

UNRESTRICTED MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE CABINET PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 13TH JANUARY, 2020

Chair	Councillor Rebecca Rennison in the Chair
Councillors Present:	Councillors Deputy Mayor Anntoinette Bramble and Cllr Jon Burke
Apologies:	Cllr Caroline Selman
Officers in Attendance	Mr Rotimi Ajilore – Head of Procurement Ms Zainab Jalal – Category Lead Social Care Ms Karen Tait-Lane - Category Lead (Construction & Environment) Mr Patrick Rodger – Senior Lawyer – Procurement - Legal & Governance Mr Gareth Wall – Head of Commissioning – Children, Adults & Community Health (CA&CH) Mr Chris Trowell - Head of Housing Supply Programme, Neighbourhoods and Housing Ms Sophie Bromfield - Project Officer, Neighbourhoods and Housing Mr Andy Wells - Civil Protection Service Manager Ms Suzy Valentine - Lawyer - Paralegal – Legal & Governance Ms Jackie Rutherford Procurement Category Officer, Finance and Corporate Resources Ms Anisah Hilali – Paralegal – Legal & Governance Mr Clifford Hart – Governance Services Officer – Legal & Governance

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor Selman.

NOTED

2 Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

NOTED

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST - Members to declare as appropriate

There were no declarations of interest.

NOTED

4 NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE, ANY REPRESENTATION RECEIVED AND THE RESPONSE TO ANY SUCH REPRESENTATIONS

There were no representations received.

NOTED

5 DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS/QUESTIONS

There were no deputations, petitions or questions.

NOTED

6 UNRESTRICTED MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF CABINET PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 2 DECEMBER 2019

RESOLVED

That the unrestricted minutes of the Cabinet Procurement Committee held on 2 December 2019 be confirmed as an accurate record of the proceedings.

7 PUBLIC SPACE SURVEILLANCE AND OPTICAL FIBRE INSTALLATION AND MAINTENANCE CONTRACT - - KEY DECISION NO. NH Q37

The Chair asked for a brief introduction of the report.

The Civil Protection Service Manager – Andy Wells advised the Committee that the report sought approval to the awarding of the Public Space Surveillance and optical fibre installation and maintenance contract. The current contract for the Council’s Public Space Surveillance (PSS) & Optical Fibre Network installation and maintenance began on 1st April 2014 and ran for a 3 year period, with the option to extend for two further twelve month periods, which expired 31st March 2019. The contract had been extended for a further one year to allow for the tender process, and the extension would expire on 31st March 2020. The contract was also used by Property Services.

Mr Wells commented that the Civil Protection Service was now responsible for managing the Public Space Surveillance systems on Housing Estates, with the current contract for Housing Estates commencing in October 2015 and operated for a 5 year period. There was a clause within the contract which enabled the client to end the contract without prejudice after 3 years. Thus, the Housing Estate contract ended in October 2018, and the two services were carried out by the existing town centre public space surveillance contractor until the new contract would commence. This enabled the existing two separate contracts to be combined into one contract to cover Housing and Town Centre PSS, enabling the council to benefit from economies of scale.

Mr Wells further commented that the Council continued to ensure a network of cameras were there to aid Police and other agencies emergency response, deter criminals and aid conviction as well as offering reassurance to members of the public. The supplier selected from this tender process (tenderer A) would be required to maintain and install the PSS and optical fibre network.

Monday, 13th January, 2020

In respect of consultation Mr Wells advised that Leaseholders were consulted in writing prior to the publishing the OJEU notice. Once the conditional contract award was proposed, leaseholders would be consulted again, by issue of a 'Notice of Proposal'. If no representations were received the Council would then proceed to award the contract. After award, a s20 'Award of Contract Notice' would be issued informing leaseholders of the outcome of the procurement process.

The Chair thanked Mr Wells for his succinct and informative introduction and asked there were any questions of the Committee.

