

5 February 2026

To all Councillors

Please take notice that a **Full Council Extraordinary Meeting** of Thornbury Town Council will be held in the **Council Chamber of the Town Hall on Tuesday 10 February 2026 at 6.30pm**.

All Councillors are hereby **summoned** to attend the above meeting for the purpose of considering and resolving upon the business to be transacted at the meeting as set out hereunder.



Hannah Bowden, Chief Executive Officer

Members are reminded that the Council has a general duty to consider the following matters in the exercise of any of its functions: Equal Opportunities (race, gender, sexual orientation, marital status and any disability), Crime & Disorder, Health & Safety, Human Rights and the need to conserve biodiversity.

Public participation: Please note that this meeting is open to the public. Please take note of the guidance notes for public participation [provided](#).

Emergency Evacuation procedure: Please familiarise yourself with the emergency evacuation procedure on display in the Council Chamber and acquaint yourself with the nearest emergency exit. The assembly point, in the event of any evacuation, is at the Town Hall noticeboard, outside Tesoro.

AGENDA

1. **To note any apologies for absence**
2. **To receive any declarations of interest from members**
3. **To receive any representations from the public relating to items on the agenda**
4. **To pass a resolution to exclude members of the public and press for the remaining agenda items due to COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE nature of the business to be transacted**
5. **To review quotes for the Landscape Architect, along with officer recommendation, and appoint the contractor**
6. **To appoint a councillor signatory for the Armstrong Hall Trust deed transfer**
7. **Date of next meeting – 10 March 2026 at 7.30pm**

