

Pre RCC Member QUESTIONS

For 2 March 2015 RCC

ITEM 4

1. In The Appendix 6 of The latest RCC papers the latest comment is : “ Stair edging alternatives have now been sourced and agreed by Planning. To Rollout across the Estate following The Beech Street Gardens Project” -

This statement is very vague and considering that Defoe RTA has been asking that the poor and dangerous condition of the risers be rectified for over 12 months now we would like a more specific update. Currently the risers constitute a hazard.

The edging tiles have now been successfully installed within the Beech Gardens Project area and tiles have been ordered for the rest of the Estate. Where tiles edges are currently missing, they have been concreted temporarily and painted white.

ITEM 5

2. Bicycle facilities – On p45, question 8 seems to show that people don't want pods. But p43 says that we're going to spend some of the funding on pods. Why is that? Are we assuming that people didn't choose pods in question 8 because they didn't know what they were?

The survey was to assist in preparation for the allocation of monies for next for financial year – if successful in receiving further funding from TfL.

3. Why not select a colour that matches one on the "approved palette"? Why not have the galvanised-iron ends (of poor quality galvanising) painted to match as above? Ditto for main frame of BIKEHANGAR?

The facilities we have received are a gift from funding via TfL and the products discussed with Planning.

4. When the Listed Building Consent Officer was consulted, was he or she informed that these rack are permanently bolted down?

Yes

5. Was the officer, referred to above, told that the installed racks are visible from above, from Defoe Place?

Yes as it was an onsite meeting.

6. At what stage in the process did BEO officers consult the guidelines?

BEO officers reviewed the guidelines and decided to involve Planning Officers.

ITEM 8 (APPENDIX 2)

7. With reference to Beech Gardens Project updates, the location of the reservoir tank, which is to replace the previous intensive irrigation system, has not been reported.

I understand that it is currently being installed at 03 level at the southeast corner of Bryer Court within the residential lift and stairs structure. I understand that whereas the previous irrigation system drew water from mains supplies locally all over the northwest Barbican podium, the replacement nine cubic metre tank concentrates its replenishment by tapping into the mains supply to Bryer Court only, and then pumping this on demand to hosepipes in the raised beds all over the northwest Barbican podium. I understand that a tank of this size full of water weighs at least nine tonnes. Apparently this does not require planning consent.

Would the Estate Officers, City Surveyors and Building Control responsible for this installation confirm the situation to us because there has been no written statement?

The above is correct. The draw from the supply can be set at the same rate (or less) as the original tank –therefore water pressure will not be affected.

8. Would they assure Bryer Court residents that their residential water supplies are not to be adversely affected and in particular their priority to the mains supply, water pressure requirement and safeguards against back contamination from the new reservoir tank and its pipe runs?

WRAS regs will be met in regard to the risk of back contamination. Bryer Court supply is also shared with John Trundle Court and Bunyan Court and would have supplied the original irrigation system and tank underneath Bunyan Court

9. Would the officers also assure Bryer Court residents that the installation, its pipe runs, pumps, valves and associated machinery are specified so as not to transmit noise or vibration to their dwellings, nor add to the pre-existing noise levels in the adjacent residential common parts and the 03 level vicinity?

Yes

10. Would the officers assure us that the adjacent structures and services are able to bear the weight of this installation and that it conforms to building regulations for residential locations and the listed building management guidelines for these parts?

Building Control and a Structural Engineer have deemed it to be a suitable location.

11. It is unclear how the ongoing water service charges and maintenance costs associated with this installation are to be accounted for and whether other areas of the podium are intended to be added to its load. It is also unclear whether the proximity of the installation to Bryer Court poses a new risk requiring increased water testing service charges for the residents' supply. Would officers be able to clarify these points?

This would have been the same as the original Bunyan Court tank

12. The Beech Gardens Project is a pilot for waterproofing all podium areas and the new planting has been designed to support this objective without the previous intensive irrigation system. The success of this replacement and the planting it sustains can only be meaningfully assessed if the amount of water being used is reported over the coming years and weather conditions. Would the officers confirm that the supply to the tank is going to be metered from the start and the readings reported periodically to RCC/BRC?

Supply to the tank will be metered.

ITEM 8 (APPENDIX 2)

13. Benjo/Breton roof apportionment. If the Consultants practice has been able to supply you with the costs of the small number of contract instructions, which are needed before a decision on the final apportionment can be made? If not, what actions are being taken/can be taken to acquire full details of the difference between the original tender figure and the final account figure?

Officers are working towards a satisfactory conclusion on the outstanding contract instructions. These have been entered onto the agreed standard apportionment template for review by the BA's Roof Sub-Committee. Only after the outcome of the review by the Sub-Committee will we be in a position to confirm the final breakdown of the percentages between the City and Long Leaseholders

14. Could you also please let me have the original tender figure and the final account figure. It is a fair assumption that the related sum has been sitting in an account for the last 10/11 years. In view of this, it is reasonable to expect that any amount owed to the residents be repaid with interest, say 5% pa.

It is not envisaged that interest would be paid.

ITEM 8 (APPENDIX 3)

15. Given the installed communal heating system for the 69 Frobisher Crescent flats, why has the CSD allowed the developer, United House, to forgo attending 'to repairs within individual flats' before they have been offered the heating system by the developer? The system remains unreliable. There have been at least two outages in the first two months of 2015.

The outages have occurred as a result of faults within individual flats not from the primary system. Until recently UH's contractor (part of the UH Group) were attending repairs under the defects liability period they had through their works contract

16. As the BEO has just started the procurement process for appointing an appropriate maintenance contractor, can we be assured by the CSD Department that the handover of the heating system will not be accepted by them until after this contractor is in place?

Yes

17. We have previously requested that the annual heating/hot water health checks now due be undertaken before CSD accepts the system. Can the CSD Department advise the progress on this issue?

UH carried out a health check on each flat completed last year offered free of charge. Any subsequent annual checks would not be free and would have to be commissioned by BE/Residents.

GENERAL

18. We appreciate that much thought and care has gone into planning how to restore the Thomas More north beds to being once again a handsome feature of that garden. We can see that new plantings are in place but we ask if there is an overall Landscape Vision for those beds which residents could know about, and possibly see, together with an estimate of when the new plantings are likely to restore beauty to those beds.

Whilst a great deal of work has gone into the northern bed of Thomas More House, the Gardens Advisory Group, BEO and Open Spaces Officers are conscious that the borders of both gardens (Thomas More lawn and Speed Garden) have not had significant investment or wholesale replanting for many years, rather more of a piecemeal exercise. This is something the GAG will be considering over the next few months and will report back with proposals

GENERAL

19. An additional question is to ask if the Directional signage at this end of the Estate could be improved particularly close to staircase 2 as on a number of occasions people looking for an exit from the podium have tried to access the car park from staircase 2 and in frustration

Signage is reviewed annually across the estate. The BEO checks that signage is current and in good condition. Where funds allow, old and tattered signs are replaced. A more comprehensive signage project would be the responsibility of the Department of the Built Environment (DBE). The stairs leading down from the podium by Defoe House (and also by Speed House) have small signs indicating that there is no access to street level. The BEO is aware that the map box by Staircase 1 of Defoe House is still missing and has been chasing this with colleagues in DBE.