

Tender Analysis Report

Project:

Public Conveniences, Church Street, Oakham

Client:

Oakham Town Council

Date of issue

12th November 2024

Status

Final

Reference

1220111/RAS

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Tender Process	4
3	Tender Result	5
4	Examination of Tenders	6
5	Consolidation of Project Costs	9
6	Recommendations	100

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This report refers to the proposed refurbishment and improvement work to the Public Conveniences, Church Street, Oakham. The project entails a number of refurbishment items including decoration, the replacement of sanitary ware, upgrading floor and wall coverings and installing new services connections. There are also works to defective copings externally.
- 1.2 The tender documentation was sent to the 3no. bidding contractors 17th September 2024. The tenders were originally due back 20th October 2024, however an extension of time was granted to all 3no. contractors. All tender bids were received between 28th – 31st October 2024.

2 Tender Process

2.1 The tender pack was produced by Eddisons and consisted of the following documents:

- Form of Tender
- Pre-Construction Information
- Schedule of Works
- Existing and Proposed drawings

2.2 The tender pack was issued via email and OneDrive on Tuesday 17th September 2024 to 3no. contractors that had expressed an interest in providing a price for this work and we have had experience of working with on previous schemes. The contractors were:

- Metcalf Ltd
- Crestel Projects Ltd
- F.A.M Building Contractors

2.3 All 3no. bidding contractors returned a tender to Ruairi Sweeney via email on or before Thursday 31st October 2024.

2.4 An extension of time was granted to the tender period by 10 working days following feedback from the contractors that they needed the extra time to get prices back from their supply chain.

3 Tender Result

3.1 Tenders were received, as follows:

Contractor	Total
Metcalf Ltd	£121,144.28 plus VAT
F.A.M Building Contractors	£165,720.00 plus VAT
Crestel Projects Ltd	£173,796.00 plus VAT

3.2 The tenders were submitted on a fixed price basis.

3.3 The tenders remain open for consideration for 8 weeks.

3.4 The works will be undertaken in accordance with the terms and conditions that form the JCT Minor Works Building Contract with contractor's design (MWD).

4 Examination of Tenders

- 4.1 We have completed the examination of the tender offers. The tender received from Metcalf Ltd is c.27% lower than the tender returned from F.A.M Building Contractors and c.30% lower than the tender returned from Crestel Project Ltd
- 4.2 The 3no. tenders were checked arithmetically, and they were all found to be correct.
- 4.3 In the Schedule of Works the contractors were asked to allow for any overtime or weekend working to meet the agreed programme (Item 7.14). Metcalf Ltd and F.A.M noted this, however Crestel Projects Ltd submitted an allowance of £14,400.00. The omission of this sum would still not bring Crestel Projects Ltd in line with Metcalf Ltd in terms of costs and competitiveness.
- 4.4 Another significant difference is with the preliminary costs. When Metcalf were asked to clarify what they had included in their costs for this portion, as they are higher than the others, they stated that they include access, scaffold and skips in their preliminary costs which the other contractors have included under other headings. Therefore this was not of concern.
- 4.5 The tender documentation states that all works are to comply with the Building Regulations. Crestel Projects Ltd have allowed £1,440.00 for this, whereas Metcalf Ltd and F.A.M Building Contractors have noted this. Should works be instructed Eddisons will liaise with an approved inspector with whom we have a relationship with to confirm their fee for the works. Please note that this fee would be in addition and separate to the agreed total contract sum for the works.
- 4.6 With regards to supervision, the contractors have all generally allowed for a working site supervisor with regular visits from contracts managers. This is deemed acceptable for this type of project.
- 4.7 All contractors confirmed they had understood the scope of work and that they had the capacity to deliver the project.
- 4.8 All services connections including but not limited to electrical, plumbing, lighting, extract ventilation, drainage, M&E are Contractors Design portions. The contractors were asked to confirm if they had undertaken the contractors design portions design during the tender period to price these elements. None of them had but had made an allowance based on the nature and extent of existing services provisions on site and their professional experience. We have deemed this to be an acceptable method. Please note that all 3no. contractors hold the relevant insurances for design work.
- 4.9 We have reservations on raising the hardstanding and levels stated in item 8.12 as there may be insufficient drainage provisions in the vicinity to allow for the adequate discharge of rain whilst maintaining safe and level access. An allowance for this work is included in the tender

sums reported, £4,323.48 for Metcalf Ltd. It is recommended that unless the Council definitively do not want to instruct this element of work, this allowance is retained in the contract and the scope of works are discussed on site with the successful contractor in order to agree the best solution.

