

Finance & General Purposes Committee

Meeting Date: 21st July 2026

Report Author: Andrew Briggs

Subject: Moredon Community Centre Refurbishment - Tender Evaluation and Award Recommendation

1. Purpose of the Report

To:

- provide Members with an overview of the Moredon Community Centre refurbishment project;
- summarise the Sport England Place Capital award position and key grant conditions;
- summarise the procurement process completed by officers;
- present the anonymised tender evaluation results and clarification interview outcome;
- confirm the funding position, including the request made to Sport England for additional funding support;
- seek a recommendation from Finance & General Purposes Committee to Full Council to award the contract to the highest ranked tenderer, being the Most Advantageous Tender.

2. Background

CSNPC has secured Sport England Place Capital funding to support the refurbishment of Moredon Community Centre. The project is intended to improve the main public activity areas of the building, with the primary focus being the main hall and foyer.



Award Offer Letter
CSNPC.pdf

The refurbishment is intended to provide a modern, flexible and accessible multi-use activity facility supporting physical activity, health, community use and wider wellbeing outcomes. The project also seeks to address dated internal finishes, improve lighting, heating / cooling, ventilation, accessibility, audio visual provision and general usability of the building.

The original tender documentation identified an estimated value of £85,000 to £100,000 ex VAT. Tender returns have demonstrated that delivery of the full capital scope is to exceed the original estimate and the Sport England approved project cost. The Clerk has therefore written to Sport England to request additional funding to support delivery of the full capital costs.

3. Key Project Details

3.1 Scope of Works Includes:

- strip-out, removal of the stage / plinths, wall treatment, making good and internal decoration;
- new suspended ceilings to the main hall and foyer, with services coordinated within ceiling voids where practicable;
- electrical installation, LED lighting, emergency lighting, sockets, data points and DB / supply review;
- HVAC / space heating design for the main hall, ventilation consideration and treatment of high-level windows / vents;
- new LVT flooring to the main hall and foyer / circulation areas;
- associated woodwork, ironmongery, trims, boarding / lining and making good;
- door works, including main hall double doors with push pad / sensor arrangement, foyer compartmentation door and small office wall / door works;
- external patio area, concrete access ramp, levels, handrails / guarding and associated making good;
- AV system provision and coordination with CCTV / alarm contractors;
- asbestos / CDM arrangements, commissioning, O&M manuals, as-built drawings, controls information, training and handover.

The objective is to deliver a fit for purpose, compliant and future-ready facility while managing capital cost, Programme risk and the limitations of refurbishing an existing building.



4. Funding and Sport England Award Framework

Sport England has issued a Place Capital Award Agreement for the Moredon Community Centre refurbishment. The key award information is summarised below. Members should note that the Award Agreement / Acceptance documentation confirms an award of £81,444. Officers will confirm the final grant figure with Sport England before contract execution or drawdown.

Funding / award item	Position
Sport England URN	2026001944
Project title	Place Capital Investment: Moredon Community Centre Refurbishment
Award date	22nd April 2026
Award amount	£81,400 recorded in the Award Agreement / Acceptance Form. Covering letter refers to £80,144; to be clarified with Sport England.
Approved total project cost	£118,500
Award period	01/04/2026 to 31/03/2027
Start / completion condition	Works must start within six months of the Award Letter date and complete within twelve months of the Award Letter date.
Payment position	Payment is made in arrears against evidenced expenditure. Sport England will withhold a 5% retention until the project has been evidenced as complete.
Additional funding request	The Clerk has written to Sport England to request additional funding support to deliver the full capital costs identified through tender.
Governance requirement	Finance & General Purposes Committee to recommend to Full Council for final approval due to the proposed contract value.

4.1 Sport England Approved Budget Headings

The Sport England Award Agreement identifies the approved project cost headings below. The tendered construction cost exceeds the original approved total project cost; therefore, any award should proceed subject to confirmation of sufficient funding and Sport England acceptance of the final tender position.

Funding Approved cost	Amount
Main hall construction and refurbishment works, including stage removal, new sports vinyl flooring, ceiling, roof repairs, kitchen/WC/reception/circulation works, accessibility, entrance DDA compliance and lightbox signage	£74,200
Mechanical and electrical upgrades, including lighting, ventilation, AC and power improvements	£9,000
Audio Visual & Digital upgrades and improvements	£5,800
Acoustic treatment and improvements	£4,000
Accessibility equipment and signage	£1,700
Activity equipment, furniture, storage and ICT systems	£9,300
Professional fees	£7,000
Contingency	£7,500
Total project cost	£118,500

4.2 Sport England Conditions and Evidence Requirements

The Award Agreement places conditions on the Council before works commence, before capital costs are drawn down, and before final payment. These conditions are relevant to the award recommendation because they affect contract timing, evidence requirements and financial risk.

