



Procurement Summary Report

WHARF ROAD CAR PARK – REMEDIAL WORKS

Consent HAS been obtained from the Lead Council Officer for release of the report and any sensitive bidder details redacted for the purpose of report to SKDC Cabinet on the 8th July 2025.

CONTRACT DETAILS	
Lead Officer (Contracting Authority)	Peter Withers
Project ID	DN773766
FTS Reference	2025/S 000-019332
Contract Dates	<u>Start</u> : 18/08/2025 <u>End</u> : 18/11/2025
Length of Contract	3 months
Procurement Value (£)	The budget prior to going to market was in the region of £350,000.00
Type of Contract	Works
CPV Codes	45213312-3 - Car park building construction work

Contents

- 1.0 [Introduction](#)
- 2.0 [The Project](#)
- 3.0 [Pre-procurement Process](#)
- 4.0 [Project Governance](#)
- 5.0 [The Public Procurement Process](#)
- 6.0 [Invitation to Tender](#)
- 7.0 [Review of the Selection Criteria](#)
- 8.0 [Evaluation of the Award Criteria](#)
- 9.0 [Bid Clarifications](#)
- 10.0 [Additional Tender Information](#)
- 11.0 [Results](#)
- 12.0 [External Financial Checks](#)
- 13.0 [Risk Implications](#)
- 14.0 [Recommendation](#)
- 15.0 [Next Steps](#)
- 16.0 [Governance](#)

Appendices

- A. [Tender Award Questions](#)
- B. [List of Evaluators](#)
- C. [Final Scores](#)
- D. [Pricing Evaluation](#)

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to ensure all the pertinent procedures followed for the selection of the Provider(s) to be awarded the contract for the works to the Wharf Road Car Park, are recorded. This is for both the provision of an audit trail, and to enable the appropriate Officer to approve the recommendation as part of the Council's internal governance and accountability arrangements. This report also satisfies the reporting requirements under the Procurement Act 2023.

2.0 The Project

- 2.1 This project is for remedial works to the Wharf Road Car Park, Grantham.

The project will comprise the renewal of the roof deck coatings to Level 3 which will require the removal of the existing lightweight membrane and asphalt substrate down to the precast deck. Sundry other minor remedial works will also be undertaken comprising: -

- Removing pedestrian steps to the vehicle ramps
- Minor brickwork repairs
- Resealing joints to Level 4
- Minor drainage remedials

- 2.2 The contract was not divided into lots as there was deemed no viable reason for doing so.

3.0 Pre-procurement Process

- 3.1 An initial meeting was held with Peter Withers and Adrian Baker (External Consultant). Adrian will be compiling the specification, the quality questions and the pricing schedule. Adrian and Peter wanted to ensure any supplier submitting a bid would be suitably qualified. Advised to include mandatory qualifications and examples of relevant experience in the quality criteria. The route to market was discussed, an open tender was deemed the most appropriate, given the specialised nature of the works required.

4.0 Project Governance

- 4.1 Details of Officer that approved the below, along with the relevant dates.
- PID – Richard Wyles - 28th March 2025
 - Budget/spend – Richard Wyles
 - To make the Tender live – Peter Withers
 - Accept any relevant abnormalities within the Tender - Peter Withers
 - Accept/Reject SQ submissions – Tom Paling

- Accept pricing submitted – Adrian Baker

4.2 Details of the Key Officers:

- Tom Paling - Procurement Lead (Welland)
- Peter Withers - Lead Officer (Contracting Authority)
- Richard Wyles - Budget Holder

5.0 The Public Procurement Process

5.1 In accordance with the Procurement Act 2023, this Tender opportunity was advertised on the Find a Tender Service (FTS). The Contract Notice (2025/S 000-019332) was dispatched on 7th May 2025 and advised that award of the contract would follow an open procedure.

5.2 On publication of the opportunity, organisations were asked to register their interest via the Council's "ProContract" e-Sourcing portal, where Tender documents were available. A total of 36 expressions of interest were received, resulting in 8 Tender submissions.

