

14th October, 1959

NI (GP) (59) 37

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN NUCLEAR SCIENCE

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

CIVIL ENGINEERING AND BUILDING CONTRACT
FOR THE PHASE II BUILDINGS AT THE RUTHERFORD LABORATORY.

NOTE by the Chairman of the Rutherford
Laboratory Building Committee

1. Approval to place the above Contract as an addition to Messrs. Chivers' main contract was requested in paper NI (GP) (59) 28 and given by the Committee at the last meeting. In the above paper, it was stated, in sub-paragraph 1 (f), that Messrs. Chivers had confirmed, in writing, that they would be prepared to carry out the work on the same terms and conditions as their existing contract. It is regretted that, whilst this statement was true at the time, it no longer holds, as Messrs. Chivers have since written withdrawing their offer prior to their being officially approached by the A.E.R.E. Contracts Section. Since then, Messrs. Chivers have made a revised offer which shows an increased cost of £11,500 on their previous statement to the Chief Architect. This revised offer has been considered by the Building Committee and, despite the increase, is considered fair and reasonable. Details are given in the attached letter from the Chief Architect's Department.

2. Financial implications

In order to limit the scope of Phase II to the grant received from the General Purposes Committee, some reduction in the scope of the Phase II buildings has been necessary. This is due to the 10% cut imposed previously by the Committee and the above increases in costs. It will, however, be necessary to request some increase for Phase III buildings at a later date.

3. Financial approval requested

The Committee is asked to approve the placing of the Contract for the Phase II buildings with Messrs. Chivers, notwithstanding the amendment to their offer.

P. BOWLES

Mr. G. W. Dixon,
Chief Architect
S.W.O.

Rutherford Laboratory Contract for Phase II Buildings

1. You are aware that Messrs. Chivers withdrew their offer to execute the work on Phase II on the same terms and conditions as Phase I.
2. A fresh offer made by them in their letters dated 3.9.59 to Messrs. Faulkner and Partners, has been examined by the latter who have made a full report in their letter dated 4th September, 1959 (See E175 in contract File).
3. The Senior Quantity Surveyor comments on the report are at 60 on the contract file.
4. Summarised the position is :
 - (a) The revised offer is considered to be fair and reasonable in view of the extremely competitive terms of the first contract.
 - (b) The revised terms will add approximately £11,500 to the cost of Phase II work, i.e., approx. 3 1/3% on to the estimated cost of the civil and building work viz. £340,000 approx.
 - (c) The Senior Quantity Surveyor and the consultants are both of the opinion that better terms will not be secured by further competition and I concur.
5. Apart from this question of not gaining financial advantage from further competitive tender action other reasons for retaining Messrs. Chivers on site are :-
 - (a) The site is a very congested one and the introduction of a second civil and engineering building contractor would cause great inconvenience because of the necessity for additional plant, stores, workshops, as well as complicating site supervision. This might well cause a disruption of work which would jeopardise the existing programme.
 - (b) A second contractor would introduce an undesirable competition for local labour.
 - (c) The extension is mainly to building in course of erection or already built by Messrs. Chivers and the rates in their existing contract will cover the new works, subject to the addition of the percentage on preliminaries.
 - (d) Messrs. Chivers are familiar with the Authority's and the Institute's requirements, with the standard of finish, the positions of existing services and the local conditions concerning excavation, etc.,
6. It is recommended that Contracts' approval be sought for acceptance of Messrs. Chivers' amended offer and also the approval of the G.P.C. to this course. In the event of approval being given, it is recommended that this should form a new contract and not an extension of the existing.

P. B. DUNTHORNE
Assistant Chief Architect

Southern Works Organisation,
220

1st October, 1959

cc: Mr. Powell