



LLANHARAN COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Trens and Ewenni Crossings Project Committee (TEC) held by remote attendance at 7.00pm on Thursday 2nd April 2026

The meeting was held in accordance with:
The Local Government and Elections (Wales) Act 2021

Present:

Councillors Chris Parker (Chair), Janine Turner, Rhys Jenkins, Mark Steer, Neil Feist, Robert Smith, Nick Richards, Andrew Morgan.

Apologies: None.

Absent: Cllrs David Evans, Will Thomas.

Burroughs Project Manager: Ryan James.

Members of the public: 1

Clerk to the Council: Leigh Smith.

TEC2026/012 Welcome and Apologies

The Chair welcomed all attendees.

TEC2026/013 disclosures of personal and/or prejudicial interests from members in accordance with the Code of Conduct.

Cllr Neil Feist declared a general personal interest being a member of Cycling UK.



TEC2026/014 Minutes of TEC Committee meeting 12th February 2026

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the TEC Committee meeting held on 12th February 2026 as a true and accurate record.

TEC2026/015 Public Speaking

A member of the public spoke on agenda item 11.

TEC2026/016 Correspondence

Noted.

TEC2026/017 TEC Committee Action Plan

Noted.

TEC2026/018 Reports or recommendations from the Trenos Crossing and Ewenny Bridge Working Group

None.

TEC2026/019 'Project Status Tracker, Budget Tracker and Risk Register for the project.

Current budget tracker noted. Project tracker and updated risk register not provided.

TEC2026/020 To note a written motion submitted by a member to the CIL Committee in relation to a proposed increase in CIL funding for the project.

Noted.



TEC2026/021 To note 'decisions made tracker' and 'decisions required. Log' and to consider the decisions required

Noted. Decision required referred to in TEC2026/022

**TEC2026/022 To consider the procurement strategy for the project.
*RESOLVED***

To adopt the following procurement strategy following the recommendations of Burroughs.

Works Packaging: Single works package

Procurement Route: Two-stage Design and Build

Tendering Procedure: Open Procedure

Pricing Mechanism: Two-stage approach with initial fixed price for bridge structure, followed by agreement of final contract price post - PCSA

Form of Contract: Pre-Construction Services Agreement followed by NEC4 Engineering and Construction Contract (Option A or Option C to be confirmed).

TEC2026/023 Next Steps

Noted. For a future meeting to consider aspects of the council's existing decision-making matrix and other factors to be included in a future tender and for the Council to decide on the appropriate mechanism to issue a tender in consultation with Burroughs.

TEC2026/024 Urgent Information or Suggestions for Future Agenda Items

None.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.10pm

Date of next scheduled meeting: 5th May 2026

Councillor Chris Parker

Chair of the Trens and Ewenni Crossings Project Committee



LLANHARAN COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Trenos and Ewenni Crossings Project Committee (TEC) held by remote attendance at 7.00pm on Thursday 12th February 2026

The meeting was held in accordance with:
The Local Government and Elections (Wales) Act 2021

Present:

Councillors Chris Parker (Chair), Janine Turner, Rhys Jenkins, Mark Steer, Neil Feist, Robert Smith, Nick Richards, Andrew Morgan.

Apologies: None.

Absent: Cllrs David Evans, Will Thomas.

Burroughs Project Manager: Ryan James.

Members of the public: None.

Clerk to the Council: Leigh Smith.

TEC2026/001 Welcome and Apologies

The Chair welcomed all attendees.

TEC2026/002 disclosures of personal and/or prejudicial interests from members in accordance with the Code of Conduct.

Cllr Neil Feist declared a general personal interest being a member of Cycling UK.



TEC2026/003 Minutes of TEC Committee meeting 27th November 2025

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the TEC Committee meeting held on 27th November 2025 as a true and accurate record.

TEC2026/004 Public Speaking

None.

TEC2026/005 Correspondence

Noted.

TEC2026/006 TEC Committee Action Plan

Noted.

TEC2026/007 Reports or recommendations from the Trenos Crossing and Ewenny Bridge Working Group

None.

TEC2026/008 'Decisions made tracker' and 'decisions required. Log' and to consider the decisions required.

Noted

TEC2026/009 Risk Register

Noted.

TEC2026/010 Quotations for initial ecological works



RESOLVED

To select the quotation from 'Soltys Brewster' for initial ecology work given that this is the recommendation of Burroughs, the quotation and specification providing the best balance of cost vs scope, including key baseline work required without committing to a bigger upfront package. To authorise the officers to spend up to £2,880 accordingly.

TEC2026/011 Urgent Information or Suggestions for Future Agenda Items

Burroughs will provide a quotation for a cost uplift to include the paths to the north and south of the bridges into their scope of works. This will be considered at a future meeting.

Burroughs report that RCTCBC planning have stated that a full planning application will be required for the project.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8pm

Date of next scheduled meeting: 12th March 2026

Councillor Chris Parker

Chair of the Trenos and Ewenni Crossings Project Committee

From: [Leigh Smith, The Clerk, Llanharan Community Council](#)
To: [Trenos Crossing and Ewenny Bridge Working Group](#)
Subject: Additional consultancy fees to incorporate paths into the project. FW: 51312 | LCC Ewenny MUB | Information
Date: 01 April 2026 14:40:00
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[51312-BUR-XX-XX-T-X-90401-P02.pdf](#)
[image008.png](#)

Members of the Trenos and Ewenny Bridge Working Group,

Burroughs have quoted an additional £2,472 to incorporate their extra work involved with the addition of the paths to the north and south of the bridges to the project.

x. 106 ADDITIONAL SCOPE - Inclusion of connecting footways			
x.106.	001	Project Familiarisation and Site Visit <i>Reviewing provided information and undertaking a site visit with the Client to understand the scope and extent of works.</i>	£ 475.75
x.106.	002	Supporting Sketches <i>Allowance to create supporting sketches to be created to assist with Stakeholder Engagement</i>	£ 969.38
x.106.	003	Stakeholder Engagement and Meetings <i>Additional time to ensure adequate stakeholder engagement and Client support is provided.</i>	£ 258.50
x.106.	004	Additional Scope Writing <i>Additional time to include footpaths into tender scope.</i>	£ 768.63
			£ 2,472.25

This is a no-brainer for me (and also essential) and so if there are no objections I intend to agree to this under delegated authority. (This falling within the terms of the delegation).

If there is any dissent to this, could you please let me know by close of play Friday.

Feel free to give me a call to discuss if you wish.

