

Notice of Meeting



17 Queen Street, Pingelly
Western Australia 6308
Telephone: 9887 1066
Facsimile: 9887 1453
admin@pingelly.wa.gov.au

Dear Elected Member

A Special meeting of Council will be held on Monday 29 February 2016 in the Council Chambers, 17 Queen Street, Pingelly commencing at 8am.

The meeting has been called by the President.

The purpose of the meeting is to:

1. Award the Tender for Architectural Services for the PRACC.
2. Council to endorse the CEO to approach WALGA with an offer to conditionally provide a house for a family affected by the recent fires in the Shire of Harvey.
3. Elected Members motion for Council to support the Chief Executive Officer request to increase staffing resources only in the short term to deliver the large number of additional projects over and above normal business.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'G. Pollock'.

Gavin Pollock
Chief Executive Officer

26 February 2016

DISCLAIMER

No responsibility whatsoever is implied or accepted by the Shire of Pingelly for any act, omission or statement or intimation occurring during Council or Committee meetings or during formal/informal conversations with staff. The Shire of Pingelly disclaims any liability for any loss whatsoever and howsoever caused arising out of reliance by any person or legal entity on any such act, omission or statement or intimation occurring during Council or Committee meetings or discussions. Any person or legal entity that act or fails to act in reliance upon any statement does so at the person's or legal entity's own risk.

In particular and without derogating in any way from the broad disclaimer above, in any discussion regarding any planning application or application for a licence, any statement or limitation of approval made by a member or officer of the Shire of Pingelly during the course of any meeting is not intended to be and is not taken as notice of approval from the Shire of Pingelly. The Shire of Pingelly warns that anyone who has an application lodged with the Shire of Pingelly must obtain and only should rely on WRITTEN CONFIRMATION of the outcome of the application, and any conditions attaching to the decision made by the Shire of Pingelly in respect of the application.

AGENDA

Shire of Pingelly
Special Council Meeting
29 February 2016

MISSION STATEMENT

To enhance the quality of life for the people of Pingelly through the provision of leadership, services and infrastructure.

DISCLAIMER


INFORMATION FOR PUBLIC ATTENDING COUNCIL MEETINGS

PLEASE NOTE:

The recommendations contained in this agenda are officers' recommendations only and should not be acted upon until Council has resolved to adopt those recommendations.

The resolutions of Council should be confirmed by perusing the minutes of the Council meeting at which these recommendations were considered.

Members of the public should also note that they act at their own risk if they enact any resolution prior to receiving official written notification of Councils decision.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'G. Pollock', written in a cursive style.

**GAVIN POLLOCK
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

COUNCIL MEETING INFORMATION NOTES

Your Council generally handles all business at Ordinary or Special Council Meetings.

From time to time Council may form a Committee to examine subjects and then report to Council.

Generally all meetings are open to the public; however, from time to time Council will be required to deal with personal, legal and other sensitive matters. On those occasions Council will generally close that part of the meeting to the public. Every endeavour will be made to do this as the last item of business of the meeting.

Public Question Time. It is a requirement of the Local Government Act 1995 to allow at least fifteen (15) minutes for public question time following the opening and announcements at the beginning of the meeting. Should there be a series of questions the period can be extended at the discretion of the Chairman.

Written notice of each question should be given to the Chief Executive Officer fifteen (15) minutes prior to the commencement of the meeting. A summary of each question and response is included in the Minutes.

When a question is not able to be answered at the Council Meeting a written answer will be provided after the necessary research has been carried out. Council staff will endeavour to provide the answers prior to the next meeting of Council.

Councillors may from time to time have a financial interest in a matter before Council. Councillors must declare an interest and the extent of the interest in the matter on the Agenda. However, the Councillor can request the meeting to declare the matter trivial, insignificant or in common with a significant number of electors or ratepayers. The Councillor must leave the meeting whilst the matter is discussed and cannot vote unless those present agree as above.

Members of staff, who have delegated authority from Council to act on certain matters, may from time to time have a financial interest in a matter on the Agenda. The member of staff must declare that interest and generally the Chairman of the meeting will advise the Officer if he/she is to leave the meeting.

Agendas, including an Information Bulletin, are delivered to Councillors within the requirements of the Local Government Act 1995, i.e. seventy-two (72) hours prior to the advertised commencement of the meeting. Whilst late items are generally not considered there is provision on the Agenda for items of an urgent nature to be considered.

Should an elector wish to have a matter placed on the Agenda the relevant information should be forwarded to the Chief Executive Officer in time to allow the matter to be fully researched by staff. An Agenda item, including a recommendation, will then be submitted to Council for consideration. The Agenda closes the Monday week prior to the Council Meeting (i.e. ten (10) days prior to the meeting).

