



***CABINET***  
***Monday, 1st June, 2020***

You are invited to attend the next meeting of **Cabinet**, which will be held at:

**Online Meeting using Zoom**  
on **Monday, 1st June, 2020**  
at **7.00 pm** .

**G. Blakemore**  
Chief Executive

**Democratic Services**  
**Officer**

A. Hendry (Democratic Services)  
Tel: (01992) 564246 Email:  
democraticservices@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Members:

Councillors C Whitbread (Leader of the Council & Leader of the Conservative Group) (Chairman), S Stavrou (Deputy Leader and Business Support Services Portfolio Holder) (Vice-Chairman), N Avey, N Bedford, A Lion, A Patel, J Philip, S Kane and H Whitbread

---

**PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS MEETING IS OPEN TO ALL MEMBERS TO ATTEND**

**WEBCASTING/FILMING NOTICE (VIRTUAL MEETINGS)**

**Please note: this meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site - at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed.**

**You should be aware that the Council is a Data Controller under the Data Protection Act. Data collected during this webcast will be retained in accordance with the Council's published policy.**

**Therefore by participating in this virtual meeting, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes. If members of the public do not wish to have their image captured they should ensure that their video setting throughout the virtual meeting is turned off**

and set to audio only.

In the event that technical difficulties interrupt the virtual meeting that cannot be overcome, the Chairman may need to adjourn the meeting.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact the Corporate Communications Manager on 01992 564039.

## **1. WEBCASTING INTRODUCTION**

1. This virtual meeting is to be webcast. Members are reminded of the need to unmute before speaking.

2. The Chairman will read the following announcement:

“I would like to remind everyone present that this meeting will be broadcast live to the internet (or filmed) and will be capable of repeated viewing (or another use by such third parties).

Please also be aware that if technical difficulties interrupt the meeting that cannot be overcome, I may need to adjourn the meeting.”

## **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

To be announced at the meeting.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

To declare interests in any item on this agenda.

## **4. MINUTES (Pages 5 - 20)**

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 15 April 2020.

## **5. REPORTS OF PORTFOLIO HOLDERS**

To receive oral reports from Portfolio Holders on current issues concerning their Portfolios, which are not covered elsewhere on this agenda and a verbal update on the Coronavirus situation.

## **6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND REQUESTS TO ADDRESS THE CABINET**

To receive any questions submitted by members of the public and any requests to address the Cabinet.

### **(a) Public Questions**

To answer questions asked by members of the public after notice in accordance with the provisions contained within Part 4 of the Constitution (Council Rules, Rule Q3)

on any matter in relation to which the Cabinet has powers or duties or which affects the District.

**(b) Requests to Address the Cabinet**

Any member of the public or a representative of another organisation may address the Cabinet on any agenda item (except those dealt with in private session as exempt or confidential business) due to be considered at the meeting, in accordance with the provisions contained within Article 7 of the Constitution (The Executive, Paragraphs 27 and 28).

**7. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY**

To consider any matters of concern to the Cabinet arising from the Council's Overview and Scrutiny function and to identify any matters that the Cabinet would like the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to examine as part of its work programme.

**8. COUNCIL HOUSEBUILDING CABINET COMMITTEE - 12 MARCH 2020 (Pages 21 - 26)**

(Housing and Property Services Portfolio Holder) to consider the attached minutes from the meeting of the Council Housebuilding Cabinet Committee, held on 12 March 2020, and any recommendations therein.

**9. ACCEPTANCE OF TENDER - CONTRACT 590 EXTERNAL MAINTENANCE REPAIRS AND REDECORATION PROGRAMME 2020-25 (Pages 27 - 40)**

(Housing & Property Services) To consider the attached report (C-001-2020-21).

**10. ACCOMMODATION PROGRAMME (Pages 41 - 80)**

(Leader) To consider the attached report (C-002-2020-21).

**11. FINANCIAL ISSUES - COVID 19 (Pages 81 - 92)**

(Leader) To consider the attached report (C-003-2020-21).

**12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, together with paragraphs 6 and 24 of the Council Procedure Rules contained in the Constitution requires that the permission of the Chairman be obtained, after prior notice to the Chief Executive, before urgent business not specified in the agenda (including a supplementary agenda of which the statutory period of notice has been given) may be transacted.

In accordance with Operational Standing Order 6 (non-executive bodies), any item raised by a non-member shall require the support of a member of the Committee concerned and the Chairman of that Committee. Two weeks' notice of non-urgent items is required.

**13. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**Exclusion

To consider whether, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press should be excluded from the meeting for the items of business set out below on grounds that they will involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the following paragraph(s) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act (as amended) or are confidential under Section 100(A)(2):

Agenda Item No	Subject	Exempt Information Paragraph Number
Nil	Nil	Nil

The Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, which came into effect on 1 March 2006, requires the Council to consider whether maintaining the exemption listed above outweighs the potential public interest in disclosing the information. Any member who considers that this test should be applied to any currently exempted matter on this agenda should contact the proper officer at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

Background Papers

Article 17 of the Constitution (Access to Information) define background papers as being documents relating to the subject matter of the report which in the Proper Officer's opinion:

- (a) disclose any facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the report is based; and
- (b) have been relied on to a material extent in preparing the report and does not include published works or those which disclose exempt or confidential information and in respect of executive reports, the advice of any political advisor.

The Council will make available for public inspection one copy of each of the documents on the list of background papers for four years after the date of the meeting. Inspection of background papers can be arranged by contacting either the Responsible Officer or the Democratic Services Officer for the particular item.

## EPHING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL CABINET MINUTES

<b>Committee:</b>	Cabinet	<b>Date:</b>	15 April 2020
<b>Place:</b>	Online Meeting using Zoom	<b>Time:</b>	7.00 - 8.00 pm
<b>Members Present:</b>	C Whitbread (Chairman), N Avey, N Bedford, A Lion, A Patel, J Philip, S Kane and H Whitbread		
<b>Other Councillors:</b>	R Bassett, L Burrows, D Dorrell, S Heap, S Heather, C McCredie, S Murray, S Neville, C C Pond, C P Pond, M Sartin, B Vaz and J M Whitehouse		
<b>Apologies:</b>	S Stavrou		
<b>Officers Present:</b>	N Dawe (Chief Operating Officer), G Blakemore (Chief Executive), A Blom-Cooper (Interim Assistant Director (Planning Policy)), T Carne (Corporate Communications Team Manager), D Fenton (Service Manager (Housing Management & Home Ownership)), Ferrigi (Service Manager (ICT & Business Support)), J Houston (Strategic Partnership Specialist and Economic Lead), S Jevans (Strategic Director), S Mitchell (PR Website Editor), P Tredgett (Executive Assistant) and G Woodhall (Democratic & Electoral Services Officer)		

---

### 99. WEBCASTING INTRODUCTION

The Leader of Council made a short address to remind everyone present that the meeting would be broadcast live to the internet, and would be capable of repeated viewing, which could infringe their human and data protection rights.

### 100. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Cllr N Avey declared a personal interest in agenda item 16 – Community Interest Company – and item 17 – Council Owned Sites: Sale of Assets to Qualis Commercial – by virtue of being a Council-appointed non-executive Director on the interim Qualis Board of Directors. The Councillor had determined that his interest was non-pecuniary and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of these items.

(b) Cllr J Philip declared a personal interest in agenda item 16 – Community Interest Company – and item 17 – Council Owned Sites: Sale of Assets to Qualis Commercial – by virtue of being a Council-appointed non-executive Director on the interim Qualis Board of Directors. The Councillor had determined that his interest was non-pecuniary and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of these items.

(c) Cllr J M Whitehouse declared a personal interest in agenda item 17 – Council Owned Sites: Sale of Assets to Qualis Commercial – by virtue of being a member of Epping Town Council and a resident of St John's Road in Epping. The Councillor had determined that his interest was non-pecuniary and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of this item.

(d) Cllr J M Whitehouse declared a personal interest in agenda item 18 – Development Opportunity: St John the Baptist Church, Epping – by virtue of being a resident of St John’s Road in Epping. The Councillor had determined that his interest was non-pecuniary and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of this item.

(e) Chief Executive G Blakemore declared a personal interest in agenda item 16 – Community Interest Company – and item 17 – Council Owned Sites: Sale of Assets to Qualis Commercial – by virtue of being a Council-appointed non-executive Director on the interim Qualis Board of Directors. The Officer had determined that her interest was non-pecuniary and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of these items.

(f) Strategic Director S Jevans declared a personal interest in agenda item 16 – Community Interest Company – and item 17 – Council Owned Sites: Sale of Assets to Qualis Commercial – by virtue of being a Council-appointed non-executive Director on the interim Qualis Board of Directors. The Officer had determined that her interest was non-pecuniary and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of these items.

## **101. MINUTES**

### **Decision:**

(1) That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 6 February 2020 be taken as read and signed by the Leader of Council as a correct record.

## **102. REPORTS OF PORTFOLIO HOLDERS**

The Leader of the Council asked Councillors to join him in recording his thanks to staff for their hard work and professionalism in adapting to the changing circumstances caused by the Coronavirus lockdown, from organising the distribution of food parcels to implementing various emergency initiatives such as grants to local businesses. The financial position of the Council remained stable while it continued to support residents and the local business community. The Leader of the Council also offered his thanks to all the volunteers, the National Health Service staff and carers across the District.

The Cabinet and other Councillors noted the continuation of Council services since the start of the pandemic. Particular attention was drawn by Cllr M Sartin to the continuation of the full Domestic Waste and Recycling Collection Service provided under contract by Biffa, in contrast to other areas of Essex where capacity issues had led to the reduction or withdrawal of various refuse and recycling services in different district, borough and unitary authorities.

## **103. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND REQUESTS TO ADDRESS THE CABINET**

The Cabinet noted that no public questions or requests to address the Cabinet had been received for consideration at the meeting.

## **104. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY**

The Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, Cllr M Sartin, stated that there was nothing to report as the last meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in March had been postponed, due to the social distancing measures introduced just

prior to the lockdown and invitations to external parties had been issued for that meeting.

**105. ASSET MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CABINET COMMITTEE - 16 JANUARY 2020**

The Portfolio Holder for Commercial & Regulatory Services, Cllr A Patel, presented the minutes from the meeting the Asset Management & Economic Development Cabinet Committee, held on 16 January 2020.

The Portfolio Holder reported that there were no recommendations to consider, but the Cabinet had received progress reports on Asset Management Development Projects, and Economic Development Projects.

**Decision:**

- (1) That the minutes of the meeting of the Asset Management & Economic Development Cabinet Committee, held on 16 January 2020, be noted.

**106. FINANCE AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT CABINET COMMITTEE - 23 JANUARY 2020**

In the absence of the Business Support Services Portfolio Holder, who had tendered her apologies for the meeting, the Leader of Council, Cllr C Whitbread, presented the minutes of the meeting of the Finance & Performance Management Cabinet Committee.

C Whitbread reported that there was one recommendation from the Cabinet Committee to consider, the approval of the updated Corporate Risk Register. In addition the Cabinet Committee had considered the Finance Strategy for 2020/21, Quarter 3 performance against the Council's Corporate Plan, and the development of the interim Council & Community Plan for 2020.

**Decision:**

- (1) That the minutes of the meeting of the Finance & Performance Management Cabinet Committee, held on 23 January 2020, be noted; and
- (2) That the updated Corporate Risk Register be approved.

**Reason for Decision:**

It was essential and good business practice for the Corporate Risk Register to be kept up to date.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

The Cabinet was satisfied that opportunities to suggest new corporate risks for inclusion or changes to existing risks on the Register had been available to Councillors at the meeting of the Cabinet Committee.

**107. NURTURING GROWTH - DELIVERING AN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

The Portfolio Holder for Community & Partnerships, Cllr N Bedford, introduced a report on the development of an Economic Strategy for the District.

Cllr Bedford reminded the Cabinet that it had been previously agreed the Council would produce an economic strategy following the adoption of the District's Local Plan. A strategy consultation document 'Nurturing Growth' was produced, which outlined a clear and long-term direction for economic growth across the Epping Forest District and identified key priorities and actions that could be adopted by stakeholders across the District to achieve this. The consultation document was released in draft, for consultation to a wide range of stakeholders in April 2019 and again in September 2019. The responses from the consultation periods had informed the development of the Economic Strategy.

The Cabinet was requested to approve the development and delivery of a five -year Economic Development Action Plan to enable the aspirations of Nurturing Growth to be realised and associated resourcing to enable this work to be undertaken. The Cabinet was also requested to agree the four priorities within the Action Plan, namely:

- (i) Local High Streets (recommendations from the Task & Finish Review);
- (ii) Rural Strategy;
- (iii) North Weald Airfield (Economic Growth); and
- (iv) Infrastructure.

Cllr Bedford explained that the Strategy had been drafted in advance of both the current Coronavirus pandemic and the significant package of measures announced by the Chancellor in the budget to support the economy. Officers would be ensuring that the prioritization of the Delivery Plan actions aligned with central government guidance and the needs of the local economy. The Cabinet noted the impact of the Coronavirus pandemic on the Strategy and the need for short-term delivery plans to support local businesses.

**Decision:**

- (1) That the results of the consultation on the Council's Economic Development Strategy '*Nurturing Growth*' be noted and the revised Strategy, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report, be adopted;
- (2) That the development of a delivery plan for Nurturing Growth be agreed, setting out a phased implementation programme that would be monitored as part of the revised Corporate Strategy;
- (3) That the prioritisation of the following four key actions over the course of the delivery plan be agreed:
  - (i) Local High Streets;
  - (ii) Rural Strategy;
  - (iii) North Weald Airfield as a location of economic growth; and
  - (iv) Infrastructure;
- (4) That the allocation of District Development Funding in the sum of £35,000 in 2020/21 and £50,000 in 2021/22 be agreed, as already



earmarked, for the appointment of a member of staff on a fixed term basis to deliver actions identified in the Strategy, including work to support the sustainability of local high streets.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The Nurturing Growth Strategy had been developed to provide a clear statement on the priorities and ambition of the District in terms of economic growth, at a time when the local economy faced sustained and dynamic change. A clear statement on the priorities and support for local economic growth would influence the policy and investment of a wide range of stakeholders in order to make Epping Forest 'a great place to live, work, study and do business'.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To not to adopt the strategy in its revised form. However, the District currently had no long-term plan to guide or support the local economy and the economic aspirations in the Local Plan. A series of operational priorities had been pursued over recent years and although these had been effective in the short term, there was no clear direction of travel or detailed understanding of areas of opportunity linked to regional and national plans and as such, this hampered the District's ability to bid for external economic support and funding.

**108. ICT STRATEGY**

The Portfolio Holder for Customer Services, Cllr S Kane, introduced a report on the replacement of the existing ICT Strategy with a new ICT Strategy for the period 2020-22.

Cllr S Kane reported that the current ICT Strategy had been drafted in 2017 for implementation throughout the period 2018-23. An independent review was recently carried out across ICT and the organisation to refocus on current and near future requirements. The outcome of the independent review was that a revised ICT Strategy would be required to focus on the expectations of the organisation for the next two years, by improving the basics and making better use of what the Council already had and the investments that the Council had already made. This aim promoted an element of the Council's Customer Strategy; fixing the basics and an element of the MHCLG Local Digital Declaration (attached at Appendix B of the report); fixing our own plumbing.

Councillor S Kane also noted the success of the Strategy by enabling remote and agile working during the current pandemic lockdown and the process undertaken by Officers in selecting HoTH as the internal client/customer CRM system employed by the ICT Service Desk. Councillor Kane noted comments concerning the adoption of a 'one phone' policy and assured members the suggestion would be considered.

**Decision:**

- (1) That the replacement of the existing ICT Strategy for 2018-23 with a revised ICT Strategy for 2020-22 be approved.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The current Strategy was developed in 2017. Since then, the organisation had progressed considerably and so had the requirements and expectations of ICT. Thus, the current Strategy was no longer fit for purpose.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To continue to work to the 2018-23 ICT Strategy; however, this was discounted as the Strategy was no longer fit for purpose and would not achieve the desired outcomes for the organisation.

**109. HARLOW AND GILSTON GARDEN TOWN DRAFT HEALTHY TOWN FRAMEWORK**

The Planning Services Portfolio Holder, Cllr J Philip, presented a report on the draft Healthy Town Framework for the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town (HGGT) proposed for public consultation.

Cllr J Philip reminded the Cabinet that Harlow and Gilston was designated as a Garden Town by the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government in January 2017 and would comprise new and existing communities in and around Harlow. The District Councils, Harlow, East Herts and Epping Forest were working together with Hertfordshire and Essex County Councils to ensure plans for the Garden Town supported sustainable living and a healthy economy; provided a good quality of life for existing and future residents; and responded to local landscape and character.

Cllr J Philip reported that the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town (HGGT) Vision had set out, as one of the objectives, that the Garden Town would be a healthy place to live. To ascertain the features that make a healthy town, the HGGT Team had commissioned the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) to prepare a Healthy Town Framework (draft Framework). A number of key stakeholders were involved in the preparation, including the NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups, NHS Trusts (including Princess Alexandra Hospital), Public Health England and the Harlow Health Centres Trust.

Cllr J Philip stated that the draft Healthy Town Framework provided a framework for realising the HGGT Vision and would provide guidance for development proposals to ensure the Garden Town became a healthy place to live and supported the wellbeing of existing and future residents. The draft Framework was agreed by the HGGT Member Board in July 2019 and the next stage was to seek agreement from this Council to publish for consultation.

Cllr S Neville enquired whether cycleways would be part of the plan for the Garden Town? Cllr J Philip confirmed that they would, and that cycle and pathways would be properly overlooked by residents to ensure the safety of the walkers and cyclists.

**Decision:**

- (1) That the publication of the draft Harlow and Gilston Garden Healthy Town Framework for a six-week period of public consultation be agreed; and
- (2) That, following the end of the public consultation, the Harlow and Gilston Garden Healthy Town Framework be updated; and
- (3) That the final version of the Harlow and Gilston Town Healthy Town Framework be submitted to a subsequent meeting of the Cabinet to be agreed as a material planning consideration for the preparation of masterplans, pre-application advice, assessing planning applications and any other development management purposes.

**Reasons for Decision:**

Following consultation and any subsequent revisions to the document, including the preparation of an accompanying Health Framework Action Plan, it was intended to give planning weight to the Framework by endorsing it as a material planning consideration. This status would ensure that development proposals would achieve garden town ambitions, and that clear parameters were established for future master planning pre-application advice, assessing planning applications and any other development management purposes within the Garden Town.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To not agree the draft Framework for consultation; however, this would mean that there would be no agreed approach to ensure that development proposals would achieve the Garden Town's ambitions to improve health and wellbeing.

**110. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LOCAL PLAN: UPDATE ON PROGRESS**

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Services, Cllr J Philip, presented a report updating the Cabinet on the progress made with the implementation of the Local Plan.

Cllr J Philip reminded the Cabinet that, following the Cabinet meeting in October 2018 which agreed the governance arrangements for the implementation of the Local Plan, the Implementation Team had made a commitment to provide members with regular updates on the progress of Masterplans and Concept Frameworks within the District to ensure that members were kept fully up to date.

Cllr J Philip reported that, although there had been a delay in the securing the adoption of the Local Plan, the strategic sites were progressing well and were currently on track to meet the delivery of housing noted within the Housing Implementation Strategy Update 2019 (see EB410A and EB410B). The Council was also continuing to work proactively to identify an interim approach to address the backlog of planning applications held in abeyance following the advice from Natural England, pending completion of the additional Habitats Regulations Assessment. Counsel's advice was awaited on the lawfulness of any proposed interim approach.

Cllr S Murray commented that local residents were appreciating the retained green space at Jessel Green for exercise during the current Coronavirus pandemic.

**Decision:**

- (1) That the progress of Masterplans and Concept Frameworks, including the use of Planning Performance Agreements and the progress of other proposals at pre-application and application stage, be noted.

**Reasons for Decision:**

To ensure that Members were kept fully up to date on the progress of Masterplans and Concept Frameworks and other major proposals being promoted within the District.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To not update members on the progress with the implementation of the Local Plan; however, that would be contrary to the commitment made by the Implementation

Team on 18 October 2018.

#### 111. GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Services, Cllr J Philip, presented a report requesting approval for the draft Green Infrastructure Strategy to begin public consultation.

Cllr J Philip stated that the Council's emerging Local Plan had set out policies in relation to Green and Blue Infrastructure, the protection of ecological assets and high quality design. To support these policies and address the requirement to provide suitable avoidance or mitigation measures to manage any potential impacts of growth on protected sites, primarily the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and a number of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI's), the Council had produced a Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy. This would ensure high quality Green and Blue Infrastructure, including the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Spaces (SANG), was delivered alongside the proposed growth in the District.

Cllr J Philip informed the Cabinet that this report therefore provided Members with an update on the aims, objectives and purpose of the Green Infrastructure Strategy and confirmed the proposed consultation programme on the Draft Strategy. The intention was that, following the consultation and any updates arising thereout, the final Strategy would be submitted to the Cabinet for endorsement as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, masterplans/concept frameworks and guide design and implementation processes.

