

## **Record of Cabinet decisions**

**Tuesday, 29 September 2015**

**3.00pm to 3.42pm**

**Date of publication: 30 September 2015**

**Subject to call-in these decisions will be effective from 8 October 2015  
The record of decisions is subject to approval at the next meeting of the Cabinet**

<b>Present:</b>	Councillor Alan Jarrett	Leader of the Council	
	Councillor David Brake	Portfolio Holder for Adult Services	
	Councillor Jane Chitty	Portfolio Holder for Planning, Economic Growth and Regulation	
	Councillor Phil Filmer	Portfolio Holder for Front Line Services	
	Councillor Adrian Gulvin	Portfolio Holder for Resources	
	Councillor Andrew Mackness	Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services	
	Councillor Mike O'Brien	Portfolio Holder for Children's Services	
	Councillor Rupert Turpin	Portfolio Holder for Business Management	
	<b>In Attendance:</b>	Dr Alison Barnett, Director of Public Health	
		Stephanie Goad, Assistant Director Communications, Performance and Partnerships	
Richard Hicks, Director of Regeneration, Community and Culture			
Perry Holmes, Assistant Director, Legal and Corporate Services/Monitoring Officer			
Anthony Law, Democratic Services Officer			
Barbara Peacock, Director of Children and Adults Services			
Phil Watts, Chief Finance Officer			

### **Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Howard Doe (Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Housing and Community Services) and Rodney Chambers OBE (Inward Investment, Strategic Regeneration and Partnerships).

### **Record of Decisions**

The record of the meeting held on 25 August 2015 was agreed and signed by the Leader as correct.

### **Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests and Other Interests**

#### Disclosable pecuniary interests

There were none.

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

### Other interests

Councillor Adrian Gulvin declared an interest in agenda item 4 (Youth Offending Team Strategic Plan 2014 – 2016 Refresh) because his brother worked for the Youth Offending Team and was the author of the report.

Councillor Filmer declared an interest during the discussion on agenda item 10 (Building Repairs and Maintenance Fund) because he was a Director of Medway Norse, who were referenced within the report.

### **Youth Offending Team Strategic Plan 2014 - 2016 Refresh (Policy Framework)**

#### **Background:**

This report outlined the Medway Youth Justice Plan Refresh 2014-2016, which was attached at Appendix A to the report.

The Youth Justice Plan, which was updated annually, formed part of the Council's policy framework and had been developed following discussions with partner agencies. It set out the aims and objectives for 2014/2016 in relation to working with young people who offend or who were at risk of offending.

The Plan had been reviewed, taking into account achievements and modifications to the delivery plan and updated data sets to provide appropriate context. Details of the significant changes that had been made as part of the refresh process were set out in Appendix C to the report.

It was noted that a Diversity Impact Assessment had been undertaken and this was attached at Appendix B to the report.

It was noted that the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee had considered the Medway Youth Justice Plan Refresh 2014-2016 on 22 September 2015. The Committee had recommended to Cabinet that the Youth Justice Plan Refresh 2014-16 be referred to Council for approval. Details of the Committee's consideration were set out within Supplementary Agenda No.1.

#### ***Decision number:***

#### ***Decision:***

**119/2015**

**The Cabinet noted the views of the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee and recommended that Council approve the Youth Justice Plan Refresh 2014-2016, as set out at Appendix A to the report.**

#### **Reasons:**

The Youth Justice Plan ensures that Medway Council and other agencies have effective strategies for addressing youth offending behaviour and delivers outcomes that have positive benefits for our communities.

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

The updated Medway Youth Justice Plan has been reviewed by the Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Committee and been the subject of consultation with key partners. The adoption of the updated plan seeks to address the underlying local causes of youth crime.

### **Draft Medium Term Financial Plan 2015/2020**

#### **Background:**

This report set out the major financial issues facing the Council over the next four years. It also provided a framework for the more detailed preparation of the draft Revenue Budget for 2016/2017.

The report included details of the Council's financial position, together with an overview of the Government's spending plans and the need for the Medium Term Financial Plan to be able to respond to the changing policy context in which the Council and its partners operated. An assessment of likely available resources and details of a number of key spending issues across the Council's directorates were set out in the report and accompanying appendices. It was also noted that Diversity Impact Assessments would be undertaken and reported to Members as part of the budget and service planning process as the quantum of resources and the impact on Council services unfolded.

It was reported that there was a forecast deficit of £13.8m in 2016/2017, which increased to over £41m by 2019/2020. This gap was largely attributable to the projected reductions in Revenue Support Grant from £38.8m in 2015/2016 to around £7.4m by 2019/2020.

Notwithstanding the service pressures impacting on the Council's budget requirement and the significant financial constraints imposed through Government grant reductions, it was noted that it must remain the Council's main strategic aim to achieve a sustainable budget without recourse to reserves. That aim would only be achieved through a combination of focussing resources on services that deliver the Council's corporate priorities, by delivering these services more efficiently through, among other things, digital transformation and by seeking to maximise all revenues, including local taxation and fees and charges.

