

Finance & General Purposes Committee

Meeting Date: 18th February 2026

Report Author: Andrew Briggs

Subject: Refurbishment of Princess Elizabeth and Pembroke Gardens Pavilion

1. Purpose of the Report

To:

- Provide an overview of the pavilion refurbishment projects
- Present tender return information and evaluation outcomes
- Highlight key project risks
- Outline planning and building control requirements
- Seek approval for ancillary financial requirements
- Confirm contractor appointment

2. Background

CSNPC has now completed the ITT procurement stage for refurbishment works of both the Princess Elizabeth Pavilion and Pembroke Gardens Pavilion. Projects intended to modernise facilities and provide functional space for Council and community use.


The works are being procured under a competitive tender process using a 'Most Advantageous Tender' (MAT) approach, with evaluation weighted:

- **Quality: 60%**
- **Price: 40%**


The procurement has been managed in accordance with the Council's financial regulations and procurement principles of fairness, transparency, and equal treatment.

Indicative designs:

Pembroke Garden:



Princess Elizabeth Pavilion:



3. Key Project Details

3.1 Scope of Works Includes:

- Internal reconfiguration to provide council chamber / office accommodation
- Structural alterations
- Mechanical and electrical upgrades
- Accessibility improvements
- Building fabric repairs
- Roofing works
- Windows & doors
- External works and drainage connections

The objective is to deliver fit for purpose, compliant, and future ready buildings while managing ongoing maintenance liabilities.

3.2 Structural Site Visit Report – Impact on Refurbishment Works

A structural appraisal survey of both Pembroke Gardens and Princess Elizabeth Pavilion was undertaken by SOLID Engineering on 6th January 2026 to assess the condition of the existing structures and advise the proposed refurbishment works.

3.2.1 Nature of the Inspection

The survey comprised a visual inspection only, without opening up works or specialist testing. As such, the consultant confirms that concealed defects may exist, and further investigation may be required during construction.

3.2.2 Key Findings – Pembroke Gardens Pavilion

The report identifies several issues affecting the building condition:

- Extensive moisture and water ingress to the concrete roof soffit
- Areas of significant concrete spalling
- Frost damage and deterioration to external brickwork at low level
- Localised cracking to blockwork in the plant room
- Ceiling deterioration caused by moisture
- Requirement to replace the concrete roof slab as part of refurbishment works

Externally the structure is generally in reasonable condition, however internal moisture damage and roof deterioration represent key areas of intervention.

The report confirms refurbishment proposals should include:

- Removal of the existing chimney stack
- Replacement of the concrete roof slab
- Localised masonry repairs
- Consideration of loadbearing walls and structural requirements for new layouts

3.2.3 Key Findings – Princess Elizabeth Pavilion

The inspection identified a range of defects affecting the existing building, including:

- Cracking to internal and external masonry
- Evidence of water ingress from roof defects
- Missing roof tiles and lack of insulation
- Corrosion to steel elements and structural components
- Deterioration of timber posts supporting the external canopy
- Foundation movement suspected in parts of the building
- Uneven external concrete slab and inadequate drainage
- Rainwater goods missing or disconnected

The report recommends:

- Trial pits to investigate potential foundation movement
- CCTV survey of drainage to assess impact on foundations
- Localised roof repairs and reinstatement of weatherproofing
- Removal or full replacement of the external canopy
- Consideration of structural and insulation requirements within refurbishment design

3.2.4 Implications for the Project

The findings have several implications for the Council's refurbishment programme:

3.2.5 Increased Structural Risk

The presence of water ingress, structural deterioration, and potential foundation movement increases the risk of additional works being required once construction begins.

3.2.6 Potential Cost and Programme Impact

Further investigation works (trial pits, drainage surveys, structural repairs) may:

- increase project costs
- extend programme duration
- require design adjustments

3.2.7 Drainage and Foundation

The report highlights that defective drainage may be contributing to foundation movement and structural issues.

3.2.8 Contingency

As the inspection was limited to visual assessment only, unknown conditions may emerge during construction. Appropriate contingency and contractor risk management will therefore be critical.

4. Planning and Building Control

Both projects will require appropriate statutory approvals.

4.1 Planning

Where planning permission is required, this will be progressed in advance of construction to avoid programme delays.

4.2 Building Control

Building Regulations approval will be required and will cover key compliance areas including:

- Structural safety
- Fire safety and means of escape
- Accessibility (Part M)
- Thermal performance
- Ventilation
- Electrical and mechanical installations
- Drainage

NB; No' of toilets under DDA regs to be confirmed.

4.3 Programme Risk Associated with Approvals

Delays in planning or building control approval could impact the overall programme; however, officers and contractors will manage this proactively.

