

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 22 November 2019	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Strategic Director of Children's and Adults' Services
<b>Report title:</b>		<b>Gateway 2 - Contract Award Approval</b> to the appointment of a design team for phase 2 of The Charter School East Dulwich project	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		South Camberwell, Village, East Dulwich	
<b>From:</b>		Bruce Glockling, Head of Regeneration – Capital Works & Development, Place & Wellbeing Directorate	

### RECOMMENDATION(S)

1. That the Strategic Director of Children's and Adults' Services approve the award of the architect-led design team contract for phase 2 of The Charter School East Dulwich project to Feilden Clegg Bradley Studios (FCBS) for RIBA stages 2 - 4 for the sum of £651,083.40 for a period of 9 months commencing in December 2019.

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. On 8 December 2015 Cabinet approved the Council entering into an agreement with the Education Funding Agency (EFA) for the council to oversee and manage the procurement and construction of a new school, The Charter School East Dulwich (TCSED), which is to be developed on the site of the existing Dulwich Community Hospital (East Dulwich Grove, London SE22 8PT). Cabinet approved a £5,000,000 contribution from the Council's capital programme to address a projected funding shortfall and improve design quality of the building.
3. The EFA purchased 5.21 hectares of the Dulwich Community Hospital site from the NHS, to lease on to TCSED on a peppercorn rent for 125 years. The sale agreement with the NHS releases the land to the EFA in three parcels:
  - **Parcels 1 and 2** (the north east and south west parcels) for phase 1 of the School. This land was released in October 2015.
  - **Parcel 3** for phase 2 of the School. This land is expected to be released in April 2020 when the NHS clinical services still operating in the hospital will relocate to the new NHS health centre currently being built on the **parcel 4** land which the NHS is retaining.

Diagram 1 – Aerial of site showing land parcels



4. On completion, TCSED will be an eight form entry secondary school for 1700 children including a 480 place sixth form and 20 pupil place Special Educational Needs (SEN) resource. Phase 2 will enable the school to increase its intake to 240 pupils a year.
5. In 2015, the Council appointed Feilden Clegg Bradley Studios (FCBS) for RIBA Stages 0 - 3 to develop designs for the school and obtain planning consent which was granted in 2016 (16/AP/2740). FCBS were then novated to the phase 1 contractor Kier.
6. Phase 1 was completed in 2018 and opened in January 2019. It was built under a Design and Build contract. FCBS were novated to the contractor Kier. The works included demolition of hospital buildings and new build construction. Phase 1 delivered the main teaching accommodation with art and science classrooms (on parcel 1) and sports hall (on parcel 2).
7. On 28 June 2019, GW1 approval (Appendix 1) was given to the procurement of an architect-led design team using the Greater London Authority (GLA) Architecture Design and Urbanism Panel (ADUP) Framework Agreement, Lot 10, to develop phase 2 of the scheme to RIBA Stage 4 (Technical Design), incorporating the SEN resource agreed since the planning consent and to develop the technical detail of the designs, including input from specialist sub-contractors, to enable the council to tender a well researched and developed scheme to a Design and Build contractor.
8. Phase 2 will deliver the main school entrance, administration areas, sixth form centre, music facilities, lecture hall, SEN resource, multi-use games areas (MUGAs), general landscaping. Like phase 1, phase 2 will involve extensive demolition of unused hospital wings to be replaced by the new school buildings. In addition, it will include refurbishment of the central hospital block, known as 'the chateau', which is being retained. Built in 1887, the chateau is

not listed but public consultation on the planning application showed strong local support for retaining it.