Regards

Leigh Smith
Clerk to the Council.
Llanharan Community Council
Clerk@llanharan-cc.gov.wales
project@llanharan-cc.gov.wales
www.llanharan-cc.gov.wales
Tel: 01443 231430 / 07769 266675

Mae'r neges ar gyfer y person / pobl enwedig yn unig. Gall gynnwys gwybodaeth bersonol, sensitif neu gyfrinachol. Os nad chi yw'r person a enwyd (neu os nad oes gyda chi'r awdurdod i'w derbyn ar ran y person a enwyd) chewch chi ddim ei chopio neu'i defnyddio, neu'i datgelu i berson arall. Os ydych chi wedi derbyn y neges ar gam, rhowch wybod i'r sawl sy wedi anfon y neges ar unwaith. Mae'n bosibl y bydd holl negeseuon yn cael eu cofnodi a/neu fonitro unol â'r ddeddfwriaeth berthnasol.
llanharan-cc.gov.uk

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain personal, sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or use it or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately. All traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.
llanharan-cc.gov.uk

From: Ryan James <ryan.james@burroughs.co.uk>
Sent: 30 March 2026 09:29
To: Leigh Smith, The Clerk, Llanharan Community Council <project@llanharan-cc.gov.wales>; Tanisha Aburieki <Tanisha.Aburieki@burroughs.co.uk>
Cc: Chris <chris.parker@llanharan-cc.gov.wales>
Subject: Re: 51312 | LCC Ewenny MUB | Information

Hi Leigh,

Please find attached updated Decisions REQUIRED and MADE tracking logs updated as suggested.

I also attach our fee for the inclusion of the footways within our scope. This is predominantly additional time to write into tender documents, additional stakeholder engagement and sketch creation to support LCC with stakeholders as discussed.

Hopefully the attached is acceptable but happy to discuss should you need to.

Kind regards

Ryan

Ryan James
BSc (Hons) | Eng MICE MAPM NECR Reg
Senior Project Manager

BURROUGHS

From: Leigh Smith. The Clerk. Llanharan Community Council <project@llanharan-cc.gov.wales>
Sent: 29 March 2026 19:35
To: Ryan James <ryan.james@burroughs.co.uk>; Tanisha Aburieki <Tanisha.Aburieki@burroughs.co.uk>
Cc: Chris <chris.parker@llanharan-cc.gov.wales>
Subject: RE: 51312 | LCC Ewenny MUB | Information

Hi Ryan/Tanisha,

- Just a reminder that we need an updated decision Made log and decisions required log please ASAP for our meeting on Thursday 2nd April (Invite to be sent in due course).
- Now that we have the budget plan (Excluding the paths for the moment) could I also ask for a project plan/tracker (Gantt), although I m not expecting this by Thursday, I appreciate you might need guidance on the procurement strategy (eg Design and build) first.
- We will have on the agenda to decide upon the procurement strategy for the project (eg Design and build / design/bid – build etc... etc.), could you please provide a paper giving your recommendation and the pros and cons of both approaches, and why you recommend D&B please?

I have attached an AI dump as a starting point. Noting that we are now assuming that all 3 paths (Northern path , connecting path and southern path) are included. (I appreciate that some of the options would be excluded, I have not looked in detail, I just wanted to suggest a template and give a starting point for the document).

As ever with these things if some of the documentation will not be ready in time please let me know and we can run with what we have. I would rather a second meeting in a few weeks if necessary if you need more time to develop some of the documents. (I will need the decision made and required logs though pls).

Best regards

Leigh Smith
Clerk to the Council.
Llanharan Community Council
Clerk@llanharan-cc.gov.wales
project@llanharan-cc.gov.wales
www.llanharan-cc.gov.wales
Tel: 01443 231430 / 07769 266675

Mae'r neges ar gyfer y person / pobl enwedig yn unig. Gall gynnwys gwybodaeth bersonol, sensitif neu gyfrinachol. Os nad chi yw'r person a enwyd (neu os nad oes gyda chi'r awdurdod i'w derbyn ar ran y person a enwyd) chewch chi ddim ei chopio neu'i defnyddio, neu'i datgelu i berson arall. Os ydych chi wedi derbyn y neges ar gam, rhowch wybod i'r sawl sy wedi anfon y neges ar unwaith. Mae'n bosibl y bydd holl negeseuon yn cael eu cofnodi a/neu fonitro unol â'r ddeddfwriaeth berthnasol.
llanharan-cc.gov.uk

This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain personal, sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or use it or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately. All traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.
llanharan-cc.gov.uk

From: Leigh Smith. The Clerk. Llanharan Community Council <project@llanharan-cc.gov.wales>
Sent: 22 March 2026 16:49
To: Ryan James <ryan.james@burroughs.co.uk>; Tanisha Aburieki <Tanisha.Aburieki@burroughs.co.uk>
Cc: Chris <chris.parker@llanharan-cc.gov.wales>
Subject: Re: 51312 | LCC Ewenny MUB | Information

Hi Ryan,

No problem.

Regarding the decisions required log, A1-A4 have already been addressed, can these be removed and transferred to the decisions made log please?

Will you now be in a position to also provide the budget plan and gannt project plan at this stage?

Catch up next week.

Best regards



Llanharan Community Council - TEC Action Plan at 16th March 2026

Action no	Date added	Category	From	Action	Notes	Status	Owner
TEC2025/202b)	27.6.2025	TEC	TEC	TEC2025/020 Parameters (scope) and process to be used in the procurement process to obtain a project manager for the project. b) RESOLVED To form a task and finish working group to assess and score the tenders, following the closing of the deadline and the opening of the tenders in line with the Council's Financial Regulations. The working group to make a recommendation to the TEC Committee on whom to award the tender. The members of the working group to comprise Cllrs Claire Morgan, Robert Smith, Chris Parker and the Clerk.	To be actioned once tender mailbox opened. Completed.	Completed	LS
2025/319a)	19/12/2025	Full Council	TEC	2025/319 Resolutions and recommendations of the Trenos and Ewenni Crossings Project (TEC) Committee held on 27th November 2025 TEC2025/037 Scheme of Delegation for the Ewenny Bridge Project RESOLVED To adopt the scheme of delegation as presented in Appendix 3 to the meeting subject to the following alteration: That the value of £2,500 be replaced with the value £4,000 in the line, "The decision does not incur or commit expenditure likely to exceed £2,500(exclusive of VAT, if applicable)"	Amend scheme wording.	Completed	LS
2025/319b)	19/12/2025	Full Council	TEC	2025/319 Resolutions and recommendations of the Trenos and Ewenni Crossings Project (TEC) Committee held on 27th November 2025 TEC2025/039 'Decisions made tracker' and 'decisions required. Log' and to consider the decisions required. A1) RESOLVED To instruct Burroughs that the Council wishes to submit a planning LDC (Lawful Development Certificate) application and to obtain 3 prices from suitable planning consultants from which the Council will select, in order to facilitate the application.	Contact Burroughs. Seek planning consultancy quotations. Burroughs informed, awaiting quotes. EDIT: Burroughs have completed the LDC application in-house and it has been submitted	Completed	LS
2025/319c)	19/12/2025	Full Council	TEC	2025/319 Resolutions and recommendations of the Trenos and Ewenni Crossings Project (TEC) Committee held on 27th November 2025 A3) RESOLVED To indicate consent for Burroughs to engage directly with the LPA, NRW and DCWW as well as the Wildlife Trust of South and West Wales and those other groups and organisations explicitly mentioned in the tender pack or in subsequent correspondence.	Communicate this to Burroughs	Completed	LS
2025/319d)	19/12/2025	Full Council	TEC	2025/319 Resolutions and recommendations of the Trenos and Ewenni Crossings Project (TEC) Committee held on 27th November 2025 A4) RESOLVED To consent to Burroughs seeking 3 quotations for the undertaking of an ecology survey to the wider area surrounding the project including the bridge, paths and potential contractor accesses. The Council to select a vendor in due course.	Inform Burroughs. Await quotations. Quotations recieved, on agenda of Feb 26 meeting.	Completed	LS

