

Millbrook Skate Park Tender Review Panel Meeting

Thursday 30th March 2023

at 1:00pm in Millbrook Village Hall Balcony Room

Tender review panel: A. Barrett, S. Stevenson, K. Stone, B. Dye, Cllr N. Roberts, Cllr P. Polak.

Note taker: Jo Bennetts.

Notes of meeting

Purpose of Meeting

To examine in detail the tenders submitted for construction of a new concrete skate park in Millbrook and to score the submissions on relevant criteria then select a preferred tender to recommend to the full council.

Three tenders were received and were anonymised to ensure a fair process. Each company's liquidity was researched by the Clerk from public information and this was included in notes to the group.

The minutes will refer to tenders A, B and C.

Tender A

1. Interpretation of design

This company has not demonstrated a very imaginative understanding of the brief.

The design is very basic given the aspiration and budget; it is low on value for money and features. There was no obvious flow through the whole design although different levels of expertise were catered for. The nature of the design would make adjustments major and potentially outside of budget and timeframe. Support with public engagement offered.

2. Quality of quotation

The quotation, while including the required elements, did not make it sufficiently clear when examples were being used rather than reference to Millbrook itself. Appendices were not adequately referenced. Otherwise, the quality was good and all required information was provided. The tender process was not adhered to and images were shared to an email address other than the tender address.

3. Track record

Good reference. Case studies included with contact information. Satisfactory public information search by Clerk. Many years of experience in this field.

4. Resources

Full details of materials, staff training and construction method, risk assessment and site management procedures were provided. The panel's concrete specialist considers use of spray concrete, as in this tender, to be the preferred approach. Insurances have been supplied.

Assessment scoring took place individually.

Tender B

1. Interpretation of design

This company has demonstrated a very clear and imaginative understanding of the brief with a lot of great ideas and they have listened intently and delivered a design that fits the site and the village. From a skateboarder's point of view, the design is very well thought out and includes excellent features and flow. Some minor adjustments were discussed but the nature of the design would make those adjustments straightforward and fit within our timeframe.

Inclusion: plenty of quieter areas for younger users. Great for all wheel users including wheelchairs. Access at ground level in places. Very original and imaginative with the wave feature.

Keen to engage with local schools and the wider public. They offer their services to assist with obtaining planning consent.

2. Quality of Quotation

Very professional. Clear and concise.

Included case studies from other groups.

3. Track record

15 years experience with 150 skateparks. Satisfactory public information search by Clerk. Excellent references.

4. Resources

Proposal covers maintenance, materials, qualifications of staff, risk assessments, site access and management plans. Spray concrete is specified. A complete package holistically. Post build support offered for opening ceremony and raising local awareness and participation. Insurance documents provided.

Assessment scoring took place individually.

Tender C

1. Interpretation of design

This company has demonstrated a moderate understanding of the brief with some good ideas, but have misinterpreted comments about the existing mini ramp and included it in their design when it is clearly reaching the end of its useful life. The designated use for the flat area beside the main space, offering an easy beginners' area, was well received. The design would need considerable reworking to meet the requirements of the group and this does not fit with our timescales. The number of features for the cost was not considered value for money. Inappropriate location of seating area would be a H&S issue which raised concerns. Too much emphasis on expensive paint to the detriment of budget for features. Offers support with the planning process and public engagement.

2. Quality of quotation

Very clear and well presented, but lacked crucial design content. Well thought out sections on environmental impact and inclusion, with lots of visuals. Tender process was not adhered to and tender submission was shared to an email address other than the tender address.

3. Track record

Concerns about liquidity of the company from Clerk's research. Some negative feedback received from another parish. No other references received but several examples of other projects provided.

4. Resources

Have their own workforce but can use local workers. Materials to be sourced within a relatively local area. Our concrete expert had reservations about the build design and materials, as spray concrete was not mentioned in the tender and the joints in the design would be particularly weak with conventional concrete.

Assessment scoring took place individually.

Scoring

The scoresheets were collated by NR and JB and the individual scores totalled as follows:

A 1230
B 2670
C 1630

B was the clear winner and will be referred to the Parish Council to be ratified as the chosen contractor.

The meeting ended at 14:57