Committees:		Dates:
Policy and Resource Committee	e – for information	19 January 2017
Project Sub-Committee – for dea	cision	31 January 2017
Corporate Asset Sub-Committee	e – for information	10 February 2017
Subject:	Gateway 1&2 Project	Public
Guildhall Great Hall Stonework	Proposal	
Defect	Regular	
Report of:		For Information
City Surveyor		
Report Author:		
Dorian Price, Guildhall Manager		

### Recommendations

1.	Approval track and next Gateway	Approval track: 2. Regular  Next Gateway: Gateway 3/4 - Options Appraisal (Regular)			
2.	Resource requirements to reach next Gateway	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)
		Staff funding for 5 days	To consider options for scaffolding	Local Risk	£500
		Staff funding for 10 days	To consider options for repair of stonework	Local Risk	£1,000
		Temporary Crash-Deck Scaffold Construction Estimate	Due to urgency, this crash-deck was installed 21/11/16. Cost includes hoarding, decorating, lights and hire to 20/01/17	2016/17 City's Cash Provision for New Schemes	£37,500
		Temporary Crash-Deck Scaffold	Estimated cost for ongoing hire of the scaffold. £800 per week to 28/04/17	2016/17 City's Cash Provision for New Schemes	£11,200
		Scaffold Design Fees	To carry out preliminary assessment and initial design.	2016/17 City's Cash Provision for New Schemes	£2,000

	Pinnacle Scaffold Construction Estimate	Estimated costs for specialist scaffold up to and around Pinnacle	2016/17 City's Cash Provision for New Schemes	£70,000	
	Structural Engineer Fees	To carry out preliminary assessment and design solution.	2016/17 City's Cash Provision for New Schemes	£5,000	
	Stonework Conservation Design Fees	To carry out preliminary assessment and initial design.	2016/17 City's Cash Provision for New Schemes	£4,500	
			Estimated Total	£131,700*	
	* Subject to furthe	r technical investigatio	n		
3. Next steps	3.1 Construct sp the stonework de	ecialist scaffold to e	enable close	inspection of	
	3.2 To employ a consultant structural engineer to carry out a detailed inspection of the west pinnacle of the Great Hall and produce a structural survey report and advise on proposed repair methods.				
	3.3 Structural engineer to review photographic drone survey results of the east pinnacle.				

### **Project Summary**

# 4.1 A photographic drone survey conducted in July 2016 on the Great Hall identified a small number of cracks in some stonework on the pinnacle of the Great Hall roof, at the apex of the west gable, which required further closer inspection. The inspection carried out on Saturday 19th November by Stone Technical Services Ltd, identified stonework on the west gable pinnacle that was determined to be unsafe and a risk of falling masonry. 4.2 Due to the condition of the masonry, Stone Technical Services were not able to carry out any remedial works to consolidate the loose masonry for fear of dropping any loose

structural engineer.

3.3 Engage a stonework conservation consultant to provide design options for remedial works in conjunction with the

<u> </u>		
		elements, or causing a partial collapse of the pinnacle onto the glazing below.
		4.3 Due to the risk of falling masonry, specialist scaffold is required to inspect the stonework and dismantle, if necessary, safely and without the risk of partial collapse and causing damage to the area below.
		4.4 The first priority was to make area safe, Officers implemented immediate control measures and the closure of the West ambulatory corridor while our contractor, a crashdeck tunnel structure was built underneath the West ambulatory glass canopy.
		4.5 This crash-deck tunnel was installed on 21 <sup>st</sup> November and will enable further specialist scaffold to be built up and around the pinnacle.
5.	Brief description of project	5.1 To access the west gable pinnacle by specialist scaffolding, and undertake any necessary repairs to prevent falling masonry.
6.	Consequences if project not approved	6.1 Loose masonry, or a partial collapse of the pinnacle onto the glazing below.
7.	SMART Objectives	7.1 To repair the high level Great Hall cracks to the stone Pinnacle at a high quality standard.
		7.2 To ensure repair work is within cost approved.
		7.3 Repairs are conducted in a timely manner with minimal impact to events.
		7.4 Repairs are carried out safely and all risks are mitigated.
		7.5 Repair complies with the legal obligation to maintain our historical asset, and on-going monitoring is undertaken to ensure the repair is successful.
		7.6 Key milestone dates are identified as;
		<ul> <li>Scaffold Design Proposal – January/February 2017</li> <li>Stone survey assessment – January/February 2017</li> <li>Remedial works undertaken – March 2017</li> </ul>
8.	Success criteria	The project will be measured by the following outcomes;
		8.1 Repair will be conducted on time and within budget.
		8.2 No operational impact to the use of the Great Hall.
9.	Key Benefits	9.1 Repair and maintain a heritage asset.
		9.2 Improved stability and an even loading to all corners of the structure.
		9.3 Reduces the health and safety risk of falling masonry.