Councillor Burke, on behalf of Councillor Selman, who was the portfolio member for the report, asked if Councillor Selman had been consulted at all stages of the project. In response Mr Wells advised that Councillor Selman had been consulted at all stages and was fully in agreement to the proposals.

In response to points of clarification Mr Wells advised that in terms of insourcing of work related to the contract all of the engineering aspects – a considerable amount, was carried out in house, together with the design elements. The technical support was specialist and was from the private sector.

There being no further points of clarification or questions, on a MOTION by the Chair it was:

RESOLVED

- i. That approval be given to the awarding of the Public Space Surveillance and optical fibre installation and maintenance contract to Supplier A as detailed in the exempt appendix to the report; and
- ii. that approval be given to a 3 year contract with the option to extend for a further 4 years in 2 yearly increments, with a maximum potential spend /contract value of £14.63m.

RELATED DECISIONS

The Business case was approved at the CPC meeting on 12th November 2018 authorising the commencement of the procurement process for the provision of Public Space Surveillance and Optical fibre installation and maintenance.

REASONS FOR DECISION/OPTIONS APPRAISAL

The report was seeking approval to award to the Public Space Surveillance and optical fibre installation and maintenance contract to Supplier A.

The current contract for the Council's Public Space Surveillance (PSS) & Optical Fibre Network installation and maintenance began on 1st April 2014 and ran for a 3 year period, with the option to extend for two further twelve month periods, which expired 31st March 2019. The contract was extended for a further one year to allow for the tender process, which would expire on 31st March 2020. This contract was also used by Property Services.

The Civil Protection Service was now responsible for managing the Public Space Surveillance systems on Housing Estates. The current contract for Housing Estates began in October 2015 and operated for a 5 year period. There was a clause within the contract which enabled the client to end the contract *without prejudice* after 3 years. Thus, the Housing Estate contract

Monday, 13th January, 2020

ended in October 2018, the two services were carried out by the existing town centre public space surveillance contractor until the new contract commences. This enabled the existing two separate contracts to be combined into one contract to cover Housing and Town Centre PSS, enabling the council to benefit from economies of scale.

The Council continued to ensure a network of cameras are there to aid Police and other agencies emergency response, deter criminals and aid conviction as well as offering reassurance to members of the public.

The supplier selected from this tender process would be required to maintain and install the PSS and optical fibre network.

A number of options were considered:

1. One contract package for all service areas;

Comprehensive 'insurance style' contract where an annual fee is paid for a guaranteed level of service;

Two separate contract packages for the two areas;

Insourcing, and

Existing framework contract.

Option 1 above was the preferred option, giving maximum value for money to the Service areas, and maximising efficiency in managing the contract.

Section 20 (s20) is a clause in the Landlord and Tenant Act 1985 (and as supplemented by the Common hold and Leasehold Reform Act 2002) intended to protect leaseholders from paying unnecessarily large sums for work carried out to their building. s20 is a notice to inform leaseholders that the Council intends to carry out work and will apply to all leaseholders who will be affected by the works and services of this contract.

Leaseholders were consulted in writing prior to the publishing the OJEU notice. Once the conditional contract award had been proposed, leaseholders would be consulted again, by issue of a 'Notice of Proposal'. If no representations were received the Council would then proceed to award the contract. After award, a s20 'Award of Contract Notice' would be issued informing leaseholders of the outcome of the procurement process.

5.1.5. The contract will be a schedule of rates contract and works will be carried out within existing budgets.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS (CONSIDERED AND REJECTED)

The following options were considered:

One contract package for all service areas.
Comprehensive 'insurance style' contract where an annual fee is paid for a guaranteed level of service.
Two separate contract packages for the two areas.
Insourcing
Existing framework contract.

Option 1 - Is the preferred option, giving maximum value for money to the Service areas, and maximising efficiency in managing the contract.

Option 2 - Is considered too expensive and inflexible by the PSS Team. Due to the nature of the work we do we need to have the flexibility to order equipment and works that fits the operational requirement and probe the market for new technology that offers us the best value for money.