It was noted that the Business Support Overview and Scrutiny Committee would be considering the report on 8 October 2015.

#### ***Decision number:***

#### ***Decision:***

**120/2015**

**The Cabinet endorsed the underlying aims of the Medium Term Financial Plan.**

**The Cabinet noted the forecast level of overall funding outlined in Section 4 of the report; spending priorities in Section 5 of the report and the projected budget deficit identified in Table 2 of the report.**

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

**121/2015**      **The Cabinet agreed to bring forward proposals, through the financial planning process, to address the deficit.**

**Reasons:**

This was a preparatory document to meet the budget process and timetable set out within the Constitution.

### **Treasury Management Strategy Mid-Year Review Report 2015/2016**

**Background:**

This report presented the mid-year review of the Treasury Management Strategy 2015/2016, which had been approved by Full Council alongside the Capital and Revenue Budgets on 26 February 2015.

The report included an economic update for the first six months of 2015/2016 and reviewed the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy; the Council's investment portfolio and borrowing strategy for 2015/2016; and, compliance with Treasury and Prudential Limits for 2015/2016.

Proposals to include property funds in the list of approved investments contained within the Strategy were set out in the report. It was noted that such funds, comprising a strong portfolio of high quality properties with good quality reliable tenants, were generally able to provide consistent annual yields; even when capital asset values fluctuated due to market conditions. Property funds of the type approved by HM Treasury were also relatively liquid and units could be bought or sold fairly quickly to respond to significant changes in the Council's cashflow forecasts. This proposal would need to be referred to Full Council for approval.

It was noted that the Audit Committee had considered the mid-year review on 24 September 2015 and details of the Committee's consideration were set out within Supplementary Agenda No.1. The Committee had recommended the mid-year review to Cabinet and that the proposed inclusion of property funds to the list of non-specific investments be subject to a £5m counter party limit, in order to manage risk. Further detailed information to the CCLA Local Authorities Property Fund would be included in the report to Council.

***Decision number:***

***Decision:***

**The Cabinet noted the comments of the Audit Committee, as set out in Supplementary Agenda No. 1.**

**122/2015**      **The Cabinet noted and recommended to Council the mid-year review of the Treasury Management Strategy 2015/2016, as set out within the report.**

**123/2015**      **The Cabinet recommended to Council that the Treasury Management Strategy be revised to add property funds to the list of non-specified investments, subject to a £5m**

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

### **counter-party limit for such investments and any investments being made in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Resources and The Leader.**

#### **Reasons:**

In accordance with the Chartered Institute of Public Finance Accountancy's (CIPFA) Code of Practice for Treasury Management, there should be a review of that strategy at least half yearly.

### **Technically, Environmentally and Economically Practicable Assessment of Recycling Services**

#### **Background:**

This report presented a Technically, Environmentally and Economically Practicable (TEEP) Assessment for Medway Council.

It was explained that from 1 January 2015, Regulation 13 of the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 (as amended) required all waste collectors in England and Wales to separately collect glass, metal, paper, and plastic where it:

- (a) was necessary, in effect, to ensure high-quality waste recovery; and
- (b) was Technically, Environmentally and Economically Practicable (TEEP).

Local Authorities were required to conduct a Necessity and TEEP Assessment to determine the route they take for waste collections arrangements.

The Medway Necessity and TEEP Assessment was set out in Appendix 1 to the report and details of the questions frequently asked about the 2011 Regulations were listed at Appendix 2 to the report.

It was noted that the conclusion of the Assessment for Medway Council was that separate collection was not currently required as it failed the economic practicability test.

Members were advised that the Necessity and TEEP assessment had been considered by the Regeneration, Community and Culture Management Team, who had recommended that Members be made aware of the assessment and its importance at the next procurement round. It had also been reviewed by a specialist environmental law barrister, who had confirmed the document was fit for purpose.

#### **Decision number:**

#### **Decision:**

**The Cabinet noted the outcome of the Necessity and TEEP Assessment of the Council's recycling services.**

**124/2015**      **The Cabinet agreed that due consideration should be given to the Necessity and TEEP test in preparation for the procurement of the next collection contract.**

**125/2015**      **The Cabinet agreed that a watching brief be kept on relevant developments in law, policy and guidance,**

**including as follows:**

- a) The Environment Agency, as regulator, will require collectors to submit information on collection methods and the Necessity and Practicability (TEEP) tests;**
- b) Relevant legislative announcements by the EU and the UK Government will be monitored;**
- c) WRAP will be monitored for updates to the Route Map.**

**Reasons:**

To ensure that Members have been formally notified of the outcome of the recent Necessity and TEEP assessment and to ensure that the Council can continue to deliver a high quality recycling service in the future.

**Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services Local Transformation Plan**

**Background:**

This report set out the requirement for Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG), in partnership with Local Authorities, service providers, young people and families and other key stakeholders to submit a Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) Local Transformation Plan to NHS England by 16 October 2015 and the steps that were necessary to attain sign-off and approval.

