

TITLE OF REPORT SPRINGFIELD PARK RESTORATION PROJECT CONTRACT APPROVAL Key Decision No. NH O80	
CPC MEETING DATE (2019/20) 08 July 2019	CLASSIFICATION: Open with exempt appendices By Virtue of Paragraph(s) 3, Part 1 of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 appendices A-F are exempt because they contain Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding the information) and it is considered that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.
WARD(S) AFFECTED Springfield	
CABINET MEMBER Cllr Feryal Clark Deputy Mayor and Cabinet Member for Health, Social Care, Leisure and Parks	
KEY DECISION Yes REASON Spending and savings	

GROUP DIRECTOR

Kim Wright (Neighbourhoods & Housing)

1. CABINET MEMBER'S INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report sets out recommendations to support the contractual engagement of Supplier A to deliver the Springfield Park Restoration Project.
- 1.2 The construction and restoration works will restore and bring back into use the Grade 2 Listed White Lodge, which is currently on the Historic England Heritage at Risk Register, and the associated Georgian Stable Block and walled garden. The White Lodge will be extended to provide additional space for the café servery which will allow the original layout of the two rooms facing the Park to be restored. A new community events building and courtyard will be built for community use and public hire which will bring additional income into the park and provide a much needed venue space in the local area. A new play area will also be built close to the White Lodge. All elements of the scheme have been subject to extensive consultation with the key stakeholders.
- 1.3 The project will also deliver landscaping improvements to the Park. Springfield Park is designated as a Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphologic Site (RIGS), a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and Local Nature Reserve so it is vital that the unique landscape and biodiversity is carefully restored and protected for future generations to appreciate and enjoy.
- 1.4 The National Lottery Heritage Fund (NLHF) have awarded a grant of £3.1m to the project for the works and revenue costs. The NLHF funding allocation for the capital works is £2,829,638, this coupled with the LBH contribution of £726,864, the Country House Foundation funding of £20k and the £150k anticipated funding from the London Marathon Trust gives a total budget for the works of £3,744,252. Once the construction and landscaping works are complete, a newly appointed Park Development Manager will deliver the Activity Plan, agreed with the NLHF, which will include the following:
 - Community Engagement Programme
 - Healthy Living Activities
 - Schools Engagement
 - Work Placements and Apprenticeships
 - Volunteering
 - Volunteer Training
- 1.5 In conclusion, the restoration of Springfield Park will not only save and improve it's historically important landscape and buildings, long term, it will make the Park more financially sustainable, create a space for the local community and park users to come together and deliver a whole host of activities that will encourage healthy living, help people into work and to gain skills for life.

2. GROUP DIRECTOR'S INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 Following a competitive procurement process, this report seeks approval to appoint a contractor to deliver the restoration project in Springfield Park.

The project will deliver the following:

- Restoration and extension of the Grade 2 Listed White Lodge
- Restoration of the Stable Block and conversion into lettable units
- New Community Events Building
- New Play Area
- Restoration of the ornamental pond
- Landscaping Improvements and a new planting scheme
- Pathways and entrance repairs

3. RECOMMENDATION(S)

Cabinet Procurement Committee is recommended to:

- 3.1 **Approve the appointment of Supplier A (as shown in Appendix C) to deliver Springfield Park Restoration Project. The scope of the project includes restoration of the Grade 2 Listed Buildings, including a new extension to the White Lodge, the construction of a new Community Events Building and the restoration of the Grade 2 Listed Park Landscape. The anticipated contract duration is twelve months therefore if it commences in August 2019 it will be completed by August 2020.**

4. RELATED DECISIONS

- **Springfield Park Restoration Project Business Case** – The decision to combine the construction and landscaping contracts and re-tender was approved by Hackney Procurement Board (HPB) 11 December 2018.
- **Springfield Park Restoration Project Business Case** – Approved by Hackney Procurement Board (HPB) 13 March 2018.
- **Unilateral Undertaking** relating to Springfield Park E5 9EF, executed under seal 5 September 2017.
- **Planning Permission Granted** – Ref. No 2017/0887, 5 September 2017.
- **Listed Building Consent Granted** – Ref. No 2017/0919, 5 September 2017.
- **Cabinet Report Springfield Park Restoration Project**, Key Decisions No. NH N46, endorsement of proposals, approval of HLF bid and match funding from the Council of £840k, 23 January 2017.

