

Report to the Cabinet

Report reference:

C-053-2009/10

Date of meeting:

21 December 2009



**Epping Forest
District Council**

Portfolio: Housing

Subject: Disabled Adaptation – 2 Crossfields, Loughton

Responsible Officer: Paul Pledger (01992 564248).

Democratic Services Officer: Gary Woodhall (01992 564470).

Recommendations/Decisions Required:

That, in accordance with Financial Regulations (Appendix B Item 32 Clause 2.60), the contract for the construction of an extension providing disabled accommodation at 2 Crossfields, Loughton exceeded the Contract Sum by £10,166.24 (24.5%) be noted.

Executive Summary:

Following receipt of a recommendation for a major disabled adaptation from ECC Social Care Occupational Therapists, Officers turned down this request as the works would cost in excess of £30,000. However, following approval from the Housing Appeals Panel, a ground floor extension to provide an additional bedroom and bathroom was arranged in accordance with Contract Standing Orders. However, a number of unforeseen problems were encountered during excavations, which resulted in the project exceeding the contract sum by £10,166.24 (24.5%).

Reasons for Proposed Decision:

Financial Procedure Rules 15 2007 Appendix B Item 32 Clause 2.60 requires Officers to prepare and submit reports, jointly with the Chief Finance Officer to the Cabinet, on completion of all contracts where the final expenditure exceeds the approved contract sum by more than the lesser of 10% or £25,000.

Other Options for Action:

No other options for action.

Report:

1. The recommendation for a major disabled adaptation for an additional bedroom and bathroom at ground level to 2 Crossfield, Loughton was received by the Council.
2. Initially, Officers refused the adaptation as the cost would exceed the £30,000 cap set out in the Council's Policies on Disabled Adaptations. However, following approval from the Housing Appeals Panel, a design was prepared, planning permission obtained and tenders sought for the

works in accordance with Contract Standing Orders.

3. The tenders received were as follows:

- (i) R.G.Bullocks - £42,141.36 (Reduced by £600 for a 2-week longer contract period);
- (ii) Titan refurbishment - £50,873.00;
- (iii) Richard Morris Ltd - £42,138.00; and
- (iv) Kirkman & Jourdain - £75,767.15.

4. R G Bullock were appointed to undertake the work at a reduced contract sum of £41,451.36, and the contract commenced on 14 January 2008, completing on 23 May 2008, which included a 5-week extension of time.

5. There were a number of reasons which contributed towards the delay, and consequently additional costs, and these are summarized below:

- During design it was anticipated that the existing drainage was no deeper than 1000mm. It was soon discovered that the drainage was in excess of 2000mm deep. This led to greatly increased foundation sizes and depths. It also resulted in the associated drainage works being far more complex than envisioned.
- Large amounts of ground water caused by a leaking foul drain outside of the site led to very heavy ground conditions and additional shoring up works to foundations and drainage trenches within the ground.
- During excavations, the water main serving the property was discovered to be directly under the works to the new extension, which meant that the water main had to be diverted. Problems with the main stopcock to the property at the boundary of the site were also experienced.
- Problems with the existing structure, particularly with the existing foundations were also present. These led to several design changes.

6. Agreement has now been reached with the Contractor on the final account in the sum of £51,707.60, which is an increase of £10,166.24 (24.5%). Therefore in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules 15 2007 Appendix B Item 32 Clause 2.60, Officers are required to prepare and submit reports, jointly with the Chief Finance Officer to the Cabinet, on completion of all contracts where the final expenditure exceeds the approved contract sum by more than the lesser of 10% or £25,000.

Resource Implications:

Additional expenditure funded from the Capital budget for Disabled Adaptations.

Legal and Governance Implications:

Housing Act 1985.

Safer, Cleaner and Greener Implications:

None.

Consultation Undertaken:

None.

Background Papers:

Occupational Health recommendation, Minutes of the Housing Appeals Panel, Tender Register and contract documentation.

Impact Assessments:

Risk Management

Equality and Diversity:

Did the initial assessment of the proposals contained in this report for relevance to the Council's general equality duties, reveal any potentially adverse equality implications? No

Where equality implications were identified through the initial assessment process, has a formal Equality Impact Assessment been undertaken? No

What equality implications were identified through the Equality Impact Assessment process?

Not applicable, since this report is for noting only

How have the equality implications identified through the Equality Impact Assessment been addressed in this report in order to avoid discrimination against any particular group?

Not applicable, since this report is for noting only