

**Members Questions**  
**Executive 19 May 2020**

**Agenda Item 7 - Bakers Park Improvements Newton Abbot**

**Cllr Phil Bullivant**

**Question**

The proposed future contracts for gas show significant price increases. Market statistics show gas prices at a peak in 2018/19 with significant reductions in 2019/20 and ongoing prices lower than the 2018/19 peak for the next 4 years. How is this reflected in the current proposals Re Bakers Park improvements

**Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sport, Recreation & Culture**

*Spot and Futures market prices rise and fall based on supply, demand and risk. The supply of the fuels is very different to the installation of the service and equipment, which is more likely to be fixed cost. The Pavilion will use gas for heating and water, and as such we expect the installation cost for the gas supply will not change. In terms of purchase of energy, it is anticipated that the Council will use the current energy supply framework and benefit from a purchase in advance model to guarantee value for money.*

**Question**

What is the detail behind the increased 32% in costs of Bakers Park. Can this be shown by facility (details of original estimate, latest cost, change in specification causing increase etc.) The original estimates had a car park for a greater number of cars therefore the new, much smaller car park should be less expensive

**Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sport, Recreation & Culture**

*There have been a number of specification changes compared to the original plan and allocation of funds under the last administration. Some of these have been down to internal influences; such as tree root mitigation, and some external influences; for instance the EA advice on flooding risk and also the taking into account of residents views on location of the building to minimise impact. Some of the cost is the result of tender submission being higher than expected – a trend not just confined to Teignbridge, as well as unforeseen difficulties with the existing tennis court sub-base and perimeter retaining features, poor ground conditions in the car park, as well as additional fees for professional consultancy and surveys.*

*In respect of the car park area reduction, some saving was made, but the underestimate of the cost of the tennis courts has exceeded this saving. The saving would have been higher, had the ground conditions on the smaller area specified not been quite so poor.*

### **Question**

Have alternative quotes been received from alternative qualified contractors.

### **Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sport, Recreation & Culture**

*Both the civils and Pavilion contracts have been competitively tendered and evaluated in accordance with the Councils procurement rules. The civils contract was awarded and works are now nearing completion, the additional works required have used the tendered rates where available. Following the Executive approval for additional funding, the Pavilion building contract will be awarded to the best value tender which also offered lowest price. It is worth noting that average tender responses have been climbing across the country. Despite the lockdown, it is not anticipated that tender responses will become more competitive due in part to the hostile environment policy of Central Government resulting in the loss of construction staff back to Europe.*

### **Question**

The original plans for car parking were rejected by the executive. How much will now be generated through car parking charges to defray these increased costs and how will prices be set.

### **Response from the Portfolio Holder for Sport, Recreation & Culture**

*We are not currently planning on charging for parking at Bakers Park, this can be considered if necessary. The increased cost will be paid from planning Section 106 contributions. Your request for it to be charged will be passed to the car park review group for consideration.*