



Executive decision by the Executive Director for Housing Regeneration and Public Realm

Report title: Calabash Improvement Project – Contract Award Approval for Adaptations and improvement Works.

Date: 10th June 2021

Key decision: Yes

Class: Part 1

Ward(s) affected: Rushey Green / Borough Wide

Contributors: Capital Programme Delivery, Legal Services, Financial Services and Procurement & Contracts

Outline and recommendations

This report seeks approval from the Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm to appoint a principal contractor to undertake the refurbishment and adaptation works to the Calabash Centre. The centre is located at 22 – 24 George Lane, SE13 6HH, following the advertised opportunity on 23rd April – 21st May 2021, via the Council's online tendering system (Pro-Contract Procurement Portal), as per the Council's Contract Procedure Rules.

It is recommended that the Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm approve the appointment of Logic CP Limited as Principal Contractor to carry out the proposed refurbishment and adaptation work to the Calabash Centre, at the tendered sum of £463,769.87

Timeline of engagement and decision-making

The team advertised the tender opportunity on 23rd April – 21st May 2021, via the Council's online tendering system (Pro-Contract Procurement Portal), as per the Council's Contract Procedure Rules.

The report was placed on the forward plan on 14th April 2021 and Members can elect to scrutinise at the Overview Scrutiny Business Panel (OSBP).

A PID for this project was approved by Regeneration and Capital Programme Delivery Board on 13th October 2020

On the 17th December 2020 the Executive Director for Corporate Resources approved a single tender action to allow the initial feasibility consultancy to continue with the detailed design in order to fast track the project due to Covid-19 and the premature closure of the incumbent service provision.

On the 21st December 2020 the Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm approved the procurement strategy to obtain a suitable Principal Contractor to carry out the refurbishment and adaptation work at the Calabash Centre, (22-24 George Lane, SE13 6HH). This was in order to facilitate the provision of a flexible, commissioned building based day service in the Borough for older adults with various needs and abilities in the borough.

This procurement is a key decision as the value of the works is £463,769.87 and the potential usage of the building by older adults across the Borough.

1. Summary

- 1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek authority from the Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm for the appointment of Logic CP Limited as principal contractor to refurbish and adapt the Calabash Centre in order for the Council to provide the new Older Adult Service provision, at the tendered sum of £463,769.87, following the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and the open tender process.
- 1.2. The newly refurbished and adapted Calabash Centre will provide one of two main commissioned day services for older adults in the Borough, as well as improving the building offer to other community groups.
- 1.3. In 2019, concept designs of the Calabash Centre were developed to feasibility RIBA Stage 2 by IG9 Consultancy, including outline proposals for structural alterations, building services systems, specifications and a preliminary budget estimate. IG9 were subsequently retained in 2020, to fast-track the project providing detailed design and providing the roles of Architect/ Surveyor/ Contract Administrator, Cost consultant, Principal Designer and CDM Adviser provisions up to RIBA stage 7. Also to secure Planning and building regulation approval, due to the premature closure of the building and service provision by Covid-19.
- 1.4. On 21st December 2020, approval was granted by the Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm to the strategy approach to procure a suitable Principal Contractor to undertake the refurbishment and adaptation works.
- 1.5. The construction market was approached (23rd April – 21st May 2021) via the Council's online tendering system (Pro-Contract Procurement Portal) by an open tender process.

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>

- 1.6. 67 contractors expressed an interest in provision of the construction build, 19 formally opted out to submit the tender documentation, 38 didn't submit any documentation by the close of tender at 12 noon on 21st May 2021. Of the 10 tenders submitted, 5 were deemed incomplete by the Councils' Procurement Team and 5 were evaluated and went on to evaluation and moderation of quality based on the quality assessment criteria.
- 1.7. Logic CP Limited achieved the highest economically advantageous overall score based on a robust assessment of quality and price. Contractor "E" were the lowest priced at £418,710.00, but failed due to submitting incomplete documentation, therefore no quality criteria was assessed or scores apportioned. The only score of quality went to Logic CP Limited who achieved above the minimum threshold and was priced more at £463,769.87, but was the lowest price tendered of the five (5) tenderers that went through to the evaluation process.
- 1.8. It is considered that Logic CP Limited, submitted the most economically advantageous bid based on quality and price and have demonstrated comprehensive skills, knowledge, experience and an ability to deliver this project.
- 1.9. A full synopsis of the tenders is included in the confidential appendix (A) attached to this report.
- 1.10. It is recommended that Logic CP Limited be appointed as principal contractor.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1. The Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm is recommended to approve the appointment of Logic CP Limited as Principal Contractor to carry out the refurbishment and adaptation work to the Calabash Centre, at a tendered sum of £463,769.87 and a construction duration of 16 weeks