6.0 Invitation to Tender

6.1 The Tender was made up of two questionnaire sets: one questionnaire for the selection criteria questions, and one for award criteria questions.

6.2 The award questionnaire was constructed in sections to facilitate evaluation. Some sections carried a percentage weighting (%). For every weighted section, there was at least one question that carried an individual question sub weighting (%). The overall weighting (%) of questions within a section also totalled 100%.

6.3 Award Criteria

The award criteria questions considered the merit of the eligible Tenders to identify the most economically advantageous Tender.

The Council evaluated the award criteria as follows:

- A quality assessment worth **40%**; the following criteria, weighting and methodology were applied:

Each bidder's response to each question was evaluated and marked a maximum of 5 marks as per the below scoring matrix:

In the evaluator's reasoned opinion, the response is an:	
5	Excellent Response

	The response is excellent in relation to the stated requirements of the question. The response provides an excellent level of detail and demonstrates that the bidder's expertise and approach significantly exceeds the Council's minimum requirements such as to provide added value.
4	Strong Response The response is strong in relation to the stated requirements of the question. The response provides a good level of detail and demonstrates that the bidder's expertise and approach exceeds the Council's minimum requirements.
3	Satisfactory Response The response is satisfactory in relation to the stated requirements of the question. The response provides a satisfactory level of detail and demonstrates that the bidder has the necessary expertise to meet the Council's minimum requirements and has a reasonable understanding of what those minimum requirements are.
2	Weak Response The response is weak in relation to the stated requirements of the question. The response provides a low level of detail and provides less than satisfactory evidence to demonstrate that the bidder has the expertise to satisfy the Council's minimum requirements and/or demonstrates some misunderstanding of those requirements.
1	Poor Response The response is poor in relation to the stated requirements of the question. The response provides a very low level of detail. There is a significant lack of evidence to demonstrate that the bidder has the expertise to satisfy the Council's minimum requirements or really understands what those requirements are.
0	Unacceptable Response The response is unacceptable in relation to the stated requirements of the question. The response provides no detail and fails to provide any evidence that the bidder can meet the requirements of the question. OR No answer has been given.

The award criteria questions were split into the following sections:

Section Title	Question Number	Question Sub Weighting (%)
Award Criteria – Quality	1	3%
	2	14%
	3	20%
	4	3%

Bidders were advised that irrespective of the methodology described above, an agreed score for any of the quality questions of '0' or '1' would result in the elimination of their Tender, as the Council requires a minimum quality threshold.

- A price assessment worth **60%**; the following criteria were applied:

Price scores were calculated based on the bidder with the lowest overall compliant price being awarded the full score of 60%. The remaining bids were scored in accordance with the following calculation:

$$= \left(\frac{\text{lowest submitted price}}{\text{potential supplier's submitted price}} \right) \times \text{price weighting}$$

- 6.4 Bidders were required to submit responses by no later than midday on the 6th June 2025.
- 6.5 Following an amendment to the specification post moderation, bidders were given an additional week to submit amended responses. Bidders were required to submit updated responses by no later than midday on the 23rd June 2025.

7.0 Review of the Selection Criteria

- 7.1 The selection questionnaire responses were reviewed by Tom Paling, Contract & Supply Specialist, Welland Procurement.
- 7.2 The following bidders did not pass the selection criteria and Welland Procurement recommended that as stated in the Tender documentation, the remainder of their Tender was therefore not evaluated:
- Bidder 7 – no quality submission or pricing schedule was included in their submission.
 - Bidder 8 – no quality submission or pricing schedule was included in their submission.

8.0 Evaluation of the Award Criteria

- 8.1 An evaluation panel was constructed to ensure that individuals assigned to evaluate questions were the most suitable and relevant to the criteria being examined, based upon qualifications and experience. Each question was evaluated by at least two evaluators and their scores, and comments recorded (see appendix B for details).
- 8.2 Subjective evaluation was undertaken, and initial scores to a maximum of 5 marks were awarded using the scoring matrix above.
- 8.3 A process of moderation for each individual evaluator's scores was undertaken by Welland Procurement. The responses were discussed at a moderation meeting held on 10th June 2025, attended by all evaluators and chaired by the moderator. Following the resubmission of the submissions, following an amendment to the specification, a second moderation meeting was held on the 24th June.

