

APPENDIX A - VARIATION SUMMARY

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - Q3 2023/24 - SUMMARY OF VARIATIONS FROM APPROVED PROGRAMME

Variations on individual schemes	Date of meeting	Revised 2023/24	Revised 2024/25	Revised 2025/26	Revised 2026/27	Revised 2027/28	Total
		£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Current approved capital programme							
Programme approved by Executive 18/01/2023	Exec 18/01/23	79,302	33,098	34,744	10,150	0	157,294
Net underspend 22/23 rephased to 23/24	Exec 05/07/23	99,645					99,645
Sub-total - approved programme prior to Q1 monitoring		178,947	33,098	34,744	10,150	0	256,939
Variations in the estimated cost of approved schemes							
<i>(i) Variations previously approved by the Executive</i>							
Chislehurst Library redevelopment	ERC PDS 23/11/22		Cr 1,000				Cr 1,000
West Wickham library and housing improvements (RRH)	Exec 08/02/23	3,959					3,959
Changing Places Fund (RRH)	Exec 29/03/23 05/07	405					405
Crystal Palace Park (RRH)	Exec 29/03/23	304					304
Addition to Basic Need (s106) (CEF)	Exec 29/03/23	43					43
Digital infrastructure - Strategic Investment Fund (RRH)	Exec 05/07/23	49					49
Non-turf cricket pitches (RRH)	Exec 05/07/23	40					40
Addition to Devolved Formula Capital (CEF)	Exec 20/09/23	55					55
Adjustments to TfL estimates (grant funded) (ECS)	Exec 20/09/23	Cr 1,425	Cr 500				Cr 1,925
Supplementary estimate for Churchill Court (RCCM)	Exec 20/09/23		4,250				4,250
Investment Fund used for housing schemes	Exec 20/09/23	Cr 11,688					Cr 11,688
Addition to Disabled Facilities Grant (RRH)	Exec 20/09/23	2,656					2,656
Proposed housing scheme - Bromley North (RRH)	Exec 20/09/23	6,283	12,150	7,067			25,500
Proposed housing scheme - Beckenham (RRH)	Exec 20/09/23	631	7,200	6,600	769		15,200
Supplementary estimate for York Rise - approved Jun 2021 (RRH)	Exec 20/09/23	2,072					2,072
Net rephasing between 23/24 and future years - Q1	Exec 20/09/23	Cr 60,366	30,354	24,669	5,343		0
Supplementary estimate for depots (ECS)	Exec 29/11/23		1,893				1,893
Supplementary estimate for the treatment of RAAC (RCCM)	Exec 29/11/23		3,000				3,000
Supplementary estimate for Liquid Logic (RCCM)	Exec 29/11/23	700					700
Correction to Basic Need budgets for s106 (CEF)	Exec 29/11/23		2,280				2,280
Supplementary estimate for OPR Central Library (RCCM)	Exec 29/11/23		500				500
Use of OPR Churchill Theatre budget to fund Central Library (RCCM)	Exec 29/11/23		Cr 500				Cr 500
Net rephasing between 23/24 and future years - Q2	Exec 29/11/23	Cr 25,375	19,828	1,547	4,000		0
		Cr 81,657	79,455	39,883	10,112	0	47,793
Sub-total - approved capital programme prior to Q3 monitoring		97,290	112,553	74,627	20,262	0	304,732
<i>(ii) Variations requiring the approval of the Executive</i>							
Removal of various complete overspent schemes		416					416
		416	0	0	0	0	416
<i>(iii) Variations not requiring the approval of the Executive</i>							
Removal of various complete underspent schemes		Cr 1,056	Cr 90				Cr 1,146
Reduction in Central Depot Wall scheme		Cr 77					Cr 77
Reduction in Financial Systems Replacement scheme		Cr 200					Cr 200
Net rephasing between 23/24 and future years - Q3		Cr 26,982	16,728	10,029	225	0	0
		Cr 28,315	16,638	10,029	225	0	Cr 1,423
<i>(iv) Proposed new schemes requiring the approval of the Executive</i>							
Kelsey Park Bridge		133	434				567
Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) Switch Off			1,000				1,000
Local Highways Maintenance		455	455				910
		588	1,889	0	0	0	2,477
TOTAL REVISED CAPITAL PROGRAMME		69,979	131,080	84,656	20,487	0	306,202
Less: estimated further slippage projection		Cr 10,000	10,000	0	0	0	0
Add: provision for uncertainty and future schemes			0	107	4,000	4,000	8,107
TOTAL TO BE FINANCED		59,979	141,080	84,763	24,487	4,000	314,309

CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING - Q3 2023/24 - SUMMARY OF VARIATIONS FROM APPROVED PROGRAMME**SCHEME REPHASING**