2025/319e)	19/12/2025	Full Council	TEC	<p>2025/319 Resolutions and recommendations of the Trenos and Ewenni Crossings Project (TEC) Committee held on 27th November 2025 TEC2025/040 Route of the accessible paths to the North and South of the bridges.</p> <p>A2) i) RESOLVED</p> <p>For the proposed route of the accessible multiuser path to the South of the Trenos railway crossing bridge to run from Bryncae Community Centre Carpark to the Trenos railway crossing bridge. (Shown as the 'Yellow route' on the access audit plan). The full route, north to south to be both wheelchair friendly and Bridleway specification along its length insofar as is possible.</p> <p>A2)ii) RESOLVED</p> <p>For the proposed route of the accessible multiuser path to the north of the Ewenny bridge to run from the northern end of the bridge up to the 'crossroads' in Brynna woods (shown as the 'orange route' on the access audit plan) and then to continue to the western exit to the woods at 'The Green' (Eco-houses) (shown as the left hand fork of the 'red route' on the access audit plan). The full route, north to south to be both wheelchair friendly and Bridleway specification along its length insofar as is possible.</p>	Instruct contractors accordingly. Burroughs informed.	Completed	LS
TEC2026/010	13/02/2026	TEC	TEC	<p>TEC2026/010 Quotations for initial ecological works</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To select the quotation from 'Soltys Brewster' for initial ecology work given that this is the recommendation of Burroughs, the quotation and specification providing the best balance of cost vs scope, including key baseline work required without committing to a bigger upfront package. To authorise the officers to spend up to £2,880 accordingly.</p>	Burroughs informed - Feb 26	Completed	LS
		TEC	TEC	Note: Check also the Decisions made and decisions required trackers			

51312-00 - Ewenni Multi-User Bridge Replacement						
Activity Description	Unit	Approx Quants	Rate	Total	Ref	Comment
Indicative Cost Plan						
<u>Phase 1 - Data Gathering and Design</u>						
1	Topographical Survey			£ 2,500.00		
2	Ground Investigation (via bore hole)			£ 20,000.00		
3	AIP			£ 13,000.00		
4	Foundation Design			£ 12,000.00		
5	Full Bridge Design			£ 10,000.00		
6	Design & Check Certificate			£ 8,000.00		
7	Temporary Works Design			£ 15,000.00		
8	<i>Sub-Total</i>			<u>£ 80,500.00</u>		
<u>Phase 2 – Consents</u>						
9	NRW Consent (including drawings, form completion and application fees)			£ 15,000.00		
10	<i>Sub-Total</i>			<u>£ 15,000.00</u>		
<u>Phase 3 – Manufacture</u>						
11	Manufacture of 20m x 3.5m bridge			£ 140,000.00		
	<i>Sub-Total</i>			<u>£ 140,000.00</u>		
<u>Phase 4 – Construction</u>						
12	Project Management			£ 25,000.00		
13	Temporary Works on Site			£ 20,000.00		
14	Remove existing bridge			£ 10,000.00		
15	Construction of Foundations			£ 75,000.00		
16	Transport			£ 10,000.00		
17	Bridge Installation			£ 20,000.00		
18	<i>Sub-Total</i>			<u>£ 160,000.00</u>		
19	Total Indicative Cost Plan			£ 395,500.00		
<u>Assumptions / Caveats to Indicative Cost Plan</u>						
20	This cost plan is indicative only and is based on a budget estimate / informal early contractor input received from Beaver Bridges following a site					
21	The estimate has been prepared based on the information available at the time and is subject to change as the design, scope and constraints are developed.					
22	The fee is based on a 42 week programme broken down as below: - 8 weeks for Design - 15 weeks for Consenting / Planning - 12 weeks for bridge manufacture - 6 weeks for on site works					
23	The allowance is understood to relate primarily to the bridge structure and associated installation, based on the early discussions held on site.					
24	The estimate assumes that the full extent of the wider scheme has not yet been defined (due to when this was prepared), particularly in relation to path improvements and associated civils.					
25	The estimate assumes site access is achievable using the routes discussed at the time of the site meeting.					
26	It excludes costs associated with public interface management / traffic management.					
27	The estimate assumes no abnormal ecological mitigation, seasonal restrictions or protected species licensing requirements beyond what is known at this stage.					
28	It excludes abnormal tree works, tree protection measures, arboricultural supervision, replacement planting and mitigation arising from access or installation requirements.					
29	The estimate assumes the scheme can obtain the necessary permissions and approvals without material redesign or onerous conditions.					
30	The estimate assumes there are no major utility diversions or protection works beyond normal good practice.					
31	The estimate excludes contractor risk pricing that may arise through a formal tender process once scope and risk allocation are defined.					
32	Tender inflation, market testing and supply chain availability have not been formally assessed.					
33	Formal procurement may return prices materially different from this initial budget indication.					



LLANHARAN COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Written Motion Submission Form

To be completed by Councillors wishing to submit a written motion in accordance with Standing Order 23

- Motions must require the Council/Committee to consider some specific course of action that is relevant to the powers and duties of the Council or some important local matter to the satisfaction of the Proper Officer
- Motions requesting a discussion or to provide information on a topic would not normally be accepted for inclusion onto an agenda unless relating to a matter of significant local importance or interest.

Section 1:

Councillor Details – Proposer

Name: Chris Parker

Email Address: chris.parker@llanharan-cc.gov.wale

Section 2: - Name of Committee to whom motion is submitted, or Full Council. (Under normal circumstances any matter that should be dealt with by a Committee can only appear on the agenda for full council if approval is given by the Committee chair. The Clerk reserves the right to refer the matter to the appropriate Committee where necessary)

CIL Committee

Section 3: Motion Details

Title of Motion:

To increase the earmarked funds for the Trenos, Ewenni Crossing Project from £275000 to £600,000 **CLERK'S NOTE** *On 24/3/2026 following a conversation with Cllr Parker, after having received Burrough's partial budget forecast, Cllr Parker requested that his written motion be amended to propose an increase from £275,000 to £600,000 and not the £450,000 originally submitted in the motion. Therefore the figure £450,000 has been replaced with £600,000 throughout the document.*

Date of Submission: 24/01/26 amended to reflect increase to £600,000 24/3/26

Meeting Date for Consideration: Next CIL Meeting

Section 3: Motion Text

Please write the full text of your proposed motion below. Ensure clarity and specificity. Members can **ONLY** consider matters included in the motion. If a cost is involved, you should state a figure/ceiling cost for members to consider or clause for the officers to carry out research to ascertain approximate costs to be considered at a later date.

