



Contact: Jacqui Hurst  
Cabinet Secretary  
Direct : 020 8379 4096  
or Ext: 4096

e-mail: [jacqui.hurst@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:jacqui.hurst@enfield.gov.uk)

## THE CABINET

**Tuesday, 16th August, 2016 at 8.15 pm in the Conference Room,  
Civic Centre, Silver Street, Enfield, EN1 3XA**

### **Membership:**

Councillors : Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council), Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader of the Council), Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment), Yasemin Brett (Cabinet Member for Community, Arts & Culture), Alev Cazimoglu (Cabinet Member for Health & Social Care), Krystle Fonyonga (Cabinet Member for Community Safety & Public Health), Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency), Ayfer Orhan (Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection), Ahmet Oykenen (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) and Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration & Business Development)

### **Associate Cabinet Members**

Note: The Associate Cabinet Member posts are non-executive, with no voting rights at Cabinet. Associate Cabinet Members are accountable to Cabinet and are invited to attend Cabinet meetings.

Bambos Charalambous (Associate Cabinet Member – Non Voting), George Savva MBE (Associate Cabinet Member – Non Voting) and Vicki Pite (Associate Cabinet Member – Non Voting)

### **NOTE: CONDUCT AT MEETINGS OF THE CABINET**

Members of the public and representatives of the press are entitled to attend meetings of the Cabinet and to remain and hear discussions on matters within Part 1 of the agenda which is the public part of the meeting. They are not however, entitled to participate in any discussions.

## AGENDA – PART 1

### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

### 2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Members of the Cabinet are invited to identify any disclosable pecuniary, other pecuniary or non pecuniary interests relevant to items on the agenda.

## DECISION ITEMS

### 3. URGENT ITEMS

The Chairman will consider the admission of any reports (listed on the agenda but circulated late) which have not been circulated in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information and Meetings) (England) Regulations 2012.

Note: The above requirements state that agendas and reports should be circulated at least 5 clear working days in advance of meetings.

### 4. DEPUTATIONS

To note that no requests for deputations have been received for presentation to this Cabinet meeting.

### 5. ITEMS TO BE REFERRED TO THE COUNCIL

To note, that there are currently no reports to be referred to full Council.

### 6. EDUCATION SERVICES: A NEW MODEL OF SERVICE DELIVERY (Pages 1 - 16)

A report from the Chief Education Officer is attached. This proposes a new model of service delivery. **(Key decision – reference number 4339)**

(Report No.53)  
(8.20 – 8.30 pm)

### 7. REMEDIATION FRAMEWORK (Pages 17 - 80)

A report from the Director – Regeneration and Environment and Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services is attached. This seeks approval to the appointment of contractors onto a remediation framework for Enfield Council and other public sector authorities. (Report No.55, agenda part two also refers). **(Key decision – reference number 4351)**

(Report No.54)  
(8.30 – 8.40 pm)

**8. ISSUES ARISING FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

There are no issues arising for consideration at this meeting.

**9. CABINET AGENDA PLANNING - FUTURE ITEMS (Pages 81 - 88)**

Attached for information is a provisional list of items scheduled for future Cabinet meetings.

**10. MINUTES (Pages 89 - 108)**

To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet held on 7 July 2016.

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

**11. ENFIELD STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP UPDATE**

To note that there are no written updates to be received.

**12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

To note that the next meeting of the Cabinet is scheduled to take place on Tuesday 6 September 2016 at 8.15pm.

**CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS**

**13. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

To consider passing a resolution under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 excluding the press and public from the meeting for the item of business listed on the part 2 agenda on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in those paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006).  
(Members are asked to refer to the part 2 agenda)

This page is intentionally left blank

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. **53**

**MEETING TITLE AND DATE:**

Cabinet 16 August 2016

**REPORT OF:**

Chief Education Officer

Jenny Tosh

Telephone: 0208 379 3250

Email: [jenny.tosh@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:jenny.tosh@enfield.gov.uk)

<b>Agenda - Part: 1</b>	<b>Item: 6</b>
<b>Subject:</b> Education Services: a new model of service delivery	
<b>Wards:</b> All	
<b>Cabinet Member consulted:</b> Cllr Ayfer Orhan	

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 Education Services in Enfield have a well-documented and evidenced reputation for working in partnership with schools and settings to bring about continued improvement.
- 1.2 As the Enfield context has changed and the needs of our pupils have become more complex there is a clear need for schools and settings to sustain and build on this improvement.
- 1.3 The ongoing reduction of funds to the Council and the proposed changes to the schools' funding formula are placing increasing pressure on Education Services' budgets.
- 1.4 Although the government has made some changes to the White Paper it is still committed to its election manifesto that all schools will convert to academy status by 2022, and become part of Multi Academy Trusts (MATs);
- 1.5 This report seeks approval to investigate alternative models of service delivery that will still enable the council to work with all schools, whatever their status, and
  - continue to meet its statutory responsibilities,
  - provide the appropriate support to and with schools and settings,
  - places services in a strong position to offer support to other local authorities (LAs),
  - maintains strong and effective relationships with the Enfield learning community,
  - ensures Education Services contribute to delivering the council's savings agreed in the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP).
- 1.6 It is intended that the new model of service delivery will have the potential to develop additional income streams through wider trading beyond the Borough of Enfield and through applying for external funding not generally available to the Council.
- 1.7 In addition it will have the opportunity to work with schools and other partners to strengthen and develop the partnership and may support and partner with schools in their development of MATs.

## **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

**This reports seeks approval for the Chief Education Officer to:**

- 2.1 Set up a shadow board, to be called Ensen, as part of the Portfolio in Education Services for 2016/17, maintaining the existing budgetary and employment arrangements for 2016/17, therefore enabling the Education Services to fulfil the current Service Level Agreements with schools;
- 2.2 Develop a full business plan to be operational from 2017/18 to address the future financial viability of the company. This will also include a marketing strategy within and outside Enfield so that schools and settings are clear about the traded offer from Ensen from April 2017;
- 2.3 Ensure that Ensen, as a key part of Education Services, contributes to delivering the council savings agreed in the MTFP
- 2.4 In consultation with the Director of Children's Services and Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection, to:
  - investigate the range of possible legal structures and propose the most appropriate model
  - propose the structure and operating principles of Ensen
  - consult with schools and council partners and other stakeholders regarding the proposal
- 2.5 produce a follow up report to Cabinet setting out options for the formation and formal establishment of a company, called Ensen, with a distinct legal entity based on the most advantageous model and structure. This will also include a business plan.

## **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 Enfield Council's Education Services have developed an excellent reputation for working in partnership with schools and settings to bring about improvement so that 94% of Enfield schools have been judged as Good or Outstanding.
- 3.2 As the Enfield context has changed and the needs of our pupils have become more complex there is a clear need for schools and settings to sustain and build on this improvement.
- 3.3 Education Services have prioritised the development of strong and effective relationships with schools and settings so that the Enfield Learning Community is focussed on raising achievement for all children and young people.
- 3.4 The strength of this relationship has been evidenced by the development of effective traded services over a number of years, provided and brokered by the council, that consistently achieve a high

level of buy back from schools. In addition to this schools have demonstrated their support for Enfield Education Service by agreeing to the ongoing funding of Central services from the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). Evidence of impact of this support is regularly recognised in Ofsted reports.

- 3.5 The ongoing reduction of funds to the Council and the proposed changes to the schools' funding formula are placing increasing pressure on Education Services budgets.
- 3.6 Although the government has made some changes to the White Paper, it is still committed to its election manifesto that all schools will convert to academy status by 2022, and become part of Multi Academy Trusts (MATs).
- 3.7 This report seeks approval to investigate alternative models of service delivery that will still enable the council to work with all schools, whatever their status, and
  - continue to meet its statutory responsibilities,
  - provide the appropriate support to and with schools and settings,
  - places services in a strong position to offer support to other local authorities (LAs),
  - maintains strong and effective relationships with the Enfield learning community,
  - ensures Education Services contribute to delivering the council's savings agreed in the MTFP.
- 3.8 It is intended that the new model of service delivery will have the potential to develop additional income streams through wider trading beyond the Borough of Enfield and through applying for external funding not generally available to the Council.
- 3.9 In addition it will have the opportunity to work with schools and other partners to strengthen and develop the partnership and may support and partner with schools in their development of MATs.
- 3.10 In response to the current educational climate, many other local authorities are also in the process of exploring alternative models of service delivery. A model that establishes a trading company, making use of existing skills and expertise appears to be the main option that LAs are exploring. The structure and purpose of the company varies according to the needs and organisational structure of each local authority For example Camden is establishing a joint schools' company, Croydon has just completed its first year as a limited trading company and Tower Hamlets is about to start a similar model. Enfield Education Services will continue to work with a wide range of LAs and carry out research into ensuring that we develop the most appropriate model that will meet the needs of Enfield's children and young people.

### **3.11 Proposal Outline – Phase 1 Financial Year 2016-2017**

3.11.1 During 2016/17 Ensen would operate as a virtual trading company with a pooled single budget across the services. A full business plan is being drawn up to assess future viability. The outcome of which will be included in a future report to implement phase 2.

3.11.2 As the budgets have been agreed, and schools have indicated their level of buy back of services, during 2016/17 Ensen will be a shadow structure, mirroring existing council duties and responsibilities within Education Services. Therefore the existing council budgetary and employment arrangements will not change.

3.11.3 During phase 1 the following services have been identified for inclusion within the shadow structure

- School Improvement Service
- Schools Personnel Service
- Behaviour Support Service
- Early Years

3.11.4 The Education Services teams considered for inclusion as part of Ensen phase 1 have a strong track record of traded services. Schools have also agreed continuing DSG funding for them in the short- to medium-term. The Schools Personnel Service, which falls under the Chief Executive's Department, is also included as there is a natural synergy in their traded relationships with schools.

3.11.5 It is anticipated that other services, within and outside of Education Services, would form part of Ensen in a later phase but their inclusion would be subject to full market testing and dependent on their strategic fit and financial viability.

3.11.6 It is proposed Ensen would be registered as a not for profit company as soon as possible with marketing to be launched in September 2016 and with a view to trading under this name from April 2017.

### **3.12 Proposal Outline – Future Phases 2017 and beyond**

Future phases will be the subject of a further detailed report including a full business case and financial analysis. Investigations of other models, including Joint Ventures and Mutuals, will be undertaken to establish the "best fit" model for Enfield.

## **4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

4.1 An Options Appraisal scoring matrix is attached as Appendix 1 which assesses the ability of the various alternative options listed below to meet the Education Services' overarching objectives in seeking to establish the company.



**4.2 Alternative option one: Continue with the current Education Services / Do nothing**

This option would not allow the Education Services to continue to support the Learning Community in Enfield effectively. By continuing with the current model, the services will diminish over time if Enfield schools convert to Academy status and seek services elsewhere. In addition, the Council's funding is likely to reduce as the Government removes statutory duties. The staff team from Education Services will dwindle to fulfil the bare minimum statutory duties still remaining. If Ensen is not able to be set up swiftly, this will be the default option and there will not be the workforce capable of subsequently setting up external to the Council.

**4.3 Alternative option two: Immediately cease all services except Statutory duties**

This option is an accelerated version of alternative option one, to cease all services except for minimum statutory duties only, revising these further in line with central government direction. This is not seen as a desirable option because the Education Services have an excellent reputation for improving schools in Enfield and this would see expertise lost overnight. There is a reputational risk to the Council if it ceases Education Services that have been highly valued and had demonstrable positive impact within Enfield. The Council would lose its ability and expertise to offer support to schools. Setting up Ensen allows the skills and local expertise to remain in house and focussed on improving outcomes for Enfield children.

**4.4 Alternative option three: Outsourcing/Privatisation of services**

This option has been explored, on a service by service basis, with a range of private providers who are working with other LAs. This option will have a greater impact on employment conditions of Enfield staff and could lead to staff being TUPEd and their conditions of service being reduced. Ensen would initially use existing staff for 2016/17 and there will be no immediate change to contractual arrangements. This ensures that the skills and expertise remain in Enfield Council. As there is a current lack of clarity about the future statutory responsibilities of the council there is less risk to Enfield if Ensen can continue to directly provide support and challenge to schools and services. However, this remains a future possible option if no other solutions are found.

**4.5 Alternative option four: Joint working with other local authorities**

This option has been explored extensively over recent years with some joint working with Haringey and Waltham Forest over past years and more recently due to funding received to explore joint delivery with Barnet and Harrow. Whilst strategically this fits within the priorities and aims of Enfield Council, identifying a suitable LA partner has not been possible. Each Council will have its own priorities both in terms of supporting school improvement and financial pressures. However, most London boroughs and local authorities across SE England are known to be considering either a model of 'spinning out', schools led companies or outsourcing. This remains a future possible option for a number of services not yet considered for Ensen if no other solutions are found.

#### 4.6 **Alternative option five: Supporting a schools company**

A schools company (as opposed to LA led company) was previously considered in Enfield but was not able to gain the required support from schools and settings. This has been the preferred model in some other areas where there has been a higher percentage of buy-in from schools. Ensen would encourage schools to be partners in this model of service delivery rather than leaders. Meeting the increasing diversity and level of need in Enfield remains a priority for the Council. The proposed Ensen model of joint membership for schools and the LA, provides the best model to reduce the risk of underachievement and failure.

### 5. **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

5.1 Establishing Ensen as a trading company is the recommended option because it specifically addresses the Council's priorities and is an opportunity to build on and further strengthen the best of Enfield Education Services. It seeks to ensure that the Education Services' purpose, vision and functions are protected and enhanced as a result of the future-proofing by establishing as a company.

5.2 Ensen would:

- Meet the Council's statutory duties, in a more cost effective way, achieving the savings identified in the MTFP;
- Continue the Council's drive for improvement in all our schools and foster improved partnership working;
- Be customer focused for Enfield and beyond;
- Have the ability to bid for funds from a variety of sources that are not traditionally accessible to local authorities;
- Be best placed to respond to the Government's proposals for the setting up of Multi-Academy Trusts.

#### 5.3 **The case for change**

There are a number of compelling reasons to select Ensen as the best way to safeguard the future of education provision across Enfield:

##### 5.3.1 **Strengthening the Enfield learning community:**

Ensen is the best option to support a thriving learning community in Enfield, continuing to play the role which Enfield Council has long held as the bond which holds the learning community together. As the statutory education duties of local authorities reduce, schools across Enfield will have less of a relationship with the Council. Establishing Ensen will safeguard this role, ensuring that the Enfield learning community continues to function in the best interests of all children across Enfield.

##### 5.3.2 **Long-term stability in a changing policy environment:**

The publication of the White Paper '*Educational Excellence Everywhere*' by the DfE on 17 March 2016 has the potential to

significantly change the policy landscape and questions the future role of local authorities in education as part of widespread academisation. Ensen will secure the future of a collective education responsibility for the children and young people of Enfield, redefining the relationship between the Council and schools and provide a means to enable continued strong civic governance from the Council.

**5.3.3 Sustainable, flexible and future-proof:**

Ensen would be a flexible organisation which is able to respond swiftly to changes in the policy and market landscape. This makes Ensen the most sustainable and future-proof option. There is scope for additional income sources which are not currently available to the Council and the potential to later become a Multi-Academy Trust.

**5.3.4 Building on a highly experienced and motivated team:**

Education Services have a highly experienced and motivated staff team who seek to provide the best services for the children and young people of Enfield. All options will in the short- to medium- term involve some positions being removed but Ensen offers the best opportunity to protect employment by bringing in additional income sources; retaining the expertise which has allowed Enfield Council to maintain its pivotal role in the Enfield Learning Community.

**5.3.5 Minimising reputational risk to the Council:**

Establishing Ensen will allow Enfield Council to demonstrate commitment to excellence in education by transforming the services into a more sustainable model of delivery in the long term. Ensen is a positive choice to do something differently in response to the policy trends and should Ensen be successful will be seen as a very positive and forward-thinking decision taken. Alternative options carry increased risks in suggesting that the Council isn't able to respond to the projected threat to the diminishment of services and is not able to safeguard the future of education within the Borough of Enfield.

**6. COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

**6.1 Financial Implications**

6.1.1 There are no financial implications for 2016-17.

6.1.2 Financial implications for 2017-18 onwards will need to be determined once approval has been granted to set up a company. Consideration will need to be given to the savings targets that are included for Education Services in the MTFP for the period 2017-18 to 2019-20 which need to be delivered. These are as follows:

- Traded Services - £1.6m
- School Improvement - £252k

- 6.1.3 It should also be noted that the Schools National Funding Formula consultation published in March includes a proposal to remove the ESG general funding rate from 2017/18 and reform the duties that are funded from the grant which will see a reduction in funding to the authority which will result in further savings requirements.
- 6.1.4 A financial assessment of the potential models has been completed and is included as part of the Options Appraisal (see Appendix 2). Further modelling will be carried out once details of the White Paper and Fair Funding model are known.

## 6.2 Legal Implications

- 6.2.1 Further legal advice and analysis will be needed to advise on, and ascertain specific answers to, the variety of legal issues that are raised in progressing an Enfield Council decision to establish a company. These issues will range from the correct legal form for the company, to the legal implications for the Council (and the company) arising out of and including procurement, tax, employment/TUPE, real estate, and general vires issues - all of which will require specialist legal advice to the Council, to ensure the project progresses smoothly at all stages of its development.
- 6.2.2 The Council should ensure that at each stage of the project, it requests and receives the necessary legal advice, so that it can then progress the project without any impediments, legal or otherwise.

## 7. KEY RISKS

- 7.1 The key criteria in establishing this company is to ensure that Education Services meet the savings identified in the MTFP. The management board of the company will be responsible for monitoring the progress made in delivering the targets and taking appropriate action if they are not achieved.