3. Policy Context

- 3.1. Provision of a flexible, commissioned building based day service for older adults with various needs and abilities in the borough, contributes to the Council's Corporate Strategy 2018-2022 priorities and in particular :-

- Open Lewisham
- Delivering and defending, health, social care and support
- Making Lewisham greener

- 3.2. Further and more specifically, the completed building works will reduce energy consumption with the inclusion of modern energy conserving materials, heating boiler, gas appliances and LED lighting is consistent with the Council's energy policy, which was agreed at Mayor and Cabinet in July 2014, and more recently the Council's commitment to the borough being carbon neutral by 2030.

4. Background

- 4.1. The Council owns the Calabash Centre, 24-26 George Lane. There are two commissioned services located at the centre (The Calabash Older Adults' Day service and Nexus New Beginings) and a number of voluntary groups (The Active Elders Group and the Asian Elders Group).
- 4.2. In 2019, the Council consulted with service users and stakeholders on changes to the older adult day services within the borough. The proposal required the three currently commissioned day services to be combined and for a new single day service offer be located at the Calabash Centre from 1st October 2020 when the then current contracts

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>

ended. This reflects an increase in total number of older adults from 25 to 35 a day. The building can support a total occupancy of up to 70 people at a time and will accommodate the increase of 10 people a day.

- 4.3. The Council is seeking for the Calabash Centre to be one of its two main locations for commission day services for older adults, as well as improving the building offer to other community groups. To deliver this outcome to a good standard, the centre requires a significant programme of modernisation and improvements to make it more accessible to people with significant physical disability, to support and promote the maintenance of skills of daily living, and to make the best use of the available space: for example the plans include a second kitchen area, an additional separate activity room, and an improved safer outdoor area. The development of a new service offer will also require the purchase of new furniture and fittings.
- 4.4. The improvements to the building are required to ensure that the services and other activities continue to run effectively, also to ensure that the building meets current building, fire and energy efficient standards.
- 4.5. These works overall will also support the Council and its service providers manage any guidance regarding services in the current and post Covid-19 environment. The current building does not support the delivery of services to groups in their 'bubbles', staggered arrival and finish times, as set out in current Covid-19 guidance documents supporting the reintroduction of day service provision. See link below.

<https://www.scie.org.uk/care-providers/coronavirus-covid-19/day-care/safe-delivery>

- 4.6. The Impact of the Covid-19 pandemic has meant that the building and its associated services have been closed since the end March 2020. This has also significantly impaired the commissioning of the new service. Recent increases in Covid infection suggest that the service is unlikely to recommence this financial year. Therefore, this seems an opportune time, while the building is empty, for the Council to undertake these remedial and improvement works.

5. Summary of Proposed Works

- 5.1. The Centre will undergo a significant programme of modernisation and improvements to make it more accessible to people with significant physical disability, support and promote maintenance of daily living skills, make the best use of the available space, whilst meeting current building, fire and energy efficient standards.
- 5.2. The adaptation and improvement plan includes:-

- New Roof tiles, rainwater good and drainage
- Mechanical and electrical services upgrading
- Fire safety doors and alarm upgrading
- Garden re-surfacing and provision of an out building
- Improvements and relocation of hygiene room facilities
- Redesigned general usage toilets and DDA toilets
- Addition of separate cooking facilities.
- An additional activity room
- Internal decorations, floor coverings and refurbishments
- New LED lighting
- New furniture and equipment

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>

6. Procurement Approach and Evaluation

- 6.1. The procurement opportunity (Tender) was advertised via the Council's online tendering system (Pro-Contract Procurement Portal), which publishes opportunities through the London Tenders Portal, Contracts Finder and into the OJEU when necessary, as per the Council's Contract Procedure Rule.
- 6.2. Suppliers were able to tender for this contract via the Pro Contract Procurement Portal and were assessed on a criteria of price and quality (social value represented 5 percent of the quality score) of 50/50 split.
- 6.3. The value of the works is classified as Category B under the Council's Contract Procurement Rules.
- 6.4. The tender was issued to the construction market on 23rd April 2021 with a tender return date 12 noon on May 21st 2021.

