

Cabinet Report



Listening Learning Leading

Report of: Head of Community Services – Donna Pentelow

Author: Ian Burtenshaw

Telephone: 01235 422255

E-mail: ian.burtenshaw@southandvale.gov.uk

Wards affected: Thame

Cabinet member responsible: Lynn Lloyd

Tel: 01844 354313

E-mail: lynn.lloyd@southoxon.gov.uk

To: CABINET

Date: 9 April 2019

Thame Leisure Centre – boiler replacement

Recommendation

That Cabinet agrees to award a JCT Design and Build Contract to Oxford Direct Services to carry out the works to replace the two boilers at Thame Leisure Centre at a cost of £130,466.

Purpose of Report

1. To request cabinet's approval to appoint Oxford Direct Services to undertake the boiler replacement works at Thame Leisure Centre, Oxford Road, Thame, South Oxfordshire OX9 2BB.

Corporate Objectives

2. This project will contribute towards the strategic objective of "Sustainable communities and wellbeing" and corporate priority of ensuring that "we will increase participation in sport and leisure", specifically by "improving accessibility and availability of leisure facilities in South Oxfordshire".

Background

3. The boilers at Thame Leisure Centre generate and supply heat for the swimming pools and all other areas of the building. Due to mechanical failure, one of the two existing boilers has now had to be isolated from service leaving just one boiler and a Combined Heat and Power Unit (CHP), to meet the full demand of heating two swimming pools, sports hall, changing areas, gym, studios, hot water and reception areas.

4. Any further failure to either the CHP or the remaining boiler may result in significantly lower building temperatures and or loss of service to all or parts of the building. To avoid this the client team have been planning a controlled replacement of the boilers into more efficient and flexible modular units that will meet the energy demands of the centre whilst reducing operating costs and delivering improved carbon efficiencies.
5. The schedule of works has been programmed in a way which allows the service to continue without disruption to customers.
6. The Council has undertaken the procurement process in line with the Capita procurement process in order to secure a suitable contractor to carry out the works. The Council received four compliant tenders and following evaluation, Oxford Direct Services have been selected as the most economically advantageous tender to undertake the works at a contract cost of £130,466. Details of the evaluation process and the prices submitted in the procurement process are detailed in appendix 1.

Options

7. Failure to carry out these works in a planned way and if the remaining boiler were to fail would result in a loss of service. This would cause significant dissatisfaction among customer and school users and reputational damage to the council.

Financial Implications

8. This project will be funded from the approved leisure facilities essential repairs and maintenance budget.

Legal Implications

9. The appointment of the contractor would be made through use of a JCT Contract which would be finalised with the legal team. This form of contract maximises the guarantees to the council for the works undertaken.

Risks

10. To minimise or negate risks, the provision of Risk Assessments and Method Statements (RAMS), a Project Lifetime and a Construction Phase Plan formed part of the Request for Quotation Employers Requirements in the procurement process.

Other implications

11. None

Conclusion

12. Officers recommend that the boilers at Thame Leisure Centre are replaced at the earliest opportunity, to maintain service provision to the residents and visitors of South Oxfordshire.

Background Papers

None

Appendix 1

Tenders received for Thame boiler replacement:

The evaluation of all submissions was based on a financial and technical split, 60% of the marks were awarded for the financial submission and 40% was available to the technical information provided. The technical evaluation was based on five questions which covered the way in which the programme of works would be delivered, the resources each contractor would apply to the works. It also included the Health and safety planning and risk management of the project and how sub-contractors would be selected which included their qualifications and experience and then managed. The final aspect of the technical evaluation was the delivery of the project on site whilst maintaining the service and the continuity of the works and then the way in which the contractor dealt with defects and their rectification.

The table below provides the value of the tenders submitted and the average score awarded from each of the three officers who evaluated the submissions.

N/C applies to companies whose bids were not compliant.

Company	Tender Value	Evaluation One	Evaluation Two	Evaluation Three	Total Score
Company A	N/C	N/C	N/C	N/C	N/C
Company B	N/C	N/C	N/C	N/C	N/C
Company C	£130,466	86	92	76	84%
Company D	£145,535	75	73	71	73%
Company E	£188,798	63	63	60	62%
Company F	N/C	N/C	N/C	N/C	N/C
Company G	£271,000	46	48	50	48%

Company C are the recommended company to appoint based on a score of 84%.