END OF AGENDA

Landscape Architect	Date Received	Cost £ (not incl vat)	Notes	Initial response	Design quality & response to brief (30%)	Technical integration with hydrology & RIBA stages (20%)	Community, play & inclusivity (20%)	Experience & competence (15%)	Price & programme (15%)	Overall Score
Company A	02/02/2026	24,340	RIBA stages 2 - 4	☒	Very clear, context-led and nature-based design narrative, with explicit alignment to the brief (de-culverting, natural play, habitat, use of existing consultation) and a structured RIBA 2-4 methodology with visuals and engagement material; main limitation is that Mundy-specific design ideas are described more than illustrated. 4.5/5	Repeated emphasis on "working within the hydrological framework", early integration with WRA, detailed descriptions of how Stages 2, 3 and 4 will be coordinated, and clear statements about aligning drawings/specs with hydrological performance and regulatory requirements. 5/5	Strong focus on inclusive play, social inclusion and Make Space for Girls, plus education and interpretation; clear offer to support TTC-led engagement with graphics and attendance at events, though there could be one or two more concrete, Thobmury-specific engagement tools. 4.5/5	Landscape Institute Registered Practice and Certified B Corp with extensive UK and international park, play and recreation experience, including flood-defence and water-play projects; highly relevant case studies (tidal flood-management pools, parkland ponds, playables riverside landscapes, estate ponds, river-vision project) and a clear team structure and resourcing. 5/5	Fees are clearly broken down by RIBA stage with a transparent total, sensible inclusions/exclusions and realistic programme; day rates sit in the mid-range, but the overall offer is not the lowest-cost option.	92.0 / 100
Company B	02/02/2026	18,875	RIBA Stages 1-4	☒	They show a clear grasp of your core aims and provide an initial concept plan with ideas such as two-stage channels, natural pools, landform from spoil and natural water-play zones; however, the submission is lighter on play-space character and detailed user experience than others 4/5	Very strong on watercourse enhancement and eco-hydrology; concept notes explicitly reference WRA's modelling; two-stage open channel, bank stabilisation methods and integration of hydrological interventions; they commit to RIBA 2-4 but the stage-by-stage technical methodology is less fully spelled out than others. 4.5/5	They acknowledge natural play, safe access, interpretation, dipping platforms and education, but assume TTC leads engagement and only offer plans/sections/images plus optional (extra-fee) attendance at consultation; there is limited detail on inclusive play strategies or engagement techniques. 3/5	Practice profile shows a robust, multidisciplinary environmental consultancy with Landscape Institute and CIEEM registered status and strong wetland/BiNG projects, but the material provided focuses more on ecology and nature-based solutions than on child-focused water play and park design case studies. 4/5	They reference working within an assumed £250k capital budget and offer hourly rates for additional work, but the extract we've shared does not include a clear stage-by-stage fixed fee breakdown or a defined timetable, so value for money and deliverability are harder to compare directly with other bids. 3.5/5	76.5 / 100
Company C	02/02/2026	23,650	RIBA Stages 1-3 only	☒	4/5 – Clear understanding of site and objectives, with a well-written appreciation of restoring the stream, integrating SuDS and natural play, and addressing the splash pad; methodology sets out how they will develop a cohesive, legible park-wide framework, but there is limited illustration of specific play experiences or character at concept stage compared with the narrative detail.	4/5 – Strong emphasis on working with the Lead Consultant's hydrological strategy, including integration of sustainable drainage, flood resilience and long-term maintenance, and a stage-based methodology for RIBA 2-4; however, they have not offered a Stage 4 fee and propose that a Design & Build contractor undertakes detailed design, which weakens direct technical continuity through to construction information.	3.5/5 – They recognise the value of engagement, inclusive water play and learning through play, and commit to supporting TTC's process with clear visual material and information; the proposal is less detailed on specific inclusive-play strategies, engagement techniques or examples of previous community-led water-play work.	4/5 – Practice profile and CVs show a competent multidisciplinary team with relevant park, water and heritage projects (e.g. new country parks, pond and dam restoration, visitor access improvements), plus LI registered-practice status and QA processes, though the highlighted case studies focus more on wider park and water restoration than on child-focused natural water play.	2.5/5 – Fee breakdown is only provided for RIBA Stages 2 and 3, with no Stage 4 price, and they explicitly flag that this may make the bid non-compliant; this reduces cost certainty and would require either later negotiation or a separate appointment for technical design, although their standard charge-out rates and terms of agreement are clearly stated.	73.5 / 100
Company D	02/02/2026	27,255	RIBA Stages 1-4	☒	Very clear, structured understanding of our brief, directly referencing TTC 2025 engagement findings, stream daylighting, natural play, biodiversity and the splash-pad issue; they describe how they will turn this into options, visuals and plans, though they stop short of offering specific Mundy design concepts at this stage. 4.5/5	Exceptional depth on eco-hydrology, SuDS, NFM and blue-green infrastructure, plus a clear, staged scope for 0-4 that is explicitly "in tandem with WRA", including soils surveys, hydrological data review, channel profiles, gradients and Ordinary Watercourse consent inputs; the partnership brings in a hydrogeologist and has prior projects with them. 5/5	Strong emphasis on accessible water play, intergenerational use, inclusive paths and seating, and educational landscapes; they propose engaging, hand-drawn consultation material and reference successful inclusive/play projects that are somewhat local. 4.5/5	Extremely strong CVs and case studies in precisely relevant areas: urban park wetlands, two-stage channels, river restoration, educational SuDS and natural play; team includes a CMU landscape architect, a specialist blue-infrastructure landscape architect and a wetland hydrogeologist with international standing. 5/5	Fees are clearly broken down by stage with a transparent total and sensible inclusions/exclusions, but only one in-person site visit is included and several elements (extra meetings/visits, additional work) are at relatively high day rates; programme detail is less explicit than others and would need confirming against your desired dates. 3.5/5	92.25 / 100
Company E	02/02/2026	21,323	RIBA Stages 1-4 - not Vat registered. No vat chargable	☒	They express a good general intent to "remodel the use of water" for play, biodiversity and park character, and to make Mundy a destination, but there is no real methodology, no specific design approach, and no indication of how they would handle swales, bioretention, de-culverting or integration with existing features beyond broad statements. 3/5	They say they are "keen to work with you and the hydrologist" but provide no detail on how they would collaborate with WRA, no stage-by-stage RIBA 2-4 process, and no reference to hydrological performance, constraints or technical coordination; the proposal reads more like a fee letter than a technical methodology. 2/5	Strong emphasis on consultation and inclusion, with a clear example from Nailsea Millennium Park and an "organic" approach that goes to where young people already are; visual "Mundy Opportunities" sheet reinforces interest in water-play and experiential landscape, though inclusivity is described more socially than in terms of detailed accessible design tools. 4/5	The letter states that Bill Armitage and Michele Lavette have considerable experience with water and community-engaged park design and notes attached CVs, but the material provided here does not give specific, hydrology-rich case studies or a practice-wide resource profile; competence is credible but less evidenced than others 3/5	Fees are clearly broken down into task-based day ranges with a lump-sum total, expenses and contingency, and they propose a realistic delivery window (intensive work April-May and July-August, completion for summer 2027); however, the link between days and RIBA stages is not explicit and scope assumptions are quite light. 4/5	63.0 / 100
Company F	30/01/2026	20,335	RIBA Stages 1-4	☒	4/5 – Strong narrative about turning hydrological interventions, habitat creation and child-inclusive play into a coherent park-wide scheme, with good use of relevant case studies and a clear RIBA-based methodology; however, there are no Mundy-specific illustrative concepts or sketches yet, so the design response remains largely described rather than shown.	4.5/5 – Methodology is explicitly built around collaboration with the hydrologist, including review of the Stage 1 report, translation of models (streams, swales, bioretention) into landscape form, regular coordination meetings and detailed Stage 2-4 tasks; they also propose a 5-year management plan, which supports long-term performance.	4/5 – They demonstrate solid experience in child-inclusive and educational landscapes, 3D visualisation and stakeholder engagement, and commit to providing engagement materials and supporting TTC in capturing feedback; explicit reference to safe, inclusive water play is present, though the bid could say more about specific inclusive-play features for Mundy itself.	4.5/5 – Team includes a CMU Director as project lead, an experienced senior landscape architect as project manager, and a designer with inclusive-play and habitat experience, backed by ISO-accredited QA systems and substantial watercourse restoration and child-focused project portfolio, indicating strong capacity to deliver.	4/5 – Fee proposal is clearly broken down by activity and RIBA stage, with total hours and cost and a Gantt-style programme that aligns work across 2-4; assumptions are reasonable (client to provide surveys and mapping), though only two site visits are included and any extra inputs would need additional agreement.	83.5 / 100

