ITEM NO: 22



Executive 14th November 2005

Report from the Director of Children & Families

For Action

Wards Affected: Preston Ward

Award of Architectural and Consultancy Services Contract for Rebuilding of Wembley Manor Infant and Junior Schools

Forward Plan Ref: C&F05/06-020

Appendices 1 and 2 of this report are Not for Publication

1.0 Summary

1.1 This report requests authority to award the contract for the architectural and contract administration as required by Contract Standing Order 88. This report summarises the process undertaken in tendering this contract and, following the completion of the evaluation of the tenders, recommends to whom the contract should be awarded.

2.0 Recommendations

2.1 Following the evaluation of the tenders, it is recommended that Members award the contract of architectural and consultancy services for rebuilding of Wembley Manor Junior and Infants Schools (the "Project") to Walters and Cohen Architects.

Meeting Date Version no. Date

3.0 Detail

- 3.1 Both Wembley Manor Junior and Infant Schools have major condition and suitability issues with their current buildings. The existing buildings do not meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and do not lend themselves easily for adaptation to meet the Act. Due to housing developments in the Wembley area, it is projected that there will be a need for extra pupil places in the local area equivalent to one form of entry in each year group.
- 3.2 The Local Education Authority (LEA) has been consulting with the governing bodies and staff of Wembley Manor Junior and Infant Schools and the public on the proposal to amalgamate the two schools and build a newly expanded four form entry primary school in their place on the existing site.
- 3.3 A report was sent to the Executive requesting approval to invite expressions of interest and tenders for a proposed Architectural and Consultancy Services contract in respect of the proposed development of Wembley Manor Junior and Infant Schools. On 23rd May 2005 the Executive granted the then Director of Education, Arts and Libraries authority to:
 - (a) invite contractors to submit expressions of interest, evaluate prequalification questionnaires and shortlist potential tenderers in accordance with the approved criteria listed in the Executive report of 23rd May 2005 and invite the short listed contractors to submit tenders;
 - (b) to evaluate tenders in accordance with the approved criteria in the Executive report of 23rd May 2005.
- Following consultation by the LEA on amalgamation of Wembley Manor Junior and Infant Schools, the Executive on 15th August 2005 resolved to refer objections to such proposal to the School Organisation Committee (SOC) for decision. The SOC met on 9th September and unanimously agreed to the amalgamation proposal.

The tender process

- 3.5 The new contract for Architectural and Consultancy Services will be let using Conditions of Contract and Specification based on the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Standard Conditions of Engagement for the Appointment of an Architect incorporating amendments to reflect the Council's interests.
- 3.6 Advertisements were placed in the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU) seeking Expressions of Interests on 14th June 2005 with a return date of the 22nd July in line with European procurement rules. The contract was also advertised in the Architects Journal on 16th June 2005 with the same date of return.

- 3.7 The adverts elicited a response from 78 contractors. Shortlisting questionnaires and an information pack containing the outline specification and the tender approach were sent out.
- 3.8 Of the 78 companies who expressed an interest, the Council received 58 completed pre qualification questionnaires.
- 3.9 In line with standing orders, the returned pre qualification questionnaires were then assessed by relevant Council Officers for financial standing, health and safety and technical ability.
- 3.10 Following the assessment of pre qualification questionnaires, nine contractors were on the 8th August 2005 invited to tender. All contractors invited to tender had a distinguished track record in school design, either providing exemplar designs for the Department for Education and Skills or having award winning buildings.
- 3.11 The nine contractors invited to tender were provided with tender documentation compiled by Brent Legal Services.
- 3.12 All nine contractors attended a briefing in August 2005 with Council Officers (including a representative from Brent Legal Services) and a visit to the proposed site. This enabled Council Officers to discuss the project, take questions and share answers with all contractors present prior to their tendering.
- 3.13 Tenders were received from 6 of the 9 contractors by the due date of the 22nd September. Three contractors withdrew giving the reason for withdrawal as the size of competition for the contract.
- 3.14 The tendering instructions stated that the contract will be awarded on the basis of the most economically advantageous offer to the Council. All tenders were evaluated in line with criteria outlined in the report to the Executive dated 23rd May 2005.
- 3.15 The tenderers were evaluated on the agreed weightings of 40% as to fee proposal and 60% as to quality/design capability. A breakdown of fee proposals and a cost summary is attached as Appendix 1
- 3.16 Each tender was evaluated against the agreed criteria of quality and design capability which was further tested at interview as laid out in the report to the Executive of the 23d May 2005. The assessment of design capability and quality included at least, but not exclusively, information from practice profiles, experience, expertise and track record of developing school briefs and delivering high quality statements about Impact, Functionality and Added Value school buildings within budget and on time, understanding the process of inclusion (wider consultation methods) of and participation by stakeholders in the development of the brief, and an understanding of current innovative practice in developing school design such as the potential for use of School Design Quality Indicators (DQIs); demonstration of recent delivery of innovative design (including interpretation of the schools' and LEA brief);

