

KEY DECISION*

**Double click here and delete this rectangle if the report is not a key decision.*



EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR HOUSING, REGENERATION AND PUBLIC REALM

43 and 45 Bromley Road Refurbishment - Contract Award Approval for Refurbishment Works

Date: 4 February 2021

Key decision: Yes

Class: Part 1

Ward(s) affected: Catford South

Contributors:

Mia Agnew, Senior Lawyer, Legal Services

John Johnstone, Acting Group Finance Manager, Financial Services

Sorcha Rooney, Procurement and Commercial Services

Outline and recommendations

The purpose of the report is to seek authority from the Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm to approve the appointment of Hawksmoor Construction Services Limited to refurbish Council premises at 43 and 45 Bromley Road in order to reinstate a young care leavers' facility and a training and support base for Lewisham's foster carers, at the sum of £527,084 following an open tender process.

Timeline of engagement and decision-making

This is a key decision as the value of works is £527,084. This will be placed on the forward plan and Members can elect to scrutinise at Business Panel.

A PID for this project was approved by Regeneration and Capital Programme Delivery Board on 14 April 2020.

On 4 September 2020 the Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm agreed to tender a contract to refurbish Council premises at 43 and 45 Bromley Road in order to reinstate a young care leavers' facility and a training and support base for Lewisham's foster carers.

1. Summary

- 1.1. The purpose of the report is to seek authority from the Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm to approve the appointment of Hawksmoor Construction Services Limited to refurbish Council premises at 43 and 45 Bromley Road in order to reinstate a young care leavers' facility and a training and support base for Lewisham's foster carers, at the sum of £527,084 following an open tender process.
- 1.2. 43 and 45 Bromley Road are large Victorian semi-detached properties. The young care leavers' facility will be a dedicated hub for care leavers to attend. The Support and Training Hub for foster carers will be used as a facility which will support the recruitment, training and retention of foster carers.
- 1.3. In 2019, feasibility and concept designs to RIBA Stage 2 were prepared for reinstatement of the services outlined above at 43 and 45 Bromley Road by Pinnacle ESP, including outline proposals for structural design, building services systems, outline specifications and preliminary costs. PinnacleESP were subsequently engaged in March 2020 to provide the role of Architect/ Surveyor/ Contract Administrator, Cost Consultant, Principal Designer and CDM Advisor and to secure Planning Permission.
- 1.4. On 4 September 2020 officers obtained approval from the Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm to approach the construction market via an open tender process to seek an appropriate contractor to undertake refurbishment works.
- 1.5. An open tender process was followed, advertised through the London Tenders Portal. 16 tenders were submitted. Tenders were assessed as set out in this report, 10 were deemed incomplete and 6 went to moderation. Based on assessment of price and quality it is recommended that Hawksmoor Construction Services Limited be appointed.
- 1.6. Full analysis of tender proposals is set out in the confidential appendix. In summary, Hawksmoor Construction Services Limited achieved the highest overall score based on a robust assessment of quality and on price. Hawksmoor were the second lowest price at £527,084, and second highest score on quality. The highest quality score on quality went to a company whose price was significantly more at £691,121. The lowest price tenderer at £ 495,768 was ranked 5th in terms of quality which was the lowest of the 5 tenders submitting a complete tender and achieving above the required minimum scores.
- 1.7. It is considered that Hawksmoor Construction Services Limited have demonstrated comprehensive skills, processes, abilities, experience and resources, including in house tradespeople, to deliver this project. Hawksmoor's price is very competitive and is below the pre- tender estimate. A full synopsis of tenders is included in the confidential appendix to this report.

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

Recommendations

The Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public is recommended to approve the appointment of Hawksmoor Construction Services Limited to refurbish Council premises at 43 and 45 Bromley Road in order to reinstate a young care leavers' facility and a training and support base for Lewisham's foster carers, at the sum of £527,084. The contract will be for a duration of fourteen weeks.

2. Policy Context

- 2.1. The Ofsted inspection completed in July 2019 has raised a number of concerns around the overall quality of the service provision to Care Leavers and notes that the improvements in the fostering service has started from a very low base. The re-establishment of 43-45 Bromley Road will support the significant service improvements required.
- 2.2. The leaving care service needs to support young people to train to live independently. Just as any good parent supports their children to prepare for independence, children and young people in care should be helped to develop practical domestic skills like cooking healthy meals, doing their own laundry and managing their money. Personal Advisors are also required to undertake group work and individual sessions to help young people enhance their social skills. The service is required to have drop in facilities to provide support to young people at the time they need it and ensure that those living on their own are not isolated and have a place that they can go to have a meal, wash their clothes, meet other young people and are safe.
- 2.3. A key role of the service is to help young people gain employment and training. The re-establishment of Bromley Rd will enable the service to work with partner agencies to provide resources and support to help young people to find employment and training opportunities.

