



Caroline Pidgeon MBE AM
Leader, London Assembly Liberal Democrat Group
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
London
SE1 2AA

15 June 2015

Sir Peter Hendy CBE
Commissioner of Transport

Transport for London
Windsor House
42-50 Victoria Street
London SW1H 0TL

Phone 0343 222 0000
www.tfl.gov.uk

Dear *Caroline*

Garden Bridge

Thank you for your recent letter setting out a number of detailed questions regarding the procurement process for the design of the Garden Bridge.

An initial Invitation to Tender (ITT) was issued in February 2013 to select a designer to develop the concept for a new bridge across the Thames in central London. A copy of this is attached to this letter. This was issued to three suitable designers/architects as at the time there was no approved TfL architectural framework in place. The value of this contract was under the OJEU threshold and therefore obtaining proposals from three nominated practices was an acceptable way forward.

The ITT document stated clearly the assessment criteria that would be used in the evaluation of bids with 75% of the evaluation based on technical criteria and 25% based on commercial criteria. For the commercial evaluation, the ITT made it clear that bids would be assessed on day rates not a fixed fee. This is quite common for an initial feasibility study where the scope is less clearly defined. In addition to this we also requested an estimate of total prices for the work, although the ITT made it clear these did not form part of the evaluation of bids. Three bids were received with technical responses, schedule of day rates and key personnel.

Whilst we are not able to reveal the exact day rates quoted by all three bidders for reasons of commercial sensitivity we can say that they were within a very narrow range, with the cost of the most expensive Principal Level or equivalent team member being less than 4% higher than the cheapest. As a result, all three submissions received the same commercial score in the evaluation.

We received a broad range of estimates for the total price from each of the bidders (Marks Barfield, £15,125, Wilkinson Eyre £49,939, and Heatherwick studio £173,000) showing that there was a very different interpretation of the scope of the brief by all three bidders. These estimates did not form part of the formal evaluation. In response to your question about redaction, the inconsistent redaction of the total prices between the three bids when information was supplied to the Architects' Journal as part of a Freedom of Information request was a simple and unfortunate case of human error and we have written to the journalist, Will Hurst to correct our mistake.

Following the assessment of all three bids, Heatherwick studio was awarded the contract based on the day rates submitted but with a capped fee of £60,000. The actual value of work undertaken under this contract was £52,000. The two evaluation reports that you refer to in your letter are in fact just different presentations of the same scores. The only difference is that one contains both the technical and commercial scores whereas the other contains just the technical scores.

A second tender was issued in April 2013 to progress the technical design of the bridge to a point where a planning application could be submitted. This procurement was for a consultant who could provide a range of technical services to progress the next stage of the work. The Invitation to Tender for this contract was issued to all 13 firms on the TfL Engineering Project Management Framework. A copy of the ITT for this procurement is attached to this letter. In response to this, we received submissions from all 13 consultants from the framework and following an evaluation of bids, Arup were appointed as lead consultant.

In this procurement, the ITT set out the scope of the technical work and made it clear that *"TfL anticipates that bidders may not have sufficient design capability in-house and has no objection to appropriately qualified designers being engaged by the Consultant as sub-contractors. This should be noted for the purpose of this tender"*. In response to this and following their appointment, Heatherwick studio was retained a sub consultant as part of the Arup team, working directly to Arup.

To ensure we are being as transparent as possible, we have published all relevant documents relating to TfL's involvement in the Garden Bridge on our website at: <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/template-footbridge>.

In response to your letter and the general level of interest in the Garden Bridge, I have instructed a review of the overall process of procurement of the Garden Bridge design contracts, the findings of which I will publish in full.

As part of our commitment to delivering more river crossings to support London's growth I am pleased to say that we have granted funding of £170,000 to Sustrans, matched with £30,000 from businesses in the area, to investigate the potential of a new pedestrian and cycle bridge between Canary Wharf and Rotherhithe. Sustrans' detailed feasibility work is due to be completed in the summer and I await the results of their work with interest.

I trust that this response has provided the answer to your questions but if you require any further information, please do not hesitate to get back in touch.

Yours sincerely



Sir Peter Hendy CBE

Enc:

- Invitation to Tender for bridge design consultancy services – February 2013
- Invitation to Tender – Technical brief for consultancy services – April 2013