Variations on individual schemes	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	TOTAL
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
<u>Rephasing of schemes</u>					
Churchill Theatre (RCCM)	Cr 4,498	4,498			0
Churchill Court (RCCM)	Cr 8,000	8,000			0
Financial Systems Replacement (RCCM)	Cr 250	250			0
Emergency Works on Surplus Sites (RCCM)	Cr 47	47			0
Property Disposal/Feasibility Work- Growth Fund (RCCM)	Cr 26	26			0
OPR Surface Car Parks (RCCM)		Cr 823	823		0
Replacement of District Heating System Boilers & Works to Walnuts Leisure Centre (RRH)	Cr 580	580			0
Penge Town Centre (RRH)	Cr 71	71			0
Digital infrastructure - Strategic Investment Fund (RRH)	Cr 49	49			0
Bromley High Street Improvements- Growth Fund (RRH)	Cr 771	500	271		0
OPR Traveller Sites		150	Cr 150		0
Beckenham housing (RRH)		Cr 5,000	5,000		0
Site G (RRH)	Cr 2,424	2,424			0
Kelsey Park Lake Desilting (ECS)	Cr 1,900	1,900			0
Depot Improvement Works (ECS)	Cr 8,066	3,756	4,085	225	0
Capital Maintenance in Schools (CEF)	Cr 300	300			0
TOTAL REPHASING ADJUSTMENTS	Cr 26,982	16,728	10,029	225	0

APPENDIX C - FINANCING

CAPITAL FINANCING STATEMENT - Q3 2023/24 (NB. Assumes all capital receipts - see below)

	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28
	Estimate £'000	Estimate £'000	Estimate £'000	Estimate £'000	Estimate £'000
<u>Summary financing statement</u>					
Capital grants	18,759	19,132	15,000	1,500	0
Other external contributions	5,873	19,643	250	0	0
Usable capital receipts	19,232	79,098	52,364	0	0
Internal borrowing	1,708	10,824	8,400	0	0
Revenue contributions	10,812	5,259	271	0	0
External borrowing*	3,595	7,124	8,478	22,987	4,000
Total expenditure	59,979	141,080	84,763	24,487	4,000
<u>Usable capital receipts</u>					
Balance brought forward	31,787	48,686	28,564	0	0
New usable receipts	43,779	69,800	32,200	0	0
	75,566	118,486	60,764	0	0
Capital financing	Cr 19,232	Cr 79,098	Cr 52,364	0	0
Repayment of internal borrowing	Cr 7,648	Cr 10,824	Cr 8,400	0	0
Balance carried forward	48,686	28,564	0	0	0
<u>Internal borrowing</u>					
Balance brought forward	Cr 5,940	0	0	0	0
Capital financing	Cr 1,708	Cr 10,824	Cr 8,400	0	0
Repaid from new capital receipts	7,648	10,824	8,400	0	0
Balance carried forward	0	0	0	0	0
<u>General Fund</u>					
Balance brought forward	20,000	18,607	18,607	18,607	18,607
Less: capital financing	0	0	0	0	0
Less: use for revenue budget	Cr 1,393	0	0	0	0
Balance carried forward	18,607	18,607	18,607	18,607	18,607
TOTAL AVAILABLE RESERVES	67,293	47,171	18,607	18,607	18,607

The future transfer of land from the General Fund to the HRA does not result in a capital receipt, as the HRA is not a separate legal entity but the effect would be similar in that it would mean that the Council can incur more capital expenditure without needing to borrow. Although the accounting arrangements are 'technical' in order to meet statutory accounting requirements the effective transfer of land has the same impact as generating a capital receipt of an equivalent value and therefore the equivalent value can be used to fund future capital schemes.

Notes/assumptions:

*External borrowing - housing schemes. Given the volatility in interest rates, internal borrowing may be used as an interim measure where suitable. Internal borrowing is also being used to fund Site G until capital receipts pay back.
Capital receipts - includes figures reported by Property Division as shown in Appendix E

Investment Fund	£'000
Revenue Funding:	
Approved by Executive 7th September 2011	10,000
Approved by Council 27th February 2013	16,320
Approved by Council 1st July 2013	20,978
Approved by Executive 10th June 2014	13,792
Approved by Executive 15th October 2014	90
Approved by Executive 26th November 2014 (Transfer to Growth Fund)	Cr 10,000
New Home Bonus (2014/15)	5,040
Approved by Executive 11th February 2015 (New Homes Bonus)	4,400
Approved by Executive 10th June 2015	10,165
Approved by Executive 2nd December 2015 (New Homes Bonus)	141
Approved by Executive 10th Feb 2016 (New Homes Bonus)	7,482
Approved by Executive 6th December 2017	3,500
Approved by Executive 21st May 2018	2,609
	84,517
Capital Funding*:	
Approved by Executive 11th February 2015 (general capital receipts)	15,000
Approved by Executive 2nd December 2015 (sale of Egerton Lodge)	1,216
Approved by Executive 7th November 2017 (Disposal of 72-76 High St)	4,100
	20,316
Total Funding Approved:	104,833
Property Purchase	
Approved by Executive 7th September 2011 (95 High St)	Cr 1,620
Approved by Executive 6th December 2012 (98 High St)	Cr 2,167
Approved by Executive 5th June 2013 (72-76 High St)	Cr 2,888
Approved by Executive 12th June 2013 (104 - 108 High St)	Cr 3,150
Approved by Executive 12th February 2014 (147 - 153 High St)	Cr 18,755
Approved by Executive 19th December 2014 (27 Homesdale)	Cr 3,938
Approved by Executive 24/03/15 (Morrisons)	Cr 8,672
Approved by Executive 15/07/15 (Old Christchurch)	Cr 5,362
Approved by Executive 15/07/15 (Tilgate)	Cr 6,746
Approved by Executive 15/12/15 (Newbury House)	Cr 3,307
Approved by Executive 15/12/15 (Unit G - Hubert Road)	Cr 6,038
Approved by Executive 23/03/16 (British Gas Training Centre, Thatcham)	Cr 3,666
Approved by Executive 15/06/16 (C2 and C3)	Cr 6,394
Approved by Executive 14/03/17 (Trinity House)	Cr 6,236
Approved by Executive 01/12/17 (54 Bridge Street, Peterborough)	Cr 3,930
	Cr 82,869
Other Schemes	
Approved by Executive 20th November 2013 (Queens's Garden)	Cr 990
Approved by Executive 15th January 2014 (Bromley BID Project)	Cr 110
Approved by Executive 26th November 2014 (BCT Development Strategy)	Cr 135
Approved by Executive 2nd December 2015 (Bromley Centre Town)	Cr 270
Approved by Executive 15th June 2016 (Glades Shopping Centre)	Cr 400
Approved by Executive 11th January 2017 (Disposal of Small Halls site, York Rise)	Cr 46
Approved by Executive 10th July 2019 (Modular Homes at York Rise site)	Cr 3,500
Approved by Executive 2nd August 2019 (Provision of Housing in Burnt Ash Lane)	Cr 2,989
Approved by Executive 10/02/21 - property acquisition scheme	Cr 6,000
Valuation for 1 Westmoreland Rd	Cr 5
Valuation for Biggin Hill - West Camp	Cr 10
Growth Fund Study	Cr 170
Crystal Park Development work	Cr 200
Civic Centre for the future	Cr 50
Strategic Property cost	Cr 258
Total further spending approvals	Cr 15,133
Uncommitted Balance on Investment Fund	6,831

