

# CITY OF ARMADALE

## MINUTES

OF TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COMMITTEE ROOM,  
ADMINISTRATION CENTRE, 7 ORCHARD AVENUE, ARMADALE ON MONDAY, 4  
APRIL 2016 AT 7:00PM.

---

**PRESENT:**

Cr G Nixon (Chair)  
Cr G A Best  
Cr K Busby  
Cr R Butterfield  
Cr C Frost  
Cr L Sargeson  
Cr J A Stewart

**APOLOGIES:**

Mr K Ketterer    Executive Director Technical Services

**OBSERVERS:**

Mr H Zelones

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Mr G Davies	Executive Manager Technical Services
Mr P Lanternier	Manager Parks
Mr N Burbridge	Manager Environmental Services
Mr P Penter	Manager Property Services
Mrs A Owen-Brown	Minute Secretary

**PUBLIC:**

3

*“For details of Councillor Membership on this Committee, please refer to the City’s website  
– [www.armadale.wa.gov.au/your\\_council/councillors](http://www.armadale.wa.gov.au/your_council/councillors).”*

## **DISCLAIMER**

---

The Disclaimer for protecting Councillors and staff from liability of information and advice given at Committee meetings was read as there were members of the public present.

## **DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

---

- Cr K Busby Recommendation No – 3.1 - Tender No 2/16 – Supply and Installation of Street Lighting - Nicholson Road (Piara Drive to Armadale Road) Stage 4
- Cr K Busby Recommendation No - 3.2 - Tender No 3/16 - Nicholson Road - Hakea Water Main Relocation Stage 2
- Cr K Busby Recommendation No - Tender No 7/16 - Lead Design Consultancy Services for the Piara Waters (South) Playing Field and Pavilion

## **QUESTION TIME**

---

### **Ms J Withoud – PCAWA Technical Delegate**

Ms Withoud raised questions in relation to “Item 3.6 – Tender No 1/16 – Fletcher Park Cross Country Course Construction”, as detailed below.

**Q1:** Has the Committee cited business cases where the builder has built before with no experience?

**Response:** The Chair advised the Committee had not and this specific tender includes the provision for a person to assess and approve the course elements before being signed off. The Executive Manager Technical Services confirmed that the design had been carried out by an experienced designer.

**Q2:** What has Council done to check experience and knowledge of the builder in relation to building safe fences?

**Response:** The Chair advised that all jumps and fences would be assessed and approved and that if they were not constructed in accordance with the specification, would not be approved.

**Q3:** Wouldn't an inexperienced builder require more time with the designer?

**Response:** The Chair again advised that all jumps and fences would be assessed and approved before installation and that a requirement for an accredited course designer was a part of the required approvals process.

**Q4:** Have all three tenderers consulted with a designer?

**Response:** The Chair advised it was part of the tenderer's requirement to have the course elements assessed and approved by an accredited person, based on the designs developed by an experienced designer.

**Q5:** In the selection criteria, “Experience”, which is most closely aligned to safety, had the lowest weighting. Was the panel biased towards non-experienced builders? Was price put above safety? How did the two most esteemed designers and builders rank lower?

**Response:** The Executive Manager Technical Services stated there was no bias. The Chair advised that ranking was applied to information from documents that were provided in the tender submissions.

**Q6:** What equestrian knowledge did the technical person on the panel have?

**Response:** The Executive Manager Technical Services advised the person had no equestrian knowledge as the technical information would be supplied by an accredited course designer.

**Q7:** Was the panel biased toward non-experienced tenderers?

**Response:** The Chair responded that the panel was not biased.

**Q8:** Why were other designers not sought for the assessment panel?

**Response:** The appointed course designer also submitted a quote and could therefore not be included on the assessment panel.

#### **Ms L Smith – PCAWA Executive Officer**

Ms Smith raised questions in relation to “Item 3.6 – Tender No 1/16 – Fletcher Park Cross Country Course Construction”, as detailed below.

**Q1:** Why have none of the accredited course designers in Perth (submitted list) been contacted about this course?

**Response:** The Chair advised that the tender had not yet been awarded and that this matter would be finalised after the tender award.

**Q2:** What guarantee can Council give to protect the technical delegate when signing off on a course built by a builder with no experience?

**Response:** The Chair advised if the construction did not meet the specification, then the technical officer would not approve the construction.

**Q3:** Will the technical officer be there to sign off to the end of the contract?

**Response:** The Executive Manager Technical Services advised the contractor would have someone on their team to perform this function.

**Q4:** Will the technical officer have the minimum qualifications on list (supplied)?

**Response:** The Chair advised the City will ensure that the technical officer would have the necessary accreditation.

**Ms M Barnsby Johnson**

Ms Barnsby Johnson raised questions in relation to “Item 3.6 – Tender No 1/16 – Fletcher Park Cross Country Course Construction”, as detailed below.

**Q1:** Can Council ensure the builder has official qualifications used in tender and can Council ensure the qualifications be approved?

**Response:** The Chair advised that course designer was required to have the necessary accreditation to assess and approve the constructed works.

**DEPUTATION**

---

Nil.

**CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

---

**RECOMMEND**

**Minutes of the Technical Services Committee Meeting held on 29 February 2016 be confirmed.**

Moved Cr C Frost  
**MOTION CARRIED (7/0)**

**ITEMS REFERRED FROM INFORMATION BULLETIN**

---

▪ **Outstanding Matters and Information Items**

Nil.

▪ **Monthly Departmental Reports**

Technical Services Works Programme

*Committee noted the information and no further items were raised for discussion and/or further report purposes.*

# CONTENTS

## TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

4 APRIL 2016

---

<b>1. PARKS AND RESERVES</b>	
1.1 CITY OF ARMADALE URBAN FOREST IMPLEMENTATION PLAN PROGRESS REPORT .....	16
<b>2. PROPERTY SERVICES</b>	
2.1 MAINTENANCE STANDARDS IN CITY OWNED BUILDINGS .....	24
<b>3. TENDERS</b>	
3.6 TENDER NO 1/16 - FLETCHER PARK CROSS COUNTRY COURSE CONSTRUCTION.....	6
3.1 TENDER NO 2/16 - SUPPLY AND INSTALLATION OF STREET LIGHTING - NICHOLSON ROAD (PIARA DRIVE TO ARMADALE ROAD) STAGE 4.....	30
3.2 TENDER NO 3/16 - NICHOLSON ROAD - HAKEA WATER MAIN RELOCATION STAGE 2.....	40
3.3 TENDER NO 4/16 - SUPPLY OF HIRED PLANT - WET HIRE OF GRADERS .....	45
3.4 TENDER NO 6/16 - HARRISDALE (EAST) STAGE 2 PAVILION CAR PARK AND PLAYGROUND .....	50
3.5 TENDER NO 7/16 - LEAD DESIGN CONSULTANCY SERVICES FOR THE PIARA WATERS (SOUTH) PLAYING FIELD AND PAVILION .....	34
<b>4. COUNCILLORS' ITEMS</b>	
1 VERGE COLLECTION .....	55
<b>5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TECHNICAL SERVICES REPORT</b>	
1 ROUTE ASSESSMENT - FORRESDALE BUSINESS PARK (FBP).....	56

**3.6 - TENDER NO 1/16 - FLETCHER PARK CROSS COUNTRY COURSE  
CONSTRUCTION**

WARD : ALL  
FILE No. : M/171/16  
DATE : 30 March 2016  
REF : NB  
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director  
MANAGER : Technical Services

**In Brief:**

- Tender No 1/16 was recently called for the Fletcher Park Cross Country Course Construction.
- Four (4) tender responses were received.
- This report was considered by the City Strategy Committee on 21 March 2016 who supported the Officers Recommendation.
- At the Ordinary Council meeting of 29 March 2016, and after receiving a number of queries during public question time, Council recommitted the matter to the Technical Services Committee meeting of 4 April 2016 for further consideration.

**Recommend:**

- That with Tender No 1/16 - Fletcher Park Cross Country Course Construction, Council accepts the tender from Terra Firma Constructions for a period of twelve (12) weeks commencing from the date of contract for the consideration of \$107,012 (excluding GST).

**Tabled Items**

Nil.

**Officer Interest Declaration**

Nil.

**Strategic Implications**

2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments

2.8 A natural environment and bushland that is sustained, enhanced and strengthened.

2.8.1 Develop an appropriate policy and long term works programs to protect and enhance our bushland and natural environs under the City's control.

### **Legislation Implications**

Assessment of legislation indicates that the following apply:

- *Local Government Act 1995: Section 3.57 – Tenders for Providing Goods or Services*
- *Local Government (Functions and General Regulations) 1996: Division 2 – Tenders for Providing Goods or Services*

### **Council Policy/Local Law Implications**

Assessment of Policy indicates that the following are applicable:

- Council Policy ADM 19 – Procurement of Goods or Services

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

Costs can be accommodated within the 2015/2016 Annual Budget allocation.

### **Consultation**

- Intra Directorate.

## **BACKGROUND**

Fletcher Park, within the City of Armadale, is home to the Wallangarra Riding and Pony Club (WRPC). The reserve is vested in the City of Armadale and leased to the WRPC.

The sport of Eventing takes place at the reserve and comprises Dressage, Cross Country and Jumping. The WRPC holds three One Day Events (ODE's) per annum in which the cross country course is utilised. Part of the current course is located within sensitive bushland, protected under environmental legislation.

Given the presence of the sensitive bushland, the reserve is subject to the 'Fletcher Park Bushland Management Plan'. During the finalisation of this plan in 2011, Council requested that an investigation be performed on the relocation of the cross country course from the sensitive bushland areas into degraded areas of the reserve.

As a result, the City engaged a consultant to assess the feasibility of relocating the course and provide a detailed design.

Currently, the reserve is able to accommodate a course that meets the Pony Club Association of Western Australia (PCAWA) requirements for B, C, D and E grade courses. The new designs produced indicate that B, C, D and E grade courses may continue to be accommodated after relocation into the degraded area. The course designs have been reviewed and signed off as meeting the prescribed standards by a steward of the PCAWA. Consequently, the next step in the process is for the City to enable the construction of a new course.