3. Background

- 3.1. 43 and 45 Bromley Road are large Victorian semi-detached properties with the potential for refurbishment and possibly extension. The total size of the existing site measures approximately 0.09ha. The properties are on a busy main road on the edge of an attractive residential area, close to Catford Town Centre and within a conservation area.
- 3.2. There are no existing external boundaries between the two properties and they share front and rear gardens. A disabled access ramp leads to number 45. The two buildings are very similarly proportioned. No. 43 is linked to 45 on the first floor by a single door. Previously, the location where the kitchen is located within no 43 (within the front bay area) used to connect directly to the adjacent room within no. 45.
- 3.3. No 45 is currently occupied by one member of staff from the Occupational Therapy Team where occupational health assessments are undertaken by a visiting GP.
- 3.4. No 43 has been empty for 4 years and formerly provided office space for the 'Leaving Care Team' who delivered at the property numerous services to young people between the ages of 18-25 who have been previously looked after by the borough. Up to 20 staff formerly resided in the building, plus visiting staff.

Proposed Uses and activity

- 3.5. The building is to be refurbished and organised in order to reinstate a young care leavers' facility and to provide a training and support base for Lewisham's foster carers. Budget for this work has been approved from the Council's Capital Programme.

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

- 3.6. The young care leavers' facility will be a dedicated hub for care leavers to attend - an integrated service with Housing, Serious Youth Violence and Compass in the same building. Young people have expressed their wish to return to this venue so they can have access to their Personal Advisor (PA's) and meet in a familiar and relaxed environment. The Service previously achieved a good judgement during its last Ofsted inspection in 2016. In the most recent Ofsted inspection (July 2019), their service received a lower rating of Requires Improvement and a number of key areas of improvement have been identified. Improving services to Care leavers is a key priority for the council and the re-establishing of the care leavers facility will improve service delivery and support aspiration outcomes for young people who have grown up in our care.
- 3.7. The facility would support care leavers needs and assist their preparation for independence. It would be a place where young people can feel at home e.g. having access to facilities where they can learn essential skills for independence. . A place away from a corporate building where young people can experience more relaxed surroundings. Young people have talked about it being a home away from home. Young people will be free to come to the house without an appointment.
- 3.8. Young people will attend preparation groups and attend after care group work to learn life skills to prepare them to live independently before they move into their own properties, e.g. cooking, financial literacy classes.
- 3.9. It is planned to reinstate the group work sessions and a variety of other work sessions to develop their Life Skills. Separate spaces will be provided - one for classes and one for general relaxing/ hanging out. An interview room will also be provided so that the young people can meet their Personal Advisers in private, and have a safe space in which they can talk to a trusted adult. Young people using the services require a degree of anonymity and can sometimes be volatile due to anxiety and personal issues.
- 3.10. In total the Service works with approximately 400 care leavers at a time and it is likely that at least 10 to 20 young people would be visiting the building at any one time for a service.
- 3.11. The building would be used daily from 9:00 – 17:00, plus approximately three evenings per week from 6pm – 8pm to run the Children in Care Council and Care Leaver's Forum, which a number of young people attend. The CICC meet regularly to discuss issues that are then reported back to the Corporate Parenting Panel (elected members of Lewisham Council and Lewisham senior management).
- 3.12. In terms of young care leavers' staff needs, approximately 30 staff will be accommodated, i.e. 5 x Social Workers; 18 x PAs & careers advisors; 3 x Senior PAs; 2 x Business Support officers; 2 x Team Managers.
- 3.13. The Support and Training Hub for foster carers will be used as a facility which will support the recruitment, training and retention of foster carers. The use of 45 Bromley road, will provide the fostering team with a venue to deliver fostering training sessions. Venues for training are currently paid for by the team. The support hub will also be used as a venue for contact between children and their birth families and a location for the safe handover of children and young people when they are changing placements or getting ready to see their families. In addition to the above, the support and training hub will be used as a safe child friendly space when the social work teams are trying to keep a child safe whilst awaiting a new placement. The support and training hub will also house therapeutic spaces for foster carers, children and social workers. The Support and Training Hub facility will comprise:

Ground floor

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

- Reception office – with counter and or large service hatch - reception also to accommodate 3 – 5 office desks / photocopiers etc.
- Waiting area – c. 9 m2 - seating for 8 – 10
- Ground floor contact space - soft child friendly furnishings (accommodate max 4 persons incl. child, carer and therapist). AO to provide e.g. photos. This space also to be used as a crèche type facility to host maximum 15 young, pre-school age looked after children, whilst their carers attend training.
- Large training space to seat up to 40 carers – with audio visuals for training and development days. Moveable partitioning to divide this space into 2. Enlarged opening on to garden area. Small decking area to garden
- Garden space – separated by fence from no 43, play equipment in garden for no. 10 – 12 children.
- Washroom/ shower room
- Disabled toilet

First floor

- Maintain link to no 43.
- Doorway at top of stair to be retained
- 3 x contact spaces - soft child friendly furnishings (accommodate max 4 persons incl. child, carer and therapist).
- 1 x larger contact spaces - soft child friendly furnishings (accommodate max 8 persons incl. child, carers and therapist).
- Kitchen facility
- 2 x overnight rooms including bed, chair, drawers (i.e. one bedroom space for young person one for staff) AO to provide e.g. photos. Windows to be secure.
- 1 x large board room/ meeting room.