5. Tender Process Summary

- The Invitation to Tender was issued to the market.
- A total of 8 proposals were received by the closing date (30th Jan)
- An initial compliance review was undertaken.
- Quality and pricing evaluations have been completed.
- 2 x Shortlisted bidders were invited to an informal interview to further test deliverability and commercial assumptions.

To preserve the integrity of the process, bidders are anonymised within this report.

All compliant tenders have been included within the evaluation to ensure transparency and provide Members with a full understanding of market response.

The quality and structure of pricing submissions were also considered as an indicator of bidders' understanding of the project. Contractors who undertook site visits generally produced more accurate and reliable cost submissions, reducing the likelihood of post-contract variation. Bidders who did not undertake site visits relied more heavily on assumptions, presenting increased financial risk to the Council

6. Anonymised Tender Overview

Bidder	Quality Score (60)	Price Score (40)	Combined Score (100)	Combined Price (£)
Bidder A	37.71	40	77.71	£288,467.75
Bidder B	46.29	24.97	71.26	£462,111.66
Bidder C	44.57	25.33	69.9	£455,481.86
Bidder D	44.57	33.54	78.11	£343,823.30
Bidder E	49.71	34.26	83.97	£345,674.01
Bidder F	42.86	31.48	74.34	£366,628.14
Bidder G	49.71	30.01	79.72	£380,770.99

Bidder A, C, D & F did **not** attend a site visit prior to quotation.

Bidder E & G were selected for informal interview.

6.1 Quality Scoring Matrix and Results

Quality submissions were evaluated using a structured scoring matrix to ensure a fair, transparent, and auditable procurement process. Each criterion was scored on a scale of 0 – 5, with weightings applied to reflect project priorities.

6.1.2 Scoring Scale

Score	Definition
0	No response or completely inadequate
1	Poor – fails to meet requirements
2	Fair – partially meets requirements
3	Good – meets requirements
4	Very Good – exceeds requirements
5	Excellent – significantly exceeds requirements

6.1.3 Quality Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Weight (%)
Company Profile & Relevant Experience	10
Proposed Design Concept & Methodology	15
Programme of Works & Key Milestones	10
Health & Safety & Asbestos Management	10
Insurance & Certifications	5
References from Similar Projects	3
Social Value	7

Total Quality Weighting: 60%

6.2 Quality Scores – Contractors E & G

Both contractors achieved strong quality submissions, demonstrating relevant experience, credible delivery methodologies, and appropriate project controls.

Contractor E Quality Score

			Score 0-5	%
Criteria	Question	Weight (%)		
Company Profile & Relevant Experience	Describe your company's background, including relevant experience in similar design and build projects. Provide examples and outcomes.	10	5	10
Proposed Design Concept & Methodology	Outline your proposed design approach for converting the pavilion into modern Council Chambers, office accommodation, and ancillary facilities , and how the design meets the Council's objectives.	15	4	12
Programme of Works & Key Milestones	Provide a detailed programme of works, including key milestones and timelines. Explain how you will manage project delivery and mitigate delays.	10	4	8
Health & Safety & Asbestos Management	Detail your approach to health and safety, particularly in relation to asbestos management. Include your procedures, risk assessments, and compliance with regulations.	10	4	8
Insurance & Certifications	Provide evidence of relevant insurance (e.g., public liability, professional indemnity) and certifications (e.g., CHAS, Constructionline). Explain how these support your ability to deliver the project safely and effectively.	5	4	4
References from Similar Projects	Provide at least two references from clients for similar completed projects. Include contact details and a brief description of the works delivered.	3	4	2.4
Social Value	Describe how your organisation will deliver social value through this project. This may include local employment, apprenticeships, community engagement, sustainability initiatives, or support for local suppliers.	7	4	5.6
Total			29	49.71

Contractor G Quality Score

			Score 0-5	%
Criteria	Question	Weight (%)		
Company Profile & Relevant Experience	Describe your company's background, including relevant experience in similar design and build projects. Provide examples and outcomes.	10	5	10
Proposed Design Concept & Methodology	Outline your proposed design approach for converting the pavilion into modern Council Chambers, office accommodation, and ancillary facilities , and how the design meets the Council's objectives.	15	4	12

Programme of Works & Key Milestones	Provide a detailed programme of works, including key milestones and timelines. Explain how you will manage project delivery and mitigate delays.	10	4	8
Health & Safety & Asbestos Management	Detail your approach to health and safety, particularly in relation to asbestos management. Include your procedures, risk assessments, and compliance with regulations.	10	4	8
Insurance & Certifications	Provide evidence of relevant insurance (e.g., public liability, professional indemnity) and certifications (e.g., CHAS, Constructionline). Explain how these support your ability to deliver the project safely and effectively.	5	4	4
References from Similar Projects	Provide at least two references from clients for similar completed projects. Include contact details and a brief description of the works delivered.	3	4	2.4
Social Value	Describe how your organisation will deliver social value through this project. This may include local employment, apprenticeships, community engagement, sustainability initiatives, or support for local suppliers.	7	4	5.6
Total			29	49.71

Members should note that the original project estimate of Circa £250k (combined) was prepared at feasibility stage. Market testing through the tender process has now established the realistic construction cost range for refurbishment works.