To increase the earmarked funds for the Trenos and Ewenni Crossing Project from £275000 to £600,000

Section 4: Rationale

Provide a brief explanation of the purpose and intended outcome of the motion.

See text in red, above. Budget plan submitted by Burroughs estimating costs for the Bridge alone of £400,000. Cllr Parker estimates a further £50,000 for connecting path between the bridges, £100,000 for development of the northern and southern pathways and a £50,000 contingency.

The increase in funding is also required to meet the cost of the following decision by the TEC Committee that defines the northern and southern access routes.

- **The southern route:**
 - *to be from a point adjacent to the entrance of Bryncae Community Centre Park to the Trenos crossing railway bridge, the length of which is approximately 425 metres crossing land owned by Persimmon Homes and other unknown parties.*
 - *The route is to be constructed to meet both bridleway and multiuser (including wheelchair users) standards as outlined in the Access Audit report that was commissioned by the Council.*
 - *The estimated cost is £75000, the estimate being based on previous bridleway works adjusted for inflation and the requirements for multiuser access*

- **The northern route:**
 - *from the northern end of the Ewenni River bridge to the junction with Bridleway 40 and then west along Bridleway 40 to its exit into The Green, Brynna, the length of which is approximately 325 metres.*
 - *the route crosses land under the ownership of the South West Wales Wild Life Trust.*
 - *The construction of route is to be upgraded where appropriate to meet both bridleway and multiuser (including wheelchair users) standards as outlined in the Access Audit report that was commissioned by the Council.*
 - *The estimated cost is £25000, the estimate being based on previous bridleway works adjusted for inflation and the requirements for multiuser access.*
 - *The remaining £100,000 is requested to cover further contingencies against the cost of manufacture of the Ewenni bridge, the associated civils works concern with the bridge's installation and the construction of the access route between the river bridge and railway bridge that meets where practical and possible both bridleway and multiuser (including wheelchair users) standards as outlined in the Access Audit report that was commissioned by the Council.*

Section 5: Supporting Documents (You should provide these documents and they should include all of the information that you wish members to consider as part of your motion. These can be provided as papers to support the motion)

Section 6: Signature

I confirm that this motion complies with the requirements of Llanharan Community Council's Standing Orders, including submission deadlines and content standards.

Signature (proposer):



Date: 24th January

2026 Resubmitted with amendments 24th

March 2026



Submission Notes

The decision of the Proper Officer as to whether or not to include the motion on the agenda shall be final, subject to the conditions of Standing Orders 7 and 23.

Motions affecting employees or financial matters may require additional scrutiny under Standing Orders 24 and 28

Submit completed forms to the relevant Officer via email or provide a paper copy.

Decisions MADE Tracker

Project No: 51312
Project Title: LCC Ewenni MUB
Ref: 51312-BUR-XX-XX-DMT-P-00001
Revision: P3.0
Date: 30.03.2026

Item Ref	Title	Description	Date Made:	By Whom:	Evidenced?
RIBA Stage 0-1					
A1	Planning Requirements	LCC agrees with the approach to submit an LDC application and for a planning consultant to be engaged. For Burroughs to obtain 3 quotations	28/11/25	LCC-LS	Email
A2	Extent of Works	<p>The route of the accessible paths to the North and South of the 2 bridges will be as follows.</p> <p>"The Green" (Eco-houses)</p> <p>Proposed Ewenny River Bridge and connecting path</p> <p>Brynna Woods 'crossroads'</p> <p>Brynnae Community Centre car park</p> <p>To the south – From Brynnae Community Centre carpark (Leased by LCC) to the Trenos Railway Bridge;</p> <p>To the north, from the northern end of the Ewenny Bridge to the crossroads of Brynna woods and then west to the western entrance to the woods at 'The Green' (also colloquially known as the Eco-houses).</p>	28/11/25	LCC-LS	Email
A3	Stakeholder Engagement	LCC are content with Burroughs engaging with the LPA, NRW, DCWW, and other groups listed in the tender pack / subsequent correspondence. (Note that RCT's permitted development rights are devolved to Town and Community Councils although I am not sure if that is relevant in this case. I suppose the LDC process will determine this).	28/11/25	LCC-LS	Email
A4	Ecology	LCC agreed to allow Burroughs to seek 3no. prices for undertaking an ecology survey to the wider area (bridge, pedestrian access and potential contractor accesses)? Burroughs are progressing with this.	28/11/25	LCC-LS	Email
A5	Burroughs to submit LDC application in lieu of a planning consultant.	Burroughs initially planned to appoint a Planning Consultant, but following a discussion with them and a review of the information needed as part of the application, Burroughs confirmed back to LCC that they would submit an application.	12/01/2026	Burr-RPJ	Email
A6	Planning	Following an application made by Burroughs to the LPA (RCTCBC), the LPA confirmed on 4 th February 2026 that Planning was required and stated that "A community council is not provided with any permitted development rights in the General Permitted Development Order".	04.02.2026	LPA-JE	Application 26_0083_CPRO.msg
A7	Ecology Prices	Following Burroughs seeking quotes for ecology surveys, LCC confirmed the recommendation of appointing Soltys Brewster to undertake initial survey.		LCC-LS	

Decisions REQUIRED Log

Project No: 51312
Project Title: LCC Ewenni MUB
Ref: 51095-BUR-XX-XX-DRL-P-00001
To: TUC Committee, Llanharan Community Council
From: Burroughs
Revision: P5.0
Date: 30.03.2026

Item Ref	Title	Description	Requested by:	Date Requested:	Required by:
RIBA Stage 0-1					
A5	Consultant Team	<p>Following planning decision, Burroughs currently updating programme / gantt chart to explore both design and build / traditional routes to help Council make an informed decision.</p> <p>Subject to the outcome of item A1 and our Planning approach, this will determine whether a Design & Build approach is available to us.</p> <p>Design & Build will allow us to go to market sooner and the appointed contractor will be responsible for the design.</p> <p>If Full Planning is required, then it would be more desirable to undertake a traditional approach and design the project with a consultant team and then tender the design.</p> <p>As well as a Planning Consultant, a wider consultant team would be required, which we anticipate to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal Designer • Structural engineer • Civil engineer • (subject to ecology) Environmental engineer 	BUR-RPJ	24.11.2025	-
A7	Procurement Strategy	<p>Following recent market engagement and site visits, we have now determined a procurement strategy based on the feedback.</p> <p>All 4 no. contractors engaged and provided valuable details and preferences that helped inform our decision.</p> <p>We propose to go out to the open market on a Design & Build Basis, including in the contractors scope not just the civil and structural engineering works, but also the design, planning and relevant approvals</p> <p>We would look to compile a tender document that outlined the requirements of the bridge, footpaths and access constraints, as well as ecology / environmental constraints also identifying that planning and approvals (such as FRAP, Ordinary Watercourse Consent, etc) are required.</p> <p>We therefore seek approval to continue as outlined above.</p> <p>We provide a Procurement Strategy which provides greater detail to above.</p>	BUR-RPJ	20.03.2026	-

Appendix 6b

Procurement Strategy information sheet

(Additional information to accompany item A7 on the Decision REQUIRED log and agenda item 11).

