



Barbican Residential Committee

Date: MONDAY, 21 SEPTEMBER 2020
Time: 9.30 am
Venue: STREAMED LIVE TO YOUTUBE: <https://youtu.be/ZuJU1ENpe3M>

Members:

Randall Anderson	Andrew McMurtrie
Adrian Bastow	Barbara Newman
Mark Bostock	Susan Pearson
Deputy David Bradshaw	Deputy John Tomlinson
Henry Colthurst	Mark Wheatley
Mary Durcan	Dawn Wright
Michael Hudson	
Jeremy Mayhew	

Enquiries: Julie Mayer
tel.no.: 020 7332 1410
Julie.Mayer@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting

Members of the public can observe this virtual public meeting at the below link:

<https://youtu.be/ZuJU1ENpe3M>

This meeting will be a virtual meeting and therefore will not take place in a physical location following regulations made under Section 78 of the Coronavirus Act 2020. A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one municipal year. Please note: online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

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. **ORDER OF THE COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL**

To receive the Order of the Court of Common Council appointing the Committee and setting its Terms of Reference.

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 2)

4. **TO ELECT A CHAIRMAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER 29**

For Decision

5. **TO ELECT A DEPUTY CHAIRMAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER 30**

For Decision

6. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

To approve the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 15th June 2020.

For Decision
(Pages 3 - 8)

7. **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BARBICAN RESIDENTS' CONSULTATION COMMITTEE (RCC) - WITH ESTATE OFFICERS (EMAIL REFERS)**

To note the draft minutes of the meeting held on 7th September 2020 (*to follow*).

For Information

8. **TO CONFIRM THE APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN (OR THEIR REPRESENTATIVE) TO THE CULTURE MILE WORKING PARTY**

For Decision

9. **'YOU SAID; WE DID' - OUTSTANDING ACTIONS LIST**

Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services,

For Information
(Pages 9 - 10)

10. **UPDATE REPORT**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Information
(Pages 11 - 16)
11. **2019/20 REVENUE OUTTURN (EXCLUDING THE RESIDENTIAL SERVICE CHARGE ACCOUNT)**
Report of the Chamberlain and Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Information
(Pages 17 - 22)
12. **RELATIONSHIP OF THE BARBICAN RESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE OUTTURN REPORT TO SERVICE CHARGE SCHEDULES**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Information
(Pages 23 - 34)
13. **BARBICAN ESTATE OFFICE RECOVERY PLANNING COVID-19**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Information
(Pages 35 - 50)
14. **CONCRETE REPAIRS TO THE BARBICAN ESTATE - GATEWAY 6 - OUTCOME REPORT**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Decision
(Pages 51 - 60)
15. **SALES AND LETTINGS UPDATE**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Information
(Pages 61 - 64)
16. **ARREARS**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
NB. There is a non-public appendix at agenda item 21.
For Information
(Pages 65 - 68)

17. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

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

19. **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 of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12(A) of the Local Government Act.

For Decision

20. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

To approve the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 15th June 2020.

For Decision
(Pages 69 - 70)

21. **ARREARS APPENDIX**

To note a non-public appendix in respect of agenda item 16.

For Information
(Pages 71 - 74)

22. **FIRE SAFETY WORKS - FROBISHER CRESCENT RESIDENTIAL PREMISES - GATEWAY 1-4 - PROJECT PROPOSAL AND OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Decision
(Pages 75 - 96)

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

24. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**

Agenda Item 3

RUSSELL, Mayor	RESOLVED: That the Court of Common Council holden in the Guildhall of the City of London on Thursday 16 th July 2020, doth hereby appoint the following Committee until the first meeting of the Court in April, 2021.
----------------	--

BARBICAN RESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE

1. **Constitution**

A Non-Ward Committee consisting of,

- 7 Members who are non-residents of the Barbican Estate elected by the Court of Common Council, at least one of whom shall have fewer than five years' service on the Court at the time of their appointment
- 2 Members nominated by each of the following Wards/Sides of Ward:-
 - Aldersgate
 - Cripplegate Within
 - Cripplegate Without
- the Chairman or Deputy Chairman of the Community & Children's Services Committee (ex-officio)

The Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Committee shall be elected from the Members who are non-residents of the Barbican Estate.

2. **Quorum**

The quorum consists of any three Members who are non-residents of the Barbican Estate.

3. **Membership 2020/21**

Non-Residents:-

- 1 (1) Andrew Stratton McMurtrie, J.P. *for one year*
- 4 (3) Susan Jane Pearson
- 3 (3) Mark Raymond Peter Henry Delano Wheatley
- 2 (2) Dawn Lindsay Wright *for three years*
- 2 (2) Henry Nicholas Almroth Colthurst
- 9 (2) Jeremy Paul Mayhew
- 12 (1) Michael Hudson

Residents:-

Nominations by the Wards of Aldersgate and Cripplegate (Within and Without), each for the appointment of two Members

Aldersgate

Adrian Mark Bastow
Barbara Patricia Newman, C.B.E.

Cripplegate

Mark Bostock (Cripplegate Without)
David John Bradshaw, Deputy (Cripplegate Within)
Mary Durcan (Cripplegate Without)
John Tomlinson, Deputy (Cripplegate Without)

together with the ex-officio Members referred to in paragraph 1 above.

4. **Terms of Reference**

To be responsible for:-

- (a) the management of all completed residential premises and ancillary accommodation on the Barbican Estate, e.g. the commercial premises, launderette, car parks, baggage stores, etc. (and, in fulfilling those purposes, to have regard to any representations made to it by the Barbican Estate Residents' Consultation Committee);
- (b) the disposal of interests in the Barbican Estate pursuant to such policies as are from time to time laid down by the Court of Common Council.

This page is intentionally left blank

BARBICAN RESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE Monday, 15 June 2020

Minutes of the meeting streamed on You Tube at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Michael Hudson (Chairman) *
Mark Wheatley (Deputy Chairman) *
Randall Anderson
Adrian Bastow
Chris Boden *
Mark Bostock
Deputy David Bradshaw
Henry Colthurst *
Mary Durcan
Barbara Newman
Susan Pearson *
William Pimlott
Stephen Quilter
Deputy John Tomlinson
Dawn Wright *

**Indicates a non-resident Member*

In attendance:

Helen Fentimen – Ward Member for Aldersgate

Officers:

Paul Murtagh	- Assistant Director, Barbican and Property Services, Community and Children's Services
Michael Bennett	- Community and Children's Services
Helen Davinson	- Community and Children's Services
Jason Hayes	- Community and Children's Services
Rebecca Bello	- Community and Children's Services
Anne Mason	- Community and Children's Services
Mark Jarvis	- Chamberlains
Julie Mayer	- Town Clerk's
Chandni Tanna	- Town Clerk's (Communications Department)
Alan Bennetts	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Frank Marchione	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Jeremy Mayhew, who had to leave the meeting after 15 minutes.

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

The following Members made declarations. Two resident members had either no car park space or storage and were therefore permitted to speak and vote. Of those Members who had applied for dispensations, they had been permitted to speak but not vote on the matter.

- Deputy David Bradshaw – has a car parking bay and store
- Barbara Newman – doesn't own a car or car parking bay but owns a store
- Deputy John Tomlinson –has a store but not a car parking bay
- Mary Durcan – has a car parking bay and a store
- Mark Bostock – has a store
- William Pimlott – parents have a car parking bay and store
- Randall Anderson - no car parking bay or store.

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED, that – the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 16th March 2020 be approved.

4. CHARGING POLICY FOR CAR PARKING AND STORES - ANNUAL REVIEW

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services in respect of the Annual Review of the Charging Policy for Car Parking and Stores on the Barbican Estate. The report sought Members' endorsement of the work and recommendations of the Member/Officer Working Party as set out in the report.

During the debate and questions the following points were raised:

- a. During the last 12 months, only one resident had mentioned cost as a reason for giving up their parking bay; which might suggest keeping with the direction of travel of £1500 a year for Barbican car parking. The officer advised that residents were asked to give a reason when they surrendered a bay and there was currently no waiting list for baggage stores.
- b. There was some challenge as to the level of maintenance on the car parks and it was noted that some were in a very poor condition. Members asked to see a table showing figures for the income/ maintenance of car parks.
- c. A lower charge was suggested for those who had invested in electric vehicles or smaller cars. Given the pandemic and economic uncertainty, a CPI increase was suggested with a review in 6 months' time. Members were asked to be mindful of the implications on staff resources arising from this request.
- d. Given that Covid-19 was very likely to impact on the way people travel, it was important to explore new income streams. The officer advised that larger bays/electric car discount/electric bike sockets/additional cycling spaces etc. could be considered in due course as we come out of lockdown.

It was not possible to let the general public use Barbican car parking spaces due to planning restrictions.

- e. Only renewals and not new applications would receive the congestion zone discount by TFL. The officer had been advised there would be a full consultation of Barbican residents on the congestion charge on any future changes, temporary or otherwise by TFL. Members thanked the Chairman for writing to TfL, on behalf of the Committee, objecting to the extension of the congestion charging zone hours and the exclusion of new applications.
- f. There was considerable concern expressed in that the City Corporation was already budgeting on a deficit of over £300k and a CPI increase would worsen the position. Officers confirmed that the Car Park expenditure budget for 2020/21 would be distributed to members with the minutes. The Chamberlain advised that the draft budget was presented in September last year, assuming the proposed increase would be approved. It was noted that Car park charges at the Barbican were more than other City car parks and a further view was expressed that this situation must be addressed as soon as possible.

RESOLVED, that:

Car Parking (*of the 8 members entitled to vote, 6 voted in favour*)

1. The Barbican car park charge per parking space for the ensuing year be increased to £1,420 per annum (as originally agreed at BRC in 2018 as the direction of travel to £1,500 over 3 years) and charges be reviewed again in 2021.

Stores (*unanimous*)

2. Rents for Stores within Barbican buildings (that is, Stores not constructed in the car parks which are all classed as small/standard Stores) be increased in line with CPI (based on 22 April CPI for March of 1.5%) to £331 per annum and charges be reviewed again in 2021;
3. Rents for the resident occupiers of new stores in the car parks be increased in line with CPI (based on 22 April CPI for March of 1.5%) to £873 per annum for large stores, £1,238 for extra-large and £1,746 for extra extra-large stores and charged be reviewed again in 2021.
4. Rents for the non-resident occupiers of new stores in the car parks be increased in line with CPI (based on 22 April CPI for March of 1.5%) to £1,746 per annum for large stores, £2,476 for extra-large and £3,492 for extra extra-large stores and charges be reviewed again in 2021.
5. Miscellaneous Charges be increased in line with CPI (based on 22 April CPI for March of 1.5%) to £243 per annum for motorcycles, £91 per annum for bicycle lockers and £32 per annum for bicycle pods and charges be reviewed again in 2021.

5. **PROPOSED REPLACEMENT OF FRONT ENTRANCE DOOR SETS**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Community and Children’s Services which sought Member approval to submit a supplementary Capital Bid, to be presented to the Resource Allocation Sub Committee and the Court of Common Council, for the proposed replacement of front entrance door sets to all flats on the Barbican Estate. This would ensure that they met the requirements of the current Building Regulations in relation to fire safety.