The Information Bulletin produced as part of the Agenda includes items of interest and information, which does not require a decision of Council.

Agendas for Ordinary Meetings are available in the Shire of Pingelly Office, on the website and the Pingelly Library seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting and the public are invited to secure a copy.

Agenda items submitted to Council will include a recommendation for Council consideration. Electors should not interpret and/or act on the recommendations until after they have been considered by Council. Please note the Disclaimer in the Agenda (page 3).

Public Inspection of Unconfirmed Minutes (Reg 13)

A copy of the unconfirmed Minutes of Ordinary and Special Meetings will be available for public inspection from the Shire of Pingelly Office and the Shire of Pingelly website within ten (10) working days after the Meeting.

NOTE:

Unopposed Business

Upon a motion being moved and seconded, the person presiding may ask the meeting if any member opposes it.

If no member signifies opposition to the motion the person presiding may declare the motion in sub clause (1) carried without debate and without taking a vote on it.

A motion carried under sub clause (2) is to be recorded in the minutes as a unanimous decision of the Council or committee.

If a member signifies opposition to a motion the motion is to be dealt with according to this Part.

This clause does not apply to any motion or decision to revoke or change a decision which has been made at a Council or committee meeting.

Question Time

This Policy provides guidance to the Presiding Member (noting the provisions of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulation 7*).

Question time is for the asking of questions. General comments, issues for debate etc. are to be progressed through the normal procedure for submitting Agenda items for Council's consideration. Tabled correspondence will not be accepted.

Unless the person is known to all other persons in the Chamber, the Questioner is to state their name and address prior to asking the question.

The Questioner is to stand to address the Presiding Member, unless illness or a physical or other disability prevents him/her from doing so. All questions are to be addressed to the Presiding Member.

The question must be immediately put and may be followed by a brief statement related to the question.

The Presiding Member may respond to the question or may nominate a Councillor or an Officer to respond.

Debate between the Questioner or public and a Councillor or Officer is not permitted.

Questions may not be put by Councillors to the Questioner or other members of the public except for the purpose of clarification.

If the Presiding Member determines that a full and complete answer is unable to be given at that time, the question may be taken on notice. In that case, an answer will be given in writing to the Questioner within 7 days and the response tabled at the next Ordinary Council meeting.

A summary of the question and the response only is to be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

QUESTION TIME FOR THE PUBLIC

(Please write clearly)

DATE: _____

NAME: _____

TELEPHONE : _____

ADDRESS: _____

QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT:

GENERAL QUESTION / QUESTION RELATED TO THE AGENDA *(strike out which is not applicable)*

ITEM NO	PAGE NO	QUESTION

PLEASE PASS TO THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOR REFERRAL TO THE PRESIDENT BY 11.00 AM AT THE MEETING, OR BY 10.45AM ON THE DAY OF THE MEETING AT THE SHIRE OF PINGELLY OFFICE, 17 QUEEN STREET, PINGELLY.

Public Question Time – Statutory Provisions – Local Government Act 1995

Time is to be allocated for questions to be raised by members of the public and responded to at every ordinary meeting of a council; and

Such other meetings of councils or committees as may be prescribed.

Procedures and the minimum time to be allocated for the asking of and responding to questions raised by members of the public at council or committee meetings are to be in accordance with regulations.

9A. Question Time for the Public at Certain Meetings – s5.24 (1) (b) Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996.

Reg 5 For the purpose of section 5.24(1)(b), the meetings at which time is to be allocated for questions to be raised by members of the public and responded to are:

every special meeting of a council; and

every meeting of a committee to which the local government has delegated a power or duty.

Minimum Question Time for the Public – s5.24 (2)

Reg 6 (1) The minimum time to be allocated for the asking of and responding to questions raised by members of the public at ordinary meetings of councils and meetings referred to in regulation 5 is fifteen (15) minutes.

(2) Once all the questions raised by members of the public have been asked and responded to at a meeting referred to in sub regulation (1), nothing in these regulations prevents the unused part of the minimum question time period from being used for other matters.

Procedures for Question Time for the Public – s5.24 (2)

Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996

Reg 7 (1) Procedures for the asking of and responding to questions raised by members of the public at a meeting referred to in regulation 6 (1) are to be determined:

by the person presiding at the meeting; or

in the case where the majority of members of the council or committee present at the meeting disagree with the person presiding, by the majority of members, having regard to the requirements of sub regulations (2) and (3).

The time allocated to the asking and responding to questions raised by members of the public at a meeting referred to in regulation 6(1) is to precede the discussion of any matter that requires a decision to be made by the council or the committee, as the case may be.

