



PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION MEETING

**THURSDAY 27 AUGUST 2009
4.00 PM**

**COMMITTEE ROOM 3,
HARROW CIVIC CENTRE**

MEMBERSHIP

Deputy Leader

**Issued by the Democratic Services Section,
Legal and Governance Services Department**

**Contact: Miriam Wearing, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Tel: 020 8424 1542 miriam.wearing@harrow.gov.uk**

HARROW COUNCIL
PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION MEETING
THURSDAY 27 AUGUST 2009

AGENDA - PART I

1. **Declarations of Interest and Declarations of Any Dispensations Granted by the Standards Committee:**
To receive declarations of personal or prejudicial interests, arising from business to be transacted at this meeting, from:
 - (a) all Members of the Committee, Sub Committee, Panel or Forum;
 - (b) all other Members present in any part of the room or chamber.
2. **Minutes:** (Pages 1 - 4)
That the minutes of the meetings held on 30 July 2009 and 3 August 2009 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.
3. **Petitions:**
To receive petitions (if any) submitted by members of the public/Councillors under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 15 (Part 4D of the Constitution).
4. **Public Questions:**
To receive questions (if any) under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4D of the Constitution).

(Note: Paragraph 16 of the Executive Procedure Rules stipulates that questions will be asked in the order that notice of them was received and that there be a time limit of 15 minutes).
5. **Matters referred to the Executive Member:**
In accordance with the provisions contained in Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 23 (Part 4F of the Constitution).
6. **Reports from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Sub-Committees:**
(if any)
7. **Approval to Award Framework Contract for the Supply and Installation of Park and Playground Equipment and Deliver the Playbuilder Scheme:**
(Pages 5 - 20)
Report of the Corporate Director for Community and Cultural Services.
8. **Any Other Urgent Business:**
Which cannot otherwise be dealt with.
9. **Exclusion of the Press and Public:**
To resolve that the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business, on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of confidential information in breach of an obligation of confidence, or of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972:

<u>Agenda Item No</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
6.	Approval to Award Framework Contract for the Supply and Installation of Park and Playground Equipment and Deliver the Playbuilder Scheme.	Information under paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

AGENDA - PART II

10. **Approval to Award Framework Contract for the Supply and Installation of Park and Playground Equipment and Deliver the Playbuilder Scheme:**
(Pages 21 - 22)
Appendix 2 to the report of the Corporate Director for Community and Environment at item 6.

This page is intentionally left blank

PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION MEETING

30 JULY 2009

Chairman: * Councillor David Ashton

* Denotes Member present

[Note: Councillor Chris Mote also attended this meeting to speak on the item indicated at Minute 90 below].

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL

PART II - MINUTES

84. **Declarations of Interest including Declarations of any Dispensations Granted by the Standards Committee:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members in relation to the business to be transacted at this meeting.

85. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2009, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

86. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions had been received.

87. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were received at this meeting under the provisions of Advisory Panel and Consultative Forum Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4E of the Constitution).

88. **Matters referred to the Executive Member:**

RESOLVED: That no matters had been referred to the Executive Member for reconsideration in accordance with the provisions contained in the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 22 (Part 4F of the Constitution).

89. **Reports from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Sub-Committees:**

RESOLVED: To note that no reports had been received.

90. **Review of the Grants Application Process:**

Under the Special Urgency provisions the Leader, acting as the Executive, considered a report of the Corporate Director of Community and Environment on the recommendations of Grants Advisory Panel in relation to the grants programme for 2010/11.

The report was urgent due to the need to launch the Grants Scheme for the coming year, prior to the next Cabinet programmed for 17 September 2009.

Consideration was given to the recommendations of the Grants Advisory Panel. The Leader further sought the views of officers upon the proposals particularly in relation to the proposed threshold levels of grants and the proposals around the timescale and process for the consideration of grants application.

