



Community & Children's Services Committee – Late Supplementary Pack

Date: MONDAY, 8 NOVEMBER 2021
Time: 1.45 pm
Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

18. **WINDOWS PROGRAMME & COMMON PARTS REDECORATION - GOLDEN LANE ESTATE - ISSUES REPORT**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services
19. **HIGH SUPPORT HOSTEL DEVELOPMENT - ISSUES REPORT**
Report of the City Surveyor.

Items received too late for circulation in conjunction with the Agenda.

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

Committees:	Dates:
Corporate Projects Board – For decision Community & Children’s Services Committee – For decision Projects Sub Committee – For decision	03 November 2021 08 November 2021 17 November 2021
Subject: Windows Programme & Common Parts Redecorations – Golden Lane Estate Unique Project Identifier: 11961	Gateway 3 Complex Issue Report
Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services	For Decision
Report Author: David Downing, Asset Programme Manager	
<div>PUBLIC</div>	

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: Repair, installation of secondary glazing, or replacement of existing single-glazed windows with double-glazed units and redecoration of internal and external common parts at the Golden Lane Estate. At Gateway 2, the proposed works to the Golden Lane Estate were part of wider, multi-estate Windows Replacement Programme. An Issues Report was subsequently approved (June 2017) to split the wider project into separate workstreams, with the proposed works to Golden Lane Estate to proceed through the Gateway process as a separate concern due to the particular complexity of the buildings.</p> <p>Summary: The purpose of this report is to restructure the project to allow for the prioritisation of blocks as required, thereby minimising the risk to the overall programme should design or heritage approval issues arise at any given block. The report also seeks approval to revise the project scope to include roof renewals (previously programmed to follow window replacement works) to realise efficiencies and minimise disruption to residents.</p> <p>RAG Status: Amber (Amber at last report to Committee)</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>Risk Status: Low (Low at last report to committee)</p> <p>Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): £10,893,696 (should option to revise scope to include roof renewals be approved).</p> <p>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): Increase of £2,430,000 since last report to Committee (should option to revise scope to include roof renewals be approved).</p> <p>Spend to Date: £419,527</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: N/A</p> <p>Slippage: None since previous report.</p> <p>Funding Source: Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Capital Funding</p>
2. Requested decisions	<p>Next Gateway: Gateway 4 - Detailed Options Appraisal (Complex)</p> <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) That additional budget of £95,000 is approved for the change of scope to include replacement roof design work to reach the next Gateway (b) Note the revised project budget of £1,026,150 (excluding risk) (c) Note the total estimated cost of the project at £10,893,696 (excluding risk) (d) That Option 3 is approved to restructure the project into separate work streams (to progress through the remainder of the Gateway process independently) and to revise the project scope to include roof renewals. (e) That approval is granted to rename the project 'Windows Programme, Common Parts Redecorations & Roofing Renewals – Golden Lane Estate' in light of the requested scope change.
3. Budget	<p>Roof Renewals</p> <p>At the previous Gateway, costs for the project were estimated at £8,463,696 for the window and redecoration elements only. Revising the project scope to include roof renewals would entail an increase in the estimated total project budget of £2,430,000. This expenditure (again solely funded by the HRA with an estimated 50% recovery from long leaseholders) has already been forecast in future spending plans as a key item on the next five-year major works programme and is contained within existing forecast capital budgets as notified to the Chamberlain.</p> <p>This additional sum is inclusive of the funds requested below to complete roof design work for each identified work stream, bringing each up to Gateway 4.</p>

