



## Kings Walk – Activation for Meanwhile Use

## Architects Selection – Evaluation Criteria

Winchester City Council

## Evaluation Criteria

Any quotation that is accepted will be awarded to the most economically advantageous offer and architect's submissions will be evaluated on the following weighted criteria:

### **Cost 10%**

- The lowest priced quotation will be awarded maximum points and all other quotations awarded points in proportion as below:  
*Lowest Submitted Cost / Bidder's Submitted Cost × Weighting*

### **Sustainability 10%**

- How your approach would contribute tangible social, environmental, and economic benefits to the redevelopment of Kings Walk and detail how you would measure and report these benefits to the council if successful.

### **Quality 80%**

- The qualitative evaluation will be based on the following analysis:

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Question Weighting</b>
<b>Programme</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In accordance with timescales set out in brief</li> <li>Cohesiveness and continuity of phased delivery</li> <li>Existing Kings Walk tenant engagement</li> </ul>	15
<b>Entrances</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Greening' of entrances</li> <li>Aesthetic improvements</li> <li>Middle Brook Street public realm</li> </ul>	20
<b>Loading Bay</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Convert existing loading bay to outdoor events space</li> </ul>	20
<b>Silver Hill Frontage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Upgrade facades and entrances</li> <li>Enable views through to courtyard</li> </ul>	20
<b>Roof Top Car Park</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activate roofscape as summer events space</li> </ul>	5
<b>Courtyard Garden</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create a 'pocket park' in the courtyard</li> </ul>	20

The scoring mechanism for the quality and sustainability questions is as follows:

The response exceeds the required standard, answers the question entirely with precision and relevance, and adds value and innovation as appropriate. Exceptional demonstration by the Tenderer of the relevant ability,	5 – Excellent
--	---------------

<p>understanding, skills, facilities &amp; quality measures required to provide the services. Strong evidence to support the response is provided, where appropriate, that the specified requirements will be exceeded with no concerns.</p>	
<p>The response meets the required standard, answers the question fully and with relevance. Good demonstration by the Tenderer of the relevant ability, understanding, skills, facilities &amp; quality measures required to provide the services with. Good evidence to support the response, where appropriate is provided that the specified requirements will be met with no concerns.</p>	<p>4 – Good</p>
<p>The response meets the minimum required standard in an acceptable level of detail. Satisfactory demonstration by the Tenderer of the relevant ability, understanding, skills, facilities &amp; quality measures required to provide the services. Standard or generic evidence is provided to support the response, where appropriate that the specified requirements can be met without any /or limited concerns.</p>	<p>3 – Satisfactory</p>
<p>The response partially meets the minimum required standard and relevance but with some detail missing or not answered. Contains minor shortcomings in the demonstration by the Tenderer of the relevant ability, understanding, skills, facilities &amp; quality measures required to provide the services. Limited evidence is provided to support the response, where appropriate, which, is inconsistent or in conflict with other proposals and raises concerns.</p>	<p>2 – Minor Reservations</p>
<p>The response fails to meet the minimum required standard. Inadequate detail is provided, which is not relevant to the question or there are significant omissions meaning there are considerable reservations of the Tenderer’s relevant ability, understanding, skills, facilities &amp; quality measures required to provide the services. Little or no evidence to support the response is provided and raises many concerns.</p>	<p>1 – Serious Reservations</p> <p>Submissions which receive a ‘1 – serious reservations’ will not be considered further</p>
<p>No response or information is provided to allow proper evaluation, ability is not evidenced.</p>	<p>0 – no score – Fail</p> <p>Submissions that ‘Fail’ will not be considered further</p>

Each response to the quality and sustainability questions will be scored based on the method detailed below and calculated as follows:

The score for quality / 5 x the marks available = score achieved.

A question which has a weighting of 10% and scores '4' (good) would be:

$$4/5 \times 10 = 8\%$$