- **Delegated Report of The Corporate Director of Health and Community Services, April 2014.** Spend approval for £240k from earmarked resource within the 2014/15 capital programme. Approved 9 May 2014 by Kim Wright.

5. REASONS FOR DECISION/OPTIONS APPRAISAL.

- 5.1 This report requests the approval of CPC to award the contract to deliver the restoration of the buildings and landscape of Springfield Park.
- 5.2 Springfield Park is one of Hackney's finest green spaces and is listed as a Grade II park on the English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest. It also holds a Green Flag Award. The Park is well loved by the local community and is one of Hackney's gems. The buildings in Springfield Park are in urgent need of repair and major investment is required in order to stop them from degrading further, to fulfil their potential as community spaces and to become income generating assets which will help secure a more financially sustainable future for the Park. Although in better condition than the buildings, the Park's infrastructure is also in need of improvement and significant investment. Most significantly, the Council will not be able to harness the potential of the Park to deliver the range of learning, skills and health benefits through this project without significant investment in the Park's buildings, and the potential for the Park to generate revenue to sustain this uplift will be lost.
- 5.3 Springfield Park covers 16 hectares. It is bordered by the roads Spring Hill, Springfield and Upper Clapton Road (A107), and its easterly boundary is provided by the River Lea. The Park has a wide range of traditional amenity facilities, including a play area, tennis courts, a bandstand, a pond, outdoor chess tables and a table tennis table. It also accommodates four buildings, two of which predate the Park; Springfield Mansion (or White Lodge as it is sometimes known) and its stable block. The two other structures are a bowls pavilion and a horticultural glass house. Springfield Park is designated as a Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphologic Site (RIGS), a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and Local Nature Reserve.
- 5.4 In April 2013, MTW Consultants Limited were commissioned to carry out a feasibility study into the reuse of the main buildings in Springfield Park. The study suggested that given the state of the buildings, bringing them back into use would cost approximately £2.2m. As the Council only had a budget of £700k for Springfield Park at the time, it was recommended that a bid be submitted to the Heritage Lottery Fund's Parks for People scheme (now the National Lottery Heritage

Fund) to fund the necessary capital improvements. At the time, Parks for People, was one of the only funding programmes that could offer sufficient funding to meet the capital requirements of the project as well as being the best fit in terms of aspirations and outcomes of the project as a whole. Since the study was undertaken, £90k has been spent on repairs to the stable block roof.

- 5.5 In February 2015, the Council submitted a Stage 1 HLF bid and was awarded a Development Grant of £183,610. A separate commission was undertaken to appoint a team to deliver a Conservation Plan, which was a precursor for much of the Design Team's design work and key decisions. The contract value for this work was £18,970 plus £10,205 for supporting surveys.
- 5.6 In February 2017, the Council submitted a Stage 2 HLF bid and in July 2017 was awarded a grant of £3.146m towards the delivery phase of the restoration project. The Design Team appointed during the development phase were re-appointed to work on the delivery phase of the project.
- 5.7 The vision for the Springfield Park Restoration Project is to, "Celebrate and enhance the unique heritage, character and environment of Springfield Park, establishing and improving opportunities for recreation, learning and volunteering, and creating a lasting sustainable legacy for future generations".

To achieve this vision, the main objectives for the project are to:

- a. Bring the rich heritage over the centuries to life: Restore the heritage of the park and animate its history to visitors and the local community to instil a sense of pride and connection to the unique place Springfield Park is.
- b. Restore and enhance the park's infrastructure: Revitalise the planting in this important heritage parkland and ensure the highest quality maintenance and management of hard and soft landscape elements:
 - i. Protect and conserve the valuable natural heritage of the park: Revitalise and sustainably enhance the valuable habitats of the park through improved management that meets the council's Biodiversity Action Plan objectives, develop historically complimentary planting schemes around the White Lodge and other key buildings and public areas, and provide educational and volunteering opportunities for park users of all ages.