Diagram 2 – The chateau



**Procurement project plan (Key Decision)**

<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
Design team appointment t confirmed	late Oct 2019
Surveys	Nov /Dec 2019
Revised planning approval	By February 2020
Demolition works start	March 2020
NHS hand over parcel 3	April 2020
Contractor award	May 2020
Main works start	May 2020
<b>Final practical completion and handover</b>	<b>July 2021</b>

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Completed by/Complete by:</b>
Forward Plan for Gateway 2 decision (in December)	08/10/2019
Briefed relevant Cabinet member (over £100k)	10/10/2019
Approval of Gateway 1: Procurement Strategy Report	28/06/2019
Invitation to tender	23/08/2019
Closing date for return of tenders	18/09/2019
Completion of evaluation of tenders	08/10/2019
CAB/DCRB Review Gateway 2:	30/10/2019
CCRB Review Gateway 2:	N/A
CMT Review Gateway 2: (If applicable)	N/A
Notification of forthcoming decision – Five clear working days	22/11/2019
Approval of Gateway 2: Contract Award Report	02/12/2019
Scrutiny Call-in period and notification of implementation of Gateway 2 decision	11/12/2019
Debrief Notice and Standstill Period (if applicable)	N/A
Contract award	12/12/2019
Add to Contract Register	12/12/2019
Contract start	12/12/2019
Publication of award notice on Contracts Finder	12/12/2019
Contract completion date	15/09/2020
Contract completion date – if extension(s) exercised	N/A

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Description of procurement outcomes**

- The procurement outcome for phase 2 of the TCSED project will be the appointment of an appropriately skilled design team, (including landscape architects, engineers, Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) assessors, and acousticians) with the right experience and expertise to deliver phase 2 of the project to RIBA stage 4. This will benefit the project by identifying construction risks and mitigating for them during the design stage which will avoid costly construction solutions and/or last minute changes to the design.

### **Key/Non Key decisions**

- This report deals with a key decision.

## **Policy implications**

11. The provision of new, additional school places is essential to the delivery of the council's strategy for sufficient pupil places and forms a key part of the Secondary Investment Strategy. Phase 2 of the TCSED will allow the council to deliver a total of eight form entry of secondary school places that will ensure it has capacity to meet existing and future projected need and provide an element of choice for parents applying for secondary school places in the borough. Projections show that, without the school, the authority will be short of secondary places by approximately two forms of entry in 2021.
12. This provision also fully advocates the Council Plan 2018/19 – 2021/22 priorities to give a great start in life, with a vision to offer great schools and an opportunity to thrive for a fairer future.

## **Tender process (confirming stages undertaken as required by the procurement route)**

13. The tender process followed the GLA ADUP Framework Agreement requirements.
14. To test the level of interest in advance of tender publication, all ten practices in Lot 10 were asked to indicate their interest. Five confirmed they were.
15. The tender was published on 23 August, via the Council's procurement portal, with a closing date of 18 September 2019. In line with ADUP requirements, all ten practices in Lot 10 were invited to tender however only one tender was received, from Fielden Clegg Bradley Studios (FCBS).

## **Tender evaluation**

16. The evaluation process followed ADUP user guidance, using the following ADUP award criteria which had been set out in the Invitation to Tender (ITT):
  - 70% technical/quality/ social value
  - 25% cost
  - 5% equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI)
17. The tender was scored against weighted award criteria through a set of questions also set out in the ITT (Appendix 1). Cost was scored relative to the lowest tender.
18. The evaluation panel consisted of the Council's Programme Manager and Project Manager, the Council's technical adviser, AMR Consult, TCSED Head Teacher and Department for Education Project Manager.
19. Following tender interview, a score of 81% was agreed by the panel for FCBS's tender. As only one tender was received FCBS's tender was awarded 25%.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>FCBS score</b>
Technical/quality/ social value	70%	53%
Cost	25%	25%
Equality, diversity and inclusion	5%	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>81%</b>

