



PUBLICATION OF DECISION LIST NUMBER 14/22-23

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2022/23

Date Published: 26 August 2022

This document lists the Decisions that have been taken by the Council, which require publication in accordance with the Local Government Act 2000. The list covers Key, Non-Key, Council and Urgent Decisions. The list specifies those decisions, which are eligible for call-in and the date by which they must be called-in.

A valid request for call-in is one which is submitted (on the form provided) to the Governance and Scrutiny Team in writing within 5 working days of the date of publication of the decision by at least 7 Members of the Council.

Additional copies of the call-in request form are available from the Governance and Scrutiny Team.

If you have any queries or wish to obtain further report information or information on a decision, please contact democracy@enfield.gov.uk

INDEX OF PUBLISHED DECISIONS – 26 August 2022

List Ref	Decision Made by	Date Decision came/ comes into effect	Part 1 or 2	Subject/Title of Report	Category of Decision	Affected Wards	Eligible for Call-In & Date Decision must be called in by (If Applicable)	Page No.
1/14/22-23	Joanne Drew (Acting Executive Director – Place)	Tuesday 06 September 22	Part 1 & 2 (Para 3)	Award of works contract for Fire Safety Package 5	KD 5313	Edmonton Green	Yes Monday 5 September 22	3-4
2/14/22-23	Joanne Drew (Acting Executive Director – Place)	Tuesday 06 September 22	Part 1 & 2 (Para 3)	Award of works contracts – Packages 1-3 Fire Safety Packages	KD 5313	Turkey Street, Southbury, Upper Edmonton, Southgate Green	Yes Monday 5 September 22	5-6

DECISIONS

For additional copies or further details please contact the Governance Team.

LIST REFERENCE: 1/14/22-23

SUBJECT TITLE OF THE REPORT:							
AWARD OF WORKS CONTRACT FOR FIRE SAFETY PACKAGE 5							
Part 1 or 2 (relevant exempt Paragraph)	Wards affected by decision	Decision taken by	Date Decision comes into effect	Interest declared in respect of the Decision	Category of decision (i.e. Key, Non-Key, Council, Urgent)	Contact Details	Eligible for Call-in & Date to be called in by
Part 1 & 2 (Para 3)	Edmonton Green	Joanne Drew (Acting Executive Director – Place)	Tuesday 06 September 22	None	KD 5313	Paul O'Donnell Acting Investment and Resident Safety Director Paul.O'Donnell@enfield.gov.uk Tel: 0208 132 0696	Yes Monday 5 September 22
DECISION							
<p>AGREED subject to not being called in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That approval be given to award and enter into a contract for Fire Safety Works to “Contractor A” for Package 5 for works at Cheshire House, Shropshire House, Hereford House and Leicester House for the contract price detailed in the confidential appendix. That approval be given for the contingency sum detailed in the confidential appendix. The total project cost including consultancy services, staff costs and contingency will be £7,772,486.38. 							
OPTIONS CONSIDERED							
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration was given to an alternative option to deliver the works alongside that chosen; these can be summarised as follows: Option A: A single contract of all Fire Safety Works in blocks across the borough. Option B: 4 contracts packages – grouping blocks geographically into packages which are large enough to maintain supplier appetite in a competitive market but not so large that the programme will not meet the council’s requirements. Option B was selected. Option A: Single Long-Term Contract This approach is used within the sector but usually for regular works eg decency components or regular and has benefits including management input i.e. a single relationship to manage. However, the key factors that led to its rejection are below <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Failure or poor performance is systemic and provides a major risk for the Council (all eggs in one basket) Only Major Contractors have the capacity to tender for these works and therefore competition is limited and capacity or even Major Contractors for this volume of works would be limited. The potential involvement of Small/Medium Enterprises (SMEs) is limited to working for the Main Contractor reducing local opportunities 							

7. Option B: 4 Geographically Based Contracts

8. Officers considered that this option provides the optimum solution, it was selected because:

- Having 3-4 contractors reduces the impact of failure or poor performance (across all 4 packages - 1 contract is in the scope of this Key Decision)
- The Council's delivery team and structure is ideally suited to this scale of Contract
- The size of the contract enables smaller SMEs to tender
- The Council's experience in working with SMEs to deliver this type of work has been mixed, but the experience gained would enable identification of high performing contractors

REASONS FOR PROPOSAL

1. The HRA Capital programme for 2022-23 is focused on the investment in our housing stock to ensure it meets building safety legislation requirements, especially where this would impact the safety of buildings in which residents reside.
2. Given the volume of blocks, which require fire safety works and planned timescale for completion, it was decided to separate these packages into four distinct packages – 1, 2-3, 4 and 5. Package 5 works are in the scope of this Key Decision. Packages 1 and 2-3 have been approved through a previous DAR and Package 4 will follow conclusion of a separate procurement process.
3. A compliant tender exercise has been undertaken in accordance with the Public Contract Regulations (PCR's) 2015 using the restricted procedure and in line with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules (PCR's) for above threshold procurements. The tender was evaluated based on a quality/cost split of 60/40.