#### **Decision:**

- (1) That the Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy (Appendix 1 of the report) be approved for public consultation for a six week period; and
- (2) That the Planning Services Director, in consultation with the Planning Portfolio Holder be authorised to make minor amendments to the Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy prior to the public consultation.

#### **Reasons for Decision:**

To ensure that Members were appraised on progress of the Green Infrastructure Strategy.

To comply with the Council's general obligations as a competent authority under the Habitats Directive [article 6(3)] and the Species and Habitats Regulations 2018 [Regulation 9(1)].

In response to the Planning Inspector's Advice dated 2 August 2019 (ED98) following the hearing sessions of the Local Plan examination for a SANG Strategy to mitigate the full effect of recreational pressure upon the Epping Forest SAC.

#### **Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To not bring forward the Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy for consultation; however, that would mean that there would be no guidance to support the delivery of development proposals and achieve the objectives set out in the Council's Local Plan policies SP 7, DM 1, DM 2, DM 16, T 1 and DM 6.

**112. CHRISTMAS - NEW YEAR ARRANGEMENTS**

The Portfolio Holder for Strategic Projects, Cllr A Lion, presented a report on the Christmas / New Year arrangements for the period 2020 – 22, which had originally been considered at the Group Leaders meeting on 1 April 2020.

Cllr A Lion reminded the Cabinet that for the past 18 years the Council had closed a number of Council buildings during the Christmas and New Year period. The closure of buildings was facilitated by fixing the 2 statutory days, accounting for the bank holidays and, where necessary, the Council giving an additional day(s) of annual leave to Staff. However, Council services continued to be provided during this period using a range of methods for our residents to contact us. The Council operated a website whereby our residents could access a range of information, they could request and pay for services and they could report issues within the District. In addition, an out-of-hours service was in place so that residents could speak to a individual to report an emergency issue. Outside of the Public/Bank Holidays, our Waste team was at work as were our Scheme Managers and North Weald Airfield (NWA).

Cllr A Lion reported that consultation had taken place with Service Managers and the Leadership Team about the impact of these Christmas/New Year arrangements on service provision to determine whether this would have a detrimental impact on service users. Service Managers, supported by the Leadership Team, were of the view that because of the continuing lower demand for services over this period, the most efficient way to meet this demand was by signposting the public to services rather than opening the Council offices. All essential services were covered either by the out of hours contact centre or specific staff on call over the period. Leadership Team supported the continuation of the arrangements for the next two years.

The Cabinet noted that the refurbishment of the main Civic Offices would have just been completed in December 2020, During 2021, there were likely to be additional services provided from this building and it was proposed that a review be undertaken, informed by a Customer Survey to be carried out in the coming months, to assess customer requirements regarding service provision. This review would encompass opening times throughout the year, including the Christmas/New Year period.

**Decision:**

- (1) That the Leadership Team's recommendation to continue the current Christmas/New Year arrangements for the period 2020-22, in accordance with the Schedule at Appendix 1 of the report, was agreed by the Leader of Council under Appendix 3 (Action in Designated Emergencies) of Article 7 (The Executive) of the Constitution on 1 April 2020 be noted; and
- (2) That a review of service provision across the Council be undertaken in 2021.

**Reasons for Decision:**

Previous consultation with employees had showed that 97% of respondents wished the current arrangements for the Council over the Christmas/New Year period to be continued. There were a range of ways our residents could access Council services during the Christmas / New Year period which did not require our buildings to be open.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To substitute other arrangements or decide to not continue with the current arrangements.

**113. ANY OTHER BUSINESS****Decision:**

(1) That, in accordance with Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the following items of urgent business be considered following the publication of the agenda:

- (a) Development Opportunity – St John the Baptist Church, Epping.

**114. DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY - ST JOHN THE BAPTIST CHURCH, EPPING**

The Portfolio Holder for Housing & Property Services, Cllr H Whitbread, presented a report on a development opportunity in partnership with the St John the Baptist Church in Epping.

Cllr H Whitbread informed the Cabinet that the Council had been approached by representatives of St John the Baptist Church to enquire as to whether there would be any appetite to undertake a joint project to develop a community hall and accommodation. The Church were keen to ringfence any residential accommodation for key workers, and the community hall would be utilized by the Church and other local groups. The full details were subject to negotiation; however, a brief report had been prepared by the Council's consultants, Metaplan. This had indicated that, subject to a mixture of affordable and shared ownership housing, the project would provide a healthy return for the Council over the period of the Business Plan. In addition, a much-needed community resource would also be created.

The Cabinet felt that this was an excellent scheme and a fantastic opportunity, although it was noted that there was currently no timescale for the completion of the Feasibility Study. It was suggested that this scheme should form part of the wider development in St Johns Road, Epping; however, the Leader of Council, Cllr C Whitbread, responded that this scheme had been worked on by the Church for a long time and was still a good opportunity for Epping.

**Decision:**

(1) That progression to carry out a full feasibility study on a joint project with St John the Baptist Church in Epping, in order to provide a community hall and accommodation for key workers, be approved.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The development of affordable housing supported the overall aspirations of the Councils Corporate Plan – Stronger Place, Stronger Communities.

The opportunity to partner with St John the Baptist Church provided both financial and community partnership benefits for the Council.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To not progress to full feasibility, in which case the Church would contract with a private developer.

**115. COMMUNITY INTEREST COMPANY**

The Leader of Council, Cllr C Whitbread, presented a report on the establishment of a Community Interest Company within the Qualis Group.

Cllr C Whitbread informed the Cabinet that Community Interest Companies (CICs) were a new type of limited company for organisations wishing to establish businesses which traded with social purpose, or to carry on other activities for the benefit of the community. The CIC would sit well with the other Qualis Limited Companies and provide a useful form for holding assets such as community halls and facilities, as well as trading in a conventional sense through the provision of goods and services. It would be registered as a Company Limited by shares and would need to describe the community or section of the community that the company's activities would benefit, so as to enable the regulator to decide the company's eligibility for CIC status.

Cllr C Whitbread stated that the existence of such a company was deemed to allow public realm and public services to be delivered in a flexible way whilst being attentive to local need as well as being a useful vehicle for potential future schemes where community support was essential, e.g. solar farms and water management measures. The formation of such a company would also offer appropriate financial and tax flexibility. In addition, the existence of a CIC with the support of the Qualis Group but locally focused would allow it to immediately play a role in the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town Project. Also, some of the Epping Town Centre sites and other potential developments across the District might have areas of public realm or community assets that would benefit from being operated through the Qualis Community Interest Company.

The Strategic Director, S Jevans, explained that the Cabinet was being requested to approve the establishment of the CIC, which would support the work of the Qualis Group. The benefit for the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town project had already been highlighted, and this was an exciting opportunity. It was not expected that the articles to comply with the CIC Regulations 2005 would be submitted to the Cabinet for approval. The registration process would be followed and, if successful, the CIC would report back to the Council on a quarterly and annual basis.

Cllr C Whitbread clarified that only one share would be issued for the CIC, and it would be wholly owned by the Council. The projects that had been scheduled for the CIC would benefit the local community and help to stimulate the local economy after the Coronavirus pandemic had ended.

**Decision:**

- (1) That the establishment of the Qualis Community Interest Company be approved in accordance with the following principles:
  - (a) to improve the economic, social and general wellbeing of the public through a sustainable approach to providing public infrastructure and services;

- (b) to operate in the Epping Forest District Council area, adjacent authorities and broader East of England initiatives (with partners);
- (c) to set up a representative steering group for each defined project that would make recommendations to the Qualis Community Interest Board (effectively the Qualis Group Board); and
- (d) to report the activity of the Community Interest Company to the Council on a quarterly and annual basis in line with the proposals for the other Qualis group companies.

**Reasons for Decision:**

It was important that the Council took an active role in the social and community benefits for its residents and this approach would enable a company structure to achieve significant long-term advantages. The governance that sits around the existing Qualis Group of companies would provide the skills and experience to manage this new company.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To not proceed with the set-up of this company within the existing structure; however, this would mean that the Council would potentially lose the community interest opportunities within the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town. In the same way, there would be many opportunities for the Council to create community benefit on existing Council-owned sites, such as the St John's Road development.

**116. COUNCIL OWNED SITES - SALE OF ASSETS TO QUALIS COMMERCIAL**

The Leader of Council introduced a report on the sale of Council-owned sites to Qualis Commercial, which was presented by S Jevans, Strategic Director.

S Jevans reminded the Cabinet that the Council had established a new Group of companies, including the development company known as Qualis Commercial. This company had been working on the business plan and development appraisals for the sites that were being proposed for asset sale from the Council into Qualis Commercial. The Cabinet was requested to note that the business case had been put together from the perspective of Qualis Commercial as a development company. At this pre-planning stage the business case predicted an indicative target developer return of 15%. The business case had also examined all major risks and sensitivities and under these circumstances the development was still considered financially worthwhile, with contingencies being built in to reflect uncertainties.

The Cabinet was also requested to note that whilst any land transaction would be between the Council and Qualis Commercial to reduce transaction costs, the loans would be between the Council and the Qualis Group who would then cascade these resources as needed to Qualis Commercial. This loan cascade would purposefully allow the Council to advance funding to Qualis with long term certainty around returns but would also allow individual companies in the Qualis Group to draw and repay monies within the Group (in line with normal commercial practice).

The Strategic Director stated that the Qualis Commercial business plan included development appraisals and sensitivity analysis for the following sites:

- St John's Road in Epping;
- Cottis Lane car park in Epping;
- Bakers Lane car park in Epping;



- The Epping Leisure Centre in Hemnall Street;
- land at the Civic Offices, the Conder building; and
- the Roundhills Site in Waltham Abbey.

S Jevans reported that on 6 February 2020, the Cabinet had approved the establishment of the interim Qualis Group Board. Assuming the transfer of sites into Qualis Commercial, the Group Board would oversee the detailed work required to develop each site into a full business case. Following the transfer of the sites to Qualis Commercial, the Qualis Group Board would oversee the development of full business cases on a site by site basis as designs were developed during the pre-application process. This would require the appointment of the design team and a commitment to further costs associated with detailed architectural design work required to develop the full business case ready for submission to planning.

Finally, S Jevans highlighted that a revision clause would be placed into the sale contract allowing all properties to return to the ownership of the Council at the value they were sold for unless they were developed within five years of this proposed sale.

Cllr S Murray expressed his scepticism about the process and was concerned at the potential loss of control and influence over the development of these sites. However, Cllr C Whitbread took a different view by stating that – historically – the Council would have sold such sites to a major developer for a one-off capital sum, but this approach gave the Council more control and influence over the developments, such as the planned new Sports Centre in St Johns Road, Epping. These developments would bring long-term benefits to residents and the revenue would enable the Council to fund its services into the future.

Cllr J M Whitehouse highlighted the importance of regularly reporting progress with these development projects to Members, and wanted to know when further details on these developments would be available. S Jevans responded that the detailed business cases for the schemes were being progressed and would hopefully be finished within the next month; these would then feed into the detailed planning process, which is when Members would start to see how the sites would look like when completed.

Cllr J M Whitehouse also highlighted the planning risk if the Council attempted to put more units on a site than outlined in the District's emerging Local Plan. S Jevans acknowledged this and stated that the business planning process had included the risk of development schemes being revised as they progressed through the planning process. The Chief Operating Officer, N Dawe, accepted that the figures for each site would be likely to change during the next three – six months, but the progress of each scheme would be reported to the Council every quarter to provide transparency.

Cllr J M Whitehouse also enquired about the consultation and planning strategies for these sites. N Dawe agreed that there would be issues arising for these sites, especially from the multiple site development planned for Epping, but that the Council's Planning Officers would determine the applications in accordance with the Council's agreed Planning Policies and recommend accordingly to the Council's Planning Committees. The Planning Policy Manager, A Blom-Cooper, added that all of the consultations planned for these sites would be conducted in accordance with the Council's agreed Statement of Community Involvement, and that discussions were already taking place with Officers in Qualis as to which consultations could be commenced during the current Coronavirus pandemic.

Cllr S Heap enquired if there was confidence in the ability of Qualis and its staff to deliver these projects on time and within budget, and whether the obligation to offer the 'Right-to-Buy' scheme for new Council houses was being removed. Cllr C Whitbread reassured Cllr S Heap that if Council housing was developed then there was a legal obligation to offer the 'Right-to-Buy' scheme for tenants. However, if social or affordable housing was developed then there was no obligation to offer the 'Right-to-Buy' scheme. The current Council Housebuilding Programme had suffered from delays due to the type of sites that the Council was looking to develop, such as former garage blocks, but the Council was looking to make up the time on these sites now. The Chief Executive, G Blakemore, added that the recruitment requirements for Qualis employees had been very clear to ensure that candidates with the right skills were attracted

**Decision:**

(1) That the following sale of assets be approved to support the business case with all asset purchases to be made by 30 April 2020:

(a) That the following identified properties be sold by the Council to Qualis Commercial on a 'best value' basis based on existing use values:

- (i) The St John's Road, Epping site for £5,400,000;
- (ii) Bakers Lane Car Park for £2,348,000;
- (iii) Cottis Lane Car Park for £3,737,000;
- (iv) The Condor Building (Civic Centre) for £3,100,000;
- (v) The Hemnall Street, Epping site (Epping Sports Centre) for £2,550,000; and
- (vi) The Round Hills, Waltham Abbey site for £3,060,000;

(b) That a loan be granted to the Qualis Group, to be cascaded to Qualis Commercial to allow these purchases to be made, in the sum of £22,000,000 on a single draw down facility over a 30-year principal and interest basis; and

(c) That a revision clause be inserted into the sale contract allowing all properties to return to the Council's ownership at the value sold if they were not developed within five years of the sale.

(2) That the granting of a development and construction loan be approved in support of the business case and that the decision on making these loans be dependent upon the completion of satisfactory site business cases by 30 September 2020:

(a) That a development loan be provided by the Council to the Qualis Group, to be cascaded to Qualis Commercial; and

(b) That the terms of the loan be in the total sum of £63,000,000 - with 50% to be drawn down on 30 September 2020 and 50% to be drawn down on 31 March 2021 - on a 30-year equal principal and interest basis;

(3) That decisions (1) and (2) above be made specifically in respect of:

- (a) the provision of a leisure centre on the St John's Road site following further specification and agreement reflecting the ownership, capital and ongoing operational arrangements before the development commences;
- (b) that the re-provision of the Town Council on the St John's Road site might require a net subsidy of £1,000,000 (after costs less development return) and was still to be approved;
- (c) the indicative project timelines set out in paragraph 10 of the report;
- (d) the establishment of a separate Community Interest company to include elements of the public realm and community benefit assets (see agenda item 16); and
- (e) all recommendations were fully in accordance with the values set out and approved in the 2020/21 budget.

**Reasons for Decision:**

The medium-term financial plan and the 2020/21 budget had set out the aspirations to develop these council owned sites through the development company, Qualis Commercial. This transfer of land ownership would create the opportunity to develop the sites in accordance with the Council's vision, Asset Management Strategy and Medium-Term Financial Strategy.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

To not transfer the land ownership of the sites would delay the projects and effect the ability to achieve the 2020/21 budget and Medium-Term Financial Strategy. The development of these sites was fundamental in achieving long term financial stability for the Council.

**117. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

The Cabinet noted that there was no business for consideration which would necessitate the exclusion of the public and press from the virtual meeting.

**CHAIRMAN**

This page is intentionally left blank

## EPHING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Committee:** Council Housebuilding Cabinet Committee      **Date:** Thursday, 12 March 2020

**Place:** Council Chamber - Civic Offices      **Time:** 7.00 - 7.45 pm

**Members Present:** H Whitbread (Chairman), N Avey, A Patel and C Whitbread

**Other Councillors:** A Lion

**Apologies:** J Philip and S Stavrou

**Officers Present:** D Fenton (Service Manager (Housing Management & Home Ownership)), J Leither (Democratic Services Officer) and S Mitchell (PR Website Editor)

---

### 19. WEBCASTING INTRODUCTION

The Chairman reminded everyone present that the meeting would be broadcast live to the internet and that the Council had adopted a protocol for the webcasting of its meeting.

### 20. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

The Cabinet Committee noted that Councillor C Whitbread would substitute for Councillor S Stavrou at the meeting.

### 21. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest pursuant to the Council's Code of Member Conduct.

### 22. MINUTES

**Resolved:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 December 2019 be taken as read and signed by the Chairman.

### 23. PROGRESS REPORT - PHASES 4 TO 6

The Service Manager, Housing Management and Home Ownership presented a report the Cabinet Committee, she advised that the report set out the progress that had been made across Phase 4 of the Council Housebuilding programme that had either been completed, were on-site or were currently being procured.

Package 4.1 comprised of 14x units that had been tendered and were approved at CHBCC on 19 December 2019. Package 4.2 comprised on 22x units and were now being tendered the outcome would be reported to the Council Housebuilding Cabinet Committee (CHBCC) meeting in June 2020. Package 4.3 comprised of 49x units,

previously 31x units. This package had been reviewed, resulting in some additional potential units being identified. The proposals were being progressed for planning submission, tender and reporting to the CHBCC. Package 4.4 comprised of 5x units and were now being technically progressed.

#### **Phase 4 – package 4.1**

The first group of sites within package 4.1 were competitively tendered and presented for approval at the 19 December 2019 CHBCC meeting. Package 4.1 relates to sites at Chequers Road (Site A - 3 x Properties), Bushfields (2 x Properties), Loughton. Package 2 – Chester Road (3 x Properties), Loughton. Package 3 – Queensway (4 x Properties) and Millfield (2 x Properties), Ongar, delivering the first 14 properties.

A pre-start meeting has been held, and contracts have now been issued for signing. Currently, post-tender and client changes are being priced to enable the Contractor to take possession imminently.

#### **Phase 4 – package 4.2**

Package 4.2 were currently out for tender to deliver 22 properties, comprising Hornbeam Close (B) – 3x units, Hornbeam House – 2x units, Bourne House – 2x units, Etheridge Road – 3 x units, Denny Avenue – 3 x units, Beechfield Walk – 5 x units and Kirby Close – 4 x units.

The role of the 'Principal Architect' and their involvement in the procurement of the sub-consultants, surveys and the associated scope of works had been reviewed and amended following which, it was anticipated that this may result in c£150k to c£200k of savings in the fees going forward.

#### **Phase 4 – package 4.3**

Package 4.3 comprised of Lower Alderton Hall Lane – 2x units, Inclusion of Lower Alderton Hall Lane was pending. This site was currently awaiting planning consent to be released pending the resolution with regards to the Local Plan and Natural England.

Pick Hill, Waltham Abbey – 2x units are progressing now potential drainage outfalls have been identified. The Council have reviewed the potential scope of the site at Ladyfields, Loughton, which previously had approval for six units, was now being re-planned to deliver c17x units. Woollard Street, Waltham Abbey, had been redesigned as the consented scheme was undeliverable as the ridge height exceeded the permissible height. Pentlow Way, Buckhurst Hill – 7x units and Chequers Road (B) – 5x units, have been delayed pending agreement with Thames Water to permit build over contracts which have only recently been confirmed. Chequers Road (B) was consented for 5x units however it was being reviewed as it may be possible to deliver c12x units totalling c49x units (previously approved 31x units), These schemes would now progress to tender in March/April 2020.

#### **Phase 4 – package 4.4**

Package 4.4 sites comprised of 5x units in total. Thatcher's Close, Loughton – 1x unit, Broomfield Court, Waltham Abbey – 1x unit, Shingle Court, Waltham Abbey – 1x unit, Stoneysshots, Waltham Abbey – 1x unit and Wrangley Court, Waltham Abbey – 1x unit. These were now being technically assessed with the aim of them being tendered in June/July 2020.

**Phase 5 & 6**

Work to identify sites for the above phases was due to be completed by mid-March, following this officers will begin to hold briefings with members to start the consultation process. Reports will be presented to the next CHBCC meeting.

**Phases 2 & 3**

Burton Road had six units which were completed however, challenges over the location of a gas pipe was still outstanding, although a resolution was close to being reached. A further update would be provided at the next CHBCC meeting. Queens Road, which had a delayed start due to contamination was now on target to be completed in August 2020, this was in line with the revised target date.

**Sales**

Whitehills site was to be sold at auction in March 2020.

**Rights of Way issues**

The Rights of Way/Access issues stemming from the Appropriation process were being addressed in line with the phased programme. A policy was being developed to ensure a fair and consistent approach was being taken.

The Chairman advised the Cabinet Committee that the Burton Road development, Phases 2 and 3, was due to be opened but had now been postponed due to the Coronavirus pandemic.

Councillor A Patel asked if Package 4.3 which was originally 31x units and had now been increased to provide 49x units, for clarification was this increase due to the Local Plan and had it been justified.

The Service Manager advised that she did not have that information to hand and would speak to her colleague Mr Cosgrave, who worked on the technical side and would report back at the next meeting of the CHBCC meeting. She added that through the RTB the Council lost 30 units a year therefore sites were being reviewed to maximise the potential of these sites to counteract this loss.