* Executive have approved the use of specific and general capital receipts to supplement the Investment Fund

Growth Fund:		£'000
<u>Funding:</u>		
Approved by Executive 26th November 2014 (Transfer from Investment Fund)		10,000
Approved by Executive 2nd December 2015		6,500
Approved by Executive 23rd March 2016		6,000
Approved by Executive 15th June 2016		7,024
Approved by Executive 22nd March 2017		4,000
Subject to approval by Executive 20h June 2017 (Provisional final accounts 2016/17)		3,311
Approved by Executive 21st May 2018		2,319
Total funding approved		39,154
<u>Schemes Approved and Committed</u>		
Approved by Executive 24th March 2015 (Housing Zone Bid (Site G))	Cr	2,700
Approved by Executive 24th March 2015 ((Site G) - Specialist)	Cr	200
Approved by Executive 18th May 2016 (Feasibility Studies and Strategic Employme	Cr	180
Approved by Executive 18th May 2016 (Broadband Infrastructure Investment)	Cr	50
Approved by Executive 20th Jul 2016 (BID - Penge & Beckenham)	Cr	110
Approved by Executive 1st Nov 2016 (19-25 Market Square)	Cr	10,705
Approved by Executive 1st Nov 2016 (63 Walnuts)	Cr	3,804
Approved by Executive 22nd March 2017 (Council 10th April 2017) - Bromley Town Centre Public Realm improvement Scheme	Cr	2,844
Approved by Executive 7th November 2017 - Bromley Town Centre and Public Realm	Cr	464
Approved by Executive 17th October 2018 (Bromley Town Centre - Mirrored Canopies & Shops)	Cr	415
Approved by Executive 22nd March 2017 - Project Officer cost Bromley Town Centre Public Realm improvement Scheme	Cr	40
Approved by Executive 22nd March 2017 - Community Initiative	Cr	15
Approved by Executive 24th May 2017 - Feasibility Works/Property Disposal	Cr	250
Renewal Team Cost	Cr	310
Approved by Executive 28th November 2018 (Housing Development Feasibility)	Cr	100
Approved by Executive 27th March 2019 (West Wickham BID)	Cr	75
Approved by Executive 21st May 2019 (Specialist advice for setting up local Housing company)	Cr	100
Noted by Executive 12th February 2020 - £1.5m of s106 to replace Growth Fund allocation for Bromley Town Centre capital scheme		1,500
Approved by Executive April 1st 2020 - Consultancy services for advice on urban design	Cr	50
scheme	Cr	800
Noted by Executive May 2020 - £2m of s106 to replace Growth Fund allocation for Bromley Town Centre capital scheme		2,000
Approved by Executive 30th June 2021 - £116k for 2 year FTC Planning Officer	Cr	116
Approved by Executive 20th Oct 2021 - Professional Services: Civic Centre Development	Cr	500
Approved by Executive on 9th February 2021 - Operational Maintenance Programme Manager	Cr	65
Approved by Executive on 6th October 2022 - Local Plan review process	Cr	600
Approved by Executive on 20th September 2023 - £2,250k to support supplementary estimate for Churchill Court	Cr	2,250
Approved by Executive on 17th January 2024 - £1,000k transfer to Transformation Fund 2024-2028 earmarked reserve	Cr	1,000
Total further spending approvals	Cr	24,243
<u>Schemes approved, but not yet committed</u>		
Approved by Executive 26th November 2014 (for Biggin Hill and Cray Valley)	Cr	6,790
Reversed by Executive 5th July 2023 (for Biggin Hill and Cray Valley)		6,790
Uncommitted Balance on Growth Fund		14,911

Report No.
ES20224

London Borough of Bromley

PART ONE - PUBLIC

Decision Maker: ENVIRONMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR SUSTAINABILITY, GREEN SERVICES & OPEN SPACES

FOR PRE-DECISION SCRUTINY BY ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE.