The Leader commented that the previously identified threshold levels of grants was established historically and supported by a recent scrutiny challenge process in relation to this area. He noted the proposed change in threshold would be relevant, currently, for one organisation and was advised by officers that when a consultation upon the levels was undertaken with applicants for grants no specific comments against the suggested £100,000 had been received from that applicant. He therefore concluded that the proposal to increase the threshold level for grants should not be adopted.

The Leader then raised the issue of the shortened timescale with respect to the grants process. He noted the concerns of officers with regard to the submission of grants reports and appropriate resourcing to achieve the proposals of the Grants Panel. He further examined the initial proposals by officers with regard to operating

arrangements. In deliberating upon the Panel's recommendation the Leader considered the ability of officers to engage with grants applicants in the process to ensure the accuracy of information presented for final consideration by the Panel. He also suggested that arranging an informal working group of officers and Members during January 2010 to consider initial draft applications would contribute to a more effective grants process consideration through gaining Members input at an earlier stage and therefore, create greater transparency with regard to grant approval outcomes. The Leader concluded that an amendment to the recommendation regarding the proposed timescale was required to enable the suggestions he had outlined and that the Panel recommendation should not be adopted, setting out his alternative decision instead.

RESOLVED: That (1) Recommendation 1 (Review of Grants Criteria & Results of Grants Consultation) be agreed subject to the threshold of large grants remaining at £100,000;

(2) Recommendation 2 (Funding Arrangements for 2009/10 & 2010/11) be agreed;

(3) Recommendation 3 (Review of Grants Application Process) be agreed subject to the timescale for grants round 2010/11 be as detailed in the table below:

END August 2009	Grants application round launched
END October 2009	Grants application round closing date
END October – END December 2009	Applications are assessed
Early January 2010	Informal Working Party of Members of Grants Advisory Panel, Independent Adviser and officers of Grants Team held to consider initial grant application submissions.
MID January – February 2010	Copy of draft report sent out to applicants for comments
EARLY MARCH 2010	Final Report presented to GAP to agree grant allocations for 2010/11, subject to Cabinet's decision.

Reasons for Decision:

- To address the recommendations raised in the Overview and Scrutiny Review: "Delivering a Strengthened Voluntary and Community Sector for Harrow" (December 2008).
- To ensure greater clarity and transparency in the grants process for round 2010/11.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 5.30 pm, closed at 5.49 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR DAVID ASHTON
Chairman

PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION MEETING

3 AUGUST 2009

Chairman: * Councillor Paul Osborn

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS**PART II - MINUTES**

91. **Declarations of Interest and Declarations of Any Dispensations Granted by the Standards Committee:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of interests or dispensations in relation to the business to be transacted at this meeting.

92. **Petitions and Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions had been received or public questions put under the provisions of Executive Procedure Rules 15 and 16 respectively.

93. **Matters referred to the Executive Member:**

RESOLVED: That no matters had been referred to the Executive Member for reconsideration in accordance with the provisions contained in the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 22 (Part 4F of the Constitution).

94. **Reports from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Sub-Committees:**

RESOLVED: To note that no reports had been received.

95. **HARP2 Programme Approval:**

The Portfolio Holder for Performance, Communications and Corporate Services considered a report of the Director of Business Transformation and Customer Service in relation to the Business Case for the HARP2 programme.

The report was urgent to meet the timescales laid out in the Business Case, which needed to be prior to the next Cabinet on 17th September 2009.

Consideration was given to a range of options set out in Section 2 of the report

RESOLVED: That the HARP2 Programme be approved to proceed in line with the agreed Business Case set out in Section 2 of the report.

96. **Special Needs Transport Project:**

The Portfolio Holder for Performance, Communications and Corporate Services considered a report of the Director of Business Transformation and Customer Service in relation to the Business Case for the Special Needs Transport (SNT) programme.

The report was urgent to meet the timescales laid out in the Business Case, which needed to be prior to the next Cabinet on 17 September 2009.

Consideration was given to a range of options set out in Section 2 of the report

RESOLVED: That the Special Needs Transport Programme be approved to proceed in line with the agreed Business Case, subject to the agreement and sign off of the Benefit Card related to the re-negotiation of the current fleet hire arrangements.