BACKGROUND

Please note that a copy of the Part 1 report is available on the Council's democracy pages. As the part 2 appendix contains exempt information it will not be available to press and public.

Publication of Decision List 1/14/22-23
26 August 2022

LIST REFERENCE: 2/14/22-23

SUBJECT TITLE OF THE REPORT:

AWARD OF WORKS CONTRACTS – PACKAGES 1-3 FIRE SAFETY PACKAGES

Part 1 or 2 (relevant exempt Paragraph)	Wards affected by decision	Decision taken by	Date Decision comes into effect	Interest declared in respect of the Decision	Category of decision (i.e. Key, Non-Key, Council, Urgent)	Contact Details	Eligible for Call-in & Date to be called in by
Part 1 & 2 (Para 3)	Turkey Street, Southbury, Upper Edmonton, Southgate Green	Joanne Drew (Acting Executive Director – Place)	Tuesday 06 September 22	None	KD 5313	Paul O'Donnell Acting Investment and Resident Safety Director Paul.O'Donnell@enfield.gov.uk Tel: 0208 132 0696	Yes Monday 5 September 22

DECISION

AGREED subject to not being called in:

1. That approval be given to award and enter into contracts for Fire Safety Works to “Contractor A” and “Contractor B” as follows: The first contract for Package 1 to be awarded to “Contractor B” for works at Bonington, Brookbank and Gainsborough Houses; and the second contract for Packages 2 and 3 to “Contractor A” for works at Scott, Bridport, Jackson and Swinson Houses for the contract price detailed in the confidential appendix.
2. That approval be given for the contingency sum detailed in the confidential appendix. The total project cost including consultancy services, staff costs and contingency will be £10,072,086.86.

OPTIONS CONSIDERED

1. Consideration was given to an alternative option to deliver the works alongside that chosen; these can be summarised as follows:
Option A: A single contract of all Fire Safety Works in blocks across the borough.
2. Option B: 4 contracts packages – grouping blocks geographically into packages which are large enough to maintain supplier appetite in a competitive market but not so large that the programme will not meet the council’s requirements.
3. Option B was selected.
4. Option A: Single Long-Term Contract
5. This approach is used within the sector but usually for regular works eg decency components or regular and has benefits including management input i.e. a single relationship to manage. However, the key factors that led to its rejection are below

- a. Failure or poor performance is systemic and provides a major risk for the Council (all eggs in one basket)
 - b. Only Major Contractors have the capacity to tender for these works and therefore competition is limited and capacity or even Major Contractors for this volume of works would be limited.
 - c. The potential involvement of Small/Medium Enterprises (SMEs) is limited to working for the Main Contractor reducing local opportunities
6. Option B: 4 Geographically Based Contracts
7. Officers considered that this option provides the optimum solution, it was selected because:
- Having 3-4 contractors reduces the impact of failure or poor performance (across all 4 packages - 2 contracts are in the scope of this Key Decision)
 - The Council's delivery team and structure is ideally suited to this scale of Contract
 - The size of the contract enables smaller SMEs to tender
 - The Council's experience in working with SMEs to deliver this type of work has been mixed, but the experience gained would enable identification of high performing contractors.

REASONS FOR PROPOSAL

9. The HRA Capital programme for 2022-23 is focused on the investment in our housing stock to ensure it meets building safety legislation requirements, especially where this would impact the safety of buildings in which residents reside.
10. Given the high volume of blocks, which require fire safety works and planned timescale for completion, it was decided to separate these packages into four distinct packages – 1, 2-3, 4 and 5. Packages 1 and 2-3 are two distinct contracts and are proposed to be awarded to two different contractors to ensure supplier capacity to meet required programmes, mitigating risks around possible future labour shortages and supply chain performance. Packages 4 and 5 cover the requirements at other blocks and approval will be requested separately due to different procurement procedures as they will be over the threshold for the Public Contracts Regulations (PCR).
11. A compliant tender exercise has been undertaken in accordance with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules. The tender was evaluated based on a quality/cost split of 60/40, with Contractors 1 and 2 scoring highest overall and therefore considered to have provided the most economically advantageous tender. Further details are provided in Part 2.

BACKGROUND

Please note that a copy of the Part 1 report is available on the Council's democracy pages. As the part 2 appendix contains exempt information it will not be available to press and public.

Publication of Decision List 2/14/22-23
26 August 2022