- II. Repair and restore the buildings: Undertake necessary works on the main heritage assets of the park to conserve and bring these into full use, ensuring the designing in of a range of future uses to support the community's health, education and recreation needs, and to increase sustainable income generation for the future to support parks.
- c. Increase use of the park and develop a wider audience through an improved heritage, recreational and educational offer: The project will increase use of the park itself and its facilities, including activities such as food growing, propagation and growing heritage plants, volunteering of various kinds, providing opportunities for education and to tackle health and wellbeing issues in the local community.
- d. Improve the accessibility and visibility of the park for the local community: The project will aim to increase visitor numbers by tackling barriers around use, access and the promotion of the park in the local area and wider borough.
- e. Foster a greater sense of community ownership and contribution to the management of Springfield Park: The project will consult and involve the local community and user representatives who will help with the decision making process and provide valuable feedback to evaluate the success of the project as it is developed and delivered.
- f. Generate income for the financial security of the park through the appropriate balance of commercial and non-commercial uses for park buildings and spaces: The project will aim to make good use of the restored buildings in providing valuable assets both for the community, education and local business.
- g. Encourage greater visitor numbers by improving the connectivity to the surrounding landscape: The project will establish connections to the surrounding landscape, especially the green spaces, nature reserves, blue corridors and reservoirs in the locality. Opening the park to the River Lea would be transformational and would help to make the park a destination for the local area as well as the borough and visitors from a wider area.

5.8 The project will deliver the following:

- Restoration and extension of the Grade 2 Listed White Lodge
- Restoration of the Georgian Stable Block and conversion into lettable units
- New Community Events Building
- New Play Area

- Restoration of the ornamental pond
- Landscaping Improvements and a new planting scheme
- Pathways and entrance repairs

- 5.9 This procurement has been carried out in accordance with the process approved by Hackney's Procurement Board in the project's detailed Business case (approved December 2018). The project tender value is below EU Procurement thresholds for works contracts.
- 5.10 The Business Case agreed a traditional procurement route to allow the Council to remain in ultimate control of the design in its entirety and to help increase cost certainty.
- 5.11 The decision to undertake a Restricted (two stage) tender was taken because the introduction of a Selection Questionnaire (SQ) enables project specific questions to be asked of the bidders with a view to reducing the number of contractors that can bid for the works and ensure that the contractors have the relevant qualifications and experience of working on Listed Buildings and in Parks. The top six bidders, based on their responses to the SQ were invited to tender.
- 5.12 The contract deliverables were enshrined within the tender documents and specifications that will form the contract. The contract will include the pre-construction information that will form the basis of the Construction Phase Plan for the works. This must satisfactorily address considerations of environmental protection and health and safety. The specification will also include specific provision around the protection of trees under the relevant British Standard.
- 5.13 In line with the Public Contract Regulations (PCR) 2015 and Council's Contract Standing Orders (CSOs), the tender was advertised on Contracts Finder and London Tenders Portal to ensure that we achieved the procurement principles of transparency, fairness and competition by offering the opportunity to as larger number of bidders as possible.
- 5.14 The overall cost and budget is summarised in Section 6.2.1 of this report.
- 5.15 The project will be funded by the NLHF Grant, The LBH Capital Budget, Section 106 monies and external funding. Should the London Marathon Trust funding application prove unsuccessful, the shortfall will be met by the Leisure and Green Spaces Infrastructure Budget.

5.1 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS (CONSIDERED AND REJECTED)

- 5.1.1 The option of doing nothing was considered however, this was not pursued as the buildings within the Park would have continued to decline and fall into further disrepair. In addition, any potential revenue generating opportunities to make the Park more sustainable would have been lost. It was decided in 2014 that an HLF grant offered the only realistic opportunity of addressing issues of long-term decline as the Council does not have the resources to pay for the substantial capital works required itself.
- 5.1.2 The option of appointing two contractors to deliver the construction and landscaping separately was considered and in fact initiated by the original Lead Consultant/Landscape Architect in 2018. The Lead Consultant felt that the nature of the construction and the landscaping works was so different that they should be managed by separate contractors. The Council went out to tender for the construction contract first and when the tender prices came back significantly over budget the project was put on hold. A value engineering exercise was undertaken and a new Lead Consultant and Landscape Architect were appointed. The new design team decided that it would be better, financially and practically, for one principal contractor to deliver the construction and landscaping works.
- 5.1.3 There is no framework available to the project team that would be suitable for the proposed contract.