Risk	Initial Level	Control Measures to mitigate risk	New level
If schools become academies, and form new partnership working models, there is a risk that they may not buy services from Ensen as they choose to go elsewhere in a free market.	Red	Effective Marketing and Communication is a key part of the plan for Ensen to succeed. In order for this to be effective it is vital that Ensen can be seen as the delivery arm for traded services from 1st September 2016 and demonstrate effectiveness to schools. Additionally Ensen will diversify the income streams as soon as possible through trading externally to the Borough. Schools are already indicating that they wish to not only purchase services but also work with the local authority in partnership. This	Green

		includes the 5 primary schools currently converting.	
Ensen doesn't attract sufficient income from existing sources or additional other sources	Red	Effective Marketing and Communication will be essential to mitigate this risk. A marketing strategy will be in place by September 2016. In addition an interim Business/Marketing Manager will be appointed during 2016/17 to lead on income generation.	Amber
Any change to the existing successful School Improvement Strategy may inhibit the continued increase in good and Outstanding schools and as a result the outcomes for young people. There is a reputational risk to the Council of schools failing Ofsted inspections and a lowering of standards.	Red	Ensen will still have the same high quality skills, local knowledge and expertise that the schools value. The evidence and will enhance the reputation and marketing capacity of Ensen.	Green
There is continued uncertainty about the future role of local authorities in delivering statutory duties in schools. Managing this uncertainty presents a risk for the future direction of Ensen.	Amber	There is little that Ensen can do directly to mitigate this risk as it hinges on the decisions taken by central government. However, by having a robust commissioning arrangement with schools and the Council Ensen can demonstrate sustainability. It will be vital to stay informed throughout the implementation of reforms identified in the White Paper Education Excellence Everywhere.	Amber
Ensen may not be able to meet the Medium Term Financial Plan savings identified as part of Children's Services.	Red	The business and marketing plan has already taken into account the impact of the MFTP for any service to be included in Ensen. A service's ability to deliver the savings target will be a condition of inclusion in Ensen.	Green

## 8. IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES

### 8.1 Fairness for All

Ensen would deliver on Fairness for All by continuing to support and challenge schools and settings to deliver high quality education, improving standards and narrowing education gaps for all children and young people across the Borough.

## **8.2 Growth and Sustainability**

Ensen would be able to maintain a good level of support for schools, ensuring that they are able to cater for the changing needs and growth of the population of Enfield. Through the services offered by Ensen schools will contribute to the growth and sustainability of communities, with good schools attracting more families and businesses to all areas of Enfield.

## **8.3 Strong Communities**

Schools are hubs of the community and so by ensuring the quality of education in schools, Ensen will be contributing to creating stronger community hubs within Enfield, reaching across all areas and demographics.

## **9. EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

The recommendations of this DAR will not impact the current delivery of Education Services and so no Equalities Impact Assessment has been undertaken. Education Services continue to be committed to ensuring equal opportunities for all children and young people across Enfield. The proposal to consider an alternative service delivery model through Ensen will have these values embedded through all levels of the organisation.

## **10. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

The recommendations of this DAR do not impact the current delivery model of Education Services so this will be considered further as part of the DAR for Phase 2. Establishing Ensen as a separate legal entity, built partially on principles of employee ownership, has the potential for improving performance of selected services through a greater focus on effective service delivery whilst providing value for money.

## **11. HR IMPLICATIONS**

As detailed in this report, in respect of Phase 1 of the development of Ensen there are no immediate implications for staff currently working within the departments proposed to move into the Traded Service. The staff remain Council employees on their current terms and conditions of service.

Management should ensure that staff are communicated with throughout the development process and advised of any relevant progress and outcomes.

Should the venture prove viable and Phase 2 is established as intended, TUPE will apply and the appropriate consultation will need to take place with affected staff and Trade Unions.

## **12. PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

Public Health promotes best outcomes for all children and young people in Enfield and reduces inequalities. Any new model will need to ensure that it considers the impacts on Public Health priorities in the local area and improves the wellbeing of children and young people. This will need to be fully assessed before the final model is agreed. As this report pertains to the service delivery vehicle rather than changes to the service itself there are no specific public health implications.

### **Background Papers**

None

Appendix 1

Scale 0-5 0=does not meet objectives/not possible in model 5=Fully meets objectives/inherent in model,		Option 1: Continue with current Education Services / Do nothing	Option 2: Immediately cease all services except minimum Statutory duties	Option 3: Outsourcing / Externalisation of Services	Option 4: Joint Working with other Local Authorities	Option 5: Support a Schools-led company	Option 6: Trading company				
							6a: Local Authority Trading Company	6b: Employee-owned Mutual	6c: Registered Charity	6d: Social Enterprise	6e: Not-for-profit Company
Core Objectives	To ensure children across Enfield receive high quality education and have the opportunity to achieve their full potential	4	2	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	5
	To ensure there are services which support high quality in schools across Enfield and meet statutory duties	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5
	To ensure Education Services are financially sustainable	1	4	5	3	4	4	3	3	3	3
	To ensure the continuation of proven skills, expertise and knowledge of existing services in bringing about improvement	2	2	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5
	To ensure that the services can be effectively delivered within Enfield	3	3	5	2	1	5	5	5	5	5
Secondary objectives	To ensure flexibility and ability to respond to uncertain education policy landscape	3	1	1	2	4	3	4	4	4	5
	To promote joint working across schools as part of Enfield Learning Community	5	0	2	3	5	5	5	5	5	5
	To minimise disruption to schools during any transition	3	0	3	4	5	4	4	4	4	4
	To minimise reputational risk to Enfield Council	3	2	3	4	3	5	4	4	4	4
	To meet the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4



Appendix 1

Scale 0-5 0=does not meet objectives/not possible in model 5=Fully meets objectives/inherent in model,		Option 1: Continue with current Education Services / Do nothing	Option 2: Immediately cease all services except minimum Statutory duties	Option 3: Outsourcing / Externalisation of Services	Option 4: Joint Working with other Local Authorities	Option 5: Support a Schools-led company	Option 6: Trading company				
							6a: Local Authority Trading Company	6b: Employee-owned Mutual	6c: Registered Charity	6d: Social Enterprise	6e: Not-for-profit Company
Tertiary objectives	To protect employment of Education Services staff	2	1	3	3	2	3	4	3	3	3
	Ability to support the development of a MAT	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	4	2	4

<b>Weighted scores</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>42.5</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>55.5</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>60</b>
------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-------------	-----------	-------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

**Projected cost to Council of each of the options in £'000.**  
**Figures are gross totals, including the current budget of £1,406,000.**  
**Therefore option 6 shows the greatest saving to the Council.**

<b>1,406</b>	<b>3,573</b>	<b>3,974</b>	<b>1,406</b>	<b>2,999</b>	<b>725</b>
--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	------------

Score weighting	
1.5	Core objective
1	Secondary objective
0.5	Tertiary objective

Ensen Finance Option Appraisal							
2016-17	Budget	2017-18 (Projected based on 2016/17)					
		Option 1 Continue as now / Do nothing	Option 2 Cease all services but Statutory duties	Option 3 Outsource /Privatise services	Option 4 Joint working with other LAs	Option 5 Support a schools company	Option 6 Separate company
£ (000)s							
	<b>SIS</b>						
2,587	Base Budget - Exp	2,587	2,587	2,587	2,587	2,587	2,587
-2,047	Traded & Other Income	-2,047	-2,047	-2,047	-2,047	-2,047	-2,047
1,695	DSG funding	1,695	1,695	1,695	1,695	1,695	1,695
-1,695	DSG funding	-1,695	-1,695	-1,695	-1,695	-1,695	-1,695
540	Net Budget	540	540	540	540	540	540
	Predicted Exp Budget	2,587	2,443	2,272	2,587	2,143	2,587
	Predicted Inc Budget	-2,047	0	0	-2,047	-409	-2,587
	Revised Net Budget	540	2,443	2,272	540	1,734	0
	<b>Early Years</b>						
1,102	Base Budget - Exp	1,102	1,102	1,102	1,102	1,102	1,102
-354	Traded & Other Income	-354	-354	-354	-354	-354	-354
14,379	DSG funding	14,379	14,379	14,379	14,379	14,379	14,379
-14,379	DSG funding	-14,379	-14,379	-14,379	-14,379	-14,379	-14,379
748	Net Budget	748	748	748	748	748	748
	Predicted Exp Budget	1,102	1,252	1,262	1,102	1,202	1,102
	Predicted Inc Budget	-354	-304	0	-354	-71	-400
	Revised Net Budget	748	948	1,262	748	1,131	702
	<b>Behaviour</b>						
82	Base Budget - Exp	82	82	82	82	82	82
0	Traded & Other Income	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,138	DSG funding	2,138	2,138	2,138	2,138	2,138	2,138
-2,138	DSG funding	-2,138	-2,138	-2,138	-2,138	-2,138	-2,138
82	Net Budget	82	82	82	82	82	82
	Predicted Exp Budget	82	82	415	82	182	82
	Predicted Inc Budget	0	0	0	0	0	-10
	Revised Net Budget	82	82	415	82	182	72
	<b>HR</b>						
651	Base Budget - Exp	651	651	651	651	651	651
-615	Traded & Other Income	-615	-615	-615	-615	-615	-615
0	DSG funding	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	DSG funding	0	0	0	0	0	0
36	Net Budget	36	36	36	36	36	36
	Predicted Exp Budget	651	100	25	651	75	651
	Predicted Inc Budget	-615	0	0	-615	-123	-700
	Revised Net Budget	36	100	25	36	-48	-49
1,406	<b>Cost to Council</b>	<b>1,406</b>	<b>3,573</b>	<b>3,974</b>	<b>1,406</b>	<b>2,999</b>	<b>725</b>

**Notes:**

These figures are based on the current (2016/17) actuals, including 2016/17 MTFP savings, to deliver statutory services. They do not take into account planned future saving of £983,000 in Early Years and School Improvement. Plans are already in place to meet these through savings and increased trading.

**DSG** - this funding is based on the decision of Schools Forum. Schools have already indicated they would not wish to continue to fund Behaviour Support if this is not delivered by Enfield's current provider

**Assumptions**

All the Options and Assumptions have been based on current statutory requirements and service delivery and historical patterns of school take up.

**Option 1** - current position, based on the current budget with no assumptions made. No additional saving would be achieved through this model and it would not deliver future savings as shown in MTFP.

**Option 2** - identification made of statutory services, for SIS these will cease in July 2017. Figures include an estimate of redundancy costs of staff not delivering statutory services therefore no longer required. Impact on continuing ability to trade and raise income also estimated.

**Option 3** - includes contract management costs at 10%. Assumes most staff would transfer under TUPE but there would be some redundancy costs for those no longer required. Assumes outsourced company would keep all profit

**Option 4** - generally no changes assumed as negotiations would need to take place with partner(s) on service delivery, staffing and apportioning of income. Anticipate future redundancy costs and reduced income

**Option 5** – some redundancy costs estimated, as minority partner reduced income

**Option 6** - increased opportunity to trade outside the borough and seek external grants. Continue to provide statutory and non-statutory services.

This page is intentionally left blank

## MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017 REPORT NO. 54

**Cabinet: 16<sup>th</sup> August 2016**

**REPORT OF:** Director - Regeneration & Environment & Director of Finance, Resources & Customer Services.

Contact officer and telephone number:  
Peter George x 3318 [Peter.george@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Peter.george@enfield.gov.uk)  
Patricia Salami x 2987 [Patricia.salami@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Patricia.salami@enfield.gov.uk)

<b>Agenda – Part 1</b>	<b>Item: 7</b>
------------------------	----------------

<p><b>Subject:</b> Remediation Framework Part 1 <b>Wards:</b> All <b>Key Decision No:</b> KD 4351</p>
---

<p><b>Cabinet Members consulted:</b> Cllr Alan Sitkin and Cllr Dino Lemonides</p>
---

### 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report is a review of tender returns received for the appointment of contractors onto a remediation framework for Enfield Council and other public sector authorities listed in Schedule 4 of Appendix 1 – which is the framework contract document prepared by our legal team Trowers.
- 1.2 A procurement process was carried out following OJEU rules and regulations. The procurement was intended to include, as the first appointment under the framework, remediation of the Willoughby Lane and Meridian Way sites which form part of the proposed Meridian Water development.
- 1.3 The quality and cost components of the five returned tenders have been assessed in accordance with the evaluation criteria stipulated in the ITT. Based on the assessment and a review meeting with Enfield Council on 22 April 2016 a decision was made to recommend the appointment of all five contractors returning tenders to the framework.
- 1.4 A Part 2 report sets out additional detail around the selection process and the fees associated with the work.
- 1.5 Since the return of the tenders the scope of the proposed remediation work has been subject to change due to revisions in the proposed development strategy and Meridian Way is to be excluded from the first phase of work and this will be the subject of a separate procurement outside the framework. The Willoughby Lane remediation will be a mini competition under the framework.

### 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 It is recommended that all five contractors be appointed to the framework.
- 2.2 It is recommended that any organisation that would like to access the framework be directed to the Enfield procurement and commissioning hub who will administer the framework on behalf of LBE.
- 2.3 It is recommended that the five contractors appointed to the framework be asked to resubmit a tender for the works at Willoughby Lane under the new brief and delegates the finalisation of the call-off contract (and all ancillary documentation) to the Cabinet Member, Economic Development and Business Regeneration and Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency in conjunction with the Director - Regeneration & Environment and the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services

### 3. BACKGROUND

- 3.1** Enfield is an outer north London borough, the sixth largest in London, comprising a mixture of urban and suburban neighbourhoods with distinct character areas, contrasting land uses and socio-economic conditions, and with varying levels of transport accessibility.
- 3.2** Enfield's current population of 320,607 and is forecast to grow to 334,700 by 2021. A revised target of 798 new homes per year in the period 2015 to 2025 has been agreed by the Greater London Authority. These homes will be accommodated on a range of sites across the borough but the opportunities to achieve housing delivery at a significant scale and pace are in limited supply.
- 3.3** Meridian Water is a pivotal regeneration scheme, which has the potential to accommodate over 8,000 new homes and 3,000 new jobs by 2030. The Meridian Water Masterplan was adopted in 2013 as Planning and Urban Design Guidance - Material Consideration, and provides a framework for the delivery of this new community adopted by the council in July 2013 (Key Decision: 3699).
- 3.4** The council has concluded on the procurement of a master developer for Meridian Water, and is looking to enter into a legal agreement with Barratts of London the preferred bidder. The remediation framework established via this procurement process will provide remediation services that will enable land to be used for development purposes and the building of houses.
- 3.5** The procurement process has been developed by Regeneration and Environment in consultation with the following:
- Amec Foster Wheeler as technical advisors;
  - Initially Enfield shared procurement service (with Waltham Forest) and latterly with Ernst & Young as procurement advisors; and
  - Trowers & Hamlin LLP as legal advisors
- 3.6** The establishment of the remediation framework has therefore been subject to due and proper process with specialist advice. The potential use of the framework by other London authorities is secondary to the main priority of establishing a remediation framework for use by LBE.
- 3.7** The procurement commenced with an initial prequalification exercise (PQQ). The PQQ process was used to establish Contractor standing and competence in accordance with the criteria in Table A

**Table A PQQ Assessment**

No.	Section	Scoring Mechanism/Weighting
1.	Company Information	
1.1	Organisational Details	For information only
1.2	Consortia and Sub-Contracting	For Information only
1.3	Licensing and Registration	Pass/Fail
2.	Legal Formation	
2.1	Grounds for Mandatory Rejection	Pass/Fail
2.2	Grounds for Discretionary	Pass/Fail

	Rejection	
3.	Financial Details	
3.1	Financial Assessment	Pass/Fail
4.	Policy and Procedures	10% Overall weighting allocated
4.1	Insurance	Pass/Fail
4.2	Equal Opportunities	Pass/Fail
4.3	Environmental Management	Pass/Fail
4.4	Health and Safety	Pass/Fail
4.5	Community Benefit	
4.5.1	Training and Apprenticeships	40% Sub-weighting
4.5.2	Local Supply Chain Opportunities	40% Sub-weighting
4.5.3	Sustainability, Corporate & Social Responsibility	20% Sub-weighting
5.	Technical Ability and Capability	90% Overall weighting allocated
5.1	Relevant Experience and Contract Examples	30% Sub-weighting
5.2	Specialist Remediation Services	10% Sub-weighting
5.3	Project Management	10% Sub-weighting
5.4	Commercial Management	10% Sub-weighting
5.5	Programme Management	10% Sub-weighting
5.6	Supply Chain Management	5% Sub-weighting
5.7	Stakeholder Management	5% Sub-weighting
5.8	Quality Assurance	5% Sub-weighting
5.9	Environmental Systems	5% Sub-weighting
5.10	Financial Deductions	5% Sub-weighting
5.11	Termination of Contract	5% Sub-weighting

Fourteen contractors submitted PQQ returns from which the best six compliant and top scoring contractors were selected to tender the framework. The five contractors returning tenders have all been recommended for appointment to the framework based on the evaluation in Part 1.

#### **4. TENDER PROCESS AND SCORING**

- 4.1** London Borough of Enfield (LBE) initiated a procurement comprising a framework for the remediation of various sites within Enfield. The first appointment under the framework was going to be the remediation of the Willoughby Lane and Meridian Way sites.
- 4.2** The procurement was advertised through OJEU reference 2015/S 182-328669. The Enfield works package number is 9ZPH-UXSFY1.
- 4.3** Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure UK Ltd (Amec) have been advising LBE on the technical elements of the procurement. Trowers & Hamlin have been providing legal support on the conditions of contract for the framework and the Willoughby Lane appointment.

