

Ball Park Tender Evaluation Review

1. Summary

- 1.1 To report the outcome of the recent tender evaluation exercise for the construction of a new Ball Park (Multi-Use Games Area - MUGA) in Hemswell Cliff which was undertaken by the Ball Park Sub-committee.
- 1.2 This report outlines the various options open to the Parish Council in awarding the construction of the Ball Park tender.
- 1.3 The report also includes a recommendation by the Ball Park Sub-committee for members to consider in coming to a decision about how the Ball Park development should be progressed.

2. Background and Details

- 2.1 Just over a year and half ago members agreed to explore the possibility of constructing a new Ball Park for Hemswell Cliff. Around that time a Ball Park Sub-committee was established with the Clerk and Vice Chair asked to explore the possibilities open to the Parish Council.
- 2.2 It was decided, after consultation and exploration of the various options, to replace an old Ball Park with a new one in the form of a MUGA.
- 2.3 A total of £93,450 in funding has been found to date which constitutes the budget for the initial capital spend on the development. In October 2014 the Parish Council released £8,250 (partly from reserves) to secure the majority of the external funding. A mechanism has also been found to address concerns around VAT which will be paid for through a loan.
- 2.4 Late last year the Parish Council acquired the title to the land on which the proposed Ball Park might be situated. This land, irrespective of the decision made about the proposals to construct of a new Ball Park, is now part of the Parish Council's estate.
- 2.5 In December 2014 a tender specification was drawn up following exploration of the options and discussion by the Ball Park Sub-committee – see appendix 1.
- 2.6 The formal tendering process was started on 16 December 2014 and closed on 12 January 2015. In total three tenders were received.
- 2.7 At its meeting on 11 February 2015 the Ball Park Sub-committee reviewed the three tenders and assigned scores on a criteria of 60% quality and 40% costs. The findings from the exercise from the bulk of the narrative of this report. A summary of the cost and quality scores can be found at appendix 2 and a detailed summary of the quality scores can be found at appendix 3.
- 2.8 As part of the tender evaluation exercise the Ball Park Sub-committee

has made a recommendation to the Parish Council which can be found at paragraphs 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 of this report. The request for a recommendation was made by the Parish Council at the November 2014 Ordinary Meeting.

3. Options/Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1 All three tenders submitted are within budget and have been found to be viable by the Ball Park Sub-committee.
- 3.2 An analysis of the costs revealed only a minor divergence between the three tenders. PPL £89,192 is the most cost advantageous; followed by Lightmain £91,500; HAGS (Quote 1) £92,059.10; and, HAGS (Quote 2) £92,700.
- 3.3 What follows below is a brief summary of the Ball Park Sub-committee's discussions during the tendering evaluation exercise and its findings. It was decided to take the tenders in alphabetical order and they have been presented in the same manner below.
- 3.4 It should be noted that during the evaluation the Sub-committee found all the companies that tendered had all provided similar guarantees and warranties for the work, materials and equipment. All had included a RoSPA post installation inspection and had given adequate consideration to Health and Safety during construction. All the companies gave similar assurances for starting dates and completion dates of the work.
- 3.5 It should also be noted that the three tenders offer the possibility of selecting a different colour scheme than the one provided in the designs.

Option 1 - HAGS Tender (Quote 1&2)

- 3.6 HAGS provided two quotations, the first for £92,059.10 and the second for £92,700. The only difference between the two quotes was the pitch surface, the former having a '2G' surface and the latter having a '3G' surface.
- 3.7 The Sub-committee felt that the match surface included as part of the £92,700 quote would be unsuitable for a number of sports. It was also felt that the '3G' surface would place higher running costs on the Parish Council. For both of these reasons it was decided to evaluate only the '2G' quote for £92,059.10.
- 3.8 In the course of the discussion the Sub-committee noted many commendable features of the bid. It was noted that the company had 50 years of experience, was part of the PlayPower Group and had gone to some length to meet the specification.
- 3.9 The quotation provided was on the whole clear and informative. A good 'Opening Event Package' was offered as part of the tender. The designs

submitted illustrated well HACS concept for the site and were judged to have met the specification.

- 3.10 However, the Sub-committee was concerned that HACS didn't submit a sample of the metal fencing despite the specification outlining that as a requirement. The committee also felt that the design of the shelter submitted as part of the tender was not aesthetically pleasing and wouldn't be suitable for all users of the site.
- 3.11 After consideration the Sub-committee decided that while the HACS tender had met many of the specification requirements it didn't quite fit with the vision of the Parish Council. Concern was also expressed about the fact that a sample of the fence was not provided for evaluation.
- 3.12 Following discussion and consideration a consensus quality score of 45 was arrived at for the HACS tender. A combined cost and quality score of 84 was arrived at for the HACS tender.

