

Report to Cabinet
14 December 2016
Report of Director of regeneration and development
Subject Procurement of repairs to City Hall clock tower

Item

13

KEY DECISION

Purpose

To consider the procurement process for the repairs to City Hall clock tower and to request approval to place the order

Recommendation

To approve the award of the contract for repairs to City Hall clock tower to JB Specialist Refurbishments Ltd.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority a safe, clean and low carbon city

Financial implications

The financial consequences of this report are the award of a contract for repairs to the City Hall clock tower with a tendered cost of £180,573.65, which is included within the general fund capital programme financial forecasts and budgets for this financial year (2016/17).

Ward/s: Mancroft

Cabinet member: Councillor Stonard - Resources and business liaison

Contact officers

Gary Atkins, Associate Director of Operations 01603 227903

Carol Marney, Head of Operational Property Management 01603 227904

Background documents

None

Report

Background

1. This contract is for essential maintenance to the copper finials at the top of the clock tower. They need to be removed, cleaned, tested, repaired, recoated and then replaced in order to give confidence that they will remain securely fixed for the next sixty years. The greatest cost is the erection of scaffolding so this will be utilised to repair the pointing on the clock tower where necessary as part of the project as well.

Tender process

2. The opportunity was advertised on Contracts Finder and Norwich City Council's tendering portal on 30 September 2016 with a return date of 31 October 2016.
3. Suppliers were asked to submit details of their organisation in terms of finance, contractual matters, insurances, quality assurance, environmental standards, health and safety, equality and diversity credentials, references and previous experience. These aspects were then evaluated to ensure that suppliers met the Council's basic requirements.
4. At the same time suppliers submitted details in the form of method statements proposing how they would meet the requirement for the work package and the price that they would charge to carry out this work. These method statements were evaluated once it had been confirmed that the supplier had met the Council's basic requirements.
5. Five tenders were returned by the closing date.

Tender evaluation

6. The supplier selection process required suppliers to complete a questionnaire. The responses given were evaluated against pre-determined criteria. This quality assessment carried a maximum of 65% of the marks. The lowest price was allocated 35% of the marks and marks were then deducted, pro-rata, with each increasing tender price.
7. The supplier with the highest cumulative score is deemed the best value submission. The highest scoring company was JB Specialist Refurbishments Ltd. It is recommended that they are awarded the contract at the submitted price of £180,573.65

Integrated impact assessment



NORWICH
City Council

Report author to complete

Committee:	Cabinet
Committee date:	14 December 2016
Head of service:	Head of city development
Report subject:	Procurement of repairs to City Hall clock tower
Date assessed:	1 December 2016
Description:	Repairs to copper finials and partial re-pointing of the clock tower

	Impact			
Economic (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Finance (value for money)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The tender process ensures that the Council achieves the best value for money at that particular time.
Other departments and services e.g. office facilities, customer contact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ICT services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Economic development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Financial inclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Social (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Safeguarding children and adults	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<u>S17 crime and disorder act 1998</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Human Rights Act 1998	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Health and well being	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Equality and diversity (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Relations between groups (cohesion)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Eliminating discrimination & harassment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Impact			
Advancing equality of opportunity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Environmental (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Natural and built environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The contract will ensure the built environment is maintained and improved to a high standard.
Waste minimisation & resource use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Pollution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sustainable procurement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Energy and climate change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
(Please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
isk management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>1. There is a risk of challenge from an unsuccessful supplier. This risk is mitigated by the fact the value of contracts is below the thresholds in the Public Contracts Regulations. Also the tender has followed an open process with award criteria being based on the lowest compliant tender, but there is always a risk of challenge from unsuccessful suppliers.</p> <p>2. There is a risk that the appointed supplier could fail during the duration of the contracts. This is low risk due to the relatively short nature of the contracts and the planned nature of the works. In addition to this the Council is not investing in the supplier and so the risk is one of service continuity rather than financial, which is further mitigated by the fact the work is planned not responsive in nature.</p>

Recommendations from impact assessment
Positive
Value for money and the built environment.
Negative
Neutral
Issues