Company G	26/01/2026	25.414	RIBA Stages 1-4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>5/5 – Very strong, site-specific response: they clearly understand the hydrology, Flood Zone 3 context, utilities constraints and the de-culverting corridor, and present a compelling vision, scope and illustrated concept narrative for a nature-led stream and water-play landscape directly aligned with your brief and the Stage 1 report.</p>	<p>4.5/5 – Detailed, stage-by-stage methodology for RIBA 2-4 explicitly built around the WRA model (two-stage channel, bio-engineering, utilities constraints, clearances) and Design & Build tender, with defined GA/Hardworks/Softworks, specs and coordination tasks; they do, however, exclude issuing construction-status information and detailed design of specialist play/water hardware, which will rely on others.</p>	<p>5/5 – Co-design is central to their offer, with extensive, concrete proposals for youth-focused and wider community engagement, inclusive methods and documentation of the process, plus a strong track record of nature-based play next to water and a clear intent to design inclusive, safe water play for all abilities.</p>	<p>4.5/5 – Team is a Landscape Institute registered practice led by experienced chartered landscape architects with high-profile relevant projects (urban river restoration, water-edge play, complex public realm) and specialist leads for engagement and horticulture; experience is excellent, though less explicitly focused on small-town park settings than some others.</p>	<p>4/5 – Fixed fee is provided for Stages 2-4 and is clearly broken down by stage, role and days, with a structured programme, meeting allowance and a 10% rate discount; they flag exclusions (e.g. specialist play/water feature detailed design, extra meetings, surveys) and some risks would need managing through clear scoping, but overall the offer is transparent and not at the top of the cost range you are likely to see.</p>	93.5 / 100
Company H	04/02/2026	#REF!	Extended submission to 04/02/26	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>4.5/5 – Very strong, landscape-led narrative and clear understanding of the Mundy brief: daylighting the culvert, integrating natural play with the restored stream, biodiversity and flood resilience, and supporting TTC-led engagement; they set out a structured RIBA 2-4 methodology with multiple concept options and clear deliverables, though Mundy-specific visuals are described rather than fully illustrated at this stage.</p>	<p>4.5/5 – Methodology is explicitly framed around working with WRA as lead consultant, translating the hydrological model into landscape form and coordinating exposed channels, swales, bioretention and levels through Stages 2-4; they cover CDM designer duties, planning inputs, technical drawings and contractor-query support, but specialist water-play equipment design is assumed by others.</p>	<p>4/5 – Strong track record in river-edge parks and linear water parks that combine natural play, access to water and interpretation; they propose concept options, precedents and materials for engagement and explicitly support TTC's outcomes-led engagement, though they exclude attendance at public events in the base fee and say relatively little about detailed inclusive-play features tailored to children of all abilities at Mundy</p>	<p>5/5 – Very high-calibre team with directly relevant case studies, led by a CMLI Director and Associate with extensive river-restoration and park experience, backed by a 200-strong, ISO-accredited practice and EA framework experience.</p>	<p>3.5/5 – Fixed fee for Stages 1-4 is clearly broken down by grade, task and programme over c.31 weeks, with discounted day rates and expenses largely included; cost is at the higher end of the range, they limit meetings to five online sessions, and several items (engagement event attendance, surveys, some specialist inputs) are excluded and would add to total spend.</p>	86.5/100