

Sandy Town Council

To: Cllrs P N Aldis, P Blaine, T Cole, A M Hill, W Jackson, T Knagg, G Leach, C Osborne, M Pettitt, M Scott, D Sharman, P Sharman, J Sparrow, S Sutton and N Thompson

You are hereby summoned to attend an extraordinary meeting of Sandy Town Council to be held in the Council Chamber at 10 Cambridge Road, Sandy, Bedfordshire on Monday 4 June 2018 commencing at 6.45pm for the purpose of transacting the items of business below

C J Robson

Chris Robson
Town Clerk
10 Cambridge Road
Sandy
SG19 1JE
01767 681491
30 May 2018

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS ARE WELCOME TO ATTEND THIS MEETING

A G E N D A

1 Apologies for Absence

To receive any apologies for absence

2 Declarations of interest and requests for dispensations

Under the Localism Act 2011 members of Council are not required to make oral declarations of interest at meetings but may not participate in discussion or voting on any items of business in which they have a Declarable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) and under Sandy Town Council's Standing Orders must leave the room for the duration of all discussion on such items. (All members' register of interests are available on the Sandy Town Council website or on application to the Clerk.)

*This item is included on the agenda to enable members to declare new DPIs and also **those who wish to do so** may draw attention to their stated DPIs and also any non-declarable personal interests which they have declared under Sandy Town Council's adopted Code of Conduct and which may be relevant to items on the agenda.*

- i) Disclosable Pecuniary Interests*
- ii) Non Pecuniary Interests*
- iii) Dispensations*

3 Public Participation Session

To receive questions and representations from members of the public.

Sandy Town Council

4 Planning Applications

To consider the following applications submitted for comment by Central Bedfordshire Council. Due to the number of dwellings involved in the proposed development the Full Council is asked to consider the applications.

08.05.17	CB/17/01326/ OUT Mr Underwood RKB Property Investments Ltd C/o DLP Planning 4 Abbey Court Fraser Road Priory Business Park Bedford MK44 3WH	Outline planning application with all matters reserved except access, for the redevelopment of the site to provide up to 33 no. residential (C3) units, constituting 21 market units and 12 affordable housing units with associated landscaping, car parking and utilities infrastructure at the Former Sandy Service Station, Tower Hill House, New Road, Sandy, SG19 1NY. Near neighbours Tesco, Sandy Station, Station Road, Sandy notified.
----------	--	--

5 Town Council Depot Development

To receive a report from the Cemetery Working Group with a recommendation on appointing a contractor to work with on the building of the proposed new depot and works yard.

Appendix I

6 Chairman's Items

7 Date of Next Meeting: 25 June 2018

AGENDA ITEM 5

SANDY TOWN COUNCIL

DATE: 4 June 2018

AUTHOR: Town Clerk

SUBJECT: Town Council Depot Development

1. Summary

- 1.1 As Members are aware the Cemetery Working Group have carried out a tender process for the selection of a contractor to bring forward the build of the depot and work yard. The working group have spent considerable time reviewing the tenders and meeting with shortlisted candidates in an effort to secure the best partner for the build. As previously reported the process has not been straight forward as contractors have raised additional questions and points for consideration which have had to be further researched and considered by the Working Group.
- 1.2 As reported at a meeting of the Full Council on 21 May 2018 a further meeting was held with a preferred contractor on 14 May 2018 to seek clarification on two points about the administration and management of the project and potential changes which may result in a simpler build to reduce costs. A further meeting of the Working Group was held on 23 May 2018 at which a preferred tender was agreed.
- 1.3 The following report puts forward the Working Group's recommendation for a preferred partner to work with on the development of the Council's proposed depot, works yard and the cemetery car park.

2. Requirements

- 2.1 Tender documents were issued covering the extensive needs and requirements of the build, at the core of which must be a building with a storage/working area of 175 m², separate employee and public toilets and a works yard. The materials to be used for the build were specified in line with planning permission granted.
- 2.2 Tenders asked for input and recommendations from applicants on some specific elements/features of the build. These included the type and security level of shutter doors, external lighting, roof insulation, sewage connections and additional security options such as gating.
- 2.3 The tenders sought competent companies who will be able to take on the management of the project, liaise with relevant authorities and deal with issues as they arise.

- 2.4 As previously reported the costs submitted by tenders for the work was higher than anticipated and the Working Group has worked hard with prospective partners to see where scope may be for a reduction in cost. This has resulted in a potential simpler design for the build and possible amendments to ensure the finished building is the best possible design for the Council's purposes.
- 2.5 As reported on 21 May 2018 two contractors raised concerns about the height of the eaves on the toilet section of the building and proposed this was increased to allow a taller door. An allowance for this change has been made in the recommended tenders costing.
- 2.6 The winning contractor will need to produce engineering drawings for the build and as such any possible amendments to simplify the build, possibly reducing costs and/or build time should be incorporated into that process.

3. Tenders

- 3.1 Five tenders were received, and the working group scored each tender on cost, quality, method, maintenance, examples of work and overall service.
- 3.2 The tables below give a brief outline of comments made by the working group and CBC when considering each tender.

It should be noted that the cost could be subject to change depending on final design/elements of the building which may be agreed by Council. The recommendation is to select a preferred partner to take the project forward with.