In response to a question, it was noted that the final estimate would include Frobisher Crescent. Members also noted that, as the works were classified as an improvement in the lease, residents would not have to pay.

RESOLVED, That – the recommendation from officers to submit a supplementary Capital Bid be approved, to enable the replacement of front entrance door sets to all flats on the Barbican Estate with new modern replacements that comply with ‘*Approved Document B – Fire Safety of the Building Regulations*’.

6. **'YOU SAID; WE DID' - OUTSTANDING ACTIONS LIST**

Members received the Committee’s Outstanding Actions list. The Town Clerk advised Members that the Committee’s request at the last meeting, to review its Terms of Reference, had been approved by the Policy and Resources Committee and would be presented to the Court of Common Council for endorsement at its Annual Meeting, which had moved from April 2020 to July 2020 due to the Coronavirus pandemic.

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

There were no questions.

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

There were no items.

9. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED – That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item(s) on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

Item No(s)

11, 12

Paragraph No(s)

1,2& 3

10. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
RESOLVED, that – the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 16th March 2020 be approved.
11. **BARBICAN ESTATE COMMERCIAL TENANTS AND COVID-19: PROPOSAL FOR ADDITIONAL SUPPORT**
Members considered and approved a report of the Director of Community and Children’s Services.
12. **COMMERCIAL LEASE RENEWAL**
Members considered and approved a report of the Director of Community and Children’s Services.
13. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There was one question whilst the public were excluded.
14. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There were no items.
15. **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**
RESOLVED, that – the confidential minutes of the meeting held on 16th March 2020 be approved.

The meeting ended at 3.20 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Julie Mayer
Julie.Mayer@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Actions from June 2020 Barbican Residential Committee (BRC) & other outstanding issues (*updates appear in italics*)

Issue	Source	Officer
Public Realm in and around the Barbican Estate		
<i>The City’s Corporate Asset and Procurement Sub Committee had considered this and asked that Officers produce an update report on maintenance of the Highwalks with proposals for a future meeting. This report is now expected to be presented to the September Committee.</i>	RCC March 20	Paul Murtagh
Annual Review of the Terms of Reference		
<p><i>Members of the BRC recommended to the Policy and Resources Committee and the Court of Common Council that:</i></p> <p>1) <i>the constitution of the Committee be amended to require seven Members who are non-residents and two Members nominated by each of the following Wards: -</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Aldersgate.</i> <i>• Cripplegate Within</i> <i>• Cripplegate Without</i> <p>2) <i>The quorum be amended to consist of any three Members who are non-residents of the Barbican Estate.</i></p> <p><i>The above amendment to the Terms of Reference were agreed by the Court of Common Council at its Annual Meeting on 16th July 2020.</i></p>	RCC March 20	Town clerks
Fire Safety		
<i>It was resolved that the recommendation from officers to submit a supplementary Capital Bid be approved, to enable the replacement of front entrance door sets to all flats on the Barbican Estate with new modern replacements that comply with ‘Approved Document B – Fire Safety of the Building Regulations’. The Capital Bid will be progressed through Committee in September.</i>	BRC June 20	Paul Murtagh
Contact: Michael Bennett, Head of Barbican Estates – 020 7029 3923 – barbican.estate@cityoflondon.gov.uk		

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee:	Date(s):
Residents' Consultation Committee	07 September 2020
Barbican Residential Committee	21 September 2020
Subject: Update Report	
Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services	Public

Summary

Barbican Estate Office

1. Agenda Plan

Property Services – see appendix 1

2. COVID-19 Property Services during lockdown
3. Public lift availability
4. Water tanks works
5. Fire Signage
6. Underfloor Heating Working Party
7. And finally

Recommendations that the contents of this report are noted.

Background

This report updates members on issues raised by the Residents' Consultation Committee and the Barbican Residential Committee at their meetings in March and June 2020. This report also provides updates on other issues on the estate.

1. Agenda Plan

The table below includes a list of pending committee reports:

Residents' Consultation Committee & Barbican Residential Committee

Report Title	Officer	RCC Meeting Date	BRC Meeting Date
"You Said; We Did" Actions (Separate list for RCC & BRC)	Michael Bennett	30 Nov	14 Dec
Service Level Agreement Review - TBC	Michael Bennett		
Service Charge Expenditure & Income Account - Original Budget 2020/21 & Original Budget 2021/22	Chamberlains		
Revenue & Capital Budgets – Original Budget 2020/21 and Original 2021/22 - Excluding dwellings service charge income & expenditure	Chamberlains		
Progress of Sales & Lettings	Anne Mason		
Arrears Report (BRC Only)	Anne Mason		
Commercial Arrears (BRC Only)	Helen Davinson		
Update Report (deadline 16 November) : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main update - Agenda Plan 2021 • Property Services Update (Appendix 1) 	Michael Bennett		

Contact: Michael Bennett, Head of Barbican Estates
 Tel: 020 7029 3923
 E:mail: barbican.estate@cityoflondon.gov.uk

2. Covid-19. PROPERTY SERVICES DURING LOCKDOWN

This update will focus on what changes we had to make within Property Services to maintain a good level of service to the Barbican Estate and our other estates within Housing.

At the start of 'lockdown' the services we delivered and the way in which we delivered them changed. Our repairs service was limited to emergency and urgent repairs. Projects and surveys that were being carried out were put on hold. Our contractors furloughed many of their staff, retaining key personnel only.

With a tremendous effort from all staff involved we maintained and continue to maintain a good level of service.

Property Services Officers (Resident Engineers) were on-site daily. Some of the duties they carried out during lockdown were:

- Providing support to Customer Services staff who were taking repair calls and determining whether works could be carried out safely.
- Supporting/managing our repairs contractors (Metwin) and other contractors who were on site carrying statutory work and inspections.
- Carrying out works to car park ventilation systems
- Completing the labelling of doors across the estate to assist with future security, better identification when repairs are reported and for condition surveys
- Ensuring blocks were compliant and providing necessary documentation to the London Fire Brigade during their inspections which were carried out with little notice (in some cases 24 hours).
- Assisting in the provision of PPE for estate concierge staff, organising layout routes for visitors whilst car parks were closed
- Meter readings were not considered essential so these were put on hold at the start of the lockdown. These have now recommenced and readings are being emailed to those residents that request them.

Repairs. Calls continued to be taken by the Customer Services team who, whilst they were working from home, still worked as a team through IT and telephony technology.

For the period from March 2020 to mid-August the following number of repairs/inspections were raised:

- Repairs contractor (Metwin). 1,231 orders were raised with just 7 going beyond their target date
- Garchey. 115 orders were raised direct to the Garchey team all of which were completed within target
- Property Services Officers. In addition to all the work the PSO's carry out, 273 orders were raised with just 2 going beyond the target date due to access

Surveys/Testing. Some surveys and tests were suspended at the start of lockdown. As we started to move out of lockdown many planned services have recommenced:

- Legionella monitoring has continued throughout lockdown checking water temperatures from all communal water storage tanks and sampling where required. In August, water monitoring within properties recommenced with temperatures from taps are recorded and samples taken where required.
- Asbestos Surveys. Plans to recommence the surveys started back in June when we worked with the contractor on Risk Assessments and Method Statements (RAMS). High levels of protection of staff, residents and the public is nothing new to asbestos contractors but we had to ensure they had updated their policies to make them Covid compliant. Inspections commenced in July and are now complete
- Legionella Risk Assessments. The 5 yearly risk assessments have commenced and communal storage tank assessments are due to complete in October. Access to sample properties will be required. A programme of properties is currently being developed
- Stock Condition Survey. Savills commenced the Stock Condition Survey in July and this will be completed in September. Access will be required to sample properties and this will take place after all other areas have been surveyed.

Other Updates

3. Public Lift Availability

Availability of the public lifts under the control of Property Services is detailed below:

Lift	From April 2019 to March 2020	From April 2020 to June 2020
Turret (Thomas More)	99.85%	99.92%
Gilbert House	99.82%	99.89%

4. Water tank works

We are looking to start the disruptive water tank work in September following work put on hold during Covid-19. A new completion date of November is now expected if there are no further interruptions. Residents will be notified in advance of any interruptions to water supplies.

5. Fire signage

Fire signage installations are due to be completed by February 2021 in all blocks

6. Underfloor Heating Working Party (UFHWP)

Resident members of the UFHWP have been working on how the software that controls the underfloor heating can be adjusted to allow the trial reported in February's committee can go ahead. The trial will shift some of the heating load from January/February to October /April, while keeping overall spending constant

Working with officers, the settings have been agreed and we will be carrying out a poll with all residents seeking support for the trial.

Thanks should go to the resident members and the officer members who worked specifically on calculating and agreeing the parameters for the trial to go ahead

7. AND FINALLY

During the height of the pandemic, a shipping container appeared on Cromwell Tower Forecourt for a resident who was moving. A challenging day for the team as they had to have it moved from a LFB access point and have the area checked for damage



Committee(s)	Dated:
Residents' Consultation Committee	07 September 2020
Barbican Residential Committee	21 September 2020
Subject: 2019/20 Revenue Outturn (Excluding the Residential Service Charge Account)	Public
Report of: The Chamberlain Director of Community & Children's Services	For Information
Report author: Mark Jarvis Head of Finance, Chamberlains	

Summary

This report compares the revenue outturn for the services overseen by your committee in 2019/20, with the final agreed budget for the year.

These accounts do not include income and expenditure in relation to dwellings service charges, which is the subject of a separate report before you today, but does include the following: -

- Landlord Services

This includes income and expenditure relating to short term lessee flats, void flats and commercial properties as well as grounds maintenance for public areas.

- Car Parking

The running expenses, capital charges, rent income and service charges relating to 1,525 car spaces some of which are occupied by 473 stores.

- Baggage Stores

The running expenses, capital charges, rent income and service charges relating to 1,050 baggage stores.

- Trade Centre

This is a commercial area of some 117,000 square feet bounded broadly by Beech Street, Aldersgate Street, Fann Street and Bridgewater Square. Capital charges are the main item of expense, although some premises and supervision and management costs are incurred. Income comprises rent and charges for services including Virgin Active, GSMD Practice room, Laundrette, Parking Services and Creche.

1. Total net expenditure during the year was £2,035,000, whereas the total agreed budget for net expenditure was £2,547,000, representing an underspend of £512,000. This is summarised in the table below:

Summary Comparison of 2019/20 Revenue Outturn with Final Agreed Budget – Barbican Residential Committee			
	Final Agreed Budget £000	Revenue Outturn £000	Variations Increase/ (Reduction) £000
Expenditure	(3,913)	(3,518)	395
Income	5,028	5,145	117
Net Local Risk	1,115	1,627	512
Central Risk	320	325	5
Recharges	(3,982)	(3,987)	(5)
Overall Totals	(2,547)	(2,035)	512

2. Of the Director of Community and Children’s Service’s local risk underspend of £512,000 in 2019/20, £210,000 has been agreed to be carried forward to help fund works to welfare facilities for estate cleaning staff which were delayed in the financial year. Further carry forward requests totalling £130,000 related to concrete repairs to podiums and walkways were not agreed.