20. FCBS's tendered fee proposal for RIBA stages 2-4 was £684,972 which represents 5.9% of the estimated construction cost of £11.6 million. It was based on a number of exclusions and assumptions. The fee allowed for the following services: Architectural, landscape architect, MEP, structural/civils, building control, fire engineering, acoustician. The fee proposal and resourcing are calculated to meet the project delivery programme set out in the ITT and above.
21. A reduction of £33,888 (just under 5%) was agreed, conditionally, reducing the fee to £651,083.40.
22. The complexity of TCSED phase 2, in particular the chateau refurbishment, makes it difficult to find good comparable projects against which to benchmark FCBS's fee proposal in the absence of other tenders. The design fee proposal for another recently tendered community centre project came out at 3%. FCBS's fee for the equivalent range of consultants as the community centre, based on the tendered fee proposal, is 5.5%. However, the community centre is a new build so does not require the same extent of structural engineering input and, at an estimated construction value of c. £21 million, twice that of TCSED, would attract a lower fee percent.
23. Comparing the rates in FCBS's phase 2 proposal to those they tendered for phase 1 in 2015, those for architectural, landscaping, building services and BREEAM services are on a par. The engineering fees, fire and acoustician rates are higher which is not unexpected given the additional chateau refurbishment element in Phase 2 and worsening building condition from the lapse of time. The phase 1 design services were procured under an earlier ADUP framework. Eight practices submitted competitive tenders which were evaluated on a 40:60 price to quality basis with FCBS coming out as the most economically advantageous.
24. The appointment of FCBS is recommended. FCBS performed well on phase 1 and are familiar with the vision for the school, the site history, project issues, risks, stakeholders and governance. The FCBS team has the experience, ability and resources to meet the project requirements, speed delivery and identify potential savings. They understand the design changes since the previous requirements i.e. to locate the sixth form, music and hall in the new building and incorporate the SEN resource in the refurbished, converted chateau and the extent of redesign required to do that. They have access to details from their experience on Charter phase 1, including working for the contractor, to ensure efficient integration of the phases.

25. It is further recommended that FCBS are appointed for RIBA stages 2-4, for the reduced sum of £651,083.40. This would enable development of the technical detail of the designs, including input from specialist sub-contractors, to enable the council to tender a well researched and developed scheme to get a better construction price from a Design & Build contractor.
26. To bring the appointment within the GW1 approval sum of £410k, the council could consider an appointment for stages 2/3 only which would secure the revisions required to the planning consent, a key milestone. It would allow the council more time to review the stage 4 fee proposal, which accounts for about 50% of the total fee. The Council would have the option of extending FCBS's appointment to stage 4 or including it in the procurement of the Design and Build contractor. However this approach would not necessarily be any cheaper for the project or make delivery quicker. Leaving stage 4 until the procurement of the contractor may result in a higher contract sum because construction will not have been sufficiently de-risked and the contractor would add costs on top of FCBS's. Re-tendering the contract is not recommended as it would delay the project without guaranteeing any savings.

#### **Plans for the transition from the old to the new contract**

27. N/A

#### **Plans for monitoring and management of the contract**

28. Southwark Council manages the procurement and construction delivery of the School under an agreement with the EFA. The project is overseen by a Project Steering Group including representatives from Southwark Council Capital Works & Development, the Department for Education (DfE) and TCSED which meets monthly. To ensure co-ordination across the wider site, regular meetings are held between the Project Steering Group and NHS partners.
29. The contract will be managed by Regeneration Capital Works and Development. A Project Manager will be responsible for day to day project delivery, reporting to a Programme Manager and the Head of Regeneration Capital Works and Development who will be responsible for ensuring the project is adequately resourced and coordinated to deliver its objectives and procured efficiently and effectively in accordance with best practice for major projects procurement.
30. Mechanisms to monitor and manage the contract will include issues and risk logs and trackers and regular look ahead meetings.
31. A programme of project meetings will be agreed with FCBS including:
  - Fortnightly design meetings
  - Fortnightly design user groups meetings
  - Monthly steering group meetings
  - Planning pre-app meetings
  - Building control meetings
  - Stakeholder/ wider community engagement meetings as required.
32. KPIs' will be agreed with FCBS. A payment schedule will be drawn up for each stage of work. Invoices will be vetted by the Council's Capital Works and

Development team to ensure compliance with the terms of the consultants' agreement and then passed to the Head of Regeneration for authorisation.

