

# St Marys Road Playground Tender Evaluation Pack

## Individual councillor scoring and panel moderation

Use this pack to evaluate the three tenders consistently against the published criteria. Each evaluator should first complete the compliance gateway, then score independently and record evidence for every score. The panel should moderate only after individual sheets have been completed.

## Evaluator details and conduct

|                             |                                                                                                             |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Evaluator name</b>       | _____                                                                                                       |
| <b>Role</b>                 | Councillor / officer / adviser: _____                                                                       |
| <b>Date completed</b>       | _____                                                                                                       |
| <b>Conflict of interest</b> | None / declared separately. If a conflict may affect impartiality, stop and refer it to the Proper Officer. |

**Evaluation rules:** Score only the submitted evidence and any formally issued clarification shared through the Council. Do not contact tenderers directly, introduce unpublished criteria or compare submissions outside the published requirements. Keep notes factual and suitable for the procurement record.

## Scoring method

| Raw score | Meaning           | Application                                                                                        |
|-----------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 0         | Unacceptable      | No relevant response, fundamentally non-compliant or presents unacceptable risk.                   |
| 1         | Poor              | Major weaknesses; substantially fails to meet the requirement.                                     |
| 2         | Below requirement | Partly meets the requirement but has important omissions, weaknesses or risk.                      |
| 3         | Meets requirement | Adequate and credible response meeting the requirement with manageable risk.                       |
| 4         | Good              | Meets the requirement well, with clear strengths and only minor weaknesses.                        |
| 5         | Excellent         | Comprehensive, convincing and deliverable response with material added value and minimal weakness. |

**Weighted score = raw score ÷ 5 × criterion weighting.** Record scores to two decimal places if necessary. The maximum total is 100.

## Published evaluation criteria

| Criterion                                              | Weight | Maximum weighted points |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------|-------------------------|
| Design quality, play value and community benefit       | 30%    | 30                      |
| Inclusion, accessibility and safety                    | 20%    | 20                      |
| Site response, retention, layout, surfacing and levels | 15%    | 15                      |
| Sense of place and bespoke or local response           | 15%    | 15                      |
| Durability, sustainability, maintenance and warranties | 10%    | 10                      |
| Value for money and cost transparency                  | 10%    | 10                      |

## Tender comparison summary

| Tenderer              | Ex VAT     | VAT        | Inc VAT    | Price validity                 | Programme                                                                                          |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Sutcliffe Play Ltd    | £64,208.28 | £12,841.65 | £77,049.93 | 12 months                      | December 2026, based on award in early October 2026; 12 weeks after start, excluding bank holidays |
| KOMPAN Ltd            | £64,999.95 | £12,999.99 | £77,999.94 | 30 days from tender submission | 16 November 2026; 11 December 2026                                                                 |
| Wicksteed Leisure Ltd | £65,000.00 | £13,000.00 | £78,000.00 | Valid until 7 December 2026    | Indicatively within one week of written order; Indicatively 12 weeks from written order            |

**Price context:** The lowest tender is Sutcliffe Play at £64,208.28 excluding VAT. KOMPAN is £791.67 higher and Wicksteed is £791.72 higher. The published method gives value for money and cost transparency a 10 percent weighting; lowest price does not automatically win.

## Compliance gateway

Complete this before qualitative scoring. A pending clarification is not a score deduction unless the response, after a fair and lawful clarification process, evidences a weakness against a published criterion. Any exclusion decision should be taken and recorded by the Council in accordance with the tender documents.

| Gateway check                     | Sutcliffe Play             | KOMPAN                                  | Wicksteed                              |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Received by revised deadline      | Yes                        | Yes                                     | Yes                                    |
| Form of Tender and declaration    | Present and signed         | Present and signed                      | Present and signed                     |
| Headline price and VAT stated     | £64,208.28 plus VAT        | £64,999.95 plus VAT                     | £65,000.00 plus VAT                    |
| Required return documents present | Package appears complete   | Package appears complete                | Package appears complete               |
| Compulsory site visit             | Confirmed in return        | Confirmed, attended by Emily Van Rooyen | Confirmed, attended by Stephanie Lapac |
| Material scope compliance         | Check noted clarifications | Check noted clarifications              | Check noted clarifications             |

| Tenderer              | Gateway decision         | Reason or clarification reference | Decision by and date |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Sutcliffe Play Ltd    | Pass / Clarify / Exclude |                                   |                      |
| KOMPAN Ltd            | Pass / Clarify / Exclude |                                   |                      |
| Wicksteed Leisure Ltd | Pass / Clarify / Exclude |                                   |                      |

## Points for consistent clarification

| Applies to    | Subject                    | Clarification required before final moderation                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|---------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| All tenderers | Existing toddler multiplay | The written Appendix C says remove, with replacement optional; all three tenders retain it and refer to site-visit or pre-start confirmation. Verify that the scope change was communicated equally and record the authoritative requirement. |
| All tenderers | Optional enhancements      | Ask for any missing separate prices for options the Council may wish to consider, without allowing a material change to the core tender.                                                                                                      |
| KOMPAN        | Track Ride Tower           | Confirm whether the proposed item satisfies the explicit clarification that a zip wire must not be included in the core proposal.                                                                                                             |
| Wicksteed     | Receipt timing             | Verify the mailbox receipt timestamp because the declaration is dated on the revised deadline date.                                                                                                                                           |

