

### **Playground Committee: Redevelopment of the Bourdillon Children's Playground Report for GPC Extraordinary Meeting 24.3.25**

#### **1. Management Summary**

This report from the Playground's Committee outlines the background to Goring Parish Council's (GPC) commitment to redevelop the Bourdillon children's playground. It reviews the steps taken to consult with residents and define a specification, leading to the GPC's decision in November 2024 to invite detailed designs and costs from specialist suppliers via a competitive Invitation to Tender process. It outlines how the Tenders were evaluated to produce an analysis of each Tender and shows the end results of this evaluation.

A separate paper, detailing costs and commercial terms has been produced for GPC to consider, with a view to reaching a decision on the preferred supplier and a process to agree and approve a contract with that supplier.

It is intended that the playground will be commissioned and ready for use during the 2025 school summer holidays.

#### **2. Background & Timeline**

The Bourdillon playground is nearly 25 years old and some of the equipment is in a poor state of repair. The range of equipment is very limited and there are no Accessible or Special Educational Needs (SEN) facilities.

In 2017, an SODC report outlined that investment was needed to improve children's playground facilities (NEAP – Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play). The Goring-on-Thames Neighbourhood Plan (2019) demonstrated the changing demographics of Goring with more young families and stated that play facilities needed to be improved.

In December 2022, GPC commissioned a study of the play facilities in Goring (Thirlwell Report). Specifically, it stated *"The Bourdillon should be a child-focussed area for Primary aged children. The existing equipment needs to be replaced/renovated"*. 83% of public responses endorsed the need for improved play facilities for Primary School-aged children.

GPC acknowledged the need for refurbishing playgrounds and set up a Playgrounds Work Group (WG) in 2023. The group comprised 4 parents and 2 councillors, tasked with determining how Bourdillon and Gardiner could be refurbished and the funding required.

To produce indicative designs and costs, an Expression of Interest was reviewed with specialist companies and sample designs were shared with residents at the Annual Meeting of the Parish in May 2024. Approximately 200 members of the public attended the meeting and voted playground improvement as the top priority with over 80% of voters supportive.

GPC expected that funding for the Bourdillon and Gardiner would be part grant and part GPC reserves. Attempts to obtain the grant from SODC delayed the whole process by several months and was ultimately unsuccessful. Rather than delay the process further, GPC tasked the WG with focussing on Bourdillon and changed its status to a Committee to reflect the level of commitment and funding required. Bourdillon was selected because of its poor

condition, largest available space, in the centre of the most populated part of the village and next to the Primary School. Gardiner was put on temporary hold and will be progressed once Bourdillon has been successfully implemented.

In November 2024, GPC approved the release of an Invitation to Tender (ITT) to all specialist suppliers with a view to implementing the redeveloped playground for the school Summer holidays in 2025.

### **3. ITT process**

GPC produced a detailed ITT with input from parents and other councils that had recently delivered playground projects. GPC approved the release of the ITT which was published on the Government Contract Finder procurement system in November 2024 with a maximum budget of £200K. The ITT can be viewed on the GPC web-site and includes a detailed specification, including equipment must-haves, accessibility and SEN requirements, timescales and key criteria against which each bid would be evaluated.

Responses to the ITT were required by 7<sup>th</sup> February 2025 and the indicative dates provided to suppliers included a GPC decision on a preferred supplier by the end of March and commissioning of the playground in July.

GPC received 6 Tenders, all from experienced suppliers of playgrounds for Parish Councils.

### **4. Evaluation Process**

A Playgrounds Evaluation Work Group (EWG) consisting of 3 councillors and 2 parents was formed to assess the Tenders. Background research via meetings with other councils (Haddenham, Benson, Sonning Common) helped to determine the optimum process on which to base the evaluation.

In January 2025 the EWG approved and documented the evaluation process and scoring mechanism.

In addition to detailed work by individual EWG members, the EWG held 4 meetings in February:

1. To review criteria (before Tenders received) - pass/fail and graded criteria
2. To share first impressions of Tenders after receipt
3. To identify further specific questions for suppliers
4. Final evaluation - to check variance and vote on outcome

The ITT specified a set of pass/fail criteria. Suppliers had to pass all of these to progress further in the evaluation process. Appendix 1 shows the pass/fail assessment - all suppliers progressed to the next stage of the evaluation.

The ITT specified a set of graded criteria, covering Quality of Design, Materials Used, Price and Value for Money, Installation and Commissioning. Appendix 2 shows the weighting given to each area, the next level of detail in each criterion and the scoring scheme used.

Evaluators contributed individual marks to a centrally stored spreadsheet. Each evaluator provided comments on the marks awarded. Scores that varied by 2 or more were identified and discussed and changes made if appropriate. At the end of the process, marks for all 5 evaluators were combined to give the final average scores. These are included in Appendix 3.

Finally, the EWG met, reviewed all scores and voted on its final evaluation. It voted unanimously to present the results of the evaluation and recommend a single preferred supplier to the Playgrounds Committee.

On March 5<sup>th</sup>, the Playgrounds Committee reviewed a report from the EWG and voted unanimously to approve the recommendations and to present them to GPC with a firm proposal on a preferred supplier and design. Subsequently, references have been followed up with several Parish Councils to get feedback on their experience with this supplier. All feedback has been constructive and positive and supports the Committees recommendation.

