology: 15%
- Sustainability: 10%
- Total: 60%**

Quality to be assessed by Project Team and advice provided to CIA to make an information decision. Returns to be assessed by:

- CIA
- PM/QS
- Design Team (WWM/Purcell/P&M/MF)

The Social Value question is to be only assessed by CIA.

The Pass/fail questions are solely judged by CIA.

APPENDIX A

Standard Selection Questionnaire



APPENDIX B

CM Appointment Contract (Draft)



APPENDIX C

RIBA Stage 3 Design



APPENDIX D

High Level Programme



GARDINER & THEOBALD LLP
10 South Crescent, London, WC1E 7BD
gardiner.com