Option 2 - Lightmain Tender

- 3.13 Lightmain provided a tender for £91,500 which met every aspect of the specification. In the course of discussion the Sub-committee found the Lightmain tender to be very professional and well put together.
- 3.14 The company has 24 years of experience, uses a local supply chains and provided a number of references. The company had come highly recommended from Scampton where they recently built a smaller, but nonetheless similar facility.
- 3.15 Lightmain had done a considerable amount of research into the village and surrounding area. The Sub-committee was impressed by the design of the Ball Park and shelter. They felt that both would be in keeping with the community and the village setting. It was also felt that young people in particular would like the design and proposed site.
- 3.16 The sample of 'anti-vibration' fencing provided was of a high quality giving the committee confidence in the quality of work and its durability. Lightmain as part of the tender offered to try to improve drainage. The shelter submitted as part of the tender was well proportioned and could be relocated at a later date to a new location if the Parish Council wished.
- 3.17 The Ball Park would allow for all the sports outlined on the specification as well as cricket and volleyball. The pitch surface was found to be of a high quality and the Sub-committee felt that it would be 'hard wearing'. With DDA access from behind the goals the site would be fully accessible to the community.
- 3.18 The Sub-committee was impressed by the 'Opening Event Package' offered by Lightmain. Lightmain have also said that Hemswell Cliff's Youth Council could visit the factory, possibly during construction.
- 3.19 The Sub-committee did note that Lightmain is currently in a Company

Voluntary Agreement (CVA). A letter from the Managing Director of the company was made available to the Sub-committee which outlined the situation and provided assurances. The company has also said that a letter and reference from the bank could be made available.

- 3.20 After consideration the Sub-committee decided that the Lightmain tender was very professionally put together. The designs provided were outstanding and matched the vision of the Parish Council. It was felt that residents, particularly young people, would want to use the proposed site and that it would be a real asset to the community. The committee felt that it might be appropriate to investigate further the issue of the CVA.
- 3.21 Following discussion and consideration a consensus quality score of 53 was arrived at for the Lightmain tender. A combined cost and quality score of 92 was arrived at for the Lightmain tender, representing the highest score achieved as part of the evaluation.

Option 3 - PPL Tender

- 3.22 PPL provided the most cost advantageous tender of £89,192 and was found on initial inspection to have met the specification provided.
- 3.23 It was not clear from PPL's documentation how long the company had been in operation. Some references were provided and it was noted that PPL was part of the Wicksteed Group.
- 3.24 The designs submitted as part of the tender gave a useful illustration of the company's proposals. It was noted that cricket wickets, a feature not asked but welcomed, were included in the design.
- 3.25 However, the Sub-committee expressed a number of concerns about the tender. The fence sample provided raised a number of concerns, principally that people would be able to climb up it. It was also noted that the fence came in two parts which had the potential to increase noise from vibrations. It was felt that the pitch surface supplied would make playing games such as tennis and football harder because of a 'roll-on' effect. It was also noted that there would be a full height climbing wall (3m) which the Sub-committee felt might be unsafe.
- 3.26 After consideration it was decided that while the PPL tender had met the specification requirements it didn't fit with the vision of the Parish Council. In particular the two section fencing was a concern because it was thought that the company could not produce the fencing as a single component.
- 3.27 Following discussion and consideration a consensus quality score of 45 was arrived at for the PPL tender. A combined cost and quality score of 85 was arrived at for the PPL tender.

Option 4 – Do not approve any of the tenders

- 3.28 The Parish Council could decide not to approve any of the tenders at this stage. The possibilities of re-opening the tendering process or not to

progress the development any further are also open.

- 3.29 However, it is recommended that the Parish Council approve one of the tenders as not approving any at this stage could jeopardise funding and lead to reputational damage.
- 3.30 It might not be possible to access the funding currently offered as there are deadlines attached to it. If the deadlines are passed another request for funding might have to be made with no guarantees that it would be granted again. It is likely that some of the smaller amounts of funding already received would have to be paid back.
- 3.31 In a general sense the new Ball Park represents a 'positive' development for the community which has frequently expressed a desire for improved local amenities. None approval could lead to reputational damage with the possibility that the companies which tendered this time might not do so again. Some community groups have invested a great deal of effort in advancing the Ball Park development and they might feel 'let down'.

