



Courts Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee

Date: MONDAY, 11 JUNE 2018

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOM - 2ND FLOOR WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members: Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chairman)
Alderman Sir David Wootton (Deputy Chairman)
Nicholas Bensted-Smith
Simon Duckworth
Alderman Alison Gowman
Alderman & Sheriff Timothy Hailes
Nicholas Hilliard
Michael Hudson
Deputy Edward Lord
Sheriff Neil Redcliffe
James de Sausmarez
John Scott (Chief Commoner)

Enquiries: George Fraser
tel. no.: 020 7332 1174
george.fraser@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Lunch will be served in Guildhall Club at 1PM
NB: Part of this meeting could be the subject of audio or video recording

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES**

2. **MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

3. **MINUTES**

To agree the minutes of the last meeting, held on 19 February 2018

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 4)

4. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

Report of the Town Clerk

For Information
(Pages 5 - 6)

5. **WORK PLAN**

Report of the Town Clerk

For Information
(Pages 7 - 8)

6. **MAGISTRATES COURT - EXTERNAL REPAIR WORKS**

Report of the City Surveyor

For Decision
(Pages 9 - 38)

7. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

8. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

9. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

For Decision

10. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

To agree the non-public minutes of the last meeting, held on 19 February 2018

For Decision
(Pages 39 - 46)

11. **NON-PUBLIC OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**
Report of the Town Clerk
- For Information**
(Pages 47 - 60)
12. **REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN**
Report of the Town Clerk
- For Information**
(Pages 61 - 64)
13. **MANSION HOUSE AND CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT DEPARTMENTAL BUSINESS PLAN**
Report of the Executive Director, Mansion House and Central Criminal Court
- For Decision**
(Pages 65 - 72)
14. **PROJECT PROGRAMME**
Report of the City Surveyor
- For Information**
(Pages 73 - 74)
15. **CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT - FIRE SAFETY UPDATE**
Report of the Executive Director, Mansion House & Central Criminal Court
- For Information**
(Pages 75 - 90)
16. **CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT - JURY ROOM REPAIRS**
Report of the City Surveyor
- For Decision**
(Pages 91 - 104)
17. **CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT - FIRE ALARM REPLACEMENT AND ASSOCIATED PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEM**
Report of the City Surveyor
- For Decision**
(Pages 105 - 114)
18. **CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT - PLANT REPLACEMENT: PHASE 3**
Report of the City Surveyor
- For Decision**
(Pages 115 - 144)

19. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
20. **ANY OTHER NON-PUBLIC BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

COURTS SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Monday, 19 February 2018

Minutes of the meeting of the Courts Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 10.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chairman)	Alderman & Sheriff Timothy Hailes
Alderman Sir David Wootton (Deputy Chairman)	Nicholas Hilliard
Nicholas Bensted-Smith	Michael Hudson
Alderman Alison Gowman	Deputy Edward Lord

Officers:

George Fraser	-	Town Clerk's Department
Vic Annells	-	Executive Director, Mansion House & CCC
Adam Rout	-	Head of Operations, Mansion House & CCC
Paul Friend	-	City Surveyor's Department
Jessica Lees	-	City Surveyor's Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from James de Sausmarez and John George Stewart Scott.

2. MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Edward Lord declared a non-pecuniary interest, stating that he served as a JP sitting in the City's Courts and was Deputy Chairman Elect of the Central London Bench. Alderman Sir David Wootton and Alderman Alison Gowman declared that they are JPs sitting in the City's Courts. Alderman and Sheriff Tim Hailes is also a JP but currently not sitting.

3. MINUTES

The Sub-Committee considered the minutes from the last meeting, held on 8 December 2017.

A Member noted that an item from the previous minutes under item 5 – *Magistrates Court Update* required inclusion within the Outstanding References. He explained that the poor condition of the gowns in the Magistrates Court was an issue that needed to be addressed. He explained that District Judges at City of London Courts had also been wearing their own gowns, and had now even adopted wearing them when sitting at Westminster, believing them to hold great symbolic value. It was confirmed that the City gowns were only taken to Westminster on a temporary basis as required, and

the stock was therefore maintained. The Deputy Chairman agreed that the maintenance of the gowns was an important issue. A Member noted that the Aldermen's gowns at the Central Criminal Court also required replacement. The Chairman requested that the cost of gown replacement at the Central Criminal Court be determined. (1)

RESOLVED – That the minutes be approved.

4. **OUTSTANDING REFERENCES**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Town Clerk that summarised the outstanding actions from previous meetings.

OR4 – Tour of the Old Bailey

A Member noted that the tour of the Mayor's and City of London Court still had not taken place. The Chairman noted that there had been a couple of unsuccessful attempts at organising this, though suitable dates had not yet been found. (2)

RESOLVED – That the report be received.

5. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

6. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

There was no further business.

7. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED - That under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business because they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Item Nos.	Paragraph
8-15	3

8. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The Sub-Committee considered the non-public minutes from the last meeting, held on 8 December 2017.

RESOLVED – That the minutes be approved.

9. **WORK PLAN**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Town Clerk that summarised the work plan of the Sub-Committee for 2018.

RESOLVED – That the report be received.

10. **COURTS PROJECT PROGRAMME**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the City Surveyor that detailed the timeline of all current projects relating to the City of London's Courts.

RESOLVED – That the report be received.

11. **CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT WORKS (VERBAL UPDATE)**

The Sub-Committee heard a verbal update from the Head of Operations of Mansion House & Central Criminal Court on the works ongoing in relation to the Central Criminal Court.

RESOLVED – That the oral update be noted.

