

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Cabinet Meeting | |
| Meeting Date | 8 July 2020 |
| Report Title | Barton's Point Footbridge Contract Award |
| Cabinet Member | Cllr Tim Valentine, Cabinet Member for Environment |
| SMT Lead | Martyn Cassell, Head of Commissioning, Environment and Leisure |
| Head of Service | Martyn Cassell, Head of Commissioning, Environment and Leisure |
| Lead Officer | Jay Jenkins, Leisure & Technical Services Manager |
| Key Decision | Yes |
| Classification | Open |
| Recommendations | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. To note any preference Cabinet may wish to express for option A or B.2. To give the Cabinet Member for Environment and Head of Commissioning, Environment and Leisure delegated authority to agree the preferred option, taking account of the of consultation with ward members and local parishes once complete, and to award the contract to the company with the most economically advantageous tender for the selected option. |

1 Purpose of Report and Executive Summary

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform Cabinet of the outcome of the recently undertaken tender process for the Barton's Point Coastal Park footbridge and to recommended action to award the contract.

2 Background

- 2.1 The coastal park site comprises the linear rampart, ditch and associated defensive features of the Queenborough Lines, known locally as the Canal bank and Barton's Point Coastal Park, a former defensive battery.
- 2.2 The Queenborough Lines is considered by Historic England to be of national importance for its archaeology and history and the site is regionally important for wildlife.
- 2.3 The monument is significant for its ecology and contains many nationally important and endangered species, including nationally scarce plants, beetles, endangered flies and insects. The site is home to or used by a wide range of wildlife such as butterflies, swans, bats and water vowels.

- 2.4 The footbridge links Barton's Point to the other side of the Queenborough Lines and is a well-used pedestrian and cycle route through to Halfway. The site has considerable social and community value to local people and is a very popular location for locals and visitors alike.
- 2.5 The previous timber footbridge failed in 2019 after approximately 25 years life and was closed off for several months whilst options were considered for the removal and replacement of the bridge.
- 2.6 Local Councillors and concessionaries were keen to identify a temporary solution due to the route being very popular and a well-used thoroughfare whilst the new scheme was worked up.
- 2.7 The removal of the old bridge proved problematic as the weight and limited access hindered the process. This was also compounded by very wet weather towards the back end of 2019 which resulted in the removal not taking place until February 2020.
- 2.8 The temporary solution, a floating pontoon, was installed in March 2020 and remains in place to date. This has a weekly hire fee of £364.00.

Image of previous bridge prior to demolition.



Image of Temporary Floating Pontoon



- 2.9 A full open tender has been undertaken for a provision of a 'Single Span Low Arched Footbridge' with two options, a) Timber or b) Timber & Steel Combination.
- 2.10 The specification ensures the same height clearance as the previous bridge is maintained due to the access to the boating lake required by the nearby Sea Cadet training centre.
- 2.11 In coming to a decision on the best option, we need to consider the historic nature of the ancient monument and its military history versus the most practical and longest lasting solution within the allocated budget.

3 Tender Returns

- 3.1 A specification was prepared asking companies to price up a Single Span Low Arched Footbridge made from two different materials. Option A - Timber & Option B – Timber & Steel Composite.
- 3.2 A total of ten tender returns have been received. Three were rejected at evaluation stage as a result of failing to provide mandatory information.
- 3.3 Tenders were evaluated using the Councils 'Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) criteria. This considers the price (60%) and quality (40%) of submissions. Option A and B were evaluated separately, and the Council can choose whichever option it prefers.
- 3.4 The remaining seven tenders range from £144,682.56 to £529,399.17 for Option A and £105,426.37 to £496,103.39 for Option B. A full breakdown of costings for both options is in the tables below.

Option A - Timber

| Company | Tender Price (£) | Tender Price Score | Quality score | Overall score |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|
| A – | 257,609.74 | 33.70 | 22.33 | 56.03 |
| B – Beaver Bridges | 144,682.56 | 60.00 | 20.67 | 80.67 |
| C – | 529,399.17 | 16.40 | 35.00 | 51.40 |
| D – | 376,408.90 | 23.06 | 32.00 | 55.06 |
| E – | 215,219.68 | 40.34 | 25.33 | 65.67 |
| F – | 189,813.75 | 45.73 | 19.67 | 65.40 |
| G – | 358,400.05 | 24.22 | 32.33 | 56.55 |

Option B – Timber & Steel Composite

| Company | Tender Price (£) | Tender Price Score | Quality score | Overall score |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| A – | 227,037.94 | 27.86 | 22.33 | 50.19 |
| B – Beaver Bridges | 105,426.37 | 60.00 | 20.67 | 80.67 |
| C – | 496,103.39 | 12.75 | 35.00 | 47.75 |
| D – | 356,159.13 | 17.76 | 32.00 | 49.76 |
| E – | 197,058.04 | 32.10 | 25.33 | 57.43 |
| F – | 184,626.75 | 34.26 | 19.67 | 53.93 |
| G – | 325,838.43 | 19.41 | 32.33 | 51.75 |