	<table><tr><th>Item</th><th>Reason</th><th>Funds/ Source of Funding</th><th>Cost (£)</th></tr><tr><td>Roof Design Fees</td><td>Roof design & specification to inform tender package & secure Listed Building consent.</td><td>HRA</td><td>£80,000</td></tr><tr><td>Staff Costs</td><td>Project Management Costs</td><td>HRA</td><td>£15,000</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td></td><td></td><td>£95,000</td></tr></table> <p>Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: N/A</p>	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)	Roof Design Fees	Roof design & specification to inform tender package & secure Listed Building consent.	HRA	£80,000	Staff Costs	Project Management Costs	HRA	£15,000	Total			£95,000
Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)														
Roof Design Fees	Roof design & specification to inform tender package & secure Listed Building consent.	HRA	£80,000														
Staff Costs	Project Management Costs	HRA	£15,000														
Total			£95,000														
4. Issue description	<p>1. Restructure Project into work streams.</p> <p>Following the Issues Report approved in September 2021, design work continues to progress as anticipated within that report. The project is currently structured whereby separate design options for the nine blocks on the Golden Lane Estate are to be presented for approval in a single Gateway 4 report.</p> <p>The reporting arrangements as they stand present a risk to the overall delivery of the programme as a delay in finalising any of the costed options for a single block (each block bringing its own design and heritage challenges) would hold back advancement of all the others. In order to mitigate this risk, it is proposed to split the project into defined work streams, each to progress through the remainder of the Gateway process independently, starting at Gateway 4. Splitting the project in this way will allow for the prioritisation of blocks where needs are acute.</p> <p>The proposed works streams are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Crescent House2. Great Arthur House3. Stanley Cohen House4. Cullum Welch House5. Maisonette Blocks (Basterfield House, Bayer House, Bowater House, Cuthbert Harrowing House, Hatfield House).																

2. Amend project scope to include roof renewals

Surveys of the existing roofs at the Golden Lane Estate have been completed and reveal that the existing roof coverings have reached the end of their useful operational lives. In addition, the surveys noted the paucity of roof insulation present in the existing installations at many blocks. This should also be addressed at the earliest opportunity to improve energy efficiency within the buildings and ensure compliance with current building standards.

Informed by the survey's findings, roof renewals had been scheduled to follow the window projects at Golden Lane Estate as a key component of the forthcoming next five-year Major Works programme. However, due to the delays to the conclusion of certain elements of the current Major Works programme (exacerbated by COVID-19 and the design complexities inherent in identifying acceptable solutions for Golden Lane Estate), the need to progress these roof works in a timely fashion ahead of the launch of the next programme is now pressing.

Furthermore, combining the roof works with the windows element allows for a single design perspective, which will considerably benefit moves to a joined-up approach to maximising energy efficiency, aligning with the Net Zero initiative. It also creates the opportunity to realise cost efficiencies (shared use of access equipment) and minimise disruption to residents by allowing works to proceed concurrently. For blocks such as Crescent House, should the option to replace the upper-level windows be approved, the simultaneous replacement of the roof is a necessity as the components are integrally designed.

3. Financial Implications

Revised budgets for each identified work stream are presented below. The costs for the windows and redecoration elements remain unchanged from the costs presented at Gateway 3 and are inclusive of the uplift for window design fees as approved in the September 2021 Issues Report. These costs are subject to revision at Gateway 4 when fully costed options will be presented for decision.

The proposed additional expenditure on roofing renewals has already been included within current HRA capital programme forecasts.

Windows & Redecoration Estimates (as per previous reports):

Work stream	Works	Fees	Staff Costs	Total
Crescent House	£2,030,315	£269,450	£40,606	£2,340,371
Great Arthur	£1,592,404	£159,240	£31,848	£1,783,492
Stanley Cohen	£424,641	£42,464	£8,493	£475,598
Cullum Welch	£955,443	£95,544	£19,109	£1,070,096
Maisonette Blocks	£2,494,767	£249,476	£49,895	£2,794,138
TOTAL	£7,497,570	£816,174	£149,951	£8,463,695

Roofing Renewal Estimates:

Work stream	Works	Fees	Staff costs	Total
Crescent House	£765,000	£76,500	£19,125	£860,625
Great Arthur	£150,000	£15,000	£3,750	£168,750
Stanley Cohen	£220,000	£22,000	£5,500	£247,500
Cullum Welch	£145,000	£14,500	£3,625	£163,125
Maisonette Blocks	£880,000	£88,000	£22,000	£990,000
TOTAL	£2,160,000	£216,000	£54,000	£2,430,000

Combined Workstream Estimates:

Work stream	Works	Fees	Staff Costs	Total
Crescent House	£2,795,315	£345,950	£59,731	£3,200,996
Great Arthur	£1,742,404	£174,240	£35,598	£1,952,242
Stanley Cohen	£644,641	£64,464	£13,993	£723,098
Cullum Welch	£1,100,443	£110,044	£22,734	£1,233,221
Maisonette Blocks	£3,374,767	£337,476	£71,895	£3,784,138
TOTAL	£9,657,570	£1,032,174	£203,951	£10,893,695

4. Risk

i) Price inflation during current market instability: The estimates for both the windows and roofing elements were calculated before the dual impacts of Brexit and COVID-19 were fully realised; the full extent of price inflation attributable to material and labour shortages are not yet known and longer-term trends are hard to predict with any degree of certainty. Cost estimates for the options presented for consideration will be updated and revised as each work stream progresses to Gateway 4.

	<p>ii) Income recovery from long leaseholders: As advised in preceding reports, the significant risk to income recovery from the leaseholder service charge remains. A legal challenge to cost recovery from estate leaseholders for the windows element is anticipated. Should this challenge be successful, future HRA capital programmes would need to be reconfigured to account for the extra burden on HRA resources. The City Solicitor has advised that cost recovery for the roofing element should not be as contentious as the existing installations are independently verified as life expired and replacement specifications will be dictated by Building Regulations and heritage compliance.</p>
5. Options	<p>Option 1. Continue as per existing project structures. A single Gateway 4 for window and redecorations works will be submitted when options for all blocks are ready. Roof renewals will remain as a separate project (to progress through the Gateway process independently as part of the next Major Works programme) scheduled for delivery on conclusion of the window works.</p> <p>Option 2. Restructure the project, allowing for the creation of prioritised work streams, each to progress the remainder of the Gateway process (separate Gateway 4 and 5 reports) as required. Roof renewals will remain as a separate project (to progress through the Gateway process independently as part of the next Major Works programme) scheduled for delivery on conclusion of the window works.</p> <p>Option 3. Restructure the project, allowing for the creation of prioritised work streams, each to progress the remainder of the Gateway process (separate Gateway 4 and 5 reports) as required. The project scope will be revised to include roof renewals to all blocks with an associated increase in project budget of £2,430,000, including a sum of £95,000 to facilitate roof design works to the next Gateway. This is the recommended option.</p>

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
Appendix 2	Risk Register

Contact

Report Author	David Downing
Email Address	david.downing@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	07738858729

This page is intentionally left blank

Project Coversheet

[1] Ownership & Status

UPI: 11961

Core Project Name: Windows Programme & Common Parts Redecorations – Golden Lane Estate

Programme Affiliation (if applicable): n/a

Project Manager: Jason Crawford

Definition of need: Repair, refurbishment, or replacement of existing single glazed windows with double glazed units and redecoration of internal and external common parts.

Key measures of success:

- Increased resident satisfaction
- Improved thermal efficiency in the Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) energy performance ratings of our housing assets.
- Reduction in ongoing repair and maintenance costs.

Expected timeframe for the project delivery: Aug 2022 – Dec 2024

Key Milestones:

Phased Construction (estimated start dates)

- Crescent House – Aug 2022
- Cullum Welch – Dec 2022
- Basterfield House – May 2023
- Bayer House – Oct 2023
- Bowater House – Jan 2024
- Cuthbert Harrowing – Apr 2024
- Hatfield House – Jul 2024
- Stanley Cohen House – Oct 2022
- Great Arthur House – Sept 2022

Are we on track for completing the project against the expected timeframe for project delivery? No

Impact of Covid meant that inspections and surveys had to be deferred but a lot of the design work and research was undertaken during lockdown to progress the project as far as possible. Most of the external surveys could be carried out during lockdown, and most of the internal surveys were undertaken in the short period between the easing of the first lockdown and prior to the second lockdown coming into effect.

Has this project generated public or media impact and response which the City of London has needed to manage or is managing?

Following the leaseholder challenge to the Great Arthur House curtain wall project we are applying lessons learned and are mindful of the potential for similar action being taken on the Windows project.