### **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

Tender No 1/16 - Fletcher Park Cross Country Course Construction was advertised in the Saturday 6 February 2016 edition of The West Australian newspaper, and in a notice which was displayed on the Administration Centre, Armadale, Kelmscott and Seville Grove Libraries' public notice boards. The tender was closed 23 February 2016.

The scope of works and the specifications called for the successful tenderer to supply the following service:

- Track development.
- Jump fabrication.
- Jump placement.

No native vegetation will be removed during the track development and construction process.

### **ANALYSIS**

Tender No 1/16 - Fletcher Park Cross Country Course Construction closed at 2:00pm on Tuesday, 23 February 2016. Four tender submissions were received from:

<b>Tenderer's Name</b>	
1.	Philip Patrick Bailey
2.	Terra Firma Constructions
3.	TD and EM Compagnoni
4.	TD and EM Compagnoni - (Alternate tender – Price variance only if progress payments are made)

No tenders were received after the close of deadline and no non-conforming tenders were received.



An evaluation process was undertaken having specific regard to the following selection criteria:

Item No	Description	Weighting
1	Relevant Experience	15%
2	Key Personnel Skills and Experience	15%
3	Tenderers Resources	15%
4	Demonstrated Understanding	15%
5	Price	40%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

The ranking of the tender submissions as determined by the evaluation panel is as follows:

Tenderer	Relevant Experience	Key Personnel	Tenderers Resources	Demonstrated Understanding	Price	Total	Ranking
	15%	15%	15%	15%	40%		
<b>Philip Patrick Bailey</b>	8.50	8.00	9.00	8.50	19.96	<b>53.96</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Terra Firma Constructions</b>	5.50	8.00	10.00	6.50	40.00	<b>70.00</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>TD and EM Compagnoni</b>	8.00	7.50	8.50	10.50	18.97	<b>53.47</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>TD and EM Compagnoni (Alternate)</b>	8.00	7.50	8.50	10.50	22.59	<b>57.09</b>	<b>2</b>

All submissions ranked relatively closely overall in terms of quality. However, the two submissions from TD and EM Compagnoni demonstrated marginally the highest quality submission overall.

The evaluation panel determined Philip Patrick Bailey and TD and EM Compagnoni demonstrated the highest level of experience in the area of equestrian design and construction. However, Terra Firma Constructions demonstrated the greatest level of formal qualifications, resources and experience in the area of major building and construction projects.

The evaluation panel also noted significant price differences between Terra Firma Constructions and the three other submissions particularly in the areas of site set-up, accommodation/travel, materials, labour for track development and administrative support. This resulted in the submission from Terra Firma Constructions representing the lowest cost submission by a significant margin.

With the overall qualitative scores between all firms very close; and with this project heavily focused on supply of equestrian equipment and course construction using a comprehensive and prescribed equestrian facility specification; when combined with the significant price difference between Terra Firma Constructions and the next nearest tender submission the

evaluation panel determined that despite Terra Firma Constructions limited demonstrated experience directly in the area of equestrian facilities this firm still represents the best value for money outcome to Council.

## **SUMMARY**

Based on the panel's evaluation, using a combination of the above selection criteria and price, the submission from Terra Firma Constructions represents the most advantageous submission and is therefore recommended to be selected as the City's preferred supplier.

## **FUNDING**

The contract can be funded through existing budget allocations to Environmental Services for the project. Any residual funds will be used for rehabilitating the sensitive bushland area and preventing horse access through fence construction. This was the overarching objective of Council in requesting the relocation of the cross country track to the degraded area.

## **CONCLUSION**

Tenders for the Fletcher Park Cross Country Course Construction were recently invited, with four tenders being received and assessed by an evaluation panel against compliance and selection criteria.

The result was that the submission received from Terra Firma Constructions represented the most advantageous tender to the City of Armadale.

The evaluation panel therefore recommends that the contract be awarded to Terra Firma Constructions, at a price of \$107,012 (exclusive of GST) for a period of twelve (12) weeks.

---

## **FURTHER INFORMATION FOLLOWING RECOMMITTAL**

---

The report as detailed above, was considered by the City Strategy Committee on 21 March 2016, where the officer recommendation was supported as follows (Recommendation CS23/3/16).

*That, with Tender No 1/16 - Fletcher Park Cross Country Course Construction, Council accepts the tender from Terra Firma Constructions for a period of twelve (12) weeks commencing from the date of contract for the consideration of \$107,012 (excluding GST) in accordance with the submitted tender, Council's contract documentation and Budget allocation.*

The Report was included in the Council agenda for consideration at the Ordinary Council Meeting of 29 March 2016, where after receiving comment during public question time, Council resolved as follows:

*That Recommendation CS23/3/16 be not adopted and recommitted to the April meeting of the Technical Services Committee.*

## **ADDITIONAL COMMENT**

During question time at the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 29 March 2016, a number of matters of concern were raised by the public, relating to the following, summarised for the purpose of this report.

- The suitability of the specifications and the design included as part of the tender documentation.
- The tender assessment process, in particular the compilation of the assessment panel and their related experience in cross country course design.
- The safety of the final product relating to the limited equestrian experience of the recommended tenderer. Specific reference was made to the quality assurance and oversight by a suitably accredited person of the final product, in particular the suitability of the course after completion – again related to the safety of the course when in use.

As a result of these matters being raised, the Council resolved to recommit the consideration of Tender No 1/16 - Fletcher Park Cross Country Course to the Technical Services Committee meeting of 4 April 2016 for further consideration and recommendation to the Council meeting scheduled for 11 April 2016.

This report therefore includes comment on the matters raised for consideration.

These matters are addressed on the following paragraphs:

### **Design and Specification**

Prior to the appointment of a designer for the course, the WRPC was consulted as to suitable persons in the industry who they would consider appropriate for this design and specification compilation aspects of the project. The WRPC provided two names for consideration, and both were requested by the City to make submissions together with prices.

Based on the submissions, Tom Compagnoni was appointed as the course designer and for the compilation of the specifications. It is a general tendering principle that the design and specification documentation is sufficiently detailed as to provide access to as broad a tender pool as possible. No tender should be too narrowly specified as to restrict access unreasonably.

The design process was conducted in conjunction with the WRPC who assigned two members to the process and who served on the 'design committee'. In addition, a steward of the PCAWA reviewed and approved the design and specification as being compliant and meeting their requirements.

The City therefore considers that these actions and cross checks on standards and compliance have been thoroughly documented and reasonably meet all requirements in terms of compliance and due process, and specifically the needs of the WRPC.

### **Tender Assessment**

The City applies the tender process governance requirements rigidly and it can be confirmed that this also applies to the governance aspects of this tender. The assessment panel comprised:

- A technical person with experience in building and construction who had the ability to assess the submissions and their construction ability;
- A governance officer who had experience in the probity and governance aspects of the processes and submissions;
- A technical officer with experience in the environmental aspects of the submissions.

It can be confirmed that the tender assessment panel was specifically selected not to include any City officers who had had a role in the preparation of the tender documentation (designs, drawings and specifications) or influence of any aspect of the tender compilation. This is not normally a requirement, but was deliberately done to avoid any later inference of influence in the recommendations related to this tender consideration.

It is sometimes the case that the designer and specification compiler is requested to sit on the assessment panel for tender assessments. In this case however, the designer had submitted a tender, and therefore could not be consulted to form part of the assessment panel. Nevertheless, the specifications were considered to be full and well documented and more than adequate to guide the assessment of submissions, and it was not considered necessary to include any other person on the panel.

The City can therefore be satisfied that the tender assessment process has been absolutely free of influence and that all probity and governance requirements have been met.

### **Safety**

Safety in the design of the course is a primary concern for all parties, including the City, the WRPC as well as for participants using the course. It is for this reason that the City followed the guidance of the WRPC and appointed one of their recommended course designers. In a similar manner, the course design and specification was approved by the WRPC through the involvement of their nominated representatives on the 'design committee'. In addition, the designs and specifications were reviewed and approved by a PCAWA steward as being compliant.

It is not believed that the City could have done any more to meet the requirements for a compliant course design, and that all safety requirements have been addressed in these signed off and approved documents.

It is a requirement of the tender “*that a qualified Course Designer approve the placement and final design of each jump*” and that the end product is constructed in accordance with the designs and specification as documented.

In terms of the experience of the recommended tenderer, the assessment panel assessed the actual construction elements as relatively uncomplicated and that if the designs and specifications drafted by the expert course designer were adhered to, any safety risk would be eliminated. In addition, the tenderer being a construction company, demonstrated that they possessed greater capacity and resources to deliver the required course elements, and that they had more than adequate quality assurance processes in place. The assessment considered that their relative lack of experience in the equestrian field did not disqualify them as a valid tenderer, but recognised their lack of experience in a lower rating score in this aspect of the assessment.

As part of the superintendence activities, the City will ensure that a review and an approval is received before acceptance of the final works, and before payment or progress payments are processed. This is a requirement stated in the tender documentation.

The City can therefore be satisfied that the assessment has been fair and free from bias, and has recognised that sufficient checks and balances are in place in the construction processes to ensure that all design and specifications are met, which in turn will ensure that the safety requirements will also be met.

If during the construction phase, additional requirements are identified which will improve the course or improve safety, these can be accommodated through a variation to the contract. This is a normal process in contract management, which ensures that all such variations are documented and supported by additional specifications and design drawings. Should adjustments be made on site during the final placement of jumps, these will also be documented and recorded to provide background to the final product, and record any agreements between the respective parties.

Lastly, prior to any event taking place, all jumps, placements and construction are required to be inspected by a steward or technical delegate for compliance and safety. This is then signed off prior to an event commencement and provides an additional safety check for users of the course.

## **CONCLUSION**

It is therefore clear that the City has taken all reasonable steps to ensure compliance to meet the design and safety requirements for such a course. In summary these are:

- The City has fully engaged the WRPC on all processes, designs and specifications.
- The City has requested advice from the WRPC on suitable expert course designers, and has accepted one of those experts nominated.
- The designs and specifications of the course have been reviewed and approved by WRPC members nominated to the ‘design committee’ as well as a steward of the PCAWA.