- 4.4** Following an earlier pre-qualification (PQQ) exercise six contractors were selected for invitation to tender (ITT). The ITT (Appendix 1) documents were made available on the London tenders portal on 23 November 2015 with an initial date for tender return of 8 January 2016 which was subsequently extended to 29 January 2016.
- 4.5** Amec was given access to the tender returns on 3 February 2016 for the purposes of undertaking the evaluation stated in this report.
- 4.6** Of the six contractors invited to tender one, Erith Group, advised on 13 January 2016 that they would not be returning a tender due to the contract risk profile and future commitments secured for the year.
- 4.7** The five contractors named below returned tenders on the London tenders portal by the deadline of 29 January 2016. A factual evaluation of these tenders is given in part 2 of this report.
- VHE
  - HBR Blackwell
  - Hydrock
  - John F Hunt and
  - BAM Nuttall
- 4.8** Since the tenders were returned the scope of the proposed remediation work for Willoughby Lane and Meridian Way has been subject to change due to the revisions in the proposed development strategy and Meridian Way is to be excluded from the first phase of work and will be the subject of a further report.
- 4.9** The evaluation of the tenders undertaken here has been used to provide a recommendation for Contractors to be appointed to the framework.
- 4.10** As the works information has changed significantly it is proposed that the contractors recommended to be appointed to the framework are requested to retender the revised works for remediation at Willoughby Lane.
- 4.11** The selection of six contractors to tender the framework followed an earlier PQQ exercise and those shortlisted to tender are all contractors with considerable remediation experience in urban areas including former gasworks site such as that at Willoughby Lane. The use of a framework is to enable LBE to use a mini competition or direct appointment for remediation of other sites within Meridian Water or elsewhere in the Borough having established:
- agreed conditions of contract for such work; and
  - rates and percentages from Contractors which will apply to aspects of the work (these are indexed over the period of the framework) .

This gives the Authority flexibility in appointment of proven remediation contractors in a timely and efficient way.



**4.12 Evaluation Criteria** - The ITT evaluation was based on two main criteria which are Price (70% of the overall available score) and Quality (30% of the overall available score).

**4.13 Price** - (This related to 70% of the overall rated score)- Tenderers were required to complete the activity schedule ITTv2 relating to remediation of Willoughby Lane and Meridian Way available electronically as an excel workbook and upload under the appropriate section of the online form within the tender as part of their Tender Response.

**4.14** The evaluation of price is broken down into the following sub-criteria:

**Table 1**

<b>Part A</b>	Total of the Prices and rate adjustments	<b>55%</b>
<b>Part B</b>	Analysis of rates and percentages	<b>15%</b>

**4.15** The mechanism for establishing price scores is that the lowest price Tenderer is awarded the maximum percentage score available; all other Tenderers are awarded using the following formula:  
(Lowest Bidder Price / Bidders Price) x Percentage Score Available).

**4.16 Quality** - (This related to 30% of the overall rated score) - Tenderers were required to use the 'Method Statement Template' within the ITT document to respond to all questions stated below. Written responses were assessed using the scoring mechanism in Table 2

**Table 2 Quality Scoring Criteria**

Score	Score Comment	Score Rationale
5	Excellent Response	The ITT response convincingly and comprehensively demonstrates that the Tenderer understands the requirements of the works and the Authority's aims and priorities and sets out detailed and convincing proposals for the successful delivery of projects which are fully supported by evidence.
4	Good Response	The ITT response convincingly demonstrates that the Tenderer understands the requirements of the works and the Authority's aims and priorities and sets out convincing proposals for the successful delivery of projects with some evidential support.
3	Acceptable Response	The ITT response demonstrates that the Tenderer is likely to understand the requirements of the works and the Authority's aims and priorities and sets out some convincing proposals for the successful delivery of projects.
2	Unsatisfactory Response	The ITT response fails to demonstrate that the Tenderer understands the requirements of the works and/or the Authority's aims and priorities or fails to set out convincing proposals for the successful delivery of projects..
1	Unacceptable Response	The ITT response fails to demonstrate that Tenderer understands the requirements of the works or the Authority's aims and priorities and fails to set out convincing proposals for project delivery.
0	Non-compliant Response	The ITT response does not comply with these instruction or the ITT or does not address the required submissions. Any Tenderer whose submission is determined to be non-compliant in any respect may be excluded from further consideration.

**4.17 Quality and Technical Assessment**

The evaluation of the quality questions summarised in Table 2 was undertaken by Amec with the exception of question 2, community benefit which was marked by

Enfield Council. The overall Quality score accounts for 30% of the overall available score.

No pass/fail score was specified in the ITT.

**Table 3**

No	Quality Question	Quality Weighting % (of overall 30%)
1	Environmental Management	20%
2	Community Benefit	10%
3	Project Management Structure	10%
4	Programme Management	20%
5	Cost Management	15%
6	Subcontractor and Supply Chain	5%
7	Technical Approach and Innovation	20%

#### **4.18 Financial Assessment**

The costs provided by Contractors for the evaluation of total price are comprised of the following components

- Project management – These costs include surveys, utility protection, site accommodation, site security, monitoring works etc.
- Remediation works
- Option prices – not considered in the calculation of overall price but a consideration in the overall evaluation; and
- Rates for adjustment of quantities –, not considered in the calculation of overall price but used in sensitivity analysis.

#### **4.19 Tender Clarifications**

Following an initial review of the tender returns some queries, both technical and financial were identified. It was agreed that a schedule of tender clarifications be prepared and issued to each of the five Contractors. The clarifications were issued on the portal on 8 March 2016 and returns were scheduled one week later.

### **5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

**5.1 Do nothing** – This was not an option because remediation will need to take place as LBE are building on brown field sites which is one of the ways that our housing targets will be met.

**5.2 Direct award** – make a direct award for the Willoughby Lane works to the Tenderer with the highest score. This option was deemed unsuitable as the works specification has changed considerably.

**5.3 Collaborate with another department or local authority in respect of procurement.**

This project is a discreet piece of work led by the Neighbourhood Regeneration team which is procuring a service that could be of use across other departments and local authorities. Cross departmental procurement is appropriate and has been used on this occasion. The Neighbourhood Regeneration team has collaborated with Property Services, Procurement and our consultants in devising the procurement approach

## **6 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 6.1** The recommendation to appoint all five contractors to the framework will enhance the speed of delivery of the Meridian Water Programme and will ensure that there is a selection of contractors with the capability to undertake remediation works on a variety of sites which may run concurrently. In addition all contractors selected have a wealth of experience and a track record within the industry.
- 6.2** All contractors scored well in the quality section of the competitive tendering exercise and all fully met the requirements set out in the tender brief.
- 6.3** A decision was taken at the meeting held on the 22nd of April 2016 between staff from Enfield Council, Ernst and Young (procurement advisors to the Council), Trowers & Hamlin and Amec; to recommend the appoint of all five contractors to the framework, these being:
- VHE
  - HBR Blackwell
  - Hydrock
  - John F Hunt, and
  - BAM Nuttall

## **7 COMMENTS OF THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, RESOURCES AND CUSTOMER SERVICES AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS**

### **7.1 Financial Implications**

- 7.1.1** The costs associated with the setting up of this framework mainly comprise professional fees charged by the experts providing advice and support to the Council officers in this regard. These are contained within the overall Meridian Water contract budget which was approved by Cabinet on the 10th February 2016 (KD4229).
- 7.1.2** This budget also made a provision for the remediation costs of the initial parcels of land acquired by the Council. Under recommendation 2.3 of this report the framework contractors will be required resubmit a tender for these works and, assuming these fall within the budget envelope, authority to call off the contract is sought from the Director of Environment and Regeneration. Any future remediation work awarded through the framework for Enfield will need to be contained within this budget and any increase, which could not be contained from within existing resources, would be subject to an additional authorisation request.

### **7.2 Legal Implications**

- 7.2.1** The Council has power under section 1(1) of the Localism Act 2011 to do anything that individuals may do provided that it is not prohibited by legislation and subject to Public Law principles. Creating stronger, more sustainable communities and addressing housing needs, are key priorities for the Council, and are progressed pursuant to this power.
- 7.2.2** On the basis that the procurement process to first of all compile, and then populate the Remediation Framework with the prospective suppliers (as noted in the Report), has been carried out in accordance with the applicable procurement law as advised, there

should be negligible, if any, risk to the Council in awarding a place on the Remediation Framework to the suppliers as proposed.

- 7.2.3** The further competition under the Remediation Framework, when initiated, should be in accordance with the processes laid down under the Remediation Framework, while the resultant agreement must be drafted in accordance with the call-off contract which is used as part of the of the Remediation Framework call – off process.

### **7.3 Property Implications**

- 7.3.1** Strategic Property Services supports the initiative to procure a remediation framework in accordance with OJEU rules and regulations to include, over time, all sites acquired at Meridian Water.

- 7.3.2** Whilst there are no direct property implications arising from the appointment of the five contractors to the framework, at the appropriate time, when individual commissions are made on specific sites it will be important to ensure that the specification for the works is well considered and preferably based on outputs. Advice from suitably qualified consultants should be sought for this purpose. This approach will assist in mitigating the risk of a potential devaluation of sites sold to the Master Developer and maximising site value returns.

## **8 KEY RISKS**

- 8.1 Procurement** – Poor administration of Procurement rules may lead to fines / reputational damage to the Council.

**Mitigation** – The framework will be administered by the Enfield procurement hub who will ensure that procurement rules are followed, in addition when individual commissions are made on specific sites Amec who are the Councils qualified consultants will be available to provide advice and support.

- 8.2 Legal Challenge** – there is always a potential for a procurement challenge even in a retender as a result of the costs involved in tendering. Any Legal challenge to this procurement may lead to delays to the project works and fines / reputational damage to the Council.

**Mitigation** – The OJEU process was supported by legal in the form of Trowers and Hamlin and officers ensured that all the protocols were followed so even if challenged by an unsuccessful organisation there is sufficient evidence to support the process taken.

## **9 IMPACT ON COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

- 9.1** The remediation of work at Meridian Water is a part of the Masterplan which is fundamental in achieving sustainable development. Planning and urban design guidance about the significant scale of change proposed throughout the document seeks to achieve fairness for all, sustainable growth and the development of strong communities.

## **10 EQUALITIES IMPACT IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1** The Council will have a framework which will enable the successful delivery of Meridian Water, by ensuring that sites are remediated. This will result in the delivery of a minimum of 8,000 new homes and 3,000 new jobs by 2030 which will be available to local residents. By employing high quality contractors, the Council will be able to ensure it is acting in the best interests of its communities.
- 10.2** The overarching aim of the Neighbourhood Regeneration Team is to improve the quality of life for all, within the Council's priority regeneration areas. Individual PEQIAs are prepared for each project, setting out the equalities impacts for individual interventions. The Council will work with all members of the team to ensure equality impacts assessments are considered and completed as required at all stages of the regeneration process.

## **11 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

- 11.1** Delivery of a comprehensive regeneration scheme at Meridian Water is a corporate priority within the Council's Business Plan 2012-15. Completion of the Masterplan and delivering phased infrastructure improvements will help to meet Outcome 2.10 of the Business Plan; to improve the quality of life of residents through the regeneration of priority areas and promote growth and sustainability.

## **12 HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

- 12.1** All contractors tendering for the remediation framework were required to demonstrate minimum health and safety performance as part of the PQQ process.

## **13 HR IMPLICATIONS**

Not Applicable.

## **14 PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS**

- 14.1** The remediation works are subject to planning permission which include satisfying conditions relating to environmental management and monitoring and verification reporting.

## **15 Appendices** Appendix 1 - ITT

## **Background Papers**

None

This page is intentionally left blank

**LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD**

**INSTRUCTIONS TO APPLICANTS  
AND  
PRE – QUALIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE (“PQQ”)**

**UK –Enfield: Site Remediation Works**

**Ref: 9ZPH-UXSFY1  
CONTRACT NOTICE WORKS**

Remediation of sites at Willoughby Lane & Meridian Way and  
Framework for remediation of other sites  
NEC3 Option A or Option C contracts  
Estimated value: £30m

**PLEASE READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY  
BEFORE PREPARING YOUR SUBMISSION.**

## Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
2. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS / PROJECT INTRODUCTION .....	3
3. OUTLINE TIMETABLE .....	4
4. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION .....	5
6. INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION.....	5
7. EVALUATING PRE-QUALIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRES/SCORING MECHANISM .....	7
8. SUBMISSION OF COMPLETED PRE-QUALIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRES .....	8
9. CONSORTIA AND SUB-CONTRACTING .....	9
10. QUERIES ABOUT THE PROCUREMENT .....	9
11. PROVIDER SELECTION .....	9
APPENDIX 1 PRE-QUALIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE .....	11
APPENDIX 2 – FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT.....	52
APPENDIX 3 – PQQ APPENDICES SUBMISSION TEMPLATE.....	53



## 1. INTRODUCTION

A PQQ has been prepared by the London Borough of Enfield ("the Authority") in connection with the issue of an OJEU Works Contract Notice relating to a single contract for the remediation of contaminated land at two separate sites within the borough (Willoughby Lane & Meridian Way) and the conclusion of a framework of specialist remediation contractors to deliver further remediation works as required by the Authority and by the other London Boroughs identified in the Contract Notice ("the Framework").

The Contract Notice is seeking expressions of interest from suitable contractors, **with specific experience in remediation of former gasworks sites**, wishing to be considered for appointment to the framework and delivery of the Willoughby Lane & Meridian Way contract ("Applicants"). This process is being conducted under the restricted procedure set out in the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

The PQQ sets out the information which is required by the Authority in order to assess the suitability of operators in terms of their technical knowledge and experience, capability and capacity, organisational and financial standing. This document (Instructions to Applicants) provides instruction on the completion of the PQQ and information on how Applicants' responses to the PQQ will be evaluated.

At this stage, the Authority intends to invite a short-list of the five (5 No.) highest scoring suitably qualified Applicants to be invited to tender.

The qualification criteria are a combination of both financial and non-financial factors in accordance with the information provided in Section 7 of this document.

No information contained in this PQQ or in any communication made between the Authority and any Applicant in connection with this PQQ shall be relied upon as constituting a contract, agreement or representation that any framework agreement or contract shall be awarded. The Authority reserves the right, subject to the requirements of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015, to change without notice the basis of, or the procedures for, the competitive tendering process or to terminate the process at any time without awarding any contract and/or concluding any framework agreement. Under no circumstances shall the Authority incur any liability in respect of this PQQ or any supporting documentation and organisations expressing an interest do so entirely at their own risk.

Direct or indirect canvassing of any Authority Member, public sector employee or agent by any Applicant concerning the PQQ, or any attempt to procure information from any Authority Member, public sector employee or agent concerning this PQQ may result in the disqualification of the Applicant from consideration for this requirement.

## 2. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS / PROJECT INTRODUCTION

The Authority is seeking expression of interest to appoint a suitably qualified and experienced Main Contractor with proven capability for the purpose of site remediation.

The initial project will comprise two separate sites, known as Willoughby Lane and Meridian Way.

Willoughby Lane covers an area of 6.98 ha, and is the site of the former Willoughby Lane gas works. It is located in a mixed industrial and residential area in Tottenham, North London. Access to the site is via Willoughby Lane off Leaside Road. The site is approximate rectangular in shape. It is bordered to the north by Ladysmith Park, beyond which is the A406 North Circular; to the east is a mainline railway

beyond which is the Meridian Way site. To the south is Leaside Road and some residential housing on Willoughby Lane; and to the west is residential housing on Kimberley Road.

The Meridian Way site covers an area of approximately 1.38 ha. It is a former coal handling site for the Willoughby Lane gas works. The site is generally level and low-lying at an elevation of approximately 11.5 m AOD. A number of earth bunds are present, originally located to prevent vehicular access at the perimeter and to inhibit movement around the site. Leaside Road is elevated on embankment to the south, rising in height from the Meridian Way junction to the railway overbridge adjacent to the south west corner of the site.

Further projects will be as required by the Authority and/or other users of the Framework. The Authority makes no representation as to the likely volume, size or value of projects awarded under the Framework and those Applicants which are invited to tender will be required to satisfy themselves as to the likely volumes of work.

The form of contract for the Willoughby Lane & Meridian Way site will be an amended form of the NEC Engineering and Construction Contract (Priced Option C). Any call off contracts which are issued under the Framework will be amended forms of the NEC Engineering and Construction Contract with either priced option A or priced option C as specified in any mini-competition.

Where any Applicant believes that any part of the PQQ documentation is ambiguous, capable of more than one meaning or inconsistent the Applicant must raise this as a clarification question in sufficient time prior to the final date for return of expressions of interest to allow the Authority to respond. Where any response by the Authority is of general application, it will be issued to all Applicants at the same time. Claims made by Applicants that, any part of the documentation was ambiguous or capable of more than one meaning or inconsistent, made after the final date for return of tenders will not be considered unless the Applicant has specifically and fully raised the issue in the manner set out above

### 3. OUTLINE TIMETABLE

Set out below is the current anticipated procurement timetable. This is intended as a guide and whilst the Authority does not intend to depart from the timetable it reserves the right to do so at any stage. The Authority will notify applicants of any significant changes.

Target Date	Activity
14-09-2015	OJEU notice published with PQQ made available to Applicants
16-10-2015	PQQ return date (12.00noon)
12-11-2015	Evaluation of PQQ's completed
16-11-2015	Invitation to Tender ("ITT") issued to selected Applicants
08-01-2016	Tender return date (12.00noon)
29-01-2016	Evaluation of tender's completed
17-02-2016	Notifications to tenderers / commence standstill period
02-03-2016	Mandatory standstill period ends
02-03-2016	Award of 1 <sup>st</sup> Contract Package / Award of Framework Appointments

#### **4. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

All requests for clarification or further information in respect of the PQQ shall be sent via the “Discussions” area of the Authorities e-Tendering system ([www.londontenders.org](http://www.londontenders.org)). No approach of any kind in connection with the PQQ shall be made to any other person within, or associated with, the Authority.

The PQQ is being provided on the same basis to all Applicants.

The Authority expressly reserves the right to require an Applicant to provide additional information supplementing or clarifying any of the information provided in response to the requests set out in this PQQ.

The Authority will not reimburse any costs incurred by Applicants in connection with preparation of their responses to this PQQ.

#### **5. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION**

The Authority is committed to open government and to meeting their legal responsibilities under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Accordingly, all information submitted in expressions of interest may need to be disclosed by the Authority in response to a request under the Act. The Authority may also decide to include certain information in the publication scheme, which the Authority maintains under the this or other Acts.