Recommendation(s)

3. It is recommended that this revenue outturn report for 2019/20 and the budgets carried forward to 2020/21 are noted.

Main Report

Revenue Outturn for 2019/20

4. This report compares the revenue outturn for the services overseen by your Committee in 2019/20, excluding the dwellings Service Charge account, which is the subject of a separate report, with the final agreed budget for the year.
5. Actual net revenue expenditure for your Committee's services during 2019/20 totalled £2,035,000. A summary comparison of this expenditure with the final agreed budget for the year of £2,547,000 as set out in the budget report to this Committee in December 2019, is tabulated below. In the various tables, figures in brackets indicate expenditure or adverse variances, decreases in income or increases in expenditure.

Comparison of 2019/20 Revenue Outturn with Final Agreed Budget					
	<i>Original Budget</i>	Final Agreed Budget	Revenue Outturn	Variations Increase/ (Reduction)	
	£000	£000	£000	£000	
<u>Local risk</u>					
Employees	(1,920)	(2,032)	(1,952)	80	6
Repairs and Maintenance	(1,282)	(1,342)	(992)	350	7
Other Property Related Supplies and Services	(290)	(370)	(370)	0	
	(121)	(169)	(204)	(35)	8
Total Expenditure	(3,613)	(3,913)	(3,518)	395	
Total Income	4,980	5,028	5,145	117	9
Net Local Risk	1,367	1,115	1,627	512	
Central Risk	225	320	325	5	
Total Recharges	(4,537)	(3,982)	(3,987)	(5)	
Total	(2,945)	(2,547)	(2,035)	512	

6. The underspend of £80k in Employees costs is due to less than expected overtime and temporary staff cost mainly within the Car Park Service and Supervision & Management.
7. The underspend in Repairs and Maintenance of £350k is mainly due to the delay to works on welfare facilities for estate cleaning staff caused by the longer than expected time taken to obtain planning permission and a longer tender process. There was also lower than anticipated spend on miscellaneous works, redecoration work, insurance works, drains, and sprinklers.
8. Supplies and Services related expenditure has increased due to an increase in Professional Fees and Bad Debt Provision Cost.

9. The growth in income is related to additional income in Car Parking, collected from Car Parking Bay and Stores Rental Hire.
10. Annex A1 sets out an analysis by service area of the £512,000 overall outturn variance.
11. Annex A2 shows the reconciliation of the original budget to the latest agreed budget.

Appendices

- Annex A1 - Barbican Residential Committee – Comparison of 2019/20 Revenue Outturn with Latest Agreed Budget by Service Areas.
- Annex A2 - Barbican Residential Committee – Comparison of 2019/20 Original Budget with Latest Agreed Budget.

Dr Peter Kane
Chamberlains

Andrew Carter
Director of Community & Children Services

CONTACTS

Chamberlain's Department – Senior Accountant (Housing)
T: 020 7332-1571
E: Goshe.Munir@Cityoflondon.gov.uk

Barbican Estate Office – Anne Mason, Budget and Service Charge Manager
T: 020 7029-3912
E: Anne.Mason@Cityoflondon.gov.uk

Barbican Residential Committee – Comparison of 2019/20 Revenue Outturn with Final Agreed Budget

Comparison of 2019/20 Revenue Outturn with Final Agreed Budget by Service Area				
	Original Budget	Latest Agreed Budget	Revenue Outturn	Variations Increase/ (Reduction)
Supervision and Management -General	0	0	0	0
Landlords Services	(3,223)	(2,775)	(2,454)	321
Car Parking	(238)	(457)	(414)	43
Stores	(75)	38	53	15
Trade Centre	597	648	771	123
Other Non-Housing	(6)	(1)	9	10
Total	(2,945)	(2,547)	(2,035)	512

Recharges include recharges from the Service Charge Account to Landlord and Car Park Accounts for cleaning and electricity as well as and Central and Departmental Recharges.

Barbican Residential Committee – Comparison of 2019/20 Original Budget With Final Agreed Budget

	£'000
Original Budget	(2,945)
Increase in Employees Costs	(112)
Increase in Premises Related Expenses	(188)
Increase in Customer, Client Receipts Related to Car Parking and the New Baggage Stores	143
Reduction in Recharges due to Capital Charges and Technical Recharge	555
Latest Approved Budget	(2,547)

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 12

Committee	Dated:
Residents' Consultation Committee	07 September 2020
Barbican Residential Committee	21 September 2020
Subject: Relationship of the Barbican Residential Committee Outturn Report to Service Charge Schedules	Public
Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services	For Information
Report author Anne Mason Service Charge and Revenues Manager Department of Community and Children's Services	

Summary

This report provides information on residential service charge expenditure for 2019/20. It also compares the outturn with the 2019/20 estimate and the 2018/19 actual expenditure.

Table 1	Actual 18/19 £,000	Actual 19/20 £,000	Variance Last Year %	Estimate 19/20 £,000	Estimate 20/21 £,000
Annually recurring items	(8,817)	(9,513)	7.89%	(8,827)	(9,095)
Projects	(520)	(626)	20.38%	(1,008)	(112)
Total	(9,337)	(10,139)	8.59%	(9,835)	(9,207)

The reconciliation between the amounts charged to leaseholders and the City's closed accounts is set out below.

Table 2 Summary service charge reconciliation 2019/20	£,000
Actual Service Charge Expenditure Corporate Accounts	(10,442)
Fees, charges and cleaning and lighting recharges	146
Barbican Estate Office Adjustments	157
Final Service Charge Expenditure	(10,139)

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. This report is being presented in a new format explain the variations in the service charge outturn and also to reconcile the service charge being made to residents and following the closure of the Corporate accounts.

Residents' Service Charge Outturn

2. The total amount charged to the service charge account for 2019/20 is £10,139,171 this is 8.59% higher than the 2019/20 charge and 3.10% higher than the estimate.

Analysis of the 2019/20 Service Costs ANNEX 1 –

3. This annex shows the expenditure headings on the service charge schedule, with the main basis of attribution and a comparison between the actual service charges for 2018/19 and 2019/20 The estimates for 2019/20 are also shown.
4. The comparison with the 2018/19 actuals shows significant variations for several service heads.
5. The rise in electricity costs (5.11%) is due to the increased unit prices following the tender exercise in 2018. The increased prices were only in force for the half of the 18/19 service charge year but were in force for the whole of 19/20.
6. The increase in the lift maintenance charge (19.63%) is mainly due the increased costs in following the retender of the lift contract.

7. The decrease in resident engineers' costs (12.09%) is mainly because the more time was spent on projects and non-service charge work. Also, in 18/19 training and relocation costs amounted to some £9.7k
8. The furniture and fittings charge is mainly for replacement carpets in the tower and corridor blocks. These replacements are carried out in consultation with the housegroups and usually vary considerably from year to year.
9. Most of the expenditure on cleaning materials (20.67% increase) is for refuse sacks is due to a bulk order near the end of the year for £9k. Expenditure on equipment decreased (71.65%) in comparison with the previous two years. No appliances were replaced during the year.
10. The increase in expenditure on cleaning staff reflects pay increases, changes to salary scales and cover for sickness. The lowest scale point has been removed. The pay increase (2.45% basic and 5% London weighting) salary scale changes and holiday pay resulted in an overall 3.3% increase in salary costs after recharges to other divisions. The supervision and management costs increased significantly this year.
11. The garden maintenance costs were higher due to works in the wildlife garden to construct steps and new hedging (£6,314) and planting (£4,541) in the Thomas More garden.
12. Although there was a pay increase for car park attendants the overall increase over 2018/19 was less than 0.5% this was mainly due to lower agency and overtime costs, due to lower sickness levels.
13. There was a slight decrease in Lobby porters' costs which again reflects lower levels of sickness.
14. The overall decrease in garchey costs is mainly due to a decrease in repairs expenditure. In 18/19 there was significant expenditure on parts to maintain the system.
15. Most of the general maintenance expenditure is demand led and can vary considerably from year to year. The cost of estate wide repairs increased by 54.46%. However, expenditure in 18/19 was low in comparison to 17/18. The expenditure included repairs and refurbishment to the waterfall and the installation of a new main fused isolator lake pump room. £13,742 was spent on the installation of parcel stores for residents' deliveries.
16. The increase in expenditure on electrical is mainly due to expenditure on emergency lighting and new battery packs in the terrace blocks (£37,547). Expenditure on ventilation increased by £16,577 and included the repairs and refurbishment of fans in various blocks and heating repairs increased by £4,027.

17. Expenditure on interior common parts repairs was slightly higher than 18/19. The main areas of expenditure was plumbing (£72,527), this was largely due to repairs to booster pumps and pressure vessels (£20,303). Exterior repairs increased by 8.11%, this was largely due to repairs to remedy water penetration, particularly in Shakespeare Tower, Andrewes House, Ben Jonson House, Breton House, Bryer Court and John Trundle Court. Expenditure on Safety and Security was significantly lower. The only expenditure under this heading for the year was for the eyebolt testing.
18. Overall expenditure for the above repairs headings has increased by 20.76%.
19. The allocation of House Officer, Supervision and Management recharge and Technical recharge are mainly based on timesheet information and reflect the time being spent on service charge issues. This year more of the House Officers' time has been allocated to estate management duties which is included in the Supervision and Management Charge. The overall cost for Supervision and Management and House Officer duties increased by 3.38%.
20. The contract for electricity and gas supplies for heating was tendered in 17/18 and these rates were in force for the full year in 19/20. The electricity consumption was slightly higher than in 18/19.

Comparison Corporate Account and Final Service Charge Schedule- ANNEX 2 .

21. Due to adjustments made by the BEO is £157,187 lower than the expenditure in the City's accounts.
22. The main adjustments are for supplementary revenue projects and heating. The adjustments for the redecoration and concrete projects are for works chargeable to the Landlord and Car Park accounts. The adjustment for the water tanks project is for an incorrect accrual. The heating adjustment is the reversal of last year's adjustment and an adjustment for charges to non-service charge properties.

The Corporate Outturn Report ANNEX 3

23. The service charge schedules reflect the services provided and the Lease. The headings are different to the corporate report. For example, the employees are included under the cleaning, lobby porters, car park attendants and garchey headings on the service charge schedules along with the relevant associated costs such as uniforms, materials and repairs. Annex 3 shows the allocation of expenditure in the service charge headings.

Comparisons to previous years' Service Charge ANNEX 4

24. This shows the service charges by service head for the years 2013/14 – 2018/19.

Conclusion

25. Overall the estate service charge for the annually recurring items has increased by 5.31%. The increase excluding heating is 6.48%.
26. The Actual Service Charge schedules and an explanatory letter of the various items included on the schedule will be sent to residents by early September.