97. **Waste Management Programme - Extension of Scope to include Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) for Trade Waste:**

The Portfolio Holder for Performance, Communications and Corporate Services considered a report of the Director of Business Transformation and Customer Service in relation to the extension of the scope of the Waste Management Programme, to include Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) for Trade Waste.

The report was urgent to meet the timescales laid out in the Full Business Case, which needed to be prior to the next Cabinet on 17 September 2009.

Consideration was given to a range of options set out in Section 2 of the report

RESOLVED: That the Waste Project be extended in scope to include RFID for trade waste, using the technology proposed by Bartec. This does not change the policy on charging for trade waste and any future policy changes would remain subject to a further decision by Members.

98. **Exclusion of the Press and Public:**

RESOLVED: That the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items as they contained information under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, relating to information in respect of the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information):

<u>Item</u>	<u>Title</u>
11	HARP2 Programme Approval – Appendix
12	Special Needs Transport Project Appendix
13	Waste Management Programme – Extension of Scope to Include Radio frequency Identification (RFID) for Trade Waste Appendix

99. **HARP2 Programme Approval:**

The Portfolio Holder for Performance, Communications and Corporate Services considered a **confidential appendix** to a report which appeared elsewhere on the agenda.

RESOLVED: That the **appendix** be noted.

100. **Special Needs Transport Project:**

The Portfolio Holder for Performance, Communications and Corporate Services considered a **confidential appendix** to a report which appeared elsewhere on the agenda.

RESOLVED: That the **appendix** be noted.

101. **Waste Management Programme - Extension of Scope to include Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) for Trade Waste:**

The Portfolio Holder for Performance, Communications and Corporate Services considered a **confidential appendix** to a report which appeared elsewhere on the agenda.

RESOLVED: That the **appendix** be noted.

(Note: The meeting having commenced at 3.05 pm, closed at 3.17 pm)

(Signed) COUNCILLOR PAUL OSBORN
Chairman



Ref PHD : 025/09

Subject:	Approval to award framework contract for the supply and installation of park and playground equipment and deliver the Playbuilder scheme.
Responsible Officer:	Brendon Hills, Corporate Director for Community and Environment
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Chris Mote Portfolio Holder for Community and Cultural Services
Key Decision:	Yes
Urgent/Non Urgent:	Urgent
Power to be exercised:	Portfolio holder responsibilities and paragraph 3 of the appendix to the Executive Procedure Rules part 4d of the constitution
Exempt:	No (except for appendix 2, exempt information under paragraph 3 of part 1 of schedule 12a to the Local Government Act 1971 (as amended))
Enclosures:	Appendix 1: Evaluation criteria Appendix 2: Tenderers and Scoring results Appendix 3: Draft list of Playbuilder sites

Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report sets out:

- (1) an overview of the competitive tendering process undertaken to seek a new contract for the delivery and installation of Park and Playground Equipment
- (2) an overview of the Playbuilder scheme for Harrow

Recommendations:

The Leader (or in his absence the Deputy Leader) is requested to:

(1) approve the decision to award a framework agreement to four companies:

- Wicksteed Leisure Ltd
- Playdale Playgrounds Ltd
- Playworld Systems (Europe) Ltd
- Sutcliffe Play Ltd

For a term of 3 years with the option to extend for another 1 year.

(2) approve the proposed Playbuilder scheme for Harrow.

Reason: (For recommendation)

(1) To enable the Council to secure a framework contract for the provision of playground and park equipment.

(2) To enable the Council to deliver the Playbuilder initiative as part of the Government's national Play Strategy and Harrow's local play strategy.

Section 2 – Report

Introductory paragraph

The decision to award this contract and proceed with the delivery of the Playbuilder scheme will support the council to achieve its corporate priority to:

Build stronger communities

The recommendation to approve the award of the framework agreement and deliver the Playbuilder scheme contributes to this priority by ensuring that the council provides and improves park and playground facilities across the Borough. The provision of these facilities enables all sections of the community, particularly children and families to come together and enjoy Harrow's parks and open spaces.

