



**Clerk of the Council**  
Suite 23 Liberty House  
Greenham Business Park  
Greenham, Berkshire RG19 6HW

[clerk@greenham.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@greenham.gov.uk)  
[www.greenham.gov.uk](http://www.greenham.gov.uk)  
01635 564900

**MINUTES of the extraordinary meeting of Greenham Parish Council**  
*held at Liberty House, Greenham Business Park*  
**on Tuesday 23rd May 2017 at 7.00pm**

*Present:* Cllr Julian Swift-Hook (Chair)  
Cllr Chris Austin (Vice Chair)  
Cllr Meg Thomas  
Cllr Paul Walter  
Cllr Jon Gage  
Cllr Sally-Ann Jay (from 7.02pm)

*In attendance:* None

**18. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from: Cllr Pragna Hay, Cllr Phil Barnett, Cllr Balu Sudra, Cllr Lindsey Middlemiss and Cllr Gary Puffett

**19. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No Declarations of Interest were received.

**20. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CONTROL TOWER COMMITTEE ON THE TENDERING PROCESS FOR A PROJECT MANAGER (Part 1)**

A précis of the full report was presented and is included as annex A to these minutes.

**21. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Due to the commercial sensitivity the CONFIDENTIAL full report and discussion (which detailed bidders' commercial approach to the project), it was felt necessary to table a motion to exclude the press and public.

**Proposed:** Cllr Julian Swift-Hook

**Seconded:** Cllr Paul Walter

**Resolved:** That under Section 1, Paragraph 2 of The Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business because publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest by reason of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted. The vote was carried unanimously.

**22. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CONTROL TOWER COMMITTEE ON THE TENDERING PROCESS FOR A PROJECT MANAGER (Part 2)**

(a) The full, commercially sensitive report was presented, including a detailed discussion on

the tenders for the project management role.

(b) There were 3 companies shortlisted as preferred bidders. There were no conflicts of interest for any councillors present with the short-listed companies.

(c) There was a wide variation in bid costs; Company A £12,400 (ex VAT), Company B £17,000 and Company C £27,960 (rising to above £30,000 depending on disbursements).

(d) In accordance with published assessment criteria, value for money against the project budget was considered alongside the bidder's experience delivering similar projects in the public sector.

(e) Although competition was very close, a preferred bidder moving forward was identified.

**Proposed:** Cllr Jon Gage

**Seconded:** Cllr Paul Walter

**Resolved:** That Place Partnership Ltd be offered the Project Management contract. The vote was carried unanimously.

(d) Next steps in the process of contracting the work to Place Partnership Ltd were discussed

**Proposed:** Cllr Chris Austin

**Seconded:** Cllr Meg Thomas

**Resolved:** That the Clerk, in consultation with the Chairmen of the Council and Control Tower Committee, inform Place Partnership Ltd of the council's decision, review their letter of engagement, including T&Cs, and, all being well, sign a letter of acceptance.

Once formally on contract, the Clerk would work with Place Partnership Ltd to issue a joint Press release.

(e) The Chairman proposed a vote of thanks to those involved in the tender process.

**Proposed:** Cllr Julian Swift-Hook

**Seconded:** Cllr Sally-Ann Jay

**Resolved:** That the Council recorded their thanks to the Chairman and members of the Control Tower Committee who conducted the tender process and interviews.

**There being no other business the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 7:55pm**

Chairman

Date

**Report To Greenham Parish Council On The Tendering Process For A Project  
Manager To Oversee The Final Phase Of The Control Tower Refurbishment.**

**Précis – for publication**

**22 May 2017**

As reported to Council at the GPC meeting of May 11<sup>th</sup>, a panel from The Control Tower Committee was looking to interview three companies who submitted tenders for the role of Project Manager on May 18<sup>th</sup>. I can confirm that these interviews took place on that date.

The interview panel consisted of Cllr Jon Gage, Cllr Paul Walter who was a substitute for Cllr Gary Puffett, and Mr Dean Graham. The Clerk of The Council was also present to help facilitate the interviews.