**Decision:**

That the contents of this Progress Report on Phases 4 to 6 of the Council House Building Programme be noted and presented to the Cabinet in line with the Terms of Reference of the Council House Building Cabinet Committee.

**Reasons for the Decision:**

Set out in its Terms of Reference, the Council House Building Cabinet Committee was to monitor and report to the Council on an annual basis progress and expenditure concerning the Council House Building Programme. This report sets out the progress made over the last 12 months.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

This report was on the progress made over the last 12 months and was for noting purposes only. There are no other options for action.

## 24. PURCHASE OF STREET PROPERTIES

The Service Manager, Housing Management and Home Ownership presented a report to the Cabinet Committee, she advised the report set out the progress that had been made in allocating the Council's Right to Buy receipts in line with the report which was agreed by the Council Housebuilding Cabinet Committee in July 2015.

Offers had been made and accepted on 18 properties across the district. The total spend amounts to £6,374,329m which was made up of 30% Right to Buy receipts and the remaining funded from the capital house building programme. Furthermore, the Council's Consultants have taken into account the construction methods, so as not to risk increased asset management challenges which was often the case with older properties such as pre-1945's. The Council were working towards an exchange by the end of the financial year to meet Government requirements.

In July 2015, the Council House Building Cabinet Committee considered a report on accelerating the house building programme to ensure that all 1-4-1 Receipts from Right to Buy sales were spent within the required three years of receipt and none were passed on to the Government, with interest. One of the options agreed was to purchase street properties. The recommendations of the Cabinet Committee were later agreed by the Cabinet.

To assist the Council, Steven Tarry (Metaplan – CIHCM Development Director) was appointed by the Council. The instruction included sourcing street properties which were chain free and were not pre – 1945's (the construction method made them difficult to treat).

### Overview of the properties

While the offers have been accepted, legal searches, property surveys and independent valuation surveys would need to be completed before exchange. Subject to a satisfactory outcome, it was recommended that the Council completed the purchase of the street properties, with a view to letting them at an affordable rent in line with the Rent Policy.

Councillor C Whitbread stated that although this was not the best way to spend the Right to Buy receipts, but at this time if the Council did not buy street properties they would have to pay the Government the receipts plus interest. He asked that in the future could officers not contact corporate companies that do part exchanges with a developer. The Service Manager advised that the plan going forward was never to be in this situation again.

Councillor A Lion asked how many empty properties there were in the district. The Service Manager stated that she did not know as this came under a different section.

Councillor C Whitbread asked when the Council sold a property did the Council have the first offer to buy back. The Service Manager advised that the Council did but this had not previously happened. Going forward she assured the Cabinet Committee that this would now happen.

### Decision:

That the contents of the Progress Report on the purchase of 18 street properties be noted and presented to the Cabinet in line with the Terms of Reference of the Council Housebuilding Cabinet Committee.



**Reasons for the Decision:**

To give the Cabinet assurance that all of the Councils 1-4-1 Receipts from Right to Buy (RTB) sales were spent within the required three years of receipt, and none were passed on to the Government, with Interest. The Cabinet agreed on the recommendations of the Council Housebuilding Cabinet Committee to delegate the authority to the Service Director to source properties for sale on the open market, make verbal offers to purchase and make recommendations to the Housing Portfolio Holder to agree their purchase.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

Not to purchase these properties and pass on the Receipts to Government with interest. This would not be in the best interest of the Council given the local housing need. Also, the strain put on the Council's Housing Revenue Account (HRA) due to the loss of stock under RTB would worsen.

**25. IMPACT OF RIGHT TO BUY AND COUNCIL HOUSE BUILDING PROGRAMME ON THE HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT**

The Service Manager, Housing Management and Home Ownership presented a report the Cabinet Committee, she advised the report was an initial report, highlighting the impact of the Right to Buy (RTB) purchases on the Housing Revenue Account.

The number of properties purchased under the RTB since 1977 was 4876. This amounted to a loss of nearly 50% of EFDC Council Housing stock. Furthermore, the impact on the Housing Revenue Account in today's money amounts to approximately £25m per year. On average RTB completions are in the region of 30 per year. Since 2012 Councils have been able to use the RTB receipts to part fund street purchases or a building programme. EFDC has a house building programme, to date 108 properties have been built. The current build programme was based on delivery of a total of 370 properties to 2024.

The Council's current programme will mitigate the RTB purchases, however this would only increase the Council's stock by 0.7% year on year if continued at the current rate (2021 72 properties). However, RTB creates an ongoing risk to the HRA, and before agreeing the next programme the Cabinet Committee will need to consider whether the programme should seek to introduce a pipeline which will continue to increase overall housing stock.

To mitigate the loss of Right to Buy and increase the Council's housing stock by 1% per year, the Council would need to have a council house building programme which delivered 90 units a year. The Local Plan was currently a barrier to this as there were no sites which were allocated for council house building. Furthermore, the opportunity to build on smaller sites was limited as the local plan had only a small number of 'windfall' sites (sites which were not allocated) which were permitted to proceed each year.

Moving forward, an annual report will give the context required to help Members understand the impact of the RTB and the number of new build properties needed if the Council chooses to mitigate the future losses to the HRA.

**Decision:**

That the contents of this initial report be noted. That a follow-up report was received on an annual basis to understand the ongoing impact of the Right to Buy (RTB) on the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and the steps being taken to mitigate this via the Council House Building Programme.

**Reasons for the Decision:**

Set out in its Terms of Reference, the Council House Building Cabinet Committee was to monitor and report to the Council on an annual basis progress and expenditure concerning the Council House Building Programme. It was suggested that this included the ongoing impact annually on the HRA from RTB, and mitigation by the ongoing Council Housing programme.

**Other Options Considered and Rejected:**

This report sets out the historical impact of RTB on the HRA, and the options to mitigate it going forward. There are no other options for action.

**26. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The Cabinet Committee noted that there was no other urgent business for consideration.

**27. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

The Cabinet Committee noted that there were no items of business on the agenda that necessitated the exclusion of the public and press from the meeting.

**CHAIRMAN**

## **Report to the Cabinet**

**Report reference:** C-001-2020/21

**Date of meeting:** 01 June 2020



**Epping Forest  
District Council**

**Portfolio:** Housing and Property – Cllr Holly Whitbread

**Subject:** Acceptance of Tenders – Contract 590, External Maintenance Repairs and Redecoration Programme 2020-25, to Council owned properties within Epping Forest District.

**Responsible Officer:** Haydn Thorpe (01992 564162).

**Democratic Services:** Adrian Hendry (01992 564246).

---

### **Recommendations/Decisions Required:**

(1) That, Gracelands Complete Maintenance Ltd be awarded the 1-year contract renewable annually for up to a maximum of 4-further years, for the external maintenance repairs and redecorating to Council-owned properties with an overall weighted price and quality score of 83.7%; and

(2) That, Wilton Decorators Ltd be selected as the Council's Reserve Tenderer and that, should it not be possible to enter into contract with Gracelands Complete Maintenance Ltd for some reason, Wilton Decorators Ltd be awarded the 1-year contract renewable annually for up to a maximum of 4-further years, for the renewal of the external maintenance repairs and redecorating to Council-owned properties, being the second most economically advantageous tender received, with an overall weighted price and quality score of 79.8%; and

(3) That, the overall value of the works be capped to the sums included in the Housing Revenue Account 2020-21 for the External Maintenance Repairs and Redecoration Programme on an annual basis; and

(4) That, this contract be designated as a serial contract to facilitate the annual adjustment to the tendered rates in accordance with the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) BCIS ALLCOS Resource Cost Index of All Construction: All Repair and Maintenance Work #7419.

### **Executive Summary:**

In order to undertake the Planned External Maintenance Repairs and Redecoration Programme to Council-owned properties during the financial year 2020-21 and over the following 4-year period it was necessary to undertake a procurement exercise based on the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) taking cost and quality into account to satisfy the Council's Procurement Rules.

### **Reasons for Proposed Decision:**

The current contract for the Planned External Maintenance Repairs and Redecoration Programme expires in June 2020 and therefore requires to be re-tendered in accordance with the Council's Procurement Rules.

The Council undertake a rolling programme of external maintenance repairs and redecoration on all Council owned properties in order to maintain the condition and the fabric of the buildings. A 5-year contract is required for the Planned External Maintenance Repairs and Redecoration Programme 2020-25, to prevent Council-owned properties falling into disrepair and subsequently fail the Decent Homes Standard.

The undertaking of a procurement exercise for works of this value is not only a requirement of the Council's Procurement Rules but is also a requirement of Section 20 of the Commonhold and Leasehold Reform Act 2002 when external maintenance repairs and redecorating works are undertaken on Council owned and managed blocks of flats.

### **Other Options for Action:**

The main alternative options considered are:

- (1) To re-tender the contract on an annual basis. However, this would be time consuming and inefficient. Re-tendering would not guarantee more competitive tenders due to the benefits of economies of scale and programme certainty that long-term contracts provide.
- (2) To re-tender the works based on price alone. However, this would not necessarily return a more competitive tender and would not identify or quantify a quality commitment from the lowest tenderer.
- (3) To seek quotations on an individual basis for every planned maintenance repairs and redecorating project and issue property specific HRP Works Orders. However, this is very time consuming and is not cost effective and given the volume of planned external maintenance repairs and redecorating projects carried out per annum, this would breach the Council's Procurement Rules C2 (9) with the works exceeding £25,000 in value during one financial year.

### **Report:**

1. The existing contract for the Planned External Maintenance Repairs and Redecoration Programme 2020-25 for works to Council-owned properties is due to expire and therefore in order to complete the programme it is necessary to re-tender the works.
2. The total budget for Planned External Maintenance Repairs and Redecoration Programme within the existing Housing Revenue Account 2020-21 is £500,000.
3. A tendering exercise has been undertaken for the Planned External Maintenance Repairs and Redecoration Programme to Council-properties. The Planned External Maintenance Repairs and Redecoration Programme 2020-25 tender has been based on 5-schedules of rates and the estimated repairs and redecorating works to around 59-blocks of flats included in the 2020-21 programme.
4. Incorporating the lessons learnt from previous contracts, the Council has undertaken a tender exercise in accordance with the Council's Procurement Rules, based on and assessed in terms of the MEAT with the criteria based on quality and cost. The qualitative responses made up 20% of the overall tender evaluation with cost representing 80%.
5. Tenderers were advised that the qualitative assessment would be based on a possible score of 20% which is split across a set of weighted quality questions shown in the table below;

Quality Method Statement Questions;	Reference;	Maximum Score;
Management and Resources;	1.1	10%
Staff Capability;	1.2	10%
	Total;	20%

6. Tenderers were also advised that the Cost Element Submission of the tender would be based on a total possible score of 80% which is split across the 5-Schedules of Rates which make up the price framework.

Schedule of Rate Description;	Reference;	Maximum Score;
Health and Safety, Surveys, Site and Office Overheads;	01	10%
Painting Schedule of Rates;	02	20%
Pre-Painting Repairs Schedule of Rates;	03	20%
Total HRP Works Order NHF v7 Variance;	04	10%
Total Estimated Pre-Painting Repairs and Redecorating 2020-21	05	20%
	Total;	80%

7. Tenderers were required to provide individual costs for every schedule of rate item contained in the schedules of rates even if the value of the item is a £0.00 cost. This will ensure a level and transparent tender exercise and confirm that the tenderer has at least considered and competitively priced every item.
8. The contract, initially for a period of one-year is renewable annually up to a maximum of five-years, subject to the budget allocation within the Housing Revenue Account and the contractor's performance and quality of workmanship.
9. The Service Manager Property Maintenance authorised the Contractor Selection Record Sheet for Invitations to Tender to be sent to 9-Contractors who are registered on Constructionline on the 19<sup>th</sup> December 2019.
10. Invitations to tender were issued by the Service Manager Property Maintenance on the 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2019, to the following 9-Contractors who are registered on Constructionline and are experienced in undertaking this type of work.

It should be noted that 5-Contractors shown in bold text in the table below were Leaseholder Nominated contractors and are not known to the Council.

Contractor;		Constructionline Registration Number;
1.	<b>Bell Group UK Ltd</b>	<b>4079</b>
2.	<b>Rose Construction Ltd</b>	<b>00442744</b>
3.	<b>Etec Group Ltd</b>	<b>78124</b>
4.	<b>MG Construction Ltd</b>	<b>95353</b>
5.	<b>Topcoat Construction Ltd (TCL)</b>	<b>23511</b>
6.	Wilton Decorators Ltd	00421368
7.	Flowline Builders Ltd	126527
8.	Gracelands Complete Maintenance Ltd	51468
9.	WH Construction Ltd	192670

11. The tenderers were advised that their completed scanned Tender Submission for the Planned External Maintenance Repairs and Redecoration Programme 2020-25, must be uploaded into the Delta eSourcing Tender-box no later than 12 o'clock midday on Friday 24<sup>th</sup> January 2020.
12. It should be noted that a small extension of time was requested on the 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2020 by ETEC Group Ltd. All tenderers who hadn't submitted their tender documents were advised that their Tender Submission should be returned completed in full through Delta eSourcing Tender-box no later than 17:00 hours on Friday 24<sup>th</sup> January 2020.
13. The tenders were opened on the 5<sup>th</sup> February 2020, through the Delta eSourcing platform, and present at the tender opening were the Housing and Property - Portfolio Holder and three representatives of Epping Forest District Council, a Committee Officer, the Service Manager Property Maintenance and the Team Manager Operational Assets and Compliance.
14. Invitations to tender were sent to 9-Contractors and 8-Contractors uploaded tender return documents into Delta eSourcing Tender-box before the return date and time. The results of the tender opening based only on the Contractors Cost Element Submission is shown in the table below;

Contractor;		Tender Sum £;	Position;
1.	Bell Group UK Ltd	525,890.57	4th
2.	Rose Construction Ltd	1,145,143.48	8th
3.	Etec Group Ltd	770,513.85	7th
4.	MG Construction Ltd	Did not return	
5.	Topcoat Construction Ltd (TCL)	608,003.01	5th
6.	Wilton Decorators Ltd	415,550.48	1st
7.	Flowline Builders Ltd	509,609.80	3rd
8.	Gracelands Complete Maintenance Ltd	471,673.18	2nd
9.	WH Construction Ltd	687,651.02	6th

15. A full Tender Evaluation Report was undertaken on all 8-tenders submitted. The Tender Evaluation Report included a weighted assessment of the tenderers' Quality Method

Statement Questions and the table below shows the results of the Contractors Quality Method Statement Questions as the Contractors' Total Weighted Score %;

Quality Assessment Method Statement Question Results			
Contractor;	Max total % score available;	Tenderers total % score;	Quality Assessment Result;
Bell Group UK Ltd	20	14.3	4th
Rose Construction Ltd	20	6.0	7th
Etec Group Ltd	20	15.3	2nd
MG Construction Ltd	Did not return		
Topcoat Construction Ltd (TCL)	20	14.9	3rd
Wilton Decorators Ltd	20	6.9	6th
Flowline Builders Ltd	20	7.1	5th
Gracelands Complete Maintenance Ltd	20	16.0	1st
WH Construction Ltd	20	5.8	8th

16. The Tender Evaluation Report also included a weighted assessment of the tenderers' Cost Element Submission which included a full arithmetical check, a comparison of the tenderers' submitted schedule of rate items and the identification of any pricing inconsistencies or omissions.
17. The Tender Evaluation Report identified 2-pricing inconsistencies within the tenderers submitted rates and clarification was sought on the following;
- Estimated and Actual Surveys, Site and Office Overheads Flats;
  - Estimated and Actual Surveys, Site and Office Overheads House;
  - Item 700 Supply and fit metal balustrading to staircase complete as clause 90;
18. The Variance column in the table below highlights the difference between the tendered sums and the corrected tender sums;

Contractor;	Tender Sum £;	Corrected Tender Sum £	Variance £
1. Bell Group UK Ltd	525,890.57	549,470.57	23,580
2. Rose Construction Ltd	1,145,143.48	1,176,959.59	31,816.11
3. Etec Group Ltd	770,513.85	770,513.85	0.00
4. MG Construction Ltd	Did not return		
5. Topcoat Construction Ltd (TCL)	608,003.01	661,996.26	53,993.25
6. Wilton Decorators Ltd	415,550.48	393,725.48	-21,825.00
7. Flowline Builders Ltd	509,609.80	509,609.80	0.00
8. Gracelands Complete Maintenance Ltd	471,673.18	453,973.18	-17,700.00
9. WH Construction Ltd	687,651.02	687,651.02	0.00

19. The percentage scores for both the Quality Method Statement Question Results and the Corrected Cost Element Results submitted by each tenderer is added together to determine the Overall Corrected Tender Evaluation Score.
20. The combined scores of the tenderers Quality Method Statement Questions and the tenderers corrected Cost Element Submissions, have been evaluated strictly in accordance with the MEAT criteria referenced. The results are set out in the table below:

Overall Corrected Tendered Evaluation Results				
Contractor;	Quality Assessment Total Weighted Score Percentage	Cost Element Total Weighted Score Percentage	ITT Evaluation Result Corrected Cost and Quality Submissions	Contractors Overall Position
Bell Group UK Ltd	14.3	55.4	69.6	3rd
Rose Construction Ltd	6.0	24.0	30.0	8th
Etec Group Ltd	15.3	37.6	52.9	6th
MG Construction Ltd	Did not return			
Topcoat Construction Ltd (TCL)	14.9	43.3	58.2	5th
Wilton Decorators Ltd	6.9	72.9	79.8	2nd
Flowline Builders Ltd	7.1	57.4	64.5	4th
Gracelands Complete Maintenance Ltd	16.0	67.7	83.7	1st
WH Construction Ltd	5.8	38.4	44.2	7th

21. The Contractors Overall Position are;
- Gracelands Complete Maintenance Ltd in overall position 1;
  - Wilton Decorators Ltd in overall position 2;
  - Bell Group UK Ltd in overall position 3;
22. It is therefore recommended that Gracelands Complete Maintenance Ltd, be awarded the contract for the Planned External Maintenance Repairs and Redecoration Programme 2020-25, for work to Council owned properties within Epping Forest District with annual expenditure limited to the budget included in the Housing Revenue Account, for up to a maximum of 5-years in the sum of £471,673.18 being the most economically advantageous tender received with overall percentage figures for Cost and Quality totalling 83.7%.

Contractor;	Overall Percentage;	Position;
1. Gracelands Complete Maintenance Ltd	83.7%	1 <sup>st</sup>
2. Wilton Decorators Ltd	79.8%	2 <sup>nd</sup>

23. A review of the Constructionline Supplier Report has been undertaken on the 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2020, which includes a financial check on Gracelands Complete Maintenance Ltd. The outcome revealed that in the latest set of financial accounts Gracelands Complete Maintenance Ltd has



a turnover of £8,160,194 for 2019-20, a further review will be undertaken prior to the contract award.

24. Gracelands Complete Maintenance Ltd, is an experienced contractor with a good track record of working with the Council and have in the past provided both a quality service and value for money on a consistent basis.
25. In order to mitigate the risk to the Council not being able to carry out the external maintenance repairs and redecorating programme 2020-21 due to not being able to enter into a contract with Gracelands Complete Maintenance Ltd for whatever reason or if in the future they cease trading or perform poorly, it is recommended that Wilton Decorators Ltd be selected as the Council's Reserve Tenderer for planned external maintenance repairs and redecoration to Council-owned properties, and awarded an annual contract for up to 5-years, being the second most economically advantageous tender received, with overall percentage figures for Cost and Quality totalling 79.8%.
26. It should be noted that when the contract is extended beyond the first year, all tendered schedule of rate items, are to be increased annually in accordance with the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) BCIS ALLCOS Resource Cost Index of All Construction: All Repair and Maintenance Work #7419.

#### **Resource Implications:**

£500,000 is currently allocated within the existing Housing Revenue Account 2020-21 for the Planned External Maintenance Repairs and Redecoration Programme, and contract expenditure will be contained within the existing budget.

#### **Legal and Governance Implications:**

The financial expenditure over a 5-year period is below the sum requiring an OJEU tendering exercise. Therefore, this tender complies with OJEU Legislation and the requirements as set out in the Council's Procurement Rules.

This tender, along with the prior consultation undertaken with leaseholders, also satisfies the requirements of Section 20 of the Commonhold and Leasehold Act 2002.

#### **Safer, Cleaner and Greener Implications:**

To maintain the Council's properties and prevent properties falling into disrepair.

#### **Consultation Undertaken:**

Notice of Intention under Regulation 5 (1) of Schedule 1 of The Service Charges (Consultation Requirements) (England) Regulations 2003.

Notice of intention to enter into a long-term agreement. Pre-tender consultation (Section 20 notice no.1) was undertaken with the leaseholders of the blocks of flats.

#### **Background Papers:**

Tender Evaluation Report.