[2] Finance and Costed Risk

Headline Financial, Scope and Design Changes:

‘Project Briefing’ G1 report (as approved by Chief Officer 26/09/13):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £4,333,000
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 1 – September 2013
 - Gateway 2 – September 2013
 - Gateway 3 – March 2014
 - Gateway 4 – March 2014
 - Gateway 5 – as per each individual project.

Scope/Design Change and Impact: n/a

‘Project Proposal’ G2 report (as approved by PSC 26/09/13):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £4,333,000
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £175,000
- Spend to date: £0
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates: as above

Scope/Design Change and Impact: n/a

‘Issues Report’ (as approved by PSC 06/06/17):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £12,610,000 (all blocks/estates including Golden Lane Estate estimated at £6,500,000)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): n/a
- Spend to date: £43,750 (expenditure covering multiple estates, of which £18,335 apportioned to Golden Lane Estate)
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 3 – October 2017
 - Gateway 5 – To be determined.

Scope/Design Change and Impact: As stated in the Issues Report, the scope had changed considerably with the addition of new blocks as well as whole estate which resulted in a considerable uplift in the costs reported at the previous Gateway. At Gateway 2 estimates were £4,333,000, at the time of writing the Gateway 3/4 report estimates were £12,610,000 for all blocks and estates that had been subsequently added. The report gained approval to split the project into separate workstreams, with the proposed works to Golden Lane Estate to proceed henceforth through the Gateway process as a separate concern with an estimated total project cost of £6,500,000.

‘Outline Options Appraisal’ G3 report (as approved by PSC 08/11/17):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £8,397,278
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £449,854
- Spend to date: £18,335
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 3: November 2017
 - Procurement of design team: April 2018
 - Gateway 4 Detailed Options Appraisal: November 2018
 - Planning application: May 2019
 - Gateway 5: December 2019
 - Works start: Spring 2020

Scope/Design Change and Impact: As above, the proposed works to Golden Lane Estate were split off from the wider HRA Window Renewal Programme at Gateway 3.

‘Issues Report’ (as approved by PSC 15/09/21):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £8,463,696
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £569,501
- Spend to date: £419,527
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Crescent House – Aug 2022
 - Cullum Welch – Dec 2022
 - Basterfield House – May 2023
 - Bayer House – Oct 2023
 - Bowater House – Jan 2024
 - Cuthbert Harrowing – Apr 2024
 - Hatfield House – Jul 2024
 - Stanley Cohen – Oct 2022
 - Great Arthur House – Sept 2022

Scope/Design Change and Impact: As well as the impact of Covid on the programme we have been instructed to re-examine the scope in order to prioritise Crescent House due to the continuing deterioration of the timber frame façade, specifically because of the heritage significance of the block. Working with the Design Team we have now split the blocks into archetypes based on design and material of the windows, and we are looking to adopt a phased approach to planning, tender and construction. Whereas the original approach was to submit a single planning application and listed building consents, it has become apparent that the best approach is to submit separate planning applications for each archetype. This has led to an increase in costs for the Design Team and Planning Consultant. Also, we are now looking to appoint a Quantity Surveyor to undertake detailed cost analysis as well as a Communications Consultant to draw up the statement of community involvement

as part of the requirements around resident consultations and in support of the planning process.

Total anticipated on-going commitment post-delivery [£]: Following completion of any works and at the end of the defects liability period any ongoing costs will be the remit of periodic repairs and maintenance as stipulated in warranties.