### Identified risks for the new contract

33. An assessment of programme risks and mitigation measures has been conducted, as follows:

RISK	RISK LEVEL	MITIGATION ACTION
<p>1. Statutory risk to the Council resulting from failure to deliver sufficient secondary school places by summer 2021</p> <p>Also reputational and financial for both the council and school</p>	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Efficient project planning and management and sound resourcing.</li> <li>- Contingency planning to identify priority areas for handover are agree with the school and DfE well in advance.</li> <li>- Clear governance and decision making processes</li> </ul>
<p>2. Designs exceed budget</p> <p>Financial risk</p>	Low/medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure the consultant establishes comprehensive employer's requirements and a robust and reliable cost plan that has the agreement of all parties.</li> <li>- Ensure the consultant builds in time for value engineering to ensure costs align to budget.</li> <li>- Ensure that designs are informed by up to date surveys. In particular the conversion/refurbishment of the chateau.</li> </ul>
<p>3. EFA funding. Risk of non-payment of the £12.5m balance of the £36,542,104 and the additional £2.5m</p>	Low/medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contract is in place with EFA for the £36,542,104.</li> <li>- profile for receipt of the remaining £12.5m of the confirmed grant,</li> <li>- Obtain confirmation of the additional £2.5m grant urgently, together with the payment profile of the remaining £12.5m before further commitment is made to construction costs in phase 2</li> </ul>
<p>4. Delay in design decisions because of multiple stakeholders</p>	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stakeholder refresh on governance and decision sign off procedures used to successfully deliver phase 1 to ensure design decisions can be made quickly to keep the contract and project on track.</li> </ul>

RISK	RISK LEVEL	MITIGATION ACTION
5. Lead consultant produces inadequately detailed design and specification.	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As done on phase 1, ensure that the consultant is fully briefed on the council, School and DfE requirements for phase 2.</li> <li>- As architects on phase 1 then novated to the contractor. FCBS are very familiar with the project design and specification requirements, planning and other statutory requirements, the project governance structure, stakeholder and community expectations. Feedback from the School on phase 1 has been very positive.</li> <li>- In their tender, FCBS demonstrated experience of delivering complex heritage refurbishments to a tight budget.</li> <li>- Hold regular meetings with the consultant to review progress.</li> <li>- Check quality and completeness of specification prior to being issued to the works contractor.</li> </ul>
6. Pre-construction delays by the design team	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide clear info on the key milestones to the professional services consultant and obtain credible proposals for achieving the milestones in their project execution plan.</li> <li>- Monitor and control the delivery process.</li> </ul>
7. Delay/failure by the consultant to obtain statutory consents, e.g. planning, buildings regulations.	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Early discussions with the statutory authorities.</li> <li>- The ITT emphasised the strict timetable for delivery of phase 2.</li> <li>- FCBS's programme makes conservative assumptions about the need for a new planning application and consultation.</li> <li>- FCBS designed and secured planning consent for the scheme</li> </ul>

RISK	RISK LEVEL	MITIGATION ACTION
		<p>phase 1 so are very familiar with the site issues, planning and other consent requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Designate an in-house planning contact for the programme to give planning advice and co-ordinate planning application submissions.</li> <li>- Regular project meetings with the consultants to monitor and manage progress and address any blockages.</li> </ul>
8. Insolvency of the lead services consultant	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prior to appointment, obtain up-to-date Experian report and consult GLA on their latest financial information.</li> <li>- A performance bond is not necessary for this contract which is for consultancy services.</li> </ul>

**Other considerations (For Housing Department works contracts only)**

34. N/A.

**Community impact statement**

35. The projects will increase the capacity of Southwark’s secondary schools in the East Dulwich catchment area which will positively impact families.

36. There is a positive equalities impact (Appendix 2) as a result of the implementation of this procurement strategy. Southwark will give due consideration to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) as a positive duty to consider the promotion of equality throughout the provision of new additional secondary school places.