#### **Risk Management:**

A Risk Assessment has been undertaken which includes financial, quality, and health and safety risks. A reserve Contractor is included in the recommendations to mitigate the risk of the lead Contractor either failing to enter into a contract or failing to fulfil the terms of the contract.

## Equality Impact Assessment

1. Under s.149 of the Equality Act 2010, when making decisions, Epping District Council must have regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty, ie have due regard to:
  - eliminating unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and other conduct prohibited by the Act,
  - advancing equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not,
  - fostering good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not, including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.
2. The characteristics protected by the Equality Act are:
  - age
  - disability
  - gender
  - gender reassignment
  - marriage/civil partnership
  - pregnancy/maternity
  - race
  - religion/belief
  - sexual orientation.
3. In addition to the above protected characteristics you should consider the cross-cutting elements of the proposed policy, namely the social, economic and environmental impact (including rurality) as part of this assessment. These cross-cutting elements are not a characteristic protected by law but are regarded as good practice to include.
4. The Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) document should be used as a tool to test and analyse the nature and impact of either what we do or are planning to do in the future. It can be used flexibly for reviewing existing arrangements but in particular should enable identification where further consultation, engagement and data is required.
5. Use the questions in this document to record your findings. This should include the nature and extent of the impact on those likely to be affected by the proposed policy or change.
6. Where this EqIA relates to a continuing project, it must be reviewed and updated at each stage of the decision.
7. All **Cabinet, Council, and Portfolio Holder reports must be accompanied by an EqIA**. An EqIA should also be completed/reviewed at key stages of projects.
8. To assist you in completing this report, please ensure you read the guidance notes in the Equality Analysis Toolkit and refer to the following Factsheets:
  - Factsheet 1: Equality Profile of the Epping Forest District
  - Factsheet 2: Sources of information about equality protected characteristics
  - Factsheet 3: Glossary of equality related terms
  - Factsheet 4: Common misunderstandings about the Equality Duty
  - Factsheet 5: Frequently asked questions
  - Factsheet 6: Reporting equality analysis to a committee or other decision making body

## Section 1: Identifying details

Your function, service area and team: Housing Property and Maintenance.

If you are submitting this EqlA on behalf of another function, service area or team, specify the originating function, service area or team:

Title of policy or decision: Acceptance of Tenders - External Maintenance Repairs and Redecoration Programme 2020-25, to Council owned properties.

Officer completing the EqlA: Tel: Haydn Thorpe X4162 Email: [hthorpe@eppingforestdc.gov.uk](mailto:hthorpe@eppingforestdc.gov.uk)

Date of completing the assessment: 9<sup>th</sup> March 2020.

## Section 2: Policy to be analysed

2.1	<p>Is this a new policy (or decision) or a change to an existing policy, practice or project?</p> <p>This new policy is required for the acceptance of tenders for undertaking planned external maintenance repairs and redecoration to Council owned property.</p>
2.2	<p>Describe the main aims, objectives and purpose of the policy (or decision):</p> <p>The main aim is for the Council to enter into a Framework Agreement with contractors for the provision of undertaking planned maintenance repairs and redecorating to Council owned property in accordance with the Councils Procurement Rules.</p> <p>What outcome(s) are you hoping to achieve (ie decommissioning or commissioning a service)?</p> <p>For the successful contractors to be able to undertake planned maintenance repairs and redecorating to Council owned properties it should be noted that maintenance repairs and redecoration of Council properties prevent the properties falling into disrepair.</p>
2.3	<p>Does or will the policy or decision affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• service users</li><li>• employees</li><li>• the wider community or groups of people, particularly where there are areas of known inequalities?</li></ul> <p>Yes – it will provide safe and secure homes for Council tenants.</p> <p>Will the policy or decision influence how organisations operate?</p> <p>No</p>

2.4	<p>Will the policy or decision involve substantial changes in resources?</p> <p>No</p>
2.5	<p>Is this policy or decision associated with any of the Council's other policies and how, if applicable, does the proposed policy support corporate outcomes?</p> <p>The Councils Procurement Rules dictates the procedures the Council needs to follow concerning the award of contracts.</p> <p>The Council must undertake planned maintenance repairs and redecorating to maintain fabric of the building to prevent disrepair and water ingress. Defects in these areas will have an immediate impact on the integrity of the property and cause further deterioration therefore these works ensure they;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meet the <a href="#">HHSRS minimum safety standards for housing</a></li> <li>• Be in a reasonable state of repair</li> <li>• Improve safety</li> </ul> <p>Well maintained Council housing is essential to meet the legislative requirements that are imposed on all landlords and these works are essential to ensure safe and secure housing.</p>

### Section 3: Evidence/data about the user population and consultation<sup>1</sup>

As a minimum you must consider what is known about the population likely to be affected which will support your understanding of the impact of the policy, eg service uptake/usage, customer satisfaction surveys, staffing data, performance data, research information (national, regional and local data sources).

3.1	<p>What does the information tell you about those groups identified?</p> <p>The works are undertaken on external and in communal areas of Council properties and will not affect individual groups of the population.</p>
3.2	<p>Have you consulted or involved those groups that are likely to be affected by the policy or decision you want to implement? If so, what were their views and how have their views influenced your decision?</p> <p>Not required.</p>
3.3	<p>If you have not consulted or engaged with communities that are likely to be affected by the policy or decision, give details about when you intend to carry out consultation or provide reasons for why you feel this is not necessary:</p> <p>Community engagement is not required as the work is undertaken within communal areas of Council owned flat blocks.</p>

## Section 4: Impact of policy or decision

Use this section to assess any potential impact on equality groups based on what you now know.

Description of impact	Nature of impact Positive, neutral, adverse (explain why)	Extent of impact Low, medium, high (use L, M or H)
Age	Positive; The work will have a positive effect on all of the identified equality groups as both the tenants and visitors to the property will benefit from well maintained and safe properties.	M
Disability		M
Gender		M
Gender reassignment		M
Marriage/civil partnership		M
Pregnancy/maternity		M
Race		M
Religion/belief		M
Sexual orientation		M

## Section 5: Conclusion

		Tick Yes/No as appropriate	
5.1	Does the EqlA in Section 4 indicate that the policy or decision would have a medium or high adverse impact on one or more equality groups?	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	If ' <b>YES</b> ', use the action plan at <b>Section 6</b> to describe the adverse impacts and what mitigating actions you could put in place.

## Section 6: Action plan to address and monitor adverse impacts

What are the potential adverse impacts?	What are the mitigating actions?	Date they will be achieved.

## Section 7: Sign off

**I confirm that this initial analysis has been completed appropriately.**

**(A typed signature is sufficient.)**

Signature of Head of Service: Stuart Mitchell

Date: 16 March 2020

Signature of person completing the EqlA: Haydn Thorpe

Date: 12 March 2020

### Advice

Keep your director informed of all equality & diversity issues. We recommend that you forward a copy of every EqlA you undertake to the director responsible for the service area. Retain a copy of this EqlA for your records. If this EqlA relates to a continuing project, ensure this document is kept under review and updated, eg after a consultation has been undertaken.

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Report to the Cabinet**

**Report reference:** C-002-2020/21

**Date of meeting:** 01 June 2020



**Epping Forest  
District Council**

**Portfolio:** Leader

**Subject:** Accommodation Project

**Responsible Officer:** Sacha Jevans (01992 564229).

**Democratic Services:** Adrian Hendry (01992 564246).

---

### **Recommendations/Decisions Required:**

**Cabinet are asked to approve the award of contract to ISG Fit Out Ltd for the sum of £5, 663, 062.00 (excluding VAT) for the refurbishment of the Civic Offices.**

### **Executive Summary:**

The October 2019 Cabinet made the decision to proceed with the refurbishment of the Civic Offices. Since that decision work has been undertaken to go through a procurement process to select a contractor. The full tender report from consultant Gardiner and Theobald is attached as a background paper.

The recent situation with Covid 19 has tested the organisations ability to homework and has demonstrated that EFDC has the capacity to work flexibly in a way that was previously unknown. The refurbishment of the Civic Offices is based on an approach that moves to a reduced ratio of 6:10 fixed desk ratio with additional meeting and collaborative workspaces. The home working has not been without its challenges and there are still roles/teams that would benefit from the office environment, most importantly the collaborative working spaces. It is a good time to reflect on the purpose and usage of the Civic Office space and to review the benefits of this refurbishment project for the longer term.

These include:

1. The release of the space currently occupied by the Condor building provides a significant development opportunity for EFDC. Cabinet has approved the sale of this land into Qualis Commercial for residential development to the value of £14.6m. These properties will be available for rent and so will provide a long-term revenue income of c£500k per annum to the Council.
2. There is a revenue saving of £200k for the overhead maintenance costs in the reduction of office space by losing the current Condor building.
3. There is an efficiency saving to be achieved through improving the environmental elements of the building for example new solar panels, and heating/air conditioning plants.
4. The change in ratio of fixed desks down to 6:10 located within the Civic Offices (no longer occupying the Condor building) reduces the cost of space per person from £3,

678 down to £2, 309 representing a saving of £1, 370 per person p.a.

5. The spaces within the newly refurbished building could be converted into areas that could be let to small business or serviced offices if the requirements for EFDC staff reduce over time. This also provides the added benefit of more income into the Council. By way of example the predicted income from a partner occupying 155square metres produces an income of £46k per annum.
6. The planning permission for the external entrance to create a new entrance for the public provides the opportunity to generate more income through a café facility and further collaborative workspace areas. This provides potential further opportunities for small businesses and help in the economic health of the high street.
7. Many elements within the current building are at the end of their useful life and therefore the refurbishment will enhance the life expectancy of the building to 40 years. This will have a positive impact on the capital value of the building and revenue savings on depreciation costs of the building.
8. Organisational cultural benefit of staff working in a collaborative working environment sharing ideas and collectively delivering the corporate objectives of EFDC.

## Report

Gardener and Theobald were the cost consultants commissioned to undertake the tender process for the major works. The detailed report covers the following:

- The procurement processes.
- Tender receipt and evaluation.
- Recommendations and next steps
- Mitigating the risks of Covid 19

G & T recommended using a procurement approach through an existing framework Pagabo. This framework had a range of contractors with the required skills and experience required for the proposed EFDC refurbishment works. Nine contractors were on the framework and the following six registered an interest:

- Engie Regeneration
- ISG Fit out
- RG Carter
- Styles and Wood
- Vinci Construction
- Wilmott Dixon interiors.

Only one company (ISG fit out) followed through to submit a full tender. Whilst this is not ideal Gardiner and Theobald provided the cost consultancy expertise to validate the submitted costs to give assurance on value for money and quality. The full tender report explains this in more detail.

It is therefore proposed to award the contract to ISG Fit out Ltd following the detailed evaluation process. ISG have a turnover of £2.2bn and employ 2, 800 people. They have significant experience in this type of refurbishment works and have a range of services including construction, fit out, engineering services and development. ISG have submitted several case studies of similar work including 20 Fenchurch Street (£9.5m, 70 000 sq ft) fit out of a leading insurance group over five floors; and £22m 260, 000 sq ft refurbishment of 15

floors and extensive mechanical and electrical installation work.

The project refurbishment covers the following scope of works:

- Removal of several existing walls to create open space areas and the upgrading of mechanical and electrical, and plumbing services to fit the new layout.
- Installation of new toilet and kitchen facilities.
- Renewal of the main atrium rooflight and link building rooflight.
- Replacement of new air conditioning units
- Replacement of cabling
- Fire alarm improvements
- Roof coating and installation of solar panels
- Decoration works

The proposed timeline in the tender response is a 30-week programme however ISG are preparing an alternative timeline to take into consideration the current Government Protocols related to COVID-19 and as such the programme may change. The contract appointment date is 8<sup>th</sup> June 2020, with a start on site date of 15<sup>th</sup> July 2020 and practical completion on 18<sup>th</sup> December 2020.

Discussions have taken place with ISG regarding working arrangements considering Covid 19. ISG propose measures to reduce site manning levels, for example a 7-day working week would reduce the head count on site by 25% and opening for 16 hours on staggered work shifts would reduce head count on site by 50%. There will also be zoning of floors/work areas to provide appropriate social distancing and clear programme tasks to allow the correct number of contractors on site at any one time.

### **Decant**

Staff working from the Civic Offices prior to the lockdown will not return to building and will instead move into the Condor building when government guidance is clear on the relaxation/rules around social distancing at work. In the main EFDC staff have adapted well to working from home and therefore the approach would be to continue in the same way through the decant period adjusting if needed in accordance with government guidance. Virtual meetings for Officers and Council meetings will continue.

### **Reasons for Proposed Decision:**

The accommodation project and supports the overall aspirations of the Council Corporate Plan – Stronger Council, Stronger Communities, Stronger Place.

The cost benefit analysis demonstrates greater benefits for refurbishment of the Civic Offices as the main office for EFDC staff. This negates the need to incur the cost of building a new office and will create a collaborative space that can also be used for partners and small businesses.

### **Other Options for Action:**

Do not undertake the refurbishment of the building. The current building is coming to the end of its useful life in terms of many of the essential mechanical, electrical and roof elements. These elements would need to be undertaken regardless of the refurbishment project to keep the building operational.

### **Resource Implications:**

The current budget for the accommodation project is £6.875m. This allows for the contract sum (£5.6m) and contingency for any unforeseen costs and the impact of Covid 19 social distancing.

It is worth noting the following additional benefits in efficiency and the environment that the refurbishment will achieve:

- Boilers – it is estimated that changing the existing boilers, which run well below 80% efficiency, to new condensing boilers which provide the same heat output but at 98% efficiency will save an estimated £10,015 per annum on our gas usage.
- CHP installation – this will be utilised for pre-heating of the heating and domestic hot water system. The by-product of its use is electrical generation, and this is estimated will save £12,400 per annum on our electricity usage.
- PV array – this will be relocated from the Conder building roof to the Civic roof to continue to provide energy offset to the site.
- Water – Additional use of dual flush toilets, controlled urinal flushing and reduced flow to sink taps will cut our water consumption.
- Lighting – Although existing lighting at Civic Offices is already very efficient with LED lighting already in place, by installing a far more advanced fully addressable lighting control system it is anticipated a further 10 – 20% efficiency increase, providing dimming, daylight sensing and presence detection.
- Air Conditioning – Far more environmentally friendly refrigerants with lower Global Warming Potential (GWP).
- Heating Control System – Will provide greater control to provide a uniform spread of heat throughout the building.
- Hot Water – Relocation of a calorifier will reduce distribution losses and make complying with water quality regulations (Legionella) more manageable as hot water will distribute to local outlets and reach temperature quicker.

### **Legal and Governance Implications:**

Any professional consultancy services will be procured in line with the Council procurement rules. The Civic Offices site has a draft allocation of housing within the Local Plan to be bought forward early in the plans for redevelopment. There is a Governance Board in place and regular reports of progress back to Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny. Gardiner and Theobald have been appointed as Employers Agent to oversee the contract.

### **Safer, Cleaner and Greener Implications:**

The refurbished building and will be safer by design and energy efficient.

### **Consultation Undertaken:**

Consultation with Partners to potentially occupy the Civic Offices continues. Consultation has commenced with members on the requirements and design of the member area. There will be a full consultation and communication plan for EFDC throughout the project delivery phases.

### **Background Papers:**

Cost Consultant report tender award report.

**Risk Management:**

A risk map has been developed and is reviewed monthly by the Accommodation Programme Board with mitigating actions reviewed. Key risks identified are:

1. Delays and disruption to services through the decant period
2. Major incident on site
3. Failure in staff/member communications.
4. Cost and time overrun on refurbishment works.

**Equality Analysis:**

The Equality Act 2010 requires that the Public Sector Equality Duty is actively applied in decision-making. This means that the equality information provided to accompany this report is essential reading for all members involved in the consideration of this report. The equality information is provided as an Appendix to this report.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Equality Impact Assessment

1. Under s.149 of the Equality Act 2010, when making decisions, Epping District Council must have regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty, ie have due regard to:
  - eliminating unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and other conduct prohibited by the Act,
  - advancing equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not,
  - fostering good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not, including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.
2. The characteristics protected by the Equality Act are:
  - age
  - disability
  - gender
  - gender reassignment
  - marriage/civil partnership
  - pregnancy/maternity
  - race
  - religion/belief
  - sexual orientation.
3. In addition to the above protected characteristics you should consider the cross-cutting elements of the proposed policy, namely the social, economic and environmental impact (including rurality) as part of this assessment. These cross-cutting elements are not a characteristic protected by law but are regarded as good practice to include.
4. The Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) document should be used as a tool to test and analyse the nature and impact of either what we do or are planning to do in the future. It can be used flexibly for reviewing existing arrangements but in particular should enable identification where further consultation, engagement and data is required.
5. Use the questions in this document to record your findings. This should include the nature and extent of the impact on those likely to be affected by the proposed policy or change.
6. Where this EqIA relates to a continuing project, it must be reviewed and updated at each stage of the decision.
7. All **Cabinet, Council, and Portfolio Holder reports must be accompanied by an EqIA**. An EqIA should also be completed/reviewed at key stages of projects.
8. To assist you in completing this report, please ensure you read the guidance notes in the Equality Analysis Toolkit and refer to the following Factsheets:
  - Factsheet 1: Equality Profile of the Epping Forest District
  - Factsheet 2: Sources of information about equality protected characteristics
  - Factsheet 3: Glossary of equality related terms
  - Factsheet 4: Common misunderstandings about the Equality Duty
  - Factsheet 5: Frequently asked questions
  - Factsheet 6: Reporting equality analysis to a committee or other decision making body

## Section 1: Identifying details

Your function, service area and team: Corporate

If you are submitting this EqlA on behalf of another function, service area or team, specify the originating function, service area or team:

Title of policy or decision: Accommodation Project

Officer completing the EqlA: Email: sjevans@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Date of completing the assessment: 07/10/2019

## Section 2: Policy to be analysed

2.1	Is this a new policy (or decision) or a change to an existing policy, practice or project? Change to existing practice.
2.2	<p>Describe the main aims, objectives and purpose of the policy (or decision): Maximise the beneficial use of Council land holdings. Catalyst for transformational change in working practice. Improve accommodation provision whilst realising ongoing running cost efficiencies</p> <p>What outcome(s) are you hoping to achieve (i.e. decommissioning or commissioning a service)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(a) a focus on Customer Service, 'placing them at the heart of everything we do';</li><li>(b) create an improved, modern, affordable and value for money working environment that reflects positively on the image of the Council;</li><li>(c) a transformation and culture change across the Council involving new and agile ways of working across teams;</li><li>(d) a contribution to the economic development aspirations for the District, through the Local Plan, by releasing the rear of the Civic Building site as soon as possible and not later than 5 years' time; and</li><li>(e) minimised disruption to service delivery during refurbishment.</li><li>(f) Create opportunities to co located with partners and to create workspaces for businesses to increase income.</li></ul>
2.3	<p>Does or will the policy or decision affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• service users</li><li>• employees</li><li>• the wider community or groups of people, particularly where there are areas of known inequalities?</li></ul> <p>Yes</p> <p>Will the policy or decision influence how organisations operate? No expected service delivery reduction.</p>



2.4	<p>Will the policy or decision involve substantial changes in resources?          No, the capital investment into the building is required due lifecycle expiry of key elements. Costs will enhance the capital value of the building providing a further 40 years of use.</p>
2.5	<p>Is this policy or decision associated with any of the Council's other policies and how, if applicable, does the proposed policy support corporate outcomes?          Decision links to the delivery of the Local Plan.</p>

### **Section 3: Evidence/data about the user population and consultation<sup>1</sup>**

As a minimum you must consider what is known about the population likely to be affected which will support your understanding of the impact of the policy, eg service uptake/usage, customer satisfaction surveys, staffing data, performance data, research information (national, regional and local data sources).

3.1	<p>What does the information tell you about those groups identified?</p> <p>Background papers culminating in an outline case engaged staff and pilot areas are in operation regarding new ways of working. No adverse impacts on any group raised to this point.</p>
3.2	<p>Have you consulted or involved those groups that are likely to be affected by the policy or decision you want to implement? If so, what were their views and how have their views influenced your decision?</p> <p>Communities, customers and partners have been engaged formally and informally as each element of the programme is progressed. Members have been consulted and will input further into the member room design.</p>
3.3	<p>If you have not consulted or engaged with communities that are likely to be affected by the policy or decision, give details about when you intend to carry out consultation or provide reasons for why you feel this is not necessary:</p> <p>N/A</p>

## Section 4: Impact of policy or decision

Use this section to assess any potential impact on equality groups based on what you now know.

<b>Description of impact</b>	<b>Nature of impact</b> Positive, neutral, adverse (explain why)	<b>Extent of impact</b> Low, medium, high (use L, M or H)
Age		M
Disability	Positive;	M
Gender	The work will have a positive effect on all of the identified equality groups as all accommodation changes will deliver an equal or improved offer.	M
Gender reassignment		M
Marriage/civil partnership		M
Pregnancy/maternity		M
Race		M
Religion/belief		M
Sexual orientation		M

## Section 5: Conclusion

		Tick Yes/No as appropriate	
5.1	Does the EqIA in Section 4 indicate that the policy or decision would have a medium or high adverse impact on one or more equality groups?	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	If ' <b>YES</b> ', use the action plan at <b>Section 6</b> to describe the adverse impacts and what mitigating actions you could put in place.