- 3.5 The pricing for both options were varied but in all cases option B was lower priced than option A. Higher pricing does not always mean higher quality. In some cases, the companies plan to use sub-contractors and therefore have additional costs to a company that can deliver all requirements in-house.
- 3.6 This is a very technical tender and a large amount of scrutiny was undertaken on the responses to the quality questions. Whilst the quality scores vary, all companies achieve the required standard to meet the specification. Companies that scored higher on quality are often providing services above what is required in the specification (added value). This does not mean that those with lower quality scores are not suitable to deliver the project.
- 3.7 Most timber options are in 'Ekki' but there is one option in Oak, which costs the same. It has been noted that Oak is not as hard wearing or durable as Ekki.
- 3.8 The steel work has been quoted as box section and will be treated to combat the sea air, which will enhance the lifespan of the steelwork. The paint system on the steel composite option has a 20 year to First Major Maintenance guarantee. An example can be seen in Appendix I. Steel colour can be decided at the point of commission.
- 3.9 Both options will have two resin bonded aggregate strips inserted to the planking for the prevention of slips. Inserts are compliant with the relevant codes.
- 3.10 Both bridge options are designed to Euro-code: 120 design life. Across the tenders the timber option was generally given a lifespan of approximately 25 years with the steel/timber composite providing 50-100 years without any major works, assuming the bridge is maintained appropriately.

- 3.11 As a result of the complicated removal and the ongoing hire fees of the temporary bridge, this project is projected to exceed the original budget provision. Detail is provided below in Financial, Resource and Property implications section.
- 3.12 Consultation was not quite complete at the time of writing the report. Long delays to the contract award timetable would unfortunately add further hire costs to the project and may risk losing the window of better weather for construction to take place this year.

4 Proposal

- 4.1 Due to the tight timescales involved in awarding the contract and meeting the weather window, Cabinet are asked to give delegated authority to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Head of Commissioning, Environment and Leisure to award the contract subject to completion of the consultation with local Ward members and parish councils.

5 Alternative proposals

- 5.1 A decision could be taken not to proceed with replacing the footbridge. For the reasons stated above it is not recommended as the pedestrian and cycle route is widely used by residents and visitors and encourages healthy activity and use of the coastal park.

6 Consultation

- 6.1 The Planning department have confirmed the bridge replacement can be conducted under the Council's permitted development rights.
- 6.2 Historic England are a consultee on works relating to the ancient monument. They were consulted throughout the removal of the old bridge and installation of the temporary bridge. Provided that the canal banks were not damaged/amended they were happy for the works to be carried out.
- 6.3 The Cabinet Member for Environment and Minster Parish Council were kept informed throughout the closure and subsequent removal of the old bridge.
- 6.4 Given the different style and aesthetic appearance of the two options (timber or steel/timber composite), local Ward Members for Sheerness and Minster Cliffs were asked which option they would support. At the time of writing the report, feedback has been received from the two Minster Cliffs and two Sheerness Ward members who all supported option B Steel/Timber combination.
- 6.5 Minster Parish Council are considering the options on 16th July and Sheerness Town Council on 22 June.

7 Implications

| Issue | Implications |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Corporate Plan | For the emerging Corporate Plan, this issue will fall under public realm improvements. The project is part of the Coalition's priority on improving the public realm and facilities available to residents. |
| Financial, Resource and Property | <p>The project will be funded via the Council's capital programme. Capital receipts of £120,000.</p> <p>The demolition costs for the original bridge were £23,995 and the weekly hire fee for the temporary provision is £364.</p> <p>With a projected contract award date of 04/08/20 and a project completion date of 05/10/20 this would result in a total hire cost of £12,740. Therefore, the total demolition and hire costs would be £36,735.</p> <p>The proposed contract award total is £105,426. This results in a shortfall of £22,161 against the original £120,000 budget. Members are asked to cover the shortfall via further capital receipts.</p> |
| Legal, Statutory and Procurement | Tendering of the required works has been undertaken via a JCT MWD Minor Work Building Contract with contractor's design 2016. |
| Crime and Disorder | The remote location of the bridge could provide an opportunity for vandalism however there were few reported incidents concerning the old bridge. |
| Environment and Sustainability | Sustainable timber products are specified within each of the tender submissions. Whilst use of steel has a higher carbon footprint than the timber only solution, the steel and timber composite bridge will provide a greater lifespan. |
| Health and Wellbeing | The footbridge is part of a well-used pedestrian and cycle route. This encourages healthy activity and also helps to attract users to the coastal park. |
| Risk Management and Health and Safety | Project will be undertaken in accordance to CDM Regulations and regular monitoring will be undertaken by Officers and the Projects Support Surveyor. |
| Equality and Diversity | Specification will meet disability and access requirements. Any repairs or refurbishment will be undertaken according to the relevant guidelines/legislation. |
| Privacy and Data Protection | n/a |

8 Appendices

8.1 The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report:

- Appendix I: Option Images (Please note as this is a bespoke build companies have provided the images purely as examples and the final colours/engineering drawings will be done following award).