

**Name of decision maker:** Councillor Margaret Griffiths

**Portfolio:** Housing and Regeneration

**Date of Portfolio Holder Decision:** 10/06/13

**Title of Decision: Garage Block Refurbishment Scheme 2013-14**

**Decision made and reasons:**

Many garage blocks are in poor condition and the Council is spending a large proportion of its responsive repair budget on minor repairs to individual garages and some blocks. We have identified a number of blocks that need major works this financial year 2013-14 Using the calculations on the ITT evaluation based on the figures supplied in the background information.

The recommendation is to let the contract to M H Goldsmiths Ltd

**Reports considered: (here reference can be made to specific documents)** Reports back from inspections by technical officers, reports from tenants of disrepair.

**Has budget been approved? (provide budget codes):** Yes, Budget of £500k has been approved for the year April 2013 to March 2014, which consists of this year budget of £250k and carry over from last year's budget of £250k Budget code 2001KC102 2013/14

**Officers/Councillors/Ward Councillors/Stakeholders Consulted:**

Commissioning, Procurement & Compliance  
Group Manager – Calvin Fisher

**Monitoring Officer comments:**

I have no comments to add to the report.

**Deputy Section 151 Officer comments:**

The cost of the proposed works is within the approved budget for 2013/14.

**Implications:**

Dissatisfaction from tenants with increasing rents and lack of maintenance of the garages, bad press. If this work is not carried out then we will have continued ongoing repairs and claims against the Council for damage to the belongings stored in the garages.

**Risk:**

Risk1 Garage blocks could become unusable, loss of rental income, damage to tenants belongings due to poorly maintained garages resulting in compensation claims,

Risk 2 Blocks become no go areas if many unused garages are boarded up resulting in more garages being abandoned and increased anti social behaviour.

Risk 3 The contractor fails to perform. M H Goldsmiths Ltd have carried out similar projects in the past. They are a large enough company and have the

resources to complete the project. They have carried out similar works for Dacorum in the past.

**Value for Money:**

The works were tendered through the Council electronic Procurement Portal; we had 23 responses and following the tender evaluation which was scored on 70% Price, 10% Experience and 10% Management of the contract and 10% method statement / health and safety

**Options Considered and reasons for rejection:****Portfolio Holders Signature:****Date:****Details of any interests declared and any dispensations given by the Standards Committee:****For Member Support Officer use only**

Date Decision Record Sheet received from portfolio holder: 19 August 2013

Date Decision Published: 19 August 2013

Decision No: PH/033/13

Date of Expiry of Call-In Period: 27 August 2013

Date any Call-In received or decision implemented:

**BACKGROUND**

There were 23 tender returns for this project. The price evaluation was carried out using a typical "basket" of items that we would use on an average garage refurbishment. The items below were evaluated against the prices submitted by each contractor.

---

Renew 2.5m x 3.5m felt roof replacements 1-5 Garages 8.75m2, remove, deck, felt

---

Metal up and over door replacement

---

Timber door frame replacement

---

Renew 2.5m of gutters

---

Renew 2m Down pipe

---

Renew Fibre cement roof sheets 6-10

---

Remove asbestos roof sheets 1-5 sheets (each)

---

M H Goldsmiths scored the highest based on price and have the required experience, and resources to carry out the works.

Further evaluation was carried out on the submissions looking at contractors experience on similar contracts, method statements looking at the health and safety background of the company and proposals showing how the works would be carried out for Dacorum. The evaluation also looked at the tenderers submissions relating to how they would resource the works, the number of staff allocated to the project and how they intend to management the project and how they would manage customer care and satisfaction.