## Section 6: Action plan to address and monitor adverse impacts

What are the potential adverse impacts?	What are the mitigating actions?	Date they will be achieved.

**Section 7: Sign off**

**I confirm that this initial analysis has been completed appropriately.  
(A typed signature is sufficient.)**

Signature of Head of Service: S Jevans

Date: 19/05/2020

Signature of person completing the EqIA: S Jevans

Date: 19/05/2020

**Advice**

Keep your director informed of all equality & diversity issues. We recommend that you forward a copy of every EqIA you undertake to the director responsible for the service area. Retain a copy of this EqIA for your records. If this EqIA relates to a continuing project, ensure this document is kept under review and updated, eg after a consultation has been undertaken.

**EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL  
CIVIC BUILDING AND OFFICES TENDER REPORT –  
REVISED TENDER UPDATE  
PAGABO REF: 1026-1**

13 May 2020

---

## CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary	3
2. Introduction	5
3. Revised Tender Receipt and Evaluation	6
4. Recommendation & Next Steps	8

## APPENDICES

**APPENDIX A:** Reforecast Budget

**APPENDIX B:** Tender Analysis

**APPENDIX C:** Schedule of Pricing Qualifications and Queries

Issue Nr	Document	Date	Prepared by	Reviewed by
v1	Draft Version	11/05/2020	AM	RW
v2	Draft Version	12/05/2020	AM	CB
v3	Final Version	19/05/2020	AM	RW

Authorised by (Partner) \_\_\_\_\_



---

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 This supplementary report should be read in conjunction with the v7 version of the Epping Forest District Council Civic Building and Offices Tender Report dated 29 April 2020 which details the original tender process and recommendation for Epping Forest District Council Civic Building and Offices Project.
- 1.2 Following a robust review by the client team of the original, compliant ISG Fit Out Ltd tender received 3 April 2020 as detailed in the tender report dated 29 April 2020; it was the team's recommendation that the contract should be awarded to ISG Fit Out Ltd in the Contract Sum of £5,408,630.00 (excl. VAT). This recommendation was arrived at through the use of a balanced scoring matrix that included both a cost and technical evaluation. Please refer to the previous report for the evaluation undertaken.
- 1.3 Following their original submission, ISG Fit Out Ltd were requested to submit a revised tender, one which fully considered the impact of COVID-19 upon their programme and costs. This tender was submitted on 4 May 2020 and was evaluated by Gardiner & Theobald as detailed in Section 3.0 of this report.
- 1.4 The cost uplift from ISG Fit Out Ltd was in the sum of **254,432.00**. This was primarily due to the following factors:-
- Increased programme of 6 weeks incurring additional preliminaries
  - Requirement of out of hours working
  - Introduction of safety measures to ensure compliance with COVID-19 Site Operating Procedures
- 1.5 Following a review of the revised financial offer from ISG Fit Out Ltd in conjunction with the technical evaluation carried out previously, **it is the team's recommendation that the contract should be awarded to ISG Fit Out Ltd in the Contract Sum of £5,663,062.00 (excl. VAT).**
- 1.6 Furthermore, the report also considers residual risk items, as set-out within section 4.0. To mitigate the risk items, it is recommended that a Construction Contingency of £605,000.00

is retained against the Construction Project. This is a decreased contingency level from the previous report now a revised tender has been submitted which considers the risk of COVID-19. However, there remains a residual risk that the ongoing pandemic could still have an impact on the project.

1.7 The main residual risks that have been identified that will require the project team to work closely with ISG include:-

- Rejection of additional Listed Building Consent Application.
- Timely liaison and consultation with Planning Authority.
- Agreement of contract amendments.
- Potential enhanced conditions put in place by Government on Covid-19.
- Co-ordination of client-led packages.

Further details towards each of the residual risks are included under Section 4.0 of the report.

1.8 Placing an order with ISG in the value of £5,663,062.00 (excl. VAT) and retaining a Contingency of £605,000.00 results in an underspend of £224,808.00 against the approved budget of £6,875,000.00. Owing to the ongoing situation regarding COVID-19 we recommend that the underspend is retained as a client reserve as a further contingency to cover construction risks that are not considered within the Construction Contingency. Please see Appendix A for a full breakdown.

1.9 In summary, these next steps are required to take the project forward.

<b>Action</b>	<b>Required by</b>
G&T to assess alternative Tender Offer upon receipt and provide updated recommendation to Epping.	Wednesday 13/05/2020
In parallel to the above, Epping District Forest Council to review with legal representatives and agree upon ISG Contract qualifications.	Monday 18/05/2020
Recommendation presented to Council Representatives and a decision is to be made on whether Project is to proceed at Council Meeting.	Monday 01/06/2020

---

## 2.0 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 The aim of this tender report is to update the process of procuring a Principal Contractor to undertake the design and construction of works entitled 'Civic Building and Offices', on behalf of Epping Forest District Council. The report will review the extended tender process, the analysis of ISG Fit Out Ltd.'s revised tender return and the subsequent evaluation which has led to an appointment recommendation.
- 2.2 Following a robust review by the client team of the original, compliant ISG Fit Out Ltd tender received 3 April 2020 as detailed in the tender report dated 29 April 2020; it was the team's recommendation that the contract should be awarded to ISG Fit Out Ltd in the Contract Sum of £5,408,630.00 (excl. VAT). This recommendation was arrived at through the use of a balanced scoring matrix that included both a cost and technical evaluation. Please refer to the previous report for the evaluation undertaken.
- 2.3 Following their original submission, ISG Fit Out Ltd were requested to submit a revised tender, one which fully considered the impact of COVID-19 upon their programme and costs. This tender was submitted on 4 May 2020 and was evaluated by Gardiner & Theobald as detailed in Section 3.0 of this report.

---

## 3.0 REVISED TENDER PROCEDURE AND EVALUATION

- 3.1 Please refer to previous report dated 29 April 2020 for a full summary of the original tender procedure. This report supplements the aforementioned report and details the process for the revised tender submitted by ISG Fit Out Ltd.
- 3.2 On the 16th April 2020 a conference call was held between Epping Forest District Council, Gardiner & Theobald and ISG Fit Out Ltd to discuss their original tender. During that conference call, ISG Fit Out Ltd were asked to submit a second tender offer, one that fully considered the impact of COVID-19 within their programme and cost.
- 3.3 This second, revised tender was received on 4<sup>th</sup> May 2020 as agreed between Epping Forest District Council and ISG. The opened, unaltered tender return compared to their original reconciled tender from Section 4 was as follows:-

Tendering Contractor	Tender Value
ISG Reconciled Tender	£5,408,630.00
ISG Revised Tender – COVID-19	£5,663,062.00
Cost Uplift	£254,432.00

- 3.4 Upon receipt the tender was arithmetically checked and no errors were identified.
- 3.5 ISG submitted no further qualifications within their revised submission.
- 3.6 We summarise the key observations made against an initial review of the revised tender:-
- Practical completion extended to 29/01/2021 against the previous date of 18/12/2020, an extension of 6 weeks.
  - Cost uplift of £104,327.50 for additional staff preliminaries for the extended programme.

- 
- Sub-Contractor preliminaries of £47,790.00 for increased programme duration. This has been distributed on a pro-rata basis across the works packages in the tender analysis in Appendix B
  - Additional costs of £60,773.70 in order to make the Contractor's site Accommodation compliant with COVID-19 restrictions. This includes the introduction of turnstiles, hand sanitiser stations, PPE and enhanced cleaning of the site.
  - General Preliminaries of £23,125.25 included to cover site items such as IT and broadband, First Aid consumables and small plant and tools. A full list of items this allowance covers can be found in Appendix C.
  - A risk allowance of £14,160.99, equivalent to 6% included
  - OHP was deemed included in the rates, whilst 0.90% was added to the bottom line to allow for Pagabo fees.

3.7 Queries were raised with ISG with regard to the additional General Preliminaries within the revised tender and some of the allowances included. This was documented in a schedule which is appended to the report as Appendix C.

3.8 Following responses from ISG Fit Out Ltd on the queries the reconciliation exercise was concluded with the tender values unaltered. ISG Fit Out Ltd demonstrated the rationale behind the additional costs and rates were consistent with their original tender.

---

## 4.0 RECOMMENDATION AND NEXT STEPS

- 4.1 On the basis of the financial evaluation undertaken in this report, in conjunction with the technical evaluation in the previous Tender Report dated 29 April 2020, it is the recommendation of the project team that **ISG Fit Out Ltd** should be appointed for a Contract Sum of **£5,663,062.00, excluding VAT**.
- 4.2 ISG Fit Out Ltd continue to demonstrate a keen interest in the project being very proactive in querying the Employers Requirements, taking initiative to setup conference calls to discuss Client needs and how best to approach their revised tender bid. Their revised offer is well considered and has been validated by their supply chain as one that is achievable.
- 4.3 In conjunction with the above recommendation and the previous report, Epping Forest District Council need to also consider a number of known residual risks/ issues related to this project, which will need to be mitigated in collaboration with ISG should they be awarded the Building Contract. These risks are outlined as follows:-

**Rejection of additional Listed Building Consent** – At the time of this report feedback from Historic England and the Senior Conservation Officer from Epping Forest District Council on the second planning consent to recover the entire Civic Building roof with a Sika Liquid Plastic Decothane has proposed that the covering is limited only to where the PV panels are being located. They have asked that the remaining should be left as they are visible from the public highway and should be omitted. The change of scope of the works should this be confirmed needs to be considered.

**Timely liaison and consultation with Planning Authority** – In addition to fulfilling the obligations set-out within the planning award, there is a requirement to liaise with Epping Forest District Council’s Planning Department to have finishes approved before installation on site.

**Agreement of contract amendments** – At the time of this report, the Contract amendments have not been agreed between ISG and Epping Forest District Council’s legal team. Epping Forest District Council have confirmed that they have sought legal advice.

---

There remains a risk that there could be a delay in a Contract being in place to enable start on site.

**Enhanced conditions put in place by Government regarding Covid-19** – Whilst the revised ISG Fit Out Ltd tender considers the impact of COVID-19 on programme and cost, there still remains a risk that government policy towards COVID-19 could change between the time of this report and the start of the project on site with stricter conditions put in place that may impact the Contractor’s ability to fulfil its obligations. This could be mitigated with a termination clause in the contract that allows for mutual termination by either party should Covid-19 make it impossible for the project to proceed.

**Co-ordination of client led packages** – Currently the AV and CCTV package are being designed by specialists appointed by Epping Forest District Council. These designs will need to be co-ordinated with the Contractor’s design post contract and could have an impact on cost and programme.

- 4.4 Given that this is a Contract that will follow a Design and Build Procurement route, a large proportion of the risk resides with the Contractor, rather than the Client. However to mitigate residual risk (including risk over and above those listed under item 5.3), we recommend that the revised Construction Contingency set-out within Appendix A of the report, a value of £605,000.00, is fully retained against this Construction Project. It is recommended that this figure be retained against the Project Budget until a full reconciliation of ISG’s current Tender Offer has been concluded to consider implications of COVID-19 protocols.
- 4.5 At the time of this report Epping Forest District Council and ISG Fit Out Ltd are in discussions regarding contract amendments. Epping Forest District Council issued proposed amendments and comments on ISG Fit Out Ltd.’s contract qualifications to them on 5 May 2020. ISG are due to meet with their legal advisors on 13 May 2020 with the intention to respond by 15 May 2020.
- 4.6 Discussions should be concluded in a timely fashion and contractual qualifications regarding COVID-19 and contractual mechanisms to recover cost and time should the restrictions become less onerous agreed between both parties.

# APPENDIX A: REFORECAST BUDGET



**EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL  
CIVIC BUILDING AND OFFICES**

**APPENDIX A - REFORECAST BUDGET FOR REVISED TENDER**

REF	DESCRIPTION	ISG RECONCILED TENDER	ISG REVISED TENDER	DIFF.
		£	£	£
1	Construction Value	5,408,630.00	5,663,062.00	£254,432.00
2	Construction Contingency	805,000.00	605,000.00	(200,000.00)
3	Professional Fees (i)	332,130.00	332,130.00	-
4	Direct Orders	50,000.00	50,000.00	-
5	Loose FFE (ii)	Excluded	Excluded	-
6	Decanting	Excluded	Excluded	-
7	AV / IT	Incl. in Ref 1	Incl. in Ref 1	-
8	VAT	Excluded	Excluded	-
9	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,595,760.00</b>	<b>6,650,192.00</b>	<b>£54,432.00</b>

**NOTES**

- i) Professional Fees figure as advised by Ark Consultancy
- ii) Fees exclude additional requirement for building sign off and those relating to planned café strategy
- iii) Allowance of £12,600 for additional planning fees and tree consultant
- iv) FFE cost previously advised as £800,000 were included in the budget. This has now been excluded as requested by Epping Forest District Council and will be managed directly by them.

**EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL  
CIVIC BUILDING AND OFFICES**

**APPENDIX A - REFORECAST BUDGET FOR REVISED TENDER**

REF	DESCRIPTION	APPROVED BUDGET	REVISED ISG TENDER	DIFF.
		£	£	£
1	Service Accomodation	6,660,000.00	6,650,192.00	(9,808.00)
2	Roof Works	165,000.00	Included	(165,000.00)
3	FFE	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
4	Separation Works	Excluded	Excluded	Excluded
5	CCTV	50,000.00	Included	(50,000.00)
6	IT Cabling	Excluded	Included	Included
7	Underspend / Client Reserve	0.00	224,808.00	224,808.00
<b>8</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,875,000.00</b>	<b>6,875,000.00</b>	<b>£0.00</b>

**NOTES**

- i) Budget as advised by Epping Forest District Council on 9th April 2020 and clarified on 24th April 2020
- ii) FFE cost previously advised as £800,000 were included in the budget. This has now been excluded as requested by Epping Forest District Council and will be managed directly by them.

# APPENDIX B: TENDER ANALYSIS

**CIVIC BUILDING AND OFFICES, EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL  
TENDER ANALYSIS**

ELEMENT	G&T	ISG FITOUT ORIGINAL TENDER		DIFF	ISG COVID-19 COMPLIANT TENDER	
		INITIAL £	ADJUSTMENT £		ISG RECONCILED TENDER £	ADJUSTMENT £
1.0 Civic Building and Offices						
1.1 Demolition / Enabling / Temporary Works	149,652.00	113,543.89	32,228.00	-3,880.11	145,771.89	1,441.19
1.2 Substructure	11,000.00	31,707.32	10,000.00	30,707.32	41,707.32	412.35
1.3 Frame & Upper Floors	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.4 Roof	459,638.00	143,890.73	0.00	-315,747.27	143,890.73	1,422.60
1.5 Stairs	5,000.00	13,993.63	0.00	8,993.63	13,993.63	138.35
1.6 External Walls, Windows & Doors	43,680.00	6,932.68	0.00	-36,747.32	6,932.68	68.54
1.7 Internal Walls, Partitions & Doors	215,890.00	180,479.40	9,930.80	-25,479.80	190,410.20	1,882.52
1.8 Wall Finishes	84,695.00	125,319.30	17,245.01	57,869.31	142,564.31	1,409.48
1.9 Floor Finishes	243,170.00	236,391.22	0.00	-6,778.78	236,391.22	2,337.11
2.10 Ceiling Finishes	112,248.00	85,283.25	0.00	-26,964.75	85,283.25	843.16
2.11 Fixtures, Fittings & Equipment	117,937.00	87,252.77	1,750.00	-28,934.23	89,002.77	879.94
2.12 MEPH	3,903,099.00	3,608,659.83	121,342.05	-173,097.12	3,730,001.88	36,877.19
2.13 External Works	15,000.00	345.78	7,500.00	-7,154.22	7,845.78	77.57
<b>MEASURED WORKS SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>5,361,009.00</b>	<b>4,633,800.00</b>	<b>199,996.00</b>	<b>-527,213.00</b>	<b>4,833,796.00</b>	<b>47,790.00</b>
4.0 Main Contractor Preliminaries						
4.1 Site Accomodation and Records	375,000.00	26,012.00			26,012.00	60,773.70
4.2 Management and Staff	Incl. above	163,149.00			163,149.00	104,327.50
4.3 Temporary Services	Incl. above	15,865.00			15,865.00	
4.4 Security	Incl. above	7,794.00			7,794.00	
4.5 Safety and Environmental Protection	Incl. above	5,333.40			5,333.40	
4.6 Control & Protection	Incl. above	11,659.00			11,659.00	
4.7 Mechanical Plant	Incl. above	575.00			575.00	
4.8 Temporary Works	Incl. above	72,890.00			72,890.00	
4.9 Site Records	Incl. above	350.00			350.00	
4.10 Completion & Post Completion Requirements	Incl. above	Incl.			Incl.	
4.11 Cleaning	Incl. above	22,899.00			22,899.00	
4.12 Fees & Charges	Incl. above	1,250.80			1,250.80	
4.13 Site Services	Incl. above	23,020.00			23,020.00	
4.14 Insurance, Bonds and Guarantees	Incl. above	Not Incl.			Not Incl.	
4.15 General Preliminaries	Incl. above	0.00			0.00	23,125.25
5.00 Main Contractor Design Fee(s) and Risk	286,800.00	39,000.00	22,500.00	-225,300.00	61,500.00	14,160.99
6.00 Provisional Sums & Dayworks	0.00	Incl.			Incl.	
7.00 Main Contractor OHP @ 2.5%	301,140.45	162,537.00	Incl.	-138,603.45	162,537.00	Incl.
8.00 Pagabo Fee @ 0.90%	Incl.	Incl.	Incl.		Incl.	4,254.06
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>		<b>5,186,134.00</b>	<b>222,496.00</b>		<b>5,408,630.00</b>	<b>254,432.00</b>
<b>RECONCILED TENDER RETURN TOTAL</b>	<b>6,324,000.00</b>		<b>5,408,630.00</b>			<b>5,663,062.00</b>

**NOTES**

i) Additional sub-contractor preliminaries are pro-rata'd across the works packages