The competitive tendering process has identified the highest scoring bidders who have demonstrated their qualities and ability to supply innovative, competitively priced, attractive, good quality, safe playgrounds to Harrow Council. The local community and park users have been integral in the selection of supplier and will continue to be involved in the design of playground facilities.

Value for money

The evaluation criteria for the selection of suppliers is designed in a way to identify bids that offer the best value for money. A price per play value ratio is calculated as part of the scoring matrix and helps ensure that the playground designs offer best value in terms of price, quality and play value.

Options considered

Background

An Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) tender process was conducted according to the European Union (EU) procurement rules for contract values above the prescribed threshold.

A complex, pre-defined evaluation model was constructed to fairly evaluate each tender against a set of criteria established by Public Realm Maintenance and Corporate Procurement as the most important aspects of Park & Playground equipment and installation (please see attached Appendix 1 evaluation criteria).

The tender was split into four live projects and tenderers were asked to bid for each project separately. The four projects were chosen for their distinctly different requirements, with the intention of allowing suppliers with different strengths and weaknesses the platform to showcase their potential and provide the Council with a wide breadth of skills and experience to draw from to meet the need of the diverse play environments required across the borough.

Wicksteed won scheme 1 & 2

Playdale won scheme 3

Playworld won scheme 4

And Sutcliffe Play had the next best overall score for the 4 schemes.

The framework will provide a platform for the provision of all future playground installations for the term of the contract. The framework suppliers will be invited to quote in a 'mini-competition' on a project-by-project basis. This should give both flexibility, opportunity for innovation and market competitiveness whilst being compliant with EU procurement rules.

In early 2007 the Government through the Department for children, schools and families (DCSF) announced two funding streams (Play Pathfinder/Playbuilder) aimed at improving the infrastructure of play space and embedding sustainable development of children's play by challenging local authorities to provide staff to develop and supervise play opportunities. Harrow Council were allocated Playbuilder funding as a Wave 2 authority as part of the national roll-out of the scheme. This was granted to the value of approx £1.1m over two years from 2009-2011.

This project builds on the work already taking place in Harrow to deliver the Council's Play Strategy and BIG Lottery Fund play projects. The Playbuilder project will deliver improvements to existing provision through active engagement with children and young people and use of innovative design. The play spaces have been identified through existing audit and consultation information that will be updated as the project progresses (see draft list attached at appendix 3). The project will also have a focus on developing 'door step' provision by providing much needed improvements to play spaces that serve some of the more disadvantaged areas in the Borough.

Why a change is needed

- The existing contract and framework agreement has expired and the funding available for Playbuilder projects is over the EU thresholds.
- The framework agreement is to be put in place with 4 successful contractors enabling the council to undertake a robust, mini-competition on a project-by-project basis. This should give both flexibility, opportunity for innovation and market competitiveness whilst being compliant with EU procurement rules.
- The framework agreement will also be made available to Schools, Housing and other potential users to gain maximum economies of scale, and to provide a robust, cost effective and safe purchasing solution.

Consultation

Consultation with playground users (for the 4 schemes tendered) was undertaken in a secret ballot format. The scheme proposals were displayed and users invited to score them. The outcome formed 10% of the overall evaluation. For each of the playgrounds to be developed, there will be further extensive consultation carried out by the short listed supplier.

Implications of the Recommendation

The framework will provide a competitive platform for developing exceptional, innovative, adventurous and best value play spaces in the London borough of Harrow. Not only will the competitive nature of the framework provide lower prices but also encourage innovation and creative playground design in line with the expectations of the Playbuilder initiative.

Staffing / workforce implications

A project manager has been appointed from within the existing workforce to project manage the delivery of the Playbuilder scheme. The delivery of capital projects has been planned for within existing work programmes.

Equalities impact

The provision of high quality play and park equipment through the Playbuilder scheme will improve access for all communities to play opportunities. The Play Strategy aims to ensure equal access to play for all children and young people and identified that children with disabilities were one group that were disadvantaged in accessing play opportunities. The Playbuilder scheme aims to address the need to ensure DDA (Disability Discrimination Act) compliance for some playgrounds in the Borough.