Indicative Procurement Timetable

Activity	Date
Tender Issued	23 rd April 2021
Opportunity for site visits	7 th and 11 th May 2021
Clarification Deadline	12 noon 14 th May 2021
Clarification Response Deadline	18 th May 2021
Tender Return Deadline	12 noon 21 st May 2021
Tender Evaluation Period	26 th – 28 th May 2021
Tender Moderation	2 nd June 2021
Earliest Award Decision	23 rd June 2021
Earliest Contract Commencement	7 th July 2021

- 6.5. The ratio of 50:50 (Price: Quality) weighting used to evaluate the tender covered the following areas:-
 - Financial
 - Service Delivery
 - Project Management
 - Health and Safety
 - Risk Mitigation
 - Equality and Diversity
 - Social Value
- 6.6. The tenderers bid provided a pricing maximum score of 50 percent and the lowest priced tender submission was used to rank and score the remaining submitted tenders as indicated below:-

Price score = (lowest price / tendered price) x (Price Weighting)
- 6.7. The Method Statements outlined below were used as the baseline to assess each tenderers submission against the required criterion.

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>

Main Criteria (& Weighting)	Sub-criteria Weighting	Sub-criteria	Evidence	Method Statement
Service Delivery*	15 %	Please provide a detailed and clear proposal on how you will deliver the service outlined in the Specification. <i>(You should include CV's and a structure chart of those involved).</i>	Yes	MS 1*
Project Management*	15 %	Please provide your proposed programme of works and a timetable document outlining how this will be delivered within 16 weeks. You should describe clearly the process you will undertake and how you will mobilise and manage the project from award.	Yes	MS 2*
Health & Safety	5 %	Please describe the control measures you implement as Principal Contractor to ensure all works, are undertaken in a safe manner, in line with any relevant statutory Health & Safety regulations, policies and best practices. Please outline how you will comply with the guidance set out within the 'Site Operating Procedures Protecting Your Workforce during Coronavirus (Covid-19)' published by the Construction Leadership Council.	No	MS 3
Risk Mitigation	6 %	Using examples, please describe a time where your organisation worked on a comparable project and encountered, mitigated and overcame a problem or issue and what you learnt. Please outline how the comparable project was of a similar size, scope and complexity to this one and whether or not it was ultimately delivered according to its original project timetable.	No	MS 4*
Equality & Diversity	4 %	Please attach your Equality and Diversity Policy and describe how you would implement equal opportunities within the context of the specification. You should clearly set out how you will promote and safeguard equality, diversity and inclusion for the duration of the contract.	Yes	MS 5
Social Value	5%	With the impactful and measurable Social Value commitments listed in Appendix I in mind, please detail how you propose to deliver Social Value as part of this project, the impactful and measurable targets that you are proposing in each of the four bold, headline areas and how you will meet your proposed Social Value targets over the life of the contract.	No	MS 6
Climate Change	For information only	Please confirm that as an organisation you report on your corporate carbon emissions using an accredited method. Please disclose what those emissions are. Please identify what actions or modifications they have included (if any) that will reduce carbon intensity in relation to the services you are proposing.	No	MS7

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>

- 6.8. Scores were based on a range of 0 to 10. A minimum score of 8 was required for MS1, MS2 and MS4 (as indicated by the asterisk (*)) and MS3, MS5 and MS6 a minimum score of 5 had to be achieved. MS7 was for information only and not allocated any weighting. This was detailed in the Invitation to Tender (ITT) information.
- 6.9. The tender seal was broken after 12 noon on the 21st May 2021. A good response was received to the advertised contract opportunity, with a total of ten (10) contractors submitting a bid for the project. On evaluation five (5) tender submissions were deemed incomplete and were disqualified and four (4) tender submissions did not meet the minimum threshold score requirements at moderation.
- 6.10. Details of all tender submissions are shown in the table below.

