
PROPOSED MUGA - RECREATION GROUND

6 messages

Alan Williams <alanwilliams38@btinternet.com>
To: info@llanbrynsports.org
Cc: emir evans <evansnwyn@yahoo.co.uk>

12 January 2022 at 10:08

Emir

I make early contact with you regarding procedures and "A WAY FORWARD" for progressing with the above proposal. I am happy to assist in these matters, particularly regarding the Capital contribution which will be required from the Council.

It's not easy for persons not employed in local government to fully understand various procedures relating to financial matters, budgeting and the accountability which applies. This responsibility falls on the Clerk to the Council and we have to operate within his parameters.

The Council fully supports this proposal and as you rightly mentioned it is the Council that invited the LBSA to participate. This has not changed but merely requires some financial planning to establish costs, levels of grant available, and the contribution from the Council. Time scales are also important. We have to take these matters forward so that the Council can consider a definite figure. This will be aided by inviting "FIXED PRICE TENDERS/CONTRACTS".

As I say this is early contact with you and I will submit a suggested more detailed approach to this matter in the next few days for consideration by you and the LBSA.

This project will proceed and your comments, if I heard you correctly, indicating the potential benefit to the Community and the potential to provide the LBSA with some income is also welcome.

Kind regards

Alan

Sent from my iPad

E Williams <info@llanbrynsports.org>
To: Alan Williams <alanwilliams38@btinternet.com>
Cc: emir evans <evansnwyn@yahoo.co.uk>

12 January 2022 at 16:07

Hi Alan

As discussed, please find attached all of the information they've sent through to us. The last piece arrived today, so attached you will see:

1. Essential Checklist
2. Additional Guidance
3. Application Form
4. Update (received today)

In these documents I have highlighted some areas and points that are most relevant to our bid.

I have spoken to one of the contractors who will provide us with a quote and hope to get it by the end of the week. He said they'd be able to deliver the project within the given window (March-June). He detailed the intricacies of coloured tarmac (against black tarmac) and ensuring a good weed killing process is done prior to any new membrane being laid. I'll discuss that weed issue further with Dewi from DND.

Gwyneth has emailed me in the last hour also, she has contacted the County Grants Officer today who will look into what other grants might be available to help fund this project, and hopes to hear back from him very soon.

Thanks

Emyr

[Quoted text hidden]

4 attachments

 **160.3 Wales Grassroots Facilities Fund Stage 2 Application Form 16 12 21.doc**
261K

 **160.4 Wales Grassroots Facilities Fund Update 12.1.22.pdf**
243K

 **160.2 Wales Grassroots Facilities Fund Stage 2 Additonal Guidance 16 12 21.pdf**
109K

 **160.1 Wales Grassroots Facilities Fund Stage 2 Essential Checklist 16 12 21.pdf**
238K

Alan Williams <alanwilliams38@btinternet.com>
To: info@llanbrynsports.org
Cc: emir evans <evansnwyn@yahoo.co.uk>

12 January 2022 at 19:32

Emir

Thanks for forwarding a copy of the Application Requirements in respect of the above which I have considered including the highlighted areas. I am not of a nature that tends to consider delaying progress on any matter since this is naturally against my grain.

The details required certainly puts pressure on you to meet the specified dates or even to complete the forms.

It is sometimes better to take a step back, particularly if there is any shortfall in the information required by the FAW that cannot be supplied at this time :

1. They require more than one competitive Tender probably accompanied by details of the Specification forwarded to the Contractor.
2. In the Application pack it states that only 5-10% of Applications get approved, and I suggest that the first schemes to drop out are those that are not considered to supply sufficient information. It is never a good thing to have an application refused as this reputation might follow it later when other attempts are made.
3. The provision of Flood Lighting requires planning permission. Whether this extends to providing portable units I would need to check out.
4. Required land tenure suggests a minimum ten year Lease (or maybe a 21 year Licence for the same period.) A Licence would be far easier not necessarily involving Solicitors nor the Dinefwr Estate. This would be written in clear terms guaranteeing the LSBA long term secure tenure.
5. The nature of the questions asked are seeking weaknesses in the project and therefore require very careful replies. In this regard "two heads are better than one", and you have such little time.
6. When you receive the expected Tender we will have some idea of realistic costs but these will not be definite until other Tenders are received. This has a bearing on the level of contribution required from the Council and a single Tender is not sufficient for the FAW. it is noted that no minimum or maximum percentages are quoted in the Application Package and therefore no guidance on what we should be aiming for. It merely asks for a percentage of other funding.

What are your views from a tactical viewpoint?

Alan

Sent from my iPad

> On 12 Jan 2022, at 10:08, Alan Williams <alanwilliams38@btinternet.com> wrote:

E Williams <info@llanbrynsports.org>
To: Alan Williams <alanwilliams38@btinternet.com>
Cc: emir evans <evansnwyn@yahoo.co.uk>

14 January 2022 at 01:18

Alan

Thanks for taking the time to look at those and responding swiftly. I too am not one to give up at the first sign of a tricky task.