The moderation meeting enabled the panel to review the scores awarded by each evaluator and agree a moderated score for each question. The meeting also ensured that scoring had been consistent and key points in each question had been accounted for. Average scoring was not used.

In all such cases, following discussion, the moderator concluded the most appropriate mark to be awarded.

9.0 Bid Clarifications

- 9.1 A message was sent to Bidder 7 as their submission did not include a pricing schedule or a response to the quality questions. They were asked to respond by 4pm 6th June to explain and provide the missing information. They failed to do so and so were eliminated from the process.
- 9.2 A message was sent to Bidder 8 as their submission did not include a pricing schedule or a response to the quality questions. They were asked to respond by 4pm 6th June to explain and provide the missing information. They failed to do so and so were eliminated from the process.
- 9.3 A message was sent to Bidder 3 to request copies of the PDF's they included in their submission as we were unable to access the original versions. These were provided 2 hours after the request was made.
- 9.4 A message was sent to Bidder 5 as they did not include the required supporting documentation with their submission. They were asked to respond to this request by midday on the 9th June or they would be eliminated from the process. The supporting documentation was provided alongside a new "Document 4 Open Tender" which differed from the original version that was submitted. They were advised that we would not accept an amended version of this document as it was submitted after the deadline and they would be evaluated based on the original submission.
- 9.5 Following the moderation, it was established that changes were required to both the specification and pricing document, due to additional information being made available to the consultant. It was agreed that the 6 compliant bidders would be sent the new specification, pricing document and quality assessment and would be provided one week to resubmit a bid based upon the amended documentation. These amendments included the removal of some joints from the specification, the removal of the concrete elements in the pricing schedule and the rewording of quality question three.

10.0 Additional Tender Information

- 10.1 Site visits were advised, but were not mandatory and did not need to be supervised.

11.0 Results

- 11.1 The evaluation scoring process was devised based upon a maximum score of 100% being available to each bidder as stated in the Tender documentation and outlined above.
- 11.2 Following the completion of the evaluation and moderation process the scores awarded to the participants were as follows:

1 st	Bidder 5	91.40%
2 nd	Bidder 6	69.32%
3 rd	Bidder 4	64.78%
4 th	Bidder 1	62.58%
5 th	Bidder 2	56.95%
6 th	Bidder 3	56.67%

12.0 External Financial Checks

- 12.1 Currently Welland Procurement are unable to provide any external financial checks through Experian. We therefore recommend that the Council conducts any further financial checks it sees fit to ensure satisfactory consideration has been made to financial risk.

13.0 Risk Implications

- 13.1 The procurement process has been conducted in accordance with best practice and the Procurement Act 2023, ensuring the principles of transparency, equity and fairness have been adhered to.
- 13.2 The Council will use an 8 working day standstill period following the distribution of the notification letters (after approval has been granted).
- 13.3 As part of the tender, several risks were identified. The main risks include:
- Concerns were raised around ensuring that potential suppliers were adequately qualified and experienced. A pass/fail question was included to ensure the right qualifications were held and an additional quality question was added to ensure the relevant level of experience.
 - Bidder 3 were requested to resend copies of the PDF's they included in their submission as we were unable to access the original versions. They were contacted 1 hour after the tender deadline and provided the requested documents 2 hours after the request was made. They were not permitted to submit changes to the quality responses or pricing schedule.
 - Bidder 5 were asked to resend copies of their supporting documentation as they failed to include these in their submission. They were contacted 1 hour after the tender deadline and provided the requested documents before the deadline of midday on 9th June. As the documentation requested was proof of insurance and proof of membership to the Mastic Asphalt Council it did not change the content of their submission.