This reflects inflationary pressures within the construction sector, the complexity of refurbishing existing buildings, and the need to ensure compliance with modern statutory requirements.

6.3 Tender Clarifications

Informal clarification meetings were held with 2 contractors in order to review pricing assumptions, provisional sums, programme considerations, and key project risks.

These meetings were conducted for clarification purposes only and did not form part of the scored tender evaluation process.

Final tender clarifications, including confirmed costs associated with the newly identified drainage works, were received Monday 16th Jan.

6.4 Tender Evaluation Priority

The Council's priority is to appoint a contractor capable of delivering the project safely, predictably, and within budget.

7. Drainage Connection

The Council has been advised that the existing drainage serving the Princess Elizabeth Pavilion has failed due to tree root ingress. As a result, additional drainage works will be required to ensure the pavilion can operate effectively following refurbishment.

7.1 Implications

- New drainage provision will be required, including replacement/renewal of affected drainage runs.
- A new connection is anticipated linking the pavilion drainage to the wider site pumping station.
- The route may extend across the wider site and interface with existing infrastructure (including areas adjacent to the BMX pump track), with associated reinstatement requirements.

To ensure procurement fairness and cost transparency, this information (including supporting drawings) has been formally issued to the two bidders brought forward for clarification to enable:

- Equal treatment of bidders
- Comparable pricing against the same scope information
- Reduction in the risk of post-contract variations and abortive cost



A proposed route for the new drainage connection.

7.2 Contractor Clarification

7.2.1 Drainage Allowance (Contractor E)

Following the issue of the additional drainage information, Contractor E has confirmed a budget based allowance for the drainage works, presented largely as provisional sums due to the current level of design detail.

Contractor E has confirmed that:

- The allowance has been prepared solely on the basis of the drainage information issued by the Council on 10th February 2026.
- The figures provided are indicative and may change subject to final design development, ground conditions, and statutory requirements.

Contractor E's drainage allowance is summarised below:

- Design of drainage, manholes and pump: £1,500 (Provisional Sum)
- Pump, controls and power supply: £4,500 (Provisional Sum)
- Trenching, below ground drainage, manhole installation, reinstatement and associated works: £8,500

Total indicative drainage allowance: £14,500

7.2.2 Drainage Allowance (Contractor G)

Contractor G has also reviewed the issued drainage information and provided a cost allowance for comparable works based on their assessment of the scope and site conditions.

The contractor has confirmed that:

- Their allowance is based on the information issued by the Council and supporting drawings.
- The costs remain subject to final design development, coordination with services, and ground conditions.
- Final costs may vary depending on detailed design and statutory requirements.

Total indicative drainage allowance: £17,632.00

For context, the main site contractor at Moredon Sporting Hub (MSH) has also provided a verbal indicative allowance in the region of **£10,000**, noting that final costs will depend on design and site conditions.

Contractor G total contract price - £398,402.99

7.3 Discount Offer for Combined Award of Both Pavilion Projects

Contractor E has indicated that, should both pavilion refurbishment projects be awarded to them, a 2.5% Main Contract Discount (MCD) could be applied to the combined contract value (excluding drainage works).

Based on the submitted tender value this would represent a reduction in overall project cost of around £9k. Members should note:

- The discount is conditional upon award of both projects.
- The discount relates to the main contract works only.
- Multi project discount was offered to both contractor E & G.

7.4 Solar Provision – Princess Elizabeth Pavilion

The opportunity to incorporate solar photovoltaic (PV) panels at the Princess Elizabeth Pavilion has been identified as part of the refurbishment works.

Contractor E has provided an indicative additional cost of £14,430.00

The Council is proposing to utilise Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) funding to support future sustainability and energy efficiency improvements across its estate, including potential solar provision.

Installing solar infrastructure as part of the current refurbishment programme may offer several advantages:

- Reduced future installation and mobilisation costs
- Improved long-term energy efficiency and reduced operational costs
- Reduced disruption compared with retrofit installation
- Contribution toward the Council's sustainability objectives
- Opportunity to integrate works within the main construction programme

Members may therefore wish to consider whether solar provision should be incorporated within the current refurbishment works or delivered as a future standalone project.