Appendices

Annex 1-4

Background Papers

Anne Mason

Revenues Manager

T: 020 7029 3912

E: anne.mason@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank


CROSS	ITEM	MAIN BASIS OF	ACTUAL	ACTUAL	Variance	ESTIMATE	ESTIMATE
REF. KEY		ATTRIBUTION (A)	2018/19	2019/20	(Increase) reduction %	2019/20	2020/21
1	Electricity (Common Parts and Lifts)	Actual	(468,252)	(492,180)	(5.11%)	(489,783)	(516,441)
2	Lift Maintenance	Actual	(326,164)	(390,176)	(19.63%)	(358,047)	(360,649)
3	Resident Housekeepers (Additional Pension)	E. wide lease %	(276)	(283)	(2.41%)	0	0
4	Resident Engineers	E. wide lease %	(431,853)	(379,651)	12.09%	(397,633)	(413,383)
5	Furniture & Fittings	Actual	(10,986)	(24,933)	(126.95%)	(42,000)	(26,000)
6	Window Cleaning	Contract base	(147,825)	(159,321)	(7.78%)	(154,126)	(148,785)
7	Cleaning Materials including refuse sacks	No. cleaners	(22,538)	(27,196)	(20.67%)	(32,000)	(32,000)
8	Cleaning Equipment	No. cleaners	(17,308)	(4,906)	71.65%	(4,000)	(4,000)
9	Estate Cleaners	No. cleaners	(1,078,257)	(1,207,899)	(12.02%)	(1,125,404)	(1,161,214)
10	Additional Refuse Collection	No. cleaners	(14,668)	(13,992)	4.61%	(10,052)	(8,246)
11	Garden Maintenance	E. wide lease %	(118,670)	(139,377)	(17.45%)	(130,000)	(130,000)
12	Car Park Attendants	Terrace lease %	(647,389)	(650,067)	(0.41%)	(632,264)	(658,791)
13	Hall Porters	owers one third each plus individual costs	(697,477)	(696,088)	0.00	(699,000)	(752,000)
14	Garchey Maintenance	E. wide lease %	(275,603)	(243,503)	11.65%	(256,000)	(268,000)
15	Pest Control	E. wide lease % + individual block costs	(14,071)	(16,562)	(17.71%)	(23,000)	(23,000)
16	General Maintenance (Estate)	E. wide lease % and no of repairs orders	(92,270)	(142,522)	(54.46%)	(1,265,007)	(1,438,401)
17	Electrical Repairs (Common Parts)	Actual	(118,363)	(176,557)	(49.17%)	included in above	included in ab
18	Electrical Repairs (Exterior)	Actual	(10,572)	(270)	97.45%	included in above	included in ab
19	General Repairs (Common Parts)	Actual	(134,267)	(135,641)	(1.02%)	included in above	included in ab
20	General Repairs (Exterior)	Actual	(884,853)	(1,078,982)	(21.94%)	included in above	included in ab
22	House Officer	E. wide lease %	(141,785)	(132,776)	6.35%	(192,900.00)	(140,000)
	Sub Total - Basis for apportionment of estate wide Supervision and Management Costs		(5,653,448)	(6,112,881)	(8.13%)	(5,811,217)	(6,080,910)
21	S&M technical	No of repairs orders	(279,590)	(238,918)	14.55%	(204,750)	(228,918)
23	Estate-Wide Supervision & Management costs	Ratio	(626,002)	(660,991)	(5.59%)	(578,725)	(694,000)
24	Directly attributed Supervision & Management costs	Actual time	0	0		inc above	inc above
25	Redecorations	Actual	(249,233)	(103,225)		0	0
25	Redecorations Programme 2020-2025	Actual	(7,620)	(16,356)		(103,478)	0
26	Safety/Security (included in general repairs on schedule)	Actual/E. wide lease %	(48,174)	(22,516)	-53.26%	inc in repairs	inc in repairs
27	Water Supply Works	Actual/E. wide lease %	(86,526)	(107,186)	(23.88%)	inc in repairs	inc in repairs
28	Concrete works	Actual	(237,538)	(77,250)		(57,845)	0
29	Emergency Lighting	Actual	(6,784)	0		(30,000)	(3,000)
30	Asbestos management / removal	Actual	(101,143)	(93,127)		0	0
	Electrical testing		0	0		0	0
31	Roof repairs	Actual	(70,000)	(211,082)		(176,960)	0
32	Asset management/Stock Condition Survey	Actual/E. wide lease %	(4,072)	(78,983)		(125,000)	(75,000)
35	Water Tank Repairs/Replacement	Actual	(6,098)	(428,912)		(846,568)	(112,406)
	Total Services		(1,722,781)	(2,038,546)		(2,123,326)	(1,113,324)
33	Heating - Electricity	Actual	(1,944,963)	(1,972,550)	1.42%	(1,900,060)	(2,013,099)
33	Heating - Gas	Actual	(15,503)	(15,194)	(1.99%)		
	Total Services & Heating		(9,336,695)	(10,139,171)	8.59%	(9,834,603)	(9,207,333)

<u>Narration</u>	<u>Cross- Reference key</u>	<u>CBIS Actual</u>	<u>BEO Adjustment</u>	<u>Service Charge Schedule</u>
		£	£	£
Electricity (Common Parts and Lifts)	1	(492,180.48)	0.00	(492,180.48)
Lift Maintenance	2	(387,376.33)	(2,800.08)	(390,176.41)
Resident Housekeepers (Additional Pensio	3	(283.07)	0.00	(283.07)
Resident Engineers	4	(379,650.81)	0.00	(379,650.81)
Furniture & Fittings	5	(24,933.32)	0.00	(24,933.32)
Window Cleaning	6	(159,321.24)	0.00	(159,321.24)
Cleaning Materials including refuse sacks	7	(27,195.52)	0.00	(27,195.52)
Cleaning Equipment	8	(4,906.21)	0.00	(4,906.21)
Estate Cleaners	9	(1,207,898.52)	0.00	(1,207,898.52)
Additional Refuse Collection	10	(13,992.06)	0.00	(13,992.06)
Garden Maintenance	11	(139,376.81)	0.00	(139,376.81)
Car Park Attendants	12	(649,469.57)	(597.15)	(650,066.72)
Hall Porters	13	(696,087.57)	0.00	(696,087.57)
Garchey Maintenance	14	(243,503.22)	0.00	(243,503.22)
Pest Control	15	(16,562.13)	0.00	(16,562.13)
General Maintenance (Estate)	16	(143,774.63)	1,252.91	(142,521.72)
Electrical Repairs (Common Parts)	17	(177,163.98)	607.20	(176,556.78)
Electrical Repairs (Exterior)	18	(270.00)	0.00	(270.00)
General Repairs (Common Parts)	19	(141,565.22)	5,924.39	(135,640.83)
General Repairs (Exterior)	20	(1,078,231.66)	(750.39)	(1,078,982.05)
Technical Services	21	(238,918.34)	0.00	(238,918.34)
House Officer	22	(132,775.88)	0.00	(132,775.88)
Estate-Wide proportion of Supervision & M	23	(660,990.71)	0.00	(660,990.71)
Directly attributed Supervision & Manager	24	0.00	0.00	0.00
Redecorations	25	(118,905.73)	15,680.30	(103,225.43)
Redecorations Programme 2020-2025	25	(16,355.65)	0.00	(16,355.65)
Safety/Security	26	(22,515.99)	0.00	(22,515.99)
Water Supply Works	27	(107,185.53)	0.00	(107,185.53)
Concrete Works	28	(120,212.30)	42,962.11	(77,250.19)
Emergency Lighting	29	0.00	0.00	0.00
Asbestos Management	30	(93,676.52)	550.00	(93,126.52)
Roof Repairs	31	(211,082.00)	0.00	(211,082.00)
Asset Management/Stock Condition Surve	32	(78,983.45)	0.00	(78,983.45)
Water Tank Repairs/Replacement	34	(450,888.33)	21,976.64	(428,911.69)
Heating	33	(2,059,076.46)	71,331.89	(1,987,744.57)
Insurance	N/C	(1,049.01)	1,049.01	0.00
TOTAL		(10,296,358.26)	157,186.83	(10,139,171.42)

Actual 2018-19 £'000	TABLE 3 - Service Charge Account	Original Budget £'000	Latest Approved Budget £'000	Actual 2019-20 £'000	Variations £'000
	Expenditure				
(2,487)	Direct Employee Expenses	(2,579)	(2,670)	(2,586)	84
(12)	Indirect Employee Expenses	(8)	(6)	(4)	2
(2,499)	Total Employees	(2,587)	(2,676)	(2,590)	86
(2,532)	Repairs and Maintenance	(1,856)	(2,054)	(2,468)	(414)
0	SRP projects	0	(706)	(705)	1
(2,374)	Energy Costs	(2,458)	(2,477)	(2,594)	(117)
(136)	Rents	(141)	(137)	(137)	0
(15)	Rates	(19)	(18)	(14)	4
(1)	Water Services	(3)	(3)	(2)	1
(166)	Cleaning and Domestic Supplies	(238)	(214)	(120)	94
(119)	Grounds Maintenance Costs	(130)	(130)	(139)	(9)
(5,343)	Total Premises Related Expenses	(4,845)	(5,739)	(6,179)	(440)
(33)	Equipment, Furniture and Materials	(73)	(74)	(40)	34
0	Catering	(1)	(1)	0	1
(7)	Clothes, Uniform and Laundry	(12)	(12)	(9)	3
(4)	Printing, Stationery	(7)	(6)	(3)	3
0	Fees and Services	(1)	(1)	(21)	(20)
0	Expenses	0	0	(2)	(2)
(15)	Communications and Computing	(19)	(20)	(13)	7
(59)	TOTAL Supplies and Services	(113)	(114)	(88)	26
(7,901)	TOTAL Expenditure	(7,545)	(8,529)	(8,857)	(328)
9,340	Income	8,912	10,073	10,286	213
1,439	Net Income	1,367	1,544	1,429	(115)
	Recharges				
(1,604)	Expenditure	(1,542)	(1,719)	(1,585)	134
165	Income	175	175	156	(19)
(1,439)	Total Recharges	(1,367)	(1,544)	(1,429)	115
0	Total Service Charge Account	0	0	0	0

This page is intentionally left blank

Service Charge Actuals 2014/15 - 2019/20



■ 2014/15 ■ 2015/16 ■ 2016/17 ■ 2017/18 ■ 2018/19 ■ 2019/20

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s)	Dated:
Residents Consultation Committee – For Information Barbican Residential Committee – For Information	07/09/2020 21/09/2020
Subject: Barbican Estate Office Recovery Planning COVID-19	Public
Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services	For Information
Report author: Michael Bennett Head of Barbican Estates	

Summary

The purpose of this report is to update Members on the progress that has been made by the Barbican Estate Office (BEO) in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020 and the Government, Public Health England (PHE) and Town Clerk’s advice. This report provides an update on the provision of services during the Government lockdown and subsequent recovery planning.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to note, consider and comment on the report.

Main Report

Background

1. In March 2020 the Prime Minister gave the British people a very simple instruction – “you must stay at home”. He confirmed “that the critical thing we must do was to stop the disease spreading between households and that is why people will only be allowed to leave their home for the following very limited purposes:
 - shopping for basic necessities, as infrequently as possible
 - one form of exercise a day - for example a run, walk, or cycle - alone or with members of your household;
 - any medical need, to provide care or to help a vulnerable person; and
 - travelling to and from work, but only where this is absolutely necessary and cannot be done from home”.

2. Following lockdown in March Officers reviewed staff travel and welfare arrangements and the City of London Corporation organised “Key Worker

Status” letters to allow staff to travel to work in order that they could carry out their key worker duties. The ensuing advice from PHE and the Town Clerk was that those staff that could Work From Home should do so. In May the government updated their guidelines on a general return to work specifically for contractors.

