

ST CUTHBERT (OUT) PARISH COUNCIL MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE ASSET MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE HELD REMOTELY ON MONDAY 1ST MARCH 2021.

PRESENT: Cllrs M Hayden, I Humphreys; M Lunnon; T Mallinson; M Mitchell.

IN ATTENDANCE: Cllr J Reeves; Mrs L Pool (Deputy Parish Clerk).

01. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TO CONSIDER THE REASONS GIVEN

No apologies were received.

02. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND DISPENSATIONS

02.01. There were no declarations of interest.

02.02. There were no requests for dispensations for disclosable pecuniary interests.

02.03. There were no requests for dispensation.

03. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Item 6 would exclude the press and public, if any attended during the meeting.

RESOLVED: To exclude members of the public from Item 6.

04. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no members of the public present.

05. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ST CUTHBERT (OUT) PARISH COUNCIL ASSET MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE HELD REMOTELY ON WEDNESDAY 10TH FEBRUARY 2021.

RESOLVED: To confirm and sign as correct record the minutes of the Asset Management Committee held remotely on Wednesday 10th February 2021.

06. REVIEW OF SUBMITTED TENDERS FOR THE WATER WORKS AT WOOKEY HOLE ALLOTMENTS, WELLS ROAD, WOOKEY HOLE BA5 1DN

The Committee reviewed the 2 presented un-named bids for the Scope of Works Items 1-4 of the Invitation To Tender document. This was offered to 8 contractors to complete the water works at the Wells Road allotments. It was noted that one contractor was VAT-registered and another was charging VAT on materials, which led to a discussion about recovering any VAT on money paid. The Committee discussed purchasing its own materials. This raised the question of storage of equipment owned by the council and could form a discussion at another meeting. The pricing was discussed and the possibility of over-charging explored, which may be due to machinery hire but more likely for labour costs. It was suggested that knowing the contractor may give a background of competence.

Both quotes were similar in price but one identified costs of equipment and material. The competence, efficiency and availability of both contractors was summarised by

the Deputy Clerk. Clarification was needed as to whether the Committee had the scope to approve contracts over £1000, which the Deputy Clerk would provide. Further discussion followed about the equipment priced on the quote and its value for money. The depth of the trench was discussed, to be sure of meeting regulations and avoiding frost damage, which was not stated in the tender. A suggestion was that the trench depth should be 750mm deep. The trough described in a bid was 72 gallons, which the Committee felt was too large and trough size should be the same as the other troughs ie. 4ft long. No cover was specified on the Tender document. Purchasing equipment independently and asking contractors just to supply labour could make the Council vulnerable to overspend, if a contractor needed more or different equipment in a timeframe and was delayed.

It was agreed that the tender document did not specify 3 key elements: trench depth, trough size and the hinged trough grill covering. There was a proposal that a choice should be made between the 2 contractors and the tender offered with conditions that include these 3 key elements. It was asked whether the contracts offered value for money; possibly not but with a limited number of bids, it was difficult to compare.

RESOLVED: To accept Contractor 1's proposal with the conditions that a) the trench depth is confirmed at 750mm; b) the trough size is the same 4ft size as the other 2 and c) the trough has a hinged cover. Contractor 1 is JeNBedd Ltd.