It also set out the actions that NHS Medway CCG and the Council were taking to ensure that a clear and comprehensive Local Transformation Plan was developed that met the requirements of the guidance and adequately reflected the extensive consultation and engagement that had taken place in the preparation of Medway's Emotional Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

It was noted that significant additional and recurrent financial resources were available to CCGs to support Children and Young Peoples' Emotional Health and Wellbeing and deliver improved CAMHS services in line with the aims and objectives of '*Future in Mind*'. This report was published in April 2015 by the Children and Young People's Mental Health Taskforce which was jointly chaired by NHS England and the Department of Health. The report established a clear direction and some key principles about how to make it easier for children and young people to access high quality mental health care when they needed it.

The Local Transformation Plan provided a one-off assurance framework for this additional funding in 2015/2016. Thereafter, funding would be allocated to CCGs in conjunction with established annual planning rounds.

Guidance for preparation and submission of Local Transformation Plans was issued to CCGs on 3 August 2015. A draft plan was required to be submitted to NHS England's local Team (Kent, Surrey, Sussex and Medway) on 11 September 2015 as part of a local assurance process.

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

It was noted that the Health and Wellbeing Board had considered this report on 15 September 2015. Details of the Board's discussion and decision were set out in section 7 of the report.

**Decision number:**

**Decision:**

**126/2015**

**The Cabinet agreed:**

- a) **the proposal of a stand alone Medway Local Transformation Plan for Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services, reflecting Medway's unique needs and characteristics and the planned and proposed structure of supporting services. This did not prejudice any future decisions in respect of future CAMHS commissioning.**
- b) **to note that the formal sign off of the Transformation Plan would be by the CCG through its governance arrangements.**
- c) **to delegate authority for signing off the Plan to the Director of Children and Adults Services on behalf of the Council, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and the Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board. The finalised plan would be presented to the Health and Wellbeing Board and Medway Council's Cabinet in November 2015 and would also need to be approved through the CCG governance.**
- d) **to support collaborative approaches with neighbouring CCGs in relation to the development of a Community Eating Disorder Service, in line with published commissioning guidelines and/or potential integration with other linked services e.g. substance misuse and post abuse as part of a broader Emotional Health and Wellbeing contract.**

### **Reasons:**

The CAMHS Local Transformation Plan needed to be submitted to NHS England by 16 October 2015. The Plan was developed to meet the explicit requirements of the NHS England guidance and adequately reflected the extensive consultation and engagement that has taken place in the preparation of Medway's Emotional Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

## Kent and Medway Suicide Prevention Strategy 2015-2020

### Background:

The report presented the multi-agency Kent and Medway Suicide Prevention Strategy for 2015-2020, attached at Appendix 1 of the report.

This strategy was a continuation of the 2010-2015 Kent and Medway Suicide Prevention Strategy. It combined local evidence with national research and policy direction to set out the partnership priorities and framework for suicide prevention across Kent and Medway for the next five years. It contained the first year's implementation plan.

It was noted that the strategic priorities identified for Kent and Medway were to:

- reduce risk in key high risk groups
- tailor approaches to improve mental health and wellbeing in Kent and Medway
- reduce access to the means of suicide
- provide better information and support to those bereaved or affected by suicide
- support the media in delivering sensitive approaches to suicide and suicidal behaviour
- support research, data collection and monitoring.

Appendix II to the strategy set out details of the public consultation undertaken to support the strategy development and an Equality Impact Assessment formed part of the Strategy. The Assessment had identified that there was no evidence to suggest that the updating of the Suicide Prevention Strategy would have an adverse impact on individuals because of any protected characteristic.

It was reported that the Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Medway's Health and Wellbeing Board had considered the report and accompanying strategy on 11 August and 15 September 2015 respectively. Details of the discussions were set out within the Cabinet report.

**Decision number:**

**Decision:**

**127/2015**

**The Cabinet approved the Kent and Medway Suicide Prevention Strategy, as attached at Appendix 1 to the report.**

**Reasons:**

The Strategy has been developed following consultation and reflects national priorities. By adopting the Kent and Medway Suicide Prevention Strategy for 2015-2020 the priorities and framework for suicide prevention across Kent and Medway for the next five years are set out. It contained the first year's implementation plan.



## Building Repairs and Maintenance Fund

### Background:

This report set out details of a proposed addition to the capital programme, in order to increase in the provision of the Building Repairs and Maintenance Fund.

The Fund formed part of the Council's capital programme and was utilised to support the ongoing repair and maintenance of operational buildings. It was noted that the fund was largely committed and in order to continue to undertake essential building maintenance its replenishment was being sought.

### **Decision number:**      **Decision:**

**128/2015**      **The Cabinet recommended that Full Council on 15 October 2015 approve a Building Repairs and Maintenance Fund addition to the capital programme of £1,000,000, to be funded from capital receipts based on a re-prioritisation and re-phasing of the existing programme by the Chief Finance Officer, in consultation with the Leader.**

### Reasons:

To provide sufficient capital resource to maintain key operational buildings and the services delivered from them.