Legal comments

The tender process has been conducted in accordance with all EU and domestic procurement requirements.

Community safety

The delivery of the Playbuilder scheme contributes to the prevention of crime and disorder by providing safe and stimulating play areas for children and young people. Delivery of the proposed action plan will provide opportunities for engaging children and young people in the provision of age-appropriate and usable facilities.

Financial Implications

Local authority playbuilders and pathfinder schemes will deliver the Government's £235m investment in play and transform local areas into innovative and adventurous play spaces. This programme is a major part of the National play strategy, Fair Play, launched in April 2008

From the latest round of the Playbuilder Scheme, Harrow Council has funding of Capital £1.1m and Revenue of £45k for staff and sundry costs. This arrangement will provide the Council with the opportunity to use the proposed framework for park and playground installations for the duration of the proposed contract.

Performance Issues

The proposal contributes to the achievement of the following National Indicators:

NI 5 Overall/general satisfaction with local area: Current performance from the last Place Survey indicates our performance at 70.3%. A similar question asked in the Quality of Life Survey over each of the last four years showed a gradual decline from 70% to 65 % recorded as satisfied or very satisfied. The Place Survey result, although in a slightly different form seems to return satisfaction to 2005 levels. The Council's score of +55 percentage points (i.e. those very or fairly satisfied minus those fairly or very dissatisfied) compares with an Outer London average of +58.

NI 110 Young people's participation in positive activities: Current performance shows that significantly more young people participate in positive activities in Harrow (74.6%) than both the London and national average. (London average: 67.9% and National average 69.5%)

The approval of the framework contract and delivery of the Playbuilder scheme has the potential to impact positively on both indicators through the provision of high-quality play provision. DCSF expectations regarding the delivery of the Playbuilder initiative include requirements to consult with children, young people, families and the local community. This active involvement will in turn impact on the overall general satisfaction of residents and engagement of young people. Delivery against these outcomes will also be part of the performance management arrangements for the framework contract, so that both DCSF expectations are met and the Council meets its objectives in this area.

Environmental Impact

Delivery of the Playbuilder scheme will aim to make best use of natural materials and blend play spaces in to the existing landscape. Local authorities are encouraged to use the principles outlined in 'Design for Play: a guide to creating successful play spaces', published by the Department for Media, Culture and Sport and the Department for Children, Schools and Families, as a guide to delivering innovative and sustainable play projects.

Risk Implications

The main risk identified for the Playbuilder scheme is the ability to meet the very tight deadlines to deliver 22 play schemes between 2009-2011. To help us meet these this report is marked urgent to ensure that approval to go ahead with the award of the framework contract can proceed and in turn the delivery of the Playbuilder scheme can commence.

Risk included on Directorate risk register? No
Separate risk register in place? No

Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Signature:		
Name: Sheela Thakkrar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Chief Financial Officer
Date: 19 August 2009		
Signature:		
Name: Matthew Adams	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Monitoring Officer
Date: 19 August 2009		

Section 4 – Performance Officer Clearance

Signature:		
Name: Martin Randall	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the* Divisional Director Partnership, Development and Performance
Date: 18 August 2009		

Section 5 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Name: John Edwards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Divisional Director (Environmental Services)
Date: 18 August 2009		

Section 6 - Contact Details and Background Papers

Contact: Kashmir Takhar, Interim Head of Services – Community Development
Tel: 020 8420 9331

Background Papers:
Appendix 1: Evaluation Criteria
Appendix 2: Draft list of Playbuilder sites

Signature:

Position *Divisional Director of Environmental Services*

Name (print) John Edwards

Date: 18 August 2009

For Portfolio Holder/Leader

* I do agree to the decision proposed

* I do not agree to the decision proposed

* Please delete as appropriate

Notification of personal interests (if any):

(Note: if you have a prejudicial interest you should not take this decision)

Additional comments made by and/or options considered by the Portfolio Holder

Signature:

