

## Record of Cabinet member decision

Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

<b>Decision made by</b>	Councillor Charlotte Dickson
<b>Key decision?</b>	Yes
<b>Date of decision</b> (same as date form signed)	16 September 2016
<b>Name and job title of officer requesting the decision</b>	Ruth Cross Leisure development officer
<b>Officer contact details</b>	Tel: 01235 422212 Email: <a href="mailto:ruth.cross@southandvale.gov.uk">ruth.cross@southandvale.gov.uk</a>
<b>Decision</b>	That the cabinet member for leisure, parks, grounds maintenance and waste approves the Vale Council entering into an ESPO Framework 115 drawn down contract with eibe play Ltd, eibe House, Home Farm, A3 By Pass Road, Hurtmore Godalming, Surrey GU8 6AD for the design, supply, installation and project management of the expansion of the play equipment and community area in Abbey Meadow, Abbey Close, Abingdon.
<b>Reasons for decision</b>	<p>Following the public consultation on the future of Abbey Meadow in 2015 and further option appraisal work completed by external consultants, a final scheme was approved through an Individual Cabinet Member decision in April 2016. This scheme includes improvements and an extension to the existing play area.</p> <p>The suggested improvements to the existing offering at Abbey Meadow from the public consultation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- adventure play equipment for over 10s (3)</li> <li>- improvements to under 10s play area (6)</li> <li>- multi-use games area (10)</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: brackets denote how facilities and improvements ranked in the 2015 public consultation.</i></p> <p>All of these improvements have been included in the tender opportunity.</p> <p>Following the Councils contract procurement rule 72 (e) approval was received from head of service to use the ESPO framework (115) for outdoor playground equipment. This framework has been previously used by our parks team to</p>

acquire new play equipment for the improvements at both Wantage and Faringdon play parks.

The contract opportunity was advertised as a design competition and all nine suppliers on the framework's large projects category were invited to tender.

The brief included a number of different best practice principles, feedback collated from the consultation process and Play England guidance.

The specification was for a design tender and looked for the suppliers to provide a concept plan and costings based on the available budget of £285,000 (including contingency of £10,000). The evaluation criteria is based on the design elements of the tender and not price. This was previously approved by the head of service under contract procedure rule 101 (b).

Eight of the nine companies expressed an interest in submitting a tender, reasons for non-submission are detailed in Appendix A. (confidential)

Three contractors (A, H and I) submitted a tender on the South East Business Portal. This was evaluated on a two level award criteria basis. All bids met the level one 'eligibility criteria' and were put through to level two 'selection criteria'.

Officers evaluated the three bids against the agreed award criteria based on the detailed principles with the results shown in the following table:

Rank	Bidder	Total
1	A	71.3%
2	H	64.0%
3	I	59.0%

ROSPA where commissioned to review and report on the designs. They stated..."A large enclosed mixed play area. Three reputable companies have submitted designs that offer a good mixture and range of robust equipment for all ages. Each design is different and all offer good play provision.

There are some recommendations made to assist in the "safer running of the site" on all three designs, which will be used in the refined design stage.

The project team discussed these results and agreed unanimously that the lowest scoring bidder should not be shortlisted and therefore removed from the public feedback session.

	<p>The two shortlisted designs were displayed at two stakeholder feedback sessions. One of these took place in the current play area to capture feedback from existing users. The second session was by invitation only to a drop in session for groups previously identified with an interest in the Abbey Meadow project.</p> <p>The collated feedback which asked for “Likes” and “Dislikes” with each design will be used by the project team in the refined design period with the successful tenderer.</p> <p>The project team agreed unanimously that bidder A represents a high quality imaginative design that met the tender brief and scored consistently higher from officers and recommends that the cabinet member for leisure, parks, ground maintenance and waste to award the contract to bidder A.</p> <p>The cabinet member for leisure, parks, grounds maintenance and waste reviewed the submissions from the two short listed tenderers and took into account the comments and feedback arising from the tender process. The cabinet member agrees with the recommendation to award the contract to bidder A, which is eibe play Ltd, eibe House, Home Farm, A3 By Pass Road, Hurtmore Godalming, Surrey GU8 6AD.</p> <p>Once the successful contractor has been appointed there will be an opportunity to finalise the design and incorporating some elements of the feedback provided by stakeholders.</p>
<b>Alternative options rejected</b>	The alternative option is not to change the play area, however this was discounted as an improved play area was high on the list of improvements residents wanted to see.
<b>Legal implications</b>	The ESPO framework 115 drawn down contract in the form specified above will be entered into prior to the works commencing.
<b>Financial implications</b>	<p>The works required at Abbey Meadow will be met from the capital budget.</p> <p>The cost of the project is <b>£285.000</b>. This is part of the £615,000 budget allocated to improve the Abbey Meadow.</p>
<b>Other implications</b>	<p>The framework requires a <u>ten day</u> call in period.</p> <p>A full planning application will be submitted once a final design has been agreed.</p>
<b>Background papers considered</b>	N/A
<b>Declarations/conflict of</b>	None