If an Applicant considers that any of the information included in their response to the PQQ is commercially sensitive, it must identify it and explain (in broad terms) what harm may result from disclosure if a request is received, and the time period applicable to that sensitivity.

Applicants must be aware that, even where they have indicated that information is commercially sensitive, the Authority might be required to disclose it under the Act if a request is received.

Applicants must also note that the receipt of any material marked ‘confidential’ or equivalent by the Authority shall not be taken to mean that the Authority accepts any duty of confidence by virtue of that marking.

#### **6. INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION**

Applicants must follow the instructions outlined below when completing the PQQ.

Guidance Notes detailing how to download the documents, upload your responses and raise questions regarding the PQQ, can be found within the ‘Supplier Guides’ shown on the ‘Suppliers Area’ of ProContract:

[https://www.londontenders.org/procontract/supplier.nsf/frm\\_home?openForm](https://www.londontenders.org/procontract/supplier.nsf/frm_home?openForm)

Applicants must ensure that any documents comprised in their response to the PQQ which require a signature are duly signed and included within their response to this PQQ.

Applicants must register their intent to respond using the button shown on ProContract and be bound by any Conditions stated within the PQQ.

All submissions are to be made via the [www.londontenders.org](http://www.londontenders.org) Portal.

RFQ Information	
Contract Ref No:	REDBR-UATT-8BXDUT
Contract Title:	Training Quotation
Ref No (Version):	RFQ-UATT-8BXF66-1 (Version 1)
Title:	Plough Demonstration
Response Required By:	14/01/2011 20:00:00
Attachments:	3
My Response	
Status:	New
Version:	1
Intent To Respond:	Not Sent
Supplier Ref No:	Not Set
Options	
<input type="button" value="Response Wizard"/>	<input type="button" value="Opt Out"/>
<input type="button" value="Register Intent"/>	<input type="button" value="Finish"/>

To complete an online form, Applicants must use the 'Response Wizard' button shown above.

Applicants must then follow the instructions outlined below when completing the PQQ.

Applicants must answer all questions as accurately and concisely as possible in the same order as the questions are presented. Where a question is not relevant to an Applicant's organisation, the PQQ response shall explain the position.

As a result of past experience of this practice and the problems this causes during the opening of applications, any responses to this PQQ which are returned in a format other than the original and/or include alterations or substitutions to this document or to the PQQ may not be considered by the Authority and the relevant Applicant may be excluded from further consideration.

To clarify:

- a) All Microsoft Word documents must be in Word 97-2003 Document (\*.doc) format.
- b) All Microsoft Excel documents must be in Excel Workbook (\*.xls) format.
- c) All Portable Document Format (PDF) documents must be in Adobe (\*.pdf) format.

Questions must be answered in English.

The information supplied will be checked for completeness and compliance before responses are evaluated.

Responses will be evaluated in accordance with the procedures set out in paragraph 7 Evaluating Pre-Qualification Questionnaires / Scoring Mechanism below.

Failure to furnish the required information, make a satisfactory response to any question, or supply documentation referred to in responses, within the specified timescale, may mean that an Applicant is excluded from further consideration in this process. Applicants are advised neither to make any assumptions about their past or current supplier relationships with the Authority nor to assume that such prior business relationships will be taken into account in the evaluation procedure.

The Authority is not bound to invite any Applicant to tender and reserves the right to abandon this process at any time without making any contract award and/or concluding any framework. The Authority shall have no liability whatsoever to any Applicant should it decide to abandon this process. Any action on the part of the Authority or the Applicant which might otherwise be construed as creating a legal relationship will not be construed as such and no such contract shall exist in relation to the PQQ.

## 7. EVALUATING PRE-QUALIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRES/SCORING MECHANISM

The following shows the areas of the PQQ and if / how they will be assessed:

No.	Section	Scoring Mechanism / Weighting
<b>1.</b>	<b>Company Information</b>	
1.1	Organisational Details	For information only
1.2	Consortia and Sub-Contracting	For Information only
1.3	Licensing and Registration	Pass/Fail
<b>2.</b>	<b>Legal Formation</b>	
2.1	Grounds for Mandatory Rejection	Pass/Fail
2.2	Grounds for Discretionary Rejection	Pass/Fail
<b>3.</b>	<b>Financial Details</b>	
3.1	Financial Assessment	Pass/Fail
<b>4.</b>	<b>Policy and Procedures</b>	<b>10% Overall weighting allocated</b>
4.1	Insurance	Pass/Fail
4.2	Equal Opportunities	Pass/Fail
4.3	Environmental Management	Pass/Fail
4.4	Health and Safety	Pass/Fail
4.5	Community Benefit	
4.5.1	Training and Apprenticeships	40% Sub-weighting
4.5.2	Local Supply Chain Opportunities	40% Sub-weighting
4.5.3	Sustainability, Corporate & Social Responsibility	20% Sub-weighting
<b>5.</b>	<b>Technical Ability and Capability</b>	<b>90% Overall weighting allocated</b>
5.1	Relevant Experience and Contract Examples	30% Sub-weighting
5.2	Specialist Remediation Services	10% Sub-weighting
5.3	Project Management	10% Sub-weighting
5.4	Commercial Management	10% Sub-weighting
5.5	Programme Management	10% Sub-weighting
5.6	Supply Chain Management	5% Sub-weighting
5.7	Stakeholder Management	5% Sub-weighting
5.8	Quality Assurance	5% Sub-weighting
5.9	Environmental Systems	5% Sub-weighting
5.10	Financial Deductions	5% Sub-weighting
5.11	Termination of Contract	5% Sub-weighting
-	Declaration	-

Applicants must supply as much of the information requested as possible to allow their submission to be assessed accurately. The Authority is entitled to request further additional information in the course of its evaluation.

Each Applicant will be assessed on how its expression of interest responds to the criteria and sub criteria set out above. Each weighted sub criterion set out above will be evaluated / assessed and marked in accordance with the following guidance.

Score	Score Comment	Score Rationale
5	Excellent Response	The PQQ response convincingly and comprehensively demonstrates that the Applicant's technical and professional ability meets the Authority's requirements.
4	Good Response	The PQQ response convincingly demonstrates that the Applicant's technical and professional ability is very likely to satisfy the Authority's requirements.
3	Acceptable Response	The PQQ response demonstrates that the Applicant's technical and professional ability is very likely to satisfy the majority of the Authority's requirements.
2	Unsatisfactory Response	The PQQ response fails to demonstrate that the Applicant's technical and professional ability is likely to satisfy the Authority's requirements.
1	Unacceptable Response	The PQQ response fails to demonstrate that the Applicant has relevant technical and professional ability.
0	Non-compliant Response	The PQQ response does not comply with these instruction or the PQQ or does not address the required submissions. Any Applicant whose expression of interest is determined to be non-compliant may be excluded from further consideration.

Each Qualitative Delivery Proposals will be marked separately, by members of the evaluation panel. [A moderation process will then be followed to arrive at a consensus score using the weightings set out above.]

Followings moderation [and a consensus workshop] for each sub criteria within Sections 4 and 5 (still marked out of 5) each score will be weighted in order to arrive at a final score using the weightings above.

**For Example:**

Example 1: If a question has a maximum score of 10 marks. A score of good would give a score of 4. The score of 4 would then be adjusted to a mark out of 10, i.e.  $4 \times (10/5) = 8$ .

Example 2: If a question has a maximum score of 10 marks. A score of Acceptable would give a score of 3. The score of 3 would then be adjusted to a mark out of 10, i.e.  $3 \times (10/5) = 6$ .

**Refer to Appendix 2 for the scoring evaluation of Section 3 – Financial Details**

## **8. SUBMISSION OF COMPLETED PRE-QUALIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRES**

Applicants must submit their completed response to the PQQ via the Authority's e-Tendering system ([www.londontenders.org](http://www.londontenders.org)) **no later than 12.00noon Friday 16 October 2015**. Completed responses to the PQQ may be submitted at any time before the closing date. Please note that completed PQQ's received after the closing date may be rejected.

Applicants must keep their contact details on the e-Tendering tool up to date or they will be unable to receive communications from the Authority.

## 9. CONSORTIA AND SUB-CONTRACTING

### Consortia arrangements:

If the Applicant bidding for a requirement is doing so on behalf of a consortium, the following information must be provided:

- full details of the make-up of the consortium; and
- The information sought in this PQQ in respect of each of the consortium's constituent members as part of a single composite response.

Where Applicants are proposing to create a separate corporate entity, they shall provide details of the actual or proposed percentage shareholding of the constituent members within the consortium in a separate appendix and confirm that the members of the consortium will each provide a full contractual guarantee of the performance of that entity. If a consortium is not proposing to form a corporate entity, full details of alternative proposed arrangements shall be provided in the appendix. However, please note the Authority reserves the right to require a successful consortium to form a single legal entity in accordance with Regulation 19(6) of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

## 10. QUERIES ABOUT THE PROCUREMENT

The Authority will not enter into detailed discussion of the requirements at this stage.

Any questions about the procurement must be submitted in writing via the e-Tendering system [www.londontenders.org](http://www.londontenders.org). No approach of any kind in connection with the PQQ shall be made to any other person within, or associated with, the Authority.

If the Authority considers any question or request for clarification to be of material significance, both the question and the response will be communicated, in a suitably anonymous form, to all Applicants who have responded; have expressed an interest, or those that show an interest before the closing date for the submission of the PQQ.

All responses received and any communication from Applicants will be treated in confidence but will be subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

## 11. PROVIDER SELECTION

The objective of the qualification process is to assess the responses to the PQQ and select Applicants to proceed to the next stage of the procurement.

The Authority may disqualify any Applicant who fail to:

1. Satisfy the 'pass/fail' criteria in the PQQ,
2. Provide a satisfactory response to any questions in the PQQ or who inadequately or incorrectly completes any question,
3. Submit its completed response to the PQQ before the deadline set out at Section 8.

The Authority may seek independent financial and market advice to validate information declared or to assist in the evaluation. The Authority reserves the right to obtain references, conduct reference site visits; ask for demonstrations; and/or presentations as part of the PQQ process.

Some supporting documents are not required at this point (for example certificates, statements with this questionnaire.) **However, the Authority may ask to see these documents later, so Applicants must ensure they can be made available upon request.** Applicants may also be required to clarify their answers or provide more details about certain issues.



## APPENDIX 1 PRE-QUALIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE

### 1. COMPANY INFORMATION

1.1 ORGANISATION AND CONTACT DETAILS – INFORMATION ONLY	
a) Full name of organisation tendering (or of organisation acting as lead contact where a consortium bid is being submitted)	
b) Registered office address / telephone number / email address	
c) Company or charity registration number	
d) VAT registration number	
e) Name of immediate parent company	
f) Name of ultimate parent company	
g) Dun & Bradstreet (DUNS) number (if applicable)	
h) Constructionline registration number (if applicable)	
i) Type of organisation <b>Please mark 'X' in the relevant box to indicate your trading status</b>	i) Public Limited Company
	ii) Private Limited Company
	iii) Consortium
	iv) Other Partnership
	v) Sole Trader
	vi) Limited Liability Partnership
	vii) Other (Please specify)
j) Please indicate if you are one of the following <b>Please mark 'X' in the relevant box(s) to indicate whether any of the following classifications apply to you</b>	i) Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE)
	ii) Small & Medium Enterprise (SME)
	iii) Sheltered Workshop
	iv) Public Service Mutual
Supplier contact details for enquiries about this PQQ	
Name	
Postal Address	
Country	
Phone	
Mobile	
E-mail	

<b>1.2 CONSORTIA AND SUB-CONTRACTING (BIDDING MODEL) – INFORMATION ONLY</b>	
<b>Please insert 'X' in the relevant box to indicate your answer;</b>	
a) Bidding as a Prime Contractor and will deliver 100% of the key contract deliverables yourself	Yes:  No :
b) Bidding as role of Prime Contractor and will use third parties to deliver some of the services	Yes:  No :
c) Bidding as Prime Contractor but will operate as a Managing Agent and will use third parties to deliver all of the services	Yes:  No :
d) Bidding as a consortium but not proposing to create a new legal entity <i>If your answer is 'YES', please include details of your consortium in the next column and use a separate appendix to explain the alternative arrangements i.e. why a new legal entity is not being created</i> <i>Please note that the authority may require the consortium to assume a specific legal form if awarded the contract, to the extent that it is necessary for the satisfactory performance of the contract.</i>	Yes:  No :  <b>Consortium Members</b>    <b>Lead Member</b>
e) Bidding as a consortium and intend to create a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) <i>If your answer is 'YES', please include details of your consortium, current lead member and intended Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) in the next column and provide full details of the bidding model using a separate Appendix</i>	Yes:  No :  <b>Consortium Members</b>    <b>Current Lead Member</b>   <b>Name of SPV</b>
<i>If your answer is 'YES' to (b) or (c) please provide in a separate appendix (no more than 2 pages), your proposed bidding model that includes members of the supply chain, the percentage of work being delivered by each sub-contractor and the key contract deliverables each sub-contractor will be responsible for.</i>	

<b>1.3 LICENSING AND REGISTRATION – PASS/FAIL</b>	
<b>Please insert 'X' in the relevant box to indicate your answer;</b>	
<p>a) Registration with a professional body.</p> <p>If applicable, is your business registered with the appropriate trade or professional register(s) in the EU member state where it is established (as set out in Annex IX of directive 2014/24/EU) under the conditions laid down by that member state.</p>	<p>Yes:</p> <p>No :</p> <p>If Yes, please provide registration number below:</p>
<p>b) Is it a legal requirement in the State where you are established for you to be licensed or a member of a relevant organisation in order to provide the requirement in this procurement?</p> <p><i>If yes, please provide additional details in the next column of what is required and confirmation that you have complied with this.</i></p>	<p>Yes:</p> <p>No :</p>

## 2. LEGAL FORMATION

2.1 GROUNDS FOR MANDATORY REJECTION – PASS/FAIL	
<p>You will be excluded from the procurement process if there is evidence of convictions relating to specific criminal offences including, but not limited to, bribery, corruption, conspiracy, terrorism, fraud and money laundering, or if you have been the subject of a binding legal decision which found a breach of legal obligations to pay tax or social security obligations (except where this is disproportionate e.g. only minor amounts involved).</p> <p>If you have answered 'YES' to question 2.1.1 on the non-payment of taxes or social security contributions, and have not paid or entered into a binding arrangement to pay the full amount, you may still avoid exclusion if only minor tax or social security contributions are unpaid or if you have not yet had time to fulfil your obligations since learning of the exact amount due. If your organisation is in that position please provide details using a separate Appendix.</p>	
<p>If you answer 'Yes' to any question in this section your application will not be accepted.</p> <p>It is implicit that the person submitting the PQQ on behalf of the potential provider has the authority to confirm this requirement. If this is not the case then a person with the appropriate authority from the potential provider's organisation must complete the 2.1 PQQ template (Director, Company Secretary Etc.).</p> <p>You may contact us for advice before completing this part of the questionnaire.</p>	
<p><b>Please insert 'X' in the relevant box to indicate your answer;</b></p>	
<p><b>2.1 Within the past five years, has your organisation (or any member of your proposed consortium, if applicable), Directors or partner or any other person who has powers of representation, decision or control been convicted of any of the following offences?</b></p>	<p>Please answer 'Yes' or 'No'</p>
<p>a) Conspiracy within the meaning of section 1 or 1A of the Criminal Law Act 1977 or article 9 or 9A of the Criminal Attempts and Conspiracy (Northern Ireland) Order 1983 where that conspiracy relates to participation in a criminal organisation as defined in Article 2 of Authority Framework Decision 2008/841/JHA on the fight against organised crime;</p>	<p>Yes:</p> <p>No :</p>
<p>b) Corruption within the meaning of section 1(2) of the Public Bodies Corrupt Practices Act 1889 or section 1 of the Prevention of Corruption Act 1906; where the offence relates to active corruption;</p>	<p>Yes:</p> <p>No :</p>
<p>c) The common law offence of bribery;</p>	<p>Yes:</p> <p>No :</p>
<p>d) Bribery within the meaning of section 1, 2 or 6 of the Bribery Act 2010; or section 113 of the Representation of the People Act 1983;</p>	<p>Yes:</p> <p>No :</p>
<p>e) Any of the following offences, where the offence relates to fraud affecting the European Communities' financial interests as defined by Article 1 of the</p>	

Convention on the protection of the financial interests of the European Communities, within the meaning of—	
i) The offence of cheating the revenue;	Yes: No :
ii) The offence of conspiracy to defraud;	Yes: No :
iii) Fraud or theft within the meaning of the Theft Act 1968, the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969, the Theft Act 1978 or the Theft (Northern Ireland) Order 1978;	Yes: No :
iv) Fraudulent trading within the meaning of section 458 of the Companies Act 1985, article 451 of the Companies (Northern Ireland) Order 1986 or section 993 of the Companies Act 2006;	Yes: No :
v) Fraudulent evasion within the meaning of section 170 of the Customs and Excise Management Act 1979 or section 72 of the Value Added Tax Act 1994;	Yes: No :
vi) An offence in connection with taxation in the European Union within the meaning of section 71 of the Criminal Justice Act 1993;	Yes: No :
vii) Destroying, defacing or concealing of documents or procuring the execution of a valuable security within the meaning of section 20 of the Theft Act 1968 or section 19 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969;	Yes: No :
(viii) Fraud within the meaning of section 2, 3 or 4 of the Fraud Act 2006; or	Yes: No :
(ix) The possession of articles for use in frauds within the meaning of section 6 of the Fraud Act 2006, or the making, adapting, supplying or offering to supply articles for use in frauds within the meaning of section 7 of that Act;	Yes: No :
f) Any offence listed—	
i) In section 41 of the Counter Terrorism Act 2008; or	Yes: No :
ii) In Schedule 2 to that Act where the court has determined that there is a terrorist connection;	Yes: No :

g) Any offence under sections 44 to 46 of the Serious Crime Act 2007 which relates to an offence covered by subparagraph (f);	Yes: No :
h) Money laundering within the meaning of sections 340(11) and 415 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002, Money Laundering Regulations 2003 or Money Laundering Regulations 2007;	Yes: No :
i) An offence in connection with the proceeds of criminal conduct within the meaning of section 93A, 93B or 93C of the Criminal Justice Act 1988 or article 45, 46 or 47 of the Proceeds of Crime (Northern Ireland) Order 1996;	Yes: No :
j) An offence under section 4 of the Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants etc.) Act 2004;	Yes: No :
k) An offence under section 59A of the Sexual Offences Act 2003;	Yes: No :
l) An offence under section 71 of the Coroners and Justice Act 2009	Yes: No :
m) An offence in connection with the proceeds of drug trafficking within the meaning of section 49, 50 or 51 of the Drug Trafficking Act 1994; or	Yes: No :
n) Any other offence within the meaning of Article 57(1) of the Public Contracts Directive—	
i) As defined by the law of any jurisdiction outside England and Wales and Northern Ireland; or	Yes: No :
ii) Created, after the day on which these Regulations were made, in the law of England and Wales or Northern Ireland.	Yes: No :