Each member of the public who wishes to ask a question at a meeting referred to in regulation 6(1) is to be given an equal and fair opportunity to ask the question and receive a response.

Nothing in sub regulation (3) requires:

A council to answer a question that does not relate to a matter affecting the local government;

A council at a special meeting to answer a question that does not relate to the purpose of the meeting;

or

A committee to answer a question that does not relate to a function of the committee.

SHIRE OF PINGELLY

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

TO THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER:

Under the Provisions of Division 6 of Part 5 of the Local Government Act 1995, I hereby disclose a Financial Interest/s in the matter/s listed on this form, which is/are scheduled for consideration at the meeting of Council to be held on:

25 February 2016

(Print Name)

(Signature)

(Date)

NOTE: Members of Council are asked to deliver this completed form to the Chief Executive Officer on the day of the Council Meeting as required by the Act. Where this is not practicable the Disclosure/s may be telephoned to the Council Office on 9887 1066 and/or the form subsequently passed to the Chief Executive Officer prior to the meeting.

ITEM NO	PAGE NO	TYPE	REASON

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST, PROXIMITY INTEREST AND/OR INTEREST AFFECTING IMPARTIALITY

Chief Executive Officer, Shire of Pingelly

In accordance with Section 5.60-5.65 of the *Local Government Act* and Regulation 34(B) and 34(C) of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations* and Regulation 11 of the *Local Government (Rules of Conduct) Regulations*, I advise you that I declare a (appropriate box):

financial interest (Section 5.60A)

A person has a financial interest in a matter if it is reasonable to expect that the matter will, if dealt with by the local government, or an employee or committee of the local government or member of the council of the local government, in a particular way, result in a financial gain, loss, benefit or detriment for the person.

proximity interest (Section 5.60B)

A person has a proximity interest in a matter if the matter concerns a proposed —
(a) change to a planning scheme affecting land that adjoins the person's land;
(b) change to the zoning or use of land that adjoins the person's land; or
(c) development (as defined in section 5.63(5)) of land that adjoins the person's land.

interest affecting impartiality (Regulation 11). I disclose that I have an association with the applicant. As a consequence, there may be a perception that my impartiality on the matter may be affected. I declare that I will consider this matter on its merits and vote accordingly.

An interest that could, or could reasonably be perceived to, adversely affect the impartiality of the person having the interest and includes an interest arising from kinship, friendship or membership of an association but does not include a financial or proximity interest as referred to in section 5.60.

SHIRE OF PINGELLY

Agenda for the Special Meeting of Council to be held in the Council Chambers, 17 Queen Street, Pingelly on Monday 29 February 2016 commencing at 8.00am.

Contents

1.	DECLARATION OF OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS	10
1.1	Acknowledgement of Country	10
1.2	Reminder.....	10
2.	RECORD OF ATTENDANCE / APOLOGIES / APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE	10
3.	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....	10
4.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	10
5.	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE	10
6.	DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST	10
7.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON WITHOUT DISCUSSION	10
8.	PETITIONS / DEPUTATIONS / PRESENTATIONS / SUBMISSIONS	10
9.	REPORTS OF OFFICERS	11
9.1	OFFICE OF THE CEO.....	11
	9.1.1 Tender RFT 02 – 2015/16 Architectural Services Pingelly Recreation and Cultural Centre (PRACC) 11	
	9.1.2 Emergency Assistance – Shire of Harvey Bush Fires	21
10.	ELECTED MEMBERS MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN	22
11.	NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF MEETING..	22
12.	CLOSURE OF MEETING	22

1. DECLARATION OF OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

The Chairman to declare the meeting open.

1.1 Acknowledgement of Country

I respectfully acknowledge the past and present traditional owners of this land on which we are meeting, the Noongar people. It is a privilege to be standing on Noongar country. I also acknowledge the contributions of Aboriginal Australians and non-Aboriginal Australians to the security and wellbeing of all the people of this country where we live and that we share together - Australia

1.2 Reminder

“It takes a team to make the dream work” Dr John Maxwell.

2. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE / APOLOGIES / APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Cr Aaron Morton has been granted leave from the 27th February to the 19th March 2016.

3. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Nil

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

5. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

6. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON WITHOUT DISCUSSION

8. PETITIONS / DEPUTATIONS / PRESENTATIONS / SUBMISSIONS

Nil

9. REPORTS OF OFFICERS

9.1 OFFICE OF THE CEO

9.1.1 Tender RFT 02 – 2015/16 Architectural Services Pingelly Recreation and Cultural Centre (PRACC)

File Reference: 0661
Location: Shire of Pingelly
Applicant: Shire of Pingelly
Author: Gavin Pollock, Chief Executive Officer
Date: 25 February 2016
Disclosure of Interest: Nil
Attachments: Tender Submission from Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects (Attachment 1 behind blue sheet under separate cover)

Summary:

Council to consider the attached Officers report regarding the issue, review, and recommendation of an architectural firm to be engaged and deliver architectural services for the Pingelly Recreation and Cultural Centre (PRACC).

Background:

In May 2015 at the ordinary Meeting of Council the concept plans for the draft Sport and Recreation Plan were endorsed by Council as follows;

11781 - Moved: Cr Mulroney Seconded: Cr Jetta

Recommendation and Council Decision:

That Council Endorse;

- *the Concept Drawings for the New Recreation and Cultural Centre provided by the University of Western Australia (UWA) on behalf of the Sport and Recreation Focus Group.*
- *the Shire President and Chief Executive Officer to actively seek and enter into grant funding arrangements including the development of partnership opportunities for funding contributions for the New Recreation and Cultural Centre.*
- *All public comment received before the 26 June 2015 to be considered when developing the building concept drawing to final construction plans with costing for council's endorsement.*
- *the Chief Executive Officer to advise the Pingelly Tennis and Bowling Clubs that the existing Tennis and Bowling Club rooms will not be decommissioned before the New Recreation and Cultural Centre is constructed and commissioned for each club's use.*
- *the Chief Executive Officer is to gain Council endorsement before commencing any demolition of the existing Pavilion, Community Centre, Tennis or Bowling Club Rooms.*
- *the Chief Executive Officer is to gain Council endorsement before commencing the construction of the New Recreation and Cultural Centre.*

Carried: 7:0

Following Council's support of the PRACC Concept it was release to the community for comment via the Sport and Recreation Focus Group prior to Council's consideration endorsement of the Concept Drawings.

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 18 November 2015, the floor plan was presented to Council by the Sport and Recreation Focus Group and endorsed by Council as follows;

11902 - Moved: Cr Mulrone

Seconded: Cr Walton-Hassell

Recommendation and Council Decision:

That Council Endorse;

- *the Pingelly Recreation and Cultural Centre Building Floor Plan DWG – S03 Dated 12-11-2015 provided by the University of Western Australia (UWA) on behalf of the Sport and Recreation Focus Group.*
- *the Chief Executive Officer further develop the Pingelly Recreation and Cultural Centre Building Floor Plan DWG – S03 Dated 12-11-2015 with the required specifications and documentation ready for calling the construction tenders.*

Carried 8:0

TENDER ASSESSMENT REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Shire advertised a “Request for Tender” (RFT) number 2 -2015 / 16 for “Architectural Services. Architectural design, documentation, and project delivery services for Pingelly’s Recreation and Cultural Centre” in the West Australian newspaper and the Pingelly Times.

18 Submissions were received. One was disregarded because it was received after the specified Deadline.

The Assessment Team undertook a Compliance Check, and a Qualitative Criteria assessment which included an investigation of the tenderers capacity to undertake the Project, as well as their understanding of the project.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Council enters into a contract with Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects for the consideration of \$249,173.33 (Ex GST).

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This Report documents the procedure undertaken by the Shire officers and makes a recommendation to Council to enter into a contract with the preferred Tenderer.

ADVERTISING

The Shire advertised a “Request for Tender” (RFT) 2 -2015 / 16 for “Architectural Services. Architectural design, documentation, and project delivery services for Pingelly’s Recreation and Cultural Centre” in the West Australian newspaper on Saturday 6 and 13 February 2016. The RFT was also advertised in the local Pingelly Times on Tuesday 9 February 2016.

TENDER DOCUMENTS

In summary, the Tenderers were asked to:

- Make an offer
- Complete Compliance Criteria
- Provide insurance details
- Answer Qualitative Criteria
- Provide referees
- Complete a building costs spreadsheet

LODGEMENT AND OPENING OF TENDERS

Submissions were to be lodged by hand or by mail and were placed in the locked Shire Tender Box. Any submissions received after the Deadline of 10.30am 22 February (one off) were rejected.

17 Submissions were received prior to the Deadline.

The Opening of the Tender box was undertaken by Barry Gibbs (DTS) Shire of Pingelly, the recording of the Tenderers was undertaken by Craig McLennan (PM) Shire of Pingelly, and the procedures were also witnessed by John Bayly (ICE) Independent Civil Engineer. Also a representative from DWA architects - Herarn Perera - witnessed the procedures.

