



Title

Tender Analysis Report

Address

Baltic Quay, 1 Sweden Gate, Surrey Quays,
Southwark, London, SE16

Client

Parkgate Aspen

Date

11 November 2016

Prepared by

Tuffin Ferraby Taylor
Tempus Court
Onslow Street
Guildford GU1 4SS
T:+ 44 (0) 20 3479 77 77
www.tftconsultants.com



Document Issue and Revision Sheet

Project Name: Fire Compartmentation and Maintenance Works

TFT Project Reference: TBC

Rev	Date	Produced by	Checked by	Authorised by	Description
00	11/11/16	J Martin	J Allen	J Allen	

Notes:

1. Revisions relate to external document issues only (i.e. internal QA processes and revisions not shown).
2. Document checked by MRICS/FRICS or equivalent. Documents approved by Associates/Partners.
3. Unless specifically stated, this document is for the benefit of the instructing client only; Tuffin Ferraby Taylor LLP (TFT) cannot accept any liability to any 3rd party for the whole or part of its contents. TFT's appointments specifically exclude the provisions set out in the Contract (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999.

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of this report is to summarise the procurement process for the refurbishment works and demonstrate a robust, competitive tender and appraisals process culminating in tender submissions that align with the programme and budget and can be recommended for proceeding to Contract.

2.0 Scope of works

The works comprise the proposed internal refurbishment work to the common parts of Baltic Quay. Works comprise internal redecoration and replacement floor coverings.

3.0 Basis of tender

The tender documents were issued to four contractors on 20 October 2016 with a return date of 4 November 2016.

The contractors were invited to tender on a JCT Minor Works Building Contract with contractor's design 2011 Edition, incorporating Amendment 1, March 2015.

Three of the four tenders were received electronically and opened at the Guildford office of TFT by Jonathan Martin MRICS, witnessed by Edward Natt BSc (Hons).

The tender documentation forming the basis of the tender comprised:

- Specification of Works
- Drawings
- Form of Tender
- Supporting appendices

4.0 Tenders invited

The following contractors were invited to tender for the works:

- Armfield Construction Ltd
- Cooper Clarke Construction Ltd
- Niblock Builders
- Manilva

5.0 Tender examination

Due to Niblocks tender return being considerably higher than the other three tenders (£213,198.46) we have discounted them from any further analysis on this basis.

Manilva's tender offer was the overall lowest in financial terms. We have studied their priced specification and qualifications and have brought to their attention certain items, which required further explanation and clarification. These are as follows:

- No Preliminary or OH&P costs were included separately in their tender. Manilva have confirmed that these have been 'built in' to their overall cost.

Cooper Clarke's tender offer was the overall second lowest in financial terms. We have studied their priced specification and qualifications and have brought to their attention certain items, which required further explanation and clarification. These are as follows:

- Several items were missing from their initial submission due to not including tender revisions issue during the tender period. These have now been included and allowed for.

Armfield's tender offer was the overall third lowest in financial terms. We have studied their priced specification and qualifications and no further clarifications were necessary.

5.1 Tenders received

The compliant tender prices from all contractors are summarised below. All figures exclude VAT and professional fees.

Contractor	Compliant Tender Price
Manilva	£93,250.00
Cooper Clarke Construction Ltd	£94,596.00
Armfield	£194,806.47

All tender returns were adjudicated and arithmetically checked and we attach our breakdown.

5.2 Arithmetical Check

Cooper Clarke Construction Ltd

The priced Contract Sum Analysis submitted was arithmetically checked and was free from error.

Manilva

The priced Contract Sum Analysis submitted was arithmetically checked and was free from error.

Armfield

The priced Contract Sum Analysis submitted was arithmetically checked and was free from error.

5.3 Qualifications

Cooper Clarke Construction Ltd

- Items relating to ceramic floor tiling have been allowed for cleaning only. This is based on their assessment that they are in a good condition and do not require significant repair. They have provided a metre square rate which could be used if new tiles are required.
- Items relating to rubber handrail repair have been allowed for in one visit by a suitable operative. The noted cost is however higher than Manilvas cost for this item.

Manilva

- Only £750 has been allocated as a provisional sum to Item 4.1, for the renewal of floor coverings to the connecting hallway between the Courtyard and Tower Staircase. We would consider that this is very low and that Cooper Clarkes cost of £4,500 is more realistic depending on the final floor finish chosen.

5.4 Contract Period

Tendering contractors submitted the following construction programme durations:

- Armfield: 8 weeks with 4 weeks lead in time.
- Manilva: 6 weeks with no stated lead in time.
- Cooper Clarke Construction Ltd: 7 weeks with no stated lead in time.

5.5 Health and Safety

We have worked with all contractors previously and consider them to be competent to meet their duties under the 2015 Regulations.

5.6 Programme Specific Risks

The following must be established in good time to allow the project to proceed:

- Decision from Parkgate Aspen regarding proceeding with work and appointment of a main contractor
- Samples and approval of floor coverings
- Confirmation of paint colours

Cut off dates for these will be established with the main contractor once appointed.

5.7 Preliminaries and Contingency

Armfield have included general preliminaries at circa 25% with OHP at 18%.

Manilva have not separately stated their preliminaries and OHP.

Cooper Clarke have included general preliminaries at circa 9.5% with OHP at 2.3%.

All tender submissions contain a small number of provisional sums, commensurate with the scope of the specific elements of work.

The project includes a £5,000.00 contingency sum.

5.8 Value Added Tax

It should be noted that the tenders do not include VAT. An allowance for VAT has been made within our recommendation in order to ensure the overall cost including VAT does not exceed the current budget.

5.9 Pricing Levels

The level of costs provided by the tendering contractors is deemed competitive.

Attached is a full analysis of each tender offer from the three tendering contractors identifying the sum of each work section, preliminaries, arithmetical check, comment against any queries or qualifications and the adjusted tender figure where appropriate.

5.10 Financial Auditing

We have not undertaken any financial checks on the contractors. Whilst we are not currently aware of any patent concerns in the industry about the financial standing of any of the tender panel, it is quite conceivable that a contractor's liquidity could reduce dramatically in a short period.

Should this be of concern, we recommend that Parkgate Aspen undertake their own financial checks. In addition, you may wish to consider additional protective measures such as parent company guarantees or performance bonds. We await your response in this respect.

6.0 Conclusions & Recommendations

Based on the current submissions we will review Cooper Clarke's submission in comparison with Manilva's only, as Armiel's was significantly higher in cost and a week longer in programme length than Cooper Clarke's.

The issues for consideration are as follows:

- As previously noted, Manilva have provided a very low provisional cost for item 4.1. We would therefore consider that the cost for this item may increase when a floor covering is chosen.

Our recommendation at this stage is that Parkgate Aspen proceed with Manilva Contracts to complete these works.

Jonathan Martin MRICS
Building Surveyor