In due course Burroughs will produce a more comprehensive procurement strategy document (This will be Appendix 7 if received before the meeting) giving the reasons for their recommendation, The clerk recommends that this decision is deferred until that information is available to members.

In the meantime below is a basic comparison of some of the different procurement strategies available and some of their respective pro's and con's.

Note that the Clerk is unable to verify the guidance nor give further advice on the matter, it falling outside of their competency. This paper serves as a rough guide to procurement strategies only and formal advice and justification for recommendations should be sought from Burroughs.

1. Design and Build (D&B)

What it is

You tender **one contract** where the contractor is responsible for **both the detailed design and construction**, based on an **Employer's Requirements** prepared by the council (often with external advisors).

How it works in practice

- Council appoints:
 - A consultant to prepare outline design + performance specs
- Contractor tenders a **lump sum** to design and build the bridge
- Contractor appoints their own designer/engineer

Advantages

- ✓ Single point of responsibility
- ✓ Greater **cost certainty** early on
- ✓ Usually faster overall programme
- ✓ Less direct design management by the council

Disadvantages

- ⚠ Less control over detailed design/aesthetics*
- ⚠ Risk of “minimum compliance” if requirements aren’t well written
- ⚠ Changes after award can be expensive

Best suited if:

- You want **simplicity and cost certainty**
- The bridge is **relatively standard** (footbridge / bridleway bridge)
- The council has **limited in-house technical expertise**
- You can afford to invest in good Employer’s Requirements upfront

* Officer note: It may be possible to build in some controls into a design and build tender pack. For example required sign off of designs and any amendments by both the Community Council AND the relevant landowner.

2. Traditional (Design – Bid – Build)

What it is

The council appoints designers **first**, completes the design, then tenders the construction works separately.

How it works

1. Appoint engineer/designer (e.g. civil/structural)
2. Full design + drawings prepared
3. Contractors tender on a **like-for-like basis**
4. Separate building contract awarded

Advantages

- ✓ Full control over design and materials
- ✓ Easier to compare contractor prices fairly
- ✓ Well understood in public sector
- ✓ Better for sensitive or bespoke designs

Disadvantages

- ⚠ Longer overall programme
- ⚠ Council carries more design risk
- ⚠ Variations possible if design issues emerge

Best suited if:

- The bridge is **bespoke, sensitive, or architecturally important**
 - You want **strong control over appearance and specification**
 - You are happy to manage consultants
 - Funding body expects a traditional route
-

3. Two-Stage Design and Build

What it is

A hybrid approach: you appoint a contractor **early**, then develop the design together before fixing the final price.

How it works

- Stage 1: Competitive tender to appoint contractor based on prelims, overheads, experience
- Stage 2: Contractor + designer develop design and cost
- Final price agreed before construction

Advantages

- ✓ Contractor input into buildability and cost
- ✓ Better risk management than single-stage D&B
- ✓ More design influence than pure D&B

Disadvantages

- ⚠ Less price certainty until Stage 2
- ⚠ Requires strong governance and cost control

Best suited if:

- The bridge is **complex or constrained**
 - You want collaboration but still some control
 - Ground conditions, utilities, or access are uncertain
-

4. Engineer's Design + NEC/JCT Minor Works

What it is

A simpler form of the traditional route using:

- An engineer-led specification
- A straightforward contract (e.g. **JCT Minor Works** or **NEC4 ECS**)

Advantages

- ✓ Proportionate for **small community bridges**
- ✓ Lower procurement burden
- ✓ Contracts are well understood

Disadvantages

- ⚠ Less flexibility for major change
- ⚠ Council still carries design risk

Best suited if:

- The bridge is **small-scale** (pedestrian / cycle)
 - Budget is modest
 - Low risk site
 - You want a **light-touch procurement**
-

5. Framework Call-Off (if available)

What it is

Using an **existing framework** (e.g. through local authority or regional framework) to appoint designers or contractors.

Advantages

- ✓ Faster procurement
- ✓ Pre-qualified suppliers
- ✓ Reduced legal risk

Disadvantages

- ⚠ Limited choice
- ⚠ Must align with framework scope

Best suited if:

- Your principal authority allows access
 - Timescales are tight
 - You lack procurement capacity
-

6. Turnkey / Manufacturer-Led Bridge Supply

(Common for modular pedestrian bridges)

What it is

Specialist bridge manufacturers design, fabricate and install a **pre-engineered bridge system**.

Advantages

- ✓ Predictable cost
- ✓ Fast installation
- ✓ Proven designs and certifications

Disadvantages

- ⚠ Limited customisation
- ⚠ May still require separate groundwork contract

Best suited if:

- Simple footbridge or bridleway
 - Span and loading are standard
 - Access allows modular installation
-

Key Decision Factors for Your Council

When choosing the route, ask:

- **Complexity:** simple footbridge or bespoke structure?
- **Risk tolerance:** who carries ground/design risk?
- **Expertise:** do you have an engineer already engaged?
- **Funding conditions:** do grant funders specify procurement routes?
- **Programme:** is speed critical?
- **Budget certainty:** essential or flexible?

Typical Recommendation for Community Councils

For most community council bridge projects in Wales:

- ◆ **Small / standard bridge:**

- Engineer-led design + **Design & Build** or **Traditional Minor Works**

- ◆ **Complex / bespoke / sensitive site:**

- **Traditional design and build (separate design + works)**

- ◆ **Tight timescales / modular bridge:**

- **Specialist Design & Build supplier** or framework



Purpose of issue: _____

FOR INFORMATION

Document title: _____

Ewenni Multi-User Bridge Replacement Procurement Strategy

Document revision: P01

Issue date: 01 Apr 26


51312-00 | Ewenni Multi-User Bridge

Purpose of issue:

FOR INFORMATION

Document title:

Ewenni Multi-User Bridge Replacement Procurement Strategy

Report Ref:	PS001	Created	27/02/2026
Author:	Tanisha Aburieki	Checked:	Ryan James
Signed:		Signed	
Creator:	Tanisha Aburieki (Assistant Project Manager) tanisha.aburieki@burroughs.co.uk		

Document revision: P1

Issue date: 01 Apr 26

Document tracking:

Revision:	Description:	Issued by:	Date:	Checked:
P01	Issue for Approval	TA	20.03.2026	RPJ

51312-00 | Ewenni Multi-User Bridge

Contents

- 1.0 Introduction**
- 2.0 Progress to Date**
 - 2.1 Surveys
 - 2.2 Design
- 3.0 Project Analysis**
 - 3.1 Risk Allocation
 - 3.2 Client Priorities / Objectives
 - 3.3 Market Analysis / Engagement
 - 3.4 Design
- 4.0 Legislation**
- 5.0 Works Packaging**
- 6.0 Procurement Route**
 - 6.1 Available Procurement Routes
 - 6.2 Proposed Procurement Route
- 7.0 Tendering Strategy**
 - 7.1 Available Tendering Procedures
 - 7.2 Proposed Tendering Procedure
- 8.0 Contract Strategy**
 - 8.1 Available Pricing Mechanisms
 - 8.2 Proposed Pricing Mechanism
 - 8.3 Available Forms of Contract
 - 8.4 Proposed Form of Contract
- 9.0 Summary of Recommendations**

1.0 Introduction

The Ewenni Multi-User Bridge Project will replace the existing narrow pedestrian bridge over the River Ewenni in Brynna Woods, Llanharan with a new multi-user bridge suitable for pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchair users and horse riders. It will also deliver associated pathways and upgrades to connecting routes, including improved links to the newly constructed Network Rail multi-user bridge and agreed connecting paths through the woodland.