Summary

- 3.32 After lengthy consideration and evaluation of the tenders the Ball Park Sub-committee has recommended that the Parish Council agree to the construction of a new Ball Park. Furthermore it has recommended that the Parish Council consider approving the Lightmain tender for £91,500 which achieved the highest combined cost and quality score of 92.

4. Standing Orders, Policy and Financial Implications

- 4.1 The recommendations in this report conform to Standing Orders and are within the budget allocated.
- 4.2 Construction of a new Ball Park would necessitate the adoption of a new Health & Safety policy by the Parish Council.
- 4.3 It might also be necessary for the Council to draft further policies and procedures around: Community Use, Bookings and Facility Inspection.
- 4.4 It should be noted that there will be running costs associated with the proposed development. The issue was discussed at the January 2015 Ordinary Meeting and it is expected that the running costs can be accommodated within the Parish Council's existing budget.
- 4.5 There is the possibility that ongoing training of members (and possibly the Clerk) in the management of a Ball Park, Health & Safety and Risk Management will be required. It is expected that the cost of the training can be accommodated within the Parish Council's existing budget.
- 4.6 A new Ball Park will require annual RoSPA inspection. It is expected that this will cost no more than £100 per annum and can be accommodated within the Parish Council's existing budget.

- 4.7 The Parish Council has public liability insurance in place which would cover the proposed Ball Park development. However, insurance for the structure, equipment and materials would be required and would need to cover against fire, theft and vandalism. A quote sought by the Clerk suggests that an extra £819.91 per annum for 'all risk' cover would be added to the insurance premium. This would increase the insurance premium from £482.32 to £1,302.33 a year. If the proposed Ball Park were completed before August 2015, the renewal date of the Parish Council's insurance, an additional premium would also be charged.

5. **Equality Impact Assessment**

- 5.1 An Equalities Impact assessment was undertaken as part of the evaluation exercise with the recommendations as follows.
- 5.2 It was noted that the Council would need to take into account access arrangements for disabled users of the facility. An accessible route is included in all the tender options. In addition, threshold entrances to the pitches will be level, the pitches markings clearly defined and the pitch surface should be suitable for access by wheelchair users and fully accessible to ambulant disabled people.
- 5.3 While there is no direct link between the provision of a new Ball Park and the reduction of crime and disorder, the nature of the facility are expected to have a positive impact.
- 5.4 The facility will have minimal impact on climate change as currently there are no proposals for power, lighting or water to run to the site. If in the future proposals are made consideration of climate change factors might need to be taken into account.

6. **Recommendation**

The Ball Park Sub-committee has recommended that the Parish Council:

- 6.1 Agree to the construction of a new Ball Park for Hemswell Cliff;
- 6.2 Approve the budget and spend necessary to construct and maintain it, and;
- 6.3 Consider approval of the Lightmain tender for £91,500 which, following the tender evaluation exercise conducted on Wednesday 11 February 2015, achieved the highest combined cost and quality score of 92.

Report prepared by: Tom Clay, Clerk to Hemswell Cliff Parish Council.

Date Published: 13.2.2015.

Appendix 1 - Ball Park Specification

Published by: Hemswell Cliff Parish Council's Ball Park Sub-committee

Date Published: 16 December 2014

Document: Notice – open tender

Deadline Date for tenders: 12 January 2015

Description: There is an existing Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) sited to the west of the old community centre. Hemswell Cliff Parish Council wishes to replace the old rundown MUGA with new, lay a new tarmac sports surface to half of the area and Astro turf to the other. Hemswell Cliff Parish Council requires a competent supplier and installer to provide the services outlined in this document. The works will result in a new MUGA, with a new grass surface and a new surface overlay on the existing tarmac area. The specifications are as follows: Supply and maintain Heras style fencing (or equivalent) for the duration of the contract works. Remove and replace the old MUGA with new, measuring 35m x 27.5m (minimum) with 3m high perimeter fencing, 2m high central dividing fence, 4 football/basketball goals, 2 x access gates, 2 x dugout shelters with seating, tennis nets with removable posts and sockets, artificial grass surfacing (match play 2XL or higher specification, with shock pad if necessary) and markings to the grass surfacing, new tarmac overlay (30mm) to the other half, thermo-plastic court marking to tarmac area - football, basketball & tennis, a climbing wall either attached to the MUGA or at the side with associated safety flooring, RoSPA post installation inspection.

Notice

1 Parish Council Contact Details

1.1 Address: FAO Tom Clay, Hemswell Cliff Parish Council, 116 Ella Street, Hull, HU5 3AX

Mobile: 07711 091656

Tel: 01482 443857

Email: hemswellcliffclerk@hotmail.co.uk

1.2 Completed documents must be returned in a sealed envelope to the address above by the deadline date of 12 January 2015.