3. At the time of writing this report the advice is still that those who can work from home should continue to do so which includes the BEO teams. There were a number of actions and changes to our services during lockdown and as apt of our subsequent recovery planning which are outlined below for each of our Service Level Agreements with residents:

Customer Care, Supervision & Management Phase 1 (Lockdown)

4. One Senior Manager from the BEO team and four Cleaning Supervisors (who assisted in other Estate Services duties) on site each day. This remains ongoing.
5. BEO Reception open between 11am – 2pm Monday to Friday (with one team member additionally carrying out Estate Concierge/Car Park Attendant duties from time to time). This remains the current position.
6. Shielded team members (as highlighted in paragraph 18 below) contacted vulnerable and elderly residents on the Estate on a weekly basis to check on their Health and Well Being and to ascertain any specific needs and or requirements.
7. Officers worked and assisted with the setting up of the resident volunteering groups which were established for each residential block on the Estate by resident volunteers.
8. The Communications Officer initially produced two to three bulletins per week to update residents on changes to our services. Our Communications Officer quickly became one of the main contacts for residents.
9. The BEO requested that Leaseholder Alterations be paused for non-essential works (this request was reviewed on a case by case basis for kitchen and bathroom works). Unfortunately a considerable amount of time was spent on this by officers as a number of leaseholders continued with their works despite Officers best efforts to intervene.
10. Weekly virtual meetings commenced in March between the Chairs of the Residents Consultation Committee (RCC), Barbican Association (BA), a representative from the resident volunteering groups and the Head Of Barbican Estate. These meetings provided an update on all communications

and services and an opportunity for issues to be raised and reviewed by Officers.

Phase 2 (returning to normal)

11. Following changes to government advice on contractors returning to work in May an update was provided to leaseholders and residents that Leaseholder Alterations practices would be returning to normal with noisy works protocols. Officers worked with the chairs of the BA and RCC with regards to best practices whilst working on the Barbican Estate and a letter was distributed to the main private contractors regarding protocols from the BA.
12. Our Communications bulletin prioritised key messages to residents to help services return to normal.
13. The House Officer team commenced conducting their block inspections in June with all the blocks being completed and of a “good plus” standard for cleaning. This monitoring/inspection role continued on site in July and August with the help of the Commercial House Officer.
14. The London Fire Brigade carried out ad hoc Fire Safety audits in a number of residential blocks including Speed, Thomas More and Defoe House as well as Cromwell Tower with only minor issues reported.
15. Recruitment to the vacant House Officer post was completed in March 2020 before lockdown. Unfortunately the start date has been delayed to September 2020.
16. Virtual meetings for decision making committees, that is the Barbican Residential Committee were carried out in June which was for decision only and applicable information only reports.
17. As many of the Working Parties as is practically possible will look to resume this Autumn via virtual meetings.

Estate Management Cleaning

Phase 1 (Lockdown)

18. In March staffing levels at 50% (to reduce and help with staff travel and welfare arrangements with three staff members shielding due to underlying health conditions, an average of 4-6 staff sickness absences per week, one team member abroad and two staff transferring to Concierge/Car Park Attendants duties).

19. Daily rubbish collections were reduced to 3 days per week from the normal 5 day service and there was a 50% increase in volume due to the substantial increase of online shopping and the effects of more residents working from home.
20. Touch point cleaning became the priority and the focus was in the residential blocks. There was a pause on car park, podium and weekend cleaning. The “pink card” delivery system for notification to residents of a parcel delivery at the Concierge/Car Park Attendants Office/Lobbies was put on hold.
21. The window cleaning service was put on hold. During the good weather it soon became apparent that as so many residents were making use of the balconies and keeping their balcony doors open social distancing for the contractors became impossible.

Phase 2 (returning to normal)

22. Staffing increased to 100% by May (less staffing arrangements as at phase 1). Staggered hours were introduced to meet staff travel and welfare arrangements which included localised Welfare Facilities that had been set up for all Estate Cleaners.
23. The rubbish collection service was maintained at 3 days per week. There was still a 50% increase in volume and this was exacerbated by the time spent by Estate Cleaners in the breakdown of residents’ cardboard boxes from parcel deliveries.
24. Touch point cleaning remained and the normal residential communal block and podium cleaning were re-introduced. Car Park and weekend cleaning and the “pink card” delivery system remained on hold.
25. In June partial car park cleaning resumed.

Phase 3 (Normal)

26. In June the window cleaning service returned to normal.
27. In July the rubbish collection service returned to normal. A feasibility study was carried out and the time spent on the 3 day service was almost 50% greater than the 5 day service due to time spent travelling back and forth with fully loaded rubbish trolleys. Initial feedback sought from resident representatives (see appendix 1) where rubbish collections are mentioned, was that there was a preference for a five days a week service.
28. All areas of cleaning returned to normal with the exception of weekend rubbish collections for those residential blocks that have opted for this service.

29. In August shielded staff members were returning to work on a phased basis.

30. The “pink card” delivery system is not expected to be re-introduced at this stage. Officers have been conducting a number of reviews of the system which have so far highlighted the following:

- During and following lockdown there have been an average of 1,000 parcels a day delivered to the 10 Car Park Offices/Tower Lobbies
- Many parcel deliveries trigger a notification to residents
- Concierge/Car Park Attendants have been hand delivering parcels especially to vulnerable/elderly residents
- Concierge/Car Park Attendants carry out a telephone back up notification to residents
- Since lockdown there have been two parcels that have either been not accounted for and or were perishable items

31. Officers are also reviewing time spent on the “pink card” delivery system and other duties and the potential for a reduction in the number of Estate Cleaners (there are a number of unfilled permanent vacancies which have been carried out by temporary staff members) .

Concierge/Car Park Attendants

Phase 1 (Lockdown)

32. In March staffing levels were at 60% of 40 team members (9 staff members shielding and an average of 5 to 6 sickness absences per week).

33. Some car parks were closed for either 12 or 24 hours with updates in the residents bulletin and appropriate signage to stakeholders of the nearest services.

Phase 2 (returning to normal)

34. In April staffing levels increased to 90% with temporary agency staff members (less staffing arrangements as at phase 1). A reviewed of the agency person specification to customer service/reception duties for Concierge roles helped to increase recruitment.

35. In May staffing levels increased to 95/100%. Officers conducted a review of storage facilities for residents’ parcels with new facilities introduced.

Phase 3 (Normal)

36. In June staffing levels increased to almost 100% (with ongoing staffing arrangements as at Phase 2).

37. In August shielded staff members were returning to work on a phased basis. However, due to current annual leave and sickness levels there have been occasions when Car Park Offices have been closed.

Property Maintenance

Phase 1 (Lockdown)

38. The Repairs Contact Centre was set up to Work From Home prior to lockdown.

39. Priority 0/1/2 works inside properties was carried out in conjunction with triage telephone calls by the Repairs Contact Centre. Non-urgent works inside properties were not carried out. Communal repairs were carried out as normal. The On-site Duty Managers/Resident Engineers service was provided as normal.

40. Non-essential services were put on hold until it was safe to do so.

Phase 2 (returning to normal)

41. A review of non-urgent repairs took place in June as lockdown measures eased.

42. Non-essential services were reviewed with Covid-19 compliant risk assessments produced and agreed.

Phase 3 (Normal)

43. Non-urgent repairs commenced in July bringing the repairs service back to normal. A backlog due to the volume and the availability of parts from manufacturers closed during the initial phases of lockdown will mean it will be 2-3 months before the backlog is cleared.

44. Water testing, asbestos surveys, risk assessments have now all returned to a normal service

45. Whilst the service we deliver has returned to near normal, the way in which this service is delivered was different during the main part of lockdown. We are currently reviewing and determining what the new normal looks like.

Major Works

Phase 1 (Lockdown)

46. Disruptive projects and works that required access to flats was put on hold. Communal and Car Park works continued as normal.

Phase 3 (Normal)

47. In July Major Works and programmes returned to normal including, stock condition surveys and the teams are looking to start disruptive work in September (to coincide with children returning to school) which will include the water tank work that will require an interruption to the water supply to flats with new safe working practices in place.

Open Spaces

Phase 1 (Lockdown)

48. In March reduced staffing to two team members of gardening team due to shielding/sickness absences. City Gardens teams working flexibly across the City.

49. In April following Government/PHE guidance there were issues of residents' inappropriate use of the private gardens on the Estate. The City of London Police and senior Officers agreed a protocol for use of the private gardens with appropriate signage (including social distancing, groups, sunbathing, use of play equipment) and updates were provided in the residents' bulletins.

Phase 2 (returning to normal)

50. In May one member of the gardening team was shielding. The Open Spaces Department reviewed staff travel and welfare arrangements ahead of getting back to normal.

Phase 3 (Normal)

51. In May the above measures in paragraph 49 were relaxed following Government and PHE advice (signage was removed and the residents bulletin was updated). The play equipment was opened up in July with appropriate signage and cleaning schedules introduced.

52. In June the gardening team returned to normal (less one part-time member of the team).

RCC Member comments

53. Officers asked via the virtual meetings with the RCC/BA Chairs (highlighted in paragraph 10) for comments on our services during and since lockdown which can be found in Appendix 1. A review of these comments and others from the September Committees will be considered by Officers with appropriate updates to future reports.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – RCC Member comments July 2020

Michael Bennett

Head of Barbican Estates

Department of Community and Children's Services

T: 020 70293923 and E: michael.bennett@cityoflondon.gov.uk

APPENDIX 1

Barbican Estate Office Recovery planning COVID-19 – Comments from RCC representatives July 2020

1. One topic which has come up is parcel delivery. In the Towers it normally works like this: delivery-man arrives and porter calls up to say to expect a delivery. Doorbell rings and we accept the delivery. If the porter knows that we are not in then the package is kept at reception. This still happens with our regular porters but with some relief personnel, they do nothing and the first we know is when we open the door to the flat (often to put out the rubbish last thing at night) and find a package. This is a lapse in security as the next delivery-man they allow in could easily take what he sees lying outside the door. I can't think of any valid reason for this other than laziness or they haven't been told what to do.

Please note - this chimes with the agency CPA at Andrewes saying that 'Security' should be involved when we have no 'Security' personnel. A training matter.

2. Lambert Jones Mews.

Blocked roof drains remains an unresolved issue: no action taken over the lockdown period and I understand (informal oral communication from Senior Resident Engineer) that the tender for clearing the drains has not yet been published (though we have been debited for the estimated cost in our most recent quarterly service charge).

Otherwise I think the BEO has been reasonably constructive: a problem with failed mastic sealing on the external staircase has been addressed (this is a qualified positive: according to Senior Resident Engineer, all the external staircases will have pointing raked out and replaced; broken tiles replaced etc - this will almost certainly mean removing and replacing the mastic. The contractor has been asked for a price.

The pointing on the east facing (garden) wall of the block has failed in places leading to water penetration to the interiors – this has been inspected by the Senior Resident Engineer; he says scaffolding will be required for a proper inspection and for rectification. This is to happen in the indefinite future.

Otherwise, I have heard no complaints from neighbours and I think the BEO has done well to continue to provide rubbish collection, concierge service and a reasonable level of cleaning.

