

## Appendix A - Faraday Road Football Ground Q&As

Question	Response
<b>Scope and Objective</b>	
What actual project scope and objectives were produced by the Council?	The scope and objectives were set by the incoming Administration, with a clear commitment made to 'immediately return football to Faraday Road'. Therefore, the objective was to do this as expediently as possible.
Were these supported by project plans?	The project was scoped, and a drawing produced which included a specification.
Were these provided to suppliers to provide a quote against?	Yes, this was provided to the Council's term contractor.
<b>Decision Making and Procurement Process</b>	
Was a written project scope, specification and objectives produced?	A drawing was produced including a specification. This proposal was considered by the Executive at an internal governance meeting. There was no formal decision needed by the Council to enable the proposal to be implemented or the budget allocated. The budget was approved in March 23 by Full Council as part of the 2023/24 Capital Programme and officers have delegated authority in line with the Council's Constitution to allocate the funded for schemes that met the purpose of the budget allocation.
Who produced this?	WBC Project Engineer.
Who verified and approved this?	Service Director Environment along with the Council's Administration. The drawing was also presented at a meeting with Newbury Community Football Group on 20 <sup>th</sup> July 2023 and was displayed at the Sport at Faraday Road Community Forum on 17 <sup>th</sup> August 2024.
Can a copy of this be provided?	Yes.
What written specification was provided to enable suppliers to provide quotes for various elements of the required work?	The drawing included a specification for any items not within the Term Contract specification.
Did the Portfolio Lead for Culture, Leisure, Countryside, Public Health and Sport review and approve the project scope, specification and objectives?	The Portfolio holder was fully aware of the scope, specification and objectives.

<b>Project Management</b>	
Who was the project manager?	The Administration requested that that this scheme was delivered in as short a timescale as possible and no one individual was responsible to manage the project and various elements. Officers worked together as a mini project team to deliver the scheme. The scheme was delivered by the following Officers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Countryside Manager</li> <li>• Principal Engineer Structures</li> <li>• Project Engineer Drainage</li> <li>• Service Director Environment</li> </ul>
Was a project plan produced?	No, this was a relatively short-term project and a project plan not deemed necessary.
When was the initial project plan produced?	N/A
What if any changes were made to the initial project plan?	N/A
What was the required delivery date?	As soon as possible.
Who signed off / approved the works undertaken?	The grounds maintenance work to bring the pitch back into use was signed off by the Countryside Manager.  The new cabins, fencing, utility connections and associated civil engineering works was signed off by the Project and Principal Engineers in consultation with members
Did the Portfolio Lead for Culture, Leisure, Countryside, Public Health and Sport review and approve the project plan?	All members of the Executive received a briefing and copy of the plan of the project at an internal governance meeting.

<b>Cost / Budget of £230,000</b>	
Was the budget approved BEFORE any contracts / purchase orders were placed? If so, who approved this and when?	The budget used for this work was approved in March 23 by Full Council as part of the 2023/24 Capital Programme.
From what budget did this spend come from?	A combination of two budgets 1) Open Space improvements to Faraday Road and 2) the delivery of the Playing Pitch Strategy
What Governance and sign off processes (pre and post spend) was followed?	Usual delegated authority to spend an approved budget was followed in accordance with the Constitution.