- The tender process has demonstrated to have been thorough and meets all governance and probity requirements.
- The construction process requires on-site review and approval of all course elements prior to acceptance and payment.

## **OPTIONS**

The options available to the Committee and Council in the consideration of Tender No 1/16 - Fletcher Park Cross Country Course Construction, are as follows:

1. Accept the tender from Terra Firma Construction as previously recommended.  
This option is recommended.
2. Accept one of the other three (3) tenders.  
This option is not recommended.
3. Not accept any of the tenders submitted.  
This option is not recommended.

Option-1 which was originally recommended by the City Strategy Committee, is therefore recommended for adoption.

*(NB: Should Option 2 or Option 3 be selected, reasons will need to be recorded in the minutes.)*

## **ATTACHMENTS**

There are no attachments for this report.

**Committee Discussion**

*Committee discussed various aspects of the tender including weighting, price and the difference between the two submissions from TD and EM Campagnoni. Clarification was sought that the contract would only be awarded if all the requirements confirmed in the tender conditions had been met, including the requirement for an accredited person to assess and approve the final construction.*

*The Committee requested clarification on the details of the approvals process prior to the Council recommendation of this tender on 11 April 2016.*

**T13/4/16          RECOMMEND**

**That, with Tender No 1/16 - Fletcher Park Cross Country Course Construction, Council:**

- 1.      Accepts the tender from Terra Firma Constructions for a period of twelve (12) weeks commencing from the date of contract for the consideration of \$107,012 (excluding GST) in accordance with the submitted tender, Council's contract documentation and Budget allocation.**
- 2.      Notes that each element of the project is to be assessed and approved prior to acceptance by the City.**

**Moved Cr C Frost  
MOTION CARRIED (7/0)**

***1.1 - CITY OF ARMADALE URBAN FOREST IMPLEMENTATION PLAN PROGRESS REPORT***

---

WARD : ALL  
FILE No. : M/95/16  
DATE : 15 February 2016  
REF : MS  
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director  
MANAGER : Technical Services

**In Brief:**

- The City's adopted Urban Forest Strategy (T 29/5/14) was created to guide the establishment of large numbers of additional trees in the City's parks, reserves and streetscapes.

Over the next 10 years, the City will invest significant resources in the implementation of this strategy.

Following the commencement of the UFS Implementation Plan, it has been identified that the City should benchmark progress, identify real value, capture success and substantiate claims.

**Recommend:**

- That Council receive the City of Armadale Urban Forest Implementation Plan Progress Report.

**Tabled Items**

Nil.

**Officer Interest Declaration**

Nil.

**Strategic Implications**

1. Community Wellbeing
  - 1.6 Support the community in emergency and fire management planning.
    - 1.6.5 Consider opportunities for partnership projects with other agencies that enhance community amenity.
2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments



- 2.1 Long term planning and development that is guided by a balance between economic, social and environmental objectives.
- 2.4 Attractive and user friendly streetscapes and open space.
  - 2.4.1 Implement townscape, streetscape, and parkland improvements, to enhance the distinctive character of the City.
  - 2.4.2 Maintain and improve where required, the quality, amenity and accessibility of open spaces.
- 2.9 Recognition of climate change
  - 2.9.2 Identify and pursue appropriate initiatives to reduce greenhouse gases and energy consumption.
- 4. Good Governance and Management
  - 4.3 An informed and engaged community.
    - 4.3.1 Ensure there is effective two way communications with the local community.

### **Legislation Implications**

General assessment of relevant legislation (eg Local Government Act) has not revealed any restrictions).

### **Council Policy/Local Law Implications**

Assessment of Policy/Local Law indicates that the following are applicable:

- Policy ENG 6 – Streetscape Management – Street Tree Removals and Replacements in Streets, Ways and Reserves

### **Policy Revisions**

The following policies are being reviewed and may be amended if required in line with the City's Urban Forest Strategy and Implementation Plan:

- Policy ENG 6 – Streetscape Management
- Policy ENG 14 – Landscaping
- City of Armadale Landscaping Guidelines – Industrial and Commercial
- City of Armadale Landscaping Guidelines – Plants to Avoid

- City of Armadale Landscaping Guidelines – Screening
- City of Armadale Landscaping Guidelines – Grouped Dwellings

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

The adoption of the recommendation contained in this report has no financial implication.

### **Consultation**

Nil.

## **BACKGROUND**

The City of Armadale was one of the first Local Governments in Western Australia to develop an Urban Forest Strategy (UFS) to protect and improve the existing landscape of the City.

The City's adopted Urban Forest Strategy (T29/5/14) was created to guide the establishment of large numbers of additional trees in the City's parks, reserves and streetscapes.

The City of Armadale Urban Forest Implementation Plan is a document that provides both an implementation and ongoing management plan for the planting of street and reserve trees in line with the City's UFS (May 2014). The City of Armadale's UFS provides a holistic approach to understanding and managing the City's urban forest. The implementation plan will give guidance for the implementation and management of trees as public infrastructure. 'Urban Forest' refers to the total vegetation in a city, whether formal or informal, public or private. Used in this sense, the City has a vast urban forest.

The City of Armadale has led the way in Western Australia by being one of the first local authorities to develop an Urban Forest Strategy in line with international best practice. Over the next 10 years, the City will invest significant resources in the implementation of this strategy, and it is important to clearly define what would constitute success. Following the commencement of the UFS Implementation Plan, it has been identified that the City should benchmark progress, identify real value, capture success and substantiate claims.

## **DISCUSSION**

The Urban Forest Strategy was approved by Council in 2014 with subsequent funding allocations. The works involved are well understood, but a programme of this scale has not been implemented before in the City. The initial years have therefore provided some lessons with the implementation, some of which are detailed in this report. This report will be the first of a series of progress reports, following the commencement of the UFS Implementation Plan.

## **Ensuring Success**

A number of factors have been identified which have increased the probability of success of this project. These are:

- **Percentage Canopy Cover Measurement**

The accepted measure of urban forest in Australia (and elsewhere) is percentage canopy cover. Councils in Australia have been mapping their existing canopy cover in order to establish a base line against which to compare future growth. The City is currently investigating the capture of this base line measure of tree cover along with field and web mapping and information systems dedicated to vegetation management. This would include on ground field data collection, spatial, and temporal mapping, geospatial tools, thermal imaging and detailed urban heat island study and valuation modelling.

- **Large Tree Species**

The cost of maintaining a large tree is comparable to the cost of maintaining a small growing tree, yet the large tree provides greater canopy cover. While it is not always possible to plant larger trees due to external factors such as overhead wires, it is usually a more efficient use of resources to do so where possible.

- **Tree Mortality**

There is not much hard data available in Perth but it is suggested that mortality rates of young trees in Councils across the metropolitan area could be as high as 70%. This is clearly not acceptable and all efforts are to be made to reduce mortality rates to within acceptable norms, with a zero loss goal.

## **Performance – Year 1**

The City is now well into Year 1 of its Urban Forest Implementation Plan and a number of factors are apparent.

- **Resident Assistance**

Whenever street trees are planted it was anticipated that residents would adopt the street verge tree outside their residence and assist with watering and basic maintenance. Despite efforts to enlist the help of residents, there has been little evidence of this to date.

- **Ability to Meet Ongoing Demand**

It has become apparent that the City's existing resources are struggling to cope with the demands of tree establishment on a large scale. The City has seconded members of other working crews (mowing field staff) to establish a dedicated team for the implementation of the UFS, but the other teams have been unreasonably placed under pressure to perform their normal duties with smaller than standard numbers.

- **Planting and Watering**

Within the Year 1 area, a total of 915 street trees were planted. The target number of street trees to be planted was 1,500; a shortfall of 585 street trees. Each tree currently receives 20 litres of water a week e.g. 18,300 litres per week. This demand of this scale on staff capacity was not anticipated and current staffing arrangements cannot maintain these unanticipated demands.

- **State Authority Cooperation**

The primary areas for envisaged tree planting are the central medians and verge areas of the main roads through Armadale. These areas are impacted by the authorities in control of elements through road reserves, in particular Western Power, where planting under power lines is not supported due to the potential risks associated with their overhead lines. The other areas of difficulty are the median strips on Albany Highway and Armadale Road, where Main Roads WA (MRWA) is resisting any new tree planting in the median.

Negotiations are on-going, but progress is slow and may require intervention in due course.

## **Planned Delivery Methodology - Year 2**

Taking into account the lessons learnt from Year 1, a number of changes are envisaged for Year 2 implementation. These are as follows:

- **Resident Assistance**

It is planned to improve the City's communication strategy and marketing to foster greater collaboration with the community required from inception to delivery.

The UFS places emphasis on the need for collaboration between the City and its residents. Experience elsewhere has shown that a sense of community ownership of the urban forest contributes greatly to its perceived value and ultimate success.

- **Proposed In-House Urban Forest Crew**

Given Council's strong desire to see the City's urban forest expand and the limited in-house resources currently available to achieve it, it is proposed to establish a new Urban Forest Crew comprising of two field staff and associated supporting tools and a vehicle for planting and maintenance activities associated with the City's Urban Forest Implementation Plan. This proposal will be included in the Work Force Plan deliberations currently under consideration.

- **Outsourcing Trial**

Outsourcing of Urban Forest Implementation, while new in WA, is already established practice in Councils across NSW, Victoria, Queensland and the ACT.

This additional service is about to become available in WA. It offers a total street tree planting, watering and maintenance service to local government. While full details are not yet available, this service is currently being investigated. Given Council's strong desire to see the City's Urban Forest expand and the limited in-house resources, there is potential for the City to trial an outsourcing option along with the provision of the suggested additional in-house resources, resulting in the possible best long term arrangement.

▪ **Grower Contracts**

Tree supply is an ongoing problem in Perth and will become increasingly so as councils accelerate the pace of their Urban Forest implementation. It is planned to set up grower contracts over the next (twelve) 12 months with several reputable Perth tree nurseries, allowing the City to best achieve its goal of using larger grown species where opportunities present.