3. I left a message because there was a rough sleeper on the Podium outside the Wallside houses on Monday. Nobody has got back to me. Surely they should have had a way of picking up urgent calls, Covid or not .

The Andrewes CPA was helpful and said they had a rough sleeper number and the sleeper vanished.

4. The major problem at Willoughby House was the failure of the House Officer/Estate Office to silence the exceptionally noisy and dirty work that was

unaccountably taking place during the early phase of the lockdown in a flat on the 5th floor. Residents in the neighbouring flats beside, below and above were greatly distressed since they were either trying to work from home or simply living in lockdown.

There was an additional fear that there might be an infection risk from these workmen.

It was felt that the workmen were taking no notice of the restrictions - and the flat was empty not urgently waiting for the owners to return etc, as we were told.

5. I think concierges were excellent and cleaning was very good in the circumstances. Not at all clear what anyone else was doing.

6. Noise and disturbance during lockdown has been highlighted in the BEO Bulletin. For example, people in tower flats exercising by walking around the fire-escapes past others' flats! This is a great invasion of privacy and also gives folk a start. BEO flagged up that this should not be done. Good!

But!...Even if people stick to their own balcony they can still be disturbing because invariably quite a few of the slabs are loose and clunk loudly. If a person is on their balcony you hear it and if it's a couple of clunks then you ignore it. But if the clunks are every few seconds and go on for 10 or 15 minutes as the person exercises back and forwards along their balcony it drives you up the wall! However, this is something that the BEO can do something about - it is high time that they got contractors to fix slabs so they don't clunk.

We will very likely go into another lockdown and people will continue to exercise on their balcony. Having now found they can do it, they may continue to do so anyway, lockdown or not - better a balcony than a stinky CoL street?

7. As you will see there are a wide range of topics covered, but I note that where rubbish collections are mentioned, there is a preference for five days a week.

8. Reception opening hours

During our last meeting you asked about reception opening hours at the BEO and I confirmed that I have not had any feedback on that. On reflection, however, it occurs to me that many (the majority?) of the people visiting reception are tradespeople, carers and other third parties rather than residents. So that may explain the lack of feedback.

9. Breton House

BEO have done a very good job in continuing to provide all essential services and should be congratulated for doing so. Obviously the need for reduced staffing has made things difficult for all staff, whether working on the Estate or from home.

However, those staff members who have had to work on the Estate have had the added risks of having to travel as well.

Our CPAs became even more essential - and overworked - and have done a fantastic job, especially at the outset when numbers were reduced and deliveries increased. Hopefully the changed arrangements for food deliveries took some of the pressure off the CPAs.

Our real area of concern is around the lifts and common parts where the supplied PPE wasn't worn all the time. I appreciate it must be difficult doing physical work wearing masks, which meant that the cleaners in particular had a tough time. This made the two-way risk of infection worse, especially as several residents appear to have had the virus and could well have used the common parts and lifts, without PPE, whilst being infectious.

I know more residents have taken to using stairs rather than lifts and a lot more have been taking their rubbish to the bin areas. As a result, three collections a week should be feasible, giving cleaners more time for cleaning. However, there are drawbacks, as can be seen from the attached photo of what looks like a car boot sale in the Breton bin area this morning.

Also, as you will be aware, a whole consignment of recycling couldn't be recycled because someone had dumped a paint can in a recycling bin. Perhaps not a problem had the tin been empty! However, the fact that there were no restrictions on people coming into the Estate after the construction industry guidelines were relaxed not only caused more health and safety risks but meant a lot more "rubbish" was dumped in the bin areas. More people also led to more dirt and dust in the common parts and lifts, so more work for the cleaners at the wrong time.

Finally, I think we should also acknowledge City Corporation's role in all of this. Not only has it protected its staff but it immediately recognised the potential reduced ability of both residents and tenants to meet rent, service charge and council tax/rates liabilities as a result of the virus.

Additional comment from Breton House:

"It has been a difficult period for all concerned. The cleaners have done their best as staffing levels have been reduced during the lockdown. But on occasions it has been necessary for me to sweep the bin area because it got so dirty. I am not sure why, but other blocks use the Breton House/Ben Johnson waste disposal area e.g. those who live in Frobisher and Defoe House.

Fairly large items have been dumped in this area including fridges, microwaves, large tyres and furniture. There were a few occasions when the entrance door leading to the lower ground 2 lift was half blocked so it was necessary for me to move the offending, and heavy, item from the doorway. The fire riser inlet is always blocked."

10. Gilbert House:

They clearly were under enormous pressure during this time and were very obviously struggling with reduced staffing levels both within the office and across the estate be it CPAs or cleaners. So it is easy to identify a feeling of being abandoned during a very difficult time but I am sympathetic to their challenges.

So far as I know the City did not furlough staff so I wonder if redeployment could have been considered to provide the right levels of support and cover during a very difficult time.

Standards have clearly fallen and I hope this is acknowledged and there is a plan to reset the dial.

The CPAs were great but clearly under pressure with the right levels of staffing.

Overall the communications to residents were weak at the outset of lockdown. They got a bit better but something more proactive perhaps with the BA or house group chairs may have been beneficial.

11. One immediate thought is that the weekly email from the BEO has had nothing for some time now about the cleaning routines that were, and presumably still are, in place having been instigated by the arrival of the coronavirus. It would be helpful to be kept up-to-date on this.

12. Gratitude to our CPAs particularly. At the outset, especially when not enough was understood about Covid-19, they remained present and helpful. They will also have dealt with a phenomenal volume of deliveries.

Echo comments about the paucity of information. I would have liked to have received precise information about the cleaning and infection mitigation protocols (this is true on an everyday basis by the way, not only during lockdown).

They may have been using this already, but if they have not, would the Estate Office use longer-lasting disinfectant on all 'touch' surfaces - all stair handrails, doors/door handles, lift buttons and lift-rail. There are plenty of products out there - some lasting up to 30 days or more, and a number simply applied by misting. If the BEO is already using this, then I would point to the comment above.

13. A good point about the sterling efforts of the CPAs who certainly deserve acknowledgement in any feedback.

Talking to one of them the other day they recognise that lockdown will have resulted in a 'permanent' step-change in the volume of ongoing internet shopping and the BEO might need to consider this in planning staffing and cover. This might also be impacted by any changes made to delivery processes and timing introduced by the City Corporation to manage traffic levels better (although so far not much of a problem!).

The general preference within the (Gilbert) House Group is for daily collections Monday-Friday, as before lockdown. The reasoning is that savings would be minuscule, and that it is very helpful indeed to have someone walking through the hall building every day.

It's a form of daily check which is useful because not only is Gilbert House a corridor block, it is a block that is used as a shortcut by non-Gilbert residents.

Also, as discussed previously, in the absence of granular accounts, any saving will quickly 'disappear' - it won't be ring-fenced.

We can certainly do a residents' survey later on if the idea gains more traction, and if we can demonstrate clear advantages such as tangible cost savings. I can put that again to the House Group in due course.

14. Seddon House: Feedback from one resident follows.

I entirely understand why the cleaning teams, inspections, the regular care that takes place on our state is not happening at the moment. But it is clear that this is causing a range of issues. For example, in the many years I've lived here, I have never seen so much litter and detritus across the estate. It is also clear at the moment that there are people urinating everywhere, There are endless people on bikes, and an increasing number of people, mostly delivery people, on motorbikes riding across the estate. There are groups endlessly tramping through all of the planting, and it feels like a place increasingly out of control.

I wonder what steps the Barbican estate office in the city will take to re-establish a sense of calm and order that so many of us appreciate but the Barbican. I do not think it will be enough simply to reinstate the service levels. I suspect something additional will be required. For example, is it possible to introduce some form of light touch but fairly clear patrolling. This will begin to eradicate some of the behaviours that have grown up over the last few months. And hopefully restore the estate to its previous condition. If all of that can take place sooner rather than later it will save the city money in terms of preventing escalation in some of the issues that are already becoming increasingly prevalent.

Having worked for various London boroughs for very many years now, I know how easy it is to lose control of an environment. And how extraordinarily it is to pull it all back. I'm not for one second suggesting that the Barbican looks like some of the estates for which I have been responsible in some of the London boroughs. But I do see a serious deterioration in standards and general behaviour.

I would very much welcome your thoughts and any ideas you may have. And just to say again, I entirely understand why full-service is not in place at the moment. And also understand the pressures that the BEO face. I remain resolutely supportive of their work. So this is sent in a spirit of positivity rather than a complaint.

15. Shakespeare Tower:

At Shakespeare Tower's HG zoom meeting on Wednesday we discussed the 3 times per week rubbish collection idea and on balance the view was "keep it as it was" at 5 days per week for us, when normal working is resumed.

The members thought that the collection had been good during the lock-down but noted that the number of residents had been less and consequently that performance was not necessarily indicative of a normal in-residence level.

16. John Trundle Court:

First the positives:

- A resident was very grateful to their House Officer for help and commitment in response to questions.
- I am also grateful to the Officer for keeping an eye on the more elderly residents and for keeping me informed. Also the CPI's - when there was reason for concern.
- The 3 day rubbish collections appear to have worked.
- A resident reported that the cleaning of lift 58 was good.

The Negatives:

- Lack of cleaning on stair 56 - litter left on the stairs.
- Lift 55 was not cleaned to it's usual standard and the protection padding left until I reported that it was swinging on one hook and presented a H&S problem
- The cleaning is now up to its usual standard.
- Builders in a flat, finishing tiling early on in Lockdown, hadn't informed the residents: The drilling caused distress as some people were working from home: One university student, that day, was taking one of her final papers. The problem was solved by the student's parent locating the flat owner - who fortunately lives in the block.

Outside of housekeeping:

- I have been asked to point up the concern over the uncertainty regarding the increases in service charges - namely re decoration. This following increased car park and storage charges'
- These increases come just at a time when there is so much uncertainty in the country; when even the Government is asking landlords to hold back on rent demands.
- During this Lockdown period we have had more people enjoying the space - which is Beech Gardens:
- Some concern about skateboarding and cycles (although I noticed mostly young children).
- One resident wonders why there is no longer a visible police presence.

- I have noticed that we no longer have a 'no cycling / skateboarding' notice anywhere on the BG walk.

17. Lauderdale Tower

Lifts

One or two Lauderdale Tower residents have raised the issue of whether there should be guidance for the use of the lifts during the pandemic. I think this is particularly an issue for the tower blocks where the lifts are busy all day not just with residents but with delivery men, contractors and so on, and where the stairs are not an easy alternative.

We have been getting along quite well using common sense and courtesy but delivery men and contractors do not necessarily observe the niceties, nor do they tend to wear masks. Many of our more vulnerable residents moved away during the worst of the crisis but they are now coming back and may be nervous about sharing lifts.

Our house group's view is that we are not virologists and are not qualified to say whether or not there's a risk. So we are neutral on this and regard it as entirely a matter for the City of London or the UK government to issue any rules or guidance. Any residents asking for guidance are being asked to write to the estate office and at the end of this email I'm pasting the comments of one resident who did just that.

I emailed the other two tower blocks and both have been doing the same as us so far – getting along quite well using common sense and courtesy.