3.14. Disabled access to ground floors of 43 and 45 will be provided.

Feasibility, Design and Contract Administration

- 3.15. In 2019, feasibility and concept designs to RIBA Stage 2 were prepared for reinstatement of the services outlined above at 43 and 45 Bromley Road by Pinnacle ESP, including outline proposals for structural design, building services systems, outline specifications and preliminary costs.. Estimated total cost of works set out in this feasibility study is c£570,000 excluding professional fees, project management fees, final fit out (furnishings etc) and ICT equipment.
- 3.16. PinnacleESP were subsequently engaged in March 2020 to provide the role of Architect/ Surveyor/ Contract Administrator, Cost Consultant, Principal Designer and CDM Advisor. Pinnacle ESP have worked closely with the social services client and project manager to design the specification and ensure designs meet service needs.

4. Procurement Approach

- 4.1. The contract was openly tendered through ProContract, the Council's online procurement system that works with the London Tenders Portal.
- 4.2. The tender was issued 10 November 2020 with a tender return date of 12 noon on 10 December 2020 via an open process using the London Due North tenders portal and was also advertised via Contracts Finder. The indicative timetable for procurement is set out below.

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

Activity	Proposed Date
Tender Issued	10 November 2020
Opportunity for site visits	24 and 26 November 2020
Clarification Deadline	3 December 2020
Clarification Response Deadline	7 December 2020
Tender Return Deadline	10 December 2020
Tender Evaluation Period	14 December – 4 January 2021
Moderation Date	6 January 2021
Earliest Award Decision	22 January 2021
Earliest Contract Commencement	1 February 2021

4.3. A 50:50, price:quality weighting was used to evaluate proposals. Quality covered the following areas

- Technical Ability - 5%
- Technical / Service Delivery - 15%
- Health and Safety – 5%
- Capability and Experience - 10%
- Sustainable Procurement – 10%
- Covid 19 - 5%

4.4. The pricing evaluation provides the maximum score of 50 for the lowest tenderer with remaining submissions ranked and scored against the lowest submission. The quality element of the returns was assessed via the Method Statements outlined below:

Main Criteria (& Weighting)	Sub-criteria Weighting	Sub-criteria	Evidence	Method Statement
MS1 Technical ability A minimum score of 8 is required for this Method Statement response	5%	Please describe your understanding of what is required and how this can be delivered successfully.	✓	MS1*

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

<p>MS2 Technical / Service Delivery</p> <p>A minimum score of 8 is required for this Method Statement response</p>	a) 7.5%	Please set out how you propose to carry out the works. Detail every step of the process in delivering a high quality social care capital scheme, from the initial kick-off meeting, through to completion.	✓	MS2a*
	b) 7.5%	Please demonstrate your project team has the skills required to successfully deliver the project	✓	MS2b*
<p>MS3 Health & Safety</p> <p>A minimum score of 8 is required for this Method Statement response</p>	5%	Please describe your plan to ensure health and safety on site during the contract period.	✓	MS3
<p>MS4 Capability and Experience</p> <p>A minimum score of 8 is required for this Method Statement response</p>	10%	Please provide three (3) case studies of similar projects you have undertaken that demonstrate the experience and capability you have of delivering similar types of work. Please also provide references.	✓	MS4*
<p>MS5 Sustainable Procurement</p> <p>A minimum score of 8 is required for this Method Statement response</p>	10%	<p>Please set out measure you will undertake in respect of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduction in carbon footprint 2. Local businesses accessing sub-contracting and supplier opportunities 3. Reducing and consolidating deliveries and travel to work 4. Sustainable sources used on contract 5. Reduction in waste sent to landfill 6. Demonstrate commitment to work practices that improve staff physical and mental wellbeing and reduce absenteeism due to ill health 7. School engagement offers delivered to LBL schools 8. Engagement offers to young person's social care client group 9. Any other social value that applies to the project in relation to the areas of: Employment, Skills and Economy; Greener Lewisham; Making Lewisham Healthier; Training Lewisham' Future. 	✓	MS5*

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

MS6 Covid-19 Implications	5%	<p>What are your plans for your organisation to safely deliver the works to ensure that their supply chains are able to delivery in line with The Health Protection (Coronavirus) Regulations 2020 and published government advice?</p> <p>This should cover any internal arrangements for staff and your supply chain, as well as where there is any interaction with the public in the delivery of the contract. Please detail any additional services, measures and working arrangements associated with the plans in place (e.g. resource number and assumptions / cleaning products/ PPE).</p>	✓	MS6
---------------------------	----	---	---	-----

- 4.5. Scoring was on a range of 0 to 10. A minimum score of 8 was required for MS1, MS2a, MS2b, MS4 and MS5. For MS3 and MS6 a minimum score of 5 was required. This was detailed in the Invitation to Tender.
- 4.6. The tender seal was broken after 12 noon on 10 December 2020. A good response was received with a total of 16 contractors making a bid for the project. 6 tenders were deemed incomplete and were disqualified before evaluation. 10 tenders went to moderation of which 5 did not meet the minimum threshold scores. Details of the complete tenders are shown in the table below.