6. PROJECT PROGRESS

6.1 Developments since the Business Case approval.

6.1.1 None.

6.2 Whole Life Costing/Budgets:

6.2.1 The overall project budget is summarised in the table below:

Capital Cost	£
Projected Construction and Landscaping Cost including Contingency of £225k	3,575,004
Total Professional Fees	121,028
Design Contingency	33,500
Surveys	14,765
Total Delivery Costs	3,744,297
Capital Funding	£
LBH Capital Budget	726,864
HLF Grant Minus Project Revenue	2,829,638

Costs (£3,146,037 - £316,399)	
Sec 106	17,750
Country House Foundation	20,000
London Marathon Trust	150,000
Total	3,744,252

6.2.2 All of the funding sources have been confirmed and secured apart from the £150k from the London Marathon Trust which is subject to an ongoing funding application. The outcome of the application will be known in July 2019. Should the funding application prove unsuccessful then the shortfall will be met from the Green Spaces Capital Infrastructure Budget.

6.3 SAVINGS

6.3.1 There will be no significant impact on cashable savings, though the Project Team sought best value for money wherever possible through the design and procurement process.

7. SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

7.1 Equality Impact Assessment and Equality Issues:

7.1.1 There will be no adverse equality issues resulting from the restoration of the Park and the construction of the new facility. The buildings and landscaping will meet all relevant British Standards and Regulations and be compliant with the Equality Act 2010 (formerly Disability Discrimination Act 1995).

7.1.2 The Springfield Park Restoration Project will deliver a range of inclusive learning, skills and health benefits to the local community. There will be increased access and site information for all visitors, improved landscape and biodiversity for local interest groups including those serving homeless/elderly groups. Increased opportunity for educational programs for all ages. Play equipment will be installed to encourage families to use the Park.

7.2 Environmental Issues:

7.2.1 The demolition and construction work will have a potentially adverse impact on the local environment. Building on any green space brings with it a set of environmental implications such as the potential loss of green space and impact on local aesthetics. Additionally, any building project has implications for local liveability such as noise, dust and air pollution. These issues have all been fully assessed during the planning and Listed Building Consent process. Working hours will be

restricted and any disruption during the course of the works will be carefully managed, monitored and clearly communicated so that any disruption will be kept to a minimum.

7.2.2 A Conservation Management Plan was produced during the Development Phase of the project which identified the required environmental surveys. Ecologists were appointed to undertake Bat and Biodiversity surveys to ensure that the impact of the construction and landscaping on the wildlife and natural environment is minimised. The presence of bats was discovered during the surveys therefore a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence (EPSM) was applied for from, and granted by, Natural England. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement has also been produced to ensure that the impact on the trees in the park is carefully managed.

7.2.3 The Planning Conditions associated with the permission and Listed Building Consent required significant detail about how the project will be managed to reduce the impact on the environment such as noise surveys, further biodiversity surveys, a refuse and recycling management strategy, operational management plan, delivery and servicing plan, travel plan, parking plan, demolition and construction management plan and details of cycle parking, refuse storage, surface water drainage and rainwater harvesting.

7.2.4 The tender documents were written such that the contractors would have a good track record of environmental management and suitable environmental accreditations, for example be members of the Considerate Contractors Scheme. There is a potential for recycling of waste materials from the construction and demolition which could reduce project costs, the volume of waste materials going to landfill and the carbon footprint from manufacturing and transportation. In view of this, the tender ensured that the contract will include proper environmental procedures and during the work on site there will be regular monitoring include a requirement for the contractors to submit details of their proposal for the removal and disposal of any waste materials in a Demolition and Construction Management Plan. KPI's relating to the above environmental considerations, such as reporting on waste management and local sourcing of materials, will also be included in the contract.

7.2.5 Please see Exempt Appendix F for detailed information provided by Supplier A regarding Sustainability outcomes.

7.3 Economic Issues:

7.3.1 There will be no adverse economic impacts from the restoration of Springfield Park. The project will have a positive impact on the local

community as the existing park does not fulfil the needs of the local community in the Springfield ward.