The Tender Box was unlocked and each Tender was recorded on the Tender sheet. These entries were subsequently transferred into the Tender Register.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Each Assessor signed a document declaring they had no conflict of interest that would affect their review of the Submissions or affect their decision.

REVIEW OF TENDERS

Each submission was independently assessed against the Quantative Criteria by the RFT Review Team consisting of Gavin Pollock (CEO), Barry Gibbs (DTS), Craig McLennan (PM) and John Bayly (ICE). Mr Bayly was engaged for his specialist abilities and experience in assessing Tenders within Local Government over the past 30 years.

The combined weighted scores obtained were entered into the standard Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) Tender Review Document and a ranking from one to 17 was determined:

RANKING TABLE

	Tenderer	TOTAL weighted score	TOTAL weighted score	TOTAL weighted score	TOTAL weighted score	GRAN D TOTAL	RANKING
1	DWA Architects Pty Ltd	54.5	62.0	64.0	49.0	57.4	15
2	Donovan Payne	41.0	64.0	89.0	74.5	67.1	11
3	Hodge Collard Preston	59.0	79.5	81.0	78.5	74.5	5
4	Slavin Architects	84.0	77.5	86.5	65.0	78.3	4
5	Site Architecture Studio	63.5	83.0	79.0	65.0	72.6	9
6	MCG Architects	73.5	88.5	75.0	91.5	82.1	1
7	Judith McDougall	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.1	17
8	Iredale Pedersen Hook	82.0	85.5	80.0	75.5	80.8	2
9	Vittino Ashe	62.5	67.0	75.5	88.0	73.3	7
10	Holton Connor	63.5	74.5	80.5	69.0	71.9	10
11	Paul Meschiati & Ass Pty Ltd	50.5	44.0	63.5	30.0	47.0	16
12	Lycopodium	49.0	68.5	66.5	50.0	58.5	14
13	HMA Architects	64.5	67.5	73.5	54.5	65.0	12
14	ADC Projects	63.0	80.0	67.5	81.5	73.0	8
15	H+H Architects	67.5	76.5	81.0	70.0	73.8	6
16	Cameron Chisholm Nicol	73.0	81.0	92.0	69.5	78.9	3
17	Rob Anson Architects	54.0	59.5	65.0	58.5	59.3	13

FURTHER REVIEWS

The top ten ranked submissions were revisited and scrutinised in greater depth. This review resulted in a reorganising of the Submissions based on the concept of “Best Value” for the Principal.

The top five were then reviewed again and, finally, the number one submission was critiqued in even greater depth. This included a review of the costings against the three QS assessments obtained by the Shire.

One submission withstood this critique and subsequently is the recommended Contractor.

Comment:

The Shire advertised the Request For Tender (RFT) and received 55 requests for documents. Five of these were second requests and one was from a timber engineering company. At the specified Deadline, the Shire had received 17 submissions. A later submission was eliminated as it did not satisfy the requirement of the Deadline as specified in the RFT.

The submissions were each independently assessed by the RFT Review Team consisting of Gavin Pollock (CEO), Barry Gibbs (DTS), Craig McLennan (PM) and John Bayly (ICE). Mr Bayly was engaged for his specialist abilities and experience in assessing Tenders within Local Government over the past 30 years.

NOTES OF ASSESSMENT

This section is prepared as providing feedback to the Tenderers.

Note: No other Tenderer is specifically referred to.

1. DWA Architects Pty Ltd
 - DWA highlighted two examples (and five unrelated building types) in their Submission, viz: Harvey Agricultural College and the Swan Valley Community School.
 - DWA's portfolio was eclipsed by other Tenderers. This is reflected in the Ranking.
2. Donovan Payne
 - Award winning architect for their aquatic centres. Olympic stadium, new wave pool, and Beatty Park refurbishment.
 - Very little experience demonstrated for buildings of the scope and complexity of the PRACC.
 - Not the Preferred Tenderer.
3. Hodge Collard Preston Architects (HCPA)
 - HCPA presented a good submission despite the images being small and mostly untitled.
 - The document referred to "...the City's specific requirements..." and Project timeline was cut and pasted from the "Quinns / Mindarie" project.
 - Overall, the submission, in comparison to the other Tenderers, did not fully convince the Assessors and the ranking of 5th demonstrated this consideration.
4. Slavin Architects
 - Good submission liked by Assessors.
 - Prior to preparing the submission, the two directors of the company visited the site with Pingelly's Project Manager. This effort was reflected in the quality of the submission.
 - There was some discussion by the Assessors as to whether the submission was "complete" as the costing document was submitted only on a thumb drive. It was decided to revisit this issue should it represent an unfair advantage with respect to the other Submissions and /or the weighted criteria showed a ranking of "1".
 - However, closer scrutiny revealed costings appeared incomplete and the Assessors considered that other submissions demonstrated better experience with the building type and its requirements.
5. Site Architecture Studio
 - This submission elicited the widest differential in marks by the Assessors.
 - The issues were the addition of unrequested information and the lack of timber construction.
 - The company has a good array of buildings but, ultimately, not to the extent of the preferred tenderer.

