

CABINET

22 AUGUST 2019

MULTI STOREY CAR PARK IMPROVEMENT WORKS TENDER

Cabinet Member: Cllr Simon Clist, Cabinet Member for Housing and Property Services.

Responsible Officer: Andrew Busby, Group Manager for Corporate Property and Commercial Assets.

Reason for Report: For Cabinet to review the results of the Multi Storey Car Park (MSCP) Improvement works tender and to award the JCT minor works Building Contract to a contractor.

RECOMMENDATION:

- To award the JCT Minor Works Building Contract with Contractor's Design 2016 Edition for the MSCP improvement works.
- To delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive (151) and the Cabinet Member for Housing and Property Services to agree on which Category 2 items as detailed on Part 2 Annex B should be included within the Contract award to supplier B, subject to ongoing budget authority after essential works have been concluded.
- To approve an additional £50k to the Capital project for 2019/20 as set at item 5.4.

Relationship to Corporate Plan: Property assets are linked to the delivery, vision and priorities of the Council. The way that the Council manages its land and property assets has a direct impact on the quality of services delivered, as well as maximising the value derived from our property holdings for the on-going contribution in balancing the Councils budget. It is, therefore, important that efficient and effective use is made of our asset portfolio to support corporate and service objectives.

Financial Implications: The tender contract was to incorporate improvement works in all areas of the asset. The budget available in the 2019/20 financial year does not meet the cost involved therefore the improvement works will need to be phased over three financial years.

Legal Implications: The contract will be let via a JCT Minor Works Building Contract with Contractor's Design 2016 Edition (MWD) with a JCT Public Sector Supplement 2011. Special conditions of Contract were contained in the Invitation to Tender and the Contract shall be subject to those special conditions with a JCT Public Sector Supplement 2011.

Risk Assessment: As part of the contract the contractor will need to provide a risk assessment specific to the site. All works will be compliant with the construction (design and management) regulation 2015.

Equality Impact: There is no negative impact to equality

Impact on Climate Change: The Contractor will be required to be committed to managing and minimising our environmental impact.

- This project is planned in a manner which takes account of the environmental impact, seeking to reduce such effects as much as possible. This will include travelling to site and effective planning to reduce the number of deliveries. This will introduce and promote environmental monitoring as a key element of management of the project. The impact of these works will result in an increase in our reported Carbon Footprint under scope 2 which will be reported in 2020/21 figures and the Council will look at measures to offset the additional carbon used on this project, e.g. energy efficiency lighting.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The MSCP has had works identified for essential maintenance and improvement works. Some of the works are required for insurance purposes, this includes but is not limited to increasing the height of the safety railings to meet current standards and this work has been prioritised. The Property Services team were aware of the pending Premier Inn Project and given the scope of the works to construct the hotel it was sensible to hold back the improvement scheme until the construction works for the project had been completed.
- 1.2 The detailed specification incorporated a range of essential improvement works which was tendered during May 2019 and the tender submissions were received on 12 July 2019.
- 1.3 Property Services and Procurement officers evaluated the seven tenders received on 15 July 2019 and three of the tenderers were invited for an interview on 2 August 2019 where the decision was made on which contractor to offer the tender to.
- 1.4 Property Services had identified works that were required for routine maintenance, however it was clear that the Premier Inn project was going to involve demolition works and committing expenditure for maintenance would be potentially abortive work until the Premier Inn was complete.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The MSCP was originally constructed in the early 1990's. The property has an asbestos register that will be formally issued to the successful contractor and was included as an appendix to the main tender, as part of the Pre-Construction Information pack. It is expected that the MSCP will have increased usage post completion of the Premier Inn project. The improvement works for the MSCP will take place to coincide with the opening of the Premier Inn to improve the appearance and to maximise the advantages of having the Premier Inn in Tiverton. Any lighting initiatives will

be low energy initiatives, such as L.E.D. The improvement works will take place once the Premier Inn construction team have demobilised from the premises, this will enable the existing welfare setup to be utilised for the successful supplier.

