



**ALEXANDRA PARK AND PALACE CHARITABLE TRUST**  
**BOARD MEETING**  
**24 JANUARY 2022**

**Report Title:** Award of Contract for Parking Management System (PMS)  
**Report of:** Louise Stewart, CEO

**Purpose:** This report sets out the procurement exercise undertaken and seeks approval to award the Parking Management Services contract to the successful bidder.

**Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 – N/A**

**1. Recommendations**

- 1.1 To approve the award of contract for the provision of car park management infrastructure and services to Bidder 2, for a period of 10 years, with the option to extend for a further 5 years;
- 1.2 To authorise the Haringey Council's Head of Legal and Governance to seal the contract.

**2. Executive Summary**

- 2.1 Following extensive research, discussions and consultation the Trustee Board approved car park charging proposals in September 2020 and a tender specification was produced for the provision of a parking management system (PMS). The background information on the Board's decision to charge for car parking is included at Appendix 1.
- 2.2 With support from Haringey Council's Procurement Service (HCPS) a restricted tender process commenced in June 2021 and concluded in January 2022. This report sets out the procurement process followed and the basis for recommending the successful bidder.
- 2.4 The recommendations in this report are supported by the commercial information contained in exempt Appendix 2, agenda item 14.

### 3. Procurement Procedure

- 3.1 The Council's procurement rules and Public Procurement Regulations 2015 apply to the Trust, which, as an unincorporated body, relies on the Corporate Trustee to enter into contracts on its behalf.
- 3.2 In March 2021 a further competition framework procedure (awarded suppliers on a framework are invited to tender) was initiated but halted before significant resource was invested. It became apparent that this route could result in more than one provider for different elements of car park management and was a risk to the flexibility and control of the scheme that the Trustees had requested.
- 3.3 The Council's Contract Procurement Service provided expert support and recommended one of two methods for going to market:
- an open procedure (any organisation can submit a tender), and;
  - a restricted procedure, where bidders are invited to tender.
- 3.4 With 15 providers having expressed interest to the Trust during early market engagement, it was likely that the contract notice would attract a large number of bidders. The restricted procedure involved publishing a standard selection questionnaire (SQ) seeking to ensure a supplier had the finance, experience and references to deliver such a contract. The five top scoring providers are then invited to tender; if fewer than five applied, each supplier would still be required to pass the tests before progressing to the next stage.
- 3.5 Although a restricted procedure required a minimum of 14 weeks and would delay the January 2022 implementation it was agreed to be the preferred route to secure the best contract. The Trust would have a maximum of five bids to evaluate that had already been through a process of due diligence.

- 3.6 The timetable for the process:

#### Stage 1

28 June 2021	SQ published
30 July 2021	Deadline for SQ submission
2 Aug.- 6 Sept.	SQ Evaluations

#### Stage 2

1 October 2021	Send ITT to successful suppliers
11 November 2021	Deadline for ITT submission
15 Nov.-17 Dec.	ITT Evaluations
20-21 Dec. 2021	Clarifications meetings with suppliers
12-14 Jan. 2022	Moderation meeting & final ranking

### 4. The procurement process

#### 4.1 Stage 1

- 4.1.1 The standard questionnaire (SQ) was published on the Government's *Contracts Finder* website via the HCPS portal on 28 June 2021 and the deadline for submitted SQs was 30 July 2021.

- 4.1.2 The SQ contained a range of compliance and information questions. Some scored and others (essential requirements) evaluated on a 'pass' or 'fail' basis, to enable assessment of the suitability of potential suppliers based on the following selection criteria:
- a. Professional honesty, solvency and reliability
  - b. Economic and financial standing
  - c. Technical or professional ability
  - d. Aspects relevant to contract requirements (e.g. Insurance, Health and Safety, Equality and Diversity, Quality Assurance).
- 4.1.3 During this period suppliers were permitted to submit clarification questions (via HCPS) for responses to be provided by 22 July. Three clarifications were submitted, two related to the specification that would be sent to bidders at Stage 2 and the other related to site visits.
- 4.1.4 On the 30 July a total of nine SQs were returned and a 30 day evaluation period began for the Trust to request references and score the submissions, during which one supplier dropped out of the process.
- 4.1.5 The Stage 1 Evaluation Panel comprised: Emma Dagnes (Deputy CEO), Simon Fell (Director of Event Operations) and Natalie Layton (Charity Secretary). Once individual evaluations were complete scores were submitted to moderator, Shashi Sharma (Haringey Council, Procurement Officer), who calculated the final scores and ranking.
- 4.1.6 The Council's procurement methodology was used to calculate each suppliers' financial standing. Suppliers who scored above 15 out of 40 passed the criteria.
- 4.1.7 The Evaluation Panel used the Council's procurement scoring system to score the technical and professional ability questions based on:
- References/ new start up explanation (total weight 60)
  - Case studies (weight 20)
  - People (weight 10)
  - Technical facilities (weight 10)

