

**Report to** Cabinet  
9 September 2015  
**Report of** Executive head of strategy people & neighbourhoods  
**Subject** Procurement of works for structural maintenance and improvement – structural repairs at Heathgate Phase 2

**Item**

14

## KEY DECISION

---

### Purpose

To consider the procurement process and to seek approval the award of a large structural repair contract.

### Recommendation

To approve the award of a structural repair and improvement contract to JB Specialist Repairs Ltd for works at Heathgate Phase 2.

### Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority “Decent housing for all” and the service plan priority to continue to deliver the programme of making all council homes decent.

### Financial implications

The financial consequences of this report is the award of the contract for structural repairs for a total tendered cost of £367,546.55, which is included within the Housing Revenue Account financial forecasts and budgets for this financial year (2015/16).

**Ward/s:** Thorpe Hamlet

**Cabinet member:** Councillor Harris - Housing

### Contact officers

Russell O’Keefe, Executive head of strategy people & neighbourhoods 01603 212908

Gary Atkins, Associate Director Operations, NPS Norwich Ltd 01606 227903

Carol Marney, Head of Operational Property Services, NPS Norwich Ltd 01603 227904

### Background documents

None

# Report

## Background

1. The council has a programme of structural repairs and improvements deemed necessary in order to ensure the housing stock remains in a good state of repair and tenants have quality homes to live in. The contract covered in this report forms a part of this programme of works.
2. The scope of the work at Heathgate Phase 2 includes concrete repairs, replacement railings and waterproofing on concrete decks to two blocks of flats.

## Tender process

3. The opportunity to tender was advertised on the council's e-tendering portal and Business Link/Contracts Finder.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. The tender return date was 8 May 2015.

## Tender evaluation

7. The supplier selections process required suppliers to complete a questionnaire. The responses given were then evaluated against pre-determined criteria. It was a pass/fail evaluation and determined whether the tender submitted was compliant with the specification requirements.
8. Five suppliers returned quotations on time and the initial evaluation was conducted by NPS Norwich using the agreed evaluation criteria as set out in the documentation provided to the suppliers. Two suppliers passed the qualitative assessment with the tender from JB Specialist Repairs Ltd being the lowest compliant tender, i.e. the lowest price that fully meets all the requirements of the specification.

## Integrated impact assessment



**NORWICH**  
City Council

The IIA should assess **the impact of the recommendation** being made by the report

Detailed guidance to help with completing the assessment can be found [here](#). Delete this row after completion

### Report author to complete

<b>Committee:</b>	Cabinet
<b>Committee date:</b>	9 September 2015
<b>Head of service:</b>	Executive head of strategy people & neighbourhoods
<b>Report subject:</b>	Procurement of works for structural maintenance and improvement – structural repairs at Heathgate Phase 2
<b>Date assessed:</b>	14 July 2015
<b>Description:</b>	

	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Without these repairs the buildings would become unsafe, posing potential hazards to tenants.

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"/>	
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 contracts 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

<b>Risk management</b>	<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>
------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

<b>Recommendations from impact assessment</b>
<b>Positive</b>
Value for money & built environment.
<b>Negative</b>
<b>Neutral</b>

Issues