▪ **Planting/Watering**

In Year 2, the remaining 585 street trees planned to be planted in Year 1, will be planted commencing May 2016. A further 1,500 street trees are to be planted in accordance with the City's Urban Forest Implementation Plan, Year 2. It is proposed to carry out watering of a trial area to twice-weekly watering of a given number of trees within the Year 2 area, to 50 litres a week. Mitigating the urban heat island effect may require increased water use during dry periods to maintain tree health.

**COMMENT**

Trees are potentially the largest and most significant element in the urban landscape and provide critical ecosystem services such as shade, habitat, filtration and carbon sequestration. Trees also provide a connection to nature, a sense of local character, reduced heat related stress and can act as traffic and stormwater control devices. By applying appropriate levels of resources and 'best practice' management, the City is endeavouring to develop streetscapes and parks that provide attractive, healthy and appropriate trees for the benefit of the entire community that maximises the environmental, psychological, economic and aesthetic benefits that trees provide to the community, for now and in the future. As the combined pressures of climate change and population growth makes the protection of existing trees more vital than ever before.

The Federal Government recently announced plans to increase tree cover in Australia's cities. Long-term government planning will attempt to lower temperatures and improve the health and quality of life as part of its new focus on the lives of city dwellers. It has been acknowledged that "*an effective way to reduce the severity of the heat island effect is to increase the greenery in our cities*". It is expected that an outline of a plan to set decade by decade goals up to 2050, to develop urban canopies and increase overall tree coverage, will be released later in the year.

There will be many and varied strategies and actions to be further considered in future years as our City, like many others, faces significant challenges including population growth, land development, climate change and urban heating, which all place significant pressure on the

community. A healthy urban forest will play a critical role in maintaining the health and liveability of our local community.

## **CONCLUSION**

The City is confident that the trees planted will provide a sufficient canopy cover to reduce the City's heat island effect over the long term and in doing so, contribute and maximise the benefits to the health and wellbeing of the community.

The following steps are planned to ensure that these aims are achieved in 2016/2017:

- Map existing canopy cover in order to create a base line to measure future canopy coverage.
- Develop in-house resources through the establishment of a dedicated Urban Forest Crew.
- Trial outsourcing to specialist contractors for street tree planting, watering and maintenance.
- Monitor street tree mortality rates to ensure the adopted practices are producing desired outcomes.
- Enter into grower contracts to ensure high quality stock, tree species availability and contractor reliability.
- Trial twice-weekly watering alternatives to ensure the required outcomes.
- Complete all envisaged planting for Stages 1 and 2 by September 2016.

By taking these and other best practice measures of continuous improvement, the desired outcomes of the UFS are achievable.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

There are no attachments for this report.

**Committee Discussion**

*Committee discussed this item at length including tree mortality rates, tree species and watering cycles. The Manager Parks provided information and comments on the City's trial areas and factors such as weather conditions in Western Australia that are affecting the tree survival rate. Committee discussed other aspects of the report and made comments regarding verge size in the newer areas.*

Cr Jim Stewart left the meeting, the time being 07:58 PM

Cr Jim Stewart returned to the meeting, the time being 08:01 PM

**T14/4/16          RECOMMEND**

**That Council receive the City of Armadale Urban Forest  
Implementation Plan Progress Report.**

**Moved Cr K Busby  
MOTION CARRIED (7/0)**

**2.1 – MAINTENANCE STANDARDS IN CITY OWNED BUILDINGS**

WARD : ALL  
FILE No. : M/76/16  
DATE : 24 February 2016  
REF : PP  
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director  
MANAGER : Technical Services

**In Brief:**

- A Councillor request was made for information regarding the standard of building maintenance in the City.

**Recommend:**

- That Council note the content of this report on the Maintenance Standards in City Owned Buildings.

**Tabled Items**

Nil.

**Officer Interest Declaration**

Nil.

**Strategic Implications**

2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments

2.6 Council buildings and facilities that meet community needs.

2.6.1 Maintain Council buildings, facilities and public amenities to the determined levels of service.

**Legislation Implications**

Assessment of legislation indicates that the following apply:

- Local Government Act 1995: Section 3.57 – Tenders for Providing Goods or Services.
- Local Government (Functions and General Regulations) 1996: Division 2 – Tenders for Providing Goods or Services.

**Council Policy/Local Law Implications**

Assessment of Policy/Local Law indicates that the following are applicable:

- Council Policy ADM 19 – Procurement of Goods or Services.



### **Budget/Financial Implications**

The adoption of the recommendation contained in this report has no financial implication.

### **Consultation**

- Intra Directorate.

### **BACKGROUND**

The matter of Maintenance Standards in Council Buildings was referred to the Technical Services Committee at the Ordinary Council Meeting of 21 December 2015 as follows:

*“Concerns are that many of the older Council buildings require maintenance programs to ensure that the standards of maintenance and equipment provided in these facilities are improved and compliment the public perception of the City of Armadale.*

*Information was requested as to whether additional funding was required or was there other options available to uplift and improve overall maintenance standards.”*

At the Technical Services Committee Meeting of 1 February 2016, Committee resolved as follows (T5/2/16):

*That the matter of City Buildings – Maintenance Standards be referred to Technical Services for investigation.*

This report addresses this referral.

### **Current Process**

The City has developed a documented management process which categorises maintenance activities into manageable areas and for which budget provision can be readily formulated.

These are as follows:

### **Preventative or Programmed Maintenance**

Preventative or Programmed maintenance can be identified as one of the following maintenance types:

- **Compliance maintenance** is the statutory and legal maintenance requirements imposed on the City. Compliance maintenance is non-negotiable and it is critical that the works are undertaken within the recurrent funding provided. These works are prioritised and the balance of funding is applied to condition based maintenance works.
- **Condition based maintenance** is the ‘normal’ type of maintenance, determined through an inspection program or through a works program, and generally ensures that a level of renewal maintenance is undertaken in any budget period. Renewal

requirements are usually initially identified by the Asset Management evaluation process, which through data gathered from audits and assessments, ascertains the extent of renewal works required in all buildings and facilities.

This set of works is then listed for execution but is dependent on the financial limitations of the Long Term Financial Plan. The identified works are prioritised, and the works not funded, form part of the 'unfunded' listings should funding become available through the budget process, at the mid-year budget review stage.

### **Unplanned or Reactive Maintenance**

Unplanned or Reactive maintenance can be identified as one of the following maintenance types:

- **Reactive maintenance** is maintenance which is caused by operational breakdown or failure. A typical example would be a hot water geyser failure, or an electrical fault.
- **Incident maintenance** is maintenance caused as a result of property damage including vandalism and graffiti.

Historical analysis of the expenditure on facilities is used to identify patterns of spending to approximately forecast the budget required for reactive and incident maintenance costs.

It is however, difficult to be precise with these budget provisions as by its nature, incident maintenance is difficult to predict and can seriously impact the budget. These unforeseen circumstances make managing the budget difficult and can ultimately have an impact on other maintenance requirements of the facility.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Levels of Service (LOS)**

The level of service that is required to be provided varies according to the classification of the facility. Buildings are classified in the following ways:

Class 1 Buildings are:

- Those occupied by the City's staff such as the Administration Building, Visitors Centre, etc.
- Halls and facilities which are hired out to various user groups and members of the public such as Frye Park and Piara Waters Pavilion.
- Purpose built sporting facilities such as Arena and Aquatic Centre.

The City is responsible for ensuring that budgets are provided for all maintenance activities within these buildings.

Class 2 Buildings are:

- Those facilities where lease or management agreements have been authorised by Council e.g. Scout and Guide Halls, Sporting Clubs, etc. Clauses contained within the documentation pertaining to the agreements identify what degree of maintenance each party to the agreement is required to carry out.

There are minor variations but in general the tenant/user group is responsible for Reactive, Incident and Compliance maintenance and the City is responsible for Renewal type maintenance of the facility.

Class 3 Buildings are:

- Those facilities leased through a property management company e.g. Armadale Library and Kelmscott Library. Maintenance is nearly always undertaken by the owners and billed directly to the City through the operating expenditure account. Property Services only undertakes internal maintenance not directly covered by the lease.

Class 4 Buildings are:

- Those facilities where the City holds a commercial lease on the facility and maintenance is undertaken by the City and on-costed to the tenant in the form of variable outgoings. The tenancy by TAFE from the Old Civic Building is an example of this type of classification.

### **Dependencies**

The LOS currently delivered has mostly been set by past practices but is also largely determined by the funding available for this purpose. Currently the funding available is less than that which is ideal for the suite of facilities in the City – as borne out by the Asset Management processes determinations. This is one of the reasons that the LOS has not improved to any great degree over the years. The matter of funding to meet expected renewal levels will be the subject of separate discussions with Council in the determination of the 2016/2017 asset renewal budgets and will not be expanded upon in this report.

Use patterns is a new factor affecting the costs of maintenance and operations of buildings, as follows:

- Many facilities are now open for longer hours to meet changes to the extended shopping period recently introduced. This requires that maintenance and cleaning must take place after hours, which incurs additional costs.
- Bookings for our buildings are at higher levels, particularly the newer pavilions, which again provide a shortened window to undertake maintenance, requiring out of hours attendances to be undertaken. Utility costs are also much higher, particularly power consumption. Wear and tear is much higher, shortening the period of renewal for a range of maintenance activities.
- The cost escalation factor for maintenance activities is growing greater than the additional funds provided for CPI annually.

- The backlog of renewal maintenance in facilities impacts on the cost of maintenance, with reliability and the accelerated rate of deterioration to the building fabric being most relevant.

### **Funding**

While the funding allocated to buildings is a large determinant of the LOS for these facilities, other factors are a drain on the funding available, which could possibly be addressed over time. These are:

- Full recovery of outgoings on leased buildings. There are many instances where the tenants on Council owned buildings do not bear all the operational costs of the facility. These are largely historical in nature and are usually based on the ability of the tenant to pay. These tenants are normally sporting clubs, not-for-profit groups or community groups who run on a volunteer basis.
- 'Minor' maintenance of leased buildings or buildings under a management agreement, where under normal lease conditions, the tenant would be required to bear the cost of such maintenance. Examples of these are cleaning, damage repairs, security, internal painting, electrical fault repairs and internal plumbing repairs.