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

Tenderer	Complete	Min. scores met	Price £	Total score	Rank
A	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
B	yes	no	636,532	n/a	n/a
C	no	n/a	557,835	n/a	n/a
D	yes	no	620,345	n/a	n/a
E	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
F	yes	yes	770,917	61.75	5
G	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Hawksmoor construction Services Limited	yes	yes	527084	88.09	1
H	yes	no	614,615	n/a	n/a
I	yes	no	235,064	n/a	n/a
J	yes	no	631,394	n/a	n/a
K	yes	yes	691,121	71.8	4
L	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
M	yes	yes	495,768	87.5	2
N	yes	yes	589,891	81.51	3
O	no	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

4.7. Credit scores were requested via 'Creditsafe' for each contractor to identify any contractor who may present a financial risk to the Council.

4.8. Tenders were evaluated by three officers:

- Project Manager, Capital Programme Delivery
- Project Officer, Capital Programme Delivery

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

- Architect/ Surveyor/ Contract Administrator, Cost Consultant, Principal Designer and CDM Advisor, Pinnacle ESP

4.9. Following independent analyses by the 3 evaluators a moderation meeting was held and overseen and managed by a Senior Procurement and Contracts officer. Evaluators discussed each practice and their individual responses to the method statements whereby the four parties agreed a consensus score between them. A full synopsis of tenders is included in the confidential appendix to this report.

5. Key risks

- 5.1. Pinnacle ESP have already undertaken surveys, including structural and asbestos, so the risk of identifying issues which might extend the programme has been addressed. Planning permission for the work has been secured
- 5.2. Covid-19 could potentially effect supply chains and does impact on working practices. Covid 19 measures is one of the quality criteria for assessing tenders.

6. Financial implications

- 6.1. This report recommends that the Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm approves the appointment of Hawksmoor Construction Services Limited to refurbish Council premises at 43 and 45 Bromley Road in order to reinstate a young care leavers' facility and a training and support base for Lewisham's foster carers, at the sum of £527,084 following an open tender process.
- 6.2. Budget for this work has been approved from the Council's Capital Programme.

7. Legal implications

- 7.1 The report seeks approval for the procurement of a contractor to carry out refurbishments at 43 and 45 Bromley Road. Given the potential spend on this contract this contract would be categorised by Contract Procedure Rules as a Category B contract.
- 7.2 Contract Procedure Rules place requirements on how that should happen. The Rules require that when letting contracts steps must be taken to secure value for money through a combination of cost, quality and competition, and that competitive tenders or quotations must be sought depending on the size and nature of the contract (Rule 5). Given the potential spend on this contract the procurement regulations (Public Contracts Regulations 2015) will not apply. The requirements of Contract Procedure Rules would be satisfied by the approach proposed, being an open advertised process. The process for procurement will have to be in accordance with the Contract Procedure Rules. As a Category B contract, it would be for the Executive Director to take a decision on the award of any contract.
- 7.3 Since this contract is below the value at which the procurement regulations apply, the provisions of the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 do not apply. However, the Council has adopted a Social Value policy which must be considered and applied; and the Council's Sustainable Procurement Code of Practice will be applied to the contract. The matters to be considered must only be those relevant to the services to be procured and it must be proportionate in all the circumstances to take those matters into account. The report sets out the social value issues which arise, and any

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

future decision by the Executive Director will also need to take those matters into consideration.

- 7.4 The Council has a public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty - The Equality Act 2010, or the Act). It covers the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
- eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
 - advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
 - foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 7.5 It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other prohibited conduct, or to promote equality of opportunity or foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. It is a duty to have due regard to the need to achieve the goals listed above. The weight to be attached to the duty will be dependent on the nature of the decision and the circumstances in which it is made. This is a matter for the decision maker, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. The decision maker must understand the impact or likely impact of the decision on those with protected characteristics who are potentially affected by the decision. The extent of the duty will necessarily vary from case to case and due regard is such regard as is appropriate in all the circumstances.
- 7.6 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found on the EHRC website.
- 7.7 The EHRC has issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty. The 'Essential' guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice.