Requirement	Committee / project implication
Award acceptance documentation	Award Acceptance Form, Bank Details Form, bank statement and Project Contacts Form must be submitted to Sport England.
Tender evidence	Tender Report Form and evidence of the formal tender process must be provided, including at least three comparative tenders/quotes and tender information from successful and unsuccessful contractors.
Contractor Statement Form	The selected contractor/design and construction advisers must agree to Sport England construction conditions and sign the Contractor Statement Form.
Formal contract	The Council and selected contractor must enter into a legally binding contract for the works, design and construction, with a copy supplied to Sport England before capital drawdown.
Partnership funding / affordability	All partnership funding or a realistic contingency plan to replace it must be in place before entering into contract. This is relevant given the tendered cost exceeding the approved project cost.

Security of tenure	Evidence of registered leasehold must be provided to Sport England before drawdown.
Planning / Building Regulations	Evidence of required planning permission, or a written statement if not required, must be provided. Building Regulations approval / certificate or equivalent completion evidence is required before final payment.
CDM / H&S / asbestos	Works must comply with CDM 2015, statutory safety requirements and asbestos requirements. Surveys must identify ACMs before relevant work begins.
Accessibility and inclusion	The design and operation must clearly consider use and participation by people with a diverse range of abilities and needs.
Payment and claim evidence	Claims are paid in arrears and must be supported by invoices and expenditure summary. Evidence must cover total project spend, not just the grant value.
Completion evidence	Practical Completion Certificate or equivalent documentary evidence, Building Regulations certificate and post-completion survey/photos will be required.
Publicity	Sport England contribution must be acknowledged appropriately, including signage, publications, online materials and social media where applicable.

5. Procurement Process Summary

- Officers prepared an Invitation to Tender / Employer's Requirements document, pricing schedule, quality questions and supporting project information.
- The opportunity was advertised as a below-threshold works tender through Find a Tender.
- The contract was tendered on a Design and Build basis using JCT Design and Build Contract principles.
- A site visit was recommended and tender clarifications were issued to maintain equal treatment.
- Tenders were required by 12 noon on 18th June 2026.
- Seven tenders were received and evaluated against the published criteria.
- Following written evaluation, selected tenderers were invited to clarification interview on 13th July 2026.
- Clarification interviews were used to test and clarify submitted proposals only. Tenderers were not permitted to materially amend or re-price their tenders.

5.1 Procurement Timeline

Milestone	Date / status
Sport England Award Letter	22nd April 2026
Tender opportunity published	May 2026
Clarification deadline	12 noon on Friday 12th June 2026
Tender return deadline	12 noon on Thursday 18th June 2026
Initial evaluation and moderation	July 2026
Clarification interviews	13th July 2026
Finance & General Purposes Committee	21st July 2026
Full Council award decision	29th July 2026
Contract award and mobilisation	Subject to Full Council approval, funding confirmation, Sport England requirements and contract documentation

6. Evaluation Methodology

The ITT stated that tenders would be evaluated on the Most Advantageous Tender basis using the published weighting model below. Quality was scored using a 0-5 scoring scale, with weightings applied to each criterion. Price was scored using the published formula: lowest submitted tender price divided by tenderer price, multiplied by 40.

Criterion	Weighting
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%
Price	40%
Total	100%

6.1 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.

7. Anonymised Tender Overview

For Member reporting purposes, all tenderers are anonymised. The tenderer identities are retained in the confidential procurement record and should not be included in any public version of this report until the Council has completed the required award and notification steps.

Tenderer A is ranked first overall and is recommended as the Most Advantageous Tender. Tenderer B has been re-moderated and placed third overall following review of the quality proposal. Although Tenderer B provided a strong written submission, the proposal was considered less directly aligned with the Council's required scope than Tenderer C, particularly in relation to final floor finish alignment and the need for further clarification on key specification assumptions.