Were these costs either recovered from tenants in terms of a 'normal' lease arrangement, or if the minor costs were borne by the tenant as in 'normal' lease arrangements, then this would free up considerable amounts of funding through which the LOS of buildings could be raised.

While the community perception of the City's facilities in the recent community survey did not indicate that there was a great concern with the LOS that is provided, it is undeniable that there is a large disparity in quality between the newer facilities and the older buildings. Should it be required that the gap between these two standards be narrowed, additional funding will need to be allocated for this purpose.

### **ANALYSIS**

In the consideration of the LOS of the City buildings, the positive and negative aspects of the current arrangements have been considered as follows:

#### **The Positives**

- The City presently meets its legislative compliance maintenance in relation to the facilities under its management.
- The City meets all of its breakdown maintenance requirements.
- Existing budgets provide for some renewal works to be undertaken annually.
- The recent Community Survey did not mention the standard of buildings as a negative.

### **The Negatives**

- Expectations are sometimes for a higher level of service than what can be provided for within existing budget allocations.
- Existing allocations for Renewal Maintenance do not provide substantial relief to the shortfall identified in the City's Asset Management Plan.
- The income derived from many facilities, necessary to offset the maintenance and operational costs, is largely inadequate.
- Facilities are often treated disrespectfully by users and tenants, requiring more maintenance than would otherwise be necessary.
- The failure to adequately recover costs undermines the potential to improve the LOS.

### **SUMMARY**

The level of service in City buildings is largely dependent on the funding available. Some opportunities have been identified where cost could be minimised, which would entail the gradual transfer of costs to current tenants and users.

The budget deliberations scheduled for April 2016 are to include discussions on the asset renewal funding demands, where any additional funding allocated for this purpose would provide the means for the LOS to be improved considerably.

#### **Committee Discussion**

*Committee discussed and commented on the age of some the City's buildings. Manager Property Management provided comment on the City's Asset Management Plan and advised that the City's buildings are compliant.*

### **ATTACHMENTS**

There are no attachments for this report.

**T15/4/16      RECOMMEND**

**That Council note the content of this report on the Maintenance Standards in City Owned Buildings.**

**Moved Cr K Busby  
MOTION CARRIED (7/0)**

**3.1 - TENDER NO 2/16 - SUPPLY AND INSTALLATION OF STREET LIGHTING - NICHOLSON ROAD (PIARA DRIVE TO ARMADALE ROAD) STAGE 4**

*Cr K Busby declared a financial interest in this item as one of the tenderers is a client of his computer business and left the meeting at 8:17pm.*

WARD : LAKE  
FILE No. : M/129/16  
DATE : 11 March 2016  
REF : SA  
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director  
MANAGER : Technical Services

**In Brief:**

- Tender No 2/16 was recently advertised for the Supply and Installation of Street lighting – Nicholson Road (Piara Drive to Armadale Road) Stage 4.
- Six tenders were received by the closing date.
- The Tender from Densford Civil has been assessed as being the most advantageous to Council.

**Recommend:**

- That with Tender No 2/16 Supply and Installation of Street Lighting – Nicholson Road (Piara Drive to Armadale Road), Stage 4, Council accepts the Tender from Densford Civil for the lump sum price of \$466,900.12 (excluding GST), commencing 9 May 2016 in accordance with their submitted tender, Council's contract documentation and budget allocation.

**Tabled Items**

Nil.

**Officer Interest Declaration**

Nil.

**Strategic Implications**

2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments

2.5 Safe and efficient movement of goods, services, and people.

2.5.1 Provide a safe and efficient movement network, including local and arterial roads, and associated infrastructure.

### **Legislation Implications**

Assessment of legislation indicates that the following applies:

- Section 3.57 *Local Government Act 1995* – Tenders for providing goods or services
- Division 2 *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996* – Tenders for providing goods or services

### **Council Policy/Local Law Implications**

Assessment of Policy/Local Law indicates that the following is applicable:

- Council Policy ADM 19 – Procurement of Goods or Services

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

Works can be accommodated within the 2015/2016 Annual Budget.

### **Consultation**

- Western Power & Underground Power Development.

## **BACKGROUND**

Tender No 2/16 - Supply and Installation of Street Lighting - Nicholson Road (Piara Drive to Armadale Road) Stage 4, was advertised in the Wednesday 27 January 2016 edition of The West Australian newspaper and in a notice which was displayed on the Administration Centre, Armadale, Kelmscott and Seville Grove libraries and public notice boards.

The City's upgrade of Nicholson Road Stage 4 requires the installation of street lighting and underground power to ensure the road meets the Australian Standards for street lighting. Street lighting to this standard has been installed for all previous stages of Nicholson Road from Warton Road to Piara Drive.

The works were estimated to be greater than \$150,000 and as such required a public tender be called.

## **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

Six (6) conforming tenders were received from contractors to undertake these works. The tender requested a lump sum price which included the supply and installation of all lighting and electrical infrastructure.

## Selection Criteria

An evaluation process was undertaken using the selection criteria outlined in the Tender documentation and listed below:

Item No	Description	Weighting
1	Relevant Experience	15%
2	Key Personnel	15%
3	Tenderer's Resources	10%
4	Demonstrated Understanding	10%
5	Price	50%
	Total	100%

## Tender Evaluation

After the five elements of the selection criteria were applied to each of the tenderers on the information supplied, the following tender rankings were determined with the highest ranked contractor being Densford Civil.

Tenderer	Relevant Experience	Key Personnel	Tenderer's Resources	Demonstrated Understanding	Price	Total	Ranking
	15%	15%	10%	10%	50%		
<b>Interlec</b>	8.75	9.00	5.83	6.33	41.78	<b>71.70</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Tracc Civil</b>	10.50	10.50	6.50	6.67	35.61	<b>69.78</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Reilly</b>	8.25	6.50	5.33	4.67	17.24	<b>41.99</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Brierty</b>	9.50	10.50	6.17	8.00	35.48	<b>69.65</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Power on Cabling</b>	8.75	8.75	4.67	4.00	50.00	<b>76.17</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Densford Civil</b>	11.00	10.25	7.33	7.50	47.63	<b>83.71</b>	<b>1</b>

While the assessment of the submissions indicated that in general, all of the contractors could complete this project, Densford Civil provided a thorough, detailed submission covering the full range of the four criteria.

Within their documentation were good examples of successfully completing similar sized projects, a strong response to the methodology and hence an understanding of the scope of works, as well as presenting the panel with the confidence that Densford Civil have the appropriate personnel and resources to complete this project.

Their offer as a result, represented the most advantageous to the City.



## COMMENT

Based on these rankings, the evaluation panel therefore recommends that the contract be awarded to Densford Civil for the lump sum price of \$466,900.12 (excluding GST).

## ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.

### **T16/4/16          RECOMMEND**

**That with Tender No 2/16 Supply and Installation of Street Lighting – Nicholson Road (Piara Drive to Armadale Road), Stage 4, that Council accepts the Tender from Densford Civil for the lump sum price of \$466,900.12 (excluding GST), commencing 9 May 2016 in accordance with their submitted tender, Council’s contract documentation and budget allocation.**

**Moved Cr C Frost  
MOTION CARRIED (7/0)**

*Cr K Busby remained outside the meeting room for the next item.*

**3.5 - TENDER NO 7/16 - LEAD DESIGN CONSULTANCY SERVICES FOR THE PIARA WATERS (SOUTH) PLAYING FIELD AND PAVILION**

*Cr K Busby declared a financial interest in this item as one of the tenderers is a client of his computer business and left the meeting at 8:17pm.*

WARD : LAKE  
FILE No. : M/149/16  
DATE : 17 March 2016  
REF : AB  
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director  
MANAGER : Technical Services

**In Brief:**

- Tender No 7/16 was recently called for Lead Design Consultancy Services for the Piara Waters (South) Playing Field and Pavilion.

**Recommend:**

- That with Tender No 7/16 – Lead Design Consultancy Services for the Piara Waters (South) Playing Field and Pavilion, Council accepts the tender from Fratelle Group Architects for their tendered price of \$263,350.00 (excluding GST), in accordance with their submitted Tender, Council contract documentation and budget allocation.

**Tabled Items**

Nil.

**Officer Interest Declaration**

Nil.

**Strategic Implications**

1. Community Wellbeing
  - 1.5 Sport, recreation and leisure opportunities that contribute to community health and wellbeing.
    - 1.5.1 Provide and promote Council sport, recreation and leisure facilities.
2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments
  - 2.7 Assets and infrastructure managed over the long term to meet current and future needs.
    - 2.7.3 Maintain effective liaison with other levels of government and regional bodies to ensure coordinated provision of regional infrastructure.

### **Legislation Implications**

Assessment of legislation indicates that the following apply:

- Section 3.57 *Local Government Act 1995* – Tenders for providing goods or services
- Division 2 *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996* – Tenders for providing goods or services

### **Council Policy/Local Law Implications**

Assessment of Policy/Local Law indicates that the following are applicable:

- Council Policy ADM 19 – Procurement of Goods or Services

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

Costs can be accommodated within the 2015/2016 Annual Budget allocation.

### **Consultation**

- Intra Directorate.

## **BACKGROUND**

Tender No 7/16 - Lead Design Consultancy Services for the Piara Waters (South) Playing Field and Pavilion was advertised in the 6 February edition of the West Australian newspaper, and in a notice which was displayed on the Administration Centre, Armadale, and the Armadale, Kelmscott and Seville Grove Libraries public notice boards.

A major Needs Assessment Study was completed in June 2007 which was jointly funded by the City, the (then) Armadale Redevelopment Authority (ARA) and the Department of Sport and Recreation. The Study assessed the long term needs for active sporting reserves throughout the City. The Study also assessed the current usage and condition of existing facilities, as well as the need for new active reserves in the growth areas of North Forrestdale (Piara Waters and Harrisdale), and the Wungong Urban (Haynes, Hilbert and Wungong) redevelopment area, to cater for the City's rapid population growth.