In short we are not pressing for guidance since we are not qualified to say whether it is needed, and it must be said that very few people have raised this with us – two or three at most. But we think perhaps the City might look into this and determine whether or not it's necessary, not just for the Barbican Estate but for all its housing estates and indeed its office blocks.

Rubbish collections

I believe there was a suggestion that we might stick with the reduced service. We haven't discussed this yet but my feeling is that this would be very unpopular with residents even if accompanied by a small reduction in the service charge. I don't know how other blocks function but in Lauderdale Tower we have our own dedicated cleaner who normally carries out a rubbish collection each morning and it is not clear what he would do with his time on the mornings when he had no rubbish collection to carry out.

My question would be to turn this around and ask how much longer we have to wait for a resumption of normal service. I find it unpleasant having food waste waiting two days for collection and three days at weekends.

Service charge

This is probably beyond the scope of Monday's discussion but sooner or later the service charge will come up. The question is, who will pay the extra costs arising from the pandemic – the landlord or the leaseholders? For example:

1) The City decided that lobby porters with health conditions should stay at home and that their duties would be covered by agency staff. Assuming that the lobby porters at home remained on full pay, who should pay for the extra cost of taking on agency staff?

2) Many services were cut – for example, cleaning, repairs and estate office opening times. But in some cases staff costs may remain the same whether or not services were provided. Should leaseholders be expected to pay the same cost for a reduced service?

3) Normally, estate office staff spend some of their time working for other departments and on other projects (eg the girls' school expansion or the Beech Street scheme) and this is billed out to those other projects using time sheets. If all this has come to a halt, and no time is being billed out to other departments and projects, leaseholders will face a big increase in costs even though they are not receiving any increase in service. This could explain why the BEO's central costs are budgeted to increase by 20 per cent this year.

Stairwell lock

At a micro level, one thing that went well in Lauderdale Tower was a request that the lock should be changed on the stairwell door at podium level so that residents could use their key to open it and thereby use the stairs instead of the lifts. This was done promptly and has worked very well – people used to leave the door ajar on their way out so they could get back in again on their return, but this no longer happens so there has been an increase in security.

18. Mountjoy House

- The feedback is generally very positive for how the Estate has been managed during the lockdown period.
- The only consistent negative theme was on the issue of parcels/packages. I know our car park attendants have been overwhelmed with parcels for a while now but when the pink slip system was suspended it led to even more confusion over when parcels had been delivered and when. A couple of Mountjoy Committee members are keen to have pink slips reinstated and another two were keen to modernise the process via email/alert system. Either way, the reintroduction of a logging and alert system for parcel/packages would be an improvement as lockdown continues to ease.

<p>Committees: Corporate Projects Board <i>[for information]</i> Projects Sub <i>[for decision]</i></p> <p>Barbican Estate Residents Consultation Committee <i>[for information]</i> Barbican Residential Committee <i>[for decision]</i></p>	<p>Dates: 08 July 2020 15 September 2020 07 September 2020 21 September 2020</p>
<p>Subject: Concrete repairs to the Barbican Estate</p>	<p>Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular</p>
<p>Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services</p> <p>Report Author: David Downing, Asset Programme Manager</p>	<p>For Decision</p>
<p>PUBLIC</p>	

Summary

<p>1. Status update</p>	<p>Project Description: The reinforced concrete elements of the Barbican Estate had been showing signs of deterioration. A project was initiated to first survey and test the structures to identify the causes and extent of the deterioration and then deliver a programme of repairs based on the recommendations from the condition survey. The programme of repairs is now complete.</p> <p>RAG Status: Green (Green at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Risk Status: Low (Low at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: £0</p> <p>Final Outturn Cost: £1,043,894.90</p>
<p>2. Next steps and requested decisions</p>	<p>Requested Decisions: <u>Barbican Estate Residents Consultation Committee</u></p> <p>1. To note the content of this report for information only.</p>

	<p><u>Projects Sub Committee and Barbican Residential Committee</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To note the content of this report, 2. To note the lessons learnt, 3. To authorise closure of this project.
<p>3. Key conclusions</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Works were completed within budget but not to the initial timescales envisaged. Significant delays were experienced during the procurement stage for the repairs contract where only one tender was received at the first engagement with the market. A second procurement was successful but Committee authorisation for an increased project budget was required as previous estimates were exceeded. During the delivery phase, completion of works to the upper levels of the towers was delayed due to access restrictions in place to safeguard nesting protected wildlife; it should be noted that there were no cost implications for this particular delay. 2. Following completion of the identified repairs, the concrete elements of the estate in general are in good condition which is consistent with the age and exposure of the buildings. Our external concrete corrosion specialist has confirmed that the vast majority of the residential blocks do not require further comprehensive testing for a period of twenty years from the date of survey, the car parks - where concrete corrosion was more evident - for a further ten years. 3. The contractor, Structural Renovations Ltd, who delivered both the testing and repair elements of this project performed well throughout and were proactive in working with the City's project management team to keep costs under control, to deliver the works within the agreed budget and to complete the repairs to the high standards required to satisfy heritage constraints. The direct appointment of a concrete repair specialist rather than one mediated via a larger contract management company is recommended for future works of this nature. 4. The initial survey design, testing analysis and repair specification was supplied by industry leading specialist Dr John Broomfield. Dr Broomfield's technical guidance throughout the project was invaluable and critical to the successful outcome.

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

4. Design into delivery	<p>The project design worked well. The comprehensive condition testing of the concrete post Gateway 2 allowed for a detailed repair specification to be drawn up and applied to a measured bill of quantities for the subsequent repair contract post Gateway 5. The survey design, analysis of testing results and repair specification was supplied by industry leading concrete corrosion specialist Dr John Broomfield. Procuring separate testing and repair contracts did increase programme length but follows industry best practice and enabled proposed repairs to be independently verified and allowed for greater control of costs as a single contractor was not identifying their own repairs. As both testing and repair elements were facilitated via predominantly rope access the project design did not burden the projects finances with the costs of repeat scaffolding or estate residents with prolonged inconvenience.</p> <p>The project was combined at earlier Gateways with what at face value seemed similar concrete issues at Golden Lane and Middlesex Street estates. Although brought together to explore potential savings through economies of scale, little benefit was realised from this however as the three sites presented very different design issues which inevitably had to be handled separately from the condition survey tender stage onwards. Combining the design phases did not realise any cost savings and it is highly likely that if each was addressed separately throughout the process the overall programme length would have been shortened as a delay to one site would not necessarily entail a delay to the others.</p>
5. Options appraisal	<p>The selected option to procure a contractor to deliver a programme of repairs via open tender successfully delivered the projects objectives. No changes were required during project delivery.</p>
6. Procurement route	<p>Works were procured via open tender advertised on the capital esourcing portal. During the first issue of the tender only one bid was received which was insufficient to meet Section 20 consultation regulations. The works contract was subsequently retendered and successfully procured via open tender at the second attempt with four compliant bids received.</p> <p>Procurement Reference: Itt_COL_7215</p>

v.April 2019

7. Skills base	The City of London project team had the required skills and experience to manage the delivery of the project. An external concrete corrosion specialist, Dr John Broomfield, was employed to define the testing requirements, analyse testing results, specify the repair methodology for identified repairs and oversee the enactment of those repairs.
8. Stakeholders	Stakeholders were engaged and managed well throughout the delivery of the project. A project specific FAQ document was circulated to Barbican Estate leaseholders in advance of the condition survey to ensure residents were appropriately informed. No negative feedback was received during this process.

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	<p>The project progressed as expected throughout the concrete testing phase culminating in the approval of Gateway 4 in February 2017 although as stated above may have progressed more quickly had the Barbican Estate programme been developed separately than that for the HRA Estates (albeit with continual lesson learnt transfer between the two project teams).</p> <p>Post Gateway 4 the project was subject to a series of delays that affected several key milestones. The initial attempt to procure a repairs contractor was not successful with only one estimate received through the tender process. A repeat procurement, following a market engagement exercise, was however successful as four compliant estimates from contractors were received. These were carefully evaluated on the quality and cost criteria as laid out in the procurement process with Structural Renovations Ltd subsequently identified as the successful contractor. Following the procurement process the total project budget for the Barbican Estate concrete repairs project, encompassing the successful tender for the repairs, the completed concrete testing programme and the associated fees and staff costs for both, exceeded the estimated budget approved at Gateway 4 by £389,775.22. An Issues Report seeking authority to increase the project budget by this sum was approved by Projects Sub Committee and the Barbican Residential Committee (March 2018). The total delay to programme covering the contractor engagement, re-procurement and securing approvals for a budget uplift combined was 9 months.</p>
--	--

	<p>Post Gateway 5 the project proceeded largely as planned, although completion of the works to the Towers was delayed by 3 months due to access restrictions in place during the nesting period for protected wildlife.</p>
<p>10. Assessment of project against Scope</p>	<p>There were no changes to project scope from design to delivery.</p>
<p>11. Risks and issues</p>	<p>The project proceeded as planned with no significant risks realised during the delivery phase. This is largely attributable to the successful application of lessons learnt from previous projects which were incorporated into the project design and specification which greatly aided the management of the resultant repairs contract.</p> <p>Conducting comprehensive surveys in advance of procurement of a main works contractor was highly beneficial in minimising risks for the delivery phase of the project. A defined bill of quantities provided a degree of certainty for both client and contractor and set clear parameters for the execution of the contract.</p> <p>The risk of a failed procurement exercise was realised in an early phase of the project. The initial procurement for a works contractor only attracted one submission; a minimum of two being required for a compliant Section 20 consultation with long leaseholders.</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision was not applicable to this project.</p>
<p>12. Transition to BAU</p>	<p>The repairs have a defect liability period of 12 months commencing from the date of practical completion. There is also an additional a two year warranty covering both materials and workmanship with the contractor. At the close of this period, the ongoing maintenance of these repaired sections of concrete will transfer to the general Repairs & Maintenance contract.</p> <p>Dr Broomfield has advised that the vast majority of the residential blocks do not require further comprehensive testing for a period of 20 years from the date of last survey (2016) whilst the car parks should be considered for reinspection in 10 years from this date. He further advised that there may be ongoing highly localised minor repairs required in sporadic areas of low reinforcement cover that may emerge in the intervening years between testing.</p>