37. There will be an impact on residents who possess one or more of the protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, this procurement strategy will exercise all of its functions, and will have due regard (section 149 Equality Act 2010) to the need to (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other prohibited conduct, (b) to advance equality of opportunity and (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it.

**Social Value considerations**

38. The Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 requires that the council considers, before commencing a procurement process, how wider social, economic and environmental benefits that may improve the well being of the local area can be secured. The social value considerations included in the

tender (as outlined in the Gateway 1 report) are set out in the following paragraphs in relation to the tender responses, evaluation and commitments to be delivered under the proposed contract.

### **Economic considerations**

39. Opportunities will be sought through the interventions made at the East Dulwich site to enhance the area in general, and the school provision will stimulate economic activity locally through additional footfall.
40. The successful professional services consultant will be expected to deliver direct benefits to the local community and local residents. It is proposed that these benefits will be delivered through some or all of the following possible means:
  - Supply chain and procurement with local businesses;
  - Use of local labour and training initiatives, including a construction employment, skills and training scheme linked to the council's Building London Creating Futures programme, which aims to match local residents with construction vacancies especially where these are linked to key development sites and regeneration activities;
  - Corporate social responsibility and sustainability.
41. Once construction works commence on site the traders in the vicinity of the site are likely to benefit from increased trade.

### **Social considerations**

42. The council is an officially accredited London Living Wage (LLW) Employer and is committed to ensuring that, consultants and sub-consultants engaged by the council to provide services within Southwark pay their staff at least the LLW rate. It is expected that payment of the LLW by the successful consultant for this contract will result in quality improvements for the council. These should include more experienced staff and will provide best value for the council. It is therefore considered appropriate for the payment of LLW to be required. The successful contractor will be expected to meet LLW requirements and contract conditions requiring the payment of LLW have been included in the draft contract included in the tender documents.

### **Environmental/Sustainability considerations**

43. The new school will be designed to a minimum of BREEAM very good standard of environmental performance where applicable. This will entail designing efficient and cost effective low energy building engineering services.
44. The new buildings and works will use recycled and low carbon materials where possible and energy efficient fittings and building management systems where appropriate.

### **Market considerations**

45. TCSED is a significant Council project, set up to meet the council's commitment to provide additional secondary school places in high quality buildings for future generations. Demonstrating good value for money whilst

still maintaining the high level of design quality required is therefore vital and formed a key part of the evaluation criteria for the phase 2 design team. FCBS demonstrated relevant experience and skills in designing and delivering high quality secondary schools and heritage buildings cost effectively.

46. Procurement of the architectural service through a framework rather than an EU compliant tender process substantially reduces the time and cost of this part of the process. Selection of an appropriate framework allows selection from suitable specialists as compliance and capability has already been assessed. This has simplified the procurement process as we are working on the basis of the completed evaluations which allows for a quick and efficient mini competition.

### Staffing implications

47. This project will be delivered from existing Regeneration Capital Works staff resources.

### Financial implications

48. The budget for the project is £44.0 million (Cost code E-1406-0340). It consists of:

Source	Sum (£)	Note
EFA funding	36,542,104	£25,420,750 released so far.
EFA additional capital grant	2,500,000	Tbc
Council funding	5,000,000	Cabinet approval December 2015
<b>Total</b>	<b>44,042,104</b>	

### Investment implications

49. This procurement will enable the council to deliver phase 2 of this school project. Phase 2 will enable the school to increase its intake to 240 pupils per year and this will help the Council meet its statutory responsibilities to provide sufficient secondary school places within the borough. In The Schools Census for July 2015, pupil roll projections and existing school capacity show that there will be an anticipated shortfall of places. Without TCSED expansion as planned, secondary pupil choice will be severely limited by 2021. Local Authorities have a statutory duty to ensure that there are sufficient school places to meet the needs of its area, and failure to do so could potentially leave the authority open to legal action from parents and carers.

50. The timeline of this procurement enables the lead consultant to further develop the design of the school. This will enable the building contractor to accurately price the project.