In July 2010, the City entered into a Memorandum of Understanding for the shared use of open space for community facilities on and/or adjacent to school sites in the City of Armadale, with the (then) Armadale Redevelopment Authority and the Department of Education. One of the sites under consideration was the Piara Waters (South) site.

## DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The City of Armadale invited tenders for Lead Design Consultancy Services for the Piara Waters (South) Playing Field and Pavilion on 6 February 2016.

The overall project includes bulk earthworks, drainage, irrigation, turf installation, boundary fencing and bollards, sports lighting, multi-use pavilion, change facilities, playground, car park, lighting and all associated services. The Lead Design Consultant will be responsible for coordinating all elements of the design and documentation, including control and coordination of all sub-consultants.

The successful Tenderer will be required to provide the following:

- Concept / schematic design services;
- Design development;
- Prepare tender documentation;
- Construction administration;
- Post construction phase services;
- Prepare approvals documentation;
- Review design and documentation milestones; and
- Run coordination workshops between sub-consultants.

Council approval is sought to award the tender for Lead Design Consultancy Services for the Piara Waters (South) Playing Field and Pavilion until the completion of the works from the date of contract acceptance.

## COMMENT

### Analysis

The Request for Tender (RFT) seeks the provision of the required services, commencing 18 April, 2016.

The tender closed at 2:00pm on 1 March 2016. Submissions were received from:

Tenderer's OR Respondent's Name	
1.	Peter Hunt Architect
2.	Donovan Payne Architects
3.	Broderick Architects
4.	River Engineering Pty Ltd
5.	Hodge Collard Preston Architects Pty Ltd
6.	Bollig Design Group Pty Ltd
7.	Site Architecture Studio

8.	Edge Consulting Engineers
9.	Midas Engineering Group Pty Ltd
10.	Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects
11.	Holton Connor Architects & Planners
12.	SPH Architecture + Interiors
13.	Lycopodium Infrastructure Pty Ltd
14.	Scatera Clocherty Architects
15.	Paul Meschiata & Associates Pty Ltd
16.	Rob Anson Architect Pty Ltd
17.	GHD Woodhead Pty Ltd
18.	Fratelle Group Architects

An evaluation process was undertaken having specific regard to the following Qualitative Criteria:

The eighteen (18) tenders presented prior to the close of deadline met the compliance criteria.

An evaluation process was undertaken having specific regard to the following qualitative criteria and weighting:

### **Relevant Experience (30%)**

This criterion was focused on respondents understanding of the project brief, as well as providing details of similar work. The respondents' understanding of safety in design and an understanding of Green Star design principles also came into consideration.

Twelve (12) of the eighteen (18) submissions provided responses considered 'very good' by the evaluation panel. The submissions from Donovan Payne Architects and Peter Hunt Architect provided excellent examples, and were clearly able to demonstrate their understanding of the project brief. The submissions from Hodge Collard Preston, Bollig Design Group, Rob Anson, GHD Woodhead and Fratelle Group followed closely behind.

### **Key Personnel (20%)**

This criterion required respondents to identify the key personnel who would be working on this project, along with their relevant experience and availability. Just over half of the submissions scored 'very good' or higher. Fratelle Group, Bollig Design Group and GHD Woodhead clearly demonstrated their strength in this criterion, providing requisite experience as well as significant depth in their nominated teams.

### **Tenderers Resources (20%)**

Tenderers were required to demonstrate their ability to complete the design process within the City's anticipated timeframe, as well as provide evidence of their current commitment schedule.

The information provided by Fratelle Group, supported by referee follow-up, was able to demonstrate (to the satisfaction of the review panel) their ability to deliver the design program in line with the City's expectations. Submissions from Donovan Payne Architects, Bollig Design Group, Site Architecture Studio, Lycopodium Infrastructure, Rob Anson and GHD Woodhead followed closely behind.

### Tendered Price (30%)

The volume of submissions received is evidence of current market conditions, and as such, much of the pricing reflected a tight market. Due consideration was given when evaluating the submitted prices.

Tenderer	Relevant Experience	Key Personnel	Tenderer's Resources	Price	Total	Ranking
	30%	20%	20%	30%		
<b>Peter Hunt Architect</b>	25.00	14.00	12.00	23.06	<b>74.06</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Donovan Payne Architects</b>	26.50	14.67	14.00	16.36	<b>71.53</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Broderick Architects</b>	20.00	10.00	9.33	22.15	<b>61.48</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>River Engineering Pty Ltd</b>	21.00	12.67	7.33	27.03	<b>68.03</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Hodge Collard Preston Architects Pty Ltd</b>	24.00	13.33	11.33	16.03	<b>64.70</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Bollig Design Group Pty Ltd</b>	24.00	15.33	14.67	20.84	<b>74.84</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Site Architecture Studio</b>	23.00	14.67	14.00	21.56	<b>73.23</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Edge Consulting Engineers</b>	5.00	4.67	6.00	21.07	<b>36.73</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Midas Engineering Group Pty Ltd</b>	13.50	10.00	4.67	9.82	<b>37.99</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects</b>	22.50	14.00	13.33	12.95	<b>62.79</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Holton Connor Architects &amp; Planners</b>	21.00	14.00	12.67	16.32	<b>63.99</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>SPH Architecture + Interiors</b>	23.00	12.00	12.00	19.97	<b>66.97</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Lycopodium Infrastructure Pty Ltd</b>	16.00	14.00	14.67	30.00	<b>74.67</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Scatena Clocherty Architects</b>	11.00	10.00	9.33	19.34	<b>49.68</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Paul Meschiati &amp; Associates Pty Ltd</b>	19.00	12.67	8.00	18.82	<b>58.49</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Rob Anson Architect Pty Ltd</b>	23.00	14.00	15.33	14.38	<b>66.71</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>GHD Woodhead Pty Ltd</b>	23.00	15.33	14.67	18.21	<b>71.21</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Fratelle Group Architects</b>	23.00	15.33	16.67	20.48	<b>75.48</b>	<b>1</b>

Based on the panel's evaluation, using a combination of the above qualitative criteria and price, the submission from Fratelle Group Architects represents the most advantageous submission for the City.

### CONCLUSION

Tenders for Lead Design Consultancy Services for the Piara Waters (South) Playing Field and Pavilion were recently invited, with eighteen (18) tenders received and assessed by an evaluation panel against compliance and qualitative criteria.

The submission received from Fratelle Group Architects represents the most advantageous submission. The evaluation panel therefore recommends that the contract be awarded to Fratelle Group Architects at a price of \$263,350.00 (excluding GST) until the completion of the works.

## ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.

### **T17/4/16          RECOMMEND**

**That with Tender No 7/16 - Lead Design Consultancy Services for the Piara Waters (South) Playing Field and Pavilion, Council accepts the Tender from Fratelle Group Architects for the lump sum price of \$263,350.00 (excluding GST), commencing 18 April 2016, in accordance with their submitted Tender, Council contract documentation and budget allocation.**

**Moved Cr C Frost  
MOTION CARRIED (7/0)**

*Cr K Busby returned to the meeting at 8:20 pm.*

**3.2 - TENDER NO 3/16 - NICHOLSON ROAD - HAKEA WATER MAIN RELOCATION  
STAGE 2**

*Cr K Busby returned to the meeting at the start of this item however declared a financial interest in this item also, as one of the tenderers is a client of his computer business. Cr Busby remained in the room and the item was moved and carried without discussion.*

WARD : LAKE  
FILE No. : M/151/16  
DATE : 18 March 2016  
REF : SA  
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director  
MANAGER : Technical Services

**In Brief:**

- Tender No 3/16 was recently called for Nicholson Road Water Main Relocation Stage 2.
- 12 tenders were received by the closing.
- The tender from Underground Services has been assessed as being most advantageous to Council.

**Recommend:**

- That with Tender No 3/16 Nicholson Road - Hakea Water Main Relocation Stage 2, Council accepts the Tender from Underground Services for the lump sum price of \$191,080.04 (excluding GST), commencing 9 May 2016, in accordance with their submitted tender, Council's contract documentation and budget allocation.

**Tabled Items**

Nil

**Officer Interest Declaration**

Nil.

**Strategic Implications**

2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments

2.5 Safe and efficient movement of goods, services, and people.

2.5.1 Provide a safe and efficient movement network, including local and arterial roads, and associated infrastructure.



### **Legislation Implications**

Assessment of legislation indicates that the following apply:

- Section 3.57 *Local Government Act 1995* – Tenders for providing goods or services
- Division 2 *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996* – Tenders for providing goods or services

### **Council Policy/Local Law Implications**

Assessment of Policy/Local Law indicates that the following is applicable:

- Council Policy ADM 19 – Procurement of Goods or Services

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

Costs can be contained within the 2015/2016 Budget allocation.

### **Consultation**

- Water Corporation
- Cardno Engineering Consultants
- Department of Justice

## **BACKGROUND**

Following a request from the Department of Justice, the City's ongoing upgrade of Nicholson Road, which is now into its final stage between Piara Drive and Armadale Road is to include the provision for a replacement uninterrupted water supply pipeline to service Hakea Prison in Canning Vale.

This realignment has been deemed necessary due to the current pipeline alignment being located directly beneath the upgraded Nicholson Road alignment, thus potentially making future repairs to this service difficult and compromising the water main's integrity.

Nicholson Road Water Main Relocation Stage 2 involves the installation of this pipeline to be laid between Piara Drive and Armadale Road, the majority of which will be in the eastern verge.

The design drawings were prepared by Cardno Consultants and have been approved by the Water Corporation.

Tender No 3/16 for Nicholson Road – Hakea Water Main Relocation Stage 2 was therefore advertised on Wednesday 27 January 2016 in The West Australian newspaper, on the City's

website and in a notice displayed on notice boards at the City’s Administration Centre and in the Armadale, Kelmscott and Seville Grove libraries.

## DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The successful tenderer will be required to carry out the works to meet the requirements of the tender documentation including the specification and approved drawings and to work in conjunction with the City’s own crews undertaking the road upgrade.