12. **CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURTS - COURT REFURBISHMENT AND ASSOCIATED JURY ROOMS UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the City Surveyor that provided Members with an update on the works to refurbish the Central Criminal Court Courtrooms and associated Jury Rooms.

RESOLVED – That the report be received and recommendations be made to the Policy & Resources Committee.

13. **NEW COMBINE COURTS FACILITY FEASIBILITY STUDY (VERBAL UPDATE)**

The Sub-Committee heard a verbal update from the City Surveyor on the recent feasibility study that had taken place focusing on the new Combined Courts Facility.

RESOLVED – That the City Surveyor be heard.

14. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

There were no further questions.

15. **ANY OTHER NON-PUBLIC BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

There was no further business.

The meeting closed at 11.22 am

Chairman

Contact Officer: George Fraser
tel. no.: 020 7332 1174
george.fraser@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

COURTS SUB-COMMITTEE

11 June 2018

OUTSTANDING REFERENCES

No.	Meeting Date & Reference	Action	Owner	Status
1.	19-02-18 Item 3 – <i>Minutes</i> Gowns Replacement	The Chairman requested that the cost of gown replacement at the City of London Magistrates' Court be determined.	Mansion House	OUTSTANDING
2.	19-02-18 Item 5 – <i>Outstanding References</i> Tour of the Mayor's and City of London Court	A Member noted that the tour of the Mayor's and City of London Court still had not taken place. The Chairman noted that there had been a couple of unsuccessful attempts at organising this, though suitable dates had not yet been found. Update 31-05-18: It was proposed that the tour take place following the September/October meeting of the Sub-Committee.	Town Clerk/ City Surveyor	DUE SEPTEMBER 2018
3.	08-12-17 (3) Item 5 – <i>Magistrates Court Update</i> Lord Mayor's Plate & Chief Magistrate's Mace	The Head of Operations for Mansion House and the Central Criminal Court agreed to check who was responsible for the Lord Mayor's Plate and the Chief Magistrate's Mace in Court 1. Update 31-05-18: The Head of Operations, Mansion House and CCC confirmed that the Sword and Harp had now been returned to their position.	Mansion House	OUTSTANDING

This page is intentionally left blank

Courts Sub-Committee

Work Programme – June 2018

Category	19 February	11 June	Sep/Oct TBC	10 December	Meeting 1 2019
Central Criminal Court	- Refurbishment of Courts and associated Jury Rooms Update (Report)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fire Safety Update (Report) - Business Plan (Report) - Fire Alarm Replacement (Report) - Jury Rooms and Judges Benches (Report) - External Façade Repairs (Report) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fire Safety Update (Report) - External & Internal Decorations (Report) - Jury Rooms and Judges Benches (Report) - Roof Works (Report) - External Façade Repairs (Report) - External Lighting (Report) 	- Fire Safety Update (Report)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fire Safety Update (Report) - Fire Alarm Replacement (Report)
Magistrates Court	-	- External Capital Works Programme (Report)	-	- External Capital Works Programme	
Mayor's & City of London Court			- Tour of Mayor's and City of London Court		

This page is intentionally left blank

Committees:	Dates:	
Court Sub	11 June 2018	
Projects Sub	13 June 2018	
Subject: External Repair works at the City of London Magistrates Court Gateway 3 Report reference: CS/225/18	Gateway 3 Options Appraisal(Regular)	Public
Report of: City Surveyor Report Author: Jessica Lees & Samantha Williams – City Surveyors Department		For Decision

Summary

Dashboard

- Project Status – Green
- Timeline: The project was approved at gateway 1/ 2 for an option appraisal to be submitted under gateway 3/ 4
- Approved expenditure at gateway 1/ 2 - £15,000
- Spend to date:£5,184 (£9,816 remaining)
- Requested expenditure for this gateway - £20,000 (£9,816 from original £15,000 and £10,184 uplift)
- Total estimated project cost (option 2) - £635,000 (to be confirmed at gateway 4/ 5)

Progress to date

The forward maintenance plan for the Magistrates Court has identified a significant amount of external works required over the next few years.

Members approved a gateway 1/ 2 report in January/February 2017 to instruct a consultant to carry out a survey on options to be presented at gateway 3/ 4.

The building itself is in a poor state and hasn't had any work carried out on the external façade for at least 30 years, and work is now urgently required. To support this point, in June 2017 there was a discovery of unsafe stonework, which meant as a matter of urgency a "tap/hammer test" took place and any stonework deemed unsafe was removed. The options presented in this report continue on from this work.

Carden & Godfrey Architects were appointed to carry out the options appraisal. Their report highlighted that essential works are required and presented three options following a short, medium and longer term strategy.

This gateway report has changed from the proposed 3/ 4 to a gateway 3 to allow the team to agree the funding strategy with HMCTS and develop the specification, with an appropriate procurement strategy to be proposed at gateway 4/5.

Overview of options

Option 1 - short term/immediate

To continue maintaining the building to its current condition and only carry out immediate works to areas that pose a health and safety risk. This option also includes short term cyclical maintenance i.e. repairs and decoration but not renewal. The total estimated cost for this option would be £363,000 including consultant's fees for the design stage of £15,000 to progress this project to gateway 4/ 5. This option ensures that the general condition of the building will not immediately deteriorate, however in time the cost of repairing what is broken and leaking will steadily increase and may get to a stage where the building may become uninhabitable.

