

Record of individual Cabinet member decision

Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

Decision made by	Councillor Robin Bennett, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet member for economic development and regeneration
Key decision?	Yes
Date of decision (same as date form signed)	31 August 2023
Name and job title of officer requesting the decision	Aileen David, Principal Place Officer
Officer contact details	Tel: 07917 088368 Email: aileen.david@southandvale.gov.uk
Decision	Following a successful procurement exercise, to award MICA Architects with a contract to deliver architect-led multidisciplinary design team services for the redevelopment of the council owned site at 116-120 Broadway, Didcot.
Reasons for decision	<p>In accordance with the ICMD signed on 1 March 2022, officers have undertaken a compliant procurement process via the UK Find a Tender Service and Southeast Business Portal to invite Tenders for architect-led multidisciplinary design team services to deliver the Broadway project.</p> <p>The Tender from MICA Architects was the highest scoring of 15 competitive Tenders received via this process following evaluation by a panel of three officers (two council and one from the appointed project manager, Allen Construction Consultancy) against a pre-published set of evaluation questions and subject to further clarification of the responses received to the set questions and tender submissions. Tender responses were weighted to ensure that 60 per cent related to quality and 40 per cent to price.</p>
Alternative options rejected	Please see Appendix 1 for the summary of scores and prices for all 15 bidders. The other bidders have been rejected as, whilst providing some credible submissions, they did not score most highly for either quality or price. MICA Architects scored second highest on quality (with a fine 0.2 percent margin) and highest on price (with the lowest submitted price). Their tender is therefore the most economically advantageous to the Council.

<p>Climate and ecological implications</p>	<p>10 per cent of the quality score was given to a question asking the bidders to demonstrate their approach to climate change based on at least two projects completed recently that are a similar scope to the Broadway project. Bidders were asked to show how they integrate climate change and sustainability into their designs, practices and work opportunities, with particular reference to meeting or exceeding low carbon and sustainability goals, using designs and materials that allow for sustainable practices and how they would address the climate and ecological impacts of this project.</p> <p>MICA Architects scored 5 out of 5 (10 per cent) for their response, which demonstrate a clear ability to address climate change and embed sustainability into design. MICA Architects have an in-house team of PassivHaus trained architects and embed sustainability objectives from the project outset. They have demonstrable experience of delivering sustainable developments and provided evidence of this in their response. MICA scored full marks and the panel were confident that they could work with the project team to deliver the council's sustainability and climate change objectives for the Broadway site.</p>						
<p>Legal implications</p>	<p>Legal services' input will be required to prepare the final contract documents for execution by the successful tenderer and the Council. A draft contract was included as part of the Invitation to Tender.</p>						
<p>Financial implications</p>	<p>Bidders were asked to provide costs for services in both phase one (RIBA Stages 1-3) and phase two (RIBA Stages 4-6) of the Broadway project, with phase two work subject to relevant approval at the end of phase one. MICA Architects costs to deliver the whole contract, and each phase, are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="424 1211 1474 1328"> <tr> <td>Phase one</td> <td>£110,223.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Phase two (subject to approval)</td> <td>£69,757.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>£179,980.00</td> </tr> </table> <p>MICA Architects scored 100% on price and, as the cheapest bid, were the best value for money submission.</p> <p>£500,000 budget was approved for phase one work (including this design team contract) at Council on 7 October 2021. This budget also covers the work of the appointed project manager, cost consultant and clerk of works (Allen Construction Consultancy) alongside relevant site surveys and works required in phase one. Officers continue to monitor spend against the approved budget.</p> <p>Additional budget approval will be required at the end of phase one as part of the approval to commence phase two. Officers continue to explore potential alternative funding opportunities for phase two in advance of obtaining approval to progress with phase two at the relevant time. Phase two spend will only be incurred if approval is given at that time.</p>	Phase one	£110,223.00	Phase two (subject to approval)	£69,757.00	Total	£179,980.00
Phase one	£110,223.00						
Phase two (subject to approval)	£69,757.00						
Total	£179,980.00						
<p>Other implications</p>	<p>10 per cent of the quality score was given to a question asking the bidders to demonstrate their approach to delivering social value through this contract. Bidders were asked to demonstrate how their organisations</p>						