7.3.2 The buildings are underused and largely closed due to their poor condition and the associated health and safety risks. The project will restore these buildings as spaces for the community and for local businesses. The restored stable block will be converted into four lettable spaces which will generate income for the park. The new community events building will be hired out for events, such as weddings, and will also generate income for the park. The new events space will be managed by the Councils Venues Team.

7.3.3 DBA Consulting, who were appointed to produce the Activity Plan and Business Plan for the project, have investigated the market potential for income generation and have forecast the following potential income from the new community events building:

- Based on low range occupancy: £39k year one, £73k year two and £117k in year three.
- Based on mid-range occupancy: £55k in year one, £114k in year two and £167k in year three.
- Based on high range occupancy: £80k in year one, £164k for year two and £224k in year three.

The stable block is going to be converted into B1 office space and will comprise of 4 units at 45m² each (500 sq. ft.). Based on discussions between DBA Consulting and the Council's Property Department, the forecast rent is £18-£22 per sq. ft. per annum plus £3 per sq. ft. per annum service charge.

7.3.4 Other potential income streams include external events, corporate social volunteering and sports pitch hire fees.

7.3.5 It should be noted that it was not possible to undertake apprenticeships as part of this contract due to the construction timescale being only one year. However the following requirement was included in the 'Economic and Added Value Sustainable Innovation' section of the qualitative assessment criteria:

Local Employment, Training and Added Value.

The Council seeks to encourage employment and training opportunities, arising from any commission, to benefit local residents and local businesses. In particular, the Council seeks to support vulnerable and disadvantaged sections of the community including women, BAME groups, disabled people and unemployed youth (18-25 years).

The response should shall include the following:

- Details of any proposals to positively impact (directly and through your supply chain) on the following key areas:
- Recruitment of labour from local communities and residents of the borough, including from disadvantage groups and its priority groups such as BAME communities; people with disabilities; unemployed youth (aged 18-24) and women.
- Other training and work experience opportunities, e.g. Advanced Health and Safety Training, plant training, personal developments and student (University and Secondary school) work experience placements, mentoring, learning opportunities for students, or other appropriate opportunities completed.

7.3.6 The preferred bidder A also confirmed that they will pay the London Living Wage at the applicable age and rate, as well as applying this to all firms in their supply chain.

7.3.7 Please see Exempt Appendix F for detailed information provided by Supplier A regarding Economic outcomes.

8. TENDER EVALUATION

8.1 Evaluation:

8.1.1 The Invitation to Tender (ITT) was advertised on Contracts Finder and London Tenders Portal via Pro-Contract, the Council's e-procurement system, as a 2 Stage (Restricted) Tender. Stage 1, the pre-qualifying stage, consisted of a Selection Questionnaire (SQ) which bidders had to pass before being invited to tender.

8.1.2 The SQ and draft ITT documents were uploaded to ProContract on the 23rd January 2019. The submission deadline for the SQ was 7th February 2019.

8.1.3 In addition to the standard SQ questions that the contractors either passed or failed, the evaluation team produced project specific questions to evaluate the quality of the contractors. The headings and weightings of the project specific questions are listed below:

- Relevant experience 55%
- Stakeholder engagement 15%
- Managing risk 15%
- Time, cost quality 15%

8.1.4 Eleven compliant SQ responses were received and evaluated by the Client Project Manager, Lead Consultant/Architect and the Quantity

Surveyor. The SQ project specific question responses were evaluated individually then a moderation meeting was held with the Procurement Category Manager to moderate the scores. The six highest scoring bidders were subsequently invited to tender. The long list of the eleven bidders and their scores following the SQ evaluation can be found in Exempt Appendix A and the shortlist of six bidders can be found in Exempt Appendix B.