Procurement Process	
Has the award of the various contracts followed the Council's Constitution – the two core procurement controls of Governance and e-procurement?	The work was ordered through the Council's Term contract which was procured competitively in accordance with procurement law and the Council's constitution.
Has the Council's principle called 'most economically advantageous tender' been followed / adhered to?	The Term Contract was procured using a price/quality split as approved by the Executive.
It appears that the Council's competitive purchasing process for contracts more than £9,999.99 has not been followed – why?	The Council delivered the project through its existing Term Contract which negated the need for a further procurement exercise. The terms contract was procured competitively and all processes were complied with in line with the Council Contract Rules of Procedure.
Why was this project not subject to a full competitive procurement process and any subsequent contracts awarded to the most qualified and best value suppliers?	The Term Contract was used as this is a fully compliant competitive contract and provides an expedient route to market, therefore fulfilling the objective of delivering the work as quickly as possible, and without the need for the additional expense and delay of a procurement exercise.
White Horse Contractors provided the Council with a detailed quote for secure boundary fencing. Did the Council ask for and receive a quote from Volker Highways before they decided to award them the work?	<p>I am not aware of and can find no evidence of any correspondence from White Horse Contracting to Council Officers which includes a quote for boundary fencing.</p> <p>Quotes for the specified fencing were received from Volker Highways.</p>
<p>The Volker Highways price for fencing (that only covered 2 sides of the ground) was £155,000. The White Horse Contractors quote, which covered 3 sides of the ground and provided many additional benefits such as future proofing was £54,651.</p> <p>What comparison was made by whom between the quote for fencing and who from the Council took the decision to award Volker Highways this element of the project and why?</p>	<p>The fencing provided by Volker includes a 4m chain link fencing on the north and south boundaries and a significant amount of palisade fencing on the western side of the pitch protecting the changing rooms and providing a storage area for the goals and other equipment. Also included is an 8m goal catcher fence on the north and south boundaries. The fencing proposed by White Horse Contracting is 3m chain link with 6 m goal catchers.</p> <p>The fencing provided by Volker is superior to that proposed by White Horse Contracting. It provides far more height to prevent balls from straying from the pitch. It was specifically noted by Members that as much protection as possible be provided at either end of the pitch, particularly at the southern end where the pitch is close to a busy public right of way and the River Kennet. A</p>

	<p>concern was quite rightly expressed that the risk of balls going into the River Kennet should be minimised as much as possible given that this is a very fast flowing river and was the location of the tragic accidental drowning of a child in recent years.</p> <p>The fence specification was agreed by Members and was tabled at a meeting with NCFG and Mr Morgan on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2023. It was also included in the presentation at the Sports at Faraday Road Community Forum on 17<sup>th</sup> August 2023</p>
<p>It is stated that certain elements of this project have been procured through the Council's term contract. However, no element of this contract can be or should be classified as part of the Council's "Highways, Bridges and Street Lighting Term Contract" with Volker Highways.</p>	<p>The elements of work ordered through the term contract (utility connections, drainage works, electrical works and fencing) are all normal highway works regularly ordered through the Highways Term Contract. This is a perfectly legitimate use of the contract.</p>

<p>Why was the supplier, who is the Council's Term Contractor for "Highways, Bridges and Lighting Maintenance Services" appointed over a local sports specialist supplier who are an established and existing supplier (White Horse Contractors) to the Council?</p>	<p>The Council has no direct supply relationship with White Horse Contracting. Ordering works from them without a competitive procurement exercise would be unconstitutional and would contravene procurement regulations.</p> <p>The Council's Highways Term Contract has been through a compliant competitive procurement exercise.</p>
<p>Were quotes requested / received by the Council for other elements such as trenching, pipework, electricity connection, water supply connection and temporary portacabin changing rooms – new and refurbished?</p>	<p>The trenching and pipework were ordered through the Term Contract.</p> <p>Electricity and water connections were ordered through the relevant utility company.</p> <p>The temporary portacabin was ordered online through a company that provides re-conditioned units. Given the niche nature of the provision of this type of facility and the time constraints imposed on the project, the unit was ordered after an extensive search in accordance with the Council's constitution.</p>

White Horse Contractors provided the Council with a detailed quote for pitch renovation. Who took the decision to award this element of work to Continental Landscapes Ltd and on what basis was this decision taken and who approved the decision?

The Council has no relationship with White Horse Contracting.

The Council's Grounds Maintenance contract with Continental Landscapes Ltd (CLL) has been subject to a compliant competitive procurement exercise which allows Officers to directly award works such as renovating football pitches. It should be noted that for the renovation of the Faraday Rd pitch, CLL only charged the Council for the materials. The labour and plant was offered free of charge as part of CLL's contractual obligation to provide Social Value through the contract. This explains why the cost of the renovation is significantly less than that quoted by White Horse and there was very little difference in the delivered treatment specification.