Option 3 – The PSS Team have considered splitting the contract into two separate contracts, one for installation and one for maintenance. However, this option was rejected. The contracts were previously held by two separate contractors, in 2004. This presented engineering and technical challenges, which meant the council incurred an increase in costs and complexity. There will also be an increase in officer time involved in order to tender and manage the two separate contracts.

Option 4 - Was considered not practical at this time by the Civil Protection Service. Full details of the review are available in the Business Case.

Option 5 – There are no framework contracts available to be used.

8 Extra Care Housing - Limetree Court and St. Peter's - KEY DECISION NO. CACH Q26

The Chair asked for a brief introduction of the report.

The Head of Commissioning for Adult Services – Mr Wall advised the Committee that report before them was requesting the approval of the award of a contract for personal care across two extra care housing schemes - Limetree Court at Clapton Common and St Peter's, Bethune Road. Mr Wall advised that both schemes offered extra care provision, where residents would have their own tenancies, and the extra care provision would cater for a range of needs. Extra care meant that as well as personal care, residents could make flexible use of additional support at times throughout the day that would be appropriate for them.

Mr Wall commented that the contract was for three years, at just over £700k per year. The contract signalled the Council's intention to increase the availability of extra care, subject to ongoing demand, and also it allowed the service to build its knowledge of how extra care support was developed and delivered, as the service would be reviewing its arrangements for in-house provision of personal care over the next 18 months. Mr Wall also commented that as the Committee may recall from the business case arrangements, there had been an interim provider in place across both schemes but the service wanted to put a formal contract in place while the internal work took place. This would allow officers to strengthen the contract management relationship, satisfy contract standing orders, give reassurance to both landlords regarding the Council's commitment to the schemes, and make sure of good value for money.

Monday, 13th January, 2020

With regard to the responses to the tender exercise Mr Wall advised that eleven submissions had been received, of which 10 passed the survey questionnaire stage. As a result bids were assessed by a panel that included Commissioners, Social Care staff, and both Landlords, together with a separate meeting at which residents from both schemes had been able to question bidders, at which over 20 residents and their families attended. The recommended bidder employed over 100 employees in Hackney, and currently worked with 154 residents, providing domiciliary care through the Council's contract framework.

The Chair thanked Mr Wall for his succinct introduction, and in asking if there were any questions from members, commented that she had been very impressed by the extent of resident and family involvement in the procurement process.

In response to a point of clarification from Councillor Burke Mr Wall advised that the service provision did not involve staff travelling across sites.

The Chair sought clarification as regards to a possible contradiction within the report whereby at one point it the report indicated that the procurement was not part of a savings programme, but at another point it indicated that it would enable a reduction in spending. In response Mr Wall advised that it was not part of a formal savings programme but the preferred bidder had offered a competitive price, below the forecasted budget. Also Extra Care was designed to provide better outcomes for residents and value for money to the public. If a comparison was made of the cost of a resident receiving homecare for a period, and then later nursing care when their needs changed, modelling showed that it was more cost effective overall to spread more of that time within an Extra Care setting, where the resident had their own tenancy but the level of care could then increase over time.

The Chair thanked Mr Wall for his clarification.

There being no further questions, on a motion by the Chair it was:-

RESOLVED

That approval be given to the awarding of the contract for care services to Bidder B as detailed in the exempt appendix to the report, with financial provision to cost a total amount of £2,128,501 for a period of three years.

RELATED DECISIONS

Due to the assessed risk of this contract the business case approval was sought from the Group Director and was not presented to Cabinet Procurement Committee.

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1XWsf7SRYcT-sE6prfD2dL78zqska2RoK94WcY9QsM0o/edit?usp=sharing>

REASONS FOR DECISION/OPTIONS APPRAISAL.