The current bridge is too narrow and not suitable for multi-user access, limiting safe and inclusive movement through the woodland for a wider range of users. Replacing it with an accessible multi-user bridge is needed to improve local connectivity, strengthen the route between existing path networks and support safer, more inclusive access through the woodland.

This procurement strategy describes the project progress made to date, analyses the project objective and priorities, outlines the available procurement strategy options and proposes the procurement strategy to be utilised based on the project analysis and available options.

2.0 Progress to Date

2.1 Planning

Following submission of a Lawful Development Certificate, it has been confirmed by the Local Planning Authority (Rhondda Cynon Taff CBC) that a Full planning application is required.

2.2 Surveys

Soltys Brewster have been appointed to provide ecology services to support the projects progression. Soltys Brewster's scope includes undertaking a desktop survey, Extended Phase I Habitat Survey, Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Baseline Tree Survey and Assessment. Soltys Brewster will begin survey works in March to April 2026.

2.3 Design

Following a structural engineers report undertaken by Vale Consultancy as part of a Feasibility Study, the bridge is currently anticipated to be approximately 20 m span and approximately 3 m wide, with new abutments likely to be piled, subject to design development, ground conditions and flood risk. The scope remains subject to planning, ecology, landowner requirements and further design development.

3.0 Project Analysis

To formulate the optimum approach to procurement, it is important to understand Llanharan Community Council’s approach towards risk and priorities in relation to cost, time and quality. Market analysis to ascertain the market’s attitude towards the project along with design requirements are also key factors in procurement strategy selection. This section analyses these factors to inform the procurement strategy subsequently proposed.

3.1 Risk Allocation

This procurement strategy is based around the following principles:

- Llanharan Community Council is not averse to the modern approach of maximising value for money by sharing risks on the basis of identifying the party best placed to manage such risk
- Consideration of long lead in times for materials
- Consideration of volatility of the cost of materials
- Consideration of the market’s ability to deliver and manage specialist subcontracts
- Consideration for the methodology for achieving regulatory approvals

Market analysis is a critical element of forming a suitable risk allocation approach. For example, the market may be unwilling to provide fixed-priced proposals for projects with risks that cannot be priced. Refer to **3.3** for the market analysis for the project.

3.2 Client Priorities / Objectives

Through consultation with Llanharan Community Council’s, the client priorities are understood to be as identified in **Table 1**.

Factor	Priority Rating	Reason
Cost	High	Llanharan Community Council is expected to have a finite budget and therefore requires a procurement approach that secures value for money and improves cost certainty as the design develops. Early contractor engagement has indicated a high-level all-in budget of approximately £400,000 , but this remains subject to planning, surveys, design development and final scope confirmation. Cost therefore remains a high priority, but not at the expense of deliverability or statutory compliance.
Time	Medium	Time is an important consideration, as the Client has an aspiration to complete the project within the calendar year. However, this is now considered high risk due to the requirement for a full planning application, ecology constraints and the need to discharge any planning conditions before construction. Accordingly, time remains important, but the programme is now driven primarily by consents, surveys and environmental constraints rather than a fixed immovable completion date.
Quality	High	Quality is a high priority because the completed asset must provide a durable, safe and inclusive multi-user crossing in a sensitive woodland environment, while also satisfying stakeholder requirements relating to future maintenance, technical acceptance and environmental

		<p>protection. The works must therefore achieve an appropriate standard of design, buildability, durability and suitability for intended users including pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchair users and horse riders. In addition, the bridge and associated works will need to be developed to a standard capable of meeting RCTCBC highways and structural adoption requirements, subject to the Council's review and acceptance.</p>
--	--	--

Table 1 – Client Priorities

3.3 Market Analysis / Engagement

Early market engagement has been undertaken through non-fee site visits with three contractors to discuss buildability, access constraints and likely delivery methodology. This early engagement has demonstrated that there is market interest in the project from specialist contractors, but also that the market recognises a number of material delivery risks relating to constrained woodland access, environmental sensitivity, vegetation clearance, bridge installation methodology and developing scope.

The four contractor that we have met with are:

- Alun Griffiths (Contractors) Ltd;
- Beaver Bridges Ltd;
- JBF Group Ltd; and
- Velta Construction Ltd.

Beaver Bridges provided the most developed early input, including an indicative high-level budget of approximately £400,000 from pre-planning support through to handover.

Beaver Bridges also indicated a possible bridge installation concept where the bridge was delivered to site in sections, later requiring assembly on site achieving the required dimensions to clear the dimensions of the river. This would subsequently require significant clearance works to provide an approximate area of 25m x 25m as a working area, which would mean the removal of trees and vegetation alongside the existing route to the bridge to the North of the river.

JBF Group made similar suggestions in discussions on site, although Velta did propose the use of lighter weight solution that utilised screw pile technology and a flat-pack bridge solution, although this was likely to be in timber and/or composite material.

Despite the useful discussions above, there was clear indication that the Contractors were prepared to provide a fixed price for the design work, bridge structure and other designed works included in the scope, there was some reluctance and caution about offering a fully fixed lump sum for the overall project at too early a stage, particularly before planning, ecology findings, tree impacts, access requirements and the extent of associated path works are fully defined.

The market is therefore, likely to respond more positively to a procurement and pricing approach that allows early contractor involvement, enables buildability and methodology input during pre-construction and avoids transferring unquantifiable risk to tenderers at too early a stage.

3.4 Design

Whilst no bridge project is considered as straightforward, the design requirements for this project are more complex because of the location and access constraints to the site location, which in turn will require significant enabling works.

The project now includes associated path upgrades, links to the Network Rail bridge and improvements within a constrained and environmentally sensitive woodland setting. The

design must respond to access limitations, likely foundation constraints, flood risk, ecological sensitivities, landowner requirements and interfaces with stakeholders including RCTCBC (multiple departments), the Wildlife Trust, Network Rail and DCWW.