Twelve (12) conforming tenders were received from various contractors to undertake these works as per Table 1 below:

**Table 1: Compliant Tenders**

	<b>Tenderer’s OR Respondent’s Name</b>
1.	Reilly Contracting
2.	Allwest Plant Hire
3.	Tracc Civil
4.	Densford Civil
5.	Underground Services
6.	Rob Carr P/L
7.	Dig Deep Contracting
8.	WA Plumbing Solutions
9.	R&B Directional Drilling
10.	Power On Cabling
11.	Wolfe Civil P/L
12.	SSP Diverse P/L

## Selection Criteria

An evaluation process was undertaken using the selection criteria outlined in the Tender documentation and listed below:

**Table 2: Selection Criteria**

<b>Item No</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
1	Relevant Experience	15%
2	Key Personnel	15%
3	Tenderer’s Resources	10%
4	Demonstrated Understanding	10%
5	Price	50%
	Total	100%

## Tender Evaluation

After the five elements of the selection criteria were applied to each of the tenderers on the information supplied, the following tender rankings were determined with the highest ranked contractor being Underground Services.

Tenderer	Relevant Experience	Key Personnel	Tenderer's Resources	Demonstrated Understanding	Price	Total	Ranking
	15%	15%	10%	10%	50%		
<b>Reilly Contracting</b>	9.50	7.50	6.33	6.50	21.25	<b>51.08</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Allwest Plant Hire</b>	9.00	7.50	5.33	5.00	23.13	<b>49.96</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Tracc Civil</b>	10.50	10.50	7.00	4.33	41.25	<b>73.59</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Densford Civil</b>	9.50	6.00	7.17	7.00	33.88	<b>63.55</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Underground Services</b>	7.75	7.50	5.33	7.00	50.00	<b>77.58</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Rob Carr P/L</b>	7.50	9.75	5.33	5.67	36.68	<b>64.93</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Dig Deep Contracting</b>	7.50	7.00	5.33	6.00	19.72	<b>45.55</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>WA Plumbing Solutions</b>	7.00	6.00	3.33	4.33	28.17	<b>48.84</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>R&amp;B Directional Drilling</b>	1.00	5.25	4.33	3.33	42.62	<b>56.53</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Power On Cabling</b>	6.50	7.25	4.67	4.83	49.22	<b>72.47</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Wolfe Civil P/L</b>	7.00	7.00	4.00	3.33	48.72	<b>70.05</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SSP Diverse P/L</b>	9.00	9.25	4.67	6.00	35.81	<b>64.72</b>	<b>6</b>

Tenders for Nicholson Road – Hakea Water Main Relocation Stage 2 were recently invited with twelve (12) tenders being received and assessed by an evaluation panel against compliance and qualitative criteria. The result was that the submission from Underground Services represents the most advantageous tender to the City of Armadale.

Underground Services demonstrated a thorough understanding of the scope of works and also appear to have sufficient experience, with examples given about previous related works involving water main installation and have sufficient personnel and plant.

Their offer therefore is considered to represent the most advantageous to the City.

## COMMENT

Based on these rankings, the evaluation panel therefore recommends that the contract be awarded to Underground Services for the lump sum price of \$191,080.04 (excluding GST).

## ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.

### T18/4/16      **RECOMMEND**

**That with Tender No 3/16 - Nicholson Road - Hakea Water Main Relocation Stage 2, Council accepts the Tender from Underground Services for the lump sum price of \$191,080.04 (excluding GST), commencing 9 May 2016, in accordance with their submitted tender, Council's contract documentation and budget allocation.**

**Moved Cr C Frost  
MOTION CARRIED (7/0)**

**3.3 - TENDER NO 4/16 - SUPPLY OF HIRED PLANT - WET HIRE OF GRADERS**

WARD : ALL  
FILE No. : M/145/16  
DATE : 17 March 2016  
REF : JR  
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director  
MANAGER : Technical Services

**In Brief:**

- Tender No 4/16 was recently called for the Supply of Hired Plant – Wet Hire of Graders, for projects within the City of Armadale.
- The Request for Tender seeks the provision of the required services for a period of twelve (12) months with an option to extend for a further two (2) periods of twelve (12) months.

**Recommend:**

- That with Tender No 4/16 - Supply of Hired Plant – Wet Hire of Graders, that Council accepts the tender from Allwest Plant Hire for an initial period of twelve (12) months commencing 26 April 2016, in accordance with the submitted tender, Council contract documentation and Budget allocation.
- Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to extend the contract for two (2) periods of twelve (12) months up to 25 April 2019, subject to satisfactory performance by the contractor and price adjustments specified in the Request for Tender Documentation, Clause 4.1.

**Tabled Items**

Nil.

**Officer Interest Declaration**

Nil.

**Strategic Implications**

2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments

2.5 Safe and efficient movement of goods, services, and people.

2.5.1 Provide a safe and efficient movement network, including local and arterial roads, and associated infrastructure.

### **Legislation Implications**

Assessment of legislation indicates that the following apply:

- Section 3.57 *Local Government Act 1995* – Tenders for providing goods or services
- Division 2 Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996 – Tenders for providing goods or services

### **Council Policy/Local Law Implications**

Assessment of Policy/Local Law indicates that the following are applicable:

- Council Policy ADM 19 – Procurement of Goods or Services

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

Works can be accommodated within the 2015/2016 Civil Works Budget.

### **Consultation**

- Intra Directorate.
- Inter Directorate.

## **BACKGROUND**

The City of Armadale does not possess a motorised grader for use on road construction and maintenance projects. As a result, from time to time, the City requires the hire of a motorised grader on an as and when required basis.

## **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

Tender No 4/16 - Supply of Hired Plant – Wet Hire of Graders was advertised in the West Australian newspaper on Saturday 27 January 2016, the City of Armadale website and in a notice which was displayed on the Administration Centre, Armadale, Kelmscott and Seville Grove Libraries public notice boards.

The successful tenderer will be required to supply motorised graders on a wet hire basis which will be utilised for different projects within the City of Armadale boundaries. The successful tenderer shall be responsible for all costs associated with owning and operating the grader including but not limited to fuel, insurances, servicing, major and minor repairs, tyres and operator wages including on-costs.

**DETAILS OF NEW CONTRACT**

<b>Contract Type</b>	<b>Schedule of Rates</b>
Initial Contract Duration	12 Months
Commencement Date	26 April 2016
Expiry Date	25 April 2017
Extension Permitted	Yes - As per Request for Tender Clause 4.1 Two (2) x Twelve (12) Month Extensions to 25 April 2019
Initial Contract Cost (12 months)	\$150,000 including GST (Approximately)
Total Contract Cost (36 months)	\$450,000 including GST (Approximately)
Rise and Fall Clause Included	Fixed for the first term

**COMMENT**

**Analysis**

The Request for Tender seeks the provision of the required services for a period of twelve (12) months, commencing on 26 April 2016, with an option to extend the contract for a further two (2) periods of twelve (12) months.

The tender closed at 2:00pm on Thursday, 18 February. Five (5) tenders were received from:

	<b>Tenderer's OR Respondent's Name</b>
1.	Mayday Earthmoving
2.	EXP Resources
3.	Allwest Plant Hire
4.	Mining and Drilling Services
5.	Consolidated Rentals

No tenders were received after the close of deadline.

No non-conforming tenders received.

An evaluation process was undertaken having specific regard to the following Criteria:

<b>Item No</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
1	Relevant Experience	15%
2	Key Personnel	10%
3	Tenderer's Resources	15%
4	Demonstrated Understanding	10%
5	Price	50%
	Total	100%

## Assessment

The tender submissions have been assessed and rated, with the outcome as detailed below:

Tenderer	Relevant Experience	Key Personnel	Tenderer's Resources	Demonstrated Understanding	Price	Total	Ranking
	15%	10%	15%	10%	50%		
<b>Allwest Plant Hire</b>	11.00	7.00	11.00	7.33	46.57	<b>82.90</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>EXP Resources</b>	11.00	7.33	9.50	7.00	42.41	<b>77.24</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Consolidated Rentals</b>	9.00	6.33	9.00	7.00	38.88	<b>70.21</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Mining and Drilling Services</b>	9.00	5.67	8.00	6.33	34.83	<b>63.83</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Mayday Earthmoving</b>	4.50	2.33	3.50	1.00	50.00	<b>61.33</b>	<b>5</b>

Based on the panel's evaluation, using a combination of the above qualitative criteria and price, the submission from Allwest Plant Hire represents the most advantageous submission. Allwest Plant Hire previously held the tender for the Supply of Hired Plant – Wet Hire of Graders and provided a satisfactory service to the City of Armadale. In addition, Allwest Plant Hire is a locally based City of Armadale Contractor. It is therefore recommended that Allwest Plant hire be awarded Tender No 4/16 - Supply of Hired Plant – Wet Hire of Graders.

## CONCLUSION

The evaluation panel therefore recommends that the contract be awarded to Allwest Plant hire for a period of twelve (12) months, with an option to extend for a further two (2) periods of twelve (12) months.

## ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.



**T19/4/16 RECOMMEND**

**That with Tender No 4/16 - Supply of Hired Plant – Wet Hire of Graders, that Council:**

- 1. Accepts the tender from Allwest Plant Hire for an initial period of twelve (12) months, commencing 26 April 2016, in accordance with the submitted tender, Council Contract Documentation, and Budget Allocation.**
- 2, Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to extend the contract for two (2) periods of twelve (12) months up to 25 April 2019, subject to satisfactory performance by the contractor and price adjustments as specified in the Request for Tender document, Clause 4.1.**

**Moved Cr R Butterfield  
MOTION CARRIED (7/0)**

**3.4 - TENDER NO 6/16 - HARRISDALE (EAST) STAGE 2 PAVILION CAR PARK AND PLAYGROUND**

WARD : LAKE  
FILE No. : M/146/16  
DATE : 17 March 2016  
REF : AB  
RESPONSIBLE : Executive Director  
MANAGER : Technical Services

**In Brief:**

- Tender No 6/16 was recently called for the construction of Harrisdale (East) Stage 2 – Pavilion, Car Park and Playground.