Rank	Tenderer	Price excl. VAT	Quality /60	Price /40	Total /100	Outcome
1	Tenderer A	£108,572.32	50.10	36.63	86.73	Recommended MAT
2	Tenderer C	£122,394.80	50.50	32.49	82.99	Interviewed / reserve position
3	Tenderer B	£120,196.33	49.40	33.08	82.48	Re-moderated to 3rd
4	Tenderer D	£119,573.95	47.60	33.26	80.86	Not shortlisted following moderation
5	Tenderer E	£99,413.88	38.10	40.00	78.10	Invited to interview; did not attend
6	Tenderer F	£129,000.00	37.50	30.83	68.33	Not shortlisted
7	Tenderer G	£276,843.00	50.50	14.36	64.86	Not shortlisted due to affordability

8. Anonymised Evaluation Narrative

Tenderer A

Tenderer A submitted the strongest overall proposal and was the most comprehensive at interview. The tender demonstrated clear understanding of the scope, site constraints, Design and Build responsibilities, programme, asbestos / CDM controls, HVAC / ventilation assumptions, door / access requirements, external ramp / patio and handover requirements.

- Detailed and practical understanding of the main hall and foyer scope.
- Clear approach to wall boarding / lining, suspended ceilings, services coordination and LVT flooring.
- Clarified AC / heating approach, use of high-level windows / ventilation, external plant location and service coordination.
- Confirmed main hall double door approach with automatic openers / sensor arrangement.
- Provided the clearest overall balance of quality, deliverability, experience and price.

Tenderer C

Tenderer C submitted a strong and credible proposal and attended interview. The bidder demonstrated a practical understanding of the project and proposed a perimeter bulkhead approach to retain high-level windows, natural light and ventilation while delivering the suspended ceiling solution.

- Strong methodology and practical site understanding.
- Credible approach to strip-out, replastering and making good.
- Contingency position and DB / supply allowance required further explanation.
- Main hall door automation was not fully included as automatic opening; this presents a residual clarification / scope risk.
- Overall, Tenderer C is considered a credible reserve position but less comprehensive than Tenderer A.

Tenderer B

Tenderer B submitted a strong written quality response, particularly around Design and Build methodology, health and safety / asbestos management, references and social value. Following re-moderation, Tenderer B has been placed third overall. The re-moderation reflects the quality proposal and the need for further confidence on final scope alignment.

- Strong written evidence of relevant refurbishment experience and project controls.
- Good health and safety / asbestos management narrative.
- Good references and social value proposals.
- Quality score moderated to reflect concerns around proposed floor finish / specification alignment and the need for clarification on scope assumptions.
- Not recommended ahead of Tenderer A or Tenderer C because the proposal was less directly responsive to the Council's final clarified scope.

Tenderer D

Tenderer D is a large contractor with substantial relevant Design and Build experience and capacity. The written submission scored well on corporate capability. However, moderation reflected the Council's first-hand experience on a comparable previous Council project where concerns were identified in relation to finish quality, attention to detail and delivery confidence. This was not treated as an exclusion, but was relevant to the published quality criteria.

Tenderer E

Tenderer E submitted the lowest tendered price. Clarification was required around pricing items originally shown as £0 / TBC, including ventilation, CCTV / alarm coordination and AV, and no contingency / risk allowance was included. Tenderer E was invited to interview to test these matters but did not attend. This left residual concerns around technical detail, scope certainty and deliverability. Tenderer E is therefore not recommended.

Tenderer F

Tenderer F submitted a professional design / fit-out proposal. However, the proposal was less directly aligned to the specific ITT scoring questions and provided lower confidence on technical delivery compared with higher-ranked submissions. The price was also above the original estimate. Tenderer F is not recommended.

Tenderer G

Tenderer G submitted a strong quality and compliance response, but the tender was materially unaffordable against the project budget and attracted a significantly reduced price score. Tenderer G is not recommended.

9. Clarification Interviews and Moderation Outcome

Clarification interviews were held on 13th July 2026. Tenderer A and Tenderer C attended. Tenderer E was invited but did not attend. Officers waited, re-sent the meeting invitation, allowed additional time, and then terminated the meeting when the tenderer had not joined.

The interviews focused on scope understanding, design and delivery methodology, HVAC / ventilation, programme, asbestos / CDM arrangements, provisional sums, exclusions and affordability. The interviews were not used to introduce new criteria or allow material post-tender changes.

The panel agreed that Tenderer A remained the strongest submission and interview. Tenderer A was the most detailed and comprehensive, with the clearest explanation of the main hall and foyer refurbishment, wall treatment, ceiling approach, AC / heating, high-level window / ventilation assumptions, external patio / ramp, door automation, CCTV / IT coordination, programme and handover.

Tenderer C gave a credible interview and remains a credible reserve option. Tenderer E's non-attendance meant the panel could not test unresolved pricing and technical issues. No change to the score for Tenderer A was considered necessary following interview. Tenderer B has been re-moderated and placed third overall following review of the written quality proposal.