Portfolio Holder

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1

Evaluation Criteria

Tender for the provision of Parks and Playground Equipment – PR0211

The tender process will be conducted to ensure that tenders are evaluated fairly to ascertain the most economically advantageous tender. In evaluating bids for this contract, the Council will take into account the following issues:

<p>PRICE</p>	<p>The tenderer will initially be invited to quote 4 individual Schemes of work of which an output specification will be provided for each. Each scheme will be evaluated separately.</p> <p>The price will be evaluated in terms of 'lowest suitable bid' and 'price per play value'. If the bid does not include all the requirements of the specification, a 'cost to Harrow' will be added to the bidder's price. The price must be broken down according to the price schedule (document 5)</p>	<p>30%</p>
<p>PLAY VALUE, AESTHETICS AND INNOVATION</p>	<p>Threshold (minimum requirement) score = 10% Tenders that score below 10% for criteria: Play Value, aesthetics and innovation, will be rejected.</p> <p>The tenderer will be required to submit a detailed layout for each proposal and specification sheets (including images) for each piece of equipment and natural play/landscape feature.</p> <p>Each scheme will be assessed for play value, aesthetics and innovation.</p> <p>Play Values - Quality and quantity of play values (activities)</p> <p>Aesthetics - Environment</p> <p>Innovation - Functionality, activity variety, layout, landscaping, accessibility and natural play inclusion</p>	<p>25%</p>
<p>QUALITY</p>	<p>Threshold (minimum requirement) score = 10% Tenders that score below 10% for criteria: Quality, will be rejected</p> <p>The tenderer will be required to submit a detailed layout for each proposal and specification sheets (including images) for each piece of equipment and natural play/landscape feature.</p> <p>Quality of Materials and equipment - Paint finish, steel specification, wood specification</p> <p>Strength and Stability - Construction methodology, Guarantee/Warranty period</p> <p>Suitability - Conformance to output specification</p> <p>Quality Management - QA systems and processes in place</p> <p>Safety Compliance - BS EN Compliance (EN 1176, EN 1177 and EN 15312)</p>	<p>20%</p>

<p>COMMUNITY / SERVICE USER INPUT</p>	<p>Threshold (minimum requirement) score = 5% Tenders that score below 5% for criteria: Community / Service User Input will be rejected.</p> <p>The tenderer will be required to submit a detailed layout for each proposal and a specification sheet (including images) for each piece of equipment. A user group or section of the community will undertake an evaluation of each proposal.</p> <p>Tenders will be required to meet with community groups as part of the design and development process.</p>	<p>15%</p>
<p>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT / SUSTAINABILITY</p>	<p>Harrow Council is committed to the Local Authority Sustainable Procurement Strategy. Tenderers will therefore be asked to demonstrate how their bid is able to provide value for money on a whole life basis in terms of generating benefits not only to the organisation, but also to society and the economy, while minimising damage to the environment.</p>	<p>10%</p>

Evaluation Sub-criteria

Sub-criteria for each evaluation header was broken down and scored in the following way:

