

# Seaton Valley Council

## A Community Council

### Floral Planting & Maintenance Contract 2026–2028

#### Evaluation Criteria and Weightings

Reference: SVC-FP-001A-2026

Bids will be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria and weightings. All submissions must address these criteria clearly and directly.

#### 1. Price – 40%

Assessment of:

- overall value for money
- clarity and transparency of pricing
- whole-life cost implications
- phasing cost options (100%, 75%, 50%)
- proportionality of costs to the scope of work

#### 2. Quality of Plants, Materials and Method – 20%

Assessment of:

- suitability and quality of proposed plant species
- compost, soil preparation and installation standards
- planting methodology
- assurance of plant health and establishment

#### 3. Environmental Sustainability – 12%

Assessment of:

- peat-free, pollinator-friendly and sustainable planting practices
- minimisation of waste
- water efficiency
- contribution to biodiversity

#### 4. Design Approach – 10%

Assessment of:

- visual impact and layout
- year-round interest (including winter structure)
- sensory elements where appropriate
- consideration of village character

#### 5. Experience and Capability – 8%

Assessment of:

- evidence of similar contracts delivered
- horticultural competence and team skills
- references or examples of recent work

## **6. Maintenance Methodology – 5%**

Assessment of:

- clarity and feasibility of maintenance schedule
- watering, feeding, deadheading and winter preparation
- responsiveness to issues or seasonal conditions

## **7. Communication and Contract Management – 3%**

Assessment of:

- contractor's approach to liaison with SVCC
- proposed reporting arrangements
- ability to provide updates and respond to queries

## **8. Safety and Compliance – 2%**

Assessment of:

- health and safety systems
- risk assessments
- employee and public liability insurance
- evidence of competent staff and safe working practices

## **Scoring Scale (0–5)**

- 0 – Unacceptable: Fails to meet requirement; significant concerns.
- 1 – Poor: Serious weaknesses; insufficient evidence.
- 2 – Adequate: Meets minimum requirement but lacks detail.
- 3 – Good: Meets requirement with clear supporting evidence.
- 4 – Very Good: Strong proposal with added value.
- 5 – Excellent: Outstanding proposal with exceptional evidence.