8. Equalities implications

- 8.1. Ground floor disabled toilets and disabled access to ground floor, front and rear, will be provided for both 43 and 45 Bromley Road

9. Climate change and environmental implications

- 9.1. Consultancy services procured as part of this project require attention to sustainable design & construction and energy efficiency. In particular the following have been specified:
- 9.2. Conservation of Power: additional insulation to the loft areas and Argon gas filled

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

double glazing to the new glazing elements to reduce the amount of heat loss from the building, therefore conserving the power required to heat the property and reducing the CO2 footprint. LED lighting specified throughout, to reduce the amount of power required to provide lighting to the property and therefore reduce the CO2 footprint.

- 9.3. Environment / Sustainability: specified carpet tiles manufactured using 100% renewable electricity containing over 60% recycled materials, and a backing system with over 75% reclaimed, locally sourced content. Vinyl flooring specified which contains at least 60% recycled content and meets the highest possible current and future REACH compliance standards for chemical content. In addition, it is manufactured using 100% renewable electricity.
- 9.4. Specified low-flo toilets with flushing mechanisms which use less water. Specified kitchen fittings from a manufacturer who ensure all timber materials come from FSC (the Forest Stewardship Council) certified sources and all of the products they manufacture hold the FSC chain of custody certification.
- 9.5. Sustainability implications were included as part of the sustainable procurement requirements of the invitation to tender. Tenderers were assessed in respect of the following:
 - i. Reduction in carbon footprint
 - ii. Local businesses accessing sub-contracting and supplier opportunities
 - iii. Reducing and consolidating deliveries and travel to work
 - iv. Sustainable sources used on contract
 - v. Reduction in waste sent to landfill
 - vi. Demonstrate commitment to work practices that improve staff physical and mental wellbeing and reduce absenteeism due to ill health
 - vii. School engagement offers delivered to LBL schools
 - viii. Engagement offers to young person social care client group
 - ix. Any other social value that applies to the project in relation to the areas of: Employment, Skills and Economy; Greener Lewisham; Making Lewisham Healthier; Training Lewisham' Future.
- 9.6. A minimum score of 8 for sustainable procurement was required (i.e. 8 = very good: proposal meets the required standard in all aspects though may include a small number.

10. Crime and disorder implications

- 10.1. The re-establishment of Bromley Rd will enable the service to work with partner agencies to provide resources and support to help young people enhance their life opportunities.

11. Health and wellbeing implications

- 11.1. The refurbished premises and subsequent enhanced service provision will have significant positive health and well being benefits for young care leavers and foster carers.

12. Social Value implications

- 12.1. Social value implications were included as part of the sustainable procurement requirements of the invitation to tender.

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

12.2. The Project Manager, Capital Programme Delivery and the Council's Local Labour and Business Scheme Project Officer will monitor delivery of social value.

Background papers

Building Fabric, Mechanical and Electrical Schedule of Works Preliminaries & Pricing Schedule combined

Report author and contact

Adam Platts, Project Manager, adam.platts@lewisham.gov.uk

Mob: 07392 860 444

13

I approve the recommendations in this report

Signed:



Kevin Sheehan

Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

8th February 2021

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

43 and 45 Bromley Road Refurbishment - Contract Award Approval for Refurbishment Works

Date: 4 February 2021

PART 2: CONFIDENTIAL APPENDIX

A full synopsis of tenders is set out below:

- **A&A Master Builder**

Minimum scores met: N/A

Financial Score: N/A

Quality Score: N/A

Combined Score: N/A

Overall ranked position: Tender disqualified before evaluation

This submission did not include all necessary documentation. The submission comprised of Company house company information and was deemed incomplete and not possible to evaluate.

- **AMMCASS Limited**

Minimum scores met: No

Financial Score: N/A

Quality Score: N/A

Combined Score: N/A

Overall ranked position: Minimum score not met

MS1. Overall score agreed is 7 which is below the minimum threshold score of 8. No real explanation was given to the of nature of the project nor reference to specifics of a social care project. The response was fairly generic. Good details were set out of client relationship processes. The submission incorrectly refers to Harrow Council. Details were not set out in the response to this question of processes of liaison and project management - but the response to MS1, which did cover these areas, was taken into account. The processes prior to works commencing were not set out.

MS2 A - Overall score agreed is 7 which is below the minimum threshold score of 8. The response did not address site constraints, e.g access and issues with the site. Overall this response lacked detail.

MS2 B Good range of skills set out though it was not clear what is to be subcontracted. A higher score would have been achieved if more experience related to refurbished constructions had been set out.

MS3 Overall score agreed is 7 which is below the minimum threshold score of 8. No specific health and safety resource were identified. For a higher score more detail was required eg.

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

policies and plans . The response was fairly generic and lacked detail, with, for example, no reference to on site issues for safety of staff and visitors.