Date: 22nd November 2022

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Executive Key

Title: **KELSEY PARK REPLACEMENT BRIDGES (OPTIONS APPRAISAL)**

Contact Officer: David Braybrook, Strategic Commissioning Officer
E-mail: david.braybrook@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Colin Brand, Director of Environment and Public Protection
Email: colin.brand@bromley.gov.uk

Ward: Kelsey & Eden Park

1. Reason for report

This report summarises the progress made sourcing a suitable replacement for the Kelsey Park bridges, outlines the options in light of budgetary constraints and recommends a suitable replacement scheme to be added to the Council's Capital Programme to enable repair works to proceed.

2. RECOMMENDATION(S)

2.1. The Environment and Community Services PDS is asked to review and provide their comments to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces.

2.2. The Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces is asked to:

2.2.1. Note the potential options explored within the existing market to reduce costs.

2.2.2 Approve proceeding with the option to replace Bridge B with a new timber footbridge structure and authorise officers to proceed to procurement for a design and build contract to this purpose.

- 2.2.3 Approve an addition of £567k to the Capital Programme for the replacement of Footbridge B, with £412k to be funded from the Investment Infrastructure Fund and £155k to be funded from the Healthy Bromley Earmarked Reserve.**
- 2.2.4 Agree to delegate authority to the Director of Environment and Public Protection in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces to award contracts for the delivery of the footbridge replacement following the tendering process set out in Sections 4.4 – 4.10.**

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: It is proposed that the replacement structure will be accessible for disabled commuters and satisfy all current requirements of the Equality Act 2010. In addition it will also contain design features to ensure it is to a width to suit all pedestrian types including wheelchair and other mobility users.
-

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy
 2. MBEB Priority: Business and Enterprise
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: £567k one-off costs
 2. Ongoing costs: £15.4k maintenance costs over 10 years
 3. Budget head/performance centre: New capital programme for the Kelsey Park Replacement Bridges scheme.
 4. Total current budget for this head: New scheme
 5. Source of funding: £412k to be funded from the Investment Infrastructure Fund and £155k to be funded from the Healthy Bromley Earmarked Reserve.
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): N/A
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: The proposed procurement requires the approval of the Portfolio Holder. As the value is below threshold a fully regulated procurement is not required but it must comply with legal procurement principles of equity, transparency and non-discrimination.
 2. Call-in: Applicable.
-

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: Subject to agreement to commission the provision a restricted procedure will be used. As the estimated value of the procurement is above £25k it must be advertised on contracts finder and comply with PCR 2015 principles of transparency and equal treatment. If approval is received, the commissioner must take all necessary professional advice, and work closely with Procurement colleagues in agreeing a refined timetable and relevant documentation for going to market.
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): All visitors to Kelsey Park.
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Yes
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: Owing to the lateness of this report, Ward Councillor comments will be gathered at a briefing arranged prior to the date of the committee, and with permission of the chairman, a verbal update will be given to the committee at their meeting.

3. COMMENTARY

Background

- 3.1 Kelsey Park is a large park within Beckenham that serves as an important wildlife habitat but also a community hub with facilities ranging from nature trails through to tennis courts, a café and playground. Its significant footfall demonstrates that it is a valued community facility.
- 3.2 Within the park are two pedestrian timber glulam bridges which both span a shallow body of water which is fed from the River Beck, one of the tributaries of the River Ravensbourne, the locations of which are given in **Appendix A** of this report. Bridge A is located at the north end of the Park, adjacent to the Information Centre. Bridge B is located at the south end of the Park, near to the Stone Avenue Entrance, and is a key route for crossing from one side of the lake to the other. Both bridges are suffering significant decay and have been deemed dangerous to use, so have been closed to the public.
- 3.3. An independent structural assessment was carried out on both footbridges by Colin Toms Partners in December 2021 in order to both ascertain their condition and in turn, determine the most cost effective method of repair, along with identifying the condition of the embankment substates and confirm whether any additional supports, strengthening or replacement of the foundations was required.
- 3.4. The investigations concluded that whilst it may have been possible in theory to repair and strengthen the existing structures, it was considered that the extent of the repairs and the specialist nature of the works that this would entail would be cost prohibitive. Therefore the overall recommendation was made that the two structures should be replaced.

Draft Option Study

- 3.5. The Council undertook an options study for the replacement of the two footbridges to consider the access constraints, substructure requirements, whole life costs and the required construction programme. This has allowed consideration of replacement schemes which demonstrate value for money whilst also considering the buildability and suitability of the options presented. The design of the suitable replacement included both a like for like timber basis and a new galvanised steel structure.
- 3.6. The Council, under the J B Riney contract, instructed Waterman's Infrastructure and Environment Ltd (WIE) to carry out the feasibility study in order to develop restoration proposals that fit the brief in 3.5, whilst also engaging with key stakeholders such as the Environment Agency. The feasibility study was undertaken through the Council's existing contractual arrangements for both major and minor highway works with JB Riney, as outlined previously in report **ES18040**. Spend to date on this contract has been £c36k and was agreed by the Portfolio Holder for Environment to fund out of Earmarked Reserves.
- 3.7. The total estimated cost of both proposals contained within this draft option report presented in August 2022 were higher than initially anticipated. Therefore as agreed by the Environment and Community Services Policy Development Scrutiny Committee at their meeting on 6th September 2022 (report **ES20208**), officers have undertaken a full options appraisal for the proposed works, which included exploring existing options within the market to ensure that any proposed remedial solution provides value for money for the Council. This was considered particularly important given the financial pressures faced by the Council.
- 3.8. This paper outlines the results of this options appraisal and then makes a recommendation for Members consideration based on the results. The options considered have included making use of existing abutments, exploring use of different materials, assessing the market to benchmark costs, and consideration of contingency allowances.