# APPENDIX C: SCHEDULE OF PRICING QUALIFICATIONS & QUERIES

#	CLIENT TEAM QUERY	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	Comments from Conf Call dated 9 April 2020	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	Add/Omit	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM
ISG									
ARCHITECTURAL									
1	A - Demolition and Alteration item 1.1. Quant for demo seems high, please confirm area is correct	This is to remove all existing floor finishes across the project (excluding the retained stone flooring).		No further action needed		Noted			
2	A - Demolition and Alteration item 1.6 Quant for internal doors seems low. Please confirm number	Any doors within the existing partitioning being removed will be included under the removal of partitions. These are doors sitting in retained partitions only.		No further action needed		Noted			
3	A - Demolition and Alteration item 1.7. Removal of planters and fixed joinery excluded. Please provide cost or confirm these can remain in situ and will be adequately protected and works can be completed without removal	Confirmed		No further action needed		Noted			
4	A - Demolition and Alteration item 1.8 Please confirm your cost covers removal of all furniture left on site as per discussion during site visits. EFDC to remove and store all retained furniture prior to site possession by Contractor	Confirmed.		No further action needed		Noted			
5	B - Substructure item 1.1 Please provide your understanding of extent of below ground drainage required and rationale for prov sum number	Further review being undertaken as details unclear. Provisional sum included for potential basement car Park soffit level services rearrangement works.		G+T have requested that ISG confirm the following  The extent of the works (if any) as they understand it.  To confirm the extent of the programme period included for these works  To confirm a suitable Prov Sum and what that sum is based on.	Further review being undertaken as details unclear. Provisional sum included for potential basement car Park soffit level services rearrangement works.	When will further information be provided on programme durations and proposed prov sum?	Proposed Prov Sum of £10,000 previously added. We cannot comment on programme durations until we know the scope of works.	10,000.00	Noted
6	D - Roof item 1, 2 and 3 Cost for roof seems insufficient. Please confirm these costs allow for the removal and complete replacement of the glazed roof lights with a like for like solution and all temporary works are included and they are compliant with the requirement of keeping an active fire exit route for Condor Building	These costs include for new rooflights only, we have included the temporary works, removal and logistics elsewhere.		G+T concerned that the value of this item is 3 times less than the quotes they received  ISG confirmed quote but that they would review and confirm by next week  Scope of service being provided to be issued to G&T	These costs include for new rooflights only, we have included the temporary works, removal and logistics elsewhere.	Noted			
7	D - Roof item 5 Cost for relocation of PV panels included. Please confirm scope covers removal of the PV panels from Condor Building and relocation and installation to Civic Building roof	We can confirm this is included.		No further action needed		Please confirm you are confident you've allowed sufficient time to remove and relocate the solar panels and to coat the roof below the panels?	We can confirm we have allowed sufficient time to remove and relocate the panels. We have allowed to make good where the existing panels have been removed and for new roofing as shown on the tender drawings.		Noted
8	F - External Windows Please confirm costs include painting / making good window reveals and soffits etc.	We have made no allowance for any works externally to the windows. We have been advised these are new and no works are required during our site visits. We have included to paint the internal reveals and soffits to the windows.		no works to external windows. Confirmed by G&T		Noted			
9	G - Internal Doors Item 2.2 Please confirm quants for Door Type A, 850x2050, Schedule shows more than 1nr. 8nr shown?	Apologies for the error. Please amend to 9nr @ £1449.62 each Total £13,046.58. Please omit £1,449.62.		No further action needed		Noted		11,596.96	
10	G - Internal Doors Item 2.3 Please confirm quants for Door Type A, 800x2050, Schedule shows less than 14nr. 6 shown?	Apologies for the error. Please amend to 6nr @ £1472.97 each Total £8,837.82. Please omit £20,621.58.		No further action needed		Noted		-11,783.76	
11	G - Internal Doors Item 2.4 When can a compliant quote be supplied	We are working on this and aim to get a fixed price to you as expediently as possible.		Agreed that the Prov Sum will be increased, from £7,500 to £10,000. Tamara to continue to chase quotes. Andrew Muir to forward quote received by G+T	We are working on this and aim to get a fixed price to you as expediently as possible.  As agreed at meeting P.Sum to be uplifted from 7.5k to 10k	Noted		2,500.00	
12	H - Wall Finishes - Item 4 WT-02 Confirm quant. Seems low	Following a check on the measures I can confirm we have missed the following from our quantities; add 43m2 to Ground floor add 40m2 to Second floor Total add 83m2 x £132.47 = £10,995.01		No further action needed		Noted		10,995.01	
13	H - Wall Finishes - Item 5 Can you provide a firm cost for undertaking the works / provide rationale for the prov sum amount	Following the initial site visit and advice from a specialist, they can not guarantee any areas that require new or reused veneer will match in colour to the existing. The cost to French polishing the existing would be; 124 lin m x £25 = £3,100.00 The cost to replace damaged panels would be:: £280 m2 x 33m2 (10% of total area) = £9,240.00 (subject to benchmarking). Please omit £30,000 provisional sum and add £12,340.00.  ISG would like to provide a survey service (included in our tender) which will provide a full schedule of works to be agreed with the design team in advance of the contract sum agreement.		Agreed that this item will remain as a Prov Sum at 30k. Agreed that this will be a Defined Prov Sum but that an early survey is to be tabled to agree the costs	Adjustment made to reinstate 30k Prov Sum	This is to be a defined prov sum as discussed. Please confirm acceptance	Confirmed accepted		Noted
14	I - Floor Finishes generally Please confirm quants. Total floor finishes including making good terrazzo (incl. stairs) c5,200mm2	We are happy to stand by our quantities.		No further action needed		Noted			
15	M - External Works generally Have you allowed for removal of the diesel tank adjacent to the pyramid building	The removal of the Diesel Tank has not been included. Confirm a Prov Sum of 7.5k to be included		G+T require the answer to this query and also the level of contaminants that may arise as a result of this item.	The removal of the Diesel Tank has not been included. Confirm a Prov Sum of 7.5k to be included	Noted		7,500.00	
MEP									
16	Sanitaryware generally Please provide cost uplift for new sanitaryware to existing WCs	Breakdown of sanitaryware to existing WCs below;							

#	CLIENT TEAM QUERY	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	Comments from Conf Call dated 9 April 2020	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	Add/Omit	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM
		N13 300 - Ideal Standard Jasper Morrison back to wall toilet E6221 with E6214 toilet seat and cover, white, E2125 concealed cistern and E4465 operating control (13nr x £396.11)		No further action needed		Noted		5,149.43	
		N13 312 - Ideal Standard Doc M sensorflow wall mounted left hand pack, stainless steel grabrail and clothes hook (2nr x £1,824.80)		No further action needed		Noted		3,649.60	
		N13 335 - Vitra 7070B003-0921 600mm, white shift compact basin with BC340(AA) Calista mixer tap (14nr x £161.98)		No further action needed		Noted		2,267.72	
		N13 429 - Dolphin Solutions BC402 stainless steel coat hook (13nr x £18.77)		No further action needed		Noted		244.01	
		N13 438 - Mirrors to WCs (6nr x £230.00)		No further action needed		Noted		1,380.00	
		N13 442 - Dolphin Solutions DP3104 prestige paper towel dispenser, stainless steel (6nr x £241.64)		No further action needed		Noted		1,449.84	
		N13 458 - Dolphin Solutions BC92455 satin stainless steel soap dispensers (8nr x £85.23)		No further action needed		Noted		681.84	
		N13 462 - Dolphin Solutions BC 266 toilet paper holders (13nr x £23.32)		No further action needed		Noted		303.16	
		Cleaners Sink (4nr x £402.50)		No further action needed		Noted		1,610.00	
		Installation of Sanitaryware		No further action needed		Noted		6,040.00	
17	Item 3.1 Please confirm work allowed for. Cost seems high	ISG confirm as Fixed Price				Noted			
18	4.13 and 4.14 Please provide details of the work allowed for softened water system	This is an error and shouldn't have been included in our tender.		No further action needed		Noted			
19	7.1 Please provide details of the work allowed for smoke ventilation fans	Allowance includes for replacing of roof attenuators and the new compressor in the absement. Existing containment is to be reused. No allowance has been made for the existing connecting sytem; as not part of the ERs		Discussion held. G+T confirmed that there is currently 85k allocated to this item within the ISG submison. ISG to confirm what this allowance includes for. In particular G+T require confirmation around the smoke ventilation (as within this system is the AOVs, vents and compressor)	Allowance includes for replacing of roof attenuators and the new compressor in the absement. Existing containment is to be reused. No allowance has been made for the existing connecting sytem; as not part of the ERs	Noted			
20	8.11 Please provide cost for UPS to IT room	This response conflicts with query number 31 on the post tender qualifications, where it is stated that the existing UPS is being retained. Please clarify what is required.		Existing UPS to remain		Noted			
21	10.4 Please advise the details of lift beneficial use (which lifts, durations, replacement of lift components after beneficial use, protections, etc)	<b>Beneficial Use</b> <b>Prior to Beneficial use</b> • Client inspection of the lift on completion of installation & prior to commencement of beneficial use. • Protection of the lift car interior as far as is practicable. • A permanent, dedicated telephone line will need to be made available in order to facilitate use of the emergency communication system during beneficial use. – or GSM unit can be provided at additional cost of £495.00 <b>During Beneficial Use Period</b> • Interim maintenance contract to cover servicing & callouts* <b>Post Beneficial Use</b> • Others to strip out car protection or SLL if Fitted by them • Client inspection of the lift in order to determine any damages caused to the lift during beneficial use. Any repairs required will be subject to extra to contract charges. • Full clean down & service inspection. • Re-commissioning of the lift.		No further action needed		Noted			
22	11.2 Please provide cost for stripout of redundant fire hose reel	Additional cost for strip out of hose reel system is £3,500.		No further action needed		Noted		3,500.00	
23	11.7 Please provide cost for fire curtains to atrium	Please confirm this is required as the RFI's during the tender states 'There is no requirement to replace fire curtains and shutters as part of the tender documentation.' We have based our tender on this response.		Agreed to include a Prov Sum for this item. G&T to send through a quote they received from from Coopers and basis of the quote will form the basis of the Prov Sum. ISG to review quote and confirm any issues etc.	Assume this response is superseded by line 81 where £11,087.88 has been added for fire curtains. Please confirm	Agreed			Noted
24	12.13 Please provide cost for WiFi	We can confirm this is included in our original tender.		No further action needed		Noted			
25	Pricing Schedule Rev B, item A3.2 on line 51 of the Preliminaries sheet. Can ISG confirm that the maintenance they refer to is routine PPM, which I would not expect to form part of the defects liability period, and not Reactive works i.e. plant/component failure which would normally be considered a defect within the 12month period.					Confirmed			Noted
	General								
25	3 Nr Tender Addendum were issued. Please sign and return acknowledgment cover sheet for Addendum #3	Please find attached signed acknowledgement for Addendum 3.				Noted			

#	CLIENT TEAM QUERY	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	Comments from Conf Call dated 9 April 2020	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	Add/Omit	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM
26	Design fees seem low. Please confirm resource allocation and ability to take design on from Stage 3, through to Stage 5	Our fees include for the completion of the design and services scheduled, brief scope below.  We have included for creating new drawings and re-draw/re-badge of Bissett drawings. Included to lead early design meetings with client to gain all sign-offs. Presenting samples for sign off. All roof drawings/design are by the specialist contractor with involvement for some remedial works/aboutments associated with new roof work). We have made an allowance for client design meetings. Sub contractor meetings/ site inspections and site sketches/advice.  Our Project team would provide support and work on construction drawings once the design is signed-off along with our internal design management.  Our MEPH subcontractors have included for the design requirements within their price and are fully capable of providing this service.			Following further discussion and review with Fee providers, an additional 10k sum has been included to ensure all design work and PD fees are covered	Noted		10,000.00	
27	OHP and Risk Levels. Please confirm you have sufficient risk levels to take on the project and deliver successfully whilst maintaining a margin of profit	Within our tender submission we have considered the risk levels based on the tender information and the conditions of the contract and have allowed sufficient levels of risk accordingly. Our OHP is as highlighted and within the framework range.		No further action needed		Noted			
28	No Schedule of MEP rates has been provided. Please issue	All supply chain submissions have requested SOR, these will be forwarded upon receipt.		Discussion held and DMH confirmed that this is being followed up on but that it is likely this will not be received until the relevant SC has been confirmed. G+T require this and currently it is showing as non compliant.	SOR's expected to be received this week and will forward on	Noted and we await receipt	Please see attached QSoR's		Noted
29	Please confirm you have allowed programme and cost for the asbestos as advised in the report and any remediation works	We have allowed for an asbestos survey to be carried out on the areas not accessible in the report issued. The areas identified in the report have been included (3 gaskets as non-notifiable items), however any remediation works and the effects of these works as a result of the survey will be treated as a variation. We suggest an 'undefined' prov sum should be included for these works.		No further action needed		Noted			
30	Who is responsible for the MEPH design as no consultant is shown in organogram or costs	The MEPH subcontractor is a full d&b subcontract agreement.		No further action needed		Noted			
31	Please confirm who is overseeing the co-ordination between MEPH and Architectural. Are you comfortable you have enough resource to manage this?	We have included within the management structure for a TSM to manage this coordination. This role is in addition to the general project management role who has overall responsibility for all coordination.		No further action needed		Noted			
32	Organogram doesn't show utilisation of staff. Site based assumed 100%. Please confirm assumption and provide utilisation for visiting staff	Site based staff assumption is correct at 100% non site based staff utilisation is not based on a pure % across the project, but is allocated proportionally in relation to the management required throughout the various stages of the project. We can confirm that the structure and allocations are at the required levels in order to deliver the project works.		No further action needed		Noted			
33	Can you give examples of where a local supply chain has been utilised in your offer	With 96% of our selected supply chain members being located within 15 miles of the EFDC Civic Buildings we have specifically procured with the local spend as a major priority. This 96% is further broken down into 10% within 5 miles, 45% within 10 miles and 41% within 15 miles.		No further action needed		Noted			
34	It would be good to understand who ISG's proposed MEP sub-contractors are likely to be, or if these are intended to be one single company. In addition, would the MEP sub contractor undertake their own design / drawings, or would this be sub-contracted to a specialist design consultant.	As part of our submission we have a comprehensive set of MEPH submissions from the Supply Chain. Whilst we haven't determined the final allocation it is likely to be a separate Mechanical and Electrical procurement but importantly we have tendered this package with SC members who have worked together on a repeat basis and therefore are confident of whichever final choice is made it will be a very collaborative one. All SC members have a mix of internal design capabilities and external consultant usage		DMH confirmed that the SC are still in competition which was recognised by G+T. DMH confirmed the likely SC to be awarded as Farr (Mech) and AVA (elec).		Noted			
35	Have you considered the required electrical pre-start enabling works?	Yes, each of our SC Member submissions are required to include a detailed approach to the logistics and scope of works. This information is reviewed and integrated into our Main Contract approach to the delivery to ensure a 'One Team' approach to the project works.		No further action needed		Noted			



#	CLIENT TEAM QUERY	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	Comments from Conf Call dated 9 April 2020	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	Add/Omit	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM
36	I note there is no cost in the Tender break-down for employing the services of a structural engineer to check and verify structural implications of the proposed works is this required?	This Item relates to a previous clarification re the Rooflight structural reliance. As noted within the response to that clarification, currently we have not allowed any fees for a full structural review of the integrity of the existing structure in relation to the proposed works. We noted that specific areas such as the Rooflight housings and the Sliding folding wall areas should be reviewed. If this is required to be undertaken by ISG we would require to include a fee for this service.		Agreed that ISG will provide a fee for the Structural Engineer fees for providing a survey and calculations for the Rooflight areas and the sliding folding wall areas. ISG confirmed that the risk for any resultant issues with the existing structure remains with the Employer which was agreed.	Please add £7,500 for the Structural Fees.	Noted		7,500.00	
37	Please clarify how the design/specification of the MEP element is to be coordinated.	The Subcontract will be a full D&B responsibility, with either the M or the E being appointed as Lead MEPH designer. Importantly ISG TSM and management will be responsible for ensuring the design and coordination process is undertaken in line with the ISG management processes and essentially the required upstream approvals / TQ responses.		No further action needed		Noted			
38	Please clarify how the listed elements in our building will be protected during refurbishment.	It is our intention to undertake a full survey (including photographic dilapidation survey) of all 'listed / important items'. From this it will be agreed with EFDC whether items should be removed from the site work face / protected. From that the correct level of protection for each item will be decided, installed and maintained.		No further action needed		Noted			
39	Epping would prefer for some key roles e.g. the on site Project Manager and the Designer Manager to have recent experience with listed buildings, protection of listed elements and understanding of the planning and heritage constraints. Can you confirm the proposed team have this experience.	The team have been selected on their experience of this type of project. In addition to the experiences included within the Technical Submission a pack of case studies etc will be provided. Projects to be issued are  Confidential Client - 40 Argyll Street L4- PC September 2018 - 25,000 sq ft Cat B fitout Confidential Client - 40 Argyll Street L2 - PC March 2020 - 15,000 sq ft Cat B fitout Department of International Development - Cat B fitout		Case study pack required	The team have been selected on their experience of this type of project. In addition to the experiences included within the Technical Submission a pack of case studies etc will be provided. Projects to be issued are  Confidential Client - 40 Argyll Street L4- PC September 2018 - 25,000 sq ft Cat B fitout Confidential Client - 40 Argyll Street L2 - PC March 2020 - 15,000 sq ft Cat B fitout Department of International Development - Cat B fitout	Noted and we await receipt	Case Study Pack attached		Noted
40	What is the preferred method of resourcing and operating on site from page 20 due to Covid-19? We will need to discuss this in more detail as we have limitations on onsite working hours set by Planning.	It would be the intention to discuss as a team the most effective route for this project. It is difficult to decide the best route until you have that collaborative discussion with all parties and specifically the SC Member MD's. Extended working hours mon - fri are an effective method as it is important for the delivery team to have the correct downtime and work/life balance etc		To be discussed at Con Call with Client on Thursday		Noted			
41	Please provide detail how you manage business continuity risks in a live environment especially around power and data / IT infrastructure.	To be discussed at Con Call with Client on Thursday		To be discussed at Con Call with Client on Thursday		Noted			
42	What external car park area will be taken up by the contractor for operative parking, deliveries/delivery vehicle routes, waste storage or additional compound (especially as the site entrance and material entrance into the building both discharge into the car park area as shown on page 50 and 51)? Nothing marked on a plan. This is also relevant to staff working in homefield house. Confirm if only the basement car park will be used and if these spaces are enough.	It is the intention to utilise the half of the car park as originally advised, to herras fence or as required segregate this area with the correct directional and safety signage for the EFDC staff. This area will be used for off loading and materials removal etc, with the basement are being the office and welfare spaces.		No further action needed		Noted			
43	No traffic management and logistics plan in Appendix 6 and no fire plan in Appendix 7 of the construction phase plan. Can these be provided	To be completed in collaboration with client's new strategy during the precommencement period.		To be completed in collaboration with client's new strategy during the precommencement period.		Noted			
44	Please clarify how you will provide maintenance access for EFDC personnel to identified service rooms in the basement and ground floors.	We operate a weekly look ahead process where we will meet with the relevant stakeholders and understand what works / access is required by each party for that week. In addition to this access as required can be accommodated through the liaison on site between the EFDC staff and our Site point of contact.		No further action needed		Noted			
45	P48 shows the basement may be used for some staff parking for as long as possible. Will there be temporary services kept live in this area to permit safe use?	Yes		No further action needed		Noted			
46	How can the GF, 1F and 2F staff kitchens in the "link" areas be constructed ahead of occupation of the main building, when the corridor routes in that "link" need to be maintained as fire exits from the conder building and the GF needs to continue as a temporary reception? (the programme shows link kitchens completion date of 06/10/20 but the main building as not complete until 17/11/20)	This was revised to be compliant in the Rev 1 programme			This was revised to be compliant in the Rev 1 programme	Rev 2 programme provided. Assume this is the programme you refer to?	Agreed		Noted
47	How will the first floor of 323 house be accessed by operatives? (the GF access is shown as via the old front door).	The only access to the 1st floor of 323 House is via the link bridge, see attached drawing. Access to the ground floors is via the existing front door. Within the logistics plan full access/egress strategie will be included and updated through out the project.		The only access to the 1st floor of 323 House is via the link bridge, see attached drawing. Access to the ground floors is via the existing front door. Within the logistics plan full access/egress strategie will be included and updated through out the project.	The only access to the 1st floor of 323 House is via the link bridge, see attached drawing. Access to the ground floors is via the existing front door. Within the logistics plan full access/egress strategie will be included and updated through out the project.	Noted			
48	Link staircase - no mention of management of any contractor movements on the link staircase as this forms part of the fire escape strategy for EFDC staff remaining in the Conder building.	Minor works are required to the Link Staircase. Re-decoration, clean Terrazzo floor, replace 1no radiator, Smoke detectors. These have been phased with Section 3. These works are to be carried out OOH.			Minor works are required to the Link Staircase. Re-decoration, clean Terrazzo floor, replace 1no radiator, Smoke detectors. These have been phased with Section 3. These works are to be carried out OOH.	Noted			
49	Page 77 works by others, Items 7 and 11 by Contractor. Please confirm cost	We have included the costs for these items.		We have included the costs for these items.		Noted			
50	ISG document refers to a site activity planner & a "delivery booking system" - Please confirm who populates & manages these.	ISG Site management team manage this system with each potential delivering partner having access to the system to 'log' their deliveries. From this the site activity planner is constructed so as daily and weekly deliveries are managed		No further action needed		Noted			

#	CLIENT TEAM QUERY	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	Comments from Conf Call dated 9 April 2020	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM ISG	Add/Omit	FURTHER RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM
51	Page 109 refers to practical completion & preparation of both the O&Ms & HSF. Please will ISG acknowledge the requirements for O&M Manuals / HSF in the PCI document section 7 and appendix 4. Appendix 4 sets out the requirement for an O&M Manual tracker & format for each manual & confirm that their costs allow for compliance with the descriptions in the PCI?	Confirmed		No further action needed		Cost for O&Ms £350, which seems light for the work involved. Can you confirm your proposed arrangements in terms of who is undertaking the work and there is sufficient time in the programme to allow for the production of good quality O&Ms and HSF	Our Document Controllers collate and manage the O & M's and the resource has taken this into consideration. The £350 is for printing and stationary required for formatting		Noted
52	Accident Incident Rate included on page 137. Please will ISG provide further information about the 4 major incidents in Apr 18 - Mar 19 (type, region, any lessons learnt, etc.?)	Please refer to the separate attachment.		Please refer to the separate attachment.					
53	No reference to HSE interventions have been found in either the Technical or Commercial submissions. Please can ISG provide a statement - even if it is to confirm that they have had no HSE interventions in the past 3 years?	ISG have not been issued any Improvement or Prohibition Notices within the last 3 years.			ISG have not been issued any Improvement or Prohibition Notices within the last 3 years.				
54	As per the tender documentation, ISG are required to hold their offer open for a period of 120 days. Please confirm you have read this clause in the prelims and in the ITT and are happy to accept this								Noted