- 2.2 Once the Premier Inn works have been completed the Multi Storey will have 565 carpark spaces.
- 2.3 Part of the Multi Storey Car Park is currently let to the Tiverton and District Community Transport Association and this service level agreement expires on 31March 2020. Property Services will review the lease that requires updating.
- 2.4 Work Items included within the tender specification were identified to assist our efforts in reducing anti-social behaviour with the MSCP, such as additional CCTV cameras.

3.0 THE PROCUREMENT PROCESS

- 3.1 The tender was released through the e-tendering portal 'Supplying the South West' on the 22 May 2019. The tender submissions were received on the 12th July 2019 from a total of seven suppliers, but one was disqualified due to missing documentation from the supplier at the time of tender. This left six suppliers which were evaluated. Given the wide range of improvement works included the design for extending hand rails, expansion joints, coping stones and materials for coating the top decks, the period for submitting tenders was extended from the standard 31 days to 83 days to ensure best value for money.

4.0 SUMMARY OF TENDER EVALUATION

4.1 Evaluation Criteria and Weightings

- The tender submissions have been evaluated on the most economically advantageous tender. The evaluation criteria contained a mix of quality and commercial questions to which a percentage weighting was assigned.
- The evaluation criteria and weightings used for this procurement process are detailed below.
- Quality 40%

○ Lighting proposal	10%
○ Signage proposal	10%
○ Limiting 24-hour access	5%
○ Value engineering	5%
○ Construction programme	2.5%
○ Health and Safety	2.5%
○ Presentation	5%
○ Subtotal	40%

- Price 60%
 - Individual roles 28%
 - Inside IR35 10%
 - Outside IR35 10%
 - Commercial Questions 12%
 - Subtotal 60%

4.2 Scoring Methodology

4.2.1 The scoring methodology used to evaluate the quality and commercial criteria was:

Score 0	No response	No response	
Score 1	Extremely Weak	Very poor proposal/ response; does not cover the associated requirements, major deficiencies in thinking or detail, significant detail missing, unrealistic or impossible to implement and manage	Weak
Score 2	Very Weak	Poor proposals/ response; only partially covers the requirements, deficiencies in thinking or detail apparent, difficult to implement and manage	
Score 3	Weak	Mediocre proposal/ response, moderate coverage of the requirements, minor deficiencies in either thinking or detail, problematic to implement and manage	
Score 4	Fair- Below Average	Proposal/ response partially satisfies the requirements, with small deficiencies apparent, needs some work to fully understand it	Fair - Good
Score 5	Fair – Average	Satisfactory proposal/ response, would work to deliver all of the Authority’s requirements to the minimum level	
Score 6	Fair – Above Average	Satisfactory proposal/ response, would work to deliver all of the Authority’s requirements to the minimum level with some evidence of where the Applicant could exceed the minimum requirements	
Score 7	Good	Good proposal/ responses that convinces the Authority of its suitability, response slightly exceeds the minimum requirements with a reasonable level of detail	
Score 8	Strong	Robust proposal/ response, exceeds minimum requirements, including a level of detail or evidence of original thinking which adds value to the bid and provides a great deal of detail	Strong – Excellent
Score 9	Very Strong	Proposal/ response well in excess of expectations, with a comprehensive level of detail given including a full description of techniques and measurements employed	

Score 10	Outstanding/ Excellent	Fully thought through proposal/ response, which is innovative and provides the reader with confidence of the suitability of the approach to be adopted due to the complete level of detail provided	Strong - Excellent
----------	---------------------------	---	---------------------------

4.3 Tender submissions

4.3.1 A summary of the tender submissions has been set out in Part 2 of this report as Part 2 Annex A.

4.3.2 The contract was advertised to be of an initial value of circa £400k for the 2018/19 financial year and suppliers had provided options as part of the tender exercise, using the specification a key 1 to 3 as detailed below to prioritise works. Suppliers provided alternative solutions to the specification as part of the value for money presentation pricing schedule.