Options Appraisal: Value for Money

Option 1 – Make use of existing Abutments

- 3.9. As part of their brief WIE were informed that the Council wished to install replacement structures wider than those currently present to accommodate all pedestrians and disabled commuters, which would necessitate widening the existing abutments. One option suggested was to instead retain the bridges (and thus the abutments) at the same width, meaning less resurfacing could be required on the approaching pathway and a retaining structure would not be required potentially reducing overall costs.
- 3.10. The Council must have due regard to its public sector equality duty which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation; to advance equality of opportunity and to foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Advice from the Council's Planning, Litigation and Licensing section noted that retaining the structures at the existing width was not anticipated to adversely affect any of these objectives, so long as any disabled pedestrian has the equal opportunity to cross the bridge as those who are not.
- 3.11. However, in order to assess if the existing abutments would be suitable for the loading of a new structure, it would be necessary to undertake extensive investigations including preparation of a full specification and the sourcing of quotes from specialist contractors, which was estimated to cost c£44k. Such costs would then become abortive were it to become apparent that the abutments are not suitable, and a further redesign would then accrue an additional estimated cost of c£22k. Initial investigations had suggested structural concerns about the existing abutments which increases this risk.
- 3.12. Officers have therefore concluded that this option is not suitable, particularly given the high risk of abortive costs and reduced accessibility.

Option 2 – Explore Different Materials

- 3.13. Consideration of materials for the replacement structures other than Timber and Steel have been considered by officers including:
- **Fibre Reinforced Polymer:** This material offer several advantages such as greater durability and lower overall material weight. However, it would have higher upfront capital costs than Timber or Steel, and WIE faced difficulties in sourcing providers that work with this material.
 - **Concrete:** Concrete pedestrian bridges offer considerable versatility in a range of finishes, however have higher upfront capital costs than Timber or Steel and were considered to not be aesthetically in-keeping with the wider park environment.
 - **Timber and Steel Mix:** This option allowed for either undertaking the cheapest option for each bridge (which would be timber for Bridge A and steel for Bridge B), or placing bridges in both locations that are a mix of both materials. However, this would not change the initial capital costs of the bridges and would result in an overall increase in project costs, as it would require multiple contractors (each specialised in only one type of material) on site.
- 3.14. Further exploration of providers of different materials would also constitute a change in the scope of the Option Study for WIE and would increase prices by £c5k. This coupled with the

likelihood that different materials are unlikely to be cheaper than those costs already obtained, has meant that Officers do not recommend pursuing this option.

Option 3 – Assessing the Market

- 3.15. Officers did attempt directly approaching other suppliers of timber and steel bridges to assess whether a cheaper supplier could be found, however accurate costings were not possible without technical drawings. Officers asked WIE to review the market to see if a cheaper supplier could be found, however this would also incur the £5k costs referenced in 3.14 due to a change in the scope of the Option Study. The professional advice of WIE is that owing to the busy current market conditions, such an exercise is highly unlikely to result in reduced costs.
- 3.16. Officers did however undertake a desk based study of similar structures being procured by other local authorities for due diligence purposes. Owing to the particular nature of this site and situation, a direct like for like comparison was difficult, however it did reveal that the prices obtained by WIE are broadly in line with wider market conditions.
- 3.17. Desk based research did also note that there are other consultancies that could offer a similar service for the next phase of works. However as the Council has already procured the option study of these works via WIE, through its existing contractual arrangements with JB Riney, it was felt that it would un-necessarily increase officer time and costs to complete a further tendering exercise to both undertake the next phase of works that may follow and to manage the successful contractor at the construction phase, and is unlikely to result in an overall reduction in cost given the impact of inflation and other adverse market conditions which have occurred after the submission of rates available through the JB Riney contract.
- 3.18. The extra expenditure associated with both the above scenarios with the risk that neither would produce a better value for money option has meant that officers do not recommend pursuing this option.

Option 4 – Reduction in 44% Contingency.

- 3.19. The upfront capital costs provided by WIE as part of the Option Study include a contingency of 44% as recommended per the *HM Treasury Green Book – Central Government Guidance on Appraisal and Evaluation*. These prices have then been further uplifted by a 10% contingency on the client side, in line with best practice used by the Council for capital projects.
- 3.20. Consideration has been given to removing this 44% contingency to attempt to make the quoted prices more manageable. However, the higher levels of contingency are recommended for good reason: there is considerable uncertainty in the market and particular volatility in construction industry as a result of rising material costs. Anecdotal, there is evidence of tenders being priced well in excess of estimated costs. Removing this contingency could leave the Council open to further risk particularly as there are unknowns still to be worked through as a result of ecology, arboricultural and geotechnical surveys planned at the next stage.
- 3.21. Therefore owing to the inherent risks outlined above, officers do not recommend this option.

Remaining Options

3.22. The Options Appraisal for value for money has concluded that there is no recommended way to reduce costs or secure better value for money in the replacement of the Kelsey Park bridges. Following the Options Appraisal it has been concluded that the Council has three remaining options to take this project forward:

1. Proceed with repairing both bridges.

The estimated costs for replacing both Bridge A and Bridge B are set out below.