Description	ISG Tender	G&T PTE	Comments						
1.0 Sanitaryware	Only allowed to new WCs	Includes replacement of existing	ISG asked to price replacement of existing – ALREADY COMPLETE			Included above. Noted			
7.1 Fire smoke duty / standby extract fans 7.5 and 7.15 Automatic opening Vent (AOVs) / Refurbish smoke control vents to Atrium (pneumatic automatic smoke vent)	£85,206.95	Includes for AOVs and replacement of compressor / accumulator	Query with ISG what has been priced. BWB spec states 'The mechanical contractor shall employ a smoke ventilation specialist to fully design install and provide all necessary equipment and wiring to the replacement smoke vents at the head of the atrium. This will typically include the replacement of the pneumatic compressor and accumulator, along with all controls. The installation shall be in full coordination with the new roof-light replacement works.'	Answered above in item 19		Noted			
7.16 Lift shaft ventilation (provision)	Excluded	Included	BWB spec says as per lift manufacturer's spec / ISG to price confirm this has been allowed for in lift costs	No allowance made for lift shaft ventilation as not included within ER specification, if this is required suggest a provisional sum.		Suggest prov sum of £2,000.00	Please allow £2000 prov sum as advised.	2,000.00	Noted
11.2 Removal and strip-out of redundant fire hose reel	Excluded	Included	ISG to price - £3,500 uplift priced			Duplicate of item 22 (line 41) above. £3,500 to be added for removal of redundant hose reel.	Cost for this included in item 22.		Noted
11.7 Fire curtains	Excluded	Priced in Architectural	Please Add £11,087.88 for the Coopers Quote, including extra over cost options and allowances for builderswork associated with the removal of existing and installation of new.			Also referred to above, item 23 (line 42). £11,087.88 to be added for fire curtains to Atrium	Agreed	11,087.88	Noted
12.13 WLAN / Wifi	Excluded	Included	ISG to price via updated copy of Worm Purple quote USED WORM PURPLES REV A BID IN ORIGINAL SUBMISSION			Noted			
12.26 Lift redcare	Excluded	Included	ISG to price	Currently the Lift costs include for the preparation for contacts, the system is by others		Contradicts Qualifications where Redcare is priced?	Please accept our apologies, this can be removed and refer to Qualifications.		Noted
13.17 Roof light compressor replacement	Excluded	Included in ventilation costs 7.15	Confirmed included.			Noted			
16.8 Existing services diversion	Excluded	Included	Please allow a provisional sum of £15,000.			Noted		15,000.00	
16.11 Building mounted external lighting (retain existing but includes cleaning, relamping with LED and reinstated)	Excluded	Included	Please allow a provisional sum of £3,000.			Suggest £5,000.00	Please allow £5000 prov sum as advised.	5,000.00	Noted
16.12 Column mounted external lighting (retain existing but includes cleaning, relamping with LED and reinstated)	Excluded	Included	Please allow a provisional sum of £5,000.			Suggest £10,000.00	Please allow £10000 prov sum as advised.	10,000.00	Noted

REVISED TENDER QUERIES									
1	The Construction Manager allowed for under A4, looks to be an additional CM. Allowed 7 weeks normal hours, 7 weeks out of hours and 6 weekends. Is this correct? Please clarify role and requirement	Yes this is correct. With the overlapping of these 2 sections the uplift in management is required, and includes Out of Hours operations	Noted						
2	Programme extended by 6 weeks, yet some additional costs are for 7 weeks. Please clarify	These will be for the overlapping period of the sections which is 7 weeks	Noted						
3	Bulk of the work is completed by Christmas, with only Section 3 pushing out into 2021. Presumably less staff / labour on site, is this reflected in costs?	Yes, the 6 week period of extension the management costs have been reduced	Noted						
4	Please provide more clarity on what the General Prelims cover	The general prelims is an assessment of the general site running elements, with a view taken on the elements required	Can a breakdown be provided?	the allowance picks up the following general items. Site accommodation allowance IT Calls/broadband allowances First Aid consumables Stationary & Printing consumables General Safety and information signage Temporary Services allowances Access / site security allowances General PPE allowances Fire Safety allowances General segregation and fencing allowance Small Plant & Tools Waste Management	Noted				

#	QUALIFICATION WITHIN TENDER RETURN	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	Add/Omit	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR
	<i>Carried forward</i>					117,671.69		
	<i>General</i>							
1	We have made no allowance for any cost and programme implications resulting from the UK's planned withdrawal from the European Union. Our tender may be subject to supplemental agreement and cost changes. This includes, but is not limited to any taxes, duties, protective tariffs and other charges and restrictions imposed on non-UK companies, goods and personnel.	Contractual comments sit with EFDC currently. To be discussed during conference call 16'3	Noted				Epping confirmed feedback from legal advice expected week commencing 20th April 2020	Noted
2	Whilst our tender makes no specific allowances for the effects/or implications of the ongoing public health issue, Covid-19 or Coronavirus, we have recognised within our technical submission that this is an ongoing situation that may affect the productivity of the project programme and it is on this basis that we suggest a collaborative discussion is required to be held and that it is likely that a sum of monies should be included as part of the Project Risk Register and held by the Employer to be utilised and instructed as required in order that additional measures can be introduced throughout the project. We would suggest this process is managed under the Change Control process within the main contract.	Contractual comments sit with EFDC currently. To be discussed during conference call 16'3	Noted				Epping confirmed feedback from legal advice expected week commencing 20th April 2020	Noted
3	We have made no allowance for Electrical and water consumption charges and assumed these are by the client	This is deemed compliant, however please note the following from the prelims: Water use on site is to be monitored by the Contractor via water metering. The Site Manager is to keep records and review water consumption figures regularly; including at possession and completion. Costs to be contra-charged to the Contractor if usage is deemed by the Employer to be excessive. Please confirm you agree	Understanding of 'excessive' is required. Our bid does not include for any costs.	Noted. Contractor to monitor water and should use best endeavours to ensure water consumption is reasonable. No taps / hoses left running etc.	Agreed and confirmed		Noted	
4	We have assumed that listed building consent and approval will be obtained by others.	Listed Building consent application is by EFDC. Responsibility for discharging requirements such as the sign off of finishes is by the Contractor. Information for all conditions needs to be provided by the contractor and submitted to EFDC for discharge. Please confirm you understand and agree	Confirmed that contractor is required to issue information to enable discharge however responsibility for sign off remains with EFDC.	Responsibility for discharging Listed Building Consent application is Contractor's responsibility and they should manage and co-ordinate the process.  This risk should be considered within your costs. Please confirm and advise any uplift	Revised Fees being sought, and confirmation to follow.	5,000.00	Please confirm and close out ASAP. It is our opinion that the conditions are not onerous, and largely involve getting sign off of finishes	Noted, have included an additional fee for these works
	<i>Architectural</i>							
1	We have made no allowance for spare finishes.	Just a note, the Client has confirmed they wish to have 5 boxes of 20 tiles for maintenance / patch repairs.	Please add £250 for a box of spare tiles.	Client wants 5 boxes, so £1,250.00 to be added for spares	Uplift amended.	1,250.00	Noted	
2	For the SC-02 timber panelling finish, we have included a provisional sum to make good existing via French polishing only subject to site survey. No allowance has been made for new.	Any existing timber, whether that be the reception desk or panelling will require an allowance for repair and finish as required. A condition survey will determine the extent of this. This will be by a specialist subcontractor and appropriate to Listed Buildings	Refer to item 13 in Queries.					
3	We have included a provisional sum for the fire rated glazed sliding door pending receipt of a compliant quote.	Please provide firm price for the glazed sliding door	Refer to item 11 in Queries.					
4	We have assumed the structural calcs for the Rooflight and Sliding Folding Walls have been carried out and the building can carry these loads.	No survey has been done to the rooflights. Contractor to undertake necessary steps to ensure solution proposed is suitable. This was relayed at site visits and mid-tender and pinpointed as a critical path item. Tender Addendum #3 issued as built information on existing rooflights. Please allow for structural input to inform your design. Contractor will be responsible for delivering this element of work	Please allow fees of £4,750.00 for the appointment of a structural engineer to undertake a survey/calculations of existing structural integrity of the rooflight housing area.	£7,500.00 added for structural fees under #36 of queries. Confirm this supersedes the £4,750 and is not £4,750.00 + £7,500.00	Please remove £4,750 as this appears to be a duplication to item 36 of Queries.		Noted	
5	We have assumed the existing raised floor can be reused in its entirety and have not included for any replacement pedestals or tiles.	Noted						
6	We have not made any allowance for acoustic barriers to the floor void, should these be required, this would be at an additional cost.	Noted						
7	Should underlay and adhesive need removing following strip out of the existing floor finishes, this would be an extra over cost of £7/m2	Pricing document refers stripout to allow for underlay and adhesive. Please confirm cost for all inclusive scope.	Please add 4604m2 x £7/m2 = £32,228.00	Noted		32,228.00		
8	Should the strip out need to be carried out outside normal working hours, this would be an additional cost of £44,282.44.	Prelims provide working hours as set by Listed Building consent. Contractor to allow sufficient time in programme for stripout. Please confirm	We can carry out all strip out works during normal working hours 8am-6pm Monday - Friday and 8am-1pm Saturday.	Noted				
9	The specification for the partitions is based on; 70 C Stud including 25mm insulation, 1 x 12.5mm Plasterboard each side, tape and Joint both sides. Allowed average 3m height as floor heights vary	Partitions should be as specified: Gypframe 48 5 50 'C' stud 2 Layers of 12.5mm Gyproc Soundbloc on both sides 25mm Isover Acoustic Partition Roll (APR 1200). Please confirm rate for compliant partitions	Please add £7,617.60 to allow for this specification for the drywall.			7,617.60		
10	Making good existing walls is based on a provisional quantity subject to survey following the strip out. The rate included is for minor repairs only ie filling holes and minor spot replacements.	Noted						
11	The specification for the suspended plasterboard ceiling is based on; MF, 1 x 12.5mm Plasterboard, tape and joint. Access panels by Profab 600 x 600	New plasterboard ceiling is to match existing in accordance with listed building consent.	Noted.	Noted				
12	The extra over for 6mm ply substrate to vinyl floor finishes is £17/m2. This is not included within the tender.	Noted						
13	The extra over for 12mm ply substrate to timber floor finishes is £25/m2. This is not included within the tender.	Noted						
14	The extra over for waterproofing to the wall tiling is listed below. This is not included within the tender.	This is deemed compliant. Waterproofing is not required	Should waterproofing be required, please refer to the provided schedule of items and costs.	Noted				
15	We have not included for decorations to the existing radiators, pipework, window cills etc.	Please provide cost uplift for these works	Window cills are french polished therefore we believe no paint finish is required. The radiators are all being replaced for new, please confirm that paint is required. We would like to add a further £1,750 to allow for painting all visible new/existing pipework.	Noted		1,750.00		
16	The atrium cannot be cleaned using a nebulous spray as described on the drawing. As the location is internal, water discharge is not containable. We have therefore allowed for a mixture of steam and hand clean to the areas, using a mild alkaline detergent.	Providing the area is protected there should be no issue with the Nebulous approach. The approach you suggest does not sound appropriate for a listed building and we would therefore want to see verification by a specialist that this will not damage the fabric of the building at all. It is likely that this will also need to be approved by the conservation officer.	Noted. We have investigated this system and based on the requirement to protect the listed joinery elements within this area, still consider the Nebulous system not advisable. We are happy to bring our specialist to a quality workshop to discuss a way forward that meets your requirements.	ISG need to ensure they are using a cleaning system appropriate for the listed building. In my experience there are generally 2 options for listed buildings; Nebulous or Steam cleaning as these are both non evasive. We will review if there are any other appropriate methods but suggest one of these are cited for the moment.  We propose that a workshop / demonstration is provided to show the proposed solution is suitable.  Should this not be the case, ISG are responsible for providing the nebulous approach as per the ERs	Noted and agreed, re workshop. If the nebulous system is required then a revised cost will be provided. Suggest a small Prov sum for this in the interim? Say 5k	5,000.00	Noted and agreed	

#	QUALIFICATION WITHIN TENDER RETURN	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	Add/Omit	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR
17	The two external terraces can be cleaned using a high-pressure jet. A nebulous spray as described on the drawings is not appropriate on these areas and will be disproportionate cost as requiring then a hand scrub.	We would need to see confirmation that this would not damage the existing building fabric.	Noted. We have investigated this system and based on the requirement to protect the listed joinery elements within this area, still consider the Nebulous system not advisable. We are happy to bring our specialist to a quality workshop to discuss a way forward that meets your requirements.	ISG need to ensure they are using a cleaning system appropriate for the listed building. In my experience there are generally 2 options for listed buildings; Nebulous or Steam cleaning as these are both non evasive. We will review if there are any other appropriate methods but suggest one of these are cited for the moment.  We propose that a workshop / demonstration is provided to show the proposed solution is suitable.  Should this not be the case, ISG are responsible for providing the nebulous approach as per the ERs	Noted and agreed, re workshop. If the nebulous system is required then a revised cost will be provided. Suggest a small Prov sum for this in the interim? Say 5k	0.00	Noted and agreed. Prov sum included in above item	
18	Allowed for new sanitaryware to new WC's only on the Ground and Second floor. Should any new sanitary fittings be required to existing WC's these would be at an additional cost.	Please provide uplift for new sanitaryware to existing WCs	Refer to item 16 in Queries.	Noted				
<b>Mechanical and Electrical</b>								
1	We have made no allowance for any BIM Modelling.	This is not required and thus compliant	Noted.	Noted				
2	We have allowed all cabling to lighting and power to be in Twin & Earth cable	This is deemed compliant	Noted.	Noted				
3	No fire rate cable allowed other than the fire alarm system.	Noted, although LSF cable specification (as specified) to be utilised. Please confirm you have allowed for the specified cable	Confirmed included.	Noted				
4	No containment allowed below raised floor, assumed we will clip direct to the slab.	Existing below floor trunking and basket to be utilised	Noted. No additional costs.	Noted				
5	All containment in the walls to be in PVC.	Wall recessed PVC conduit acceptable.	Noted.	Noted				
6	No under desk or desk top modules allowed, assume furniture installer will supply and install and will PAT test these upon completion.	This is deemed compliant	Noted.	Noted				
7	Lighting control system is not interfaced to BMS or static inverter.	Interface with the Trend not specifically required, but remote access control and monitoring as specified required. Please confirm you have	We can confirm we have allowed for this.	Noted				
8	Luminaires B or B2 were not in the luminaire schedule, so prices have been based upon B1 only.	B2 is a 950mm diameter variation of the B1 and is likely to be more expensive. Please confirm you are happy to hold rate or confirm new rate	We can confirm we are happy to hold previous rate.	Noted				
9	Our costs for luminaires N1, N2 and N3 are provisional as Dextra missed these off their quotation.	Please provide firm rate	Dextra have updated their quotation for the project and the additional uplift would be £34,864.61.	Noted		34,864.61		
10	Audio/Visual & TV assumed by others.	ISG should include allowance for containment, power supply and data. ISG tender allows £4.9K, ISG to advise the extent of allowance (ie which rooms)?	Our allowance of £4,900.00 includes for power and containment associated with the Audio Visual installation as per drawings.	Noted				
11	We have not allowed for any floor mounted lamps.	This is deemed compliant	Noted.					
12	We have not allowed for any electronic sound masking.	Noted	Noted.					
13	We have not allowed for any downtime accumulated by Asbestos findings.	Please confirm you have allowed programme and cost for the asbestos	Refer to item 29 in Queries.	Noted				
14	There are no sprinkler works detailed in the spec or drawings, therefore we have excluded any works.	This is deemed compliant	Noted.					
15	We have not allowed for any utility services or diversions.	Have you priced for the utility works as shown in drwg BWD-00-XX-DR-	No works required. Existing Utility services are being retained.	Noted				
16	Whilst we have allowed for validations, we can take no responsibility for any existing systems which are to be reutilised, any defects discovered will be reported and costed where necessary.	Noted	Noted.					
17	We have based our offer on the basis that retained plant and equipment and shell and core infrastructure has the capacity to deliver the performance criteria within the specification and drawings.	Noted	Noted.					
18	We have not allowed for any upgrade for any of the existing services in our offer.	Please clarify which services you refer to?	We have assumed all existing services that are to be utilised in the new scheme are in good working order and are sized sufficiently to accommodate the new works. No allowance made to upgrade existing plant etc.	Noted				
19	No allowances have been made to employ an acoustician to review services in noise sensitive areas.	Noted, however noise levels as specified in the Performance Specification shall not be exceeded. Please confirm your acceptance	We can confirm we will accept this.					
20	We have made no allowances to supply or install any external acoustic plant enclosures.	As above, the Contractor is responsible for meeting the noise levels as specified in the performance spec. Please confirm your acceptance	We confirm our acceptance.					
21	On the mechanical package, we had no response from any named suppliers, so we have used our trusted supply chain.	Please confirm in writing what alternatives you refer to, as many of the specified equipment and suppliers has been agreed with the client.	We have included for all named suppliers in the MEP specification. This clarification relates to where we have deviated from the named subcontractors for Fire Alarm and Security etc.	Noted. See other responses				
22	We have not allowed any special finishes.	Noted	Noted.					
23	No allowances have been made to carry out any Mechanical fire safety works as there was not enough information. This element shall be developed during the design period.	ISG to advise and allow for a provisional allowance?	We assume this is relating to gas suppression to the comms room? If this is the case please allow a provisional sum of £25,000.00 to cover this. All sprinkler works are currently excluded.	BWB advise that existing comms room gas suppression systems are to be retained as existing	If this is the case please remove the £25,000 prov sum allowance for this.		Noted	
<b>Security / Access Control / CCTV</b>								
24	The named CCTV specialist RVTV have refused to price so we have used our own trusted supply chain.	This will need to be reviewed as RVTV are the client nominated specialist and have access to the council and police dept' rules and standards that were not issued as part of the Tender.	Noted. We await your response.	RVTV are to be the sub-contractor for this element of work. EFDC are liaising with RVTV to progress detailed design to be complete by the end of May. A budget cost for RVTV is to be provided. This will be a defined prov sum  CCTV remains in the scope of works and ISG are expected to manage and co-ordinate the works.  Please confirm acceptance	Based on received quote from G+T received via email from A. Muir dated 16.04.20 for RVTV Security	9,640.00	Please note that RVTV quote excludes containment. RVTV expect costs to reduce upon finalised design. Suggest £25,000 prov sum to cover excluded items	Daryl Hardy email 21'4'20 confirms omission of existing cost of CCTV at £15,360