8. Key Project Risks

8.1 Structural Uncertainty

Refurbishment projects inherently carry risk relating to hidden defects such as:

- roof condition
- drainage
- structural integrity
- ground conditions

Appropriate contingency and contractor capability are therefore critical.

8.2 Statutory Approval Risk

Failure to secure planning or building control approval in a timely manner could delay project stages.

8.3 Cost Escalation Risk

Refurbishment projects carry inherently greater risk than new build construction due to the potential for unforeseen conditions once works commence. Where tenders rely on provisional sums, there is increased likelihood of cost adjustment during construction.

The evaluation has prioritised cost certainty and deliverability to mitigate this.

8.4 Programme Risk

Delays may arise from:

- intrusive surveys
- statutory approvals
- unforeseen building conditions

9. Additional Funding Requirements

9.1 Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment (FFE)

While some furniture has already been secured, additional funding will be required to ensure the building is fully operational upon completion.

Including:

- Office furniture
- storage
- Kitchenette appliances.
- ancillary equipment

9.2 Digital Connectivity – Airbridge / Fibre

CSNPC currently uses OneCom as its managed IT provider and has requested outline pricing to support the required IT infrastructure for the refurbished pavilions.

Fibre connectivity was installed to the main building at the Moredon Sporting Hub in 2025 at cost to the Parish Council. Extending fibre to the Princess Elizabeth Pavilion would result in additional capital cost and potential site disruption due to trenching and installation works.

Alternative connectivity solutions are being explored to ensure value for money while maintaining operational reliability.

This requirement is being considered as part of the wider project funding considerations to ensure the building is fully operational upon completion.

Reliable connectivity is essential for:

- council operations
- hybrid meetings
- community use

Two options:

9.2.1 Airbridge

- Lower capital cost
- Faster installation
- Suitable where line of sight is achievable

9.2.2 Fibre

- Higher installation cost
- Greater long term resilience
- Future proofed infrastructure

A funding allocation will be needed to support the preferred solution once feasibility is confirmed.

10. Third Party Capital Contribution – Pembroke Gardens

The Council is expecting a capital contribution toward the refurbishment of Pembroke Gardens Pavilion from Rodbourne Cheney Baptist Church, who intend to share use of the site to support and deliver community based activities.

This partnership presents several strategic benefits:

- Enhanced community utilisation of the facility
- Increased social value
- Broader programme of local activities and engagement
- Reduction in the long term financial burden on the Council

The contribution remains subject to formal agreement, and appropriate governance arrangements will be established to ensure clarity regarding:

- Shared use
- Access arrangements
- Ongoing responsibilities
- Any operational considerations

Members should note that third party contributions reduce overall Council exposure but should not be relied upon until formally secured.

11. Financial Projections

Councillors should note:

- Construction costs represent only part of the total project requirement.
- Supporting infrastructure and operational matters must be budgeted alongside the main works.

Based on Contractor E's proposal, including the 2.5% multi contract discount, provisional drainage allowance, digital connectivity provision (£6k), an FFE allowance (£1k), and a 3% contingency (£10k), the anticipated total project cost is approximately **£355,402.16**.

Should the council secure up £30k from RCBC this would reduce the capital sum to Circa **£325k**.

EMR333 (Pembroke Garden Youth Hub) – Has an allocation of £13,198.09 available.

Overall project costs remain broadly in line with the Council's original forecasts and the approved capital works programme. The proposed expenditure is considered manageable within existing financial planning, and the Council will remain able to deliver its other priority capital projects.

12. Next Steps

- Complete contracts.
- Progress planning and building control approvals

13. Recommendations

Committee is asked to:

1. **Note** the progress of the tender evaluation.
2. **Note** the planning and building control requirements associated with the project.
3. **Note** the anticipated capital contribution from Rodbourne Cheney Baptist Church.
4. **Note** the identified drainage works and associated costs.
5. **Approve** appointment of **Bidder E** as the Most Advantageous Tender at **£345,674.01**
6. **Approve** a 2.5% MC discount for the award of both projects together.
7. **Approve** additional provisional costs for associated drainage works up to £14,500.
8. **Approve** an indicative allocation to deliver Digital Connectivity up to £6,000.
9. **Approve** an allocation of capital funding for Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment up to £1,000.
10. **Approve** a 3% contingency for unforeseen matters.

11. **Note** all costs are to be attributed to the Public Works Loan budget.
12. **Consider** the inclusion of solar panels for Princess Elizabeth at an additional cost of £14,430.00.
13. **Approve** all recommendation to present to Full Council.