



LEE VALLEY REGIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
26 MARCH 2015 AT 10.00

Agenda Item No:

7

Report No:

E/401/15

GROUNDS MAINTENANCE CONTRACT RENEWAL

Presented by the Corporate Director of Parklands & Venues

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Authority's grounds maintenance contract was re-tendered during 2013 and the new 5 year contract awarded to Glendale Grounds Management Ltd. Throughout 2014 there has been protracted debate between the Authority and Glendale on specific areas of the contract.

These issues were resolved in February 2015 to the satisfaction of the Authority whilst adhering to the requirements of the original tender process and officers are now recommending that the Authority formally enters into this contract which, due to the price, requires the Authority seal.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Members Approve:
- (1) entering into a grounds maintenance contract with Glendale Grounds Management Limited; and
 - (2) subject to (1) above applying the Authority Seal to the contract.

BACKGROUND

- 1 The Authority's contracts for grounds maintenance (GM) cover maintenance of countryside sites and open space at the majority of the venues. The previous contracts expired on 31st October 2013.
- 2 When considering the re-tendering of the contracts the following decisions were made to:
 - amalgamate all of the contracts into one overarching contract;
 - move from a Default Process to an Incentive Based process;
 - utilise modern technology to monitor the GM contractor;
 - review the entire tendering process enabling prospective tenderers to ensure they had sufficient staff and equipment to meet the criteria.

- 3 Using an Incentive Based contract allowed the Authority to further expand on the use of its monitoring software system, ParkTracker, through utilising ParkTracker reports to apply a range of Key Performance Indicators to specific areas of the contract. The tenderers were required to price the contract based on 80% 'core' costs and 20% 'at risk' incentive payments.

CONTRACT AWARD

- 4 The tender process included two industry open days to give contractors an insight into the requirements of the GM contract and any difficulties they may encounter. The team of Authority officers individually scored the tender submissions and the amalgamated score was used to confirm the successful contractor.
- 5 The preferred bidders were identified as Glendale Grounds Management Ltd., who had the best overall tender submission and contract negotiations commenced with them in mid October 2013. Glendale were awarded the contract which commenced in November 2013 for a period of 5 years.
- 6 Shortly after commencing work Glendale submitted a revised contract and made a challenge on a specific area of the contract regarding insurances. In March 2014 the Authority asked Glendale to sign the contract as was set out in the specification and again confirmed this requirement in April 2014. However Glendale continued to query this element of the contract through the summer of 2014.
- 7 In November 2014 Glendale supplied some insurance documentation but its form was queried by the Authority's legal services and the final query was issued in December 2014. Agreement was finally reached between the Authority and Glendale in mid February 2015.
- 8 During this period Glendale have provided a good service at the agreed contract price which is lower than the price being paid to the previous contractors. Officers believed that the consequences of re-advertising the contract far outweighed the issues that arose from the negotiating period.
- 9 Officers are now requesting that the grounds maintenance contract with Glendale is formally completed. Due to the price of the contract Authority Financial Regulations require that the contract is completed under seal.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 10 The environmental implications are contained within the body of the report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 11 The contract sum is built into the Authority's revenue budgets.

HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 12 There are no human resource implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 13 There are no legal implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 14 There are no risk management implications arising directly from this report.

EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 15 There are no equality implications arising directly from the recommendations in this report.

Author: Vince Donaldson, 01992 709 816, vdonaldson@leevalleypark.org.uk

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

GM Grounds Maintenance

This page is blank