<p><b>2.1.1 Non-payment of Taxes</b>  <b>Has it been established by a judicial or administrative decision having final and binding effect in accordance with the legal provisions of any part of the United Kingdom or the legal provisions of the country in which your organisation is established (if outside the UK), that your organisation is in breach of obligations related to the payment of tax or social security contributions?</b></p>	<p>Please answer  'Yes' or 'No'</p>
<p><b>Please insert 'X' in the relevant box to indicate your answer;</b></p>	
<p>a) If you have answered 'Yes' to this question, please use a separate Appendix to provide further details. Please also use this Appendix to confirm whether you have paid, or have entered into a binding arrangement with a view to paying, including, where applicable, any accrued interest and/or fines?</p>	<p>Yes:   No :</p>

<b>2.2 GROUNDS FOR DISCRETIONARY EXCLUSION – Part 1 – PASS/FAIL</b>	
<p>The Authority is entitled to exclude you from the procurement if any of the following apply but may decide, having considered all the relevant circumstances, to allow your tender to proceed. If you answer 'Yes' to any question, please set out (in a separate Appendix) full details of the relevant incident and any remedial action taken subsequently. The information provided will be taken into account by the Authority in considering whether or not you will be able to proceed any further in respect of this procurement exercise.</p> <p>It is implicit that the person submitting the PQQ on behalf of the potential provider has the authority to confirm this requirement. If this is not the case then a person with the appropriate authority from the potential provider's organisation must complete the 2.2 PQQ – Part 1 template (Director, Company Secretary Etc.).</p> <p>If you select 'Yes', please provide detail in a separate Appendix.</p>	
<b>Please insert 'X' in the relevant box to indicate your answer;</b>	
<b>2.2 – Part 1</b>	Please answer 'Yes' or 'No'
<b>Within the past three years, please indicate if any of the following situations have applied, or currently apply, to your organisation.</b>	
a) Your organisation has violated applicable obligations referred to in regulation 56 (2) of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 in the fields of environmental, social and labour law established by EU law, national law, collective agreements or by the international environmental, social and labour law provisions listed in Annex X to the Public Contracts Directive as amended from time to time;	Yes: No :
b) Your organisation is bankrupt or is the subject of insolvency or winding-up proceedings, where your assets are being administered by a liquidator or by the court, where it is in an arrangement with creditors, where its business activities are suspended or it is in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure under the laws and regulations of any State;	Yes: No :
c) Your organisation is guilty of grave professional misconduct, which renders its integrity questionable (please see the note below relating to blacklists);	Yes: No :
d) Your organisation has entered into agreements with other economic operators aimed at distorting competition;	Yes: No :
e) Your organisation has a conflict of interest within the meaning of regulation 24 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 that cannot be effectively remedied by other, less intrusive, measures;	Yes: No :
f) The prior involvement of your organisation in the preparation of the procurement procedure has resulted in a distortion of competition, as referred to in regulation 41, that cannot be remedied by other, less intrusive, measures;	Yes: No :
g) Your organisation has shown significant or persistent deficiencies in the performance of a substantive requirement under a prior public contract, a prior	Yes:



contract with a contracting entity, or a prior concession contract, which led to early termination of that prior contract, damages or other comparable sanctions;	No :
h) your organisation—	
i) Has been guilty of serious misrepresentation in supplying the information required for the verification of the absence of grounds for exclusion or the fulfilment of the selection criteria; or	Yes: No :
ii) Has withheld such information or is not able to submit supporting documents required under regulation 59 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015; or	Yes: No :
i) Your organisation has undertaken to—	
i) Unduly influence the decision-making process of the contracting authority, or	Yes: No :
ii) Obtain confidential information that may confer upon your organisation undue advantages in the procurement procedure; or	Yes: No :
j) Your organisation has negligently provided misleading information that may have a material influence on decisions concerning exclusion, selection or award.	Yes: No :
<p><b>Blacklists</b></p> <p>The Authority has agreed to take a proactive stand against the illegal use of prohibited lists (also known as blacklists) by construction companies. These lists have been compiled without the individual subject matter's knowledge or consent and found to contain information such as trade union membership information which may have been used to determine whether or not to recruit individuals.</p> <p>At its Cabinet meeting on 10th July 2013 the Authority agreed to support the national union campaign by not allowing tenders from companies who subscribe to the use of such lists by seeking confirmation from prospective suppliers during the tendering process.</p> <p>The Authority considers that the use of such lists is grave misconduct as referred to at section 2.2(c) and Applicants must complete their expression of interest on that basis</p> <p><b>Conflicts of Interest</b></p> <p>In accordance with question 2.2 – Part 1 (e), the Authority may exclude the Applicant if there is a conflict of interest which cannot be effectively remedied. The concept of a conflict of interest includes any situation where relevant staff members have, directly or indirectly, a financial, economic or other personal interest which might be perceived to compromise their impartiality and independence in the context of the procurement procedure.</p> <p>Where there is any indication that a conflict of interest exists or may arise then it is the responsibility of the Applicant to inform the Authority, detailing the conflict in a separate Appendix. Provided that</p>	

it has been carried out in a transparent manner, routine pre-market engagement carried out by the Authority should not represent a conflict of interest for the Applicant.

**Taking Account of Bidders’ Past Performance**

In accordance with question (g), the Authority may assess the past performance of An Applicant (through a Certificate of Performance provided by a Customer or other means of evidence). The Authority may take into account any failure to discharge obligations under the previous principal relevant contracts of the Applicant completing this PQQ. The Authority may also assess whether specified minimum standards for reliability for such contracts are met.

In addition, the Authority may re-assess reliability based on past performance at key stages in the procurement process (i.e. Supplier selection, tender evaluation, contract award stage etc.). Applicants may also be asked to update the evidence they provide in this section to reflect more recent performance on new or existing contracts (or to confirm that nothing has changed).

**‘Self-cleaning’**

Any Applicant that answers ‘Yes’ to questions 2.1, 2.1.1 and 2.2 – Part 1 must provide sufficient evidence, in a separate Appendix, that provides a summary of the circumstances and any remedial action that has taken place subsequently and effectively “self-cleans” the situation referred to in that question. The Applicant has to demonstrate it has taken such remedial action, to the satisfaction of the Authority in each case.

Such evidence shall be considered by the Authority (whose decision will be final) in accordance with Regulations 57(13) to 57(17).

In order for the evidence referred to above to be sufficient, the Applicant shall, as a minimum, prove that it has;

- Paid or undertaken to pay compensation in respect of any damage caused by the criminal offence or misconduct;
- Clarified the facts and circumstances in a comprehensive manner by actively collaborating with the investigating Authorities; and
- Taken concrete technical, organisational and personnel measures that are appropriate to prevent further criminal offences or misconduct.

The measures taken by the Applicant shall be evaluated taking into account the gravity and particular circumstances of the criminal offence or misconduct. Where the measures are considered by the Authority to be insufficient, the Applicant shall be given a statement of the reasons for that decision.

**2.2 GROUNDS FOR DISCRETIONARY EXCLUSION – Part 2 – PASS/FAIL**

The Authority reserves the right to use its discretion to exclude an Applicant where it can demonstrate the Applicant's non-payment of taxes/social security contributions where no binding legal decision has been taken.

Please note that Section 2.2 – Part 2 relating to tax compliance only applies where the Authority has indicated that the contract is over £5million in value, and the Authority is a Central Government Department (including their Executive Agencies and Non-Departmental Public Bodies).

“Occasion of Tax Non-Compliance” means:

- (a) Any tax return of the Supplier submitted to a Relevant Tax Authority on or after 1 October 2012 is found to be incorrect as a result of:
1. A Relevant Tax Authority successfully challenging the Applicant under the General Anti-Abuse Rule or the Halifax Abuse Principle or under any tax rules or legislation that have an effect equivalent or similar to the General Anti-Abuse Rule or the Halifax Abuse Principle;
  2. The failure of an avoidance scheme which the Applicant was involved in, and which was, or should have been, notified to a Relevant Tax Authority under the DOTAS or any equivalent or similar regime; and/or
- (b) The Applicant's tax affairs give rise on or after 1 April 2013 to a criminal conviction in any jurisdiction for tax related offences which is not spent at the Effective Date or to a penalty for civil fraud or evasion.

It is implicit that the person submitting the PQQ on behalf of the potential provider has the authority to confirm this requirement. If this is not the case then a person with the appropriate authority from the potential provider's organisation must complete the 2.2 PQQ – Part 2 template (Director, Company Secretary Etc.).

**Please insert 'X' in the relevant box to indicate your answer;**

2.2 – Part 2 From 1 April 2013 onwards, have any of your company's tax returns submitted on or after 1 October 2012;	Please answer 'Yes' or 'No'
a) Given rise to a criminal conviction for tax related offences which is unspent, or to a civil penalty for fraud or evasion;	Yes:  No :
b) Been found to be incorrect as a result of:	
i) HMRC successfully challenging it under the General Anti-Abuse Rule (GAAR) or the “Halifax” abuse principle; or	Yes:  No :
ii) A Tax Authority in a jurisdiction in which the legal entity is established successfully challenging it under any tax rules or legislation that have an effect equivalent or similar to the GAAR or the “Halifax” abuse principle; or	Yes:  No :

<p>iii) The failure of an avoidance scheme which the Applicant was involved in and which was, or should have been, notified under the Disclosure of Tax Avoidance Scheme (DOTAS) or any equivalent or similar regime in a jurisdiction in which the Applicant is established</p>	<p>Yes: No :</p>
<p>If answering “Yes” to either a) or b) above, the Applicant should provide details of any mitigating factors that it considers relevant and that it wishes the Authority to take into consideration. This could include, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Corrective action undertaken by the Supplier to date;</li> <li>● Planned corrective action to be taken;</li> <li>● Changes in personnel or ownership since the Occasion of Non-Compliance (OONC); or</li> <li>● Changes in financial, accounting, audit or management procedures since the OONC.</li> </ul> <p>In order that the Authority can consider any factors raised by the Applicant, the following information must be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A brief description of the occasion, the tax to which it applied, and the type of “non-compliance” e.g. whether HMRC or the foreign Tax Authority has challenged pursuant to the GAAR, the “Halifax” abuse principle etc.</li> <li>● Where the OONC relates to a DOTAS, the number of the relevant scheme.</li> <li>● The date of the original “non-compliance” and the date of any judgement against the Applicant, or date when the return was amended.</li> <li>● The level of any penalty or criminal conviction applied.</li> </ul>	

### 3. FINANCIAL DETAILS – PASS / FAIL

3.1 FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT – PASS/FAIL	
<p>This section assesses the financial standing and capability of the Applicant submitting a PQQ response.</p> <p>Please ensure that all the information and documentation provided is up to date, as failure to explain any discrepancies between provided accounts and information contained in the bid may result in exclusion from the process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This assessment will only be undertaken in respect of those Applicants who meet the minimum compliance requirements, i.e. who pass Sections a), b) and c) (if applicable).</li> <li>2. The Authority will obtain an external report on each candidate to verify the accounts submitted by the candidate and to validate the financial calculations made by the Authority.</li> <li>3. Where this PQQ is being submitted by a candidate/lead organisation wishing to rely on the capacities of other entities or members in a group or Consortium, for the purposes of their financial standing, must provide additional details of those capacities and how they will be made available to the candidate.</li> <li>4. If the Applicant is a subsidiary company, the financial standing of the ultimate holding/parent company, where this applies, therefore also forms part of the evaluation process – all the financial information requested below for the bidding organisation must be provided for the parent organisation as well. External reports on such entities will also be obtained.</li> <li>5. If Applicants are successful in passing the PQQ stage, they are required to advise the Authority of any significant changes during the second stage of the procurement process. Significant changes are those which if they had occurred before this PQQ would or may have resulted in changes to their scores or them not passing the PQQ stage. The Authority will take significant changes into account in reaching the decision to award the contract. Failure to disclose this information may result in termination of the contract if awarded.</li> <li>6. Evaluation of the financial information provided, except where stated otherwise, will be based on a three-year average which will be scored to determine the financial capacity and capability of each Applicant. The data of Applicants who started trading recently will be averaged by the number of years of accounts provided.</li> </ol> <p>Section a) has a PASS/FAIL criteria and the financial information requested must be attached to allow the Authority to assess the financial standing of the Applicant.</p>	
<b>Please insert 'X' in the relevant box to indicate your answer;</b>	Please answer 'Yes' or 'No'
<p>a) Please confirm that you attach one set of the last two financial years audited (as appropriate) / signed accounts for your organisation.</p> <p><i>The accounts provided must cover the last two years of trading or for the period that is available if trading for less than two years.</i></p> <p><i>If the Applicant submitting this PQQ is a subsidiary company, the information</i></p>	<p>Yes:</p> <p>No :</p>

<p><i>requested is required for both the subsidiary and the ultimate holding/parent company.</i></p> <p><i>If the Applicant is submitting this PQQ as a lead organisation wishing to rely on the capacities of other entities or members in a group or Consortium for the purposes of their financial standing assessment the Applicant must provide additional details of those capacities and how they will be made available to the potential provider.</i></p> <p><b><i>In order to carry out the calculation of the key financial ratios detailed in Appendix 2 which form part of the pass/fail assessment, detailed accounts must be provided; abbreviated accounts which do not provide the relevant data for the calculation of the key financial ratios will not be accepted.</i></b></p> <p><i>Applicants who FAIL to provide the accounts with the necessary information will be excluded from further consideration in the PQQ.</i></p> <p><i>All accounts provided must be signed.</i></p>	
<p>b) Does your organisations latest set of audited accounts relate to a period more than 12 months before the date of this submission?</p> <p><i>If your response is 'No' please ignore the next question.</i></p> <p><i>If your response is 'Yes' please complete section c)</i></p>	<p>Yes:</p> <p>No :</p>
<p>c) Please confirm that you are providing a copy of your most recent business plan, budget or similar document that includes the financial projection for the current year.</p> <p><i>If your latest set of audited accounts relates to a period more than 12 months before the date of this submission, please provide a copy of your most recent business plan, budget or similar document that includes a financial projection for the current year.</i></p>	<p>Yes:</p> <p>No :</p>

#### 4. POLICY AND PROCEDURES – 10% WEIGHTING

4.1 INSURANCE – PASS/FAIL	
Please insert 'X' in the relevant box to indicate your answer;	Please answer 'Yes' or 'No'
<p>Please confirm below whether you already have <i>or can commit to obtain</i>, prior to the commencement of the contract, the levels of insurance cover indicated below:-</p> <p>Employer's Liability Insurance of not less than £10,000,000</p> <p>Public Liability Insurance of not less than £10,000,000</p> <p>*Professional Indemnity Insurance of not less than £2,000,000</p> <p>Product Liability Insurance - deemed to be included within professional indemnity.</p> <p>All of which are in relation to any one claim or series of claims.</p> <p>*and shall ensure that all professional consultants or sub-contractors involved in the provision of the services hold and maintain appropriate cover.</p> <p><i>Applicants are to ensure that they attach a copy of their insurance certificate.</i></p>	<p>Yes:</p> <p>No :</p>

#### 4.2 EQUALITY OPPORTUNITIES AND DIVERSITY – PASS/FAIL

The Authority has a duty in law pursuant to the Equality Act 2010 (this act replaces the Race Relations Act 1976, the Sex Discrimination Act 1975, the Equal Pay Act 1970, the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and the Equality Act 2006), in the carrying out of its functions, to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different racial groups. This duty applies where the Authority carries out its functions directly and where it does so through external contractors.

In the performance of their contractual obligations, contractors shall not discriminate against any person or persons on the grounds of race, colour, religion, and ethnic or national origin. Additionally, contractors shall not discriminate against any person or persons not being an employee of the contractor on the grounds of disablement, gender, sexual orientation or marital status.

Organisations shall comply with the Code of Practice for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Promotion of Equal Opportunity in Employment issued by the Commission for Racial Equality and on request provides the Authority with copies of:

- 1) Instructions to staff concerned with recruitment, promotion and training in regard to their equal opportunity policy.
- 2) Documents available to employees, recognised trade unions or other representative groups of employees in regard to the organisations equal opportunity policy.
- 3) Recruitment advertisements or other literature.

Organisations are also encouraged to comply with the Code of Practice on the Elimination of Sex Discrimination Issued by the Equal Opportunities Commission and the Code of Good Practice on the Employment of Disabled People, issued by the Employment Service. Organisations shall also take all necessary steps to secure the observance of this part of the Code by all their employees or agents.

Generally and the foregoing notwithstanding, contractors who carry out functions on behalf of the Authority will be expected to demonstrate that they can meet the Authority's commitment to and compliance with current equalities legislation as if the Authority was carrying out such functions itself. Such equalities legislation includes the statutory obligations under the Equality Act 2010.

