Request for Quotation for Open space Mapping and Standards in Cambridgeshire

**Clarification Questions**

1. Is a price ceiling for this piece of work?

*Thank you for your enquiry regarding a ceiling price for this piece of work, at this stage we haven’t specified a price as we are seeking competitive bids which will be evaluated as per the process outlined.*

1. In undertaking analyses how would you wish to treat local spaces that cut across administrative boundaries- LAs, wards. I’m sure that some will exist.

*While these will be few in number, we would ask that you propose an approach that is complementary with your methodology overall, in discussion with the Project Team. ​Where such cross over exists we would be content that the sq.m of the site is sub divided by the amount within each corresponding authority boundary. This is something we would discuss in more detail with the successful bidder.*

1. Perhaps it would be helpful to have a threshold size for informal parkland and amenity space- the latter term in particular leaves great scope for interpretation?

*You will note that the Peterborough City Council Open Space Strategy does not create a standard for informal parkland and amenity space, hence it was assumed that a minimum size for such sites may not be required.  We are however happy to work with the successful bidder to define this thresholds if they feel it appropriate to define such and subsequently set standards for such.*

1. How do you anticipate avoiding double-counting in applying the typology?  For example, the characteristics of country parks state that they should provide inter alia for outdoor sports and play. However, such provision may well also be accounted for under other development plan standards. Is it likely that such components will be ‘cut out’ of the host space polygon (and in the case of play) addressed via a separate polygon?

*Each of the green spaces will be tagged with one typology to ensure that spaces are not double counted. The aim being to select the primary function of each site.  It is considered unlikely that data will be available to sub divide a larger site into varying component typologies In terms of the facilities offered within these spaces, we aim to show the locations of play areas as point data only within the larger polygon*

1. Is the intent to develop one set of standards to cover all participant authorities; or, bespoke to each authority. There are inherent issues either way, but an initial steer would be helpful for the submission with reference to the requirements of the NPPF.

*The intent is to develop one set of standards to cover all local authorities. However, if analysis of the data demonstrates that this would be neither robust nor withstand scrutiny then the project team would be happy to review this approach.*

1. Finally with reference to 4) above – the process of agreeing standards will (I sense) be iterative and perhaps take longer than the project schedule suggests. Therefore is there any flex in the delivery deadline for the final output?

*The project is on a tight timeframe as part of the Future Parks Accelerator process and we advise all contractors to propose an approach that within the deadline. An output of this work will be the proposal of standards, however, it is not expected that they will be agreed by the time the contract is concluded. We have asked all bidders to provide an hourly rate should there be additional work required outside/after the initial contract*.​

1. Please could you confirm the procurement route i.e. is this an open tender or have you invited a select list of companies to quote for the work? We understand that you are seeking competitive bids however an indicative budget would be helpful, if this is at all possible?

*This is an open tender for any suitably qualified bidder to apply for. At this stage we haven’t specified a price as we are seeking competitive bids which will be evaluated as per the process outlined.*