The maximum score (100) was multiplied by the total weighted (evaluated) score to give each supplier's total and the top five ranking suppliers were invited to tender.

## 4.2 Stage 2

- 4.2.1 The Invitation to Tender (ITT) was sent to the successful suppliers via the HCPS portal on 1 October 2021 and the deadline for returns was 11 November 2021.
- 4.2.2 The tenders were evaluated against 60% Quality and 40% Price.
- 4.2.3 The suppliers were provided with a Pricing Schedule to complete for the total contract price for years 1-10. Scores were created by dividing the lowest price by each supplier's tendered price. The ratio is multiplied by the price weighting (40%) to give a price score for each Tenderer.

4.2.4 The ITT pack also contained the contract specification and an additional information document about Alexandra Park and Palace (AP) and the site and five method statements for completion:

4.2.5 The method statements were based on the specification around:

- Capital infrastructure (weight 17)
- Revenue technology (weight 16)
- Revenue operations (weight 16)
- Added value and innovation (weight 5)
- Social value (weight 6)

4.2.6 The mechanism for assessing quality was based on a score of zero to 5:

Score: 0	Question not answered
Score: 1	Poor – Falls well short of meeting the requirements of the Question
Score: 2	Low Expectations - Meets some of the requirements of the Question
Score: 3	Satisfactory - Largely meets the requirements of the Question.
Score: 4	Good - Meets all major requirements of the Question.
Score: 5	Excellent - Meets and complies with all the requirements of the Question. No Reservations.

4.2.7 During Stage 2 of the process two bidders pulled out, for the reasons given in exempt Appendix 2.

4.2.8 The Stage 2 Evaluation Panel comprised: Emma Dagnes (Deputy CEO), Simon Fell (Director of Event Operations), Louise Johnson (Strategic Programmes Manager, Tom Fleming (ITP Consultant), Natalie Layton (Charity Secretary) and Shashi Sharma (Haringey Council, Procurement Officer). The Panel held clarification meetings with each of the remaining 3 bidders on 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> December, to answer questions on their bids and each bidder was invited to revise their final submission in response to the clarifications discussed, more information is included at exempt Appendix 2, agenda item 14.

4.3 A moderation workshop was held on 12 January 2022, where the evaluation panel, for the first time, discussed their individual scores for each question (method statement) and agreed final scores.

4.4 The final results based on scoring of Price (40%) and Quality (60%) were

Bidder 1	71
Bidder 2	85
Bidder 3	84

## 5. Reason for the decision

5.1 The evaluation process was thorough and all the tenders submitted were of high quality. However, the winning bidder evidenced their extensive experience, expertise and highly flexible approach, demonstrating their acute understanding of the dynamic environment in which they would be operating. The winning bidder's price, although the highest, reflected the quality of the offer and provided a comprehensive suite of both infrastructure and technology which could deliver in all modes of operation without compromise.

## **6. Risks**

- 6.1 Reputational risks – There is a risk that despite the open and transparent approach that has been taken to date and the very obvious need for the Trust to generate new income streams there could still be a level of objection to charging. The winning tender demonstrated a clear understanding of existing sensitivities around the new scheme and proposes to work closely with the Trust on implementation abiding by best practice standards at all times.
- 6.2 Contractor does not deliver on the specification – Fortnightly meetings will take place with the contract management team to monitor contract delivery and key performance indicators will be agreed from the outset, in line with the contract terms and conditions.