**For organisations working outside of the UK please refer to equivalent legislation in the country that you are located.**

Please insert 'X' in the relevant box to indicate your answer;	Please answer 'Yes' or 'No'
a) In the last three years, has any finding of unlawful discrimination been made against your organisation by an Employment Tribunal, an Employment Appeal Tribunal or any other court (or in comparable proceedings in jurisdiction other than the UK)?	Yes: No :
b) In the last three years, has your organisation had a complaint upheld following an investigation by the Equality & Human Rights Commission or its predecessors (or a comparable body in jurisdiction other than the UK), on grounds or alleged unlawful discrimination?	Yes: No :



*If you have answered 'Yes' to one or both of the above questions, please provide, as an Appendix, a summary of the nature of the investigation and an explanation of the outcome (so far) of the investigation.*

*If the investigation upheld the complaint against your organisation, provide as an Appendix, an explanation of what action (if any) you have taken to prevent unlawful discrimination from reoccurring.*

*Applicants must note that if you have answered 'Yes' to one or both of the above questions you may be excluded from tendering if you are unable to demonstrate to the Authority's satisfaction that appropriate remedial action has been taken to prevent similar unlawful discrimination reoccurring.*

c) If you intend to use sub-contractor(s), please confirm as to whether any of the above circumstances apply to these other organisations?

Yes:

No :

<b>4.3 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT – PASS/FAIL</b>	
For organisations working outside of the UK please refer to equivalent legislation in the country that you are located.	
<b>Please insert 'X' in the relevant box to indicate your answer;</b>	Please answer 'Yes' or 'No'
a) Has your organisation been convicted of breaching environmental legislation, or had any notice served upon it, in the last three years by any environmental regulator or authority (including local authority) in relation to activities similar to this covered by this contract?	Yes:  No :
<p><i>If your answer to the above question is 'Yes', provide details as an Appendix of the conviction or notice and details of any remedial action or changes you have made as a result of conviction or notices served.</i></p> <p><i>Applicants must note that the Authority will not select Applicant(s) that have been prosecuted or served notice under environmental legislation in the last 3 years, unless the Authority is satisfied that appropriate remedial action has been taken to prevent future occurrences/breaches.</i></p>	
b) If you intend to use sub-contractor(s), please confirm as to whether any of these organisations have been convicted or had a notice served upon them for infringement of environmental legislation?	Yes:  No :

<b>4.4 HEALTH &amp; SAFETY – PASS/FAIL</b>	
For organisations working outside of the UK please refer to equivalent legislation in the country that you are located.	
<b>Please insert 'X' in the relevant box to indicate your answer;</b>	Please answer 'Yes' or 'No'
a) Has your organisation or any of its Directors or Executive Officers been in receipt of enforcement/remedial orders in relation to the Health and Safety Executive (or equivalent body) in the last 3 years?	Yes:  No :
<p><i>If your answer to the above question is 'Yes', provide details as an Appendix of any enforcement / remedial orders served and give details of any remedial action or changes to procedures you have made as a result.</i></p> <p><i>Applicants must note that the Authority will exclude Applicant(s) that have been in receipt of enforcement/remedial action orders unless the Applicant(s) can demonstrate to the Authority's satisfaction that appropriate remedial action has been taken to prevent future occurrences / breaches.</i></p>	
b) If you intend to use sub-contractor(s), please confirm as to whether any of the above circumstances apply to these other organisations?	Yes:  No :
<p><i>If your answer to the above question is 'Yes' please provide evidence of the procedures you use to monitor sub-contractors' Health and Safety arrangements. This should include any questionnaires used, and details of communication and monitoring methods.</i></p>	
c) Please self-certify that your organisation has a Health and Safety Policy that complies with current legislative requirements.	Yes:  No :
<p><i>If your answer to the above question is 'Yes', provide full details and supporting evidence including but not limited to, confirmation of any registrations and/or accreditations, copies of health and safety at work policies and details of measures utilised to ensure robust health and safety work practices are adhered to.</i></p>	

**4.5 COMMUNITY BENEFIT – 100% SUB-WEIGHTING****4.5.1 TRAINING AND APPRENTICESHIPS – 40% SUB-WEIGHTING**

Please provide details and evidence of your organisation's approach towards supporting the Authority's corporate priority of up-skilling the local workforce, creating local employment opportunities and providing apprenticeships and other training opportunities to the local community on similar, comparable successfully completed projects. (Max. 1000 words.)

Applicants must note that your response should include the following:

- Detailed examples of your approach towards the provision of apprenticeship and training programmes to young people.
- Detailed examples of your approach towards generating employment and training opportunities for long-term unemployed people.
- Detailed evidence of your approach towards retention of the skilled workforce following the completion of the apprenticeship and training programmes.
- How this approach has been embedded into the local community.
- Number of apprentices employed.
- Percentage of workforce directly employed.
- Total investment provided.

**Response:**

**4.5.2 LOCAL SUPPLY CHAIN OPPORTUNITIES – 40% SUB-WEIGHTING**

Please provide details and evidence of your organisation’s approach towards promoting and providing full and fair opportunity to new and small enterprises (SME’s) to assist in the delivery of similar, comparable successfully completed projects. (Max. 500 words.)

Applicants must note that your response should include the following:

- Detailed examples of suppliers used.
- Detailed examples of new enterprises and SME’s that have been used.
- How this approach has been embedded into the community.
- Percentage of suppliers, new enterprises and SME’s that have been used.
- Details of the projects involved.

**Response:**

**4.5.3 SUSTAINABILITY, CORPORATE & SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (CSR) – 20% SUB-WEIGHTING**

Outline how your organisation's Sustainability, Corporate & Social Responsibility (CSR) approach has been delivered to provide added value to public bodies which your organisation works with. (Max 300 words)

**Response:**

## 5. TECHNICAL ABILITY AND CAPABILITY – 90% WEIGHTING

This section assesses the experience, technical capability and capacity of the Applicant to carry out remediation works at the Willoughby Lane and Meridian Way sites as well as elsewhere in the Greater London area under the Framework and in accordance with an NEC3 Option A or NEC3 Option C Contract to the Authorities requirements.

### 5.1 RELEVANT EXPERIENCE AND CONTRACT EXAMPLES – 30% SUB-WEIGHTING

Please provide details of **three** contracts, in any combination from either the public or private sector, that are relevant to the Authority's requirement. Contracts may be from the past **five** years and should include a minimum of **two** projects executed in a similar urban area and minimum of one project which has taken place on a former gasworks site.

You should ensure that the named customer contact provided by you is be prepared to provide a formal written reference and evidence to the Authority to confirm the accuracy of the information provided below.

Consortia bids should provide relevant examples of where the consortium has delivered similar requirements; if this is not possible (e.g. the consortium is newly formed or a Special Purpose Vehicle will be created for this contract) then three separate examples should be provided between the principal member(s) of the proposed consortium or Special Purpose Vehicle (three examples are not required from each member).

Where the Supplier is a Special Purpose Vehicle or a managing agent not intending to be the main provider of the works, the information requested must be provided in respect of the principal intended provider(s) or sub-contractor(s) who will deliver the works.

<b>Contract 1</b>
Name and Address of Client's Organisation
Point of contact in Client's Organisation, including position in organisation, telephone number and e-mail address
Point of contact for formal reference (if different from above)
Project Name, Location, Type of Works and Form of Contract used.
Contract Start and Completion Dates (as originally programmed and actually achieved)
Reasons for any early completion or delay
Contract Value £
Final Account Value £



In no more than 500 words, please provide a brief description of the contract delivered including evidence as to your technical capability in this market.

<b>Contract 2</b>
Name and Address of Client's Organisation
Point of contact in Client's Organisation, including position in organisation, telephone number and e-mail address
Point of contact for formal reference (if different from above)
Project Name, Location, Type of Works and Form of Contract used.
Contract Start and Completion Dates (as originally programmed and actually achieved)
Reasons for any early completion or delay
Contract Value £

Final Account Value

£

In no more than 500 words, please provide a brief description of the contract delivered including evidence as to your technical capability in this market.

<b>Contract 3</b>
Name and Address of Client's Organisation
Point of contact in Client's Organisation, including position in organisation, telephone number and e-mail address
Point of contact for formal reference (if different from above)
Project Name, Location, Type of Works and Form of Contract used.
Contract Start and Completion Dates (as originally programmed and actually achieved)
Reasons for any early completion or delay
Contract Value £
Final Account Value £

In no more than 500 words, please provide a brief description of the contract delivered including evidence as to your technical capability in this market.

If you cannot provide at three examples for the above question, in no more than 250 words please provide an explanation for this e.g. your organisation is a new start-up.

**5.2 SPECIALIST REMEDIATION WORKS – 10% SUB-WEIGHTING**

Please provide details demonstrating your experience of and competence in the following categories;-

- Dealing with Japanese Knotweed.
- Dealing with Giant Hogweed.
- Non-aqueous phase liquid (NAPL) recovery.
- Utility services protection and/or diversions.

(Max 1000 words.)

**Response:**

**5.3 PROJECT MANAGEMENT – 10% SUB-WEIGHTING**

Please provide details of the project management structure and methodology your organisation has employed in relation to delivering projects similar to those of the Authority's requirements (Max 1000 words.)

Applicants must note that your response should include the following:

- Organogram structure
- Details of personnel, their qualifications and competencies
- Systems of control
- Software systems used

**Response:**



**5.4 COMMERCIAL MANAGEMENT – 10% SUB-WEIGHTING**

Please provide details of how your organisation has monitored and managed the commercial aspects of projects similar to the Authority's requirements and under similar forms of contract. (Max. 1000 words)

Applicants must note that your response should include the following:

- Cost management.
- Dispute resolution.

**Response:**

**5.5 PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT – 10% SUB-WEIGHTING**

Please provide details of your organisations approach towards programme delivery and management on comparable successfully completed projects, ensuring that your response includes the processes involved in monitoring, control and implementation of any mitigation measures (Max. 1000 words)

**Response:**

**5.5 SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT – 5% SUB-WEIGHTING**

Please provide details of your organisations approach towards supply chain arrangements on similar, comparable successfully completed projects. (Max 1000 words.)

Applicants must note that your response should include the following:

- Sub-contractors and suppliers previously used & % used for overall supply.
- Documentation to demonstrate the control procedures associated to procuring and managing sub-contractors.
- Key Performance Indicators

**Response:**

**5.6 STAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT – 5% SUB-WEIGHTING**

Giving specific examples, identify how your organisation has managed stakeholder relationships to deliver projects from inception to completion. (Max 500 words)

Applicants should also consider the following as part of their response:

- What 'added value' were you able to deliver?
- Key factors & attributes that differentiated your organisation from your peer group.
- How you managed communications with local residents, businesses and any other parties affected by or interested in the remediation works.

**Response:**

**5.7 QUALITY ASSURANCE – 5% SUB-WEIGHTING**

Please provide details of your organisation's Quality Management system utilised on similar, comparable projects to those outlined in this PQQ. (Max 500 words.)

Applicants must note that your response should include the following:

- Evidence of the system used for monitoring performance.
- Evidence of the system used for monitoring customer care.
- Evidence of the system used for dealing with non-conformities.

Applicants who are ISO 9000: 2000 accredited and provide evidence of their certification as an Appendix will be awarded top score for this question.

**Response:**

**5.8 ENVIRONMENTAL SYSTEMS – 5% SUB-WEIGHTING**

Please provide details of your organisations Environmental Management system utilised on similar, comparable projects to that required under this contract. (Max. 500 words.)

Applicants who hold ISO 14001 accreditation (or similar) and provide evidence of their certification as an Appendix will be awarded top score for this question.

**Response:**

**5.9 FINANCIAL DEDUCTIONS – 5% SUB-WEIGHTING**

Has your organisation suffered financial deductions in respect of any contract in the last three years?

These may include liquidated and ascertained damages, any kind of financial sanctions, or retention of payments that would otherwise have been paid.

**Please insert 'X' in the relevant box to indicate your answer;**

Yes:            No :

If your answer to the above question is 'Yes' please provide full details and describe any remedial actions or changes you have made to prevent future occurrences in no more than 500 words.

**Response:**

**5.10 TERMINATION OF CONTRACT – 5% SUB-WEIGHTING**

Has your organisation had a contract terminated or your employment determined under the terms of the contract in the last 3 years?

**Please insert 'X' in the relevant box to indicate your answer;**

Yes:            No :

If your answer to the above question is 'Yes' please provide full details and describe any remedial actions or changes you have made to prevent future occurrences in no more than 500 words.

**Response:**



<b>DECLARATION</b>	
<p>I declare that to the best of my knowledge the answers submitted in this form are correct. I understand that the information will be used in the selection process to assess my organisation's suitability to be invited to tender for the Authority's requirement and I am signing on behalf of my organisation.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>[Insert name of your organisation]</i></b></p> <p>I understand that the Authority may reject my submission if there is a failure to answer all relevant questions fully or if I provide false/misleading information.</p> <p>I have provided a full list of any Appendices used to provide additional information in response to questions.</p> <p>I also declare that there is no conflict of interest in relation to the Authority's requirement.</p> <p>I also understand it is implicit that the person submitting the PQQ on behalf of the Applicant has the authority to confirm this requirement. If this is not the case then a person with the appropriate authority from the Applicants organisation must complete the PQQ template (Director, Company Secretary Etc.).</p>	
<b>FORM COMPLETED BY</b>	
<b>Name:</b>	
<b>Role in organisation:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Signature:</b>	

## APPENDIX 2 – FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT

The following describes the assessment of the financial accounts / business plan or budget provided as part of the PQQ that will take place, the PASS/FAIL for each criterion. All financial criterion must record a PASS.

No.	Assessment Used	Scoring Mechanism
a)	Suitable Trading Level (STL)  As part of the assessment of financial standing & capacity, the Authority has calculated a STL of £20M for this contract.	STL > £20 million PASS  STL < £20 million FAIL
b)	Net Assets - Liabilities	Positive PASS  Negative FAIL
c)	Current Assets/Liabilities	Ratio > 0.8 PASS  Ratio < 0.8 FAIL
d)	Total Interest Bearing Debt/Net Assets	Ratio < 4 PASS  Ratio > 4 FAIL
e)	Profit - Loss before tax	Positive PASS  Negative FAIL



This page is intentionally left blank

## THE CABINET

### List of Items for Future Cabinet Meetings (NOTE: The items listed below are subject to change.)

<b>MUNICIPAL YEAR 2016/2017</b>
---------------------------------

<b>SEPTEMBER 2016</b>
-----------------------

- 1. Unecol House Project** James Rolfe

This will seek approval to progress the Unecol House project. **(Key decision – reference number 4237)**
- 2. Housing Gateway Ltd. Annual Report** James Rolfe

This will present an annual report to Housing Gateway's sole shareholder detailing the company's progress over the past year. (Non key)
- 3. Upper Secondary Autistic Provision** Jenny Tosh

This will present the full business case for the Minchenden Scheme and all development options. **(Key decision – reference number 4293)**
- 4. Re-provision 2 – Care Home Capital Funding and Procurement** Ray James

This will report feedback outcome of feasibility, seek approval of capital funding for the total scheme including the proposed works, technical services, furniture and equipment, and any other associated costs and to set out procurement process. **(Key decision – reference number 4337)**
- 5. Scrutiny Annual Work Programme 2016/17** James Rolfe

This will set out the proposed scrutiny work programme and work streams for 2016/17 for comment prior to approval by Council. (Non key)
- 6. Review of Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Proposals: Phase 3** Ian Davis

This will seek approval of revised and updated Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Proposals. **(Key decision – reference number 4222)**
- 7. Housing Revenue Account Affordable Rent Levels 2016-17** Ian Davis

This will propose the level of rent to be set for newly built or newly acquired properties within the HRA in the 2016-17 year. **(Key decision – reference number 4341)**

- 8. Meridian Water Compulsory Purchase Order** Ian Davis
- This will seek agreement to the in principle compulsory purchase of all land necessary to be acquired in order to deliver the Meridian Water Regeneration Scheme. To authorise the Director – Regeneration and Environment, to begin work towards making a CPO for the Meridian Water site. **(Key decision – reference number 4348)**
- 9. Montagu Estate Asset Management** James Rolfe
- This will seek approval of the options for the asset management of the Montagu Industrial Estate. **(Key decision – reference number 4357)**
- 10. Investment Property Asset Management** James Rolfe
- This will seek approval to the establishment of an investment property asset management fund. **(Key decision – reference number 4356)**
- 11. Bury Street West** James Rolfe
- This will provide an update on the progression of the redevelopment of the former depot. **(Key decision – reference number 4008)**
- 12. Capital Programme Monitor – 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2016/17** James Rolfe
- This will present the capital programme monitor first quarter 2016/17. **(Key decision – reference number 4362)**
- 13. July 2016 Revenue Monitoring Report** James Rolfe
- This will present the July 2016 revenue monitoring report. **(Key decision – reference number 4365)**
- 14. Edmonton Futures Housing Zone 2** Ian Davis
- This will seek authority to enter into contract with the GLA as part of the Council's successful Housing Zone Designation. **(Key decision – reference number 4334)**
- 15. Claverings Industrial Estate** Ian Davis
- (Key decision – reference number 4381)**

<b>OCTOBER 2016</b>
---------------------

- 1. Quarterly Corporate Performance Report** Rob Leak
- This will provide performance information against the indicators contained in the Corporate Performance Scorecard, which shows the progress being

made in delivering the Council's priorities. **(Key decision – reference number 4330)**

**2. Small Housing Sites 2 (Phase 2b) Delivery** Ian Davis

This will set out a business case for delivering over 100 new homes across Council owned HRA sites. **(Key decision – reference number 4304)**

**3. Empty Property Compulsory Purchase Orders** Ray James

This will seek authorisation to make compulsory purchase orders on two empty residential properties. **(Key decision – reference number 4338)**

**4. Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for Enfield Town** Ian Davis

This will seek approval of Cycle Enfield proposals for Enfield Town for implementation. **(Key decision – reference number 4112)**

**5. Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A110 Southbury Road** Ian Davis

This will seek approval of Cycle Enfield proposals for the A110 for implementation. **(Key decision – reference number 4113)**

**6. Small Sites Update** Ian Davis

This will provide a summary of the current position and proposed next steps to deliver the scheme. **(Key decision – reference number 4298)**

