

Record of officer decision

Decision title:	Commissioning of Mechanical & Engineering consultants for Holme Lacy and The Paddock sites. The cost of the contract is £12,250
Date of decision:	21 March 2022
Decision maker:	Director of Resources & Assurances (Chief Finance Officer)
Authority for delegated decision:	<p>Cabinet decision on 22 July 2021 approved:</p> <p>An outline design for the council site at the former Holme Lacy Primary School is commissioned to allow housing market assessment and for the designs up to and including planning submission for houses on this council owned site;</p> <p>An outline design for the council site at The Paddock, Aylestone Hill Ward, is commissioned to allow for the design, submission of planning application and disposal of the site subject to securing planning permission; and</p> <p>The Chief Finance Officer is authorised to take all operational decisions with regard the former Holme Lacy Primary School and The Paddock, Aylestone Hill Ward, projects including any potential future land sale of the site within a budget of £400k. Link to decision:</p> <p>Issue details - Recommendation for potential sites to progress affordable housing delivery in Herefordshire - Herefordshire Council</p>
Ward:	Dinedor Hill and Aylestone Hill Ward
Consultation:	The Cabinet Member Commissioning, Procurement and Assets, Cabinet Member Housing, regulatory services and community safety, Commercial Services and Legal Services have been consulted and confirmed that the decision may be taken
Decision made:	<p>M&E consultant work to be carried out by Smith Consulting.</p> <p>Three quotes were requested from three companies and Smith Consulting were chosen as offering best value</p>
Reasons for decision:	As part of the design work for Holme Lacy and the Paddocks M&E work is required to help with the design process
Highlight any associated risks/finance/legal/equality considerations:	Not awarding this work to Smith Consultings would compromise the council's ability to deliver on time, utilising the services of a procured partner is considered value for money.
Details of any alternative options considered and rejected:	Commission this work in house. This option has been rejected as the council does not have sufficient capacity or expertise in house and this approach would potentially put the council at risk of not being able to proceed with the site due to the lack of expertise and knowledge.
Details of any declarations of interest made:	None

Signed:

Andrew Lovegrove
Director of Resources and Assurance

Date: 21 March 2022