Tenderer	Completed	Min scores met	Sum £	Total Score	Rank
A	Yes	No	537503.90	N/A	N/A
B	Yes	No	609082.63	N/A	N/A
C	No	N/A	644056.00	N/A	N/A
D	Yes	No	536566.91	N/A	N/A
E	No	N/A	418710.00	N/A	N/A
F	No	N/A	447647.50	N/A	N/A
G	No	N/A	No price submitted	N/A	N/A
Logic CP Limited	Yes	Yes	463,769.87	89.30	1
I	Yes	No	550555.00	N/A	N/A
J	No	N/A	530882.12	N/A	N/A

- 6.11. Credit scores were requested via “Creditsafe” for each contractor to identify any that may present a financial risk to the Council.
- 6.12. The tender submissions were evaluated by three personnel as follows:-
- Project Manager, Capital Programme Delivery, LB Lewisham
 - Project Officer, Capital Programme Deliver, LBL
 - Associate Director, IG9 Consultancy.
- 6.13. Following independent analysis by the 3 evaluators a moderation meeting was held and overseen and managed by LB Lewisham’s Procurement and Contracts Manager. The evaluators discussed each qualifying tenderers submission responses to the individual method statements and an agreed consensus score was reached by the evaluation members to each tender submission.
- 6.14. A full synopsis of tendered submissions is included in the confidential appendix (A) to this report.

7. Risks

- 7.1. IG9 Consultancy have already undertaken surveys, (including structural, asbestos and drainage) limiting the possibility of unknown risks which might extend the 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>

and potentially increase costs. Planning permission was granted on 18th May 2021 and Building Regulations approval applied for on 23rd March 2021.

- 7.2. Covid – 19 could potentially affect supply chains and any latest government guidance procedures, may impact on working practices.

8. Contract terms

- 8.1. The JCT Intermediate Building Contract With Contractors Design 2016 conditions of contract will be used, amended to incorporate the Councils standard clauses. The construction work is anticipated to commence in August 2021 for a period of 16 weeks between August 2021 – December 2021 (or as per final agreed programme).

9. Financial implications

- 9.1. This report recommends that the Executive Director for Housing Regeneration and Public Realm approves the appointment of Logic CP Limited to undertake the refurbishment and adaptation works at the Calabash Centre, 24 – 26 George Lane, SE13 6HH, in order to facilitate the new Older Adults Commissioned Base Day Services, at the tendered sum of £463,769.87
- 9.2. The total project budget is £515,000.00 and was approved at the Regeneration and Capital Programme Delivery Board in October 2020 and as part of the overall capital programme reported to Mayor and Cabinet in February as part of the budget report. The project will be funded from the Adult Social Care Capital Grant of the Capital Programme.

10. Legal implications

- 10.1. The Council's Constitution contains requirements about how to procure and manage contracts. These are in the Contract Procedure Rules (Constitution Part IV). Some of the requirements in those Rules are based on the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 as amended by the Public Procurement (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations ("the Regulations") with which the Council must comply. Given the value of the contract the Regulations apply.
- 10.2. The value of the works contract means that this is a Category B contract for the purposes of the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and one which is to be awarded by the Executive Director.
- 10.3. This contract has been externally and openly advertised as required by the Regulations and the Council's Constitution. If the proposal to award the contract is approved, award notices must be published in the prescribed form.
- 10.4. The report explains the evaluation approach and process applied to the bid and the reasons for recommending the successful bid for approval. The Invitation to Tender set out that tenderers had to reach specified scores. The process followed, including exclusion of tenderers who did not reach the minimum score, was in compliance with the advertised and required procedures.
- 10.5. This decision is a Key Decision under Article 16.2 (c) (xxiii) of the Constitution as it has a value of more than £200,000. It is therefore required to be contained in the current Key Decision Plan.
- 10.6. 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

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>

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

- 10.7. The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 10.8. 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.
- 10.9. The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the decision maker, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations. 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.
- 10.10. The Equality and Human Rights Commission has issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality 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 at:
- <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/>
- 10.11. The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:
1. The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
 2. Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
 3. Engagement and the equality duty
 4. Equality objectives and the equality duty
 5. Equality information and the equality duty
- 10.12. 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

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>

guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at:

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/>

11. Equalities implications

- 11.1. The Calabash Centre improvement and adaptations will have a positive impact on Boroughs Older Adults Day Service, Active Elders Group, Asian Elders Group as well as other users. It will support the Council and its service providers manage any guidance regarding services in the current Covid-19 environment allowing delivery of services to groups in their “bubble”, staggered arrival and finish times; thus secure a safe environment, reducing the risk of potential covid infection, that disproportionately affects the elderly and in particular those from the Black and Ethnic Minority Group. It is also expected that positive improvements will be borne by those with protected characteristics relevant to the Equality Act 2010.