Option 2 – medium term (Recommended Option)

To carry out cyclical maintenance at an estimated total project cost of £635,000, including consultant's fees of £20,000 for the design stage. This option would address immediate requirements and ensure the building is maintained to a good condition for the next 5 years which is in line with the City Surveyor's Asset Management Strategy for the Operational property Portfolio. This option will not reduce the future maintenance costs but would keep the costs manageable and predictable for the next 5 to 10 years.

Option 3 – long term

To carry out a full overhaul, replacing all elements that require replacement and repair those deemed necessary. The total estimated cost would be £1,242,000, including consultant's fees of £25,000 for the design stage. Although this option would provide a greater confidence for the future condition of the building and reduce cyclical maintenance costs, it is deemed not feasible for a building where occupiers are due to vacate in 5 – 10 years. This option would also have the greatest upfront expenditure and would cause the greatest disruption to the operation of the Courts.

The requirement to carry out significant external work to the Magistrates Court over the next few years was identified by the forward maintenance plan. The option appraisal presents the opportunity to deliver this work under one project, which will be more cost effective, less disruptive to HMCTS and demonstrates to HMCTS the City's commitment to the property.

Proposed way forward

The proposed way forward is for Members to approve the recommended option 2 so that consultants can be appointed to prepare a specification enabling the City to tender the works and proceed to a gateway 4/ 5, authority to start work.

By agreeing to option 2 the City would be ensuring that the building is maintained in a good condition and with more manageable and predictable maintenance costs over the next 5 years or until the final decision is made regarding the future of this asset.

Whilst the design stage is underway, the City will agree a funding strategy with Her Majesty's Court and Tribunal Service (HMCTS). A Memorandum of Understanding with the Lord Chancellor sets out the mechanism to recover costs that exceed a set threshold. Initial discussions are already underway with HMCTS and we will report back at gateway 4/ 5 on agreement to the funding of this project.

As this work is essential to ensuring that the external fabric of the building is brought up to a safe standard and ensuring that the building is fit for purpose, we recommend that option 2 is approved so that the design process can start and ensure no further delays are incurred whilst an agreement is made with HMCTS.

Procurement approach

Consultants, further surveys and works will be procured in accordance with the purchasing arrangements details in the City of London Procurement Code.

Design stage

We will work with City Procurement to appoint consultant(s) to carry out indepth surveys and draw up the necessary specification against the recommended option.

Construction stage

As the project is estimated over £400,000 but less than the EU threshold, we will be approaching City Procurement to undertake a competitive tender via the Capital e-Sourcing portal. A PT4 form will be submitted at gateway 4/ 5.

Option 2 – breakdown of costs

Option Appraisal	Rounded up to £,000
Feasibility survey and report	£5,000
Option appraisal sub total	£5,000
Design Stage – Specification to tender	
Consultants Fees	£10,000
Surveys	£10,000
Design stage sub total	£20,000
Construction Stage	
Asphalt Roof Repairs – Patch repairs, application of solar reflective paint and re-slate mansard slopes	£125,000
Cladding and Rainwater Pipe Works – Patch repairs to copper cladding, replacement of lead weathering, replacement of asphalt gutter, CCTV survey of internal rainwater pipes	£25,000
Stonework Repairs – Parapet wall repairs, repointing of open mortar joints	£75,000
External Redecoration Works – Repairs to metal windows, grilles and joinery, redecoration roof top joinery and doors	£55,000
Prelims and Scaffolding	£250,000
Consultants Fees (Inc. Project Manager, Lead Designer, H&S, Listed Building)	£75,000
Construction stage sub total	£630,000
Staff project costs	£5,000
Total estimated project total (all stages, incl staff costs)	£635,000

Costs presented within the table above are based upon estimated outturn prices.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Approve option 2, to carry out essential works which will ensure the building is maintained to a good condition for the next 5 years, whilst substantial progress is made on the new judicial centre.
- Approve the recommendation to consolidate the work and deliver under one project.
- Approve a gateway 3 cost of £20,000, made up of the remaining £9,816 from the original £15,000 budget approved at gateway 1/ 2 and uplift of £10,184 from the the City's Cash Annual Provision for New Schemes. This will be to develop a specific design and specification ready to tender the works.
- Note that the current total project estimated cost is £635,000. A funding strategy is to be agreed with HMCTS and submitted to Members within a gateway 4/ 5 report.
- Note that we will engage with City Procurement and present preferred procurement route also to be presented within the gateway 4/ 5 which will be submitted for Committee approval.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Options Appraisal Matrix
Appendix 2	Risk register

Contact

Report Author	Jessica Lees
Email Address	Jessica.lees@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	0207 332 1941

Report Author	Samantha Williams
Email Address	Samantha.williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	0207 332 1759

Appendix 1 - Options Appraisal Matrix

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>	<i>Option 3</i>
1. Brief description	Short term/ immediate health and safety work to externals	Medium term, including immediate work (recommended option)	Long term, including immediate health and safety items
2. Scope and exclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To carry out patch repairs to roof, copper cladding, mansard roof slopes and asphalt guttering; • Apply application of solar reflective paint to asphalt; • CCTV survey of rainwater pipes; • Repairs to parapet wall stonework and repointing of open mortar joints; • Repairs and redecoration to railings and window joinery; • Redecoration of joinery/doors and metal windows; • All scaffolding for the duration of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To carry out all works as per option 1 and the following; • Remove cables and other fixings from copper cladding and patch repair; • Replacement lead weathering to cable entry; • Re-slate rather than patch repair mansard roof slopes; • Replace rather patch replace asphalt gutter. • All scaffolding for the duration of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To carry out all works as per option 1 and 2 and the following; • Replacement of asphalt to main roof; • Insulation to roof areas; • Stonework repairs to elevations and stone cleaning; • Replacement of lead protection to string courses and pediments; • Replacement of windows were required; • Repairs/replacement of broken or missing ironmongery to windows; • Replacement of steps and repair of door; • All scaffolding for the duration of the project.