#	QUALIFICATION WITHIN TENDER RETURN	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	Add/Omit	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR
25	We have not allowed for any monitoring.	Please clarify	Previously not included see below costs for monitoring.  BT Redcare secure GPRS Grade 2 Supply, Installation & Connection Charge: £240. Monitoring Charge (Domestic Premises): £280 per annum Monitoring Charge (Commercial Premises): £310 per annum  BT Redcare secure GPRS Grade 3 Supply, Installation & Connection Charge: £240. Monitoring Charge (Domestic Premises): £320 per annum Monitoring Charge (Commercial Premises): £370 per annum  Police Unique Reference Number (URN Application Fee) Intruder Alarm Police Response Cost: £43.49 Panic Alarm Police Response Cost: £43.49	Cost for Domestic and Commercial monitoring included. Presumably only latter is required and either Grade 2 or Grade 3? Inconsistent with respos to item 29 below	Commercial Monitoring Grade 3 cost is £696.98  Police Unique Reference Number (URN Application Fee) Intruder Alarm Police Response Cost: £43.49 Panic Alarm Police Response Cost: £43.49  TOTAL REVISED COST = £783.96	783.96	Noted	
26	We have used our own trusted supply chain for the intruder/access control system. The uplift to use Mitie would be £45,000.00.	Which sub-contractor have you used? Mitie are specifically specified by the client as they look after the whole of Epping Council's estate - any alternative would need to work with Mitie and adpt their standards and work with the Mitie access control software - to be reviewed.	Noted. We await your response.	ISG can use another sub-contractor, instead of Mitie, for access/intruder control but they must be Grosvenor Technology Ltd approved. We use Grosvenor's "Sateon" system at the civic offices and oakwood hill depot. They only allow approved partners to install their system.  Please confirm your proposed sub-contractor is an approved installer	We can confirm WLS are an approved Grosvenor Sateon systems installer. Uplift removed.			
27	Fire Alarm Audibility Tests - Until the building is completed and includes the furnishings and internal decoration, the acoustic properties of each room will be unknow. It is for this reason that we reserve the right to submit additional costs for any additional devices required, therefore, on completion audibility level tests will be conducted. Results of these tests recorded and any non-compliant sound pressure levels reported.	This is not compliant and should be covered as part of the costs. Please confirm cost	We cannot provide costs until the layout of each room is provided or audible tests are completed.	Please assume each room requires its own sounder to achieve dB levels for fire alarm	Based in this assumption we can confirm no additional costs for this.		Noted	
28	No Void detection has been allowed for as none shown on drawings.	Please confirm that the main roof void has been covered / allowed.	This has not been allowed for as nothing was shown on the layout drawings. Please provide details.	Please refer to Tender drawing EDC-BWB-00-RF-DR-E-2004 as a basis of requirements	There is nothing shown for void detection. We suggest 30no. Detectors to cover the area at a cost of £5850	5,850.00	Confirmed sufficient by BWB on 21'4'20	
29	We have not allowed for any monitoring.	The ability for off site monitoring (Redcare or similar) shall be provided. Please provide cost	Redcare: Supply, Installation & Connection Charge: £445 Monitoring charge: £395 per annum	Item 25 also provides different costs. Confirm £840 to be added to tender to allow for Redcare	We can confirm £840 is the correct cost for this.	840.00	Noted	
30	We have used our own trusted supply chain for the Fire Alarm System. The uplift to use Mitie would be £55,000.00.	Which sub-contractor have you used?	We have utilised WLS Ltd for the Fire alarm works.	It is acceptable to use an alternative fire alarm sub-contractor	Noted, Uplift removed.		Noted	
31	Data Installation Worm Purple the incumbent specialist have excluded the following works from their tender - a. Strip out works b. Enabling works c. Incoming Services d. CW1308 Voice link cables e. Patching or jumpering of voice circuits f. PABX equipment, telephone handsets, servers and PCs g. Active switching h. UPS units i. Wireless Access Devices	31A - ISG should allow for strip out cost for redundant IT cabling. ISG to withdraw this clarification or advise a cost uplift. 31H - Existing UPS to be retained. 31I - Worm Purple quotation we have on file includes for WiFi AP's - please request a copy of their current quotation and confirm cost.	31A - We can confirm this is included elsewhere. 31H - Noted 31I - This is an error, we can confirm Wifi Ap's are included.	Noted				
1	Programme Six weeks for completion of Stage 4 Design activities. IS that sufficient, especially given procurement activities overlap from Day-1? How will the placing of early orders and completion of design be managed/ coordinated?		The six weeks design completion period is sufficient in our view based on our review of the competition works required. The procurement strategy is based on a progressive delivery and indeed early engagement of the key supply chain and early validation of existing design and services.	Noted				
2	Can we have a clear, concise date for each trade package #'s 17-33 for when a design is frozen and order is placed. Currently unclear. Especially important to know for key procurement items.		This is shown in the Pre Construction programme that was included in the tender submission. The dates are also included in the attached document - EFDC Schedule of design & approval dates	Noted				
3	#36 states 'works completed by others' and shows elements that are not stated in prelims as by 'client/ others', what activities does this cover?		The decant scope has been attached that is mentioned in the clarifications. On the programme I have included a milestone as this is clearly a client activity to be undertaken prior to possession of site. The list is as per the attached document. The only reason I can see confusion is because they are looking at the Strategic programme which shows the detail rolled up, the next items on the Strategic Programme are our activities also rolled up.	Noted				
4	Q4 - #36 states 'works completed by others' and shows elements that are not stated in prelims as by 'client/ others', so what does this mean and is this non-compliant.		Refer to item 3 above	Noted				
5	Section 3 is shown as commencing earlier than Section 2 completing? IS this possible? My interpretation was that scope of Section 3 remained live, operational space until the new fit-out had completed in full?		See revised programme rev 1 attached which shows Section 3 after Section 2 fit out. The PC date is not changed.  There are examples of areas that have to remain live throughout like the Comms room etc, this has been allowed for with the provision of a temporary power supply etc. The only area that requires Public Access is the temp reception in the Ground Floor of Section 3. This starts after Section 2 completes so a provision could be allowed in the newly refurbished reception whilst we carry out the works in Section 3. The requirements are shown in the Pre-Construction Link and site plan attached to your email.	Rev 02 attached. Assume this is the correct programme?	Confirmed		Noted	
6	#39 eight weeks to install lifts is tight? Has this been discussed with Essex lifts, is this achievable?		The duration is acceptable this has been agreed with our preferred supplier.	Noted				

#	QUALIFICATION WITHIN TENDER RETURN	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR	Add/Omit	RESPONSE FROM CLIENT TEAM	RESPONSE FROM CONTRACTOR
7	Section 2 has handed over before work to roof are shown to be completed, how will this work? Can this be clarified?		The roof Glazing, part of Section 2, runs 2 weeks past the completion of the fit out works in section 2. The roof dates have been coordinated with the Supply Chain so as to ensure they are compliant.	Noted				
8	No indication of timescales for design team validation and review of proposed design information? Can this be clarified, design team need two weeks from receipt, is this considered? Also dates for information release would be useful to see.		This is shown in the Pre Construction programme that was included in the tender submission. The dates are also included in the attached document - EFDC Schedule of design & approval dates	Noted				
9	If programme start date was pushed out, the entire programme would move out in accordance with the delayed start? Is this a correct assumption?		In its current form yes the programme would be required to be time shifted, however discussions are being held around what could be achieved in order to accommodate a later construction start, these would include the development of the design / key package placement/ validations and surveys etc so as the programme can be de risked and achieve a speedier delivery.	Noted				
10	Validation activities and surveys are overlapped with completion of Stage 4 design. Surely this doesn't work, as Stage 4 will need to consider the result of the surveys?		The pre commencement stage is designed to be progressive and in order to achieve early delivery surety the periods overlap, but importantly are considered in their approach.  We have attached a separate schedule of these dates	Noted				
11	No asbestos removal considered in programme. This is non-compliant. An asbestos survey was included in the tender documents and cost and programme should consider the results		Refer to item 29 in Queries.	Noted				

	<u>222,495.86</u>
Original Tender	5,186,133.54
<b>Revised Tender</b>	<b>5,408,629.40</b>



This page is intentionally left blank



## **Report to the Cabinet**

**Report reference:** C-003-2020/21

**Date of meeting:** 01 June 2020



**Epping Forest  
District Council**

**Portfolio:** Leader

**Subject:** Financial Issues Covid 19

**Responsible Officer:** Nick Dawe (07939449512).

**Democratic Services:** Adrian Hendry (01992 564246).

---

### **Recommendations/Decisions Required:**

- (1) To discuss this report and agree the actions and priorities set out in sections 2 and 3.
- (2) To invite detailed investment proposals to be considered at the July Cabinet.
- (3) To note that a further report including details of intended proposals and purchases will be taken to Cabinet in July.

#### **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 The following paper updates Cabinet on the actual and assumed impact of Covid 19 on the District and sets out a general approach and certain specific proposals to assist the local economy with a sustainable post Covid 19 recovery.
- 1.2 Cabinet should note that whilst the current position reflects information known to officers, the pace and nature of “lockdown” easing will significantly impact on the figures. In addition, although the impacts on cash-flow are more immediate and require management, the income and expenditure impact may be less, i.e. individuals may not be paying their housing rent now but may recognise the total amounts owing by the end of the financial year.
- 1.3 In terms of recovery actions, in line with initial Cabinet guidance all activities need to “walk the fine line” between encouragement to recovery without inadvertently and negatively distorting the local economy. Again, taking previous Cabinet guidance into account, making good use of retained and useable reserves and taking an “investment” review of recovery actions has also informed the proposals brought forward.

#### **2. Covid 19 Impact on Epping Forest District Council**

- 2.1 The District has been monitoring and forecasting the Covid 19 impact on income and expenditure and in addition have been matching this against specific grants received from the Government, (£58,652 and £1,306,973).

- 2.2 The loss of income to EFDC is recorded as being over £900,000 a month with business rates, council tax, leisure income and car parking item being the areas where the greatest risk is reported.
- 2.3 Allowing for a general recovery from July the predicted annual loss of income is £6m. However, £2.7m of this figure relates to business rates where the Government specific grant is likely to reduce this loss significantly. A revised view of business rate losses is currently being produced.
- 2.4 The loss of leisure income for the period July 2020 to March 2021 stands at £500,000 and again depending on Government guidelines around social distancing set against the benefits of exercise, this figure may be overstated.
- 2.5 In terms of additional net expenditure this is estimated as being around £0.6m for the whole year with around half of this being due to potential compensatory payments in respect of leisure services, which may be challenged. Currently the District is in discussion with Places for Leisure on an open book examination of costs and lost income which should be concluded this week).
- 2.6 Although the general reserve balance at year-end has yet to be confirmed, it is expected to be in the order of £8m.
- 2.7 Details of the income and expenditure estimates are attached, and it should be stressed that these are emerging figures and should be set against both the additional Government funding and healthy general reserve balances.

### **3. Supporting the Post Covid 19 Recovery Locally**

- 3.1 Cabinet in the Budget for 2020/21 and subsequently approved a key role for Qualis in supporting and delivering sustainable growth in terms of housing, business and social goods, e.g. St Johns Leisure Centre. A continuation of these projects and ambitions will be a key engine for recovery especially as it is still intended to carry out developments to the pre Covid 19 timetable with only minor adjustments to the sales and lettings timetable on completion (within the current risk and sensitivity view in the Business Case).
- 3.2 District has existing and is working on revised strategies around economic growth and supporting and developing High Streets and other town centres. The District has also a successful apprenticeship scheme. The District has embarked on master planning for North Weald as well. Again, building on these initiatives will be important in the post Covid 19 world.
- 3.3 The first proposed initiative in support of the post Covid 19 recovery is: investment in local high streets properties. The District has formed Qualis to lead the redevelopment of the Epping St Johns and other Epping sites with detailed planning underway. The Cabinet has signalled that Qualis will take a future role in providing and managing investment in other towns within the District. Details of these potential projects in future years including the master planning for North Weald are currently taking place. The uncertainty around current and future market conditions needs to be stressed and any investment would need to see this reflected in the price of acquisition and the certainty of payback. Associated with these strategic initiatives there are a series of more immediate purchases that could fit well with this long-term vision. These potential purchases have been identified as follows (see full report as

attachment). Detail of sites is being gathered and how they will potentially fit into broader economic and investment strategies is being evaluated for the end of June.

- 3.4 The second proposed initiative in support of the post Covid 19 recovery is: the development and support of companies. Potentially in support of the high street initiatives and being mindful of existing companies in recovering and absent companies from the high street, the District may take a more direct role (initially). The District has had significant experience in terms of acting as a landlord and offering served premises but it may be appropriate to “bump start” businesses via measures such as start off stock, fitting out premises, provision of payroll and book keeping services and similar more practical issues. The District will need to approach this initiative in an entrepreneurial way but avoid wherever possible a distortion of the market. This initiative may be geared to a particular subject or approach, i.e. providing drop in office style accommodation, facilities such as CAD or 3d printing, virtual meeting technology and similar. Alternatively, it may fit “gap” in the high street with more traditional but missing retail and commercial presence. It is suggested that 2-3 absent or new business opportunities are found and evaluated for each major high street by the end of June.
- 3.5 The third proposed initiative in support of the post Covid 19 recovery is: the development and support of franchises. In essence, this model is very similar to proposal 3.4 but has a more uniform approach across the district. It may be for instance that the District sets up a franchise for on-demand transport that chimes with the sustainability agenda or similar developments which are in line with other strategies, e.g. the (further) development of horticultural business franchises. It is suggested that 2-3 absent or new business opportunities are found and evaluated for each major high street by the end of June.
- 3.6 The fourth proposed initiative in support of the post Covid 19 recovery is: to invest in companies via shareholdings. There may be companies who are recovering who do not have the capital to return as quickly as they would like or to invest in the future. These companies may be willing to offer an element of their shareholding in return for capital, in practice as per the “angel financing” model. This initiative would need to both invite and/or find these opportunities and assess the financial and future worth of companies and the products and services they wish to offer. This will require a risk and reward assessment and in line with other such market initiatives may have one success (which in practical and financial terms) offsets three comparative failures. Areas of investment that provide broader opportunities, although also have risks would include, IT, 3d Printing, locally sourced products and food, added value agricultural services and potentially the attracting of existing more distant companies to this area. This initiative can be geared to local businesses appropriately and in line with current legislation. It is suggested that 3 to 5 business opportunities are found and evaluated by the end of June.
- 3.7 The fifth proposed initiative in support of the post Covid 19 recovery is: to provide loans at market rates to businesses. There are currently signs of increased cash flow problems for otherwise viable businesses and despite the support provided to businesses from the Government, e.g. the furlough scheme and the business loan scheme. In simple terms the Authority can borrow at around 2.5% (using its covenant) and can offer loans at market rate, i.e. around 5%. In the previous banking crisis, authorities did offer financial support directly or via other institutions. For this approach to succeed it will be important to have a vigorous risk assessment of the loan applications, (e.g. loan to value and debt servicing considerations), good repayment collection and follow-up processes. This initiative may be best delivered

through the risk assessment processes being developed by Qualis or another partner may be required. It may also be possible, by using partners, that the Government intended 50% loans for companies such as those in the IT sector could be “topped up” by local contributions, nominally from the private sector. i.e. subject to appropriate registrations, loans provided by Qualis and/or another partner. This initiative can be geared to local businesses appropriately and in line with current legislation. It is suggested that 3 to 5 loan opportunities are found and evaluated by the end of June.

- 3.8 The sixth proposed initiative in support of the post Covid 19 recovery is: to enhance work opportunities and life opportunities by developing further skills, professional training schemes and extending the apprenticeship scheme. The broad proposal here is that EFDC formalises a management and professional training scheme building upon the success of the apprentice scheme. This can be orientated to provide opportunities to develop and support the District, develop experience and careers and (potentially) substitute for ad-hoc and interim staff in areas such as Planning or Finance. The cost per individual for this scheme will be around £50,000 a year. This cost will be partially offset by savings on interim overheads and agency amounts. It would also be possible to further extend the current apprentice scheme and potentially further extend this scheme to provide staff and training opportunities with other partners in the private and voluntary sector or possibly organisations such as the Clinical Commissioning Group. Such an initiative can obviously geared to District residents. It is proposed that options to provide and extend current skill an apprenticeship schemes are formulated by the end of June.
- 3.9 One of the issues Cabinet needs to consider is whereas Qualis is expected and planned to assist with first initiative, would Qualis be useful to assist with other more commercial initiatives, i.e. the second, third, and fourth suggestion?
- 3.10 Equally it may be that certain of the initiatives, i.e. the fifth and sixth suggestion may need in addition a further partner with financial risk assessment and loan making credentials, such as a local finance institution?
- 3.11 Cabinet are reminded that all the above initiatives have different elements of risk and opportunity and should be considered as medium to long-term investments with a five year plus timeframe. Apart from the primary risk and reward measure other benefits are possible nationally and locally as a result of these initiatives, e.g. corporation tax, employment tax, business rates and council tax yields.

#### **4. Next Steps**

Before formal consideration by the Cabinet on 1<sup>st</sup> June and possibly 11<sup>th</sup> June it will be possible to add further detail to the initiatives identified above and/or strike from the list proposals that the Cabinet do not wish to follow-up.

Proposed actions are identified in Section 3.

## E. Equality Impact Assessment

1. Under s.149 of the Equality Act 2010, when making decisions, Epping District Council must have regard to the Public-Sector Equality Duty, ie have due regard to:
  - eliminating unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and other conduct prohibited by the Act,
  - advancing equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not,
  - fostering good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not, including tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.
2. The characteristics protected by the Equality Act are:
  - age
  - disability
  - gender
  - gender reassignment
  - marriage/civil partnership
  - pregnancy/maternity
  - race
  - religion/belief
  - sexual orientation.
3. In addition to the above protected characteristics you should consider the cross-cutting elements of the proposed policy, namely the social, economic and environmental impact (including rurality) as part of this assessment. These cross-cutting elements are not a characteristic protected by law but are regarded as good practice to include.
4. The Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) document should be used as a tool to test and analyse the nature and impact of either what we do or are planning to do in the future. It can be used flexibly for reviewing existing arrangements but in particular should enable identification where further consultation, engagement and data is required.
5. Use the questions in this document to record your findings. This should include the nature and extent of the impact on those likely to be affected by the proposed policy or change.
6. Where this EqIA relates to a continuing project, it must be reviewed and updated at each stage of the decision.
7. All **Cabinet, Council, and Portfolio Holder reports must be accompanied by an EqIA**. An EqIA should also be completed/reviewed at key stages of projects.
8. To assist you in completing this report, please ensure you read the guidance notes in the Equality Analysis Toolkit and refer to the following Factsheets:
  - Factsheet 1: Equality Profile of the Epping Forest District
  - Factsheet 2: Sources of information about equality protected characteristics
  - Factsheet 3: Glossary of equality related terms
  - Factsheet 4: Common misunderstandings about the Equality Duty
  - Factsheet 5: Frequently asked questions
  - Factsheet 6: Reporting equality analysis to a committee or other decision making body

## Section 1: Identifying details

Your function, service area and team: **Finance**

If you are submitting this EqlA on behalf of another function, service area or team, specify the originating function, service area or team: **NA**

Title of policy or decision: **Finance Update Covid 19**

Officer completing the EqlA: Tel: **07939449512** Email: **ndawe@eppingforestdc.gov.uk**

Date of completing the assessment: **18<sup>th</sup> May 2020**

## Section 2: Policy to be analysed

2.1	<p>Is this a new policy (or decision) or a change to an existing policy, practice or project? It is purposefully a briefing and indication of preference paper. <b>Update on Covid 19 financial impacts. Covid 19 may generally a variable impact on different groups. The detailed proposals that are due to come back to Cabinet in July may have a differential impact, i.e. increase employment opportunities. A fuller EqlA will accompany the July report.</b></p>
2.2	<p>Describe the main aims, objectives and purpose of the policy (or decision):</p> <p><b>To update Cabinet on Covid 19 impacts and possible post Covid 19 recovery actions.</b></p> <p>What outcome(s) are you hoping to achieve (ie decommissioning or commissioning a service)?</p> <p><b>Continuation of detailed monitoring and post Covid 19 recovery actions.</b></p>
2.3	<p>Does or will the policy or decision affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• service users</li><li>• employees</li><li>• the wider community or groups of people, particularly where there are areas of known inequalities?</li></ul> <p><b>Universal impact currently. Future proposals yet to be formulated.</b></p> <p>Will the policy or decision influence how organisations operate?</p> <p><b>Potentially</b></p>
2.4	<p>Will the policy or decision involve substantial changes in resources?</p> <p><b>Potentially</b></p>

2.5	<p>Is this policy or decision associated with any of the Council's other policies and how, if applicable, does the proposed policy support corporate outcomes?</p> <p><b>This policy is all encompassing and potentially line with; The Budget, Economic Strategy, High Street Policy, Sustainable Travel and other strategies as actions are considered in detail in July.</b></p>
-----	---

### **Section 3: Evidence/data about the user population and consultation<sup>1</sup>**

As a minimum you must consider what is known about the population likely to be affected which will support your understanding of the impact of the policy, eg service uptake/usage, customer satisfaction surveys, staffing data, performance data, research information (national, regional and local data sources).

3.1	What does the information tell you about those groups identified?  <b>Assessment not yet carried out, will follow approval to actions.</b>
3.2	Have you consulted or involved those groups that are likely to be affected by the policy or decision you want to implement? If so, what were their views and how have their views influenced your decision?  <b>Decision point not yet reached, consultation not yet launched.</b>
3.3	If you have not consulted or engaged with communities that are likely to be affected by the policy or decision, give details about when you intend to carry out consultation or provide reasons for why you feel this is not necessary:  <b>Will follow</b>



## Section 4: Impact of policy or decision

Use this section to assess any potential impact on equality groups based on what you now know.

<b>Description of impact</b>	<b>Nature of impact</b> Positive, neutral, adverse (explain why)	<b>Extent of impact</b> Low, medium, high (use L, M or H)
Age	<b>Neutral pending decision which may confirm neutrality or improvement</b>	?
Disability	<b>Neutral pending decision which may confirm neutrality or improvement</b>	?
Gender	<b>Neutral pending decision which may confirm neutrality or improvement</b>	?
Gender reassignment	<b>Neutral pending decision which may confirm neutrality or improvement</b>	?
Marriage/civil partnership	<b>Neutral pending decision which may confirm neutrality or improvement</b>	?
Pregnancy/maternity	<b>Neutral pending decision which may confirm neutrality or improvement</b>	?
Race	<b>Neutral pending decision which may confirm neutrality or improvement</b>	?
Religion/belief	<b>Neutral pending decision which may confirm neutrality or improvement</b>	?
Sexual orientation	<b>Neutral pending decision which may confirm neutrality or improvement</b>	?

## Section 5: Conclusion

		Tick Yes/No as appropriate	
5.1	Does the EqIA in Section 4 indicate that the policy or decision would have a medium or high adverse impact on one or more equality groups?	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Not yet determined whether a positive or negative impact will result</b>
		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	If ' <b>YES</b> ', use the action plan at <b>Section 6</b> to describe the adverse impacts and what mitigating actions you could put in place.

**Section 6: Action plan to address and monitor adverse impacts**

<b>What are the potential adverse impacts?</b>	<b>What are the mitigating actions?</b>	<b>Date they will be achieved.</b>

**Section 7: Sign off**

**I confirm that this initial analysis has been completed appropriately.  
(A typed signature is sufficient.)**

Signature of Head of Service: N Dawe

Date: 18<sup>th</sup> May 2020

Signature of person completing the EqIA: N Dawe

Date: 18<sup>th</sup> May 2020**Advice**

Keep your director informed of all equality & diversity issues. We recommend that you forward a copy of every EqIA you undertake to the director responsible for the service area. Retain a copy of this EqIA for your records. If this EqIA relates to a continuing project, ensure this document is kept under review and updated, eg after a consultation has been undertaken.