Programme Affiliation [£]: n/a

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name: Golden Lane Window Replacements & Common Parts			PM's overall risk rating: Low		CRP requested this gateway		£ -		Average unmitigated risk		6.1		Open Risks		14								
Unique project identifier: PV11961			Total estimated cost (exc risk): £ 10,893,695		Total CRP used to date		£ -		Average mitigated risk score		5.0		Closed Risks		0								
General risk classification																							
Risk ID	Gateway	Category	Description of the Risk	Risk Impact Description	Likelihood Classification pre-mitigation	Impact Classification pre-mitigation	Risk score	Costed impact pre-mitigation (£)	Costed Risk Provision requested Y/N	Confidence in the estimation	Mitigating actions	Mitigation cost (£)	Likelihood Classification post-mitigation	Impact Classification post-mitigation	Costed impact post-mitigation (£)	Post-Mitigation risk score	CRP used to date	Use of CRP	Date raised	Named Departmental Risk Manager/ Coordinator	Risk owner (Named Officer or External Party)	Date Closed OR/ Realised & moved to Issues	Comment(s)
R1	5	(2) Financial	Section 20 Challenges.	Leaseholder(s) may challenge the Section 20 service charge recovery on grounds of the works being improvements or due to disrepair. Following a First Tier Tribunal Hearing in September 2019 recommendations were made to undertake more detailed surveys and tender as a cost in use exercise.	Possible	Major	12	£7,264,452.00	N	C – Uncomfortable	Not escalated to Head of Major Works and Director of Barbican & Property Services. Several options were presented (1) More detailed sample survey to quantify numbers in disrepair, (2) deed of variation to the Leases to include 'Improvement Clauses' or (3) dual tender. Officers have been instructed to continue as planned and highlight the risk to committee at Gateway 5. As no recommendations have been made.	£7,264,452.00	Likely	Major	£7,264,452.00	16	£0.00		N 08/10/2019	Jason Crawford	Jason Hayes		In order to mitigate risk Quantity Surveyor has been appointed to undertake detailed costing and monitor cost control. Q3 brief is also to draw up specifications for tender, and undertake a cost in use/lifecycle cost comparison to determine the level of repairs required to overhaul, repair and ease and adjust the existing windows. On completion of the dual tender Q3 is to repeat the cost in use exercise using the tendered rates provided by the winning bidder
R2	5	(10) Physical	Weather delays.	The weather impact on this project would be high as the majority of works are taking place outdoors. High winds can affect the contractors' ability to complete works at height. Rain and cold weather, in particular snow can prevent items such as sealants from setting properly.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	If possible works will be programmed to start Spring/Summer to minimise risk.	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00		N 17/10/2017	Jason Crawford	Jason Hayes		Works can be programmed to start to avoid periods in which we expect inclement weather.
R3	5	(10) Physical	Continued deterioration of windows	Leading to damage to building fabrics of City Assets	Likely	Serious	8	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Prioritisation to carry out the works in a cost effective and timely way with exclusions where needed	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00		N 17/10/2017	Jason Crawford	Jason Hayes		It is considered unlikely that the works won't be approved.
R4	5		Delay to works completion leads to project overrunning	Should works overrun, this may have an impact upon the budget of the project.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	No actions can currently be taken, care has been taken assessing works contractors bids to ensure realistic timescales are set. Strong contract monitoring will be undertaken to ensure that the works are progressing as planned.	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00		N 17/10/2017	Jason Crawford	Jason Hayes		
R5	5	(9) Environmental	Significant Change in sustainability sector	Covid 19 related issues could impact the project if there is a resurgence in lockdown	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	C – Uncomfortable	No action can be undertaken to prevent a resurgence but we have asked contractors to implement enhanced safe distancing measures during the works.	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£0.00	6	£0.00		N 17/10/2017	Jason Crawford	Jason Hayes		Close monitoring of government guidelines is required.
R6	5	(3) Reputation	Recommendations not approved	If approval to proceed is not granted project timelines will need to be reviewed.	Possible	Minor	3	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Ensure that recommendations are validated and well thought through, taking cost benefits and potential dis-benefits (such as disrepair claims) into account.	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00		N 17/10/2017	Jason Crawford	Jason Hayes		
R7	5	(2) Financial	Increase in pricing during works	Increased project costs.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	A clear contract and robust contract management will be carried out throughout the project to keep a focus on cost and delivery to budget. Project Managers will be alert to delays to the project, particularly those caused by the City of London as these can be used by contractors as leverage for increases in cost.	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00		N 17/10/2017	Jason Crawford	Jason Hayes		
R8	5	(3) Reputation	Challenge to tender awarding process	Could lead to project delays & increased costs.	Unlikely	Serious	4	£0.00	N	A – Very Confident	A robust tendering process and cost evaluation has been undertaken. Should a challenge arise, advice will be sought from City Procurement and Legal services to ensure the dispute is resolved rapidly and successfully.	£0.00	Rare	Serious	£0.00	2	£0.00		N 17/10/2017	Jason Crawford	Jason Hayes		
R9	5	(2) Financial	Contractor financial Viability	Could lead to project delays & increased costs.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Procurement colleagues undertake financial viability assessments as part of the tender process.	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£0.00	6	£0.00		N 17/10/2017	Jason Crawford	Jason Hayes		Whilst a robust tender evaluation process has been undertaken it's difficult to understand fully how the Covid-19 situation has impacted or will continue to impact contractors' ongoing financial viability.