<b>interest?</b> <b>Declaration of other councillor/officer consulted by the Cabinet member?</b>				
<b>List consultees</b>		<b>Name</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Date</b>
	Ward councillors	Helen Pighills Katie Finch		13 Sept 2016
	Youth Engagement	Karen Tolley	Agreed	07 Sept 2016
	Health and Safety	Sarah Minns	Agreed	07 Sept 2016
	Community Safety	Mandeep Mann	Agreed	07 Sept 2016
	Public Engagement	Phillip Vincent	Agreed	07 Sept 2016
	Legal	Sarah Solatra / Pat Connell	Agreed	09 Sept 2016
	Finance	Simon Hewings	Agreed	06 Sept 2016
	Procurement	Andrew Down	Agreed	06 Sept 2016
	Diversity and equality	Cheryl Reeves	The design and equipment will help to improve access to Abbey Meadows for children and parents/carers with disabilities.	05 Sept 2016
	Parks	Ian Matten	Agreed	07 Sept 2016
	Leisure	Kate Arnold	Agreed	07 Sept 2016
	Communications	Gavin Walton	Agreed	07 Sept 2016
	Head of service	Clare Kingston	Agreed	07 Sept 2016
<b>Confidential decision?</b> If so, under which exempt category?	Decision open to the public but the appendices remain confidential under category 3.			
<b>Call-in waived by Scrutiny Committee chairman?</b>	No			
<b>Cabinet member's signature</b> To confirm the decision as set out in this notice.	Signature ____Councillor Charlotte Dickson_____			
	Date _____16 September 2016_____			

**ONCE SIGNED, THIS FORM MUST BE HANDED TO DEMOCRATIC SERVICES IMMEDIATELY.**

For Democratic Services office use only		
Form received	Date: 16 September 2016	Time: 8:20
Date published to Scrutiny Committee	Date: 16 September 2016	
Call-in deadline	Date: 23 September 2016	Time: 17:00

## Guidance notes

1. This form must be completed by the lead officer who becomes the contact officer. The lead officer is responsible for ensuring that the necessary internal consultees have signed it off. The lead officer must then seek the Cabinet member's agreement and signature.
2. Once satisfied with the decision, the Cabinet member must sign and date the form and return it to the lead officer who should send it to Democratic Services immediately to allow the call-in period to commence. Democratic Services staff are located on the ground floor north wing (C block) of the Crowmarsh Gifford offices.  
Tel. 01235 540307 or extension 7307.  
Email: [democratic.services@southandvale.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@southandvale.gov.uk)
3. Democratic Services will then publish the decision to the website (unless it is confidential) and send it to Scrutiny Committee members to commence the call-in period (five clear working days). The decision cannot be implemented until the call-in period expires. The call-in procedure can be found in the council's constitution, part 4, under the Scrutiny Committee procedure rules.
4. Before implementing the decision, the lead officer is responsible for checking with Democratic Services that the decision has not been called in.
5. If the decision has been called in, Democratic Services will notify the lead officer and decision-maker. This call-in puts the decision on hold.
6. Democratic Services will liaise with the Scrutiny Committee chairman over the date of the call-in debate. The Cabinet member (the decision maker) will be requested to attend the Scrutiny Committee meeting to answer the committee's questions.
7. The Scrutiny Committee may:
  - refer the decision back to the Cabinet member for reconsideration or
  - refer the matter to Council with an alternative set of proposals (where the final decision rests with full Council) or
  - accept the Cabinet member's decision, in which case it can be implemented immediately.