**7. Parking Enforcement Policy** Ian Davis

This policy will set out the Council's approach to dealing with parking enforcement. **(Key decision – reference number 4058)**

**8. Flexible Housing – Capital Programme** Ray James/Ian Davis

This will seek approval of capital funding to deliver flexible housing. **(Key decision – reference number 4333)**

**9. Re-provision Project – Award of Service Contract** Ray James

This will seek approval to the award of contract for the provision of residential, nursing and respite care. **(Key decision – reference number 4309)**

**10. August 2016 Revenue Monitoring Report** James Rolfe

This will present the August 2016 revenue monitoring report. **(Key decision – reference number 4366)**

11. **Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2015-2016** Ray James  
This will present the Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2015-2016. (Non key)
12. **Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2015-2016** Tony Theodoulou  
This will present the Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report 2015-2016. (Non key)
13. **Interim Local Implementation Plan (LIP) Annual Spending Submission: 2017/18** Ian Davis  
This will seek approval to the interim Local Implementation Plan annual spending submission for 2017/18. **(Key decision – reference number 4373)**
14. **Meridian Water Station** Ian Davis  
This will outline the Network Rail contribution and implementation agreements. **(Key decision – reference number 4349)**
15. **Draft Submission Version North London Waste Plan** Ian Davis  
Following consultation on the Draft North London Waste Plan in 2015, approval is required for the draft submission version of the Plan before further consultation in the summer. **(Key decision – reference number 4280)**
16. **Green Bin Collection Service** Ian Davis  
This will detail the review of the green bin collection service and seek agreement to proposed changes to the service. **(Key decision – reference number 4376)**
17. **The Council's Main Investment Decision in Lee Valley Heat Network Ltd.** Ian Davis  
This will seek approval for referral to full Council. **(Key decision – reference number 4266)**
18. **Land Acquisition at Meridian Water** Ian Davis  
This will seek approval to acquire a 2.13 acre plot of land within the Meridian Water opportunity area. **(Key decision – reference number 4377)**
19. **Enfield Innovations Ltd. Annual Report** James Rolfe  
This will present an annual report to Enfield Innovation's sole shareholder detailing the company's progress over the past year. (Non key)



20. **Ponders End Delivery Programme** Ian Davis

This will outline for approval the Ponders End Delivery Programme. **(Key decision – reference number 4382)**

21. **Development of Edmonton Cemetery** Ian Davis

This will seek to extend Edmonton Cemetery to provide new provisions for burials within the borough given the limited capacity in existing cemeteries for future years, for referral to full Council. **(Key decision – reference number 4234)**

22. **Taking Forward Enfield Council's IT Offer** James Rolfe

This will progress taking forward Enfield's Council's IT Offer following the previous Cabinet decision. **(Key decision – reference number 4378)**

#### NOVEMBER 2016

1. **Housing Gateway Budget** James Rolfe

This will seek approval to increase its total budget to enable it to continue purchasing properties. **(Key decision – reference number 4326)**

2. **Estate Renewal Programme Report** Ian Davis

This will provide an update on the estate renewal programme and related activity and approvals where required. **(Key decision – reference number 4272)**

3. **Drug and Alcohol Action Team (DAAT) Substance Misuse Services Tender** Ray James

This will set out the tendering process for the provision of Adult Substance Misuse Services in Enfield and seek approval to contract award. **(Key decision – reference number 4302)**

4. **Regionalisation of Adoption Services** Tony Theodoulou

This will outline proposals regarding the regionalisation of adoption services. **(Key decision – reference number 4375)**

#### DECEMBER 2016

1. **Quarterly Corporate Performance Report** Rob Leak

This will provide performance information against the indicators contained in the Corporate Performance Scorecard, which shows the progress being

made in delivering the Council's priorities. **(Key decision – reference number 4330)**

2. **Capital Programme Monitor – 2nd Quarter 2016/17** James Rolfe

This will present the capital programme monitor second quarter 2016/17. **(Key decision – reference number 4363)**

3. **October 2016 Revenue Monitoring Report** James Rolfe

This will present the October 2016 revenue monitoring report. **(Key decision – reference number 4367)**

4. **Housing Supply and Delivery** Ian Davis

This will set out how the Council will increase housing supply in the short and medium terms. **(Key decision – reference number 4165)**

#### JANUARY 2017

1. **Approval of Cycle Enfield Proposals for the A1010 (North)** Ian Davis

This will seek approval of Cycle Enfield proposals for the A1010 (North) for implementation. **(Key decision – reference number 4115)**

2. **November 2016 Revenue Monitoring Report** James Rolfe

This will present the November 2016 revenue monitoring report. **(Key decision – reference number 4368)**

#### FEBRUARY 2017

1. **Budget Report 2017/18 and Medium Term Financial Plan 2017/18 to 2020/21** James Rolfe

This will present the budget report 2017/18 and the Medium Term Financial Plan 2017/18 to 2010/21. **(Key decision – reference number 4371)**

#### MARCH 2017

1. **Capital Programme Monitor – 3rd Quarter 2016/17** James Rolfe

This will present the capital programme monitor third quarter 2016/17. **(Key decision – reference number 4364)**

2. **January 2017 Revenue Monitoring Report** James Rolfe

This will present the January 2017 revenue monitoring report. **(Key decision – reference number 4369)**

**APRIL 2017**

1. **Quarterly Corporate Performance Report** Rob Leak

This will provide performance information against the indicators contained in the Corporate Performance Scorecard, which shows the progress being made in delivering the Council's priorities. **(Key decision – reference number 4330)**

2. **February 2017 Revenue Monitoring Report** James Rolfe

This will present the February 2017 revenue monitoring report. **(Key decision – reference number 4370)**

This page is intentionally left blank

## CABINET - 7.7.2016

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CABINET  
HELD ON THURSDAY, 7 JULY 2016**

**COUNCILLORS****PRESENT**

Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council), Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment), Yasemin Brett (Cabinet Member for Community, Arts and Culture), Alev Cazimoglu (Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care), Krystle Fonyonga (Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Public Health), Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency), Ayfer Orhan (Cabinet Member for Education, Children's Services and Protection), Ahmet Oykenen (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) and Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development)

**Associate Cabinet Members (Non-Executive and Non-Voting):** Bambos Charalambous (Enfield West), Vicki Pite (Enfield North) and George Savva MBE (Enfield South East)

**ABSENT**

Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader/Public Service Delivery)

**OFFICERS:**

Rob Leak (Chief Executive), James Rolfe (Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services), Ian Davis (Director - Regeneration & Environment), Tony Theodoulou (Interim Director of Children's Services), Bindi Nagra (Assistant Director - Health, Housing and Adult Social Care), Asmat Hussain (Assistant Director Legal & Governance), Jayne Middleton-Albooye (Head of Legal Services), Bob Griffiths (Assistant Director - Planning, Highways & Transportation), David B Taylor (Head of Traffic and Transportation), Mohammed Lais (Senior Asset Management Surveyor), Nicholas Bowater (Programme Manager - Policy and Performance), Rocco Labellarte (Interim Assistant Director of ICT), Glenn Stewart (Assistant Director - Public Health), Shnow Chory (Legal Services), Richard Eason (Cycle Enfield) and Laura Berryman (Press Officer) Jacqui Hurst (Secretary)

**Also Attending:**

Councillor Peter Fallart  
Abhijit Chatterjee (Representative of Jacobs – Cycle Enfield Consultant)

1

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader).

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

An apology for lateness was received from Councillor Bambos Charalambous (Associate Cabinet Member – Enfield West).

Councillor Yasemin Brett (Cabinet Member for Community, Arts and Culture) apologised that she would need to leave the meeting at 7.30pm.

**2**

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council), Ahmet Oykener (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) and Alan Sitkin (Cabinet Member for Economic Regeneration and Business Development) declared non-pecuniary interests in Report Nos. 34 and 39 – Contracting with Lee Valley Heat Network for the Provision of Heat on Enfield's Housing Estates (Minute Nos.12 and 21 below refer) in their capacity as Board Members of the Lee Valley Heat Network. The Members remained in the meeting and took part in the discussion of the reports.

**3**

**URGENT ITEMS**

NOTED, that the reports listed on the agenda had been circulated in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information and Meetings) (England) Regulations 2012. These requirements state that agendas and reports should be circulated at least 5 clear working days in advance of meetings.

**4**

**DEPUTATIONS**

NOTED, that no requests for deputations had been received for presentation to this Cabinet meeting.

**5**

**ITEMS TO BE REFERRED TO THE COUNCIL**

NOTED, that there were no reports to be referred to full Council.

**6**

**APPROVAL OF CYCLE ENFIELD PROPOSALS FOR THE A1010 (SOUTH)**

Councillor Daniel Anderson (Cabinet Member for Environment) introduced the report of the Director – Regeneration and Environment (No.27) seeking approval to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A1010 South (Lincoln Road to Fairfield Road).

NOTED

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

1. Councillor Anderson advised Members that the report set out in detail the results of the consultation which had taken place to date and presented a series of recommendations for Members' consideration and approval. Subject to approval of this report, detailed design work and statutory consultation would then be undertaken as explained in the report.
2. A number of particular issues were highlighted for Members' consideration including the options for the future configuration of the roundabout at Edmonton Green and location of the war memorial. Councillor Anderson outlined the results of the consultation on these particular issues and the potential cost implications for the alternative options. In conclusion it was explained that the recommended option was for a signalised roundabout option at Edmonton Green (Option 2) subject to statutory consultation, as set out in recommendation 2.2 of the report. This option would also enable the war memorial to remain in its existing location. Members noted the intention to enhance the look and feel of the area with appropriate environmental improvements being made as part of the final scheme design.
3. Councillor Anderson highlighted the extensive consultation which had been undertaken as set out in the report. The difficulties in engaging with local communities were recognised and extensive consultation work had been carried out in a variety of ways. There had been direct contact with local businesses; a significant number of properties had been leafleted; and, public exhibitions had been held. Members' attention was drawn to section 4 of the report which highlighted the detail of the consultation process. Section 4.10 of the report set out a number of the specific events which had occurred. The responses received were detailed in paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 of the report. Appendix B to the report provided the consultation summary in detail.
4. Councillor Anderson outlined the concerns which had been raised regarding congestion and safety issues which would be addressed further during the design work and statutory consultation. The responses that had been received from the emergency services were also highlighted to Members, as set out in the report.
5. Members' attention was drawn to the scheme design proposals in section 5 of the report. The potential impact on parking provision was highlighted for consideration. Parking would be reviewed as part of the detailed design process, as set out in the report, and mitigating measures considered where possible.
6. The Air Quality Assessment and Economic Impact Assessment provided as Appendices C and D to the report. The key issues arising from the assessments were highlighted for Members' consideration, as provided in section 5 of the report. Members noted the potential health benefits arising from increased levels of physical activity and improvements in air quality. The conclusions with regard to the impact

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

on congestion and journey times, as set out in section 5.17 of the report were also noted. The Predictive Equalities Impact Assessment was provided in Appendix E to the report. The issues raised throughout the report would be considered further during the detailed design stage and statutory consultation.

7. Councillor Taylor invited comments from Officers present. Bob Griffiths (Assistant Director – Planning, Highways and Transportation) reported that during the preliminary design phase, the Cycle Enfield Partnership Board (Enfield South East) had met on four occasions to enable stakeholders to influence the designs and share information with the organisations that they represented. Following the meeting on 1 June 2016, comments had been received from Councillor Lee Chamberlain and the Enfield Cycling Campaign. All comments had been circulated to Cabinet Members to be considered as part of the decision making process.
8. Councillor Peter Fallart was invited to address the Cabinet. Councillor Fallart highlighted his concerns regarding the level of responses received during the consultation and, therefore the potential opposition to the scheme from local people who had not formally responded. He also noted with concern the potential impact on blue light services set out in section 4 of the report and questioned whether emergency vehicles could have appropriate exemptions as referred to in the report. The issues with regard to congestion in the area and implications for journey times were highlighted.
9. Councillor Fallart drew attention to a number of concerns recognised in the report including: the provision of central refuges to assist those who had difficulty in crossing roads; the proposals for the Edmonton Green roundabout; the potential safety issues for bus stop boarders; the outcome of the Economic Impact Assessment and the need to protect local businesses from any negative impact arising from the scheme; and, the potential increase in congestion and journey times. Councillor Taylor thanked Councillor Fallart for his comments and acknowledged the issues which he had raised.
10. Councillor Taylor invited comments and questions from Cabinet Members.
11. Councillor Cazimoglu thanked Officers for their engagement with local ward Councillors and requested feedback on the ward specific issues which had been raised during the consultation period. This would enable responses to be provided to local residents highlighting the actions that were being taken in response to issues of concern.
12. Councillor Pite felt that a signalised roundabout option at Edmonton Green was the best option for cyclists. The traffic congestion in the area was recognised and, noted her personal experience that cycling in



**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

the area was a quicker option and one that the scheme would encourage and support.

13. Councillor Savva recognised the extensive consultation which had been undertaken and expressed his appreciation to the officers involved for their considerable work in engaging with local residents.
14. Councillor Taylor questioned the terms of required Traffic Management Orders and the potential exemptions for emergency vehicles. Clarification was sought on the procedures that had to be followed and the flexibility available to the Council in moving forward. Councillor Taylor also recognised the challenges faced with regard to adequate parking provision and that options would continue to be considered during the detailed design and statutory consultation of the scheme. He also noted the concerns expressed with regard to potential safety issues at bus stops and the need for reassurance and adequate protections for all users.
15. Councillor Orhan expressed her support of the scheme and recognised the extensive consultation which had been carried out to date. Challenges would need to be faced and in so doing consider the best use of the space available for all road users. Councillor Orhan praised the positive benefits that the scheme could have for children and young people in increasing cycling and recognising them as a primary road user for the first time. The scheme would provide positive opportunities for users of all ages. The potential health benefits were highlighted.
16. In conclusion, Councillor Anderson responded to the issues which had been raised during discussion. He expressed his thanks to Councillor Fallart for his constructive comments. Councillor Anderson acknowledged the challenges that had been faced during the consultation and encouraging responses from local residents. It was noted that local community groups had been engaged with and a range of groups and individuals had been involved in the consultation to date. In response to some of the concerns which had been raised, Members' attention was drawn to the Predictive Equalities Impact Assessment (Appendix E of the report), it was not the intention to disadvantage any users and all issues of concern would continue to be addressed through the detailed design and statutory consultation.
17. Councillor Anderson also highlighted the Economic Impact Assessment (Appendix D to the report) and gave assurances that every effort would be made to ensure that local businesses were not negatively affected by the scheme. The parking challenges would continue to be looked at as would the issues around bus stops and any potential impact on the emergency blue light services.
18. Councillor Anderson expressed his thanks and appreciation to Members and Officers for their support and hard work and continued to

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

welcome all feedback as the scheme progressed. The Council wanted to implement the best possible scheme for all concerned.

19. David Taylor (Head of Traffic and Transportation) outlined the conditions of implementing traffic orders and the exemptions which existed for emergency vehicles. It was also the intention to introduce a local condition relating to blue badge holders. There were steps that could be taken for temporary changes to traffic orders if the need arose in the future. In response to questions raised he also outlined the responsibilities for enforcing traffic orders.

**Alternative Options Considered:** The Council could decline the Mini Holland funding. However, this would mean forgoing £4.2 million of investment in the borough on this scheme, £38.1 million of investment on other Mini Holland schemes and the associated economic, health, and transport benefits.

**DECISION:** Cabinet agreed

1. To note the results of the public consultation.
2. That approval be granted to undertake detailed design and statutory consultation for lightly segregated cycling facilities and public realm improvements along the A1010 South, between Lincoln Road and Fairfield Road.
3. That approval be granted to proceed with the signalised roundabout option at Edmonton Green (Option 2), subject to statutory consultation.
4. That approval be granted for capital expenditure of £350,000 for detailed design and statutory consultation.
5. That delegated authority be granted to the Cabinet Member for Environment to approve and implement the final design of the scheme subject to consultation and completion of all necessary statutory procedures and make any additional changes as appropriate.

**Reasons:** As listed below and in section 7 of the report:

- To make places cycle friendly and provide better streets and places for everyone.
- To make cycling a safe and enjoyable choice for local travel.
- To create better, healthier communities.
- To provide better travel choices for the 34% of Enfield households who have no access to a car and an alternative travel choice for the 66% that do.
- To transform cycling in Enfield.
- To encourage more people to cycle.
- To enable people to make short journeys by bike instead of by car.
- To increase physical activity and therefore the health of cyclists.
- To reduce overcrowding on public transport.

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

- To enable transformational change to our town centres.  
**(Key decision – reference number 4114)**

**7**

**REVENUE AND CAPITAL OUTTURN 2015/16**

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.28) setting out the overall 2015/16 revenue and capital outturn position for the Council's General Fund and Housing Revenue Account, along with the Council's current financial state including reserves and financial risks.

**NOTED**

1. That the report also provided an overview of the budget process for 2017/18 together with the latest information on public expenditure and progress on the Government's plans to replace Revenue Support Grant with 100% retention of local business rates.
2. That the final outturn position was set out in table 1 of the report. The outturn position for 2015/16 was within budget. The pressures faced by Children's Services and Adult Social Care were highlighted to Members, as set out in the report.
3. The Housing Revenue Account remained strong, as detailed in section 5 of the report. The impact of the provision for the Southwark water billing judgement was noted, as set out in section 5.1 of the report.
4. The capital outturn position detailed in section 6 of the report was noted, as was the significant capital programme expenditure shown in table 7 of the report.
5. The finances of the Council remained strong and appreciation was expressed to both Cabinet Members and Officers for their considerable efforts. Members recognised the difficult decisions that they would continue to face in the future within the limited resources available to the Council.

**Alternative Options Considered:** None.

**DECISION:** The Cabinet

1. Noted the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account (HRA) revenue and capital outturn for 2015/16.
2. Agreed specific changes to reserves as set out in paragraph 4.2 of the report and detailed in the service appendices attached to the report.