6. MCG Architects

- Good submission demonstrating built works for a variety of Shires valued between \$400,000 to \$5.5M.
- In addition, two projects were noted to be “Completed based on another design”, and three have not been undertaken due to budget issues.
- In reviewing the cost spreadsheet, it was noted that there were “Design Contingencies” of \$966,002 and allowances for Professional and Contract Management fees of \$1,110,902
- The Panel, in reviewing the cost issues above against the other Submissions, were not confident that the price submitted and the design could be achieved within the stated budget for the Works.
- Accordingly, the submission was rejected because:
 - \$1.1M of professional fees on a \$6M project
 - Did not represent the greatest advantage for the Principal

7. Judith McDougall

- McDougall is a Building Designer located in Narrogin
- The two page submission only addressed the issues of the cost for services.
- The Panel agreed that the submission could not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the requirements and the scope of the works.
- The RFT notes that the Principal is not bound to accept the lowest Quotation.

8. **Iredale Pedersen Hook (IPH)**

- **IPH are a multi award winning architecture practice. Seven of their awards relate to timber design and use.**
- **Images of their work demonstrate originality and excitement in their design.**
- **They have considerable experience and**
- **Are noted to have a very good portfolio in timber and lightweight building.**
- **Many of those buildings have been delivered in isolated and arid conditions.**
- **IPH cite, on page 27, four projects that range between 12 and 29% under budget and on time.**
- **In checking this submission as the preferred Tenderer, the costings were scrutinised against the three QS figures the Shire has obtained. In all cases the figures were sound.**
- **Also noted was IPH’s timeline and factors affecting the delivery of the Works. The latter was rarely addressed in the other submissions.**
- **It is noted that considerable negotiation is involved in their designs – particularly with indigenous groups.**

9. Vittino Ashe

- Vittino Ashe is the formal entity with whom the Principal would contract.
- A three way group made up of Patrick Beale of Advanced Timber Concepts, Marco Vitino of Vittino Ashe, and the architectural firm of Gresley Abas.
- Concerns were raised about the structure of the entity and with whom the actual control of the enterprise would rest. The question was asked if Gresley Abas had lodged a submission as they appeared to be the main contributor.
- Given ATC and Vittino Ashe have been heavily involved in the project thus far, it was disappointing that the submission did not make more of this knowledge and the potentials of the project.
- Accordingly, this was represented in the Ranking.
- (Note: While not part of the Quantative Criteria, a review of the fee submitted indicated that it would be the second most expensive.)

10. Holton Connor

- This practise has a demonstrated ability to deliver sporting and community facilities.
- Unfortunately, they did not take the opportunity to submit any projects that had significant timber components or delivered outside of major city regions.
- The Assessors considered the practise demonstrated their competence and capacity in their submission, but did not convince the Assessors of their capability to deliver the Scope required for the Project.

11. Paul Meschiati & Ass Pty Ltd

- Meschiati took a great deal of interest in the quality of the pre submission questions asked and the submission was looked forward to in anticipation.
- However, compared to the other submission, it ranked low.
- Ultimately, the combination of a low score in comparison to the other tenderers and a not having an architectural registration saw other Tenderers preferred.

12. Lycopodium

- It was noted that in the “Background” part of the submission was slightly modified text taken from the RFT.
- Under “Demonstrated Experience”, the projects were: One Life saving club, three Main Roads projects, and an Active Open Space plan. While other projects are noted, there appears to be none reflecting the complexities and uniqueness of the PRACC.
- Lycopodium were not considered the preferred Tenderer.

13. HMA Architects

- HMA is a Bunbury based Practice of four people.
- Their portfolio is of interesting and diverse projects but none that represent the complexities and uniqueness of the PRACC.
- Consequently, HMA were not considered the preferred Tenderer.

14. ADC Projects

- The highlight of this submission is the project ADC have undertaken in Beverley for the new Recreation Ground Pavilion. But apart from the Orelia Oval Pavilion, the other examples were for buildings of different uses.
- In addition, Brian Adcroft visited the site but failed to take advantage of this in his submission.
- ADC Projects offered two fee options: One for their estimate of the Construction cost and the other of the Shires estimate. This only confused the Submission.
- Overall, the Submission lacked demonstrated experience in relationship to the other Submissions.