If I may take each of your points and respond in turn, just to clarify how we have digested some of the information in different ways perhaps:

[1. They require more than one competitive Tender probably accompanied by details of the Specification forwarded to the Contractor.](#)

Essential Checklist Document states:

Open procurement

Applicants must secure competitive tenders, or quotations for the works, in the event that an award of grant is made (normally this is a minimum of 3 tenders).

Our understanding from reading this is that the 3 quotes will need to be submitted after the grant is offered in principle (which is common terminology). The fact we have asked two suppliers already will hopefully give us a very close idea on figures and I believe the wording of the above means they anticipate some leeway in the figures to change and perhaps appreciate that the short notice / window will mean figures might change in the "phase 3" stage. They know their budgets and will have done their own homework on what applications for funding sound like feasible and realistic project costs.

2. In the Application pack it states that only 5-10% of Applications get approved, and I suggest that the first schemes to drop out are those that are not considered to supply sufficient information. It is never a good thing to have an application refused as this reputation might follow it later when other attempts are made.

Following on from point 1, there are 322 projects remaining in the process. The fact the FAW have felt the need to send out very specific caveats to certain scenarios suggests that a lot of the remaining applications may not be hitting the mark, or may not be "scoring highly".

I refer to statements in the documents such as (for example):

- *The majority of estimated costs shown in the EOIs appear to have been underestimated and do not include VAT*
- *The EOIs submitted included a large number of FAW league ground improvement projects, necessary to meet competition requirements i.e. pitch side spectator rails; hard standing/footpaths; dug outs; spectator stands and security shutters. These are unlikely to score highly against the published priority measures under this funding programme.*
- *Replacement items, such as new boilers, replacement floodlights etc are also not generally not considered to be a priority for new capital funding programmes.*

This point is later reiterated in more recent guidance on FAQs:

- *The guidance states that replacement items, such as new boilers, replacement floodlights etc, that are a result of ongoing wear and tear, should be built into your ongoing running costs and are not generally considered a priority for capital funding programmes.*

To us, the fact they have gone to the effort of producing such heavily caveated information suggests that a large percentage of the applications either remain fanciful with their figures (they state a total request of £32m in bids across 322 projects, so that averages at around £100k per application. Our is a menial request in comparison, whether it ends up being at £25k or £40k). It also suggests that many of these applications are wide of the mark in terms of needing much amendment and thought during this Phase 2 process. This would increase the probability that many of the 322 projects will drop away due to these caveats, the tight deadline, the amount of work required by volunteers to complete the form, and all that might need to go with it depending on the level of funding requested. Additionally, as was pointed to in the document notes, 5-10% of £32M is £1.6M to £3.2M that it states is likely to be made available. For me personally, it begs the question whether they'd prefer to support as many of the 322 projects as possible within that budget as opposed to funding less projects on a grander scale. I'd be willing to gamble that they'd prefer to support 100 projects at £30k as opposed to 15 projects at £200k, which then puts us in a favourable light.

I feel that the majority of these caveats do not apply to our application. As I stated in the meeting, we also meet many of the desired requirements in terms of what the project would be delivering to the large community. Therefore, in spite of the fact I do understand what you are implying when saying that putting in a failed application might tarnish the project in future, this is a one-off shot with this UK Gov source, and if this application is not successful, then our next effort would unlikely be via the same source anyway.

3. The provision of Flood Lighting requires planning permission. Whether this extends to providing portable units I would need to check out.

I have seen your email to Zoe and, from my previous dealings with Llangennech Rugby Club's reasons for the purchase and use of such equipment, I am very confident that planning consent is not required for such equipment.

4. Required land tenure suggests a minimum ten year Lease (or maybe a 21 year Licence for the same period.) A Licence would be far easier not necessarily involving Solicitors nor the Dinefwr Estate. This would be written in clear terms guaranteeing the LSBA long term secure tenure.

We appreciate the technical differences between a licence and lease from our previous discussions with you regarding potential areas of the community's Recreation ground, as per the previous and current licences granted to the Rugby and Cricket clubs, and as previously drafted for the LSBA.

However, the Essential Checklist Document states:

Evidence of your legal title/use of the area to be developed, for at least 10 years, must be submitted with the application, or a letter showing that the Freeholder will enter into a, no less than ten-year, secure agreement.

We interpret this as not having any specific detail on the technicalities of the "minimum 10 year secure agreement", therefore at this stage all we need to provide with the application is a letter from the freeholder confirming this, as was requested as part of my query at the meeting, in order to move things forward.

5. The nature of the questions asked are seeking weaknesses in the project and therefore require very careful replies. In this regard "two heads are better than one", and you have such little time.

