



ADUR & WORTHING
COUNCILS

Adur Executive Members for
Environment &
Worthing Executive Member for Digital
& Environmental Services
31 March 2021

Decision to be taken on or after
16 April 2021

Key Decision: Yes

Arboriculture Provision Contract

Report by the Director for Communities

Executive Summary

1. Purpose

- The Arboricultural Services Contract that the Parks Section holds with Connick Tree Care Ltd for specialist arboricultural works expires on 31st March 2021 having commenced in April 2018 and this report seeks authorisation to award the new contract to the winning tenderer having gone through a procurement process with the Procurement Section
- The Arboricultural Services Contract will allow specialist arboricultural services to be provided to the Council for a further three years.

2. Recommendations

2.1 Recommendation

- Decide whether to approve the Arboricultural contract awarded to the winning tenderer based on the quality of their specialist knowledge and professional set up (60% weighted score) and their financial costs being the most advantageous financially (40% weighted score).
- To decide to approve the issuing of a three year contract to the winning bidder.

3. Context

- 3.1 The Arboricultural services contract was awarded to the winning tenderer in 2018 to Connick Tree care who had themselves gone through a tendering process and won the tender and have since provided specialist arboricultural services to the Parks and Foreshore Section for tree work, felling, pruning, tree climbing and maintenance including emergency response out of hours
- 3.2 On 31st March 2021 the contract will reach the end of the term (3 years) which included a 12 month extension and the Council had to decide whether to extend the contract further or, to seek a new service provider via the Council's procurement section
- 3.3 The existing tenderer although is technically competent and has provided a quality service over the life of the contract, their tendency to be claims conscious over calculation of costings for works has meant they are expensive and so the decision was taken to test the market and seek competitive prices from the marketplace
- 3.4 This decision was based on the need to ensure value for money for the taxpayer and to not go out to re tender the service would not provide the necessary market testing to ensure the Council is getting value for money.

4. Issues for consideration

- 4.1 The procurement process sought tenders from specialist arboricultural service providers via a vigorous procurement exercise overseen by the Council's procurement section. There were a total of Ten bids submitted and Connick Tree Care was one of the bids submitted.
- 4.2 The bids were evaluated via a weighted score matrix provided by the Procurement team and contained two elements: Quality and Costs to provide the service
- 4.3 The quality assessment was split into a number of key criteria with each element scored for each tender submitted and weighted to provide 60% of the overall assessment score:
 - Means of Delivery
 - Skills and Experience
 - Health and Safety

- Provision of Emergency Works
- Sustainability
- Biosecurity

- 4.4 The quality assessment showed two companies scored full marks for the quality assessment, which were Climbers Way Ltd and the incumbent Connick Tree Care. However when the financial scores matrix were taken into account Climbers Way Ltd was the clear winner for quality and financial scoring. See Appendix 1 below for all quality scores for the 10 bids submitted.
- 4.5 The financial Implications of the assessment are included in Section 6 below.
- 4.6 The proposed option is to accept the winning tenderers submission and award the contract to the winning tender company, Climbers Way Tree Care Ltd who submitted the most financially advantageous tender taking into account the quality and financial assessments.

5. Engagement and Communication

- 5.1 This contract will be entirely run and managed as a direct service to the Parks and Foreshore Section and is for specialist arboricultural works and as such was not subject to engagement with the wider public as part of the tender process..

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1 The financial score was weighted 40% of the total assessment score and the Bill of Quantity prices were fed into a matrix with the previous year's quantity entered to provide as accurate a representative as possible of the financial costs to provide the service over its three year lifetime.
- 6.2 It is clear from the analysis of costs that the current provider of the service would have the highest costs based on their schedule of rates submitted for the new contract which can be seen in the table below.
- 6.3 It is not possible to provide a direct comparison of costs however simply based on Connick Tree Care rates from previous years and the schedule of rates for the new contract specification. This is due to changes in the specification documents following review of the contract performance over

the last three years.

- 6.3 It is clear though that an annual saving of around £12,000 for arboricultural works is likely should the same volume of work in the previous financial year occur again. Arboricultural works budget for 2020/21 financial year is £50k (to date expenditure is £57k), However this is not expected to be an exact saving as arboricultural work is often reactive but it does demonstrate a sizeable saving should be achievable in the new contract over previous years.

Company	Estimated Annual Cost	Rank (Hi-Low)
Climbers Way	£37,787.89	1
Newtimber	£38,579.35	2
Gristwood and Toms	£42,918.00	3
JA Fox	£43,594.00	4
Southern	£48,247.00	5
Glendale	£64,858.54	6
KPS	£66,735.00	7
County Tree (London)	£76,105.00	8
The Tree Co	£82,580.00	9
Connick Tree Care	£88,746.00	10

- 6.4 A credit check was undertaken as part of the procurement process by colleagues in Finance and the check revealed that although the company is fairly small they have a low risk based on the information available in the review.

7. Legal Implications

- 7.1 The Procurement Section have reviewed the contract documentation and have liaised with Legal Services in order to be able to issue and sign off on the Contract documents following the statutory 10 day stand off period and, the decision of the Executive Members for the Environment requested in this Members report.

Background Papers

None

Officer Contact Details:-

Philippa Reece

Parks and Foreshore Manager

(01273) 263060

philippa.reece@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Sustainability & Risk Assessment

1. Economic

- The proposal will see an overall reduction in expenditure on Arboricultural Services whilst maintaining a quality service provision

2. Social

- Matter considered and no issues identified.

2.1 Social Value

- Matter considered and no issues identified.

2.2 Equality Issues

- Matter considered and no issues identified.

2.3 Community Safety Issues (Section 17)

- Matter considered and no issues identified.

2.4 Human Rights Issues

- Matter considered and no issues identified.

3. Environmental

- The winning bidder has a strong environmental awareness and biosecurity processes which will enable us to improve in this area over the lifetime of the contract relating to custodianship and protection of our natural resources.

4. Governance

- The proposal allows for quality risk management of tree stocks, prompt and effective risk management, safety including emergency cover out of hours and has a robust framework and process for service delivery.
- There are no identified implications to the Councils' reputation or relationship with our partners or community relating to this proposal.

Analysis of Bidders submissions for quality

Quality Evaluation	Weighting	Climbers Way	Connick	Glendale Countryside	County Tree Surgeons	Gristwood and Toms	KPS	J A Fox	Newtimber	The Tree Co (London)	Southern Land Services
Means of Delivery	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	8	8	4	6
Skills and Experience	10	10	10	10	8	10	6	6	2	6	2
Health & Safety	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	6	4	10	4
Provision of Emergency Works	20	20	20	20	20	20	16	12	12	0	0
Sustainability	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	2	5	4
Biosecurity	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	2	5	4
Total Score	60	60	60	59	58	58	52	40	30	30	20
Rank		1	1	3	4	4	6	7	8	8	10

Winning Bidder