	Estimated upfront capital costs (inclusive of all fees)	Ongoing maintenance costs (10 years)
Replacement – Timber	£944k	£30.8k
Replacement – Steel	£1001k	£14k

Advantages

- This would be replacement on a like for like basis and full access to all parts of the park would be retained.
- The Council is likely to obtain economies of scale in repairing both bridges at once.

Disadvantages

- This would require a significant and higher capital investment that was initially anticipated.
- A high level of maintenance would be required in order for the bridges to meet their anticipated lifespan.

2. Proceed with the replacement of Bridge B but not Bridge A.

The estimated costs for replacing Bridge B in Timber are set out in the table below.

	Estimated upfront capital costs (inclusive of all fees)	Ongoing maintenance costs (10 years)
Replacement - Timber	£567k	£15.4k

Advantages

- Bridge B is considered to provide greater value in terms of navigating and access through the park, with a more direct route to park amenities such as the playground, café and toilets.

- The route closed off by Bridge A is easier and shorter to navigate than that of Bridge B.
- It will require a reduced capital investment and ongoing maintenance.

Disadvantages

- This leaves footbridge A unrepaired, meaning mobilisation costs would be incurred again should the Council wish to repair at a later date, removing any economies of scale.

3. Do not proceed with the replacement of either bridge.

If the Council decides not to proceed with the replacement of either bridge, there would be costs associated with their permanent removal, which are expected to be considerably less than replacement but which will need to be scoped at a cost of £8k.

Advantages

- Lower capital investment required to remove the bridges.

Disadvantages

- Significant loss of navigation throughout the park, which could lead to increased public scrutiny and complaints impacting upon the Council's reputation overall.
- Further costs (e.g. mobilisation) would be incurred were the Council to wish to replace the bridges at a later date.

- 3.23. Before making recommendations for the first two options, two choices of materials for construction were considered: timber, which would generally have lower upfront capital costs and be more sympathetic with the park environment but have a lower durability, and steel which would have greater durability but generally higher upfront capital costs and require specialist maintenance.

Recommendation

- 3.24. On the basis of a cost/benefit analysis, it is recommended that the Council proceeds with *Option 2* whereby Footbridge B is replaced with a like for like timber structure, as set out in **Appendix A** to this report. Whilst the galvanised steel option has been noted to be a longer term solution with an enhanced design life, this was balanced against its higher initial capital costs, the enhanced maintenance required (i.e. repainting and replacement of waterproofing) and whilst it can be made sustainable through the use of recycled materials, it was felt to not be as aesthetically in-keeping with both the wider Park environment and stakeholder (including the Council's planning and conservation section) preferences.
- 3.25. The option study has identified a number of arboricultural constraints including groups of trees and dense vegetation within the vicinity of the footbridge that will be impacted by the construction. Members should therefore note that the final design of the replacement

structure will be heavily influenced by the need to retain and protect as many trees as possible.

4. PROCUREMENT AND PROJECT TIMESCALES AND GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

Preliminary Design and Preparation of Design and Tender Documents

- 4.1. If the recommendations in this report are agreed, WIE shall proceed with the preliminary design of the chosen option, which shall include intensive ground investigations, further ecological and arboricultural surveys and preliminary designs of the abutments. This is estimated to take 3 months to complete pending the appointment of a ground investigation contractor following a competitive tender process conducted by WIE.
- 4.2. Upon acceptance of the preliminary design, WIE would support the procurement of a Design and Build Contract with a Principal Contractor, the procurement process for which is outlined in Paragraphs 4.4 – 4.11 of this report. Once appointed it is anticipated that WIE will project manage the appointed contractor including fully approving the design of both the super and substructure options, and management of project logistics on site.
- 4.3. The total estimated cost of the above process is £145k which comes in addition to £36k already spent on the option study. These fees are included in the capital costs set out in paragraph 3.22.

Detailed Design and Construction

- 4.4. It is envisaged that the works for a Design and Build contract shall be put out to a two stage competitive restrictive tender process as per the Council's Contract Procedure Rules with a tender evaluation based upon 60% cost vs 40% quality. It is recommended that authority is delegated to the Director of Environment and Public Protection to award contracts for the construction of the footbridges in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces once the tendering process has completed, to expedite delivery.
- 4.5. **Estimated Value of Proposed Action:** The total pre-tender estimated cost of the proposal outlined above is currently £422k.
- 4.6. **Other Associated Costs:** A whole life costing maintenance plan shows an indicative maintenance cost of £c15.4k for the first 10 years. This will need to be managed through managing through existing operational maintenance budgets.
- 4.7. The estimated lifespan of the replacement bridge is 40 years before replacement or major refurbishment would need to take place, were the maintenance plan outlined in 4.6. to be implemented.
- 4.8. **Governance:** The successful contractor of any affordable tender will be overseen and managed by WIE, and will report progress to the Strategic Commissioning Officer who will monitor the delivery of the project on client side.
- 4.9. **Proposed Contract Period:** It is envisaged that proposed contract period for the construction will take around 8 months, subject to the tendered submissions.

Timetable

4.10. An indicative timetable below sets out a 'roadmap' for the repair of the bridges. These times are indicative and subject to any unforeseen circumstances that may arise on site such as the requirement for additional works. Where possible the Council will look to run elements of the timetable concurrently to reduce the overall time taken.