- 1 – We feel as asset owners this should be done to protect the asset.
- 2 – Desirable but not essential for the operation of the asset.
- 3 – Items which followed the supplier presentation to ensure engineering value for money to be deferred for future consideration.

4.4 Evaluation process

4.4.1 Evaluation was conducted individually by internal officers from Corporate Procurement and Corporate Property and Commercial Assets. The tender was released from “Supplying the South West” electronically by Internal Audit, that was done for transparency reasons.

4.4.2 Please refer to below – here we have the results of the valuation process. We set out the outcome of the scoring methodology used in the report and associated ranking – further details will be shown in Part 2.

NAME: Supplier A

Deliverables	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Price	60%	0.600
Total Quality	40%	0.130
Grand Total	100%	0.730
Rank		4

NAME: Supplier B

Deliverables	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Price	60%	0.584
Total Quality	40%	0.250
Grand Total	100%	0.834
Rank		1

NAME: Supplier C

Deliverables	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Price	60%	0.548
Total Quality	40%	0.190
Grand Total	100%	0.738
Rank		3

NAME: Supplier D

Deliverables	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Price	60%	0.518
Total Quality	40%	0.180
Grand Total	100%	0.698
Rank		5

NAME: Supplier E

Deliverables	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Price	60%	0.599
Total Quality	40%	0.220
Grand Total	100%	0.819
Rank		2

NAME: Supplier F

Deliverables	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Price	60%	0.511
Total Quality	40%	0.110
Grand Total	100%	0.621
Rank		6

NAME: Supplier G

Deliverables	Weighting	Weighted Score
Total Price	60%	NO PRICE SUBMITTED DISQUALIFIED
Total Quality	40%	DISQUALIFIED
Grand Total	100%	
Rank		

5.0 Finance

5.1 The figures for the operational 2019/20 budget are:-

- Direct Costs £88,870
- Indirect Costs £242,350
- Direct Income £138,580 (To increase due to P.Inn project).
- Total Operational Budget £192,640

5.2 The budget available to fund this project within the current 2019/20 financial year is:-

- Capital brought forward from 2017/18 - £136k
- Capital from 2019/20- £70k
- Two earmarked reserves General Fund- £145k
- Maintenance budget from 2019/20- £15k
- Total £366k

5.3 It is proposed to spread the cost of the works across the next two financial years. The Council will reduce project expenditure by utilising the existing welfare facilities that will be left on site post the completion of the Premier Inn hotel, this will reduce the cost of site prelims.

5.4 It is recommended that Cabinet approve an additional £50k to increase the existing Capital budget for 2019/20.

5.5 The proposed budget allocation for the next financial year is set out within Part 2 of this report. There will be a 4% uplift for splitting the contract across two financial years.

6.0 Quality Control

6.1 The contract will be let by a JCT Minor Works Building Contract, along with a JCT Public Sector Supplement 2011. Terms of the contract will be managed by the Property Services team, including obtaining suitable warranties for products used for surfacing the carpark.

7.0 CONCLUSION

7.1 The outcome of this tender exercise has resulted in supplier B as being the winning bidder. An interview or presentation has taken place/ been received with the top three suppliers to ensure value engineering has been considered.

7.2 The recommendation to Cabinet is for the contract to be formally awarded to supplier B.

7.3 Following the decision, there will be a compulsory 10 calendar day standstill period after which the contract will be awarded.

7.4 It is envisaged that the contract will start during Autumn 2019.

Contact for more Information:	Andrew Busby, Group Manager for Corporate Property and Commercial Assets,
Background papers:	Part 1, Annex A, Specification. Part 1, Annex B, Pricing Schedule. Part 2- Not for publication- Annex A, Tender Summary. Part 2- Not for publication- Annex B, Supplier B Analysis.
File reference	None
Circulation of the Report:	Leadership team, Cabinet Member for Housing and Property Services.