## Evaluation sheet Sutcliffe Play Ltd

| Evaluator | Date  | Conflict declared | Gateway result           |
|-----------|-------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| _____     | _____ | Yes / No          | Pass / Clarify / Exclude |

| Tender price ex VAT | Tender price inc VAT | Proposed start                                      | Proposed completion                           |
|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| £64,208.28          | £77,049.93           | December 2026, based on award in early October 2026 | 12 weeks after start, excluding bank holidays |

### 1 Design quality, play value and community benefit 30 percent

Overall concept; breadth of play experiences; age range; challenge; layout; user appeal; response to community need.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 30 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

### 2 Inclusion, accessibility and safety 20 percent

Accessible entrance; inclusive play; safe surfacing; gate solution; supervision; visibility; compliance.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 20 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

### 3 Site response, retention, layout, surfacing and levels 15 percent

Use of the existing site; slope and levels; specified retentions and removals; integration of wet pour and grass matting.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 15 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |



## Evaluation sheet Sutcliffe Play Ltd continued

### 4 Sense of place and bespoke or local response 15 percent

Quality, practicality and affordability of theme, local identity, community-related features and integration into play.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 15 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

### 5 Durability, sustainability, maintenance and warranties 10 percent

Robustness; lifespan; maintenance; sustainability; warranties; suitability for unsupervised public use.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 10 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

### 6 Value for money and cost transparency 10 percent

Cost clarity; competitiveness; affordability; whole-life value; exclusions and assumptions; delivery of the full scope without hidden costs.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 10 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

## Evaluator total and recommendation

| Total weighted score | Rank at individual stage | Material clarification needed | Recommendation and reasons |
|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| _____ / 100          | _____                    | Yes / No                      |                            |

## Evaluation sheet KOMPAN Ltd

| Evaluator | Date  | Conflict declared | Gateway result           |
|-----------|-------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| _____     | _____ | Yes / No          | Pass / Clarify / Exclude |

| Tender price ex VAT | Tender price inc VAT | Proposed start   | Proposed completion |
|---------------------|----------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| £64,999.95          | £77,999.94           | 16 November 2026 | 11 December 2026    |

### 1 Design quality, play value and community benefit 30 percent

Overall concept; breadth of play experiences; age range; challenge; layout; user appeal; response to community need.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 30 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

### 2 Inclusion, accessibility and safety 20 percent

Accessible entrance; inclusive play; safe surfacing; gate solution; supervision; visibility; compliance.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 20 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

### 3 Site response, retention, layout, surfacing and levels 15 percent

Use of the existing site; slope and levels; specified retentions and removals; integration of wet pour and grass matting.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 15 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

## Evaluation sheet KOMPAN Ltd continued

### 4 Sense of place and bespoke or local response 15 percent

Quality, practicality and affordability of theme, local identity, community-related features and integration into play.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 15 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

### 5 Durability, sustainability, maintenance and warranties 10 percent

Robustness; lifespan; maintenance; sustainability; warranties; suitability for unsupervised public use.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 10 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

### 6 Value for money and cost transparency 10 percent

Cost clarity; competitiveness; affordability; whole-life value; exclusions and assumptions; delivery of the full scope without hidden costs.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 10 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

## Evaluator total and recommendation

| Total weighted score | Rank at individual stage | Material clarification needed | Recommendation and reasons |
|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| _____ / 100          | _____                    | Yes / No                      |                            |

## Evaluation sheet Wicksteed Leisure Ltd

| Evaluator | Date  | Conflict declared | Gateway result           |
|-----------|-------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| _____     | _____ | Yes / No          | Pass / Clarify / Exclude |

| Tender price ex VAT | Tender price inc VAT | Proposed start                                | Proposed completion                      |
|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| £65,000.00          | £78,000.00           | Indicatively within one week of written order | Indicatively 12 weeks from written order |

### 1 Design quality, play value and community benefit 30 percent

Overall concept; breadth of play experiences; age range; challenge; layout; user appeal; response to community need.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 30 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

### 2 Inclusion, accessibility and safety 20 percent

Accessible entrance; inclusive play; safe surfacing; gate solution; supervision; visibility; compliance.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 20 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

### 3 Site response, retention, layout, surfacing and levels 15 percent

Use of the existing site; slope and levels; specified retentions and removals; integration of wet pour and grass matting.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 15 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

## Evaluation sheet Wicksteed Leisure Ltd continued

### 4 Sense of place and bespoke or local response 15 percent

Quality, practicality and affordability of theme, local identity, community-related features and integration into play.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 15 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

### 5 Durability, sustainability, maintenance and warranties 10 percent

Robustness; lifespan; maintenance; sustainability; warranties; suitability for unsupervised public use.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 10 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

### 6 Value for money and cost transparency 10 percent

Cost clarity; competitiveness; affordability; whole-life value; exclusions and assumptions; delivery of the full scope without hidden costs.