15. H+H Architects

- H+H is an Albany based practise and, as such, delivers a variety of works across the south of WA.
- The submission was hampered by a very small text, uncited images, and a poor selection of projects without indicated prices. For example, the Gnowangerup Community Civic Centre, Morgan Richards Community and Resource Centre, and the Gnowangerup Aboriginal Heritage Centre are all refurbishments of existing building.
- Accordingly, the Assessors considered the submission did not represent the best value to the Principal.

16. Cameron Chisholm Nicol (CCN)

- CCN is a powerhouse architect firm with many years of experience and have traded for over 100 years. Their biggest project lately has been the Perth Arena in conjunction with Ashton Raggat McDougall of Melbourne.
- Given the size of their projects, it is noted that CCN presented a very good submission.

- In comparing the Organisational Capacity with the Program, it was noted that they both finished at Week 22 which is the end of the Tender negotiations and Contract award.
- Under “Relevant Experience”, four projects were cited: Perth Arena, Mundaring Indoor Sports Facility, Carine Multi Sports and Recreation Facility, and the Perth Stadium. These were considered to be a poor selection due to their scope and value.
- Accordingly, when considered against the other submissions, the Assessors felt it the submission failed to demonstrate a complete grasp of the issues relating to this specific Project.

17. Rob Anson Architects

- Under the Demonstrated Experience criteria, Anson provided details of only one like building. The other projects, while significant in their own way, did not demonstrate a capacity to deliver a building within the Scope and unique aspect of the PRACC.
- The image of their office was noted by all Assessors who agreed it should not be included in their Submission.
- The Assessors considered the Practise as competent but not the preferred Tenderer.

18. Patterson Group

- While the submission was assessed by all assessors, it was ultimately disregarded because it was not lodged before the Deadline.

PRICE AVERAGE

The average price for all submissions, is \$279,986. This includes one of \$46,496, and the late tender of \$311,424.

Excluding these two, the modified average price is \$292,614.

The Tenderer Recommended provided a price of \$249,173.33 or \$43,441 below the modified average price.

SUMMARY

The preferred Tenderer is Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects;

1. Submission was balanced and well-presented, and demonstrated a level of consideration and understanding greater than the other Tenderers.
2. Demonstrated experience in timber design. Including seven awards for use of timber.
3. Demonstrated experience in delivery of buildings in and under arid conditions.
4. Demonstrated liaison with a variety of groups – including indigenous groups on cultural issues.
5. Currently working on Yagan Square.
6. Submission demonstrates understanding of project such as:
 - a. Design issues
 - b. Funding issues
7. Their price is acceptable at \$249,173.33

PRICES SUBMITTED

	Tenderer	General Notes Provide comment when score >3<	Lump sum price
1	DWA Architects Pty Ltd		\$248,000
2	Donovan Payne		\$356,000
3	Hodge Collard Preston		\$368,750
4	Slavin Architects		\$279,480
5	Site Architecture Studio		\$212,497
6	MCG Architects		\$288,600
7	Judith McDougall	Did not supply any supporting documents.	\$46,496
8	Iredale Pedersen Hook		\$249,173
9	Vittino Ashe	Partnership Tender ATC Studio, Vittino Ashe & Gresley Abas (Included Consultancy Rates)	\$524,418
10	Holton Connor		\$299,000
11	Paul Meschiati & Ass Pty Ltd		\$236,700
12	Lycopodium		\$282,000
13	HMA Architects		\$250,000
14	ADC Projects		\$212,112
15	H+H Architects		\$316,400
16	Cameron Chisholm Nicol		\$288,705
17	Rob Anson Architects		\$270,000
18	Patterson Group	Late Tender	\$311,424

Consultation:

Specifically for the RFT assessment:

John Bayly – Independent Civil Engineer (ICE)

Gavin Pollock - Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Shire of Pingelly

Barry Gibbs - Director Technical Services (DTS) Shire of Pingelly

Craig McLennan - Project Manager (PM) Shire of Pingelly

The Tender Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects provided two Referees in the Tender document being;

Toni Tonkin – Senior Project Manager, Department of Education

Mike Hessell – Asset Manager Planning & Procurement, Department of the Attorney General

Referees were contacted and both provided strong, supportive, detailed and positive information to support the quality of work and statements made within the Tender document. Reference statements provided to Councillors under commercial confidentiality.

Statutory Environment:

Local Government Act 1995

Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Provision of goods and services Part 4. Tenders for providing goods or services (s. 3.57) Division 2

Regulation 11. When tenders have to be publicly invited

(1) Tenders are to be publicly invited according to the requirements of this Division before a local government enters into a contract for another person to supply goods or services if the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than \$150 000...