- 8.1.5 The six highest scoring bidders' financial status was checked by The Procurement Category Manager using the Dunn and Bradstreet (D&B) system. All six bidders had Low and Low-moderate risk of business failure.
- 8.1.6 The ITT was issued via Pro-Contract to the six highest scoring tenderers on the 2nd of April 2019 (ProContract system reference DN388404). A full Bill of Quantities was issued with specifications, drawings and associated appendices, such as surveys. Tenderers were given four weeks to formulate their bid submissions. The submission deadline was the 8th of April 2019.
- 8.1.7 The final contract award is based on the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT). The ITT evaluation criteria were divided between Quality (30%) and Price (70%).
- 8.1.8 As well as a completed pricing schedule the tenderers had to submit a qualitative response. The qualitative evaluation criteria headings and weightings are listed below:
 - Detailed Project Methodology 40%
 - Project Team 30%
 - Health and Safety 10%
 - Communication 10%
 - Economic Added Value and Sustainable Innovation 10%
- 8.1.9 Four of the six bidders submitted tender returns on time. Two bidders failed to submit bids. The first did not to submit a tender because they decided they would prefer to work as a landscaping sub-contractor on the project. The second bidder did not provide a reason for failing to submit a bid. We have requested feedback from them on the Portal.
- 8.1.10 The four initial tender return prices were over budget therefore a Value Engineering schedule was issued to all four bidders via the Portal. All four bidders completed the Value Engineering schedule and submitted revised prices and Forms of Tender.
- 8.1.11 The qualitative element of the four tenders were individually evaluated by the Client Project Manager, Lead Consultant/Architect and Quantity Surveyor. The evaluation team then met with the Procurement Category Manager to moderate the scores.

8.1.12 The four tenders were also technically reviewed by the Structural Engineer and Mechanical and Electrical Engineer. Tenders were checked for their accuracy in terms of the response to the supplied specifications. Where anomalies were found, such as omissions, tenderers were given the opportunity to clarify tenders and amend the information where necessary.

8.1.13 The pricing elements of each tender were analysed by the Quantity Surveyor. Please find attached the Tender Report (Exempt Appendix D) and the Value Engineering Report (Exempt Appendix E) produced by the Quantity Surveyor. The priced Bills of Quantities provided by each tenderer has been fully analysed for mathematical correctness and completeness. Any anomalies found within the tender submissions have been analysed and the tenders have been reconciled against each other to ensure that the final cost scoring represented a fair comparison between all submissions.

8.1.14 The final scores are summarised in the table below:

Tenderer	Quality Score %	Price Score %	Total Score %
Supplier A	22.9	70	92.9%
Supplier B	21.5	65.57	87.07%
Supplier C	21.8	61.28	83.08%
Supplier D	21.1	60.02	81.12%

8.1.15 The final scoring, including the breakdown of scores against each of the evaluation criteria, is provided in Exempt Appendix C.

8.2 Recommendation:

8.2.1 On the basis of the scoring information set out in section 8.1.14 of this report, the following recommendations are made:

8.2.2 Cabinet Procurement Committee is recommended to approve the appointment of Supplier A as the contractor to deliver the Springfield Park Restoration Project.

8.2.3 These recommendations are in line with the tender analysis report (Exempt Appendix D) and the Value Engineering Report (Exempt Appendix E). The reasoning for these recommendations is summarised below:

8.2.4 Supplier A is recommended for appointment due to the high scores against both cost and quality criteria, scoring 70% out of 70% for price and 22.9% out of 30% for quality.

- 8.2.5 Supplier A's tender pricing schedule was lower in cost than the other tenderers. The project team have explored and clarified this pricing to ensure that Supplier A has made a full and complete costing of all works. The financial standing of Supplier A has also been checked by the Council's Finance Officer.
- 8.2.6 Supplier A has confirmed their pricing for all elements and the project team is satisfied that the tender is compliant and all the items have been priced. The project's final budget makes provision for meeting any risks through the inclusion of suitable contingencies. This provision is reflected in the project budget.
- 8.2.7 In terms of Supplier A's qualitative response, the supplier was ranked number 1 out of the four bidders and they scored 3 and above for all of the criteria set out in section 8.1.8 – ~~8.1.9~~ of this report. In accordance with the ITT, this demonstrates that the project team consider that the tendered proposal would deliver the proposed programme of works effectively and in accordance with the Council's requirements, including all aims and objectives set out in the Business Case.
- 8.2.8 It should be noted that no provision has been made for a performance bond based on the advice of the Council's Legal Team. A parent company guarantee (PCG) will be required for the conservation and restoration contract (Contract 1) if the contractor has a main parent company.