MS 4. Overall score agreed is 7 which is below the minimum threshold score of 8. Two good and relevant refurbishment examples were given of similar scale and nature of use and for public sector clients. However, one example was of modular construction and was not relevant to 43 and 45 Bromley Road,

MS 5. Overall score agreed is 7 which is below the minimum threshold score of 8. This was a fairly comprehensive answers but not addressed were - reduction in waste sent to landfill and demonstration of commitment to work practices that improve staff physical and mental wellbeing and reduce absenteeism due to ill health. It is difficult to see how some of the proposed measures would be applied in practice to a project of this scale and nature.

MS 6. A good response and clear processes were set out. References more specific to site would have gained a full score.

- **Axel Group International Ltd**

Minimum scores met: N/A

Financial Score: N/A

Quality Score: N/A

Combined Score: N/A

Overall ranked position: Tender disqualified before evaluation.

The Standard Selection Questionnaire was not submitted as a document. There was no form of tender.

- **B Nokes Contracts Ltd**

Minimum scores met: No

Financial Score: N/A

Quality Score: N/A

Combined Score: N/A

Overall ranked position: Minimum score not met

MS 1. Overall score agreed is 6 which is below the minimum threshold score of 8. No real explanation was given of the nature of project nor reference to specifics of a social care project . Limited detail was set out of processes. There was an emphasis on flexible approach. Generic project management was included but no reference to preconstruction plans. Overall, the response lacked detail and a tailored response to the specifics of this project would have gained a higher score.

MS2 A. Overall score agreed is 6 which is below the minimum threshold score of 8. The response lacked detail eg. - no reference to phasing of different elements of work, limited info

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

provided regarding procurement of contractors and materials, no reference to communication with neighbours.

MS2 B. Overall score agreed is 6 which is below the minimum threshold score of 8. A range of project management and site management skills were set out but details lacking regarding how each would be involved. The extent of sub-contracting was not clear, Skills, qualification and accreditations are not fully detailed.

MS3 An acceptable response fairly generic in detail. The response did not describe matter specific to this site, such as site set up, organising safe delivery of material, storage of material and welfare set up.

MS4. Examples given were relevant, public sector with elements of care and public access. The examples were mainly smaller scale projects. More detail would have been beneficial. The response did show internal and external refurbishment works but could have been expanded to include more detail with regards to the structural works.

MS5. This response was fairly comprehensive and in line with scale and nature of project. Policies and procedures were provided.

MS6. Good, clear, practical measures were set out.

- **FINAN FORMWORKS Ltd**

Minimum scores met: N/A

Financial Score: N/A

Quality Score: N/A

Combined Score: N/A

Overall ranked position: Tender disqualified before evaluation.

The submission did not include a form of tender, Standard Selection Questionnaire nor method statement. The submission was marketing material. No price was submitted.

- **Foreshaw Building Services Limited**

Minimum scores met: Yes

Financial Score: 22.25

Quality Score: 39.5

Combined Score: 61.75

Overall ranked position: 5th

MS1. The submission set out an emphasis on local supply chains and the local nature of delivery. Predominantly, use own direct labour was proposed. A history of work with the

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

Council was set out. However, no real explanation was given of the nature of the project nor reference to specifics of a social care project.

MS2 A Project acceptance flow chart covered all relevant areas though no further detail was given as to how this relates to this particular project. The response was fairly generic and more detail regarding the specifics of this project would have secured a higher score.

MS2 B. The response set out a good range of relevant resource, accreditations, with a good range of project experience. The company have a long track record and are well qualified to undertake these works.

MS3. A comprehensive response was set out to onsite H&S management but this was industry standard.

MS4. Good details were provided of previous projects. Heritage projects show attention to detail and quality which would be expected on this project.

MS5. All areas were addressed very well and realistically. A good range of local suppliers were detailed and a range of local relevant examples set out. The word limit of 750 words was significantly exceeded but the project still scored above the threshold based on assessment of first 750 words.

MS6. All expected major areas were covered. The word limit of 500 was exceeded but the project still scored above the threshold based on assessment of first 500 words.

- **Hacken Limited**

Minimum scores met: N/A

Financial Score: N/A

Quality Score: N/A

Combined Score: N/A

Overall ranked position: Tender disqualified before evaluation.

The response did not include a Building Fabric, Mechanical and Electrical Schedule of Works Preliminaries & Pricing Schedule combined

- **Hawksmoor Construction Services Limited**

Minimum scores met: Yes

Financial Score: 46.84

Quality Score: 41.25

Combined Score: 88.09

Overall ranked position: 1st

MS 1. This was a good response making good reference to ISO standards, end users and the environment for users. The proposal sets out the project management processes and that in-house tradespeople are to be provided. To achieve a higher score more reference to building

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

type would have been required. Similarly more reference to the client group and associated processes to meet the needs of this client group would have secured a higher score.

MS2 A. This was a good response which detailed the respective work packages including specialist sub-contractor appointments. Comprehensive processes were set out, including good focus on planning during the mobilisation period. The work plan refers to different packages of work and proposes to undertake the works with two teams.