The interview process went smoothly and all three companies impressed the panel. As agreed at the GPC meeting of March 15<sup>th</sup> 2017 the process for the selection of a Project Manager requires full council approval and that is why this extraordinary meeting has been called.

This meeting is your opportunity to seek clarification for our decision and raise any concerns you may have before we proceed.

At the end of this meeting we will hopefully be able to make a formal offer to our preferred company to take on the role of Project Manager for the final phase of the Control Tower refurbishment.

**Background To The Tender Process**

Taking on board criticism of previous contract tenders, every effort was made to ensure the process followed good practice and was seen to be open and transparent. The use of the .gov Contract Finder website ensured that as wide an audience as possible had the opportunity to tender for the contract to ensure best value. All interested companies were sent identical tender packs, any additional information requested was sent to all parties and all tenders received were processed without bias.

No member of the review panel had any potential conflict of interest with any tender received. Within the tender pack sent to interested parties was a section indicating how their tender would be ‘scored’ against various criteria. These criteria are shown in the attached Appendix A and allow for a score out of 100 as well as two pass/fail items.

**Initial Written Tender Review**

A total of 8 companies expressed an initial interest in tendering for the role with 4 companies going on to provide a written tender coring against the criteria listed in the chart attached in Appendix A. The Clerk assembled the submitted tenders at the cease of business on the deadline (2<sup>nd</sup> May). A selection panel was convened for the following day when the panel, observed by the clerk, opened the sealed tenders.

Each member of the panel reviewed all tenders independently, there was no discussion during the review process and so each member of the panel produced their own score without outside influence.

Three companies were invited to interview, with the fourth failing to make the necessary experience criteria

After the initial review of written tenders by the panel, the three companies under consideration were scored in accordance with the published assessment criteria.

It is worth noting at this point that in our budgeting process GPC had allowed £18,000+ VAT for

project manager fees and an additional £2000+ VAT for drawings that were likely to be needed for planning and/or construction purposes.

### **Interviews**

Before companies attended interviews they were each sent identical questions to answer/discuss at interview. These questions which are listed below formed the basis for discussion at interview.

- 1) In providing the accurate cost estimates in phase 1 of the work how much assurance can you give us that enough detail and accuracy will be in these costings to ensure that, when building commences, variation from the estimates will be minimal.
- 2) It is recognised that the project may need some accurate drawings put in place. These may be needed for construction purposes and some elements of planning. Would this work be done in house or would you use an external agency? At what point would you do this work as it could be needed to get accurate costings in phase 1
- 3) At what point will you be talking to planning and conservation departments at West Berkshire Council
- 4) Will the Project Manager look to recommend a list of contractors to tender (if we can allow this) for the construction work or will it be totally up to GPC to appoint
- 5) The project has an area that requires a visitor information centre to be built with some AV equipment to be installed. What in house skills or experience has the PM in this area. Do they know of a contractor who could design and build this part of the project?
- 6) What type of contract arrangement is preferred?

Each company was reviewed given their answers to the questions above. Interviews with all three companies lasted about 1 hour 15minutes.

### **Post Interview Scoring**

After interview all three companies were again scored against the initial evaluation/award criteria shown in appendix A.

Given this reviewed score, the panel established a preferred bidder going forward. However, given the price variance with other bidders, it was considered prudent to e-mail them for written confirmation of what had been discussed at interview.

The response provided reassurance on the following areas:

- 1) A belief that costs estimated in phase 1 will be reflective of actual costs once on site.
- 2) The tender price has allowed for the provision of construction drawings.
- 3) The company will play a very active role in helping GPC secure a main contractor in accordance with The Public Contracts Regulation 2015.
- 4) A 'soft' handover and a 12 month post-completion monitoring of defects.

**Given the response provided in email and scoring in the tender evaluation/award criteria the panel identified a preferred bidder that was both within budget and represented the best value for money.**

**J GAGE  
Cllr  
Chairman of the Control Tower Committee**