9. CONTRACT MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

9.1 Resources and Project Management (Roles and Responsibilities):

9.1.1 The Project Design Team consists of the following members:

- Lead Consultant and Architect – Pringle Richards Sharratt (PRS) Limited
- Landscape Architect – Dominic Cole Landscape Architects
- Structural Engineer – Rodrigues Associates
- M+E Engineer – SVM Consulting Engineers
- Quantity Surveyor – Greenwood Projects

9.1.2 Client side project management will be carried out by LBH Project Managers attached to the Leisure and Green Spaces Projects Team within the Neighbourhoods and Housing Directorate. The project will be managed internally via a Project Board led by Senior Management Team members. The Project Sponsor is the Head of Libraries, Leisure and Green Spaces. The internal Client Project Manager will report to the Project Board and provide monthly progress reports. The project managers will be responsible for ensuring that the Board is serviced with information relating to progress against agreed targets and key

risks and issues. All major strategic decisions will be referred to the Project Board for approval.

9.1.3 The Lead Consultant (Pringle Richard Sharratt (PRS) will act as Technical Project Manager for the whole project, they will be responsible for the day to day delivery and act as Contract Administrator. This will include the issuing of all related certification, consideration of claims and the issuing of all instructions on behalf of the Council as client in relation to any variations to the project deliverables.

9.1.4 The Quantity Surveyor (Greenwood Projects) will be responsible for all liaison with the contractor with respect to the assessment of applications for payment and issuing of valuations to the architect.

9.1.5 The Mechanical and Electrical Engineer (SVM Consulting Engineers) and Structural Engineer (Rodrigues Associates) will be responsible for all quality checks in relation to the electrical fit out and commissioning and the structural integrity of the completed buildings.

9.2 Key Performance Indicators:

Main KPI Targets Set	Monitoring
1. Cost: To not allow the project cost to increase beyond budget expectations.	Monthly progress reports from the Contractor, monthly budget reports from the Quantity Surveyor and monitoring by the Lead Consultant, Architect and Project Manager.
2. Time: To deliver the construction, restoration and associated landscaping on time.	Monthly progress reports from the Contractor and monitoring by the Lead Consultant, Architect and Project Manager.
3. Quality: To ensure that all Planning Conditions are met, that the relevant British Standards are met and that the construction and restoration is delivered as per the specification.	Monthly progress reports from the Contractor and monitoring by the Lead Consultant, Architect and Project Manager.
3. Complaints and Freedom of Information Requests (FOI's): To track and respond in a timely manner.	Formal and informal complaints and FOI's logged and responded to in 'Infreemation' system by the Project Manager.
4. Environmental: To ensure the guidelines set for the protection of biodiversity, wildlife and trees and that the sustainability KPI's included in the contract are met.	Monthly progress reports from the Contractor and monitoring by the Lead Consultant, Architect and Project Manager.
5. Equality: To ensure that all	Monitoring by the Lead Consultant,

buildings and landscaping meet the relevant British Standards and Regulations and are compliant with the Equality Act 2010.	Architect and Project Manager.
6. Employment Opportunities: To ensure that the contractor provides work experience and training opportunities.	Monthly progress reports from the Contractor.

9.2.1 These KPIs and this contract meet the Neighbourhoods and Housing Directorate's vision of creating sustainable, high quality, safe, accessible and attractive neighbourhoods shaped by good planning and design. This contract also meets one of the Mayor's 5 priorities which is to prioritise quality of life and the environment and protect our parks and green spaces.

9.2.2 The project's success will also be defined by whether the outcomes set by the National Lottery Heritage Fund are delivered to budget and on time. The NLHF grant conditions state that the approved purposes must be delivered by 29th October 2021. Due to the significant delays to the project we have applied to extend the deadline to June 2024 to allow sufficient time for the activity programme to take place after the construction work is completed.