MS2 B A good range of skills were set out covering all necessary areas and in house tradespeople area included. More detail would have secured a higher score.

MS3. Comprehensive coverage was set out of all expected areas of H&S but the response lacked some detail and specifics relevant to this site.

MS4 A good range of relevant projects were set out including significant social care experience. The proposal demonstrated work on similar sites with similar constraints.

MS5. All areas were addressed very well and realistically. The proposals were relevant to the scale and nature of this project.

MS6. All expected major areas were covered.

Lengard Ltd

Minimum scores met: No

Financial Score: N/A

Quality Score: N/A

Combined Score: N/A

Overall ranked position: Minimum score not met

MS1 Overall score agreed was 6 which is below the required minimum threshold score of 8. Whilst care leavers and Lewisham foster carers were referred to, the proposal was fairly limited in detail, missing out on the opportunity to fully demonstrate an understanding of the nature of project. The programme period set out in the proposal was incorrect and sequential work packages are suggested, it is difficult to see how this would not prolongate the contract period. Overall the response to MS1 was somewhat sparse.

MS2A. The overall score agreed was 7 which is below the required minimum threshold score of 8. Good detailed processes were set out for site establishment, mobilisation, completion and handover, but details of actual processes of works were omitted.

MS2B. The response here was comprehensive and in line with the scale and nature of project. Policies and procedures were provided, however these were not specific to this project.

MS3. The response here was comprehensive, with coverage of all expected areas of H&S. An independent H&S advisor was proposed.

MS4. A range of projects was set out. An emphasis on heritage projects showed delivery of quality. A range of public sector examples were given but there were no specific social care examples.

MS5. A comprehensive proposal and in line with scale and nature of project. Policies and procedures were provided but not specific to this project. Some consideration of community

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

involvement was set out. MS6. All expected major areas were covered commensurate with the scale and nature of project.

London Building Contractors (LBC)

Minimum scores met: No

Financial Score: N/A

Quality Score: N/A

Combined Score: N/A

Overall ranked position: Minimum score not met

MS1. Overall score agreed was 4 which is below the required minimum threshold score of 8. The proposal did not include description of the nature of project nor demonstration of full understanding of project. No detail was provided about project management and overall the response is very generic. The proposal refers to block work but this is not relevant to 43 and 45 Bromley Road.

MS2 An overall score of 4 was agreed which is below the required minimum threshold score of 8. The proposal set out only a basic and generic description of processes, with no specific reference to this project. The examples set out did not relate to this type of project.

MS2B The overall score agreed was below the required minimum threshold score of 8. The proposal lacks detailed explanation of project team and skills.

MS3. The overall score agreed was below the required minimum threshold score of 5. There was no reference to accreditations or procedures to be followed and a significant lack of detail.

MS 4. The overall score agreed was below the required minimum threshold score of 8. The case studies provided were of limited relevance.

MS5. The overall score agreed was below the required minimum threshold score of 8. Main detail provided was only regarding pollution.

MS6. The main expected areas were covered.

Project Space Ltd

Minimum scores met: No

Financial Score: N/A

Quality Score: N/A

Combined Score: N/A

Overall ranked position: Minimum score not met

MSS1. The overall score agreed was 4 which is below the required minimum threshold score of 8. A very brief response to this question was set out with no reference to end users or requirements of Lewisham. Overall the response lacked detail. The response is not sufficient

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

to explain how the project will be delivered. No relevant experience of the team was referenced. Three projects were mentioned but no time period provided.

MS2A The overall score agreed was 4 which is below the required minimum threshold score of 8. The response here was not considered to be adequate. Very limited detail of processes was provided with no specific references to this project. More detailed input and consideration were required for a higher score.

MS2 B The overall score agreed was below the required minimum threshold score. Skills were not detailed and overall this response was not considered to be adequate.

MS3 The overall score agreed was below the required minimum threshold score. Only basic and generic standards to ensure health and safety on site were set out and no explanation was given as to how this will be actioned on this site nor to making sure suppliers adhere.

MS4. The overall score agreed was below the required minimum threshold score. The examples did not include social care facility projects nor public sector clients. No detail was provided about budgets, scale and timescales of project.

MS5. The overall score agreed was below the required minimum threshold score. Limited detail was provided of most expected areas but this was not specific to this project. Overall the response was not considered to be adequate.

MS6 The main expected areas were covered.

R Benson Property Maintenance Ltd

Minimum scores met: Yes

Financial Score: 30.3

Quality Score: 41.5

Combined Score: 71.8

Overall ranked position: 4th

MS1. A good response was provided. Proposes to undertake works predominantly with in-house tradesmen. A good understanding of supply chains and commitment to achieving deadlines is demonstrated. The proposal shows good understanding of nature of project and refers to delivery of social care schemes.

MS2 This was a good response with a site specific indicative programme. Very good detail was set out for preconstruction and construction stages, but more limited information provided for the post construction stage.