R10	5	(2) Financial	Works more extensive than planned for	Could lead to project delays & increased costs.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Detailed PCI has been provided as part of the robust tender package. Contractors have been asked to include Provisional Sums to cover any unforeseen works.	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00	N	17/10/2017	Jason Crawford	Jason Hayes	Whilst measures have been put in place it's possible that deterioration of the un-maintained assets may have led to deterioration of surrounds that may not become apparent until opening up works have been undertaken.
R11	5	(2) Financial	Residents refuse access.	Should residents refuse access to their homes in order to complete works, it would cause cost and time delays to the project.	Possible	Minor	3	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Early engagement has been carried out with residents to make them aware of the upcoming works. An issues on access will be reported immediately to the Estate Management teams and enforcement undertaken if absolutely necessary.	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00	N	17/10/2017	Jason Crawford	Jason Hayes	
R12	5	(5) H&S/Wellbeing	Fire risk assessments (FRAs)	It has been noted that many of the FRAs have or are about to expire. There is a potential risk that the Principal Contractor may not start works as the FRAs are out of date which could delay the proposed works affecting the overall programme and potentially an increase in costs.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	C – Uncomfortable	This has been escalated to Senior managers and previous instruction was to continue as planned. Having taken further advice from Col. Fire Safety Officer this has been escalated again. At present many of the FRAs have or are due to expire. Latest advice is that we can continue.	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£0.00	6	£0.00	N	31/10/2019	Jason Crawford	Jason Hayes	It is likely that this may impact the progress of the works and Officers will seek a resolution in the meantime - works are planned to start Spring 2021 so we will aim to resolve the risk without it becoming an issue. We have been liaising with the Principal Designer and continue to highlight any corrective actions prior to commencement of the works.
R13	4	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	Need to obtain separate heritage approvals for each block	Obtaining Listed Building Consent is not straightforward when multiple blocks with different heritage issues are concerned. Delays in heritage or planning approvals would impact in timelines for procurement & delivery and potentially in an inflating market increase overall costs.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	C – Uncomfortable	Split the blocks into different workstreams and seek to progress through approvals processes independently to ensure that a delay in approval for one block does not halt progress to the overall programme.	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00	N	15/10/2021	Jason Crawford	Jason Hayes	Issues report planned to split project as described.
R14	4	(2) Financial	Rampant inflation in Construction industry pricing following Covid & Brexit	Industry inflation creates risk to meeting planned budgets. Risk increases with every delay to project timelines.	Likely	Serious	8	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Robust project management to ensure any further delay to timelines is minimised. Wider industry conditions are outside of control.	£0.00	Likely	Serious	£0.00	8	£0.00	N	15/10/2021	Jason Crawford	Jason Hayes	
R15								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R16								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R17								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R18								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R19								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R20								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R21								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R22								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R23								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R24								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R25								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R26								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R27								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R28								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R29								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R30								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R31								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R32								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R33								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R34								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R35								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R36								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R37								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R38								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R39								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R40								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R41								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R42								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R43								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R44								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R45								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R46								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R47								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R48								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R49								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R50								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R51								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R52								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R53								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R54								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R55								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R56								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R57								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R58								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R59								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R60								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R61								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R62								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R63								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R64								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R65								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R66								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R67								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R68								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					
R69								£0.00				£0.00			£0.00		£0.00					

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