## Recruitment Freeze

### Background:

This report presented information on vacancies that officers had requested approval to commence recruitment for, following the process agreed by Cabinet on 7 January 2003 (decision number 9/2003).

Details of the posts were set out within Appendix 1 to the report.

### **Decision number:**      **Decision:**

**129/2015**      **The Cabinet agreed to unfreeze the following posts, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report:**

#### **Business Support Directorate**

**a) Building Services Engineer**

#### **Children and Adults**

**b) Admin Support Officer (Post 12173)**

**c) Admin Support Officer (Post 12174)**

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

- d) Admin Support Officer – ASO
- e) Graduate
- f) Governor Development Officer.

### Reasons:

The posts presented to Cabinet will support the efficient running of the Council.

### Abbey Court School - Relocation and Expansion Works

#### Background:

This report provided information on the recent decision to award a contract for the necessary works to relocate Abbey Court School to the disused Temple Secondary School site on Cliffe Road, Strood. The project would deliver an additional 68 places.

It was noted that in 2013 it had been agreed to use the Improvement and Efficiency South East Construction Framework to source a contractor to complete the works to relocate the school. Although the demolition works and design were completed, agreement could not be reached with the chosen contractor to deliver the construction phase. The project was retendered and details of this tender process were set out in the report. An exempt appendix contained key information in respect of the financial analysis of the scheme and tender evaluation.

The Procurement Board had considered this matter on 24 August 2015 where the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Procurement Board, had agreed to award the contract to Neilcott Construction Limited to deliver the works at Abbey Court School. The Procurement Board had also agreed that this briefing paper be presented to Cabinet for noting.

#### ***Decision number:***

#### ***Decision:***

**The Cabinet noted the contents of the report.**

### Reasons:

To ensure that Cabinet is informed of the outcome of the tender process for these works.

### Gateway 3 Contract Award: Construction Professional Services Consultancy Framework

#### Background:

This report sought permission to award a series of framework contracts, on the basis that they passed the quality requirements outlined within the tender documentation and scored within the top eight of their respective Lots where applicable.

Members were advised that having investigated local and national framework alternatives, it had been agreed that a local framework best suited Medway Council's

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

priorities. It was noted that the disciplines covered by these frameworks were in frequent demand and by putting in place a framework Medway Council would be able to better monitor spend and receive better supplier performance due to the supplier relationships being built in the correct manner.

The report included details of the procurement process undertaken and the business case for establishing the framework contracts. An exempt appendix contained key information in respect of the financial analysis of the scheme, evaluation and award.

It was noted that Cabinet had approved the commencement of this requirement at Gateway 1 on 2 September 2014. This Gateway 3 Report had been approved for submission to the Cabinet after review and discussion by Corporate Management Team and the Procurement Board.

**Decision number:**      **Decision:**

**130/2015      The Cabinet agreed the award of framework places to the contractors outlined in Exempt Appendix C to the report and as set out below:**

### Lot 1 - Project & Programme Management

Value Band 1 - £0 - £150k Construction Costs				Value Band 2 - £151k - £650k Construction Costs				Value Band 3 - £651k - £1m Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office		Client's Office		Consultant's Office		Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	LVS Construction Consultants	1	Project Solutions Technical Consultants	1	LVS Construction Consultants	1	Project Solutions Technical Consultants	1	LVS Construction Consultants	1	Project Solutions Technical Consultants
2	Project Solutions Technical Consultants	2	LVS Construction Consultants	2	Project Solutions Technical Consultants	2	LVS Construction Consultants	2	Project Solutions Technical Consultants	2	LVS Construction Consultants
3	Dunsfold Associates	3	Dunsfold Associates	3	Dunsfold Associates	3	Dunsfold Associates	3	Dunsfold Associates	3	Dunsfold Associates
4	Harbledown Construction	4	Harbledown Construction	4	Harbledown Construction	4	Harbledown Construction	4	Harbledown Construction	4	Harbledown Construction
5	McComb Partnership	5	McComb Partnership	5	McComb Partnership	5	McComb Partnership	5	McComb Partnership	5	McComb Partnership
6	Appleyards	6	The Clarkson Alliance	6	Appleyards	6	The Clarkson Alliance	6	Appleyards	6	The Clarkson Alliance
7	Pick Everard	7	Pellings LLP	7	Pick Everard	7	Pellings LLP	7	Airey Miller	7	Airey Miller
8	Sweet (UK) Ltd	8	Faithful & Gould	8	Sweet (UK) Ltd	8	Faithful & Gould	8	Pick Everard	8	Pellings LLP