CRITERIA & SUB-CRITERIA	Method of Evaluation	Available points	Weighting (1-5)	Maximum Available points / score
QUALITY		20%		
Quality of Materials and Equipment				
Paint Finish	Spec Sheet per item Q5a	5	3	15
Steel Specification	Spec Sheet per item Q5b	5	3	15
Wood Specification	Spec Sheet per item Q5c	5	3	15
Strength and Stability				
Robustness, Durability, Vandal resistance, Construction Methodology	Spec Sheet per item Q6	5	5	25
Guarantee/Warranty period	Questionnaire Q1 & 2	5	3	15
Suitability				
Conformance to, and understanding of Output Specification	Assessment (of proposal)	5	5	25
Quality Management				
QA systems and processes in place	Questionnaire Q3 & 4	5	4	20
Safety Compliance				
BS Compliance (EN 1176, EN 1177 and EN 15312) or European equivalents	Questionnaire Q5-11	5	5	25
TOTAL POINT SCORE		40		155
TOTAL CATEGORY/CRITERIA SCORE		total point score / 7.75		20
PRICE		30%		
The lowest price bid will be awarded maximum points in this criteria category. (A - then subsequent bids will be deducted 2 points for each 5% variance from the lowest priced bid OR B - bids will be ranked in order, lowest first, and awarded points proportionately - see scoring guide). Scoring method B will be used if there is a large disparity between bids. If the bid does not include all the requirements of the specification, a 'cost to Harrow' will be added to the bidder's price. Only tenders that score above 10% in Quality Criteria will be evaluated for price.	Price Schedule	10	5	50
Price per play value ratio	Assessment (of proposal & Spec Sheet Q7)	10	5	50
TOTAL POINT SCORE		20		100
TOTAL CATEGORY/CRITERIA SCORE		total point score / 3.3333		30
PLAY VALUE, AESTHETICS AND INNOVATION		25%		
Play Values				
No. of Play Values (tender with highest number of play values receives maximum points. Points deducted from subsequent tenders proportionately).	Assessment (of proposal & Spec Sheet Q7)	10	5	50
Quality of play values	Assessment (of proposal & Spec Sheet Q8)	5	4	20
Aesthetics				
Design	Assessment (of proposal)	5	3	15
Colour	Assessment (of proposal)	5	2	10

Overall attractiveness	Assessment (of proposal)	5	3	15
Suitability for the environment	Assessment (of proposal)	5	3	15
Innovation				
Functionality	Assessment (of proposal)	5	3	15
Activity variety	Assessment (of proposal & Spec Sheet Q8)	5	3	15
Layout	Assessment (of proposal)	5	3	15
Landscape	Assessment (of proposal & NP Spec Sheet)	5	5	25
Accessibility	Assessment (of proposal)	5	5	25
Natural play inclusion	Assessment (of proposal & NP Spec Sheet)	5	3	15
TOTAL POINT SCORE		65		235
TOTAL CATEGORY/CRITERIA SCORE		total point score / 9.4		25
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT / SUSTAINABILITY				
10%				
Tenderers proposal to demonstrate how their bid is able to provide value for money on a whole life basis in terms of generating benefits not only to the organisation, but also to society and the economy, while minimising damage to the environment	Questionnaire Q12 & 13	10	5	50
TOTAL POINT SCORE		10		50
TOTAL CATEGORY/CRITERIA SCORE		total point score / 5		10
COMMUNITY / SERVICE USER INPUT				
15%				
User Group consultation - User group to undertake a bid evaluation process based on play value, aesthetics and innovation criteria.	User Group Questionnaire based on PLAY VALUE, AESTHETICS AND INNOVATION criteria	10	5	50
Tenderers proposal for community / user groups consultation and interaction	Questionnaire Q14	5	5	25
TOTAL POINT SCORE		5		75
TOTAL CATEGORY/CRITERIA SCORE		total point score / 5		15

TOTAL SCORE FOR SCHEME	<u>100</u>
-------------------------------	-------------------

Each scheme outlined in the Specification and the price schedule was evaluated separately. It is envisaged that the framework agreements will be awarded based upon the highest scoring bidder for each scheme. It is also envisaged that additional bidders may be awarded a framework agreement if their overall/combined score for all four schemes is favourable.

The four schemes outlined in this tender are 'live' projects so orders may be placed with successful bidders based on their submission. The awarded suppliers will be invited to bid in mini-competitions for all future schemes during the period of the framework. The breakdown of prices provided in this tender document must form the basis of all future bids by awarded contractors

Scoring Guide

CRITERIA MARKS

For items which have available points of 0-5

A score of 0 in any category, sub-category or question may result in a bid being rejected by the evaluation team.

Point Score	Criteria
5	Excellent with no reservations at all about acceptability
4	High standard but falls just short of excellent
3	Good standard
2	Generally of a good standard with some reservations
1	Basic compliance only
0	Fails to meet the minimum requirements. (Bid rejected)
Y/N	Yes/no answers are scored 5 = yes, 0 = no (or vice versa if appropriate) Can score 2 or 3 for partial compliance if relevant.