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

3. Noted the capital outturn and agreed the funding of the Council's capital expenditure for 2015/16 as set out in paragraph 6.3 of the report.
4. Noted the budget process set out in paragraph 8.5 of the report.

**Reason:** To ensure that Members were aware of the outturn position for the authority including all major variances which had contributed to the outturn position. To manage the 2016/17 financial planning process with particular regard to continuing reductions in public spending.

**(Key decision – reference numbers 4323/4324)**

**8**

**ANNUAL TREASURY MANAGEMENT OUTTURN REPORT 2015/16**

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.29) reviewing the activities of the Council's Treasury Management function over the financial year ended 31 March 2016.

NOTED, the key points of the report as set out in section 1.2 of the report.

**Alternative Options Considered:** None. The report was required in order to comply with the Council's Treasury Management policy statement, agreed by Council in February 2014.

**DECISION:** The Cabinet agreed to accept the Treasury Outturn report.

**Reason:** To Inform the Council of Treasury Management performance in the financial year 2015/16.

**(Key decision – reference number 4325)**

**9**

**QUARTERLY CORPORATE PERFORMANCE REPORT**

Councillor Doug Taylor (Leader of the Council) introduced the report of the Chief Executive (No.30) presenting the latest quarterly report on the Corporate Performance Scorecard.

NOTED, the progress made towards delivering the identified key priority indicators for Enfield as set out in the report.

**Alternative Options Considered:** Not to report regularly on the Council's performance. This would make it difficult to assess progress made on achieving the Council's main priorities and to demonstrate the value for money being provided by Council services.

**Reason:** To update Cabinet on the progress made against all key priority performance indicators for the Council.

**(Key decision – reference number 4331)**

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

**10**

**HOUSING CAPITAL WORKS AND DECENT HOMES FUNDING PROGRAMME 2016/17**

Councillor Ahmet Oykenar (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director – Regeneration and Environment (No.31) seeking approval to re-profile part of the planned HRA funding for major works, to bring forward a number of heating renewal schemes.

**NOTED**

1. That the proposed re-profiling would maximise the opportunity to drawdown external grant funding under the “Energy Company Obligations” and Renewal Heat Incentive sustainability initiatives, as set out in the report.
2. The proposals would help to tackle the issue of fuel poverty and reduce heating bills for a number of households.
3. The financial implications of the proposals were noted, as detailed in full in the report.
4. The success of the new heating system at Exeter Road and the positive feedback which had been received to date.
5. Councillor Sitkin expressed his support of the proposals and highlighted the benefits with regard to sustainability.

**Alternative Options Considered:** None.

**DECISION:** The Cabinet agreed to

1. Approve the proposed additional programme of heating renewal works for 2016/17 as indicated in Appendix 1 of the report (based on the current cost estimates contained within the report).
2. Delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration to approve the subsequent individual schemes as they were developed and procured (in accordance with the planned programme of activity).

**Reason:** NOTED the reasons for the recommendations as set out in section 4 of the report regarding the works required within specified timescales.

**(Key decision – reference number 4244)**

**11**

**TAKING FORWARD ENFIELD COUNCIL'S IT OFFER**

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.32) setting out proposals for taking forward Enfield Council's IT offer.

**NOTED**

1. That recommendation 2.1.5 of the report was being amended to read: "That a business case is brought back to Cabinet for approval prior to the Company commencing trading once established and the board is in place" (decision 5 below reflects this amendment).
2. The reasons for setting up the proposed company and the potential benefits to the Council as outlined in the report.
3. That the Board of the ICT Company should comprise 4 Cabinet Members, rather than 3 as detailed in the report. Those 4 Members to be Councillors Georgiou, Lemonides, Orhan and Sitkin.
4. That Councillor Lemonides would be undertaking further work in the future with appropriate officers in considering the Council's companies which now existed, their establishment and membership; and, whether an umbrella company would be beneficial.

**Alternative Options Considered:** NOTE the alternative options that had been considered as set out in full in section 4 of the report: Do nothing; do the minimum i.e. to restructure the ICT team only; or, exploit ICT using restructured ICT team.

**DECISION:** Cabinet agreed to

1. Note the progress made since its February meeting on the development of the Enfield 2017 transformation offer.
2. The establishment of the IT company.
3. The governance model set out in the report.
4. Note that in parallel to the establishment of the new trading company, the Council's ICT team would be restructured in order to put in place the correct structure and skills needed to manage the services being transferred in from Serco, and ensure that Enfield's IT team was a good place to work, with excellent career opportunities.
5. That a business case be brought back to Cabinet for approval prior to the Company commencing trading once established and the board was in place.

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

**Reason:** NOTED the detailed for the recommendations set out in section 5 of the report: the Council had developed as part of the Enfield 2017 programme intellectual property rights (IPR) to the IT supporting the transformation. This IPR could be used to generate a potential income to the Council, when software using that IPR was sold on to other councils.

**(Key decision – reference number 4314)**

**12**

**CONTRACTING WITH LEE VALLEY HEAT NETWORK FOR THE PROVISION OF HEAT ON ENFIELD'S HOUSING ESTATES**

Councillor Ahmet Oykenner (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director – Regeneration and Environment and Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.34) seeking authority to enter into a series of legal agreements with Lee Valley Heat Network Ltd.

NOTED

1. That Report No.39 also referred as detailed in Minute No.21 below.
2. That the Housing Development and Renewal team had included a requirement for a distributed heating network facility on all the major developments that they had procured, as outlined in the report. It was the intention to include similar requirements in the procurement of development partners on all future estate renewal projects where they were large enough to justify the requirement and were not within range of an economic extension to an existing district heating system. Councillor Oykenner outlined the benefits and implications of the proposals set out in the report, for Members' consideration.

**Alternative Options Considered:** That the Council manage the operation of each energy centre as they came forward. This had been discounted as the experience of managing distributed heating networks within the Council had a poor reputation, and the Council wished to improve the services received by both tenants and leaseholders on the new developments. That, the Council procure an external operator for each energy centre as they were completed. This had been discounted as, individually, each energy centre was not large enough to obtain the economies of scale that were considered necessary to be able to offer competitive heat prices to the consumers and certainly not on any basis that involved consistency between regeneration projects.

**DECISION:** The Cabinet

1. Noted the progress at paragraphs 3.14 and 3.15 of the report that had been made to agree commercial arrangements between the Council and LVHN for both the operation and maintenance of known energy centre opportunities that would be developed as part of the estate renewal programme and to regulate arrangements for future distributed

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

heating network facilities that might come forward from both the existing estates and from future estate renewal projects.

2. Agreed to delegate authority to the Director – Regeneration and Environment, acting in consultation with the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services, to agree the terms of and enter into the agreements that need to be put in place to regulate the commercial arrangements between the Council and LVHN. These include a portfolio agreement, site energy agreements, and various other relevant template agreements.

**Reason:** LVHN HoldCo (with its wholly owned subsidiary operating company) Energetik was a Council-owned company that was being set-up to specialise in the operation and maintenance of a distributed heating networks with the aim of providing consumers with a competitive retail heat price, achieved through economies of scale, access to bulk purchase of fuel, access to competitive wholesale heat costs from the NLWA energy from waste plant and access to competitively priced funding, This would help achieve a key Council objective of reducing fuel poverty as well as reducing carbon emissions. Entering into a contract with Energetik for all heat network facilities that we know would come forward as part of the estate regeneration programme and for heat network facilities that would come forward in the future would help both the Council and Energetik achieve economies of scale that would not be achieved by contracting for each energy centre separately.

**(Key decision – reference number 3988)**

**13**

**APPROVAL TO INCLUDE SUPPLIERS ON A FRAMEWORK TO DELIVER FLEXIBLE HOUSING**

Councillor Ahmet Oykenar (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care and the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.35) seeking approval to include suppliers on a framework to deliver flexible housing.

NOTED

1. That Report No.40 also referred as detailed in Minute No.22 below.
2. That the Council had implemented a range of initiatives to respond to increasing demand for temporary accommodation. Approval was now being sought to include suppliers on a framework to deliver flexible housing in accordance with previous decisions made, as outlined in the report. Once the Framework Agreement had been established, a further, more detailed mini competition would be held for each specific site, open to suppliers on the Framework, to appoint the supplier for individual schemes. This would include quality criteria that were specific to the location and housing need.



**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

3. Councillor Orhan praised the innovative and creative proposals which would assist in dealing with the serious housing shortage in Enfield. In considering the provision of such housing, Councillor Orhan highlighted the housing needs of single people as well as families when considering future housing provision. Councillor Oykenyer confirmed that Members were being asked to agree the framework at this stage and that housing demands would be considered as each site specific contract was awarded in the future.

**Alternative Options Considered:** None to be considered.

**DECISION:** Cabinet agreed to

1. Approve the award of a place on the Flexible Housing Framework Agreement to the suppliers listed in part 2 of this report (paragraph 2.2) (Minute No.22 below refers) to commence on September 2016 for a four year term.
2. Note the details of the evaluation exercise were contained in part 2 of the report (section 3) (Minute No.22 below refers).
3. Delegate the decision to award site-specific contracts to the Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency, and the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care and the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services.
4. Note that appropriate approval would need to be given to increase the existing capital sums agreed for Housing Gateway if the decision was taken to purchase the units.

**Reason:** The tenders received from the contractors listed in the part 2 report were recommended for acceptance as their tenders achieved the highest overall combined (financial and quality) evaluation scores, in accordance with the tender requirements. The evaluation process had been detailed in the part 2 report (Minute No.22 below referred).

**(Key decision – reference number 4292)**

**14**

**WILLIAM PREYE DAY CENTRE, HOUNDSFIELD ROAD, N9 - REDEVELOPMENT OPTIONS**

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.36) outlining the rationale for the proposed scheme.

NOTED

1. That Report No.41 also referred as detailed in Minute No.23 below.

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

2. That the Centre had been declared surplus to operational requirements and had been disused for operational purposes since April 2015. Several options had been considered for this property, as outlined in the report. However, an options appraisal had suggested that the site should be redeveloped for residential purposes. The report outlined the rationale for the proposed scheme; sought in principle approval for the scheme; and, authority to progress the scheme with detailed feasibility work and the procurement of consultants to undertake such work.
3. The proposals to regularise the use of the adjacent Parker Centre by Age UK as outlined in section 3 of the report.
4. The proposal for the Council to directly develop this scheme to maximise its income potential, paragraph 3.14 of the report referred.
5. That the site was currently used as a polling station during elections and that an alternative polling station site in the area would need to be identified.

**Alternative Options Considered:** Not trying to redevelop the site was considered a lost opportunity to the Council. Alternative options had been considered; as detailed in the part 2 report (Minute No.23 below refers).

**DECISION:** The Cabinet

1. Provisionally approved the redevelopment of the William Preye Day Centre, 6 Houndsfield Road, Edmonton, N9 for housing, subject to final details being approved by the Cabinet in a subsequent report.
2. Agreed the addition of the project to the capital programme as detailed in the part 2 report (Minute No.23 below referred) to enable the feasibility and demolition to proceed and noted the revenue cost which could be contained within the existing capital financing budget.
3. Approved the commencement of the procurement of consultants to prepare plans for the scheme as detailed within the part 2 report (Minute No.23 below referred), and delegated approval for the appointment of consultants to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency and Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration in consultation with the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services.
4. Agreed the procurement of a developer/contractor to take forward a scheme on receipt of planning permission; but the award of a contract to be subject to further Cabinet approval.
5. Agreed the grant of delegated authority to the Assistant Director – Property Services in conjunction with the Assistant Director – Legal and Governance enter into contracts and approve the demolition of the Centre.

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

**Reason:** The existing centre was no longer considered to be fit-for-purpose, had a significant repairing liability, and was surplus to the Council's requirements. The proposed redevelopment of this site with a residential scheme was considered to be financially viable and feasible in planning terms. The scheme would also generate much needed income for the Council. The relative simplicity of the scheme also presented a unique opportunity to deliver much needed family housing within a quick turn-around period.

**(Key decision – reference number 4295)**

**15**

**ISSUES ARISING FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

**Adoption Scrutiny Work stream**

Councillor Krystle Fonyonga (Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Public Health, and, former Chair of the Adoption Scrutiny Work stream) introduced the report (No.37) setting out recommendations based on the evidence and research undertaken.

NOTED

1. The report and the response to the recommendations of the work stream from the Cabinet Member and Director, detailed in appendix A to the report.
2. The recommendations from the Adoption Scrutiny work stream as set out in 2.1 to 2.5 of the report.
3. The significant work which had been undertaken and the timely and efficient support received from the officers involved. Based on the evidence gathered from adopters by members of the work stream, Members had been satisfied that the adoption service was good, as set out in section 1 of the report. Only minor improvements had been suggested to the service as detailed in section 2 of the report.
4. Tony Theodoulou (Interim Director of Children's Services) advised Members of the Government's proposals to regionalise adoption services. It was anticipated that a report would be presented to the October Cabinet meeting considering the detail of the proposal.

**Alternative Options Considered:** None

**Reason:** To improve outcomes for children with a plan for adoption.  
(Non key)

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

**16**

**CABINET AGENDA PLANNING - FUTURE ITEMS**

NOTED, the provisional list of items scheduled for future Cabinet meetings.

**17**

**MINUTES**

**AGREED**, that the minutes of the previous meeting of the Cabinet held on 15 June 2016 be confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**18**

**ENFIELD STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP UPDATE**

NOTED, for information, a summary of the minutes of the Enfield Strategic Partnership Board meeting held on 7 June 2016. Councillor Taylor drew Members' attention to the different approach that was now being taken and the value of continued discussions in meeting the challenges faced within the Borough.

**19**

**DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

NOTED, that future meetings of the Cabinet were scheduled to take place on Tuesday 16 August and Tuesday 6 September 2016 at 8.15pm.

**20**

**EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED**, in accordance with Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the press and public from the meeting for the items listed on part 2 of the agenda on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended by the Local Government (Access for Information) (Variation) Order 2006).

**21**

**CONTRACTING WITH LEE VALLEY HEAT NETWORK FOR THE PROVISION OF HEAT ON ENFIELD'S HOUSING ESTATES**

Councillor Ahmet Oykenner (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director – Regeneration and Environment and Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.39).

NOTED

1. That Report No.34 also referred as detailed in Minute No.12 above.

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

2. The financial and legal implications of the proposals as set out in the report. The potential benefits to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) were noted together with the safeguards that had been put in place.

**Alternative Options Considered:** As detailed in Report No.34, Minute No.12 above refers.

**DECISION:** Cabinet agreed to note the financial contribution from the Lee Valley Heat Network (LVHN) to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA).

**Reason:** As detailed in Report No.34, Minute No.12 above refers.  
**(Key decision – reference number 3988)**

**22**

**APPROVAL TO INCLUDE SUPPLIERS ON A FRAMEWORK TO DELIVER FLEXIBLE HOUSING**

Councillor Ahmet Oykenner (Cabinet Member for Housing and Housing Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director of Health, Housing and Adult Social Care and Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.40).

NOTED

1. That Report No.35 also referred as detailed in Minute No.13 above.
2. The detailed evaluation which had been undertaken and the results arising as set out in section 3 and the appendices to the report. It was noted that each site would have different requirements and various models would be used. In response to questions raised by Members, a detailed explanation was given of the evaluation criteria that had been used and the results arising. Different options would be available to the Council in moving forward on individual projects.
3. Councillor Oykenner highlighted the benefits of having a range of contractors in order to ensure that the best solution for each project was implemented.
4. Members questioned any potential implications arising from BREXIT and were advised that EU regulations were still in force. The Cabinet was being asked to agree the framework only at this stage, and each contract would be fully assessed by the Council at the award stage.
5. Following further discussion, Councillor Taylor proposed that the Council host a meeting for local businesses and representatives of the voluntary sector to discuss any short-term implications arising from BREXIT and any local concerns that had arisen. Councillor Sitkin agreed to undertake this.

**Alternative Options Considered:** None to be considered.

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

**DECISION:** The Cabinet agreed

1. To note, as outlined in the part 1 report (Report No.35, Minute No.13 above), the tables attached to the report which referred to the tender evaluation details.
2. That the suppliers, as set out in recommendation 2.2 of the report, be awarded a place on the Flexible Housing Framework Agreement.

**Reason:** The tenders received from the suppliers named in the report were recommended for acceptance as their tenders had achieved the highest overall combined (financial and quality) evaluation scores, in accordance with the tender requirements.

**(Key decision – reference number 4292)**

**23**

**WILLIAM PREYE DAY CENTRE, HOUNDSFIELD ROAD, N9 - REDEVELOPMENT OPTIONS**

Councillor Dino Lemonides (Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency) introduced the report of the Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services (No.41).

NOTED

1. That Report No.36 also referred as detailed in Minute No.14 above.
2. That Members' attention was drawn to the viability analysis of the options set out in section 6.6 of the report and the residual land appraisal shown in appendix 2 to the report. It was agreed that the financial appraisal made the decision clear for Members.
3. Councillor Cazimoglu, in her capacity as Ward Councillor, supported the proposals and outlined her reasons for doing so.
4. A typing error in the figures set out in Appendix 2 which was highlighted to Members at the meeting.

**Alternative Options Considered:** NOTED that all of the options had been financially assessed and the results were set out in section 5 of the report.

**DECISION:** The Cabinet agreed to

1. Provisionally approve the redevelopment of the William Preye Centre for a residential scheme, subject to the receipt of a subsequent report outlining the scheme's details including its final costings, financials and development approach.

**CABINET - 7.7.2016**

2. Approve the demolition of the William Preye Centre at Houndsfield Road, N9.
3. The addition to the capital programme for the sum detailed in recommendation 2.2 of the report, to enable the feasibility and demolition to proceed.
4. Note that the initial budget would be used to appoint consultants to assist in preparing scheme designs, feasibility studies, other investigations, site preparation and public consultation to support the preparation and submission of a planning application and appropriate documents to assist in the procurement of a developer/contractor.

**Reason:** As detailed in Report No.36, Minute No.14 above referred.  
**(Key decision – reference number 4295)**

This page is intentionally left blank