## **5. Timescales**

Once GPC has approved a preferred supplier, it is intended to negotiate final design details and contract terms and place a contract with the supplier as soon as possible. In parallel, a planning application will be registered with SODC for the final design with a view to receiving approval as Permitted Development so that we can proceed with the implementation project and achieve a summer 2025 handover for the children of Goring.

## Appendix 1 - Pass/Fail criteria

Criterion	Description	Supplier 1	Supplier 2	Supplier 3	Supplier 4	Supplier 5	Supplier 6
		Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N	Y/N
Proven experience in the supply of playgrounds, play equipment and surfacing	Track record of delivering to Parish Councils Reference 1 Reference 2	Yes Provided Provided	Yes Provided Provided	Yes Provided Provided	Yes Provided Provided	Yes Provided Provided	Yes Provided Provided
Tender Received by 3pm 7/2	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Confirmation of ability to deliver project within specified timeframe	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Signed Certificate of Collusion	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Health & Safety Policy	Copy of Policy provided	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Confirmation of no outstanding issues	None	None	None	None	None	None
Current Insurance at specified levels	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Financial Stability (including Credit Rating)	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Completed and signed application form, ITT Attachment 2	Yes/No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

## Appendix 2 - Graded Criteria

<b>Quality of Design (40%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Compliance with requirements.</li><li>• Ability to cater to a range of ages and abilities.</li><li>• Well-designed layout.</li><li>• Adherence to Play Area Accessibility Statement.</li><li>• Range of equipment offered.</li><li>• Design preference of Evaluation Committee</li></ul>	6.67% for each
<b>Materials (10%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Quality of materials used.</li><li>• Expected life-span for equipment and surfacing.</li><li>• Reliability and speed of supply chain.</li><li>• Availability of spare parts.</li></ul>	2.5% for each
<b>Price and Value for Money (30%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Quote for current project.</li><li>• Cost of replacement equipment.</li><li>• Warranty cover.</li><li>• Deliverance of project aftercare service.</li></ul>	7.5% for each
<b>Installation and Commissioning (20%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Own resources for implementation or subcontractor.</li><li>• Acceptable escalation process proposed between supplier and the council.</li><li>• Project plan included with tender.</li></ul>	6.67% for each

### Marking Scheme:

Each area bullet point (17 in total) has been given a score 0-5 as follows:

- 0 = Does not meet requirement
- 1 = Poor, fails to meet expectations
- 2 = Adequate, partially meets expectations
- 3 = Good, meets expectations
- 4 = Very good, exceeds expectations in some areas
- 5 = Excellent, exceeds expectations significantly

### Appendix 3 - Scores and Ranking

Criteria Area	Description	Supplier 1	Supplier 2	Supplier 3	Supplier 4	Supplier 5	Supplier 6
		Scores 1-5					
Quality of Design (40%)	1.Compliance with requirements.	2.8	3.1	2	4.4	3.4	3
	2.Ability to cater to a range of ages and abilities.	2.9	3.6	2.9	4.3	3.2	3
	3.Well-designed layout.	3	3.6	3.4	4.5	3	2.4
	4.Adherence to Play Area Accessibility Statement.	3.2	3.8	2.4	4.2	3.8	3
	5.Range of equipment offered.	3.2	4	2.4	4.5	3.2	3
	6.Design preference of Evaluation Committee.	2.2	3.1	2.8	4.4	3.4	2.8
	<b>Overall Quality of Design</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>15.9</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>17.2</b>
Materials (10%)	1.Quality of materials used.	2.8	3.6	3.4	4	3.8	3.4
	2.Expected life-span for equipment and surfacing.	2.7	4.2	3.2	4	3.6	3.8
	3.Reliability and speed of supply chain.	3	2.8	3.6	3	4	3.4
	4.Availability of spare parts.	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.4
	<b>Overall Materials</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>14.2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>14.8</b>	<b>14</b>
Price/VFM (30%)	1.Quote for current project.	3.2	3	3.6	2.6	3.6	2.6
	2.Cost of replacement equipment.	3.2	3.8	2.4	3	3.6	3.2
	3.Warranty cover.	2.8	3.6	3	3.6	3.6	3.6
	4.Deliverance of aftercare service.	3	3	3	3.2	3	2.4
	<b>Overall VFM score</b>	<b>12.2</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12.4</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>11.8</b>
Installation (20%)	1.Own resources for implementation or subcontractor.	3.2	3	3.8	3.2	3	3
	2.Acceptable escalation process proposed between supplier/council.	2.4	2.8	1.4	3.3	3	2.8
	3.Project plan included with tender.	3	3	3.4	3	3	3
	<b>Overall Installation</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8.8</b>
<b>Total Scores</b>		<b>50.2</b>	<b>57.6</b>	<b>50.5</b>	<b>62.8</b>	<b>56.8</b>	<b>51.8</b>
<b>TOTAL % of weighted scores</b>		<b>58.9</b>	<b>67.2</b>	<b>57.7</b>	<b>73.6</b>	<b>65.7</b>	<b>59.4</b>
<b>RANKING</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>