## **5. Is the decision/ action consistent with the Charity's Vision, Mission Purpose and Values? Five Year Plan priority pillars?**

- 5.1 The decision to award the contract is in line with the Charity's five year plan and strategic vision. The base line cost for keeping the Park and Palace safely open to the public is £3.6 million per year. With increasing costs and a backlog of repairs, new income streams will be critical to ensure we can continue to deliver our charitable duties. We also hope to reduce the cost of managing and clearing up after anti-social behaviour on site, particularly in the car parks, that we believe car parking charges and improved car park management infrastructure will help us to achieve.
- 5.2 Charging for parking is a fair way of funding the upkeep and delivery of our objectives that benefits everyone and therefore the decision is in the best interests of the Charity.

## **6. Equality, Diversity & Inclusion**

- 6.1 The Charity has tested public appetite for car park charges during the lockdown by asking for contributions towards the costs of reopening the car parks. The Tap to Donate scheme has been well received with more than 650 donations on the first day and only a handful of drivers declining to make a donation. There has also been, in the majority, positive social media activity from the local community and a sympathetic understanding as to why charging for parking is a fair way of assisting with funding the Charity
- 6.2. The Trustees have previously committed to parking fees remaining affordable so as not to disadvantage any particular user groups, particularly those on low incomes or with mobility issues: Blue Badge holders will be exempt from charges. The proposed charges are comparable to those of similar local open spaces and events/cultural venues. Access to the grounds remains free and they are accessible by bicycle, foot and public transport. The Board will keep the tariffs under review.

## **7. Legal Implications**

- 7.1 In October 2020 the Charity Commission granted an Order under section 105 of the Charities Act 2011 to authorise charging for car parking at Alexandra Park and Palace.

- 7.2 The Council's Head of Legal & Governance has been consulted in the preparation of this report.
- 7.3 The report confirmed that the restricted tender procedure was followed during the tender process. This procedure is permitted under the Council's Contract Standing Order (CSO) 9.01.2(b) and Regulation 26(3)(a) of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.
- 7.4 In accordance with the provisions of CSO 9.07.1(d), Cabinet may approve the award of a contract if the value of the contract is £500,000 or more.
- 7.5 Further to paragraph 7.4 above, in relation to the procurement of works, goods and services by or on behalf of Alexandra Palace and Park Charitable Trust, CSO 14(b) gives Alexandra Palace and Park Board and Panel the powers and duties of the Cabinet and therefore Alexandra Palace and Park Board and Panel has power to approve the award of the contract in the Report.
- 7.6 The Head of Legal and Governance sees no legal reasons preventing the approval of the recommendations in the report.

## **8. Financial Implications**

- 8.1 Best value was considered during the procurement process, more details in Exempt Appendix 2, and the contract is expected to bring in much needed revenue to the Trust.
- 8.2 The Council's Chief Financial Officer has been consulted in the preparation of this report, and advises that comments are contained in the exempt report.

## **9. Use of Appendices**

Appendix 1 – Background to the decision to charge for car parking

Appendix 2 – Exempt Information relating to the contract procurement

## **10. Background Papers**

Commercially sensitive tender evaluation documents.

## Background to the decision to charge for car parking

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 At a strategy day in 2017 the Board discussed the need to move towards greater financial resilience and car park charging was included in the Trust's 10-Year Strategy. Car park charging at Alexandra Palace had been looked at before but was never implemented
- 1.2 In November 2017 a report was presented to the Board including a legal assessment of the Alexandra Park & Palace (APP) Act and requirements for applying to the Charity Commission for a Section 105 order authorising car park charging. The Board authorised the CEO to proceed with further work on the options, potential issues and consultation and implementation plans.
- 1.3 The Board also sought assurances that:
  - the procurement process would be open and transparent;
  - the Trust would have control over any parking penalty appeal decisions;
  - comparison with surrounding local areas and other venues would be included in the feasibility study.
- 1.4 Independent sustainable transport planning and research consultants, Integrated Transport Planning Ltd ("ITP"), were commissioned in 2018 to review the existing car parking arrangements and advise on how to best implement parking charges. ITP were also involved in developing the PMS contract specification, taking into account the nature of the Charity, its operations and the different needs of visitors, and the procurement process.

### 2. Consultation

- 2.1 Initial consultation with the Statutory Advisory Committee (SAC) and Consultative Committee (CC) was carried out in January 2019. The Committees were supportive of the proposal to charge for parking, on the basis it would help raise income for the Charity.