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

Value Band 4 - £1m - £5m Construction Costs				Value Band 5 - £5m+ Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office		Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	LVS Construction Consultants	1	Project Solutions Technical Consultants	1	Dunfold Associates	1	Dunfold Associates
2	Project Solutions Technical Consultants	2	LVS Construction Consultants	2	McComb Partnership	2	McComb Partnership
3	Dunfold Associates	3	Dunfold Associates	3	Appleyards	3	The Clarkson Alliance
4	Harbledown Construction	4	Harbledown Construction	4	Airey Miller	4	Airey Miller
5	McComb Partnership	5	McComb Partnership	5	Pick Everard	5	Sweet (UK)
6	Appleyards	6	The Clarkson Alliance	6	Sweet (UK) Ltd	6	Faithful & Gould
7	Airey Miller	7	Airey Miller	7	Faithful & Gould	7	Keegans
8	Pick Everard	8	Pellings LLP	8	Keegans	8	Mouchel Ltd

### Lot 2 - Regeneration / Landscaping / Artisan

Value Band 1 - £0 - £150k Construction Costs				Value Band 2 - £151k - £650k Construction Costs				Value Band 3 - £651k - £1m Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office		Client's Office		Consultant's Office		Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Mouchel Ltd	1	Mouchel Ltd	1	Mouchel Ltd	1	Mouchel Ltd	1	Mouchel Ltd	1	Mouchel Ltd
2	EC Harris	2	EC Harris	2	EC Harris	2	EC Harris	2	EC Harris	2	EC Harris
3	IBI	3	IBI	3	IBI	3	IBI	3	IBI	3	IBI
4	Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design	4	Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design	4	Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design	4	Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design	4	Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design	4	Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

Value Band 4 - £1m - £5m Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Mouchel Ltd	1	Mouchel Ltd
2	EC Harris	2	EC Harris
3	IBI	3	IBI
4	PCKO Architects	4	PCKO Architects
5	PRP	5	PRP
6	Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design	6	Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design

Value Band 5 - £5m+ Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Mouchel Ltd	1	Mouchel Ltd
2	EC Harris	2	EC Harris
3	IBI	3	IBI
4	PCKO Architects	4	PCKO Architects
5	PRP	5	PRP
6	Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design	6	Tibbalds Planning & Urban Design

### Lot 3 - Architectural Design

Value Band 1 - £0 - £150k Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Mouchel Ltd	1	CC Studio Architects
2	Fulkers	2	Mouchel Ltd
3	Clay Architects	3	Fulkers
4	Pick Everard	4	Clay Architects
5	Pellings LLP	5	Pellings LLP
6	CC Studio Architects	6	Playle & Partnership
7	Playle & Partnership	7	Pick Everard
8	Frankham Consultancy	8	Frankham Consultancy

Value Band 2 - £151k - £650k Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Mouchel	1	CC Studio
2	Fulkers	2	Mouchel
3	Clay Architects	3	Fulkers
4	HMY	4	HMY
5	Pick Everard	5	Clay Architects
6	Pellings LLP	6	Pellings LLP
7	CC Studio	7	Playle & Partnership
8	Playle & Partnership	8	Pick Everard

Value Band 3 - £651k - £1m Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Mouchel	1	CC Studio Architects
2	Fulkers	2	Mouchel
3	Clay Architects	3	Fulkers
4	HMY	4	HMY
5	Pick Everard	5	Clay Architects
6	Pellings LLP	6	Pellings LLP
7	CC Studio Architects	7	Playle & Partnership
8	Playle & Partnership	8	Pick Everard

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

Value Band 4 - £1m - £5m Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Mouchel	1	CC Studio Architects
2	Fulkers	2	Mouchel
3	Clay Architects	3	Fulkers
4	HMY	4	HMY
5	Pick Everard	5	Clay Architects
6	Pellings LLP	6	Pellings LLP
7	CC Studio Architects	7	Playle & Partnership
8	Playle & Partnership	8	Pick Everard

Value Band 5 - £5m+ Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Mouchel	1	CC Studio Architects
2	Clay Architects	2	Mouchel
3	HMY	3	HMY
4	Pick Everard	4	Clay Architects
5	CC Studio Architects	5	Playle & Partnership
6	Playle & Partnership	6	Bond Bryan Architects
7	Bond Bryan Architects	7	Pick Everard
8	Frankham Consultancy	8	Frankham Consultancy

### Lot 4 - Sustainability & Environment

Value Band 1 - £0 - £150k Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	WYG Environment Planning Transport	1	WYG Environment Planning Transport
2	EC Harris	2	EC Harris
3	RSK	3	RSK
4	Pick Everard	4	Frankham Consultancy Group
5	Frankham Consultancy Group	5	Pick Everard
6	Climate Energy	6	Climate Energy
7	Tim Moya Associates	7	Tim Moya Associates

Value Band 2 - £151k - £650k Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	WYG Environment Planning Transport	1	WYG Environment Planning Transport
2	EC Harris	2	EC Harris
3	RSK	3	RSK
4	Pick Everard	4	Frankham Consultancy Group
5	Frankham Consultancy Group	5	Pick Everard
6	Climate Energy	6	Climate Energy
7	Tim Moya Associates	7	Tim Moya Associates