- 4.10 Although we have acknowledged the costs F.A.M Building Contractors and Crestel Projects Ltd submitted and used them to sense check the tender return from Metcalf Ltd, owing to the significant cost difference between the 3no. tenders returned and now we are satisfied, from this point of the report onwards we will only be reporting on Metcalf Ltd costs.
- 4.11 Metcalf Ltd confirmed that they allowed for 'Formwise' products for the cubicles, vanity sets and IPS ducting. We have experience of using 'Formwise' products on similar projects elsewhere and consequently this is acceptable.
- 4.12 Metcalf Ltd have included for white hygienic cladding behind the urinals in the male WC rather than panelling, in our view this is acceptable. Metcalf Ltd have confirmed that the cost for installing IPS Ducting behind urinals; 1500mm wide with a full height end return would be £1,508.50 +VAT.
- 4.13 Metcalf Ltd have included for cleaning the elevations externally by standard pressure washer and not a doff clean. Owing to the condition of the elevations at the time of our site meeting with the Client 16th August 2024, in our view this is acceptable. Please do let us know if the Council wish for a more thorough method.
- 4.14 Metcalf stated that the cost for the new 'Public Conveniences' and 'Church Street Toilets' signs is subject to design. The material for the new signs is provisionally to be brushed stainless steel. There are concerns that the steel may corrode in time, and consequently the materials chosen for the new sign and the fixings can be reviewed in due course. Metcalf Ltd have confirmed that there is no change for aluminium signage.
- 4.15 Contractors were asked to offer up any other areas for savings that they had seen within the scope of work. Metcalf Ltd stated that they could offer a £6,107.95 (Floor - £663. Walls - £5,444.95.) saving if the existing floor/wall tile coverings are sound and can stay in situ beneath the new floor/wall coverings.
- 4.16 When asked for clarity on the allowance of £660.00 for the new sun tunnels Metcalf Ltd stated that there are various options available for the new sun tunnels which may or may not be suitable, and that the product chosen can be ascertained once works on site have commenced.
- 4.17 There are a number of provisional sums for the work which include:

Item	Provisional Cost
Masonry and pointing repairs.	£1,000

Sun tunnel repairs	£1,500
Roofing repairs	£1,000
Electrics repairs	£1,000
Total	£4,5000

4.18 There are also a number of optional items which the Council may or may not decide to instruct. These include:

Item	Provisional Cost
<i>Item 8.14</i> - Design, Supply and Fit External Lighting with EML function and PIR sensors	£1,788
<i>Item 9.8</i> - Remove the electric security shutter complete and back to source	£255.25
<i>Item 9.31</i> - Design, Supply and fit new anti-vandal behind the mirror faucet, soap dispenser and hand dryer systems complete in the male and female WCs.	£13,750
<i>Item 9.35</i> - Design, supply and fit a new fire alarm system to provide full coverage to the whole site	£4,014.75
Total	£19,808

4.19 Metcalf Ltd confirmed that they were confident of delivering the work within a 10 week programme allowance. Lead in time from instruction will be 2/3 weeks.

4.20 Metcalf Ltd have confirmed that they have allowed for a separate site compound with a portacabin for welfare, storage and a WC.

4.21 When asked about critical path items and lead in times, Metcalf Ltd stated that there would be 4–6-week lead time for the ‘Formwise’ products. This can all be managed within the overall project timescale.

4.22 There is a contingency sum of £5,000.00 included in Metcalf Ltd tender reported.

5 Consolidation of Project Costs

5.1 Metcalf Ltd exc. Optional Costs

<i>Cost Breakdown of Tenders Received</i>		
<i>Our Ref 1220111</i>		
<i>Public Conveniences, Church Street, Oakham</i>		
Element	Cost (£)	
Construction works		121,144.28
Contingency	inc.	
Provisional Sums	inc.	
	<u>Sub Total (i)</u>	121,144.28
Fees @ 11%		13,325.87
	<u>Sub Total (ii)</u>	134,470.15
VAT @ 20%		26,894.03
Total Project Cost (£) Inc VAT		161,364.18

5.2 Metcalf Ltd inc. Optional Costs

<i>Cost Breakdown of Tenders Received</i>		
<i>Our Ref 1220111</i>		
<i>Public Conveniences, Church Street, Oakham</i>		
Element	Cost (£)	
Construction works		121,144.28
Contingency	inc.	
Provisional Sums	inc.	
Option Costs		19,808.00
	<u>Sub Total (i)</u>	140,952.28
Fees @ 11%		15,504.75
	<u>Sub Total (ii)</u>	156,457.03
VAT @ 20%		31,291.41
Total Project Cost (£) Inc VAT		187,748.44

6 Recommendations

- 6.1 We recommend the contract is awarded to Metcalf Ltd for the contract sum of £140,952.28 inc. optional costs or £121,144.28 exc. option costs. These figures do not include VAT.
- 6.2 In addition to Metcalf Ltd being the most competitive of the 3no. contractors, we are also recommending Metcalf Ltd because of their experience in carrying out these types of refurbishment schemes having recently completed the refurbishment works to the public toilets in Uppingham town centre.

We trust that this report is sufficient for your present purposes, but please contact us should you require any further information or advice.

Eddisons Commercial Ltd