Project Planning			
3. Programme and key dates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gateway 3 Approval: June 2018. • Appointment of Consultants: July 2018. • Surveys undertaken: August 2018 • Review of information with Consultants: September 2018. • Contract Documents Drafted: September 2018. • Procurement of Works: November, December 2018. • Tender Review: January 2019. • Works Start on Site: March 2019 (Subject to Surveys, Scope of works affected by weather, Highways Licences/Closures). • Completion date: September 2019 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gateway 3 Approval: June 2018. • Appointment of Consultants: July 2018. • Surveys undertaken: August, September 2018. • Review of information with Consultants: October 2018. • Contract Documents Drafted: October, November 2018. • Procurement of Works: December, January 2019. • Tender Review: February 2019. • Works to Start on Site: April 2019 (Subject to Surveys, Scope of Works affected by weather, Highways Licences/Closures). • Completion date: December 2019 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gateway 3 Approval: June 2018. • Appointment of Consultants: July 2018. • Surveys undertaken: August, September, October 2018. • Review of information with Consultants: October 2018. • Contract Documents Drafted: October, November 2018. • Procurement of Works: December 2018, January 2019. • Tender Review: February 2019. • Works Start on Site: April 2019 (Subject to Surveys, Scope of Works affected by weather, Highways Licences/Closures). • Completion date: March/ April 2020

4. Risk implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part or full closure of building if deemed unsafe. • This in turn will increase costs to address major repairs and leaks under urgent conditions. • The City does not fulfil its statutory obligations under the Courts Act and MoU. • A building failure could compromise the City's property insurance cover. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part or full closure of building if deemed unsafe. • The City does not fulfil its statutory obligations under the Courts Act and MoU. • A building failure could compromise the City's property insurance cover. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part or full closure of building if deemed unsafe. • The City does not fulfil its statutory obligations under the Courts Act and MoU. • A building failure could compromise the City's property insurance cover. •
5. Benefits and disbenefits	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current condition is maintained. • Least disruption to Court service whilst carrying out work. <p>Disbenefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reactive costs will increase over time. 	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building is maintained to a good condition. • Maintenance costs will be manageable and predictable. • Minimal disruption to the Court Service Operations. 	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater confidence in condition of building. • Future cyclical maintenance costs are reduced. <p>Disbenefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greatest disruption to Court service.
6. Stakeholders and consultees	Her Majesty's Court Service Town Clerks Planning/ Heritage	Her Majesty's Court Service Town Clerks Planning/ Heritage	Her Majesty's Court Service Town Clerks Planning/ Heritage

Resource Implications			
7. Total Estimated cost	£363,000	£635,000	£1,242,000
8. Funding strategy	Request for a contribution from the City's Cash Annual Provision for New Schemes to proceed to gateway 4/5. Funding strategy will be agreed with HMCTS for total project costs.	Request for a contribution from the City's Cash Annual Provision for New Schemes to proceed to gateway 4/5. Funding strategy will be agreed with HMCTS for total project costs.	Request for a contribution from the City's Cash Annual Provision for New Schemes to proceed to gateway 4/5. Funding strategy will be agreed with HMCTS for total project costs.
9. Estimated capital value/return	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
10. Ongoing revenue implications	This option would address immediate health and safety issues, however does not cease from the future requirement of reactive repairs which would be costly to the budget held by the City Surveyors Department.	This option will have a positive effect, rationalising on-going revenue costs, ensuring these are predictable and easily managed within the Building, Repairs and Maintenance budget held by the City Surveyors Department.	This option has the largest upfront cost, however would mean that revenue costs would be reduced to cover routine maintenance from the local risk budget held by the City Surveyors Department.
11. Investment appraisal	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

12. Affordability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not reduce reactive works in future • Is not cost effective as likelihood of further project required in next 5 years is high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces reactive costs • Predictable budget for medium term 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces reactive costs • Possible refusal from HMCTS on certain items deemed as improvements • Non recoverable costs beyond vacant possession
13. Legal implications	Under the Courts Act 2003 the City has a statutory obligation to make the building available for Court use.	Under the Courts Act 2003 the City has a statutory obligation to make the building available for Court use.	Under the Courts Act 2003 the City has a statutory obligation to make the building available for Court use.
14. Corporate property implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational assets remain in a good, safe and statutory compliant condition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational assets remain in a good, safe and statutory compliant condition. • Operational assets are fit for purpose and meet service delivery needs. • Property is managed in line with Corporate Property Asset Management Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational assets remain in a good, safe and statutory compliant condition. • Operational assets are fit for purpose and meet service delivery needs. • Property is managed in line with Corporate Property Asset Management Strategy
15. Traffic implications	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

16. Sustainability and energy implications	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work to the windows will ensure that building will be more insulated and as a consequence its energy performance will be increased 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work to the windows will ensure that building will be more insulated and as a consequence its energy performance will be increased
17. IS implications	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
18. Equality Impact Assessment	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
19. Recommendation	Not recommended	Recommended	Not recommended
20. Next Gateway	Gateway 4/ 5 - Authority to Start Work	Gateway 4/ 5 - Authority to Start Work	Gateway 4/ 5 - Authority to Start Work

21. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway				
	Item	Reason	Cost (£)	Funding Source
	Instruct consultant to carry out indepth survey	Carry out a further survey to create an accurate specification	£10,000	£9,816 remaining from gateway 1/ 2 budget and £184 from City's Cash Annual Provision for New Schemes
	Instruct consultants to draw up specification based upon surveydocument for tender against agreed option	Carry out a further survey to create an accurate specification	£10,000	City's Cash Annual Provision for New Schemes
	Total costs		£20,000	

Appendix 2 – Risk Register

City of London Gateway – Project Risk Register

Project Name External Repair Works at the City of London Magistrates Court

Gateway Stage Gateway 3 -4 Appendix 2

Estimated Capital Cost £539,087 (excluding risk)

Risk Rating

Low
Mediu
m
High

Key Risks	Description / Impact	£ Loss Before Mitigation	Mitigation	£ Loss After Mitigation	Risk Rating	Risk Owner
Works Cost						
1.1 Design Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design Development: Design developed will be based on non-intrusive investigations so risk of cost increase as a result of design development. Risk cost estimate taken as 10% of construction cost 	£54,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design rigorously reviewed & managed post options stage 	£27,000	Mediu m	Project Manager
1.2 Resource / Consultant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in Consultancy fees 	£10,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultants tenders invited 	£2,500	Low	Project Manager
1.3 Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme slippage could result in works being delayed until the following year due to available access slots Programme slippage could result in emergency works/ repairs being carried out 	£25,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early approval issued by highways Monitor programme 	£nil	n/a	Project Manager
1.4 Construction Cost Inflation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction begins later than expected: This is currently running at an average of 5% p.a. Risk cost is based on a 12 month delay to commencing construction (not included in Item 1.3 above) 	£27,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early approval issued by highways Procurement programme monitored 	£nil	Low	Project Manager

1.5	Survey Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues identified – nil risk. 	£nil		£nil	n/a	
1.6	Existing Building Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening-up works are likely to reveal issues with existing state of seating not envisaged which will have to be addressed. Cost risk is compounded by it being a listed building. Cost of risk is estimated at 10% of the construction cost. 	£54,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full surveys prior to starting Tailor programme to minimise 	£27,000	Medium	Project Manager
1.7	Court closure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Works effect HMCTS business as usual 	£6-7,000 per hour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction programme tailored to minimise impact. Noise mitigation measures within courts. Consultation with HMCTS 	£2,000	Low	Client Dept
Design Fees / QS							
2.1	Final fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final fees in excess of budget 	£10,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fee quotation will be tendered 	£5,000	Low	Project Manager
Other Costs							
3.1	Tender Exceeds Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	£	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 		n/a	
3.2	Materials delayed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Materials not being available to meet programme 	£30,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sufficient lead in time allowed in programme 	£15,000	Low	Project Manager
Staff Costs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not at risk provided project is not extended beyond City's control. 	£nil		£nil	n/a	
Total estimated risk against estimated Capital spend			£		£		

This page is intentionally left blank

CITY SURVEYOR GOLD SHEET
COMMITTEE REPORT / REPORT CONSULTATION* (*delete as necessary)
PROGRESS & APPROVAL FORM

REPORT TITLE	External Repair Works at the City of London Magistrates Ct Gateway 3/4	
COMMITTEE(S)	Court Sub Projects Sub	
COMMITTEE DATE(S):	11 June 2018 13 June 2018	
prepared by :	S. WILLIAMS / J. LEES	date : 01/06/18

CS Report Number	CS: 225/18	dates
AGENDA PLANNING ADVISED - Public / Non-public (delete as necessary)		23/05/18
GATEWAY 3		
VALUATION PANEL APPROVAL/ VCF		N/A

DRAFT REPORT APPROVAL;	
Assistant Director : ATKINLEY	Director : ATKINLEY - For Peter COLLINSON

TIMETABLE			
FINAL REPORT Sign-off date :		Town Clerk Circulation date : 23/05/18	
CONSULTATION (see notes)	Who (sent to)	date sent	Returned
Corporate Property Group (CPG)	P.F	23/05 (email)	31/05
Property Project Group (PPG)	—	—	—
Investment Property Group (IPG)	—	—	—
Operations Group (OG)	P. C/A.H	23/05 (email)	01/06
C&CS	P.M	"	—
Chamberlain	A.M	"	28/05
Property Policy Officer / Project Policy Officer	S.B	"	01/06
HR	—	—	—
Others – Eg Capital Team In Chamberlains for disposals	J.J	23/05 (email)	01/06

FINAL REPORT APPROVAL;	
Assistant Director: ATKINLEY	Director: ATKINLEY - For Peter COLLINSON.
City Surveyor...	

PDF electronic copy to TC (incl. appendices):

Please see notes on the reverse

NOTES:

All reports must

- (a) comply with corporate Guidance on Committee Report Writing and Attending Meetings and the departmental QMS procedure
- (b) be no more than 4 pages.
- (c) Observe the department timetables for Committee reports.

It is the responsibility of the officer initiating the report to consult and seek comments and input from the following parties

1 INVESTMENT PROPERTY GROUP / CORPORATE PROPERTY GROUP GATEWAY PAPER

- (a) Notify the Relevant Finance Section/Unit and Administration Officer for the relevant committee
- (b) To consult and obtain agreement from PPG on costs, procurement and programme related issues
- (c) Where appropriate seek OG comments on life cycle on FM related costs
- (d) Seek the views of other departments, although reports must not be circulated for comment until they have been approved by a Director.
- (e) Update draft attachments during progress to final version.
- (f) Where necessary supply briefing papers to the Administration Officer and representative at Committee.