Policy Implications:

Nil as the process is conducted as per Council Policy Manual part 5.11 Purchasing Policy

Financial Implications:

As part of the 2015/16 Budget review Council endorsed that \$300,000 be transferred from the Building, Land & Recreation Reserve and allocated under GL1186, Job Number RCC02 Architectural Services for the Pingelly Recreation and Cultural Centre (PRACC). No expenditure has been allocated to this account to date.

Preferred Tenderers price: \$249,173.33 (Ex GST) and will have expenditure allocated over the 2015/16 and 2016/17 financial years.

Strategic Implications:

Compliments the Community Strategic Plan with colocation of sporting infrastructure as per the Recreation and Cultural plan for the reserve.

Voting Requirements:

Absolute Majority

Recommendation:

That Council endorse the Officers recommendation to award Tender RFT 02 – 2015/16 Architectural Services for the Pingelly Recreation and Cultural Centre (PRACC) to Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects for the consideration of \$249,173.33 (Ex GST) and authorise the Chief Executive Office to enter and sign the required contract documents for engagement.

Moved: _____ Seconded: _____

9.1.2 Emergency Assistance – Shire of Harvey Bush Fires

File Reference: 00083
Location: 16 Eliot Street Pingelly
Applicant: Gavin Pollock – Chief Executive Officer
Author: Gavin Pollock – Chief Executive Officer
Date: 24 February 2016
Disclosure of Interest: Nil
Attachments: WALGA – INFOPAGE 13 January 2016 (Attachment 2 behind yellow sheet under separate cover)
Previous Reference: Nil

Summary:

That the Shire of Pingelly Council consider taking 16 Eliot Street Pingelly off the market and via WALGA offer the property as available for a family who has had a significant loss as a result of the Shire of Harvey bush fires.

Background:

On the 13th January 2016 the Shire of Harvey via WALGA requested assistance following the devastating fires experienced being the worst experienced in the past 50 years.

Assistance was requested in the way of donations to the Lord Mayor's Disaster Relief Fund or by providing staff resources, plant and equipment.

Comment:

The property would be offered in the first instance to a family and subject to all normal rental reference checks and lease agreements being in place.

The tenants would be responsible for all utilities costs they incur plus conducting normal gardening / property maintenance. The Shire would undertake the normal property repairs and maintenance as required of the landlord.

The providing of the house at 16 Eliot Street would be offered instead of making a financial contribution to the Lord Mayor's Disaster Relief Fund.

Statutory Environment:

Tenancy Act and the Local Government Act 1995.

Policy Implications:

Nil

Financial Implications:

The 205/16 budget would be adjusted to reflect the removal of the sale income and asset disposal. As the property would be offered with 12 months free rent no income would be budgeted for in the 2016/17 financial year.

With 16 Eliot Street not being sold at this point in time would see money budgeted in 2015/16 for allocation to the Building and Infrastructure Reserve deferred until a later date.

As part of the recommendation Council will be asked to allocate \$15,000 to 16 Eliot Street to undertake some minor repairs, upgrades and landscaping to make the property more presentable.

Strategic Implications:

Will bring a new family to town that will impact on the community socially and economically.

Voting Requirements:

Absolute Majority

Recommendation:

That Council:

1. remove 16 Eliot Street Pingelly from the market for sale and via WALGA offer the property as available for a family who has experienced a significant loss as a result of the Shire of Harvey Bush Fires.
2. amend the 2015/16 financial budget to reflect the non-sale of 16 Eliot Street Pingelly and allocate \$15,000 to the building maintenance account for the property to undergo minor repairs, upgrades and landscaping works to make the property more presentable and useable. The \$15,000 to be allocated from surplus funds identified during the 2015/16 Budget Review.
3. endorse the Chief Executive Officer providing a 12 month tenancy agreement for 16 Eliot Street Pingelly at a rental value of \$0.00 and that any extensions of the tenancy agreement after the first 12 months will then be charged at a reasonable rental rate in line with the Pingelly rental market.

Moved: _____ Seconded: _____

10. ELECTED MEMBERS MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Cr Steel to move:

That Council support the Chief Executive Officer request to increase staffing resources only in the short term to deliver the large number of additional projects over and above normal business.

Moved: _____ Seconded: _____

11. NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF MEETING

New business of an urgent nature introduced by decision of the meeting. Best practice provides that Council should only consider items that have been included on the Agenda (to allow ample time for Councillors to research prior to the meeting) and which have an Officer Report (to provide the background to the issue and a recommended decision).

12. CLOSURE OF MEETING

The Chairman to declare the meeting closed