proposals for quality and cost control and measures for sustainability; current capacity including the leadership of the project by a principal architect in the practice (who was required to attend the selection process); and the quality of references.

- 3.17 An evaluation panel consisting of two Council Officers from Children & Families Department, an Educational Consultant, 5 governors representing the two schools and a design challenger (who is an award winning architect and a Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment Enabler), undertook the process. The panel met on 7th October, interviewed all tenderers and scored using weighted criteria and agreed questions. The evaluation matrix showing the scoring for each of the criteria and the overall position is attached as Appendix 2.
- 3.18 Walters & Cohen were the overwhelming first choice of the panel with 8 of the panel scoring the company highest in the quality and design capability criterion. The company's fee proposal (as a percentage of the construction costs) was highly competitive and was the second lowest fee proposal.
- 3.19 Officers would recommend Walters and Cohen for the award as they best meet the criteria for award and are the most economically advantageous tender. Officers feel that they have demonstrated enthusiasm for the project as well as having the knowledge, skills and experience required to meet the needs of the contract.

4.0 Financial Implications

- 4.1 The Council's Contract Standing Orders state that service contracts exceeding £500,000 (High Value Contracts) shall be referred to the Executive for approval of the award of the contract.
- 4.2 The estimated value of this Architecture and Consultancy Services Contract is £936,451.
- 4.3 Council members agreed in February 2005 a capital budget of up to £10.0m for both the design and build of the Wembley Manor Schools.

5.0 Legal Implications

- 5.1 The estimated value of this contract over its lifetime is higher than the EU threshold for Part A Services (of £153,376) and the award of the contract is therefore governed by the Public Services Contracts Regulations 1993. The award is subject to the Council's own Standing Orders in respect of High Value contracts and Financial Regulations and as such Executive approval is required to award the contract.
- 5.2 The Conditions of Contract and Specification for this services contract are based on the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Standard Conditions of Engagement for the Appointment of an Architect incorporating amendments to reflect the Council's interests.

6.0 Diversity Implications

- The proposals in this report have been subject to screening and Officers believe that there are no diversity implications. It is considered that the Project will provide a high quality inclusive building. The percentage of free school meal children, as an index of deprivation, at the two schools is 38.9% against the Brent average for primary schools of 29.4%.
- 6.2 The corresponding Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out and a copy of the report is available.

7.0 Staffing/Accommodation Implications (if appropriate)

7.1 There are no direct implications for staffing or accommodation from this report.

Background Papers:

- i) EAL Asset Management Service Wembley Manor Infant School and Wembley Manor Junior School files.
- ii) Equality Impact Assessment Report.
- iii) Public Consultation documents.
- iv) Executive Report of 23 May 2005

Contact Officers:

Nitin Parshotam: Head of Asset Management Service

Chesterfield House 020 8937 3080

nitin.parshotam@brent.gov.uk

John Bowtell: Asset Manager: Asset Management Service

Chesterfield House 020 8937 3153

john.bowtell@brent.gov.uk

Director of Children & Families John Christie