CRITERIA MARKS

For items which have available points of 0-10

A score of 0 in any category, sub-category or question may result in a bid being rejected by the evaluation team.

Point Score	Criteria
10	Max points given to tenderer with best score / response
8	Arrange suppliers in order of their score or response and award points on a sliding scale (proportionately) i.e. if there is a large gap between the best bid and the rest the second best bid may only receive say 4 points, third = 3, fourth = 1 the rest 0.
6	
4	
2	
0	

WEIGHTING CRITERIA

Weighting	Criteria
5	Vital to the successful delivery of the project
4	Essential factor
3	Important factor
2	General requirement
1	Desirable / non essential (nice to have)

Projects in Year 2

<i>Play area</i>	<i>Project details</i>
1. Shaftsbury P.F., Hatch End	Extension to existing play area. Need identified by engagement with residents for improvements in provision for 6 yrs+
2. Little Common Pinner	Identified during local engagement to relocate and redesign play area
3. Chenduit Way, Stanmore	Improves provision at a Housing Site and of unsupervised play areas for ages 2-13
4. Newton Ecology Park, South Harrow	Develop play trail to cater for adjacent housing estates, with improved disabled access to improve provision at this environmental open space.
5. The Croft, Pinner	Improvements in landscaping, replacement of equipment Identified in the PPG 17 report as having very poor disabled access for ages 2-13
6. Kenton Recreation Ground	Green Gym Improves provision in a Destination Park in east of the borough for ages 2-13
7. Roxbourne Park, Pinner	Improves provision at the park which adjoins intensive housing including a new estate for ages 2-13
8. Montesoles P.F., Pinner	Replacement of 1980's play area in a park adjoining a large estate. This assists the Improvement to the deficiency in housing estate provision
9. West Harrow Recreation Ground	Improve landscape and provide linking equipment to existing play area for ages 2-13. to improve provision at a destination park in the south of the borough
10. Shaftesbury Circle South Harrow	Provide new play area for ages 2-13 at a small and isolated site, which adjoins major roads. This Improves provision at Housing Sites and of unsupervised play areas
11. Newton Farm Ecology Park	Provide a play trail for ages 2-13 around this environmental park.
12. Sinclair Field, Stanmore	Refurbish existing play area for ages 2-13 on housing estate green space Improves provision at Housing Sites and of unsupervised play areas

Appendix 3: Draft list of playbuilder sites (extract from Draft Playbuilder project plan)

DRAFT	
<i>Projects in Year 1 (before 31 March 2010)</i>	
<i>Play area</i>	<i>Project Details</i>
1. Kenmore Park Kenton	Replacement play area for ages 2-16 on open space land centrally located in a Housing estate and adjacent to a newly constructed Neighbourhood Resource Centre. Section 106 money will be added to the funding.
2. Headstone Manor Recreation Ground, Harrow	Install adventure play area with DDA compliant equipment. Use will include supervised 'drop stay and play' sessions for disabled children at destination park. Additional funding will include Big Lottery and possibly Aiming High for Disabled Children grant money.
3. Greenway, Pinner	Replacement of former play area with new facility for ages 2-16 on housing estate green space
4. Grove Avenue, Pinner	Refurbish existing play area on housing estate green space and provide area for ages 2-13
5. Chandos Recreation Ground, Edgware	Replacement play area for ages 2-13 at destination park Improved provision in east of the borough
6. Pinner Memorial Park	Extend play area to take advantage of natural contours and landscape
7. Weald Village Open Space, Wealdstone	Install new play facility for ages 2-13 with landscaping
8. Byron Recreation Ground, Wealdstone	Refurbish play area with DDA compliant access and equipment ages 2-13
9. Swift Close, Rayners Lane Estate	Provide new play area for ages 2-13 at a Housing Estate which is undergoing rebuilding and modernisation.
10. Queensbury Park, South Harrow	Introduce new individual pieces of equipment for ages 2-13 at destination park
11. Alexandra Park, South Harrow	Introduce new individual pieces of equipment for ages 2-13 at destination park

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank