

Element	Comments
Frame	Our scope is completely different to the benchmark samples used. We are erecting a frame on top of an existing building and the cost is then being divided by a small area which will give an artificially high £/m2. The benchmark data appears to represent simple and efficient frame solutions from ground to roof, with the costs being divided by a whole building area having the effect of a much more efficient £/m2. This is an 'apples and pears' comparison.
Upper Floors	The reasons for difference follow the same logic as the Frame.
Roof	Part of the reasons for difference follow the same logic as the Frame. Other reasons may include specification as we are providing a green roof, for example, which is worth £64/m2 on its own.
Stairs	The reasons for difference follow the same logic as the Frame.
External Walls	The reasons for difference here will be down to specification, complications of replacing cladding in/around an existing building, logistics and London supply chain. It is meaningless to contemplate comparing our cladding costs to regional student housing schemes around the UK.
Windows/External Doors	As above.
Internal Doors/Partitions	The reasons for difference follow the same logic as the Frame – logistics, London pricing, small quantities.
Internal Doors	As above.
Fittings	The key cost difference here is likely to be due to scope differences, specification levels.

MEP	The key cost differences here will be specification, logistics, specific site constraints, London supply chain and the same logic as the Frame. In short, an 'apples and pears' comparison skewed by the vast difference in GIA.
On-costs	It is virtually impossible to compare on-costs meaningfully due to varying procurement routes, contract terms and conditions and the vast differences that exist between working in London versus the regions. The fact is that the levels included by alinea could not be delivered for any lesser cost than that shown. Any independent London based QS practice would confirm this view.

General comments

- The other way to view this cost comparison is to treat the West Hampstead scheme as an all-encompassing scheme. In other words, divide the total cost for construction by the total GIA affected by building work. i.e. **£11,072,000** divided by **13,058m2** which equates to **£848/m2**. Making adjustments to this figure based on regional benchmarking would give a comparable answer to that being suggested by the council.
- It is meaningless to compare regional projects around the UK (Edinburgh, Reading, Newcastle, Stoke and Huddersfield) for the same asset class in London. There will always be significant cost differences (as there are in other asset classes) due to items such as specification level, specific site constraints, supply chain operating levels, procurement routes etc. To attempt to try to align these factors through geographic/tender price adjustments and other scope adjustments is not realistic, as the starting point is wrong.
- The key drivers of cost difference are:-
 - Logistics of West Hampstead scheme
 - Specific nature and scope of work
 - Congestion associated with working in London
 - Impact of above on programme periods
 - Supply chain capability and associated overhead and cost base
 - Product/specification differences
- There are bespoke attributes of our project which will not exist in BCIS comparisons
- Adjusting for inflation and location is arbitrary and inaccurate
- We sit on BCIS panel and have insight into their data and they consider us a respected contributor
- Our costs are founded upon real time tenders received on many other schemes in the London market. We have procured £2bn of construction in the last 18 months.