In 2012/13, at the request of the London Borough of Hackney, Family Mosaic (now known as Peabody) were asked to apply for a capital grant of £4m from the (then) Homes and Communities Agency to redevelop two of their sites to create extra care services. The London Borough of Hackney then agreed to fund a further £300k capital directly to ensure the new service was designed specifically for residents with dementia and mental health issues. The capital funding was agreed by the London Borough of Hackney on the understanding that these services would assist in delaying or preventing the need for residential care and avoiding costs to health and social care services. This became the St Peter's site. Separately, Hanover (now known as Anchor Hanover) had also developed Limetree Court as a purpose built scheme that presented an opportunity for extra-care provision in both buildings to be delivered by one care and support provider.

A homecare agency from the Council's framework contract has been delivering care and support at both schemes to date, on a short-term basis. In the medium-long term, staff from the in-house Housing with Care service will take on the provision, however this is not possible at present due to changes in the service resulting from the recent CQC Inspection. In the interim, an open tender was required in order for a homecare agency to provide care and support across both settings on an ongoing basis.

Extra Care Housing is housing designed with the needs of frailer, older people in mind and with varying levels of care and support available on site. People who live in Extra Care Housing have their own self contained homes, their own front doors and a legal right to occupy the property. This type of provision means that people can retain their independence longer, delaying and often completely avoiding the need for residential care. This model promotes the council's vision to promote independence and ensuring people are valued members of their community. This model also avoids higher cost placements in residential care.

A detailed options appraisal for the procurement approach was set out in the Business Case for this service, which was approved by the group director and is reiterated in Section 8 of the report.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS (CONSIDERED AND REJECTED)

The following options have been considered and rejected.

Option	Advantages	Disadvantages	Rec
i. Do nothing	The contract had come to an end and a decision on future delivery needed to be made. Doing nothing was not a viable option.		
ii. Open procurement for a single provider	<p>Open procurement would allow the local authority to test the market, ensure a competitive hourly rate and also allow residents to take part in choosing who provides their care.</p> <p>Helps to shape and develop the market in line with the Council's duty under the Care Act 2014, Section 5. This section of the Act sets out duties on local authorities to facilitate a diverse, sustainable high quality market for their whole local population.</p> <p>Allows for new and innovative organisations to access the local market for homecare provision.</p>	<p>Market forces can reduce prices in a way that does not always balanced adequately by changes in quality.</p> <p>This option does not support the Mayor's manifesto commitment "to review all outsourced services, including in adult social care, with a view to bringing them in-house as well as looking at new forms of employee ownership and co-ops where this is not possible."</p>	<p>✓</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
iii. Bringing service in-	At the time the business case was being developed CQC evaluated the t Provider Services as inadequate and in		

<p>house</p>	<p>order to fully commit to service improvement it was agreed that no further services would be brought in house until such time as the CQC assessment was improved.</p> <p>Hackney Council is signalling its intention to the market about its ambition for future growth in the provision of extra care, However, this is balanced alongside the Mayor's manifesto commitment to review services with a view to bringing them in house. This current approach allows the Council to build knowledge about the ability of the market to deliver effective extra care, whilst our in-house service is reviewed. A further options appraisal will be undertaken subsequent to that review of in-house services, incorporating knowledge gathered from delivery of this contract by the preferred bidder.</p>		
--------------	---	--	--

9 Daubeney Road Mixed Tenure Housing – Main Contractor Award - KEY DECISION NO. NH Q34

The Chair asked for an introduction of the report.

The Head of Housing Supply Programme, Neighbourhoods and Housing – Mr Trowell advised that the report before the Committee outlined the selection of a preferred bidder for the development of the Daubeney Road garages site, including demolition of the existing structures on site and associated enabling works. The Daubeney Road site formed part of the HSP, and was located in Lower Clapton, part of the Clapton Park Estate in the Kings Park ward.

Mr Trowell commented that the development originally consisted of six social rent and five shared ownership homes. However, in order to ensure the project remained viable in relation to the tendered build costs, it was intended to adjust the tenure mix by the introduction of four outright sale homes which would lead to a slight improvement in the viability of the project, from the budget position and the time of tendering. The improvement would offset a construction price increase on another site within the same ward with the proposed new tenure mix comprising of seven homes for social rent, and four homes for outright sale.

