

Barham Park Trust Committee 13 February 2013

Report from the Director of Environment and Neighbourhood Services

For Decision

Wards Affected: ALL

# Schedule of Updates: Proposals for Improving Barham Park Building Complex and Park

#### 1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 This report amends the report titled 'Proposals for Improving Barham Park Building Complex and Park', which is being taken for decision by the Barham Park Trust Committee on 13 February 2013. These changes do not affect the recommendations.

#### 2.0 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

2.1 That Councillors note the amendments to the report which do not affect any of the recommendations.

#### 3.0 DETAILS

- 3.1 Paragraphs 3.6-3.13 are deleted and to be replaced with the following paragraphs:
  - 3.6 At the first stage of the bidding process there were 12 bids and one later withdrew. The bids were evaluated in accordance with the published criteria, (set out overleaf) which were provided in advance to all bidders.

Applicant's Name

Scoring Explanation	Score			
Very Poor	1			
Poor	2			
Average	3			
Good	4			
Very Good	5			

% Score

# 1. Financial positioning

Criteria	Score
Individual / Company financial standing to include credit rating agency check.	
Individual / Company bank reference.	
If a short lease (upto 15 years) Guarantors financial standing to include credit	
agency check.	
Short lease - Guarantors bank reference.	
Sub Total	

Total Score out of 20/10

#### 2. Proposed use of building

Criteria	Score
Recreational as per Trust requirements	
Sensitive to Park Location	
Sub Total	

# 3. Deliverability

Criteria	Score
Applicants experience of delivering similar projects.	
Deliverability i.e. professional team, skills and resources to refurbishing property to a satisfactory timescale	
Sub Total	

	Total Score out of 10	% Score
--	-----------------------	---------

# 4. Financial Offer

Criteria / Ranking	Score
Price (if below asking price = 0, if at asking price = 1, if 2% more then asking =	
2, if 4% more then asking = 3, if 6% more then asking = 4, if 8% or more above	
asking = 5)	
Sub Total	

Total Score out of 5 % Score

After the initial process, London Borough of Brent reserves the right to introduce additional processes at which stage applicants will be re-scored based on the criteria in this scoring sheet.

# WEIGHTED SCORE SUMMARY

Assessment Criteria	Base Score	Weighting Multiplier	Weighted Score
1. Financial Positioning		20%	
2. Proposed use of building		30%	
3. Deliverability		20%	
4. Financial Offer		30%	
		Total	

3.7 The table below sets out the results of the evaluation.

								Friends of Barham	
		Alton	AOCF	EFRA	Niketa	ACAVA	Thripp	Library	CAC
	Advertised Rei	nt							
Lot 1	£ 10,100.00	Х	Х			Х			
Lot 2	£ 8,496.00	Х			Х				Х
Lot 3	£ 13,968.00	Х	Х			Х	Х		
Lot 4	£ 4,734.00	Х				Х	Х	Х	
Lot 5	£ 5,362.00	Х				Х			
Lot 6	£ 1,575.00	Х		Х		Х			
Lot 7	£ 10,700.00	Х							
Criteria	Weighting								
Financial Standing	20%	4%	4%	4%	6%	8%	4%	4%	4%
Use	30%	27%	21%	12%	27%	27%	24%	24%	18%
Deliverability	20%	14%	8%	10%	6%	18%	8%	8%	6%
Financial Offer	30%	0%	0%	0%	30%	0%	0%	0%	0%
SCORE		45%	33%	26%	69%	53%	36%	36%	28%
RANKING		3	6	8	1	2	4	4	7

- 3.8 The top bids are Nikita Patel and ACAVA. Nikita Patel scored highest and is a startup nursery business. Her bid is for Lot 2 only, but the rental income is less than the income currently generated through ad-hoc lettings and so is not recommended to the Trustees.
- 3.9 The second highest scoring bid was from ACAVA, who has bid for Lots 1,3,4,5 & 6 (totalling of 686 sq. m).
- 3.10 The Council's Finance and Corporate Services Department have undertaken financial checks confirming ACAVA will be able to fulfil their proposed rental bid, this assessment is based on accounts for the year ending 31st March 2011 and 2012.
- 3.11 ACAVA's activities fulfil the required recreational use of the building. It is a charity with a long track record, established in 1983 to support the development and practice of the visual arts. It provides studios for over 500 artists in 20 buildings, mostly in London. ACAVA use a wide variety of buildings, many converted from buildings such as industrial factory premises, offices, shops, and schools. Based on their track record we believe they would have the expertise to undertake works/alterations and deliver their programmes.

- 3.12 ACAVA have offered a rent of £43,000pa including service charge. The recommendation is that lots 1, 3, 4, 5 & 6 are let to ACAVA as overall this is the best offer for the Trust when evaluated against the published criteria:
  - 1. Demonstrate sufficient financial capacity to take on the rental obligation.
  - 2. Fit well with the recreational use required by the Trust.
  - 3. Have experience and a track record of delivering similar projects.
- 3.2 Turning to Appendix 1, paragaphs 1.18-1.27 are deleted.

# 4.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 There are no additional financial implications.

#### 5.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are no additional legal implications.

#### 6.0 DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There are no additional diversity implications.

#### 7.0 STAFFING / ACCOMMODATION IMPLICATIONS (IF APPROPRIATE)

7.1 There are no additional staffing implications.

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

None

#### **CONTACT OFFICERS**

Jenny Isaac Assistant Director Neighbourhood Services

Sue Harper Director of Environment and Neighbourhood Services