Specialist contractor input is considered beneficial during design development, particularly in relation to temporary works, access strategy, logistics, bridge fabrication, installation methodology and management of environmental and vegetation impacts. There is also a need to balance client control over key requirements with the practical benefits of utilising contractor expertise to refine the solution and improve deliverability.

4.0 Legislation

Public sector procurement is governed by a legal framework to ensure value for money, transparency, and fair competition.

The primary legislation governing public sector procurement is the Procurement Act 2023, which replaced the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 (PCR 2015), on 24th February 2025. The Procurement Act 2023 introduces a simplified structure, placing greater emphasis on competition, transparency, innovation, and procurement efficiency across the public sector.

Llanharan Community Council is a contracting authority subject to the Procurement Act 2023.

The Procurement Act 2023 establishes rules for contracts exceeding the following thresholds, effective from 1st January 2024 (originally released under PCR 2015):

Contract Type	Threshold
Public Works Contracts	£5,372,609
Public supply contracts and public service contracts (central government authorities)	£139,688
Public supply contracts and public service contracts (all other contracting authorities)	£214,904

Table 2 – The Procurement Act 2023 Thresholds

The estimated project value is currently taken as approximately **£400,000** excluding VAT, based on the current early high-level budget indication. This is below the Public Works Contracts threshold of **£5,372,609**. Therefore, the project is not expected to exceed the thresholds at which the Procurement Act 2023 would apply in full. However, best practice principles such as transparency, fair competition and value for money will still be adopted.

As this value is based on early contractor market feedback only, it should be reviewed as the design, survey information and scope develop.

The tendering procedures considered in this procurement strategy (Section 7.1) comply with the Procurement Act 2023.

As the Procurement Act 2023 has recently come into effect (24th February 2025), it is recommended that Llanharan Community Council are aware of their obligations regarding public procurement to ensure full compliance / best practice is maintained.

5.0 Works Packaging

Dependent on scale and nature, projects can be divided into works packages involving multiple procurement events. This enables the most suitable procurement route, tendering strategy and contract strategy to be applied to each works package respectively.

For example, on the Ewenni Multi-User Bridge project, this could involve separating the enabling works (tree cutting, access creating), design, the bridge structure and the footway improvements all separately.

However, based on the project analysis **(3.0)** specific to the Ewenni Multi-User Bridge project, it is not proposed that the project is divided into works packages as it is considered that one Principal Contractor will be capable of delivering the entirety of the works, utilising supply chain partners.

The reason for proposing this approach is that it will provide Llanharan Community Council (LCC) with a quicker, cleaner, simpler route to delivering both the bridge and footpath access. One Principal Contractor managing all of the works will minimise risk of coordination between multiple contractors / packages of work and provide LCC with a single point of contact who will take ownership of the project.

6.0 Procurement Route

6.1 Available Procurement Routes

The primary procurement routes used within UK construction are traditional and design and build (D&B).

- **Traditional** – a procurement route whereby the client appoints a consultant team to design the project, following which contractors tender for the construction contract.
- **Design and Build** – a procurement route whereby the client appoints a main contractor to design and construct the project.

Table 3 summarises the key differences between the procurement routes.

Factor	Traditional	Design & Build
Cost	Construction costs initially unknown - cost certainty achieved later.	Construction cost realised and fixed from initial design phase.
Design	Client retains control over design and construction.	Requires less client expertise and resources (although design team could be novated meaning relationships with design team have already been developed).
Time	Design and construction are sequential, typically resulting in longer project timelines.	Construction can overlap design completion reducing the overall project duration.
Risk	Client retains the risk of consultant performance.	Diminished risk and liability with single contractor.
Communication	Client (or appointed project manager) acts as intermediary for the design and construction issues that occur.	Single point of contact throughout project.
Variations	Contractual with limited flexibility of client-side variations. Can add time to project, will change timelines incurring greater costs if change occurs.	More flexible in accommodating client-side variations, with design and cost adjustments developed by the contractor.

Table 3 – Procurement Routes Comparison

6.2 Proposed Procurement Route

Based on the project analysis (3.0), it is proposed that a **two-stage Design and Build** procurement route is utilised. This is due to the constrained and environmentally sensitive nature of the site, the need for specialist contractor input into buildability and installation methodology and the benefit of ultimately placing responsibility for completion of the detailed design and construction with the Principal Contractor.

A two-stage Design and Build route is considered most appropriate because the current scope remains subject to planning, ecology findings, landowner requirements and further design development. Early contractor engagement has already demonstrated that construction methodology, working area requirements, access logistics and environmental constraints are key drivers of cost and deliverability.

Under the proposed approach, bidders would tender on the basis of a fixed price for the bridge structure itself, which would provide a clear basis for evaluation, and the successful contractor would then be appointed under a Pre-Construction Services Agreement to work collaboratively with the project team to develop the design, address outstanding risks and

unknowns and establish the wider construction cost prior to entering into the main works contract.

This approach is considered to provide a better balance between market competition, early cost visibility, specialist contractor involvement and appropriate risk allocation than seeking a fully fixed-price construction contract at the current stage of project development.

7.0 Tendering Strategy

7.1 Available Tendering Procedures

The primary tendering procedures available under the Procurement Act 2023 and commonly used within UK construction procurement are outlined below. Whilst these definitions are derived from the Procurement Act 2023 (applicable to most contracts procured by public sector organisations), the procedures can be applied to both public sector and private sector procurement events.

- **Open Procedure** – a single-stage tendering procedure without a restriction on who can submit tenders
- **Competitive Flexible Procedure** – A multi-stage competitive procedure designed by the Contracting Authority to suit the nature of the procurement. The procedure may include selection stages, dialogue, negotiation, or successive tender rounds in order to refine solutions and identify the most economically advantageous tender.

In determining the most appropriate tendering procedure, consideration has been given to the complexity of the works, market capacity, project programme and the need to maintain competitive tension throughout the procurement process. This procedure:

- a) may limit the number of participating suppliers, generally or in respect of particular tendering rounds or other selection processes;
- b) may provide for the refinement of award criteria;
- c) may not permit the participation of suppliers that did not submit a tender in the first round of tendering or that were excluded following an earlier round.

7.2 Proposed Tendering Procedure

Based on the project analysis (3.0), it is proposed that an **Open Procedure** is utilised for the procurement of the works.

The Open Procedure allows any interested supplier to submit a tender and is considered appropriate for this project due to the relatively defined scope of works and the anticipated level of market interest. The procedure also provides a transparent and efficient route to market, enabling the Contracting Authority to maintain competitive tension while minimising procurement timescales.

Given the nature of the works, it is not anticipated that the project requires iterative dialogue, solution development or negotiation with suppliers. The scope can be sufficiently defined within the tender documentation to allow contractors to submit fully priced tenders at the outset.

The Open Procedure therefore provides a proportionate procurement approach that balances programme efficiency with the need to obtain competitive market pricing. This approach is considered to deliver value for money while maintaining a compliant and transparent procurement process.

Alternative procurement procedures, including the Competitive Flexible Procedure, were considered. However, these were not deemed necessary given that the works do not present a level of complexity that would benefit from staged dialogue or supplier solution development.