| Evidence and reasons for score | Raw score 0 to 5 | Weighted score max 10 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|                                |                  |                       |

## Evaluator total and recommendation

| Total weighted score | Rank at individual stage | Material clarification needed | Recommendation and reasons |
|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| _____ / 100          | _____                    | Yes / No                      |                            |

## Individual evaluator summary

| Criterion                                              | Weight | Sutcliffe Play | KOMPAN | Wicksteed |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------|----------------|--------|-----------|
| Design quality, play value and community benefit       | 30     |                |        |           |
| Inclusion, accessibility and safety                    | 20     |                |        |           |
| Site response, retention, layout, surfacing and levels | 15     |                |        |           |
| Sense of place and bespoke or local response           | 15     |                |        |           |
| Durability, sustainability, maintenance and warranties | 10     |                |        |           |
| Value for money and cost transparency                  | 10     |                |        |           |
| Total                                                  | 100    |                |        |           |

| Tenderer              | Total score | Individual rank | Key strengths | Key risks or weaknesses |
|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Sutcliffe Play Ltd    |             |                 |               |                         |
| KOMPAN Ltd            |             |                 |               |                         |
| Wicksteed Leisure Ltd |             |                 |               |                         |

## Evaluator declaration

I confirm that I evaluated the tenders independently against the published criteria, recorded the reasons for my scores and declared any actual or potential conflict of interest.

| Evaluator name | Signature | Date |
|----------------|-----------|------|
|                |           |      |

## Panel moderation record

Record the agreed consensus score and a concise evidence-based rationale. Do not simply average individual scores unless the panel has expressly adopted and documented that method. Resolve clarifications consistently before confirming final scores.

### Design quality, play value and community benefit 30 percent

Overall concept; breadth of play experiences; age range; challenge; layout; user appeal; response to community need.

| Tenderer              | Consensus raw score<br>0 to 5 | Weighted score | Agreed rationale and evidence |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Sutcliffe Play Ltd    |                               |                |                               |
| KOMPAN Ltd            |                               |                |                               |
| Wicksteed Leisure Ltd |                               |                |                               |

### Inclusion, accessibility and safety 20 percent

Accessible entrance; inclusive play; safe surfacing; gate solution; supervision; visibility; compliance.

| Tenderer              | Consensus raw score<br>0 to 5 | Weighted score | Agreed rationale and evidence |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Sutcliffe Play Ltd    |                               |                |                               |
| KOMPAN Ltd            |                               |                |                               |
| Wicksteed Leisure Ltd |                               |                |                               |

### Site response, retention, layout, surfacing and levels 15 percent

Use of the existing site; slope and levels; specified retentions and removals; integration of wet pour and grass matting.

| Tenderer              | Consensus raw score<br>0 to 5 | Weighted score | Agreed rationale and evidence |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Sutcliffe Play Ltd    |                               |                |                               |
| KOMPAN Ltd            |                               |                |                               |
| Wicksteed Leisure Ltd |                               |                |                               |

## Panel moderation record continued

### Sense of place and bespoke or local response 15 percent

Quality, practicality and affordability of theme, local identity, community-related features and integration into play.

| Tenderer              | Consensus raw score<br>0 to 5 | Weighted score | Agreed rationale and evidence |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Sutcliffe Play Ltd    |                               |                |                               |
| KOMPAN Ltd            |                               |                |                               |
| Wicksteed Leisure Ltd |                               |                |                               |

### Durability, sustainability, maintenance and warranties 10 percent

Robustness; lifespan; maintenance; sustainability; warranties; suitability for unsupervised public use.

| Tenderer              | Consensus raw score<br>0 to 5 | Weighted score | Agreed rationale and evidence |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Sutcliffe Play Ltd    |                               |                |                               |
| KOMPAN Ltd            |                               |                |                               |
| Wicksteed Leisure Ltd |                               |                |                               |

### Value for money and cost transparency 10 percent

Cost clarity; competitiveness; affordability; whole-life value; exclusions and assumptions; delivery of the full scope without hidden costs.

| Tenderer              | Consensus raw score<br>0 to 5 | Weighted score | Agreed rationale and evidence |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Sutcliffe Play Ltd    |                               |                |                               |
| KOMPAN Ltd            |                               |                |                               |
| Wicksteed Leisure Ltd |                               |                |                               |

## Final moderated result

| Tenderer              | Total score out of 100 | Final rank | Clarifications resolved | Panel recommendation |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Sutcliffe Play Ltd    |                        |            | Yes / No                |                      |
| KOMPAN Ltd            |                        |            | Yes / No                |                      |
| Wicksteed Leisure Ltd |                        |            | Yes / No                |                      |

| Panel member | Role | Signature | Date |
|--------------|------|-----------|------|
|              |      |           |      |
|              |      |           |      |
|              |      |           |      |

## Decision record

|                                                    |       |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Recommended tenderer                               | _____ |
| Recommended contract sum excluding VAT             | _____ |
| Reason for recommendation                          |       |
| Council or committee decision and minute reference |       |
| Conditions before award                            |       |