- All bidders were asked to resubmit their pricing and quality responses following an amendment to the requirement. The six compliant bidders were given one week and permitted to resubmit any and all quality responses and complete a new pricing schedule.
- Adrian investigated the submitted pricing schedules to confirm the prices were feasible. An issue with the formula was highlighted in 4 of the 6 spreadsheets. These were corrected and the suppliers notified of the change to their submitted price. Adrian also highlighted some areas of concern, although these were included to highlight more of a lack of understanding rather than a fundamental error with the pricing schedule. Peter confirmed he is happy to proceed with the award and not issue further clarifications regarding the pricing schedules.

14.0 Recommendation

- 14.1 Following the completion of the procurement process, it is recommended that Bidder 5 are awarded the contract.
- 14.2 The evaluators both completed and returned a signed conflict-of-interest form, no conflicts were identified.

15.0 Next Steps

- 15.1 **The Lead Council Officer must ensure the internal governance/approval process is followed, prior to returning this summary report to Welland Procurement.**
- 15.2 This summary report does not supersede or replace any internal governance/approval process the Council may have.
- 15.3 Once the recommendation has been approved by the appropriate approvers, the preferred bidder and all unsuccessful bidders will be notified of the outcome simultaneously. Subject to the satisfactory return of due diligence, and no legal challenge being received, the Council intends to execute the Contract at the conclusion of the standstill period.

16.0 Governance

- 16.1 Signed (Procurement Lead)
 Name: Tom Paling
 Job Title and Authority: Contract & Supply Specialist, Welland Procurement
 Date: 24th June 2025

- 16.2 Signed (Lead Council Officer)
 Name: Peter Withers
 Job Title and Authority: Interim Capital Projects Officer, South Kesteven District Council

Date: 24th June 2025



16.3 Signed (Chief Officer/Approver/Budget Holder)
Name: Richard Wyles
Job Title and Authority: Deputy Chief Executive
Date:

Appendix A – Tender Award Questions

Q No.	Question
1	Please describe your organisation, its size, your location, what areas of the country it covers, and the range of services and projects you undertake.
2	Please provide project information for 3 no. asphalt installation works completed within the last 18 months, preferably on MSCP's. Include details on the size of project, customer, location and works carried out, key project challenges and how they were overcome.
3	<p>Please outline your proposed delivery plan for the works, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Undertaking the works on Level 3 whilst minimising disruption to the operation of the rest of the car park• The method of delivery and laying of asphalt• The methodology for the removal of the existing asphalt coating in a manner which mitigate risk of damage to the screed. If mechanical plant is being used please confirm type and weight• How you will remove waste• What will be your occupational requirements for Level 1• Your approach to segregation of works• How you will carry out traffic management <p>How you will minimise disruption to car park users and maintain as many car park spaces available as possible</p>
4	Please detail how you consider equality and diversity and social value in your business and on this project. Response could include ensuring the workforce is representative of the communities served, social, economic or environmental well-being or benefits and benefits to the community.

Appendix B – List of Evaluators

Name	Job Title	Authority
Peter Withers	Interim Capital Projects Officer	South Kesteven District Council
Adrian Baker	Associate Director - Cost Management	Pick Everard - Consultancy

Appendix C – Final Scores

Method Statements	Bidder 1	Bidder 2	Bidder 3	Bidder 4	Bidder 5	Bidder 6
1	1.8	1.2	1.8	2.4	1.8	1.8
2	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4	11.2	8.4
3	8	8	8	12	16	12
4	2.4	1.8	1.8	2.4	2.4	1.8
Total Quality	20.6	19.4	20	25.2	31.4	24
Quality 40% Score	20.6	19.4	20	25.2	31.4	24
Price 60% Score	41.98	37.55	36.67	39.58	60.00	45.32
Total % Score	62.58	56.95	56.67	64.78	91.40	69.32
Rank	4	5	6	3	1	2

Appendix D – Pricing Evaluation

Bidder	Total cost	% Score (out of 60%)
Bidder 1	£404,869.87	41.98
Bidder 2	£452,669.82	37.55
Bidder 3	£463,498.41	36.67
Bidder 4	£429,497.93	39.58
Bidder 5	£283,305.14	60.00
Bidder 6	£375,091.92	45.32