Again, we appreciate the point, but we do believe the strength in our application lies within the areas whereby it meets the brief in so many ways. These are stated in the opening of the Essential Checklist Document:

- *Projects that will increase participation as a result of the facility improvements, in the short and medium terms particularly impacting on women and girls and other underrepresented groups.*
- *Projects that will deliver a wider community engagement: multi-sport projects enabling participation in other sports/physical activities; social; health and wellbeing impact; volunteering and learning of new skills.*
- *Applicants with a track record of delivering development and growth with their existing and available facilities i.e. providing for large numbers of juniors, school links, girls and women's teams.*
- *Applicants who demonstrate how the project will be managed to secure the desired outputs and with strong partnerships in place.*
- *Projects demonstrating, they have robust projected financial models i.e. partnership funding; income generating potential that will secure sustainability,*

6. When you receive the expected Tender we will have some idea of realistic costs but these will not be definite until other Tenders are received. This has a bearing on the level of contribution required from the Council and a single Tender is not sufficient for the FAW. It is noted that no minimum or maximum percentages are quoted in the Application Package and therefore no guidance on what we should be aiming for. It merely asks for a percentage of other funding.

As stated in response to point 1, a single tender would not be acceptable *in the event that an award of grant is made*, at which point we would obviously ensure we meet any further needs. For the sake of the application, our interpretation is that there is no requirement to provide these 3 tender quotes. We also take your point on the percentage of funding, however it does state in

For all of the above reasons, I just don't feel yet that we are completely out of the running with this. We have 13 days to form a solid enough application and I'd be reluctant to raise the white flag on this so soon as - even with a failed application - there remains some wiggle room, as per points ii and iii, within section 7 of the Additional Guidance Document:

7. *Following the panel consideration of all valid applications, your organisation:*

- May be awarded an offer of grant because your project meets the requirements, is considered a high enough priority within the available budget and is able to proceed within the timescales in 2022; or*
- May be advised that although the project is not ready to proceed, or is not currently a priority for funding, it can be reconsidered for future funding rounds; or*
- May be advised that your application would need to be modified if it is to be considered for future funding.*

I may well be very wrong, and we are indeed unable to put in the hours to meet the application deadline, but in that case we will have learned much and can move on to seek other opportunities to meet the need for this project and many others to come to fruition as the financial sources become available. In the meantime, may I suggest we await the imminent receipt of at least one tender and move on from there.

Your comments are most welcome.

Diolch

Emyr

[Quoted text hidden]

Alan Williams <alanwilliams38@btinternet.com>

14 January 2022 at 09:00

To: E Williams <info@llanbrynsports.org>

Cc: emir evans <evanswyn@yahoo.co.uk>

Emir

Thanks for your clear thoughts on this matter with which I do not disagree. I just felt you were faced with a load of preparation work and scrutiny from the FAW.

If you are intent on proceeding then it would be very useful to Wyn if some figure of support from the Council could be reached as soon as possible. The receipt of your invited Tender will help establish the cost and arrive at the level of

support required.
Wyn will obviously be key in this.
Alan

Sent from my iPad

On 14 Jan 2022, at 01:18, E Williams <info@llanbrynsports.org> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

E Williams <info@llanbrynsports.org>
To: Alan Williams <alanwilliams38@btinternet.com>
Cc: emir evans <evansnwyn@yahoo.co.uk>

17 January 2022 at 23:42

Alan, Wyn

Further to the previous discussion I have now received one of the two quotes I requested for the cost of a MUGA. As stated, the companies I approached were the same ones who provided us with quotes back in March 2019. Lightmain has provided me with the quote today (please find attached document).

We assumed the costs would have increased somewhat.
In 2019, Lightmain quoted at £43,272.55 +VAT
Today the quote arrived at £63,526.96 +VAT
That's a project delivery cost increase of £20,254.41, which equates to 47%.
The Total (VAT inc.) cost is **£76,232.35**.

Since our time for completing this specific application is scarce; if we apply the same 47% increase to the other supplier's quote (which was the cheapest in 2019, and we are still awaiting), we would expect a new 2022 quote to be **£68,725.44**.

Considering this updated information on the much-increased project cost, without a value yet on the level of funding committed from the community council, and with the looming deadline (bearing in mind any application to third party grant sources to further support the project costs are unlikely to be processed in time to meet the FAW deadlines) we believe it is now probably the sensible option to abandon the FAW phase 2 application as we don't think they'd meet the level of funding we require from them to deliver it within the March-June window. That is, we are realistic about the project benefits and do not foresee them contributing £60k+ to it, considering they have already identified the "disposable pot" to be valued £1.6M and £3.2M. (If we assume the pot results in the average of £2.4M, an award of £60k would amount to us expecting 2.8% of available funds).

I do however believe this has been a worthwhile exercise in getting the ball rolling on this collaborative project following the Community Council's initial invite to the LBSA to do so in summer 2021. It has helped open conversations on the matter, led to getting updated quotes and provided new potential sources of funding to pursue. For example, I now await a response from the Tennis Association of Wales regarding the Government's £30m fund for refurbishing tennis courts in UK public parks (announced in October 2021). It has also generated conversations which have produced one or two other leads that we will be further discussing with those sources.

Based on all the information, would you agree on this decision?

Diolch
Emyr

[Quoted text hidden]

 **161.4 Lightmain Quote LMQ02428.pdf**
100K