### Second stage appraisal (for construction contracts over £250,000 only)

51. N/A

## **Legal implications**

52. The ADUP FA includes a standardised form of contract. The Director of Law and Democracy (acting through the contracts section of the corporate team) has reviewed the contract and advised on amendments to meet the council's specific requirements which the GLA has accepted.

53. Please see concurrent from the Director of Law and Democracy.

## **Consultation**

54. **Proposals will be consulted on widely during the design development process.**

## **Other implications or issues**

55. These have been incorporated throughout the report.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS**

### **Strategic Director of Finance and Governance (Ref: CAS19/012)**

56. The report asks for the agreement of £651k architects' fees which is 6% of the estimated construction costs of phase 2 of £11.6m.

57. Whilst the total budget of this project is quoted as £44m, of that £36.5m was confirmed as ESFA capital grant on 26 February 2016, of which £24m has been received to date with the balance of the £12.5m still to be profiled by the ESFA with officers. The Council's element of funding is capped at £5m. The total budget of £44m is therefore dependent upon a confirmation of a further £2.5m grant from the ESFA which we understand has yet to be received for the final phase of works envisaged by this report. Actual spend to date on this project before commitments is £29.75m, meaning that before the £2.5m additional grant there is only up to £11.75m budget left before allowing for any existing commitments, meaning that headroom on the project for completion of phase 2 is very limited.

58. Therefore confirmation of the additional £2.5m grant is required urgently, together with the profile for receipt of the remaining £12.5m in confirmed grant, before further commitments are made to construction costs in phase 2, beyond the architects' fees within this report. This is particularly important given that the LA has accepted any risk related to cost overruns as part of the funding confirmation letter of 26 February 2016. However, this risk is mitigated by the terms of the Development Agreement which passes certain construction risks over to the DfE provided the council exercises due diligence. Council officers are working closely with the DfE and there is formal governance in place to manage the project.

59. It is noted that it is a responsibility of the LA to provide sufficient school places and that this project is critical in meeting this requirement.'

## **Head of Procurement**

60. This report seeks approval from the Strategic Director of Children's and Adults Service to award the contract to Feilden Clegg Bradley Studios (FCBS) for RIBA stages 2 - 4 for the sum of £651,083.40 for a period of 9 months commencing in December 2019.
61. The report confirms that this procurement was conducted via the Greater London Authority (GLA) ADUP Framework Agreement, which meets the relevant EU and domestic legislation and the requirements of the Council's Contract Standing orders. The mini-competition was conducted through Lot 10, in accordance with the strategy proposed in the relevant Gateway 1.
62. The report details other frameworks that were considered in depth and the reasons that the ADUP framework best meets the council's needs whilst delivering value for money.
63. This report confirms there was only 1 bidder for this contract and that price estimated in the GW1 was exceeded as detailed in paragraphs 16 to 26.
64. This report confirm that monitoring and management of the contract will be in place for the duration as detailed in paragraphs 28 to 32.

## **Director of Law and Democracy**

65. This report seeks approval to award a contract to Feilden Clegg Bradley Studios to lead a design team and undertake professional consultancy services for phase 2 of The Charter School East Dulwich project working to RIBA stages 2 – 4.
66. The estimated value of the services required is such that their procurement is subject to the application of the (EU) Public Contracts Regulations 2015 which, amongst other things would require expressions of interest to be sought through the publication of a contract notice in the Official Journal (OJEU). However, in line with the recommendation contained in the Gateway 1 report the council has been able to access an existing (Greater London Authority Architecture Design and Urbanism Panel) framework which had been procured in line with the EU Regulations, without the need for a separate EU compliant tendering exercise.
67. The report confirms that all providers on the relevant framework "lot" were invited to participate in a mini competition, which generated only one tender.
68. The decision to approve the award of the proposed contract is one which is reserved to the Strategic Director of Children's and Adults Services by the council's Contract Standing Orders (CSOs). CSOs provide that the aim of a procurement process is to ensure that each contract is awarded to the most economically advantageous tender, so as to ensure that value for money, quality considerations and the need to implement the council's plan and strategies are taken into account.