	<p>committed to providing social value, and how they would address social value through this project to help improve the health and well-being of Didcot's residents.</p> <p>MICA Architects scored 4 out of 5 (8 per cent) for their response which focused on the importance of a representative and collaborative process that is outcomes-based, measured, sustainable, contextual and place-based. The response included a commitment to ensuring inclusivity and accessibility with engagement strategies focused on reaching under-represented groups, whilst also highlighting the importance of designing for diverse needs to reflect the values and aspirations of Didcot's communities.</p> <p>Whilst the panel did not score full marks for the submission, they felt that MICA were committed to delivering social value and could work with the project team to optimise outcomes for Didcot residents.</p>			
Background papers considered	Appendix 1. Summary of evaluation scoring MICA Architects bid and fee schedule (sensitive – not for publication)			
Declarations/ conflict of interest? Declaration of other councillor/officer consulted by the Cabinet member?	N/A			
List consultees		Name	Outcome	Date
	Ward councillors	Cllr Mocky Khan Cllr Axel Macdonald Cllr Denise Macdonald	Consulted but no comments received	N/A
	Procurement	Angela Cox	Agreed	25/07/2023
	Legal	Gillian Mason	Agreed with comments	28/07/2023
	Finance	Damon Cotterill	Budgets checked and agreed	25/07/2023
	Human resources	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Strategic property	Karen Lister	Agreed	03/08/2023
	Climate and biodiversity	Jessie Fieth	No further comments, MICA Architects received full marks for their response to the climate change questions within the tender process, demonstrating the strong in-house skills on	27/07/2023

			climate-friendly design necessary to deliver the council's ambitions for the Broadway site.	
	Diversity and equality	Lynne Mitchell	When it comes to the design team putting their ideas/plan in place please can we ensure they think about accessibility to all for this development.	25/07/2023
	Health and safety	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Risk and insurance	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Didcot Garden Town	Charlotte Cottingham	I have no comments to make and approve the draft	26/07/2023
	Communications	Peter Truman	Please keep comms updated with progress as future comms likely	03/08/2023
	SMT		Confirmed happy to support	23/08/2023
Confidential decision? If so, under which exempt category?	No			
Call-in waived by Scrutiny Committee chairman?	No			
Has this been discussed by Cabinet members?	Yes			
Cabinet portfolio holder's signature To confirm the decision as set out in this notice.	Signature _Robin Bennett_____ Date _31/08/2023_____			

Appendix 1. Summary of evaluation scoring

Supplier	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	MICA Architects (9)	10	11	12	13	14	15
Weighted Quality Score (60%)	38	47.8	50.2	38.4	47.8	40.2	46	46	56	49.8	46	40.2	56.2	52	48.2
Quality Score Rank (%)	68%	85%	89%	68%	85%	72%	82%	82%	100%	89%	82%	72%	100%	93%	86%
Price	£189,350.00	£197,005.00	£230,415.00	£226,140.50	£237,715.00	£374,300.00	£188,200.38	£307,255.00	£179,980.00	£316,867.00	£198,900.00	£189,790.00	£331,659.00	£453,036.00	£243,091.00
Adjusted price score (% of lowest)	0.95	0.91	0.78	0.80	0.76	0.48	0.96	0.59	1.00	0.57	0.90	0.95	0.54	0.40	0.74
Weighted Cost Score (x 40%)	38.02	36.54	31.24	31.84	30.29	19.23	38.25	23.43	40.00	22.72	36.20	37.93	21.71	15.89	29.62
Total weighted score	76.02	84.34	81.44	70.24	78.09	59.43	84.25	69.43	96.00	72.52	82.20	78.13	77.91	67.89	77.82
Ranking	10	2	5	12	7	15	3	13	1	11	4	6	8	14	9

Note: red boxes indicate the highest ranking for quality and price

ONCE SIGNED, THIS FORM MUST BE HANDED TO DEMOCRATIC SERVICES IMMEDIATELY.