2 GENERAL

- (a) The final hard copy plus this approval cover sheet should be given to the City Surveyor for sign off.
- (b) Once signed the final PDF version together with all appendices should be emailed to the Responsible Directors PA for onward transmission to the Town Clerk and for storage on the City surveyor's electronic filing system.
- (c) All necessary timetables for consultation, forwarding to Town Clerk and liaison with key chairman should be observed.
- (d) **Sustainability Impact:** Signing off this form is confirming that the report has been developed in accordance with the City of London Corporation Sustainability Framework or that the report contains a comment on the sustainability.
- (e) **Equalities and Inclusion:** Signing off this report is confirming that impacts of the reports proposal on protected equality groups has been considered and corporate guidance complied with.
- (f) Electronic copies -- PDF with Appendices.- Word versions to be issued to Town Clerks.

COMMENTS

Committees:	Dates:	
Court Sub	11 June 2018	
Projects Sub	13 June 2018	
Subject: External Repair works at the City of London Magistrates Court Gateway 3 Report reference: CS/225/18	Gateway 3 Options Appraisal(Regular)	Public
Report of: City Surveyor Report Author: Jessica Lees & Samantha Williams – City Surveyors Department		For Decision

Summary

Dashboard

- Project Status – Green
- Timeline: The project was approved at gateway 1/ 2 for an option appraisal to be submitted under gateway 3/ 4
- Approved expenditure at gateway 1/ 2 - £15,000
- Spend to date:£5,184 (£9,816 remaining)
- Requested expenditure for this gateway - £20,000 (£9,816 from original £15,000 and £10,184 uplift)
- Total estimated project cost (option 2) - £541,000 (to be confirmed at gateway 4/ 5)

Progress to date

The forward maintenance plan for the Magistrates Court has identified a significant amount of external works required over the next few years.

Members approved a gateway 1/ 2 report in January/February 2017 to instruct a consultant to carry out a survey on options to be presented at gateway 3/ 4.

The building itself is in a poor state and hasn't had any work carried out on the external façade for at least 30 years, and work is now urgently required. To support this point, in June 2017 there was a discovery of unsafe stonework, which meant as a matter of urgency a "tap/hammer test" took place and any stonework deemed unsafe was removed. The options presented in this report continue on from this work.

Carden & Godfrey Architects were appointed to carry out the options appraisal. Their report highlighted that essential works are required and presented three options following a short, medium and longer term strategy.

This gateway report has changed from the proposed 3/ 4 to a gateway 3 to allow the team to agree the funding strategy with HMCTS and develop the specification, with an appropriate procurement strategy to be proposed at gateway 4/5.

Overview of options

Option 1 - short term/immediate

To continue maintaining the building to its current condition and only carry out immediate works to areas that pose a health and safety risk. This option also includes short term cyclical maintenance i.e. repairs and decoration but not renewal. The total estimated cost for this option would be £363,000 including consultant's fees for the design stage of £15,000 to progress this project to gateway 4/ 5. This option ensures that the general condition of the building will not immediately deteriorate, however in time the cost of repairing what is broken and leaking will steadily increase and may get to a stage where the building may become uninhabitable.

Option 2 – medium term (Recommended Option)

To carry out cyclical maintenance at an estimated total project cost of £541,000, including consultant's fees of £20,000 for the design stage. This option would address immediate requirements and ensure the building is maintained to a good condition for the next 5 years which is in line with the City Surveyor's Asset Management Strategy for the Operational property Portfolio. This option will not reduce the future maintenance costs but would keep the costs manageable and predictable for the next 5 to 10 years.

Option 3 – long term

To carry out a full overhaul, replacing all elements that require replacement and repair those deemed necessary. The total estimated cost would be £1,242,000, including consultant's fees of £25,000 for the design stage. Although this option would provide a greater confidence for the future condition of the building and reduce cyclical maintenance costs, it is deemed not feasible for a building where occupiers are due to vacate in 5 – 10 years. This option would also have the greatest upfront expenditure and would cause the greatest disruption to the operation of the Courts.

The requirement to carry out significant external work to the Magistrates Court over the next few years was identified by the forward maintenance plan. The option appraisal presents the opportunity to deliver this work under one project, which will be more cost effective, less disruptive to HMCTS and demonstrates to HMCTS the City's commitment to the property.

Proposed way forward

The proposed way forward is for Members to approve the recommended option 2 so that consultants can be appointed to prepare a specification enabling the City to tender the works and proceed to a gateway 4/ 5, authority to start work.

By agreeing to option 2 the City would be ensuring that the building is maintained in a good condition and with more manageable and predictable maintenance costs over the next 5 years or until the final decision is made regarding the future of this asset.

Whilst the design stage is underway, the City will agree a funding strategy with Her Majesty's Court and Tribunal Service (HMCTS). A Memorandum of Understanding with the Lord Chancellor sets out the mechanism to recover costs that exceed a set threshold. Initial discussions are already underway with HMCTS and we will report back at gateway 4/ 5 on agreement to the funding of this project.

As this work is essential to ensuring that the external fabric of the building is brought up to a safe standard and ensuring that the building is fit for purpose, we recommend that option 2 is approved so that the design process can start and ensure no further delays are incurred whilst an agreement is made with HMCTS.

Procurement approach

Consultants, further surveys and works will be procured in accordance with the purchasing arrangements details in the City of London Procurement Code.

Design stage

We will work with City Procurement to appoint consultant(s) to carry out indepth surveys and draw up the necessary specification against the recommended option.