**PART A – TO BE COMPLETED FOR ALL DELEGATED DECISIONS**

Under the powers delegated to me in accordance with the council's Contract Standing Orders, I authorise action in accordance with the recommendation(s) contained in the above report.

Signature  ... Date 2 December 2019....  
**David Quirke-Thornton**

Designation: **Strategic Director of Children’s and Adults’ Services**

**PART B – TO BE COMPLETED BY THE DECISION TAKER FOR:**

- 1) All key decisions taken by officers
- 2) Any non-key decisions which are sufficiently important and/or sensitive that a reasonable member of the public would reasonably expect it to be publicly available.

<b>1. DECISION(S)</b>
As set out in the recommendations of the report.
<b>2. REASONS FOR DECISION</b>
As set out in the report.
<b>3. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED BY THE OFFICER WHEN MAKING THE DECISION</b>
Appointment for FCBS for stages 2-3 only. Retendering the contract.
<b>4. ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARED BY ANY CABINET MEMBER WHO IS CONSULTED BY THE OFFICER WHICH RELATES TO THIS DECISION</b>
None.
<b>5. NOTE OF ANY DISPENSATION GRANTED BY THE MONITORING OFFICER, IN RESPECT OF ANY DECLARED CONFLICT OF INTEREST</b>
<i>If a decision taker or cabinet member is unsure as to whether there is a conflict of interest they should contact the legal governance team for advice.</i>
None.
<b>6. DECLARATION ON CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS</b>
<b>I declare that I was informed of no conflicts of interests.</b>
Signature  ..... Date 2 December 2019. <b>David Quirke-Thornton</b>
Designation: <b>Strategic Director of Children’s and Adults’ Services</b>

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background documents	Held At	Contact
Gateway 1 Procurement strategy approval - Appointment of architect for The Charter School East Dulwich	Chief Executive's Regeneration Capital Works & Development 160 Tooley Street, London, SE1 2QH	Yvonne Shaw 0207 525 0894

## APPENDICES

No	Title
Appendix 1	Tender scoring matrix with FCBS score
Appendix 2	Equalities impact assessment

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	David Quirke-Thornton, Strategic Director for Children's and Adults' Services	
<b>Report Author</b>	Yvonne Shaw, Project Manager, Place and Wellbeing Directorate	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	7/11/19	
<b>Key Decision?</b>	Yes	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	Yes	Yes
Head of Procurement	Yes	Yes
Director of Law and Democracy	Yes	Yes
Director of Exchequer (for housing contracts only)	No	No
Cabinet Member	Yes	No
<b>Contract Review Boards</b>		
Departmental Contract Review Board	Yes	Yes
Corporate Contract Review Board	No	No
<b>Cabinet</b>	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional/Community Council/Scrutiny Team</b>	2 December 2019	

**BACKGROUND DOCUMENT – CONTRACT REGISTER UPDATE - GATEWAY 2**

Contract Name	The Charter School East Dulwich Phase 2 design team
Contract Description	Design services RIBA stages 2-4
Contract Type	Services
Lead Contract Officer (name)	Bruce Glockling
Lead Contract Officer (phone number)	0207 525 7573
Department	Chief Executive's
Division	Capital Works and Development
Procurement Route	GLA ADUP Framework Agreement
EU CPV Code (if appropriate)	N/A
Departmental/Corporate	Departmental
Fixed Price or Call Off	Fixed price
Supplier(s) Name(s)	Feilden Clegg & Bradley
Contract Total Value	£651,083.40
Contract Annual Value	N/A
Contract Start Date	02/12/19
Initial Term End Date	31/08/20
No. of Remaining Contract extensions	N/A
Contract Review Date	N/A
Revised End Date	N/A
SME/ VCSE (If either or both include Company Registration number and/or registered charity number)	N/A
Comments	None
London Living Wage	Yes

This document should be passed to the member of staff in your department responsible for keeping your departmental contracts register up to date.