**Lambeth Transport - Park and Stride Mapping for Schools**

1. **Summary**
   1. As in many boroughs, there are a number of schools in Lambeth where parent driving to school causes congestion and confrontation, with a surplus of cars on narrow and over-parked roads leading some drivers to park inconsiderately and sometimes dangerously.
   2. With a number of expanded schools in the borough with widening catchments, it has to be accepted that some car use for school journeys is inevitable. Introducing the concept of park and stride to schools recognises this but looks to move the car away from the environs of the school, reducing confrontation, improving safety and introducing an element of activity for those children driven to school.

1.3 We would therefore like to commission an organisation to produce bespoke parking and stride mapping for a number of Lambeth schools where car use to school is comparatively high and where congestion is a concern.

1.4 The desired outcomes are:

* the work contributes to highlight park and stride as an effective tool for schools to employ
* the work impacts on the levels of congestion around the schools involved in a favourable way
* The work highlights the importance of travel choices to school across the whole school community and raises awareness of basic active travel messages

1. **Specification**

**2.1 Produce a map for each school involved in the project to support and enable the concept of park and stride. Maps should indicate areas of parking availability as well as 5 and 10 minute walking catchments.**

* Undertake work to identify areas of low parking stress within 5 or 10 minutes walk from the school or identify places – such as car parks – which might provide a park and stride alternative.
* Undertake research to identify the most popular routes to school which would provide detail on where appropriate park and stride locations might be. This could be through obtaining catchment data from the school or from undertaking surveys with parents.
* Undertake work with either pupils or school families to highlight 5 and 10 minute walkable catchments around the school.
* Working with the school, incorporate popular and/or safe walking and/or cycle routes into the mapping with the inclusion of local land marks/green or play spaces/places of interest.
* It is important that the mapping is attractive and bespoke to that particular school and involving pupils (art) work, perhaps through the school community working with an artist, might be a good way of achieving this.
* Although the maps should be highly visual it is important that they incorporate a concise amount of messaging about the benefits of keeping cars away from the school gates and of walking and cycling to school

2.2 The end product must be a high quality attractive map for the school to promote in a number of formats, both electronically and in paper format. It is envisaged that the schools will promote the mapping on their websites and in documents such as the school prospectus. The tenderer’s breakdown of costs should include an allowance for a small initial print run of copies of the map in an appropriate size and format.

2.3 **The number of schools to be engaged with is to be decided by the tenderer within the confines of the budget.** The specific schools to be worked with will be decided by the borough. Initial contact with the schools will be made by the borough with all on-going engagement with the school to be provided by the appointed organisation.

2.4 The start date for this project is flexible but must be completed by the end of March 2017 so the maps can be available for the start of the Summer term.

1. **Procurement**

3.1 The maximum budget for this project is **£20,000 + VAT**. Tenders submitted over £20,000 + VAT will not be considered. No additional funds will be made available for this project.

3.2 Any questions and the final tender must be submitted to the below officer by 5pm on 11th November by email. Tenders submitted after this deadline will not be accepted

* Laura Cheyne, Road Danger Reduction Manager, [LCheyne@lambeth.gov.uk](mailto:LCheyne@lambeth.gov.uk)

3.3 The tender should detail:

* How many schools you intend to work with
* A project plan for the programme
* A breakdown of costs

3.4 The criteria to decide the successful tender is:

* **Quality – 100%**

1. **Evaluation of Quality**
   1. The Method Statement questions, along with; the minimum acceptable score, maximum score available, maximum number of words for each question and weighting are set out below:

**Table 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Question** | **Weight 0-5** | **Max Score** | **Max Score Available** | **Minimum Acceptable Score** |
| Project team experience | A past record of undertaking and completing similar commissions including details of the team to be working with on this project and their involvement in comparable projects and demonstration of satisfactory delivery | 5 | 5 | 25 | 3 |
| Management & Methodology | Overall appreciation of the brief, approach and methodology- with an emphasis on engagement with stakeholders. Please include the no. of schools to be engaged with for the available £20k budget | 5 | 5 | 25 | 3 |
| Timetable / Work Programme | Demonstration of how the project will be delivered by project end date within a clear timetable | 5 | 5 | 25 | 3 |
| Cost and value | Please include the breakdown of staff that will be allocated to this project, and their time input. | 3 | 5 | 15 | 3 |
| Social Value | Demonstration of additional value to the wider community. | 2 | 5 | 10 | 3 |
| **Total** |  |  |  | 100 |  |

* 1. The questions which are indicated with appropriate weightings will be evaluated by the panel and the appropriate score will be agreed and added to form the total Evaluation Mark.
  2. The Authority reserves the right to challenge any information provided in response to the Tender and request further information in support of any statements made therein.
  3. Potential Providers must achieve the minimum acceptable score, as described, for each of the questions in Table1 above.
  4. Where only one (1) submission is received which does not meet the minimum acceptable score, the Authority reserves the right to enter into dialogue and seek assurances regarding the delivery of the requirement.
  5. Potential Providers’ responses must clearly demonstrate how they propose to meet the requirements set out in the question and address each element in the order they are asked.
  6. Potential Providers’ responses should be limited to, and focused on each of the component parts of the question posed. They should refrain from making generalised statements and providing information not relevant to the topic.
  7. Whilst there will be no marks given to layout, spelling, punctuation and grammar, it will assist evaluators if attention is paid to these areas including identifying key sections within responses.
  8. Potential providers will be marked in accordance with the marking scheme.

1. **Marking Scheme**

The scoring matrix:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 0 | Failed to address the question/issue. |
| 1 | An unfavourable response/answer/solution. There is limited or poor evidence of skill/experience sought; a high risk that relevant skills will not be available. |
| 2 | Less than acceptable. The response/answer/solution/information lacks convincing evidence of skill/experience sought; lack of real understanding of requirement or evidence of ability to deliver; medium risk that relevant skills or requirement will not be available. |
| 3 | Acceptable response/answer/solution/information to the particular aspect of the requirement; evidence has been given of skill/experience sought. |
| 4 | Above acceptable – response/answer/solution/information demonstrates real understanding of the requirement and evidence of ability to meet it (based on good experience of the specific provision required or relevant experience of comparable service or supply. |
| 5 | Excellent – response/answer/solution provides real confidence based on experience of the service or supply provision required. Response indicates that the supplier will add real value to the organisation with excellent skills and a deep understanding of the service or supply requested. |

The weighting of each criterion is based on a scale of 1 – 5; 1 being low importance and 5 being highest in importance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Low Importance |
| 2 | Not Very Important |
| 3 | Important |
| 4 | Very Important |
| 5 | Extremely Important |