Stage	Details	Time Period	Completion Date
Option Study	Completion and publication of Option Study surveys (Ecology, Topography and Arboriculture). Full final draft of Option Study.	1 month	Sep-22
Review of Option Study and Committee Paper	Completion and publication of Option Study (including Ecology, Topography and Arboriculture) Presentation of recommended option at Environment and Community Services PDS Committee for approval by the Council's democratic purposes.	2 months	Nov-22
	Decision made by LBB and instruction to to WIE for next stage. Fee Proposals.	1 Month	Dec 22
Preliminary Design	Intrusive ground investigations, ecology and arboricultural surveys Preliminary design of Footbridge Abutments, Outline AIP	3 months	Jan - Mar 23
Procurement of a Principal Contractor	Preparation of tender documents, Identify tenderer lists, CDM Pre-construction information, Bill of Quantities/Activity Schedules, Specifications	2 months	Apr - May 23
Tender Period, Evaluation and Appointment of a Contractor	Project live on Portal, Receipt of tenders, review of tenders, Tender Queries, Evaluation and recommendation, Internal authorisation and Standstill Period, Contract Award	5 months	Jun – Oct 23
Detailed Design	Approval of AIP (Cat 1)	1 month	Nov 23
	Full design and check of the superstructure chosen option by the appointed Contractor	2 months	Dec 23 - Jan 24

	Full design and check of substructures (abutments, retaining walls) by WIE	1 month	Feb 24
Construction	Mobilisation period Fabrication of Footbridge Construction on Site	5 Months	Mar - Jul 24

5. MARKET CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1. **Preliminary Design and Preparation of Tender Documents:** As the current provider, having carried out the Option study brief to date, there is a clear rationale to instruct WIE to provide these works as they have the project background and on-site experience to effectively deliver. These works will be undertaken by WIE through the Council's existing contractual arrangements with JB Riney.
- 5.2. **Construction:** The proposed two-stage tender process is to ensure that the process attracts specialist bridge contractors, along with ensuring that they have the relevant civil works skillsets that will be required for any work required to embankments. The market for this work is noted to be large, although there is a limited market for the supply of the bridges themselves.
- 5.3. The 44% contingency has been retained within the quoted construction costs due to inherent risks as outlined in Section 3.20.

6. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

- 6.1. Officers have clarified consent requirements with the Council's Planning, Building Control and Conservation divisions. Any necessary consent as they may advise is required will be sought.
- 6.2. Advice has been sought from the Environment Agency (EA) on the design, who have advised that as the proposed works will be taking place on and near the River Beck, a river considered to be a 'main river' category, and that they fall under EA regulated Flood Activities, a permit is required. Such a permit will be applied for and/or impact assessments undertaken as they advise.
- 6.3. Initial observations collected by Members from The Friends of Kelsey Park (a key stakeholder in the ongoing conservation and protection of the park) were fed into the brief for the option study.

7. SOCIAL VALUE, CARBON REDUCTION AND LOCAL NATIONAL PRIORITIES.

- 7.1 Kelsey Park is a formal public park within Beckenham that historically formed part of the Kelsey Manor Estate. It is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), so both the bridge design and its manner of construction will give due weight to its impact on the parks value for biodiversity including ensuring that the proposed replacement structures do not increase flood risk and that birds and bats are not disturbed during the nesting/breeding season by any on site activity.
- 7.2. The footbridge is located within Locally Designated Site 'River Beck' which includes Langley Park Nature Reserve and the Harvington Estate Woodland. Although this is primarily intended for habitats north and south of the footbridge location, if required an assessment will be undertaken to ensure that there is no detrimental impact on the Designated Site and the features that it is designated for, with the appropriate protection measures put in place.

- 7.3. The Park is adjacent to the Manor Way Conservation area, and the proposed design will give due consideration to ensuring that the replacement is sympathetic to the surrounding areas character and appearance. All timber used is to be Forest Stewardship Council Certified.

8. IMPACT ON VULNERABLE ADULTS AND CHILDREN

- 8.1. Any proposed design will ensure that all current requirements of the Equality Act 2010 are satisfied. This includes the widening of the replacement structure so that it suits all commuter types including pedestrians, runners and walkers, and that it allows wheelchair and mobility users to pass one another comfortably. The design will also contain non-slip decking.

9. TRANSFORMATION/POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1. The '*Making Bromley Even Better*' objective of 'Business and Enterprise' refers to the Council's intentions to ensure that it progresses with its vision to build upon the borough's heritage so it continues to represent the best of town and country.
- 9.2. An improvement plan for Kelsey Park is an Action Point under Strategic Objective 2 within the Council's *Open Space Strategy 2021-2031*, through which it aims to develop proposals for the park to reflect its uniqueness, history and horticulture.

10. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 The report sets out a scheme for the replacement of Footbridge B in Kelsey Park, with a similar timber structure. A request is being made to make an addition to the Capital Programme to fund this option.
- 10.2. The total cost of the scheme outlined in 10.1 is £567k, inclusive of contingency and all fees. £412k of this is to be funded from the Investment Infrastructure Fund and £155k is to be funded from the Healthy Bromley Earmarked Reserve.
- 10.3. Officers estimate maintenance costs to be £15.4k over 10 years, which will need to be managed through existing operational maintenance budgets.
- 10.4. In the event that the project costs exceed the funding available, officers will seek to absorb these in existing revenue budgets or report back to members and set out options to complete the scheme within the existing total budget or identify further funding.

11. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1. This report requests the Environment and Community Services PDS to review and provide their comments on the contents herein to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces. It further requests the PH to authorise officers to proceed to a design and build contract for the bridge replacement, approve an addition of £567k to the Capital Programme, and agree to delegate authority to the Director of Environment and Public Protection in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability, Green Services and Open Spaces to award contracts for the delivery of the footbridge replacement following the tendering process. As the proposed procurement is between £500k and £999,999 then, under the Council's Contract Procedure Rules, the approval of the PH is required as requested by this report.

- 11.2 The Council has the legal power to acquire and maintain parks and open spaces under the Public Health Act 1875 and the Open Spaces Act 1906. As the bridges in Kelsey Park are owned by the Council then it is responsible for their repair and maintenance.
- 11.3 The proposed bridge repairs contract is a public works contract within the meaning of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 but as the value is below threshold (i.e. below £ 5,336,937) then a fully regulated procurement is not required. However the procurement must still comply with the legal procurement principles of equality, transparency and non-discrimination which must be applied in a manner proportionate to the subject matter and context of the purchase. The report explains the way in which the market is to be engaged which appears to be consistent with these principles.

12. PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 This report outlines a potential route for approval for procurement of a contract for the delivery of a pedestrian timber glulam bridge in replacement of the current structure at Kelsey Park in Beckenham following an independent structural assessment which recommended that it should be replaced. The current total cost of the actual works for construction to be procured is £422k and this excludes the £145k being spent at 4.3 above. The actual construction, if approval is granted, is estimated to take up to five months towards the end of 2024 (4.12 above refers).
- 12.2 Subject to agreement to commission the provision, a restricted procedure process will be used and a high level timetable is at 4.12 above.
- 12.3 This would be a works contract. The procurement is well below the threshold for works contract where it would be deemed to be likely to be of cross border interest. There is no direct indication of cross border interest so this opportunity does not need to be advertised on Find A Tender Service (FTS). As this contract will be advertised and will be above £25k, it must be advertised on Contracts Finder. The procurement must comply with the PCR 2015 principles of transparency and equal treatment.
- 12.4 The Council's specific requirements for authorising proceeding to procurement are covered in Rules 1 and 5 of the Contract Procedure Rules with the need to obtain the formal approval of the Portfolio Holder following Agreement of the Assistant Director Governance & Contracts, the Director of Corporate Services and the Director of Finance for a procurement of this value. In accordance with CPR 2.1.2, Officers must take all necessary professional advice.
- 12.5 If approval is received, the Commissioner will need to work closely with Procurement colleagues in agreeing a refined timetable and relevant documentation for going to market.
- 12.6 In compliance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules (Rule 3.6.1), this procurement must be carried out using the Council's e-procurement system.
- 12.7 The actions identified in this report are provided for within the Council's Contract Procedure Rules, and the proposed actions can be completed in compliance with their content.

13. STRATEGIC PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 13.1 Kelsey Park is a Council owned asset and therefore maintenance and repairing liability sits with the Council. This report sets out the proposal to replace the Kelsey Park bridges as the existing structures are no longer in an acceptable or maintainable condition.

13.2 This project has also commissioned a maintenance plan which currently identifies £15,400 of recommended maintenance activity over a ten year period following the completion of the planned works to be funded from the council's Operational Maintenance Budgets which funds maintenance of built assets across the council's operational estate. This budget allocation must be prioritised to manage statutory compliance and essential or urgent repairs. The allocation for the planned programme includes only the very highest priority schemes and is sometimes reallocated to deal with any in year emergencies. Therefore, members should note that the future maintenance activity identified in the maintenance plan cannot be guaranteed from this budget allocation; it would be considered in the context of the other maintenance needs from within the rest of the Council's operational estate.

Non-Applicable Sections:	IT and GDPR Considerations, Personnel Considerations.
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	Report ES18040: Award of Contract for Highway Maintenance Report ES20208: Kelsey Park Replacement Bridges

This page is left intentionally blank

Appendix A: Kelsey Park Replacement Bridges (Options Appraisal)

Location of Existing Bridges



Description of Existing Structures

Footbridge A

Footbridge A provides pedestrian access across a shallow stream and is located at the north end of the large lake in the park. The footbridge is approximately 9.7m long and 1.9m wide.



Footbridge B

Footbridge B provides access across the southern section of the Lake in Kelsey Park. It is approximately 17.6m long and 2m wide.



Description of the proposed replacement

Committee Report ES20224 recommends that the Council proceeds with *Option 2* presented within whereby Footbridge B is replaced with a like for like timber structure. This solution would be an all-timber footbridge with the design features that include:

- Ekki hardwood dowel laminated beams
- The footbridges to be cambered on a continuous vertical curve.
- A deck composed of Ekki deck planks treated with a non-slip system called Hi-Grip Excel (two strips of resin/bauxite inserted into grooves of deck).
- Parapets with a height of 1.4m also made of timber Ekki with vertical infill spindles.
- All timber to be hardwood and with natural finishes.
- A similar feature of natural wood as the current footbridge.

CTS Bridges was the specialist proprietary bridge superstructure fabricator and supplier for indicative prices for the work using their experience of similar constructions (<http://www.ctsbridges.co.uk>)

An example of a similar bridge is shown in the below image, however please note that there is no specific requirement for aesthetics within this project.