Monday, 13th January, 2020

Mr Trowell advised that proposed tenure change was considered by Planning Sub-Committee on 8th January 2020 and was approved.

Mr Trowell also advised that in addition the development would also provide a new pedestrian only through route connecting Daubeney Road and Redwald Road, together with landscaping and public realm improvements. Mr Trowell further commented that outside of the outlined procurement, but within the scope of the overall development project, the Council would be delivering a permanent community garden on Redwald Road on the Clapton Park Estate, to replace the temporary facility previously located on the development site. Also a contribution of £20,000 would be made towards local greening initiatives (Daubeney Road parklet/Ten Times Greener project).

With regard to the proposed contract Mr Trowell commented that the Council would enter into a JCT Intermediate Building Contract 2016 with the preferred bidder. The contract required the successful bidder to deliver an 11 home development and included the demolition of the existing structures on site and associated enabling works. The tendered bids were evaluated against the forecasts contained within the financial model for the scheme and were considered with reference to the viability of the overall programme. The viability forecasts were prepared on the basis of independent cost and value information supplied by the Council's professional advisors, and subject to scrutiny and cross-checking against other comparable schemes within the programme by the Council's Corporate Finance team. Mr Trowell further reported that the proposed contractor was selected via a restricted tender, and this method had been recommended for the proposed works as it gave a wide range of suitably qualified contractors the opportunity to express an interest in participating in the tender process by completing and submitting a Selection Questionnaire (SQ). Soft market testing demonstrated that this was an attractive procurement route for generating interest among small and medium sized contractors, increasing the probability of those shortlisted being selected as the preferred bidder.

Mr Trowell concluded that the preferred bidder had been selected using the award criteria and scoring methodology detailed in the Invitation to Tender (ITT) document that was issued to shortlisted tenderers. All tenderers submitted contract prices above the anticipated budget and therefore it was intended that the project's viability would be maintained by adjusting the tenure mix to include an element of outright sale housing.

The Chair thanked Mr Trowell for his succinct and informative introduction, and asked if there any questions from the Committee.

Councillor Burke referred to para 7.1.5 of the report which gave reference to the heating system being chosen and asked whether consideration could be given to changing this to electrical heating as opposed to gas fired.

In response Mr Trowell advised that the proposed heating systems were comprised of co-efficient gas boilers and this type of heating was one of the last types to be installed in such developments. It was the case that the Committee would also decide on the Pedro street development in February 2020 which also had gas boilers. Going forward the Council would be looking to adhere to the guidance from the new London plan for renewable heat sources. Mr Trowell also commented that there had been initial exploring of the viability of electrical heating for the development, but for a development of this size it was not sensible given the cost. Mr Trowell added that any attempts to amend the design to include it now would delay the project and be not viable from a cost perspective.

The Chair referred to and welcomed the comment at para 7.2.5 in respect of the commitment of the preferred bidder to paying its workforce the London Living Wage and transferring this to its supply chain. The Chair commented that this was much welcomed and reassuring. The Chair also referred to paragraph 9.2.3 and reference to a reserve bidder E, in the event that it was not possible to award the contract to bidder B, and sought clarification on this point.

Monday, 13th January, 2020

In response Mr Trowell advised that in terms of the proposed award to Bidder B, given that the bidder had represented the requirements of the tender process in terms of quality and standard it was hoped to conclude the negotiations and have tenderer B on site. However the Council would like to put in place a contingency in the event that it was not possible to conclude a contract with Bidder B. Therefore officers sought the authority of the Committee for delegated approval by the Group Director, Neighbourhoods and Housing to appoint Bidder E as a reserve contractor in such circumstances, in order for the work to commence on site without too much further delay.