Value Band 3 - £651k - £1m Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	WYG Environment Planning Transport	1	WYG Environment Planning Transport
2	EC Harris	2	EC Harris
3	RSK	3	RSK
4	Pick Everard	4	Frankham Consultancy Group
5	Frankham Consultancy Group	5	Pick Everard
6	Climate Energy	6	Climate Energy
7	Tim Moya Associates	7	Tim Moya Associates

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

Value Band 4 - £1m - £5m Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	WYG Environment Planning Transport	1	WYG Environment Planning Transport
2	EC Harris	2	EC Harris
3	RSK	3	RSK
4	Pick Everard	4	Frankham Consultancy Group
5	Frankham Consultancy Group	5	Pick Everard
6	Climate Energy	6	Climate Energy
7	PRP	7	PRP
8	Tim Moya Associates	8	Tim Moya Associates

Value Band 5 - £5m+ Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	WYG Environment Planning Transport	1	WYG Environment Planning Transport
2	EC Harris	2	EC Harris
3	RSK	3	RSK
4	Pick Everard	4	Frankham Consultancy Group
5	Frankham Consultancy Group	5	Pick Everard
6	Climate Energy	6	Climate Energy
7	PRP	7	PRP
8	Tim Moya Associates	8	Tim Moya Associates

### Lot 5 - Valuation & Market Analysis

Value Band 1 - £0 - £150k Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Mouchel Ltd	1	Mouchel Ltd
2	Harrisons Chartered Surveyors	2	Harrisons Chartered Surveyors
3	BNP Paribas Real Estate	3	BNP Paribas Real Estate

Value Band 2 - £151k - £650k Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Mouchel Ltd	1	Mouchel Ltd
2	Harrisons Chartered Surveyors	2	Harrisons Chartered Surveyors
3	BNP Paribas Real Estate	3	BNP Paribas Real Estate

Value Band 3 - £651k - £1m Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Mouchel Ltd	1	Mouchel Ltd
2	Harrisons Chartered Surveyors	2	Harrisons Chartered Surveyors
3	BNP Paribas Real Estate	3	BNP Paribas Real Estate

Value Band 4 - £1m - £5m Construction Costs				Value Band 5 - £5m+ Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office		Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Mouchel Ltd	1	Mouchel Ltd	1	Mouchel Ltd	1	Mouchel Ltd
2	Harrisons Chartered Surveyors	2	Harrisons Chartered Surveyors	2	Harrisons Chartered Surveyors	2	Harrisons Chartered Surveyors
3	BNP Paribas Real Estate	3	BNP Paribas Real Estate	3	BNP Paribas Real Estate	3	BNP Paribas Real Estate

**Cabinet, 29 September 2015**

**Lot 6 - Mechanical / Electrical / Building Services**

<b>Value Band 1 - £0 - £150k Construction Costs</b>			
<b>Client's Office</b>		<b>Consultant's Office</b>	
1	Frankham Consultancy	1	Frankham Consultancy
2	Pick Everard	2	Pick Everard
3	Mouchel	3	Mouchel
4	Chapman BDSP	4	Chapman BDSP
5	Bailey Partnership	5	Bailey Associates
6	Bailey Associates	6	Bailey Partnership
7	PCS Consulting Services	7	CBG Consultants
8	CBG Consultants	8	PCS Consulting Services

<b>Value Band 2 - £151k - £650k Construction Costs</b>			
<b>Client's Office</b>		<b>Consultant's Office</b>	
1	Frankham Consultancy	1	Frankham Consultancy
2	Pick Everard	2	Norman Bromley Partnership
3	Norman Bromley Partnership	3	Pick Everard
4	Mouchel	4	WYG Environment Planning Transport
5	Chapman BDSP	5	Mouchel
6	WYG Environment Planning Transport	6	Chapman BDSP
7	Bailey Partnership	7	Bailey Associates
8	Bailey Associates	8	Bailey Partnership

<b>Value Band 3 - £651k - £1m Construction Costs</b>			
<b>Client's Office</b>		<b>Consultant's Office</b>	
1	Frankham Consultancy	1	Frankham Consultancy
2	Picked Everard	2	Norman Bromley Partnership
3	Norman Bromley Partnership	3	Picked Everard
4	Mouchel	4	WYG Environment Planning Transport
5	Chapman BDSP	5	Mouchel
6	WYG Environment Planning Transport	6	Chapman BDSP
7	Bailey Partnership	7	Bailey Associates
8	Bailey Associates	8	Bailey Partnership



## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

Value Band 4 - £1m - £5m Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Frankham Consultancy Group	1	Frankham Consultancy Group
2	Pick Everard	2	Norman Bromley Partnership
3	Norman Bromley Partnership	3	Pick Everard
4	Mouchel Ltd	4	WYG Environment Planning Transport
5	Baily Garner	5	Mouchel Ltd
6	Chapman BDSP	6	Baily Garner
7	WYG Environment Planning Transport	7	Chapman BDSP
8	Bailey Partnership	8	Bailey Associates