For Democratic Services office use only		
Form received	Date: 31 August 2023	Time: 13:00
Date published to all councillors	Date: 31 August 2023	
Call-in deadline	Date: 7 September 2023	Time: 17:00

Guidance notes

1. This form must be completed by the lead officer who becomes the contact officer. The lead officer is responsible for ensuring that the necessary internal consultees have signed it off, including the chief executive. The lead officer must then seek the Cabinet portfolio holder's agreement and signature.
2. Once satisfied with the decision, the Cabinet portfolio holder must hand-sign and date the form and return it to the lead officer who should send it to Democratic Services immediately to allow the call-in period to commence.
Tel. 01235 422520 or extension 2520.
Email: democratic.services@southandvale.gov.uk
3. Democratic Services will then publish the decision to the website (unless it is confidential) and send it to all councillors to commence the call-in period (five clear working days) if it is a 'key' decision (see the definition of a 'key' decision below). A key decision cannot be implemented until the call-in period expires. The call-in procedure can be found in the council's constitution, part 4, under the Scrutiny Committee procedure rules.
4. Before implementing a key decision, the lead officer is responsible for checking with Democratic Services that the decision has not been called in.
5. If a key decision has been called in, Democratic Services will notify the lead officer and decision-maker. This call-in puts the decision on hold.
6. Democratic Services will liaise with the Scrutiny Committee chairman over the date of the call-in debate. The Cabinet portfolio holder will be requested to attend the Scrutiny Committee meeting to answer the committee's questions.
7. The Scrutiny Committee may:
 - refer the decision back to the Cabinet portfolio holder for reconsideration or
 - refer the matter to Council with an alternative set of proposals (where the final decision rests with full Council) or
 - accept the Cabinet portfolio holder's decision, in which case it can be implemented immediately.

Key decisions: assessing whether a decision should be classified as 'key'

The South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils' Constitutions now have the same definition of a key decision:

A key decision is a decision of the Cabinet, an individual Cabinet member, or an officer acting under delegated powers, which is likely:

- (a) to incur expenditure, make savings or to receive income (except government grant) of more than £75,000;**

- (b) to award a revenue or capital grant of over £25,000; or**
- (c) to agree an action that, in the view of the chief executive or relevant head of service, would be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising more than one ward in the area of the council.**

Key decisions are subject to the scrutiny call-in procedure; non-key decisions are not and can be implemented immediately.

In assessing whether a decision should be classified as 'key', you should consider:

- (a) Will the expenditure, savings or income total more than £75,000 across all financial years?
- (b) Will the grant award to one person or organisation be more than £25,000 across all financial years?
- (c) Does the decision impact on more than one district council ward? And if so, is the impact significant? If residents or property affected by the decision is in one ward but is close to the border of an adjacent ward, it may have a significant impact on that second ward, e.g. through additional traffic, noise, light pollution, odour. Examples of significant impacts on two or more wards are:
 - Decisions to spend Didcot Garden Town funds (significant impact on more than one ward)
 - Changes to the household waste collection policy (affects all households in the district)
 - Reviewing a housing strategy (could have a significant impact on residents in many wards)
 - Adopting a supplementary planning document for a redevelopment site (could significantly affect more than one ward) or a new design guide (affects all wards)
 - Decisions to build new or improve existing leisure facilities (used by residents of more than one ward)

The overriding principle is that before 'key' decisions are made, they must be published in the Cabinet Work Programme for 28 calendar days. Classifying a decision as non-key when it should be a key decision could expose the decision to challenge and delay its implementation.