2 Contract Details

2.1 Title: Erection of a Ball Park (MUGA)

2.2 Description of the goods and services required:

There is an existing Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) sited at the west side of the old community centre. It is old and in a poor state. Hemswell Cliff Parish Council wishes to replace the old rundown MUGA with new, lay a new tarmac sports surface to half of the area and Astro turf to the other. Hemswell Cliff Parish Council requires a competent supplier and installer to provide the services outlined in this document.

The works will result in a New MUGA with a new surface and a new surface overlay on the existing tarmac area. The specifications are as follows:

Supply and maintain Heras style fencing (or equivalent) for the duration of the contract works.

Remove and replace the old MUGA with new, measuring 35m x 27.5m (minimum) with 3m high perimeter fencing,

2m high central dividing fence,

4 football/basketball goals,

2 x access gates,

2 x dugout shelters with seating,

tennis nets with removable posts and sockets,

artificial grass surfacing (match play 2XL or higher specification, with shock pad if necessary) and markings to the grass surfacing,

new tarmac overlay (30mm) to the other half,

thermo-plastic court marking to tarmac area - football, basketball & tennis,

a climbing wall either attached to the MUGA or at the side with associated safety flooring,

RoSPA post installation inspection.

2.3 Total quantity or scope of tender

Estimated contract start date: April 2015. Estimated contract end date: May 2015.

A warranty of 25 years on steelwork, 5 years on grass mats, 1 year on tarmac is required.

3 Administrative Information

3.1 Type of Procedure: Single stage - Any candidate may submit a tender.

3.2 Reference number attributed to the notice by the Parish Council: HCPC-BP-2014

3.3 Time Limits: Responses by 5pm on 12 January 2015

3.4 Tender submission should be sent in a sealed envelope to: FAO Tom Clay, Hemswell Cliff Parish Council, 116 Ella Street, Hull, HU5 3AX

4 Other information

For further information about the specification or to express an interest please contact:

Councillor Graham Prestwood

Clerk: Tom Clay • 116 Ella Street, Hull, HU5 3AX • hemswellcliffclerk@hotmail.co.uk • 01482 443857

Appendix 2 - Evaluation Score Summary

Tender	Cost (£)	Cost Score	Quality Score	Max Total Score	Total Score
HAGS (Q1)	92,059.10	39	45	100	84
Lightmain	91,500.00	39	53	100	92
PPL	89,192.00	40	45	100	85

Appendix 3 – Quality Evaluation Score

HAGS - Quality Score

Question	Summary	Weighting	Score	Total	Max Score	Max Total Score
BP1	Experience	4	4	16	4	16
BP2	Timescale	2	4	8	4	8
BP3	Aesthetics	4	1	4	4	16
BP4	Functionality	4	4	16	4	16
BP5	Value Added Service	1	4	4	4	4
BP6	Financial Stability	3	4	12	4	12
BP7	Goods and Services	4	2	8	4	16
BP8	Quality Assurances	4	4	16	4	16
BP9	Health and Safety	2	4	8	4	8
BP10	Running Costs	3	3	9	4	12
Totals				92		124
Quality Score	45					

Lightmain – Quality Score

Question	Summary	Weighting	Score	Total	Max Score	Max Total Score
BP1	Experience	4	4	16	4	16
BP2	Timescale	2	4	8	4	8
BP3	Aesthetics	4	4	16	4	16
BP4	Functionality	4	4	16	4	16
BP5	Value Added Service	1	4	4	4	4
BP6	Financial Stability	3	3	9	4	12
BP7	Goods and Services	4	4	16	4	16
BP8	Quality Assurances	4	4	16	4	16
BP9	Health and Safety	2	4	8	4	8
BP10	Running Costs	3	3	9	4	12
Totals				109		124
Quality Score	53					

PPL – Quality Score

Question	Summary	Weighting	Score	Total	Max Score	Max Total Score
BP1	Experience	4	3	12	4	16
BP2	Timescale	2	4	8	4	8
BP3	Aesthetics	4	2	8	4	16
BP4	Functionality	4	4	16	4	16
BP5	Value Added Service	1	1	1	4	4
BP6	Financial Stability	3	4	12	4	12
BP7	Goods and Services	4	3	12	4	16
BP8	Quality Assurances	4	4	16	4	16
BP9	Health and Safety	2	4	8	4	8
BP10	Running Costs	3	3	9	4	12
Totals				93		124
Quality Score	45					