10. Notable exclusions	10.1 No further action will be undertaken to small hairline cracks identified, other than continual monitoring.
11. Governance arrangements	Spending Committee: Finance Committee Senior Responsible Officer: Guildhall Manager Project Board: No

### **Prioritisation**

12. Link to Strategic Aims	2. To provide modern, efficient and high quality local services, including policing, within the Square Mile for workers, residents and visitors
13. Links to existing strategies,	13.1 The City Surveyor Business Plan includes strategic priorities of promoting Health and Safety compliance.
programmes and projects	13.2 The department is monitoring and managing health and safety risks in accordance with the City Corporation's current risk management framework.
	13.3 The Guildhall conservation management plan.
14. Project category	1. Health and safety
15. Project priority	A. Essential

## **Options Appraisal**

16. Overview of options	16.1 Undertake repairs - The recommended option is to install specialist scaffolding and undertake repairs as advised by a consultant structural engineer.
	16.2 To rebuild the Pinnacle if assessed as necessary.

### **Project Planning**

17. Programme and key dates	Overall programme: Up to 6 months  Key dates:  • Scaffold Design Proposal – January/February 2017  • Stone survey assessment – January/February 2017  Other works dates to coordinate: Gateway 3/4 – February/March 2017	
18. Risk implications	Overall project risk: Amber	
	The proposals outlined in this report identify health and safety and reputational risks and although the risk of falling masonry has been temporarily mitigated, there is continued cost and inconvenience of a having scaffold in place and the repair delayed for any extended period.	

19. Stakeholders and	19.1 Town Clerks
consultees	19.2 Comptroller and City Solicitor's
	19.3 DBE – Building Control and Historic Environment
	19.4 Remembrancer
	19.5 Chamberlain
	19.6 Procurement

# **Resource Implications**

20. Total estimated	Likely cost range:			
cost	1. Under £250k			
21. Funding strategy	Choose 1: Choose 1:			
	No funding confirmed	Internal - I City's own re	Funded wholly esource	y by
	Funds/Sources of Funding	<u> </u>	Cost (£)	
	Staff funding for 10 days		£1,500	
	Emergency Crash-Deck Scaffold cost (currently funded from Local risk up to be transferred to project costs)		£37,500	
	On-going Crash-Deck scaffold es cost (£800 per week to 28/04/17)	timated hire	£11,200	
	Scaffold Design Fees		£2,000	
	Pinnacle Specialist Scaffold Estimate	Construction	£70,000	
	Structural Engineer Fees		£5,000	
	Stonework Conservation Design I	ees	£4,500	
	Estimated Total to reach the ne	ext Gateway**	£131,700*	
	Funded By:			
	City Surveyor's Existing Local Ris	k Budget	£1,500	
	2016/17 City's Cash Provision for Schemes	New	£130,200	
	2016/17 City's Cash Provision	on for New	£50,000	
		Total Funding	£181,700	

	* Subject to further technical investigation  ** Funding to undertake the repair works, currently estimated at £50k, will also be subject to a bid to the Resource Allocation Sub and Policy and Resources Committees from the City's Cash Provision for New Schemes.  *** Subject to approval of the Resource Allocation Sub and Policy and Resources Committees
22. On-going revenue implications	Successful completion of repair works will reduce future maintenance and repair works to the Pinnacle stonework.
23. Investment appraisal	Not applicable
24. Procurement strategy/Route to Market	24.1 If structural survey results indicate a simple solution to undertake stonework remedial works or making safe works, costing up to £50k. Then procurement through the Interim Minor Works Framework is proposed.
	24.2 If however the structural survey indicates that more extensive works are required, then the Gateway 3/4 report would be presented outlining the costs and options.
25. Legal implications	25.1 Listed Building Status 25.2 Health and Safety
26. Corporate property implications	26.1 Operational Assets remain in a good safe and statutory compliant condition and; 26.2. Operational Assets are fit for purpose and meet service delivery needs;
27. Traffic implications	Access to Guildhall Yard will be controlled, together with general deliveries and any activities taking place in the Yard.
28. Sustainability and energy implications	Specialist structural engineer advice is required to in order to meet sustainability and energy implications.
29. IS implications	Nil
30. Equality Impact Assessment	An equality impact assessment will be undertaken

### **Contact**

Report Author	Dorian Price
Email Address	Dorian.price@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1487