Company A	
Total Cost	£164,138.00
Status	Shortlisted Rejected
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met basic elements of tender • Tender document was very limited. Breakdown of overall cost provided but lacked detail and specification on materials and build elements • Raised useful questions and provided additional information on the design of the build which could result in an improved building and a potential easier and cheaper build • Scored first on overall cost of project • Limited information on timescales for project • Knowledge of area and site • Concern over slow response times to questions, and issues with problem solving. Although tender presented the lowest price, key elements could be missing from the bid and therefore there was a high likelihood of price increases during the build 	

Company B	
Total Price	£453,391.00
Status	Rejected
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met basic elements of tender • Easy to follow document, although brief in detail in some areas • Provides organisational information and details for on-site arrangements • Provides good level of health and safety information with Risk Assessments • Breaks down overall cost of tender into one-line headings. No details are provided within those headings or information on material specifications • Example timeframe is included which is clear to follow • No information/consideration of the elements for which recommendations were asked. No specific provisional sums to cover these elements • Scored 5th on pricing with a tender cost 176.25% greater than the lowest tender 	

Company C	
Total Price	£303,019.32
Status	Rejected
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met basic elements of tender • Tender document was easy to follow • No information on organisation, working arrangements or health and safety. The tender did not give a clear picture of how the project would operate, both on-site and working with the Council • No information on timescales • Includes a breakdown of project costs with details and material specifications • Allows provisional sums for those elements for which the Council sought recommendations, however it does not provide any details or actual recommendations for consideration. • Scored 4th on pricing 	

Company D	
Total Price	£249,920.56
Status	Rejected
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met basic elements of tender • Well-presented tender document which was easy to follow • Very large amount of information on organisational set up, working arrangements and health and safety reports. This information provides the bulk of the tender. Provides a very clear picture of personnel and on-site working arrangements • Risk Assessment information provided • Provides some information on a possible time frame for the build • Breaks down the overall cost of the project into detailed expenditure and provides information on materials to be used and their specification 	

- Does not provide detail on those elements for which the council asked for recommendations (E.g. Roof insulation, shutter door, lighting) However, the tender does allow some provisional sums to cover these elements
- Scored 3rd on pricing
- Attended site and met with Clerk and representatives from the Working Group to get an understanding of the site

Company E

Total Price £193,362.20

Status **Shortlisted**
 Recommended

- Professional presentation of tender. Easy to follow and understand
- Provides good amount of information on organisational structure of company. Clear who would be dealing with each aspect of the build
- Information provided gave the Working Group confidence that the company would be able to work with the Council on the management of the project and address any potential issues
- Provided clear documentation on project programme and methodology
- Timescale presented which was broken down into individual elements of the overall project
- Communications plan included in tender
- CV's of key personnel showing work on similar projects
- Two references provided
- Provided the most detailed breakdown of overall project cost with material specifications
- Brought forward recommendations and provisional sums for those elements the Council asked for advice on
- Clearly studied planning conditions and addressed areas where there could be possible issues and made allowances within the tender
- Scored 2nd on overall pricing
- Several representatives attended the site and met with Clerk and representatives from the Working Group to get an understanding of the site

4. Recommendation

4.1 The working group recommend that the Council select Company E as its preferred partner and take forward the development of the Council depot and yard forward. The Working Group believe that the recommended contractor will be able to successfully manage the build and address any issues which may arise during the process. The contractor has already demonstrated the ability to work with the Council to solve potential problems and look at alternative options to ensure the Council achieves a build that meet its requirements.

5. Financing

- 5.1 Sandy Town Council resolved to fund the cemetery extension and depot build work through an internal loan from Fallowfield Earmarked Reserves. This is to be paid back over a 20-year term with interest at an equivalent rate to Public Works Loan Board interest rates at the time. A repayment amount is allowed for within the Council's revenue budget, but this may need to increase depending on final costs. The Council currently has a budget amount of £293,220 highlighted within its capital and projects budget line for the project.
- 5.2 The total cost of archaeological works is still uncertain as it is dependant on excavation results and the level of analysis required on finds.

The following cost breakdown is based on assuming archaeological costs will be in line with the amount stated in the accepted tender. It is possible that costs may be less or should a significant number of bodies be found, the cost could increase due to required analysis of human remains.

Item	Cost (£)
Archaeological Excavation and analysis	75,595
Archaeological Write Up/Reporting	25,000
Demolition and UP Power Network Costs	6,160
Prelims and build of depot and yard	193,362.20
Build of car park, turning circle, some paving and entrance/exist on to Stratford Road	85,167.85*
Total	£385,285.05

* *Planning conditions state the car park and entrance road will need to be built before the site comes into use*

- 5.3 The tendered costs for the depot build increase the required budget and Members should consider what funds are available to the Council and allocating these to the project accordingly. Once funds are allocated, this can be reflected in the budget.
- 5.4 The following capital funds are available to the Council and could be assigned to the project without the need to use general reserves if desired.

Funds	Amount (£)
Fallowfield	£312,530 (repaid via loan)
Capital Receipts	£52,364
Unallocated Earmarked Reserves	£23,028
Total	387,922

- 5.5 The Council remains in a healthy position within recommended general reserves and has a capital project fund of £48,500 for the 2018/19 year. Costs for section 106 improvements to the play parks could be taken from these

funds while awaiting repayment from CBC. The Clerk is exploring the possibility of CBC paying the supplier directly, to remove the need for the Council to pay out in advance of repayment by CBC.

6. Archaeological Excavation

- 6.1 The Archaeological Excavation is ongoing, and work is due to begin on the second phase of the site. During excavation of phase one, archaeologists discovered finds which offered significant developments to their understanding of Roman Sandy. Central Bedfordshire Council's Archaeologist, who is responsible for monitoring the site and signing off on planning conditions related to the excavation, has offered to come and speak with Councillors about the significance of the excavations findings to date and potential implications for the future development of the cemetery area. A suitable date for a meeting is to be agreed.