

RECORD OF OFFICER EXECUTIVE DECISION

Subject: Review of Council owned sites in Burgess Hill

Officer: Tom Clark

(1) Record of decision taken:- to agree to award the contract to DMH Stallard for the provision of planning advice on Council land assets at a cost of £5950.

(2) Date of decision:- 06 November 2014

(3) Statement of reasons for making the decision

Legal Basis for Decision - Contracts up to £20,000

- (a) *Where the estimated value or amount of a proposed contract does not exceed £20,000 and provision has been made in the Council's annual budget for such expenditure, the Head of Service concerned shall have the authority to enter into any such contract provided the Head of Service is satisfied that the Council is receiving value for money. In the event of a Head of Service exercising their right to enter into a contract under this Rule 5 the Head of Service or other officer appointed to do so on their behalf shall prepare and retain a report detailing the reasons for the appointment of the relevant contractor having regard to the experience, competency, workmanship and the financial status of the contractor.*
- (b) *A Head of Service may at his/her discretion invite quotations in accordance with Rule 6 where the estimated value or amount of a proposed contract is £20,000 or less.*

A project brief was drawn up and sent to DMH Stallard and Batcheller Monkhouse with a request to quote for the work. This was to provide detailed expert planning advice on Council owned sites in Burgess Hill.

The purpose of this work is to assist officers only and is not for publication to any third parties.

DMH Stallard quoted a figure of £5950, whilst Batcheller Monkhouse would charge £9500. There seemed little to differentiate between the two companies on the basis of the work they would provide and the proposal is to appoint DMH Stallard on the basis of the significantly lower cost. This work will provide time and efficiency savings and DMH Stallard would be able to undertake the work within a 6 week period.

(4) Alternative options considered and rejected

It was not considered necessary to invite other consultants to tender for this work in view of the quotes obtained.

(5) Name of Cabinet Member with whom decision discussed

Councillor Gary Marsh

(6) Any Code of Conduct Interests of the Cabinet Members

None

(7) Any relevant Code of Conduct dispensations

N/A

Signed: 
Officer – Tom Clark, Solicitor to the Council