The proposed tendering process will therefore consist of a single-stage competitive tender, with submissions evaluated in accordance with the evaluation methodology set out in Section 8.

7.3 Proposed Tendering Process

The proposed procurement process will comprise the following stages:

1. Publication of Tender Notice
2. Supplier Selection / Shortlisting (if appropriate, but likely to be open tender)
3. Issue of Invitation to Tender
4. Tender Period
5. Tender Evaluation
6. Clarifications (if required)
7. Contract Award

The above process would then likely be followed by the delivery phase and would likely comprise the following stages:

1. Pre-construction phase
2. Approvals
3. Construction Phase
4. Handover and use

8.0 Contract Strategy

8.1 Available Pricing Mechanisms

The pricing mechanism selected for a construction contract determines how cost risk is allocated between the client and contractor and how the final contract price is established.

The primary pricing mechanisms used within UK construction are as follows:

- **Cost reimbursement / Cost 'plus'** – the contractor is paid the actual costs incurred to undertake the works, plus an additional fee (typical overheads and profit).
- **Fixed Price / Lump Sum** – the contractor provides a fixed price to undertake the scope of works. If the actual cost to undertake the works exceeds the fixed price then the contractor bears the additional cost, whereas if the actual cost to undertake the works is less than the fixed price then the contractor gets the savings.
- **Guaranteed Maximum Price** – A guaranteed maximum price is set. If the actual cost to undertake the works exceeds the maximum price then the contractor bears the additional cost. If the actual cost to undertake the works is less than the maximum price then the contract states how the savings are to be allocated (i.e. client / contractor / shared).
- **Re-measurement** – the contractor provides rates against estimated quantities of work within the tender documentation. The final contract value is determined by applying these rates to the actual quantities of work completed. As such, the final cost of the project may vary from the original estimate if the actual quantities differ.
- **Target Cost** – the contractor is paid for actual costs incurred in undertaking the works, with share percentages of pain / gain agreed depending on whether the final cost is above or below the target cost.

The selection of an appropriate pricing mechanism will depend on the level of design development, the allocation of risk and the Client's priorities in relation to cost certainty and collaboration.

8.2 Proposed Pricing Strategy

Based on the project analysis (3.0), it is proposed that a two-stage pricing approach is utilised. This is due to the current level of project uncertainty, including planning risk, ecology constraints, access methodology, vegetation clearance implications and the developing extent of the associated works.

At tender stage, bidders would be asked to provide a fixed price for the bridge structure itself, which would form the principal commercial basis for tender evaluation. The successful contractor would then be appointed under a Pre-Construction Services Agreement to work collaboratively with the project team to develop the design, address outstanding risks and unknowns and establish the wider construction cost.

During this stage, the contractor will contribute to the development of the construction methodology, programme, logistics and buildability of the works, allowing key risks and constraints to be explored and mitigated prior to entering into the main works contract.

The final pricing basis for the main works contract would then be agreed once the scope, risks and delivery methodology are sufficiently developed, and may take the form of a fixed price or target cost arrangement depending on the level of cost certainty achieved.

This approach is considered more appropriate than seeking a fully fixed price for the whole of the works at the outset, as the market is likely to include significant risk allowances where elements of the scope and delivery constraints cannot yet be fully defined. The proposed approach enables the client to test the market on a key comparable element of the works, whilst avoiding the premature transfer of unquantifiable risk.

This approach is considered to provide a balanced allocation of risk between the client and contractor, while supporting the development of a robust and deliverable cost for the works.

8.3 Available Forms of Contract

NEC and JCT are the most commonly used standard forms of contract for procuring and managing construction works in the UK. The key available suites of NEC and JCT contracts are as follows:

- NEC4 Engineering and Construction Short Contract (2017)
- NEC4 Engineering and Construction Contract (2017)
- JCT Standard Building Contract (2016)
- JCT Intermediate Building Contract (2016)
- JCT Minor Works Building Contract (2016)
- JCT Major Project Construction Contract (2016)
- JCT Measured Term Contract (2016)
- JCT Design and Build Contract (2024)

The selection of an appropriate form of contract is influenced by factors including the allocation of risk, the chosen pricing mechanism, the complexity of the works and the desired level of collaboration between the parties.

JCT contracts generally adopt a more traditional approach, with a focus on defined responsibilities, liabilities and risk allocation, whereas NEC requires and enables a more proactive and collaborative approach to managing the contract (such as found in the early warning and programme provisions). NEC attempts to eliminate the use of legal terms and instead provides for simple language, giving words their natural meaning.

NEC and JCT include an allocated person to act on behalf of the client (Contract Administrator in JCT, Project Manager in NEC). They both include obligations relating to time, cost and quality, although the explicit requirements are quite different.

8.4 Proposed Form of Contract

It is important that the form of contract selected is mutually acceptable to both the successful contractor and Llanharan Community Council. The nature and scope of the works must be aligned with a suitable form of contract.

In choosing the most suitable form of contract for the project, the common standard forms of contract set out in Section 8.3 have been considered. Based on the project analysis (3.0), it is proposed that the project is procured on a two-stage basis, with the successful contractor appointed initially under a Pre-Construction Services Agreement (PCSA), followed by entry into the main works contract once the design, risks and pricing have been sufficiently developed.

For the main works contract, the NEC4 Engineering and Construction Contract is considered the most suitable form of contract due to its suitability for infrastructure works, its proactive approach to managing time, cost and risk and its compatibility with collaborative working and early identification of issues through mechanisms such as early warnings and programme management. NEC4 is considered more appropriate than JCT

for this project due to its emphasis on proactive contract management and collaborative risk management.

It is anticipated that the contract will be based on either Option A (priced contract with activity schedule) or Option C (target cost contract), with the final option to be confirmed following completion of the pre-construction phase and agreement of the pricing strategy.

9.0 Summary of Recommendations

The recommendations made throughout this procurement strategy are summarised in **Table 5**.

Element	Works Package
Works Packaging	Single works package
Procurement Route	Two-stage Design and Build
Tendering Procedure	Open Procedure
Pricing Mechanism	Two-stage approach with initial fixed price for bridge structure, followed by agreement of final contract price post-PCSA
Form of Contract	Pre-Construction Services Agreement followed by NEC4 Engineering and Construction Contract (Option A or Option C to be confirmed)

Table 5 – Procurement Strategy Summary

This strategy is considered to provide the most appropriate balance between cost certainty, risk management, programme efficiency and market engagement, based on the current level of project definition and identified constraints.

It is recommended that Llanharan Community Council review and approve this procurement strategy to enable progression to the tender stage.



burroughs.co.uk

Registered Office:
 4 Radnor Court
 256 Cowbridge Road East
 Cardiff, CF5 1GZ

T: 029 2064 7484
 E: admin@burroughs.co.uk

Registration No: 2256733
 VAT Registration No: 484 3312 48
 Group branches: Isle of Man

Burroughs is the trading name of Alistair Burroughs Design Partnership Ltd