The committees' comments to the board were:

- That charges should not be prohibitive to visitors;
  - A comprehensive public consultation should be carried out to assess the impact of charging on beneficiaries and stakeholders;
  - The impact on local residents should be taken into account;
  - Staff and volunteers should not suffer financially;
  - The Charity should monitor traffic issues and usage, including to ensure balanced usage between cars and other transport, including bicycles.
- 2.2 A public consultation was carried out in November 2019 and ran for 60 days to January 2020, comprising an online survey (including questions on the impact of charging) and a series of drop-in sessions. The consultation was advertised online, on-site and via a mail drop to over 9,000 local households. 2,121 survey responses were received and around 20 people attended a drop-in session.

- 2.3 The consultation results were used to develop the charging proposals, including in relation to exemptions. The Trustees recognise that the majority of survey respondents were not in favour of parking charges, but also that (i) only a minority (around 25%) of local households that received a survey responded to it, (ii) of those that did, almost 20% were in favour of charges, and (iii) almost every car visiting since the donate-to-pay scheme was introduced has made a donation.
- 2.4 In January 2020, following the public consultation, the office of Catherine West MP notified the Trust of comments raised by constituents around the impact of the proposals on surrounding streets. The Trust responded and invited the MP to make further contact. No further issues have been raised by local MPs and the proposed scheme has been in the public domain for some time with progress updates on the Trust's website.
- 2.5 The Charity offered meetings to Alexandra, Bounds Green, Fortis Green, Hornsey, Muswell Hill, Crouch End and Noel Park Ward councillors to discuss the proposals and engaged directly with Hornsey and Alexandra Ward councillors. Hornsey councillors noted that local residents understood the rationale, although some were concerned about the impact of the proposals on local parking.
- 2.6 Further consultation was carried out with the SAC/CC during 2020. The committees were provided with the results from the public consultation, the proposed parking plans, including charges and discounts/exemptions, and information on the next steps. Final meetings of the SAC and CC were held on 1 September 2020 and comments, considered by the Board on 14 September 2020, included that parking fees should be kept affordable so as not to disadvantage any particular user groups and the impact of the scheme on the surrounding area should be monitored and mitigated.

### **3. Reasons for implementing a car parking scheme**

- 3.1 The financial implication for the Trust if it does not find new income sources is that it will not have sufficient resources to deliver its charitable purposes in the future. Car park charging is a missed opportunity to generate income to maintain car parks and improve infrastructure and assist the Trust in delivering its charitable purposes.
- 3.2 The Covid-19 pandemic has significantly impacted the Charity's financial position. It is not currently possible to hold events and in normal circumstances event and leisure income accounts for half of the Charity's income.
- 3.3 The Charity has implemented a temporary donate to park system during the Covid-19 pandemic to cover the costs of operating the car park when there is no income from events or related activities. Only a small number of visitors have declined to donate the £3 suggested donation, which is in line with the proposed tariff structure for a 2 hour stay on site.
- 3.4 The scheme will deter anti-social behaviour, which risks harm to the park and building (and to staff and the public) and will deter use of the Charity's land as overflow residential parking or commuter parking for the station. In addition charging may further encourage the use of public transport by visitors.
- 3.5 The approach is in line with other open spaces and event and cultural venues in London and the surrounding areas.



#### **4. Risks**

- 4.1 Reputational risk and adverse media coverage - the management of the development of the proposals and consultation process to date had been open and transparent. The Charity will monitor the scheme, continue to engage with the local authority and councillors in relation to parking, and carry out an annual review, taking user views into account.
- 4.2 If the Charity's income does not increase over the coming years, it will face redundancies, insolvency and site degradation, which they consider contrary to the Charity's best interests, and also those of the local area.
- 4.3 Adverse impact on local residents - The Charity has engaged with the local authority regarding the potential impact on local residents and Haringey's Transport Team around local parking issues..
- 4.4 Staff/volunteers should not suffer financially: The Charity has developed an exemption system in relation to parking charges [and staff and volunteers will be exempt].
- 4.5 The Charity will monitor traffic issues and usage, including to ensure balanced usage between cars and other transport, including bicycles: [Free bicycle parking will remain available] and the Park and Palace are fully accessible by public transport.
- 4.6 The impact of the scheme on the surrounding area will be monitored and mitigated: If the scheme is implemented, the Charity will continue to engage with the local authority and councillors in relation to it.
- 4.7 The Charity will also carry out an annual review of parking, taking the views of users into account. The 'donate to park' scheme introduced as a result of Covid-19 has not resulted in any significant displacement of visitor parking onto surrounding streets.