Construction stage

As the project is estimated over £400,000 but less than the EU threshold, we will be approaching City Procurement to undertake a competitive tender via the Capital e-Sourcing portal. A PT4 form will be submitted at gateway 4/ 5.

Option 2 – breakdown of costs

Option Appraisal	Rounded up to £,000
Feasibility survey and report	£5,000
Option appraisal sub total	£5,000
Design Stage – Specification to tender	
Consultants Fees	£10,000
Surveys	£10,000
Design stage sub total	£20,000
Construction Stage	
Asphalt Roof Repairs – Patch repairs, application of solar reflective paint and re-slate mansard slopes	£112,000
Cladding and Rainwater Pipe Works – Patch repairs to copper cladding, replacement of lead weathering, replacement of asphalt gutter, CCTV survey of internal rainwater pipes	£13,000
Stonework Repairs – Parapet wall repairs, repointing of open mortar joints	£51,000
External Redecoration Works – Repairs to metal windows, grilles and joinery, redecoration roof top joinery and doors	£42,000
Prelims and Scaffolding	£218,000
Consultants Fees (Inc. Project Manager, Lead Designer, H&S, Listed Building)	£75,000
Construction stage sub total	£511,000
Staff project costs	£5,000
Total estimated project total (all stages, Incl staff costs)	£541,000

Costs presented within the table above are based upon estimated outturn prices.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Approve option 2, to carry out essential works which will ensure the building is maintained to a good condition for the next 5 years, whilst substantial progress is made on the new judicial centre.
- Approve the recommendation to consolidate the work and deliver under one project.
- Approve a gateway 3 cost of £20,000, made up of the remaining £9,816 from the original £15,000 budget approved at gateway 1/ 2 and uplift of £10,184 from the the City's Cash Annual Provision for New Schemes. This will be to develop a specific design and specification ready to tender the works.
- Note that the current total project estimated cost is £541,000. A funding strategy is to be agreed with HMCTS and submitted to Members within a gateway 4/ 5 report.
- Note that we will engage with City Procurement and present preferred procurement route also to be presented within the gateway 4/ 5 which will be submitted for Committee approval.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Options Appraisal Matrix
Appendix 2	Risk register

Contact

Report Author	Jessica Lees
Email Address	Jessica.lees@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	0207 332 1941

Report Author	Samantha Williams
Email Address	Samantha.williams@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	0207 332 1759

Appendix 1 - Options Appraisal Matrix

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
1. Brief description	Short term/ immediate health and safety work to externals	Medium term, including immediate work (recommended option)	Long term, including immediate health and safety items
2. Scope and exclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To carry out patch repairs to roof, copper cladding, mansard roof slopes and asphalt guttering; Apply application of solar reflective paint to asphalt; CCTV survey of rainwater pipes; Repairs to parapet wall stonework and repointing of open mortar joints; Repairs and redecoration to railings and window joinery; Redecoration of joinery/doors and metal windows; All scaffolding for the duration of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To carry out all works as per option 1 and the following; Remove cables and other fixings from copper cladding and patch repair; Replacement lead weathering to cable entry; Re-slate rather than patch repair mansard roof slopes; Replace rather patch replace asphalt gutter. All scaffolding for the duration of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To carry out all works as per option 1 and 2 and the following; Replacement of asphalt to main roof; Insulation to roof areas; Stonework repairs to elevations and stone cleaning; Replacement of lead protection to string courses and pediments; Replacement of windows were required; Repairs/replacement of broken or missing ironmongery to windows; Replacement of steps and repair of door; All scaffolding for the duration of the project.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Project Planning 3. Programme and key dates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gateway 3 Approval: June 2018. • Appointment of Consultants: July 2018. • Surveys undertaken: August 2018 • Review of information with Consultants: September 2018. • Contract Documents Drafted: September 2018. • Procurement of Works: November, December 2018. • Tender Review: January 2019. • Works Start on Site: March 2019 (Subject to Surveys, Scope of works affected by weather, Highways Licences/Closures). • Completion date: September 2019 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gateway 3 Approval: June 2018. • Appointment of Consultants: July 2018. • Surveys undertaken: August, September 2018. • Review of information with Consultants: October 2018. • Contract Documents Drafted: October, November 2018. • Procurement of Works: December, January 2019. • Tender Review: February 2019. • Works to Start on Site: April 2019 (Subject to Surveys, Scope of Works affected by weather, Highways Licences/Closures). • Completion date: December 2019 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gateway 3 Approval: June 2018. • Appointment of Consultants: July 2018. • Surveys undertaken: August, September, October 2018. • Review of information with Consultants: October 2018. • Contract Documents Drafted: October, November 2018. • Procurement of Works: December 2018, January 2019. • Tender Review: February 2019. • Works Start on Site: April 2019 (Subject to Surveys, Scope of Works affected by weather, Highways Licences/Closures). • Completion date: March/ April 2020

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
4. Risk implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part or full closure of building if deemed unsafe. This in turn will increase costs to address major repairs and leaks under urgent conditions. The City does not fulfil its statutory obligations under the Courts Act and MoU. A building failure could compromise the City's property insurance cover. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part or full closure of building if deemed unsafe. The City does not fulfil its statutory obligations under the Courts Act and MoU. A building failure could compromise the City's property insurance cover. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part or full closure of building if deemed unsafe. The City does not fulfil its statutory obligations under the Courts Act and MoU. A building failure could compromise the City's property insurance cover.
5. Benefits and disbenefits	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current condition is maintained. Least disruption to Court service whilst carrying out work. <p>Disbenefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reactive costs will increase over time. 	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building is maintained to a good condition. Maintenance costs will be manageable and predictable. Minimal disruption to the Court Service Operations. 	<p>Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater confidence in condition of building. Future cyclical maintenance costs are reduced. <p>Disbenefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greatest disruption to Court service.
6. Stakeholders and consultees	Her Majesty's Court Service Town Clerks	Her Majesty's Court Service Town Clerks	Her Majesty's Court Service Town Clerks