12. Climate change and environmental implications

- 12.1. The improvements and adaptations of the Calabash Centre will modernise and energise the building creating flexible space for alternative use. New LED lighting, modern heating boiler and controls along side improvements to the building fabric, will create energy efficiencies and reduce running costs.

13. Crime and disorder implications

- 13.1. There are no specific crime and disorder implications arising from this report

14. Health and wellbeing implications

- 14.1. The modernisation and improvements will make the Calabash more accessible to people with significant physical disability, support and promote the maintenance of skills of daily living and provide a basis whereby active involvement of the elderly is encouraged within the community, thus reducing isolation. All of which promotes health and mental wellbeing.

15. Social Value implications

- 15.1. The Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 requires the council to consider a number of issues including, how what is proposed to be procured may improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of the local area for higher value contracts. The council is committed to these principles for all contracts over £50,000 in value. For contracts less than £50,000 the Council requires that where practicable a Lewisham based organisation be invited to quote for the goods, works or services.
- 15.2. A section of the tender evaluation for quality is based on the social value commitments bidders make in their method statement. The final weighting given to the social value element of the method statement was agreed with the Procurement team and is in line with the Council’s Social Value Policy.
- 15.3. The Calabash improvement will aim to deliver on social value to the London Borough of Lewisham. The amount of outcomes per metric agreed with the contractor will need to be both relevant and proportionate to the size and duration of the contract. Some suggested deliverables could be:-

Employment, Skills and the Economy.

- Paying London Living Wage.

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>

- Create / Advertise job opportunities locally.
- Apprenticeship.
- Adult residents on work experience.
- Local spend i.e materials from suppliers or sub-contractors.
- Use of sustainable materials.
- Modern slavery policy.

Greener Lewisham.

- Reduction of single use plastics.
- Use of sustainable resources.
- Measured reduction in carbon footprint.
- Reduction in landfill.
- FORS accreditation for vehicles (use of a green vehicle fleet).

Training Lewisham's Future.

- Provide work experience for young people.
- Youth engagement sessions.

Making Lewisham Healthier.

- Support for a specific health initiative.
- Promotion of general healthy living.

16. Background papers

- 16.1. Project Initiation Document (PID) 14/10/20
- 16.2. Single Tender Action Report – 17/12/2020
- 16.3. Approval to Tender Report – 21/12/2020
- 16.4. Planning Permission Approval – 18/5/2021

17. Glossary

Term	Definition
Contracts Finder	The Government's one stop shop for suppliers to find new procurement opportunities across the public sector
JCT	Joint Contracts Tribunal who produce standard forms of contract for construction works
Procurement	The process of finding and agreeing to terms, and acquiring goods, services or works from an external source, often via a tendering or competitive process
Tender	Document submitted by an organisation including business questionnaire, instructions to tenderers, contract conditions, specification, pricing document, form of tender and tenderers'

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>

Term	Definition
	responses for the delivery of supplies, services or works in response to an invitation to tender. This normally involves submission of the offer in a sealed envelope to a specified address by a specified time and date.
Evaluation	A methodological analytical process to determine the most economically advantageous supplier against a prior set baseline targets.
PID	Project Initiation Document. A documentation process of governance enabling best practice of managing projects, aligned with Projects in Controlled Environments (Prince 2) methodology.
OJEU	Official Journal of the European Union. A publication for suppliers in European union to find new procurement opportunities.
CPR	Contract Procurement Rules. The Council's procurement procedure when the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 does not apply.
LED	Light emitting diode. A low energy consumption light source

18. Report author and contact

- 18.1. If there are any queries on this report please contact Les Senior, Project Manager
Email: Les.Senior@Lewisham.gov.uk, Tel: 020 8314 2025

19. Conclusion

- 19.1. On the basis of the information within this report, the Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm, is recommended to approve the appointment of the principal contractor following the procurement process that has been outlined.

20. Decision

Acting in accordance with Standing Orders (paragraph 20 of Section I), I hereby approve the appointment, as per the details set out in this report.

Signed



Date 16th June 2021

Name (printed) Kevin Sheehan

Executive Director for Housing, Regeneration and Public Realm

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>

CONFIDENTIAL APPENDIX “A”

Calabash Improvement Project – Contract Award Approval for Adaptations and improvement Works.

Date: June 2021

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. The proposal was at a good standard but was somewhat generic in the response, minimal details provided on the CVs, more specific information required in terms of stakeholder engagement and communication plans. Very good project planning, governance and quality assurance - more specificity to the project would have improved the score but the relevant knowledge, experience and skills was explained. There was a very good consideration of site logistics and how deliveries would be managed in terms of traffic management and the safe storage of building materials.

Consensus score of 8 agreed by the panel.

MS2. Very good response, provided detailed programme for within the 16 weeks as required, set out some critical phases for delivery including further detail, very good consideration of associated risks especially with regard to supply chains and covid-19 impacts - section on management was very good but may have fitted better in MS1, overall a very good response.

Consensus score of 8 agreed by the panel.

MS3. Adequate detail on health and safety approach with discussion of legislation and regulations, more detail needed on implementation on-site i.e. health and safety personnel, site security etc. Statutory guidance good, but practical focus would have helped improve the response, covid-19 guidance was clear. Reference to the application of CDM and health and safety at work act being implemented needed in order to demonstrate understanding. Day-to-day management of the scheme was adequate, inductions for staff and sub-contractors was a successful area as was discussion of RAMS and working from height. A more practical application was needed for a higher score.

Consensus score of 6 agreed by the panel.

MS 4. The proposal barely met the required standard. The response of a comparable project and problems encountered; lacked substance of site risks / mitigation and needed further consideration in terms of lesson learnt from suitable examples. Example 1, focused on covid-19 and supply chain management. The second example being a financial problem solving approach in conjunction with stakeholders, rather than site focused, which clearly overlooked site risks.

Consensus score agreed by the panel is 6, which is below the minimum threshold score of 8.

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>

MS 5. A vague and poor response provided, not enough information to indicate implementation of equality and diversity in relation to the context of the project specification. The Equality and Diversity policies lacked specific content on some elements of key protected characteristics and needed improvement.

MS 6. Demonstrated commitment to social value and provided details of previous project commitments in the contents. A clear outline identified, aimed to promote inclusion of young people and employ skilled individuals from the local area.

MS 7. This provided information only, that the organisation reports on their corporate carbon emissions using an accredited method.

Ark Build PLC

Minimum scores met:	N/A
Financial Score:	N/A
Quality Score:	N/A
Combined Score:	N/A
Overall ranked position:	Minimum score not met

MS 1. Good project planning, governance and quality control mentioned. Consideration of specific site logistics and constraints on transportation (i.e. materials storage and waste management) could have been better. Well-presented CVs of key personnel with relevant work examples and detailed approach of project delivery with sub-contractors. Appraisal of the pre-construction information and the need to progress initial design mentioned.

Consensus score of 8 agreed by the panel.

MS 2. Alternative contract programme of 24 weeks submitted with very good level of detail to demonstrate evidential reasoning of step-by-step to delivery and risk approach. The response set out sourcing of materials, lead times for specialist materials, phasing of works and a detailed site logistics plan. The section on logistics was an excellent well thought out response.

Consensus score of 9 agreed by the panel.

MS 3. The proposal met the required standard and provided a good level of detail information regarding health and safety, but failed to mention site specific procedures for first aid and emergencies and adequately to the Construction & Design Management Regulations (CDM) 2015, which would have warranted a higher score. The response to Covid-19 working arrangements demonstrated robust procedures being implemented for safe working including site visitors.

Consensus score of 8 agreed by the panel.

MS 4. Good risk management outline, showed awareness of associated risk to project, but needed to provide details of lessons learnt. Mitigation and overcoming issues such as covid-19, noise / dust working practices and materials was very good.

Consensus score agreed by the panel is 7, which is below the minimum threshold score of 8.

MS 5. Excellent Equality and Diversity policy and evidenced implementation within the project, especially in the area of recruiting staff, consultation workshops and awareness training.

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>

MS 6. A very good social value action plan, with clear measurable and impactful targets alongside local benefits realisation such as liaison with schools on work experience placement, identify local suppliers, office training, apprenticeships and job adverts.

MS 7. This provided information only, that the organisation reports on their corporate carbon emissions using an accredited method.

Foreshaw Building Services Limited

Minimum scores met: No
Financial Score: N/A
Quality Score: N/A
Combined Score: N/A
Overall ranked position: Tender disqualified before evaluation.

The submission did not provide a signed and priced pricing schedule as clearly and specifically requested in the ITT.

Foster Property Maintenance Limited

Minimum scores met: N/A
Financial Score: N/A
Quality Score: N/A
Combined Score: N/A
Overall ranked position: Minimum score not met

MS 1. The proposal met the required standard providing a minimal outline of how the project would be delivered. The personnel outline relative to the delivery of this project was barely adequate, more detail needed on roles and responsibilities of staff members. CVs suggested skill set was focused on planned maintenance rather than refurbishment. Good communication and stakeholder management approach, by dedicated Communities Manager role. More evidence of learning from similar projects to influence delivery of this specification would have improved scoring.

Consensus score agreed by the panel is 6, which is below the minimum threshold score of 8.

MS 2. A detailed programme was produced that showed how the works intended to be phased through to completion, however, critical elements weren't itemised i.e. internal fire doors, external courtyard area and roof windows and the did not allow for any continuation of the initial design as required.

MS 3. Failed to mention legal requirement such as CDM and health & safety at work act, gave some evidence of approach to covid-19 working, but with very little attention to details. Overall not the required standard to ensure confidence in the approach to this area. Consideration was given to general Health & Safety requirements i.e. Working practices, RAMS and PPE etc. but no mention of safe distancing, break times, hygiene and welfare area.

MS 4. Risk management and mitigation plan was outlined well and easy to follow - but not clear on issues encountered on a comparable project. A comparable project example was provided but did not really provide evidence or lessons learnt. A reactive approach to risk and mitigation management, rather than planned demonstrated. A supplemented planned

approach example would merit better credit.

MS 5. The Equality & Diversity policy informed corporate strategy, but did not explain how this would be implemented throughout the project duration. An improvement to the response would be specifically tailored to suit the project and the specification. However, a clear presentation of the equality and diversity policy, recruitment and selection process - such as local advertisements and maintaining a prejudice free selection process.

MS 6. A very good response and commitment to provide social value benefits, including offers of work experience in offices or site based. Really strong evidence of approach to realisation of a greener Lewisham and local college apprenticeships. The provision of clear targets and commitments in term of impactful and measurable social value in Lewisham, would have merited an increased score.

MS 7. This provided information only, that the organisation reports on their corporate carbon emissions using an accredited method.

Gowlain Building Group Limited

Minimum scores met: No
Financial Score: N/A
Quality Score: N/A
Combined Score: N/A
Overall ranked position: Tender disqualified before evaluation.

Tenderer did not provide complete documentation as requested in the ITT, this included the omission of a supplier questionnaire document and answers to the project method statements.

Grenville Construction.

Minimum scores met: No
Financial Score: N/A
Quality Score: N/A
Combined Score: N/A
Overall ranked position: Tender disqualified before evaluation.

Tenderer did not provide a signed and priced pricing schedule as clearly and specifically requested in the ITT.

Ivan Cicak.

Minimum scores met: No
Financial Score: N/A
Quality Score: N/A
Combined Score: N/A
Overall Ranked position: Tender disqualified before evaluation.

Did not submit any tender documents, only submitted photographs of generic work including a

bathroom.

Comments from the portal: "We have over 15 Years' experience in Painting Decorating - Plastering - Tiling - Bathroom Fitting within Insurance Building Companies seeking to expand and looking for any new opportunities. Any References Can be provided".

Logic CP

Minimum scores met: Yes

Financial Score: 50

Quality Score: 39.3

Combined Score: 89.3

Overall ranked position: 1st

MS 1. A well thought out delivery plan that covered in detail the general requirements of service delivery. Governance and control mentioned, relevant skills, knowledge and experience outlined in management team. A team structure chart was provided and abridged CVs and outlined that full CVs would be available on request. However, more detailed information required on the continuation of the initial design element and stakeholder engagement. Site logistics, traffic management, pre-construction information and covid-19, healthy Lewisham and waste management covered in excellent detail, a strong response.

Consensus score of 8 agreed by the panel.

MS 2. Very good response. Proposal met all aspects and exceeded in some areas, detailed programme produced indicating project delivery to completion. Gant chart could be improved with more details of the continuity of initial design. The Structural and drainage design elements were not as thoroughly considered in the textual answer, was the only slight downside in an otherwise thorough answer of the 16 week delivery. Clear detail on mobilisation provided, however, the construction sequence may have been clearer communicated through a table rather than a block of text, but overall this was a very good response.

Consensus score of 8 agreed by the panel.