9.2.3 The LBH Project Manager will provide progress reports and financial claims to the NLHF on a quarterly basis. The success of the contract will be measured against the NLHF approved purposes listed below:

- Capital works to Grade 2 Listed White Lodge comprising conservation and restoration of the entire building, clearing of the café servery, park's office and toilets from the principal principle reception rooms, a new lift, gallery and exhibition space. Parks office relocated to the first floor.
- New two story extension to White lodge to accommodate toilets on the lower-ground floor and the new café servery and kitchen area on the upper-ground floor.
- Restoration of the Georgian stable block, and conversion into business starter units and a meeting room.
- Restoration of the remaining walled garden fragments and recreation of the original line of the wall.
- Removal of the 1970's derelict greenhouses and replacement with approximately-designed new build, community events space and courtyard (adding 200m² additional outdoor space).
- Restoration of the Sexby re-designed ornamental pond including de-silting and edge repairs. Implementation of new Management & Maintenance Plan to support key features including the acid grassland.
- Repair and redecoration of the bandstand and seating shelter.
- Entrance and path repairs.

- Preservation of key view lines by carefully targeted tree removals.
- New play facilities adjacent to the café in the White Lodge.
- 3 year, 9 month activity programme as set out within the Activity Plan, including: Community engagement programme, healthy living activities, interpretation, schools engagement, work places and apprenticeships, volunteering, volunteer training and capacity building for the Springfield Park User Group (SPUG).

10. COMMENTS OF THE GROUP DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND CORPORATE RESOURCES

- 10.1 The report recommends awarding the tender to contractor A, who achieved the highest quality score and submitted the cheapest bid. The funding and budget for the award has been secured mainly through a £3.1m HLF bid, the only element unconfirmed is £150k of London Marathon Trust funding which will be announced in July. If unsuccessful, this will be substituted with any underspend in the project contingency or parks infrastructure capital budget.
- 10.2 Following restoration the park has potential to generate £100-150k of additional income which is considered alongside the additional revenue activities/costs in the HLF application and funding.

11. VAT Implications on Land & Property Transactions

- 11.1 Not Applicable.

12. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF LEGAL AND GOVERNANCE SERVICES

- 12.1 The works comprising the Project in this Report were assessed as Medium Risk and therefore in accordance with Contract Standing Order 2.5.3 were approved at Business Case by Hackney Procurement Board on 11th December 2018. However the value of the proposed contract to be awarded in this Report is in excess of £2m and therefore this Report is being submitted to Cabinet Procurement Committee for approval pursuant to Contract Standing Order 2.7.7.
- 12.2 The works in the contract to be awarded are of a value below the threshold for works under the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 of £4,551,413 so it was not be necessary to publish an OJEU notice. It was, however, necessary to ensure that the procurement process undertaken complied with the principles set out in Regulation 18 to treat bidders equally and without discrimination and act in a transparent and proportionate manner. Details of the procurement process are set out in this Report.

12.3 Subject to approval, Legal Services will assist with the drafting and execution of a suitable works contract as requested in due course.

13. COMMENTS OF THE PROCUREMENT CATEGORY LEAD

13.1 This procurement has been undertaken in close liaison with the Construction and Environment Procurement Team and tendered by them through the Council's e-tendering system.

13.2 This is the second time that this project has been tendered and the procurement route and detail of the specification and contract have been given very detailed consideration.

13.3 The procurement has been carried out in accordance with the Business Case submitted to HPB on 13.3.18 and is fully endorsed

APPENDICES

Exempt Appendix A – Long List of SQ Bidders and Scoring

Exempt Appendix B – Short List of ITT Bidders

Exempt Appendix C – Detailed Costing and Scoring

Exempt Appendix D – Quantity Surveyor Tender Report

Exempt Appendix E – Quantity Surveyor Value Engineering Report

Exempt Appendix F – Information regarding Sustainability and Economic Issues Provided by Supplier A

EXEMPT

By Virtue of Paragraph 3, Part 1 of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 this report and/or appendices are exempt because they contain information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding the information) and it is considered that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

In accordance with The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) England Regulations 2012 publication of Background Papers used in the preparation of reports is required

NONE

Report Author	Katie Tomkins, 020 8356 2972. Katie.Tomkins@hackney.gov.uk
Comments for and on behalf of the Group Director of Finance and Corporate Resources	Simon Theobald, 020 8356 4304 Simon.Theobald@hackney.gov.uk
Comments for and on behalf of the Director of Legal and Governance Services	Patrick Rodger, 020 8356 Patrick.Rodger@hackney.gov.uk
Comments of Procurement Category Lead	Clare Brennan, 020 8356 1359 Clare.Brennam@hackney.gov.uk