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
	Planning/ Heritage	Planning/ Heritage	Planning/ Heritage
Resource Implications			
7. Total Estimated cost	£363,000	£541,000	£1,242,000
8. Funding strategy	Request for a contribution from the City's Cash Annual Provision for New Schemes to proceed to gateway 4/5. Funding strategy will be agreed with HMCTS for total project costs.	Request for a contribution from the City's Cash Annual Provision for New Schemes to proceed to gateway 4/5. Funding strategy will be agreed with HMCTS for total project costs.	Request for a contribution from the City's Cash Annual Provision for New Schemes to proceed to gateway 4/5. Funding strategy will be agreed with HMCTS for total project costs.
9. Estimated capital value/return	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
10. Ongoing revenue implications	This option would address immediate health and safety issues, however does not cease from the future requirement of reactive repairs which would be costly to the budget held by the City Surveyors Department.	This option will have a positive effect, rationalising on-going revenue costs, ensuring these are predictable and easily managed within the Building, Repairs and Maintenance budget held by the City Surveyors Department.	This option has the largest upfront cost, however would mean that revenue costs would be reduced to cover routine maintenance from the local risk budget held by the City Surveyors Department.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
11. Investment appraisal	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
12. Affordability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not reduce reactive works in future Is not cost effective as likelihood of further project required in next 5 years is high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces reactive costs Predictable budget for medium term 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces reactive costs Possible refusal from HMCTS on certain items deemed as improvements Non recoverable costs beyond vacant possession
13. Legal implications	Under the Courts Act 2003 the City has a statutory obligation to make the building available for Court use.	Under the Courts Act 2003 the City has a statutory obligation to make the building available for Court use.	Under the Courts Act 2003 the City has a statutory obligation to make the building available for Court use.
14. Corporate property implications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational assets remain in a good, safe and statutory compliant condition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational assets remain in a good, safe and statutory compliant condition. Operational assets are fit for purpose and meet service delivery needs. Property is managed in line with Corporate Asset Management Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational assets remain in a good, safe and statutory compliant condition. Operational assets are fit for purpose and meet service delivery needs. Property is managed in line with Corporate Asset Management Strategy

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
15. Traffic implications	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
16. Sustainability and energy implications	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work to the windows will ensure that building will be more insulated and as a consequence its energy performance will be increased 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work to the windows will ensure that building will be more insulated and as a consequence its energy performance will be increased
17. IS implications	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
18. Equality Impact Assessment	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
19. Recommendation	Not recommended	Recommended	Not recommended
20. Next Gateway	Gateway 4/ 5 - Authority to Start Work	Gateway 4/ 5 - Authority to Start Work	Gateway 4/ 5 - Authority to Start Work

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
21. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway			
</			

Appendix 2 – Risk Register

City of London Gateway – Project Risk Register						
Project Name		External Repair Works at the City of London Magistrates Court				
Gateway Stage		Gateway 3 – 4 Appendix 2				
Estimated Capital Cost		£539,087 (excluding risk)				
Risk Rating		<div>Low</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>High</div>				
Key Risks	Description / Impact	£ Loss Before Mitigation	Mitigation	£ Loss After Mitigation	Risk Rating	Risk Owner
Works Cost						
1.1 Design Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design Development: Design developed will be based on non-intrusive investigations so risk of cost increase as a result of design development. Risk cost estimate taken as 10% of construction cost 	£54,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design rigorously reviewed & managed post options stage 	£27,000	Medium	Project Manager
1.2 Resource / Consultant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in Consultancy fees 	£10,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultants tenders invited 	£2,500	Low	Project Manager
1.3 Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programme slippage could result in works being delayed until the following year due to available access slots Programme slippage could result in emergency works/ repairs being carried out 	£25,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early approval issued by highways Monitor programme 	£nil	n/a	Project Manager

1.4	Construction Cost Inflation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction begins later than expected: This is currently running at an average of 5% p.a. Risk cost is based on a 12 month delay to commencing construction (not included in Item 1.3 above) 	£27,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early approval issued by highways Procurement programme monitored 	£nil	Low	Project Manager
1.5	Survey Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues identified – nil risk. 	£nil		£nil	n/a	
1.6	Existing Building Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening-up works are likely to reveal issues with existing state of seating not envisaged which will have to be addressed. Cost risk is compounded by it being a listed building. Cost of risk is estimated at 10% of the construction cost. 	£54,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full surveys prior to starting Tailor programme to minimise 	£27,000	Medium	Project Manager
1.7	Court closure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Works effect HMCTS business as usual 	£6.7,000 per hour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction programme tailored to minimise impact. Noise mitigation measures within courts. Consultation with HMCTS 	£2,000	Low	Client Dept
Design Fees / QS							
2.1	Final fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final fees in excess of budget 	£10,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fee quotation will be tendered 	£5,000	Low	Project Manager
Other Costs							
3.1	Tender Exceeds Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	£	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 		n/a	
3.2	Materials delayed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Materials not being available to meet programme 	£30,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sufficient lead in time allowed in programme 	£15,000	Low	Project Manager
Staff Costs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not at risk provided project is not extended beyond City's control. 	£nil		£nil	n/a	
Total estimated risk against estimated Capital spend			£		£		

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank