

Delegated Decision Notice

This form is the written record of a key, significant operational or administrative decision taken by an officer.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Decision type | <input type="checkbox"/> Key Decision | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant Operational Decision | <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Decision |
| Approximate value | <input type="checkbox"/> Below £500,000 <input type="checkbox"/> £500,000 to £1,000,000 <input type="checkbox"/> over £1,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> below £25,000 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> £25,000 to £100,000 <input type="checkbox"/> £100,000 to £500,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Over £500,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> below £25,000 <input type="checkbox"/> £25,000 to £100,000 |
| Director¹ | Director of City Development | | |
| Contact person: | Sarah Parry | | Telephone number: 0113 37 80097 |
| Subject²: | Leeds City Centre West Spatial Analysis | | |
| Decision details³: | <p>What decision has been taken? <i>(Set out all necessary decisions to be taken by the decision taker including decisions in relation to exempt information, exemption from call in etc.)</i></p> <p>The Chief Officer for Asset Management and Regeneration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Agreed to the scope and programme of the spatial analysis and approved the method of procurement as summarised below; ii. Approved the proposed evaluation and scoring method; iii. Approved the waiver of Contracts Procedure Rule 15.2 – Tender evaluation, in order to set the evaluation criteria split as 30% for price and 70% for quality. | | |
| | <p>A brief statement of the reasons for the decision <i>(Include any significant financial, procurement, legal or equalities implications, having consulted with Finance, PACS, Legal, HR and Equality colleagues as appropriate)</i></p> <p>To inform the production of a 'Growth Framework' for Leeds City Centre West, the Council is to procure specialist advisers to undertake spatial analysis, produce a spatial vision and costed infrastructure delivery plan for the area. The commission is to be completed within 16 weeks. The value set to undertake this commission is a maximum of £60,000.00 (see report attached).</p> <p>In line with CPR 3.1.14 the brief will be issued via YORtender. As the commission is considered an Intermediate Value Procurement, competition is required in line with Contracts Procedure Rule 8.1.</p> | | |

¹ Give title of Director with delegated responsibility for function to which decision relates.

² If the decision is key and has appeared on the list of forthcoming key decisions, the title of the decision should be the same as that used in the list

³ Simply refer to supporting report where used as these matters have been set out in detail.

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>The evaluation and scoring method is a balanced approach to achieving both a competitive and high quality outcome. Bidders must submit their response to the quality criteria set out at section 3.2 of the report attached.</p> <p>The response will be scored by the Evaluation Panel on a 0-10 basis (Unacceptable – Outstanding). Submissions reaching the minimum quality threshold will then be evaluated on price, receiving a total score combining quality (70%) and cost (30%). The highest three bidders meeting the minimum quality thresholds will be invited to interview. The highest scoring tenderer – on the basis of moderated quality scores and cost scores – will be appointed.</p> |
| | <p>Brief details of any alternative options considered and rejected by the decision maker at the time of making the decision</p> <p>In accordance with CPR 3.1.4, an Internal Service Provider was considered. It is agreed that an external organisation with a track record in urban design and spatial strategy would be preferred to provide insightful professional analysis, bring crucial experience and the breadth of knowledge required to produce a meaningful action plan within the timescales required.</p> <p>CPR 15.2 recommends that the price element of evaluation will always be 40% or greater. It is agreed that there is justification not to use the price-quality separated approach to evaluation and to instead use the combined price/quality split approach and that the price element of the evaluation is reduced to 30% and the quality element of the evaluation at 70%. Please see report attached.</p> |
| Affected wards: | <p>Little London & Woodhouse Hunslet & Riverside</p> |
| Details of consultation undertaken⁴: | <p>Executive Member Councillor Hayden – 19/04/2021</p> <p>Ward Councillors</p> <p>Others – Finance engagement</p> |
| Implementation | <p><i>Officer accountable, and proposed timescales for implementation</i> Executive Regeneration Manager The brief is to be advertised from 30th April with appointment within a 4 week period following this.</p> |
| List of | <p>Date Added to List:-</p> |

⁴ Include details of any interest disclosed by an elected Member on consultation and the date of any relevant dispensation given.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Forthcoming Key Decisions⁵ | If Special Urgency or General Exception a brief statement of the reason why it is impracticable to delay the decision | |
| | If Special Urgency Relevant Scrutiny Chair(s) approval Signature _____ Date _____ | |
| Publication of report⁶ | If not published for 5 clear working days prior to decision being taken the reason why not possible: | |
| | If published late relevant Executive member's approval Signature _____ Date _____ | |
| Call In | Is the decision available ⁷ for call-in? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| | If exempt from call-in , the reason why call-in would prejudice the interests of the council or the public: | |
| Approval of Decision | Authorised decision maker ⁸ Angela Barnicle, Chief Officer Asset Management & Regeneration | |
| | Signature  | Date 30 April 2021 |

⁵ See Executive and Decision Making Procedure Rule 2.4 - 2.6. Complete this section for key decisions only

⁶ See Executive and Decision Making Procedure Rule 3.1. Complete this section for key decisions only

⁷ See Executive and Decision Making Procedure Rule 5.1. Significant operational decisions taken by officers are never available for call in. Key decisions are always available for call in unless they have been exempted from call in under rule 5.1.3.

⁸ Give the post title and name of the officer with appropriate delegated authority to take the decision.