The Head of Procurement – Mr Ajilore advised that within contract standing orders the selection of a reserved bidder was allowed for so therefore the reserved bidder E had been selected in the event that the contract with bidder B could not be concluded.

The Chair thanked both Mr Trowell and Mr Ajilore for their confirmation.

There being no further points of clarification, on a MOTION by the Chair it was:

RESOLVED

- i. That approval be given to the appointment of Bidder B as the preferred contractor for the construction of mixed tenure housing at Daubeney Road for the value set out in Exempt Appendix 3 of the report, plus a 5% client held contingency to be held by the Council for scheme variations during the construction period for the value set out in Exempt Appendix 3;
- ii. That authority be delegated to the Group Director, Neighbourhoods and Housing, to approve the appointment of a reserve bidder, Bidder E, should it not be possible to enter into a contract with the preferred Bidder, Bidder B.
- iii. That that approval be given to the entering into a JCT Intermediate Building Contract 2016, and any other ancillary legal documentation relating thereto, with Bidder B (or Bidder E subject to ii. above) for the construction of mixed tenure housing at Daubeney Road, on such terms as shall be agreed by the Director of Legal and Governance; and
- iv. That the Director of Legal and Governance be authorised to prepare, agree, settle and sign the necessary legal documentation to effect the proposals contained in the report and to enter into any other ancillary legal documentation as required.

RELATED DECISIONS

At its meeting of 29th February 2016 the Council's Cabinet agreed the Housing Supply Programme.

At its meeting on 18th July 2016 the Council's Cabinet approved the Sales and Marketing Strategy, authorising the Director of Regeneration to implement the Sales and Marketing Framework in relation to shared ownership and outright sale disposals generated via both the Housing Supply (HSP) and Estate Regeneration (ERP) Programmes. Cabinet also authorised the Director of Strategic Property and the Director of Regeneration to dispose of leasehold and freehold interests in the shared ownership and outright sale homes developed or to be developed as part of those Programmes.

At its meeting of 23rd May 2017, the Council's Housing Development Board agreed to the addition of the Daubeney Road site to the HSP.

Hackney Procurement Board (HPB) approved the business case for the Daubeney Road development on 12th June 2018.

Monday, 13th January, 2020

The Council's Planning Sub-Committee resolved to grant planning approval for the Daubeney Road development on 4th July 2018, subject to the completion of a Unilateral Undertaking, which had since been authorised.

REASONS FOR DECISION/OPTIONS APPRAISAL

This report outlines the process that has been followed in selecting a preferred bidder for the development of the Daubeney Road garages site, including demolition of the existing structures on site and associated enabling works.

The Daubeney Road site forms part of the HSP. It is located in Lower Clapton and forms part of the Clapton Park Estate in the Kings Park ward.

The development originally consisted of six social rent and five shared ownership homes. However, in order to ensure the project remains viable in relation to the tendered build costs, it was intended to adjust the tenure mix. The introduction of four outright sale homes would lead to a slight improvement in the viability of the project, from the budget position and the time of tendering, and this improvement would offset a construction price increase on another site within the same ward.

The proposed new tenure mix is:

- seven homes for social rent
- four homes for outright sale.

The above tenure change was due to be considered by Planning Sub-Committee on 8th January 2020, and the outcome was confirmed as agreed.

In addition to 11 new homes the development would also provide:

- a new pedestrian only through route connecting Daubeney Road and Redwald Road
- landscaping and public realm improvements.

Outside of this procurement, but within the scope of the overall development project, the Council would be delivering a permanent community garden on Redwald Road on the Clapton Park Estate, to replace the temporary facility previously located on the development site.

Also outside of this procurement, but within the overall project, a contribution of £20,000 would be made towards local greening initiatives (Daubeney Road parklet/Ten Times Greener project).

It was proposed that the Council would enter into a JCT Intermediate Building Contract 2016 with the preferred bidder. The contract required the successful bidder to deliver an 11 home development and included the demolition of the existing structures on site and associated enabling works.