MS 3. The response identified the legal requirements relating to health and safety in construction projects and covered many of the key points of the CDM 2015 regulations requirements. The Covid-19 working arrangements demonstrated implementation of robust working procedures for safe working environments. Reference to the CDM 2015 regulations throughout the response, may have merited a higher score. Over all a very good detailed response.

Consensus score of 8 agreed by the panel.

MS 4. Well thought through proposal that met and exceeded the required standard in some areas. Good examples of comparable projects were provided with explanation of risks, mitigation and the lessons learnt. Photographic Illustration aided understanding of project examples.

Consensus score of 9 agreed by the panel.

MS 5. Adequately met the required standard. The provision of the Equality & Diversity policy, but the written response lacked substance – more evidence needed of implementation within the context of this project and its specifications in order to warrant a higher score.

Consensus score of 6 agreed by the panel.

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>

MS 6. The response provided a number of social value benefits, including opportunities for young people in Lewisham - training and apprenticeships, however, marginally lacked project specific commitment numbers to be provided. Nonetheless, this was a good response.

Consensus score of 7 agreed by the panel.

MS 7. This provided information only, that the organisation reports on their corporate carbon emissions using an accredited method.

Mitie Property Services (UK) Limited

Minimum scores met: N/A

Financial Score: N/A

Quality Score: N/A

Combined Score: N/A

Overall ranked position: Minimum score not met

MS 1. Clear detail of personnel roles and responsibilities and their direct involvement in the project with a detailed outline of project delivery. Quite a corporate response - structure chart included was organisational tailored rather than project specific. More specificity would merit a better score alongside more information on site logistics and waste management. Did not clearly explain whether the delivery approach was in-house, sub-contractors or a combination of both, better clarity welcomed, but overall a very good response

Consensus score of 8 agreed by the panel.

MS 2. A very good textual explanation of delivery programme, but omitted drainage and specificity on continuation of initial design parameters. The approach to delivery was broken down and explained in very good detail. Programme of works met expected standard outlining 16 weeks delivery. Robust information on mobilisation but less so on logistics (material storage, waste management, traffic management), to merit higher score.

Consensus score of 8 agreed by the panel.

MS 3. An excellent response to health & Safety regulations, policies and best practices. The proposals met the required standard and excelled in some areas, identified all legal requirements and covered many of the key points in great details. The response covered working arrangements, RAMS, construction phase plan, site induction, toolbox talks with daily briefing and welfare facilities and showed robust procedure regarding covid-19 working that aligned with governmental requirements.

Consensus score of 9 agree by the panel.

MS 4. Proposal adequately met the requirements providing standard response in most areas, showed a good awareness of risk management structure and had good processes in place. However, case study provided wasn't comparable in size and cost to this smaller project and didn't provide good enough evidence of problem-solving and risk mitigation. No applicable of lessons learnt provided and financial absorption not clarified explained. Not a strong answer in terms of mitigation, problem-solving and analytical skills in the areas of learning.

Consensus score of 6 agreed by the panel, which is below the minimum threshold of 8

MS 5. The response identifies the company as a top 50 inclusive employer but failed to contextualise what project specific implementation would occur in line with the specification, which is what the question specifically asks. Although production of a good equality and

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>

diversity policy and implementation corporately.

MS 6. Provided a good commitment social value, a number of benefits were itemised with implementing a continued improvement plan to ensure that targets would be met. An indication measurable baseline targets requirements such as apprenticeship, training workshop numbers etc. for the project, would provide a better response.

MS 7. This provided information only, that the organisation reports on their corporate carbon emissions using an accredited method.

Standage & Co Limited

- Minimum scores met: No
- Financial Score: N/A
- Quality Score: N/A
- Combined Score: N/A
- Overall ranked position: Tender disqualified before evaluation.

Tenderer provided an incomplete method statement document which would have led to automatic failure to meet minimum threshold scores for a number of questions.

CREDIT SCORES

Credit scores were requested via 'Credit safe' for each contractor to identify any contractor who may present a financial risk to the Council. Logic CP Limited were ranked third amongst the five successful evaluated bids with an overall a credit score of 61, which places the company in the middle to upper 25% of 20617 companies sampled from the same industry.

The five evaluated companies achieving above the minimum threshold scores is detailed below.

Company Name	Credit Safe Score
Ammcass Limited	41
Ark Build PLC	74
Foster Property Maintenance Limited	48
Logic CP Limited	61
Mitie Property Services (UK) Limited	63