Value Band 5 - £5m+ Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Frankham Consultancy Group	1	Frankham Consultancy Group
2	Pick Everard	2	Norman Bromley Partnership
3	Norman Bromley Partnership	3	Pick Everard
4	Mouchel Ltd	4	WYG Environment Planning Transport
5	Baily Garner	5	Mouchel Ltd
6	Chapman BDSP	6	Baily Garner
7	WYG Environment Planning Transport	7	Chapman BDSP
8	Bailey Partnership	8	Bailey Associates

### Lot 7 - Quantity Surveying

Value Band 1 - £0 - £150k Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Harbledown Construction	1	Harbledown Construction
2	McComb partnership	2	McComb partnership
3	Mouchel	3	Mouchel
4	Frankham Consultancy	4	Frankham Consultancy
5	Keegans	5	Keegans
6	Playle & Partnerships	6	NJC
7	Woodley Coles LLP	7	Woodley Coles LLP
8	Moreton Hayward	8	Playle & Partnerships

Value Band 2 - £151k - £650k Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Harbledown Construction	1	Harbledown Construction
2	McComb Partnership	2	McComb Partnership
3	Mouchel	3	Mouchel
4	Frankham Consultancy	4	Frankham Consultancy
5	Keegans	5	Keegans
6	Playle & Partnerships	6	NJC
7	Woodley Coles LLP	7	Woodley Coles LLP
8	Moreton Hayward	8	Playle & Partnerships

Value Band 3 - £651k - £1m Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Harbledown Construction	1	Harbledown Construction
2	McComb Partnership	2	McComb Partnership
3	Mouchel	3	Mouchel
4	Frankham Consultancy	4	Frankham Consultancy
5	Keegans	5	Keegans
6	Playle & Partnerships	6	NJC
7	Woodley Coles LLP	7	Woodley Coles LLP
8	Moreton Hayward	8	Playle & Partnerships
8	Appleyards		

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

Value Band 4 - £1m - £5m Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Harbledown Construction	1	Harbledown Construction
2	Mouchel	2	Mouchel
3	Frankham Consultancy	3	Frankham Consultancy
4	Keegans	4	Keegans
5	Playle & Partnership	5	Woodley Coles LLP
6	Woodley Coles LLP	6	Playle & Partnership
7	Appleyards	7	Appleyards
8	Moreton Hayward	8	Moreton Hayward

Value Band 5 - £5m+ Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Mouchel	1	Mouchel
2	Frankham Consultancy	2	Frankham Consultancy
3	Keegans	3	Keegans
4	Playle & Partnership	4	Woodley Coles LLP
5	Woodley Coles LLP	5	Playle & Partnership
6	Appleyards	6	Appleyards
7	Moreton Hayward	7	Moreton Hayward
8	Pick Everard	8	Airey Miller Partnership

### Lot 8 - Building Surveying

Value Band 1 - £0 - £150k Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Project Solutions Technical Consultants	1	Project Solutions Technical Consultants
2	LVS Construction Consultants	2	LVS Construction Consultants
3	Francis & Reardon	3	Francis & Reardon
4	Fulkers	4	Harbledown Construction
5	Harbledown Construction	5	Fulkers
6	Pierce Hill Property Services	6	Pierce Hill Property Services
7	Frankham Consultants	7	Frankham Consultants
8	WYG Environment Planning Transport	8	Keegans

Value Band 2 - £151k - £650k Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Project Solutions Technical Consultants	1	Project Solutions Technical Consultants
2	LVS Construction Consultants	2	LVS Construction Consultants
3	Francis & Reardon	3	Francis & Reardon
4	Fulkers	4	Harbledown Construction
5	Harbledown Construction	5	Fulkers
6	Pierce Hill Property Services	6	Pierce Hill Property Services
7	Frankham Consultants	7	Frankham Consultants
8	WYG Environment Planning Transport	8	Keegans

Value Band 3 - £651k - £1m Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Francis & Reardon	1	Francis & Reardon
2	Fulkers	2	Harbledown Construction
3	Harbledown Construction	3	Fulkers
4	Pierce Hill Property Services	4	Pierce Hill Property Services
5	Frankham Consultancy	5	Frankham Consultancy
6	WYG Environment Planning Transport	6	Keegans
7	Keegans	7	Playle & Partnership
8	Playle & Partnership	8	Sweet (UK)

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

Value Band 4 - £1m - £5m Construction Costs				Value Band 5 - £5m+ Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office		Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Francis & Reardon	1	Francis & Reardon	1	Francis & Reardon	1	Francis & Reardon
2	Fulkers	2	Harbledown Construction	2	Frankham Consultancy	2	Frankham Consultancy
3	Harbledown Construction	3	Fulkers	3	WYG Environment Planning Transport	3	Keegans
4	Pierce Hill Property Services	4	Pierce Hill Property Services	4	Keegans	4	Playle & Partnership
5	Frankham Consultants	5	Frankham Consultants	5	Playle & Partnership	5	Mouchel
6	WYG Environment Planning Transport	6	Keegans	6	Mouchel	6	Appleyards
7	Keegans	7	Playle & Partnerships	7	Appleyards	7	Airey Miller Partnership
8	Playle & Partnerships	8	Sweet (UK)	8	Pick Everard	8	Pellings LLP