The Daubeney Road development would contribute to delivering the Council's aspiration to make the best use of its land by building new social rented and affordable homes on a range of unused or under occupied sites across the borough. The outright sale homes delivered on the site would generate cross subsidy to help support the delivery of the social rented housing.

The bids for the Daubeney Road development were evaluated against the forecasts contained within the financial model for the scheme and were considered with reference to the viability of the overall programme. The viability forecasts were prepared on the basis of

Monday, 13th January, 2020

independent cost and value information supplied by the Council's professional advisors, and subject to scrutiny and cross-checking against other comparable schemes within the programme by the Council's Corporate Finance team.

The proposed contractor was selected via a restricted tender. This route was the recommended method of procuring the proposed works as it gave a wide range of suitably qualified contractors the opportunity to express an interest in participating in the tender process by completing and submitting a Selection Questionnaire (SQ). Soft market testing demonstrated that this was an attractive procurement route for generating interest among small and medium sized contractors, increasing the probability of those shortlisted being selected as the preferred bidder.

A preferred bidder has been selected using the award criteria and scoring methodology detailed in the Invitation to Tender (ITT) document that was issued to shortlisted tenderers.

All tenderers submitted contract prices above the anticipated budget. It was intended that the project's viability would be maintained by adjusting the tenure mix to include an element of outright sale housing. (The full tender process was summarised in paragraph 8 within the report.)

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS (CONSIDERED AND REJECTED)

The option to abandon the procurement process and begin a new process was considered. It was rejected due to the delay this would cause to the construction programme and the probability that continued build cost inflation would further increase the cost of tenders received in any future procurement exercise.

Value engineering of the design was considered and rejected, as it was established that there were no further value engineering measures that would significantly reduce costs without compromising the design intent of the project. It was also assessed that any minimal cost savings achieved through value engineering would, in probability, be negated by continuing build cost inflation.

Consideration was given to awarding the contract without changing the tenure mix at Daubeney Road. However, this was not supported because delivering the Daubeney Road project without adjusting the tenure mix would reduce the viability of the HSP and therefore compromise the delivery of affordable homes on other schemes within the portfolio.

10 ANY OTHER UNRESTRICTED BUSINESS THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT

There were no items of unrestricted urgent business.

NOTED

11 DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The Chair advised that meeting scheduled for 6 April 2020 would be cancelled.

Noted the following meetings of Cabinet Procurement Committee for the remainder of the Municipal Year 2019/20 commencing at 18.00hrs on:

10 February 2020
11 March 2020
11 May 2020

12 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED

THAT the press and public be excluded from the proceedings of the Cabinet Procurement Committee during consideration of Exempt items 13-16 on the agenda on the grounds that it is likely, in the view of the nature of the business to be transacted, that were members of the public to be present, there would be disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 as amended.

SUMMARY OF EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL PROCEEDINGS

13 EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF CABINET PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 2 DECEMBER 2019 - to follow

AGREED - the exempt minutes of the Cabinet Procurement Committee held on 2 December 2019.

14 PUBLIC SPACE SURVEILLANCE AND OPTICAL FIBRE INSTALLATION AND MAINTENANCE CONTRACT - KEY DECISION NO. NH Q37

AGREED – the exempt Appendices 1&2 in relation to agenda item 7 in the unrestricted part of the agenda.

15 Extra Care Housing - Limetree Court and St. Peter's - KEY DECISION NO. CACH Q26

AGREED – the exempt Appendices A & B in relation to agenda item 8 in the unrestricted part of the agenda.

16 Daubeney Road Mixed Tenure Housing – Main Contractor Award - KEY DECISION NO. NH Q34

AGREED – the exempt Appendices 1 - 3 in relation to agenda item 9 in the unrestricted part of the agenda.

17 ANY OTHER EXEMPT BUSINESS THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT

There were no items of exempt business to consider.

NOTED

Duration of the meeting: 18:00 – 18:25HRS

Contact:
Clifford Hart
Clifford.hart@hackney.gov.uk