MS2B A full team was set out, with a good range of experience and skills. In house Tradespeople are proposed to be used.

MS3 The proposal demonstrates good management systems are in place but lacks specific reference to this particular site. There is no reference to the pandemic, which should have been part of the health and safety response as well as addressed in MS6.

MS4. A good and recent range of relevant projects were set out including demonstration of significant social care experience, work on similar sites with similar constraints and significant

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

public sector experience. MS5 All expected areas were addressed very well and realistically. The proposals were relevant to the scale and nature of this project.

MS6. This was an adequate response, with good coverage of most relevant areas and project specific. However, the proposal failed to explain contingency measures for replacement tradesmen if necessary.

Re-Gen (UK) Construction Ltd

Minimum scores met: N/A

Financial Score: N/A

Quality Score: N/A

Combined Score: N/A

Overall ranked position: Tender disqualified before evaluation

The proposal failed to include the required Standard Selection Questionnaire was submitted. The tender was incomplete with no response to quality questions.

ST Construction (London) Ltd

Minimum scores met: Yes

Financial Score: 50

Quality Score: 37.5

Combined Score: 87.5

Overall ranked position: 2nd

MS1 Very good details were set out of the processes involved - although explained in a generic way with only a little reference to this project. There was no reference to specifics of a social care project. To gain a higher score elaboration on the social care element would have been required.

MS2A. A somewhat generic response was provided which exceeded word count and did not address this specific project. Detailed programme outlined with the majority of work proposed to be undertaken by direct employees. All steps of the programme were clearly set out.

MS2B The roles of the proposed team were clearly described and overall a very comprehensive range of resources were proposed. The focus was on management structures with no reference to work force or supply chain. Overall, this was a good response. To gain a higher score back up staff or contingency measure would need to have been detailed

MS3. The submission was fairly generic in response to MS3, with standard provision set out covering all that is required under CDM requirements. All expected major areas and issues were considered and roles and responsibilities were clearly set out.

MS4 Examples were set out of internal refurbishment projects but projects are single trade examples, not complex, with no external work packages. No social care facility projects were detailed but a reference to public sector client was made. More complex projects would have

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

gained a higher score as would projects which had all the elements of 43 and 45 Bromley Road.

MS5. The proposal contained details relevant to the specifics of this project but there was some concern regarding potential over reliance on external supplier Travis Perkins to deliver on sustainability aspects rather than measures within the contractor's direct control, such as a commitment to the reduction of material wastage, reference to reduce or recycle. The proposal sets out that work force will be asked to use public transport which is not relevant to the current COVID situation. School engagement and work experience placement proposals are set out.

Standage & Co Ltd

Minimum scores met: Yes

Financial Score: 40.51

Quality Score: 41

Combined Score: 81.51

Overall ranked position: 3rd

MS1. The response showed a good understanding of project deliverables. The description of work and processes was comprehensive but taken direct from tender documentation and not expanded upon. Reference was made to specifics of the project but this could have been elaborated upon further to obtain a higher score. The proposal showed an emphasis on experience of working on Victorian properties similar to 43 and 45 Bromley Road. Reference was made to working with the Council and to social value.

MS2A A comprehensive response was set out covering award of contract through to delivery. A programme chart was included which covered all relevant areas. This was good, but to be excellent this would have required more detail on how the quality aspect would be maintained throughout the project hence a score of 8.

MS2B The proposal set out good local authority experience and experience of Victorian properties. All relevant areas were covered.

MS3 Comprehensive H&S expertise and processes were set with a good outline of responsibilities.

MS4 Examples set out were relevant and included very good examples of Victorian property work and including social care elements (residential accommodation and facilities for people with learning difficulties).

MS5 The proposal addressed all expected areas commensurate with scale of project.

MS6 The proposal was comprehensive and realistic commensurate with the nature of the Project at 43 and 45 Bromley Road.

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>

Tercet construction limited

Minimum scores met: N/A

Financial Score: N/A

Quality Score: N/A

Combined Score: N/A

Overall ranked position: Tender disqualified before evaluation

The following document were not included in this bid and hence this bid was disqualified: suitability questionnaire, form of tender, method statement.

CREDIT SCORES

Credit scores were requested via 'Creditsafe' for each contractor to identify any contractor who may present a financial risk to the Council. Hawksmoor Construction Services Limited, the top ranked proposal overall scored a credit score of 73, which places the company in the middle to upper 25% of 19980 companies sampled from the same industry. Credit safe scores of all companies achieving above the threshold minimum scores is detailed below.

Company Name	Credit Safe Score
Foreshaw Building Services Limited	61
Hawksmoor Construction Services Limited	73
R Benson Property Maintenance Ltd	59
ST Construction (London) Ltd	45
Standage & Co Ltd	71

Is this report easy to understand?

Please give us feedback so we can improve.

Go to <https://lewisham.gov.uk/contact-us/send-us-feedback-on-our-reports>