### Lot 9 - Multi Discipline Services

Value Band 1 - £0 - £150k Construction Costs				Value Band 2 - £151k - £650k Construction Costs				Value Band 3 - £651k - £1m Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office		Client's Office		Consultant's Office		Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Project Solutions Technical Consultants	1	Project Solutions Technical Consultants	1	Project Solutions Technical Consultants	1	Project Solutions Technical Consultants	1	Harbledown Construction	1	Harbledown Construction
2	Harbledown Construction	2	Harbledown Construction	2	Harbledown Construction	2	Harbledown Construction	2	Keegans	2	Keegans
3	Keegans	3	Keegans	3	Keegans	3	Keegans	3	Mouchel	3	Mouchel
4	Mouchel Ltd	4	Mouchel Ltd	4	Mouchel Ltd	4	Mouchel Ltd	4	Pellings LLP	4	Pellings LLP
5	Pellings LLP	5	Pellings LLP	5	Pellings LLP	5	Pellings LLP	5	Frankham Consultancy	5	Frankham Consultancy
6	Frankham Consultancy Group	6	Frankham Consultancy Group	6	Frankham Consultancy Group	6	Frankham Consultancy Group	6	Pick Everard	6	ECD Architects
7	Pick Everard	7	ECD Architects	7	Pick Everard	7	ECD Architects	7	NPS Property Consultants	7	NPS Property Consultants
8	NPS Property Consultants	8	NPS Property Consultants	8	NPS Property Consultants	8	NPS Property Consultants	8	ECD Architects	8	Bailey Partnership

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

Value Band 4 - £1m - £5m Construction Costs				Value Band 5 - £5m+ Construction Costs			
Client's Office		Consultant's Office		Client's Office		Consultant's Office	
1	Harbledown Construction	1	Harbledown Construction	1	Keegans	1	Keegans
2	Keegans	2	Keegans	2	Mouchel	2	Mouchel
3	Mouchel	3	Mouchel	3	Pellings LLP	3	Pellings LLP
4	Pellings LLP	4	Pellings LLP	4	Frankham Consultancy	4	Frankham Consultancy
5	Frankham Consultancy	5	Frankham Consultancy	5	Pick Everard	5	ECD Architects
6	Pick Everard	6	ECD Architects	6	NPS Property Consultants	6	NPS Property Consultants
7	NPS property Consultants	7	NPS property Consultants	7	ECD Architects	7	Bailey Partnership
8	ECD Architects	8	Bailey Partnership	8	Bailey Partnership	8	Pick Everard

### Reasons:

The decision is based on having completed an OJEU compliant restricted process which going forward will streamline the tendering process and provide pricing granularity for upcoming consultancy requirements.

### Gateway 3 Contract Award: Provision of Supported Accommodation and Floating Support for Young People Aged 16+

#### Background:

This report sought permission to admit suppliers to the framework agreement for the provision of supported accommodation and floating support services for 2 years (with options to extend for two further 12 month periods). This would enable the framework agreement to be used to award contracts for individual placements to pre-tendered and approved providers.

The Council was required to procure accommodation and support services for young people 16+ and care leavers with identified care needs. This provision was tailored to aid young people in their transition into the community and adulthood. Children's Social Care was responsible for the accommodation and support for these young people and also determine the level of support to be provided.

It was noted that this Gateway 3 Report had been approved for submission to the Cabinet after review and discussion at the Children and Adults Directorate Management Team Meeting on 18 August 2015 and the Procurement Board on 9 September 2015.

## Cabinet, 29 September 2015

The report set out details of the procurement process undertaken and the business case. An exempt appendix contained key information in respect of the financial analysis of the scheme, evaluation and award.

**Decision  
number:**

**Decision:**

**131/2015**

**The Cabinet agreed that the successful tenderers, as outlined in Section 3.3 of the exempt appendix and set out below, be admitted onto the framework agreement for supported accommodation and floating support:**

- **Acorn Homes – Lot 1,2,3**
- **Aspirations Care Ltd – Lot 2**
- **CXK Ltd – Lot 1,2**
- **Haven Care Support Services – Lot 1,2,3**
- **Jordan Xavier – Lot 1,2,3**
- **Porchlight – Lot 1,2**
- **SOS – Lot 1,2**
- **Social & Community Care Ltd – Lot 1,2,3**
- **Town Centre Accommodation & Support – Lot 3**

**Lot 1 (Standard – Low Level of Support Needs)**

**Lot 2 (Enhanced Needs)**

**Lot 3 (Complex/Intensive Needs)**

**Reasons:**

The successful tenderers have demonstrated the ability to deliver services at, or exceed, the minimum standard required.

.....  
**Leader of the Council**

.....  
**Date**

**Wayne Hemingway/Anthony Law, Democratic Services Officers**

Telephone: 01634 332509/332008

Email: [democratic.services@medway.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@medway.gov.uk)