**Recommend:**

- That with Tender No 6/16 - Harrisdale (East) Stage 2 Pavilion, Car Park and Playground, Council accepts the tender from McCorkell Constructions for their tendered price of \$3,668,850.00 (excluding GST), for a period of thirty two (32) weeks commencing 18 April 2016, in accordance with their submitted Tender, Council Contract Documentation and budget allocation.

**Tabled Items**

Nil.

**Officer Interest Declaration**

Nil

**Strategic Implications**

1. Community Wellbeing
  - 1.5 Sport, recreation and leisure opportunities that contribute to community health and wellbeing.
    - 1.5.1 Provide and promote Council sport, recreation and leisure facilities.
2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments
  - 2.7 Assets and infrastructure managed over the long term to meet current and future needs.
    - 2.7.3 Maintain effective liaison with other levels of government and regional bodies to ensure coordinated provision of regional infrastructure.

### **Legislation Implications**

Assessment of legislation indicates that the following apply:

- Section 3.57 *Local Government Act 1995* – Tenders for providing goods or services
- Division 2 *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996* – Tenders for providing goods or services

### **Council Policy/Local Law Implications**

Assessment of Policy/Local Law indicates that the following are applicable:

- Council Policy ADM 19 – Procurement of Goods or Services

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

Costs can be accommodated within the 2015/2016 Annual Budget allocation.

Council was notified in May 2015 (C19/5/15) of an \$800,000 successful grant application through the Department of Sport & Recreation's CSRFF program. The original financial model forecast a \$1M grant, with the difference coming from the North Forestdale Developer Contribution Scheme No.3 as part of the current review.

### **Consultation**

- Intra Directorate.
- Project Design Consultant – Donovan Payne Architects.

## **BACKGROUND**

Tender No 6/16 - Harrisdale (East) Stage 2 – Pavilion, Car Park and Playground was advertised in the 6 February edition of the West Australian newspaper, and in a notice which was displayed on the Administration Centre, and the Armadale, Kelmscott and Seville Grove Libraries public notice boards.

In November 2014, the tender for the Provision of Lead Design Consultancy Services for the Harrisdale (East) Playing Field and Pavilion was awarded to Donovan Payne Architects (CS106/11/14). This project was to be designed and constructed in two stages.

Stage 1 included bulk earthworks, drainage, irrigation, construction of turf surface, boundary fencing, bollards, sports lighting and car park works.

Stage 2 includes a multi-use pavilion, change facilities, playground and car park works.

In October 2015, the tender for construction of Harrisdale (East) Stage 1 Playing Field and Civil Works was awarded to Ertech Pty Ltd (T74/10/15). Works have recently been completed for this contract.

## **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

The City of Armadale invited tenders for the Harrisdale (East) Stage 2 – Pavilion, Car Park and Playground on 6 February 2016.

The successful tenderer will be required to undertake construction of a multi-use pavilion and car park, associated services and civil works, supply and installation of a children's playground, and associated landscape works at the Harrisdale (East) shared use site located on Gracefield Boulevard, Harrisdale.

Council approval is sought to award the tender for construction of Harrisdale (East) Stage 2 Pavilion, Car park and Playground for a period of thirty two (32) weeks.

## **COMMENT**

### **Analysis**

The Request for Tender (RFT) seeks the provision of the required services for a period of thirty two (32) weeks, commencing 18 April, 2016.

The tender closed at 2:00pm on 8 March 2016. Submissions were received from:

<b>Tenderer's OR Respondent's Name</b>	
1.	Alita Constructions
2.	McCorkell Constructions
3.	CPD Group Pty Ltd
4.	BE Projects (WA) Pty Ltd
5.	Lanskey Constructions
6.	Ertech Pty Ltd

An evaluation process was undertaken having specific regard to the following Qualitative Criteria:

### **Relevant Experience (20%)**

This criterion required tenderers to describe their experience in completing similar projects, including details of any issues experienced, ability to deliver on time and within budget. Most tenderers provided comprehensive responses to this criterion, with a number of directly relevant examples of similar projects. The exception was the submission from Ertech Pty Ltd. The major component of the project is the pavilion and Ertech has sub-contracted this component, yet the submission does not detail current or past projects from the nominated sub-contractor.

### Key Personnel (15%)

As a minimum, tenderers were required to provide information on their nominated Project Director, Construction Manager and Site Manager. All submissions provided detailed information on nominated personnel (previous experience, qualifications, etc.), including their availability throughout the project. Submissions also included details for nominated sub-contractors (to varying degrees).

### Tenderers Resources (15%)

Tenderers were requested to provide information concerning their resources (plant, equipment, materials) as well as contingency measures, including back-up for nominated personnel. All submissions met this criterion, with the submissions from Alita Constructions, McCorkell Constructions, CPD Group and BE Projects providing slightly more information than Lanskey Constructions and Ertech.

### Demonstrated Understanding (20%)

This criterion was specifically looking to identify each tenderer's methodology for delivering the project. Alita Constructions were able to incorporate knowledge and understanding of local issues of direct relevance to the project, clearly demonstrating their understanding of the requirements of the project. McCorkell Constructions also demonstrated specific understanding. The submissions from CPD Group, BE Projects, Lanskey Constructions and Ertech, whilst still addressing the criterion, were more of a generic nature when compared to the submissions from Alita Constructions and McCorkell Constructions.

### Tendered Price (30%)

All submitted prices are within the budget allocation.

Tenderer	Relevant Experience	Key Personnel	Tenderer's Resources	Demonstrated Understanding	Price	Total	Ranking
	20%	15%	15%	20%	30%		
<b>Alita Constructions</b>	13.00	10.13	10.50	16.50	28.21	<b>78.34</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>McCorkell Constructions</b>	14.50	10.13	10.13	15.00	30.00	<b>79.75</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CPD Group</b>	14.00	9.75	9.75	13.00	28.26	<b>74.76</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>BE Projects</b>	14.50	9.00	9.00	14.00	29.91	<b>76.41</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Lanskey Constructions</b>	12.50	8.25	7.88	12.5	29.68	<b>70.80</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Ertech</b>	8.00	7.50	6.75	10.50	29.85	<b>62.20</b>	<b>6</b>

## SUMMARY

Five (5) of the six (6) submissions received were deemed suitable to carry out the project. Critically, the submission from Ertech Pty Ltd failed to provide sufficient information on their nominated building sub-contractor and given the relative importance of the pavilion construction, the evaluation panel was unable to recommend Ertech as the preferred proponent.

Alita Constructions, McCorkell Constructions, CPD Group, BE Projects and Lanskey Constructions demonstrated a high degree of relevant experience, with Alita and McCorkell also demonstrating an extremely high level of detailed understanding of the project.

Based on the panel's evaluation, using a combination of the above qualitative criteria and price, the submission from McCorkell Constructions represents the most advantageous submission for the City.

## CONCLUSION

Tender No 6/16 - Harrisdale (East) Stage 2 Pavilion, Car Park and Playground were recently invited, with six (6) tenders received and assessed by an evaluation panel against compliance and qualitative criteria.

The submission received from McCorkell Constructions represents the most advantageous submission. The evaluation panel therefore recommends that the contract be awarded to McCorkell Constructions at a lump sum price of \$3,668,850.00 (excluding GST) for a construction period of thirty two (32) weeks.

## ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.

### T20/4/16      **RECOMMEND**

**That with Tender No 6/16 - Harrisdale (East) Stage 2 Pavilion, Car Park and Playground, Council accepts the tender from McCorkell Constructions for their tendered price of \$3,668,850.00 (excluding GST), for a period of thirty two (32) weeks commencing 18 April 2016, in accordance with their submitted Tender, Council Contract Documentation and budget allocation.**

**Moved Cr C Frost  
MOTION CARRIED (7/0)**

***COUNCILLORS' ITEMS***

---

**1**            **Verge Collection (Cr Carole Frost)**

Cr Frost has received many complaints over the last four weeks about rubbish not being picked up. Some of the issues are:

- Lawns dying
- What are the penalties regarding the contract?
- Why is this contractor so slow with the pick up?
- Facebook apology to residents

Cr Butterfield suggested the City could look into other methods of collection for newer areas, perhaps the hire of skip bins.

The Executive Manager Technical Services advised the matter would be dealt with administratively and respond to Cr Frost with the outcome and that a report could be presented regarding alternative verge collection methods.

**T21/4/16**        **RECOMMEND**

**That the Councillors' item in regard to:-**

- **Verge Collection**

**be referred to the relevant Directorate for action and/or report to the appropriate Committee.**

**Moved Cr R Butterfield**  
**MOTION CARRIED (7/0)**

***EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TECHNICAL SERVICES REPORT***

---

**1           Route Assessment - Forrestdale Business Park (FBP)**

A number of business owners in the FBP have recently approached Council requesting the internal roads within the Business Park be upgraded from the current Restricted Access Vehicle Category 2 (RAV2) to RAV4 to legally accommodate the size and weight of their vehicles.

Note importantly, that this upgrade in category relates primarily to the load or weight limit being carried by the vehicle, not the length of vehicle as both RAV2 and RAV4 allow for maximum length of 27.5m. Typically this allows for vehicles such as Pocket Road Trains and B-doubles.

Currently RAV2 access allows for a maximum load of 67.5 Tonnes, whilst RAV4 allows for 87.5 Tonnes. Due to the nature of some of the businesses in the Business Park, this additional weight allowance is critical to their operations.

MRWA are the only Authority in WA that can approve an increase in Access Categories, hence they were asked by the City following the request from the businesses to investigate and provide approval should they agree.

Following their investigations, MRWA have advised that they approve the request to upgrade all roads within the Business Park (as shown on the attached plan) to RAV4 as requested by the various businesses.

Note importantly, that whilst this approval has been given and all details will be added to their Heavy Haulage Webpage to reflect these changes, this approval is conditional upon these vehicles travelling 10km/hr slower than the posted speed limits on these roads. This is standard practice and is highlighted as part of the upgrade to the Access Category on their Webpage.

The attached plan shows those roads in green as being upgraded from RAV2 to RAV4, whilst Ranford Road, which was extended from Lake Road to Armadale Road approximately 4 years ago, has also been added to the category (at present it is not listed at all).

For information.





MEETING DECLARED CLOSED AT 8:29 PM