10. Financial Implications

Issue	Position
Recommended tender	Tenderer A - £108,572.32 excluding VAT.
Lowest submitted tender	Tenderer E - £99,413.88 excluding VAT. Tenderer E was invited to interview but did not attend, leaving unresolved technical and pricing risk.
Original tender estimate	£85,000 to £100,000 excluding VAT. The recommended tender exceeds the upper end of the original estimate by £8,572.32 excluding VAT.
Sport England approved project cost	£118,500 total approved project cost, with award documentation recording £81,400 grant support. The covering award letter references £80,144 and this should be clarified.
Recommended tender vs approved project cost	The recommended tender value is within the approved £118,500 total project cost envelope; however, the approved project cost also includes headings such as AV/digital, acoustic treatment, activity equipment, furniture, ICT, professional fees and contingency. Officers therefore requested Sport England support for the full capital cost position arising from tender.
Other funding / contract entry	Sport England states that partnership funding or a realistic contingency plan must be in place before entering into any contract.
VAT	All tender figures in this report are excluding VAT unless stated otherwise. VAT treatment and recovery should be confirmed by the Responsible Financial Officer.

11. Key Project Risks

Risk	Issue	Mitigation
Funding shortfall / Sport England approval	Tendered delivery costs exceed the original estimate and may exceed the approved funding profile once full capital headings are considered.	Proceed subject to Full Council approval, confirmation of sufficient funding, and Sport England agreement to the final tender / funding position.
Grant conditions	Sport England conditions must be met before drawdown, including tender evidence, Contractor Statement Form, contract copy, partnership funding, lease evidence, planning position and claim evidence.	Maintain a grant evidence tracker and submit required documentation before contract execution / drawdown as required.
Asbestos / hidden materials	Suspected or unidentified ACMs may affect cost, programme and methodology.	Require R&D survey and asbestos controls before intrusive works. No suspected ACMs to be disturbed without appropriate controls.
Electrical capacity	Existing supply and future building loads may affect HVAC / electrical strategy.	Require early load review, DB / supply assessment and confirmation of any DNO / 3-phase implications before mobilisation.

Scope creep / provisional sums	Provisional sums, PC sums and hidden defects could increase costs.	Resolve pre-contract clarifications, agree scope boundaries and control variations through the contract.
Programme risk	Lead-in, asbestos survey, HVAC, doors, external works and Sport England conditions may affect commencement and completion.	Require a detailed programme, early design meetings and regular project reporting.
Completion evidence	Final grant payment requires suitable completion evidence, including practical completion / equivalent evidence and Building Regulations certificate.	Include completion evidence, certificates, O&M manuals, photos and financial records as contract handover requirements.

12. Legal / Procurement Considerations

The Council has undertaken an advertised below-threshold tender with published award criteria. The evaluation has been undertaken against the published 60% quality / technical and 40% price model. Tenderers have been anonymised within this report to preserve procurement integrity.

Clarification interviews were used to test and clarify submitted tenders. They were not used to materially renegotiate the tendered scope, introduce new criteria or allow tenderers to re-price their submissions.

Subject to Full Council approval and funding confirmation, contract award should be made to the highest-ranked compliant proposal, Tenderer A, as the Most Advantageous Tender. Contract execution should only proceed once due diligence, Sport England conditions, funding confirmation, insurance checks, contract documentation and pre-contract clarifications are complete.

13. Recommendations

- NOTE the Sport England Place Capital award position, including the Award Agreement / Acceptance documentation recording £81,400 grant support toward an approved project cost of £118,500, and the need to clarify the covering letter reference to £80,144 before drawdown.
- NOTE the procurement process undertaken for the Moredon Community Centre refurbishment project.
- NOTE the anonymised tender evaluation and re-moderation set out in this report.
- NOTE that Tenderer A is the highest ranked tenderer and is recommended as the Most Advantageous Tender.
- NOTE that Tenderer E was invited to interview but did not attend, leaving unresolved pricing and technical clarification risks.
- NOTE that the Clerk has written to Sport England to request additional funding support for the full capital costs identified through tender and grant review.
- **RECOMMEND** to Full Council that the Council awards the JCT Design and Build contract to **Tenderer A**, subject to sufficient funding being confirmed, Sport England requirements, due diligence and finalisation of contract documentation.
- **RECOMMEND** that any short fall is covered by existing PWLB Capital project allocation.
- **RECOMMEND** a 3% contingency is applied.