Value Review

13. Budget	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i></td> <td>Estimated cost (excluding risk): £600,000</td> </tr> </table>		<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	Estimated cost (excluding risk): £600,000																		
	<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	Estimated cost (excluding risk): £600,000																				
<p>The Gateway 2 projected cost was estimated in 2014 with no provision for cost inflation. The officers managing the project at this time are no longer with the City and the estimating methodology they used is not known.</p>																						
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i></th> <th><i>Final Outturn Cost</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Fees</i></td> <td>£40,000.00</td> <td>£14,927.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Staff Costs</i></td> <td>£60,000.00</td> <td>£32,325.38</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Testing Contract</i></td> <td>£285,480.22</td> <td>£285,480.22</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Works Contract</i></td> <td>£909,295.00</td> <td>£711,161.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Costed Risk Provision</i></td> <td>£0</td> <td>£0</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Total</i></td> <td>£1,294,775.22</td> <td>£1,043,894.90</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>	<i>Fees</i>	£40,000.00	£14,927.50	<i>Staff Costs</i>	£60,000.00	£32,325.38	<i>Testing Contract</i>	£285,480.22	£285,480.22	<i>Works Contract</i>	£909,295.00	£711,161.80	<i>Costed Risk Provision</i>	£0	£0	<i>Total</i>	£1,294,775.22	£1,043,894.90
	<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>																				
<i>Fees</i>	£40,000.00	£14,927.50																				
<i>Staff Costs</i>	£60,000.00	£32,325.38																				
<i>Testing Contract</i>	£285,480.22	£285,480.22																				
<i>Works Contract</i>	£909,295.00	£711,161.80																				
<i>Costed Risk Provision</i>	£0	£0																				
<i>Total</i>	£1,294,775.22	£1,043,894.90																				
<p>There is a total underspend on the approved Gateway 5 budget of £250,880.32. Of this sum, a figure of £198,133.20 was omitted from the tendered works contract as provisional sums included to cover additional repairs to those identified in the condition survey which had potentially arisen post drafting of the tendered bill of quantities were not required. A smaller sum included to provide provision for out of hours working if required was also omitted from the contract as all works were able to be scheduled during normal working hours. The remainder of the underspend is unused provision for professional fees and staff costs. The contractor, Structural Renovations Ltd, performed well throughout the contract and did not require the degree of management and oversight that a less diligent operator would warrant.</p>																						
<p>Final accounts have been subject to an independent verification check, undertaken by a suitably experienced officer within the relevant implementing department.</p>																						
<p>A final retention payment of £10,667.42 is due to the main works contractor on expiry of the defects liability period. This is sum is included in the table above.</p>																						
14. Investment	N/A																					

<p>15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives</p>	<p>1. The concrete has been tested to the satisfaction of a leading concrete corrosion specialist.</p> <p>2. The condition of the concrete elements of the structures is now known with appropriate future testing requirements identified and to be programmed.</p> <p>3. Repairs to the concrete have been completed, maintaining the buildings and extending their useful life.</p>
<p>16. Key benefits realised</p>	<p>A comprehensive testing programme has been carried out all identified repairs have been completed. The concrete elements of the residential buildings and car parks have been confirmed to be in a good condition for their age and exposure.</p>

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

<p>17. Positive reflections</p>	<p>Works were done to a high standard, satisfying the heritage constraints of the Barbican Estate and were delivered well within the approved Gateway 5 budget.</p> <p>Provisional sums included within the contract for any additional repairs not identified during the testing contract were not required. This speaks well to the thoroughness and accuracy of the testing contractor and also provides reassurance as to the general condition of the buildings.</p> <p>The contractor, Structural Renovations Ltd, performed well and were proactive in working with the City's project management team to keep costs under control and to deliver the works within the agreed budget. As a specialist SME, the Barbican Estate works were a key contract for this supplier who demonstrated this via their clear commitment and diligence in delivering the works.</p> <p>The consultant employed, Dr John Broomfield, is a world leader in the field of concrete corrosion. Dr Broomfield provided specialist advice throughout the project, drafted the repair specification and provided independent oversight of the repairs. The access to industry leading knowledge and experience throughout the project was a critical factor in its successful delivery.</p> <p>Works to Frobisher Crescent, a mixed use building shared with the Barbican Centre, were successfully coordinated</p>
--	---

	<p>between all relevant stakeholders to ensure any savings from combining works were realised and that any noisy elements of the works were programmed to minimise disruption to all building users as far as possible. Works were intelligently scheduled to avoid clashing with exam times and performances without the need to incur the additional expense of out of hours working.</p>
<p>18.Improvement reflections</p>	<p>Procurement – as stated above, the initial procurement for a concrete repair contractor was not successful as it attracted only one bid which was not sufficient for a compliant Section 20 consultation with long leaseholders. A subsequent market engagement exercise before re-procuring resulted in a satisfactory procurement at the second time of asking. Engaging more with the market at an earlier stage should be considered for future projects where the pool of potential contractors is limited by the specialist nature of the required work.</p> <p>Project Design – also as stated above, little benefit was realised in initial combining the project design phase with the similar works due to take place at the Golden Lane and Middlesex Street Estates. The three locations, although all with significant concrete elements in need of repair, presented very different design issues. Combining the design phases did not realise any cost savings and it is highly likely that if each was addressed separately through out the process the overall programme length would have been shortened.</p> <p>Delivery Programme – completion of the works to the Towers was delayed by access restrictions in place during the nesting period for protected wildlife. Although this delay did not realise any cost implications for the City, smarter programming of this aspect of the works would have led to an earlier conclusion of the project.</p>
<p>19. Sharing best practice</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dissemination of key information through team and project staff briefings. A standard approach to concrete repairs has been adopted by the Major Works team reflecting industry best practice. 2. Lessons learned have been logged and recorded on departmental SharePoint.
<p>20. AOB</p>	<p>N/A</p>

v.April 2019

Contact

Report Author	David Downing
Email Address	david.downing@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 1645

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 15

Committee(s) Residents' Consultation Committee Barbican Residential Committee	Date(s): 07092020 21092020
Subject: Sales and Lettings Update	Public
Report of: Andrew Carter Director of Community and Children's Services	For Information
Report author: Anne Mason	

Summary

This report, which is for information, is to advise members of the sales and lettings that have been approved by officers since your last meeting. Approval is under delegated authority and in accordance with Standing Orders. The report also provides information on surrenders of tenancies received and the number of flat sales to date.

Recommendation:

That the report be noted.

Main Report

BACKGROUND

1. The acceptance of surrenders of tenancies and the sale and letting of flats are dealt with under delegated authority.

SURRENDERS/TERMINATIONS

2.

Case No	Type	Floor	Rent Per Annum	Tenancy commenced/ expired	Reason for Surrender	Date of Surrender
1	21	3	£25,650	13/09/17/ 12/09/20	Take up a new tenancy	28/08/2020

RIGHT TO BUY SALES

3.

	18 August 2020	19 February 2020
Sales Completed	1079	1079
Total Market Value	£94,546,908.01	£94,546,908.01
Total Discount	£29,539,064.26	£29,539,064.26
NET PRICE	£65,007,843.75	£65,007,843.75

OPEN MARKET SALES

4.

	18 August 2020	19 February 2020
Sales Completed	860	860
Market Value	£157,969,271.97	£157,969,271.97

5. Fifteen exchanges of sold flats have taken place with the sum of £720,254 being paid to the City of London.

6. The freeholds of 14 flats in Wallside have been sold with the sum of £35,000 being paid to the City of London.

7. A 999 year lease has been completed with the sum of £43,200 being paid to the City of London.

APPROVED SALES

8.

CASE	Block	Floor	Type	Price	Remarks as at 13/08/2020
1	Speed House	1	20	£800,000	Proceeding (new purchaser)

COMPLETED SALES

9. There has not been any completions since the last report.

APPROVED LETTINGS

10.

CASE	Block	Floor	Type	Annual Rent	Remarks as at 13/08/2020
1	Cromwell Tower	18	1A	£38,300	Completion due 24/08/20 (existing tenant)

SALES PER BLOCK

11.

BLOCK	TOTAL NO. OF FLATS	TOTAL NO. SOLD	NET PRICE £	% NO. OF FLATS SOLD
ANDREWES HOUSE	192	184	16,648,760.00	95.83
BEN JONSON HOUSE	204	196	14,877,454.83	96.08
BRANDON MEWS	26	24	1,057,460.00	92.31
BRETON HOUSE	111	109	8,506,712.50	98.20
BRYER COURT	56	55	2,307,338.50	98.21
BUNYAN COURT	69	67	5,384,280.00	97.10
DEFOE HOUSE	178	173	17,414,782.50	97.19
FROBISHER CRESCENT	69	69		100.00
GILBERT HOUSE	88	87	11,046,452.50	98.86
JOHN TRUNDLE COURT	133	133	5,467,527.50	100.00
LAMBERT JONES MEWS	8	8	1,400,000.00	100.00
MOUNTJOY HOUSE	64	63	5,925,723.50	98.44
THE POSTERN/WALLSIDE	26	22	5,959,130.00	84.62
SEDDON HOUSE	76	75	8,445,677.50	98.68
SPEED HOUSE	114	108	12,468,148.50	94.74
THOMAS MORE HOUSE	166	162	13,668,455.00	97.59
WILLOUGHBY HOUSE	148	146	14,337,670.50	98.65
TERRACE BLOCK TOTAL	1728 (1728)	1681 (1681)	144,915,573.33 (144,915,573.33)	97.28 (97.28)
CROMWELL TOWER	112	103	27,005,801.00	91.96
LAUDERDALE TOWER	117	114	24,553,779.63	97.44
SHAKESPEARE TOWER	116	110	27,300,415.76	94.83
TOWER BLOCK TOTAL	345 (345)	327 (327)	78,859,996.39 (78,859,996.39)	94.78 (94.78)
ESTATE TOTAL	2073 (2073)	2008 (2008)	223,775,569.72 (223,775,569.72)	96.86 (96.86)

Frobisher Crescent and the freehold Wallside properties have now been included in the table.

Anne Mason

Revenues Manager

T: 020 7029 3912

E: anne.mason@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s) Barbican Residential Committee	Date(s): 21092020
Subject: Barbican Arrears	Public
Report of: Andrew Carter Director of Community and Children's Services	For Information
Report author: Anne Mason	

Summary

This report, which is for information is to advise members of the current arrears in respect of tenants and leaseholders on the Barbican Estate.

Recommendation

Members are asked to note the report.

Main Report

Background

1. Leaseholders and tenants are billed quarterly in June, September, December and March. The charges raised include charges for car parking and baggage stores.
2. A further analysis of arrears cases is contained in Appendix 1 (Non-public).

Current Position

3. Leaseholders and freeholders

	No of free/ leaseholders			
Charges raised for period	£11,302,936	2008		
Target level of net arrears	1%			
Actual level of net arrears	1.63%			
<i>Age Analysis of Debt:</i>	June 20	Dec 19		
Value of debts				
3 - 6 months	£127,242.72	136	£ 39,136.64	66
6 – 12 months	£ 17,854.36	25	£ 34,144.87	26
12 - 24 months	£ 11,053.99	9	£ 4,373.73	3
Over 24 months	£ 28,524.41	5	£ 23,809.64	5
Total arrears outstanding	£184,675.48		£ 101,464.88	
<i>Action taken:</i>				
Amounts subject to arrangement	£ 4,386.83	5	£ 5,308.77	2
Amounts referred to Comptroller for recovery action	£ 49,675.07	5	£ 57,259.99	8
Net debt outstanding	£130,613.58		£ 38,896.12	

There is a total of 145 leaseholders in arrears.

Of the amounts owing for over 12 months (£39,578.40) £37,344.23 is included in the amounts referred to C&CS, £1,162.82 is in dispute, £83.71 is subject to arrangements. The remaining £997.64 relates to 5 cases.

The net debt outstanding comprises 135 accounts including 2 cases in dispute.

4. Tenants

Charges raised for period	£1,779,262	No of tenants	65		
Target level of net arrears	1%				
Actual level of net arrears	0.61%				
	June 20		Dec 19		
<i>Age Analysis of Debt:</i>					
Value of debts					
3 - 6 months	£ 17,374.30	6	£ 8,846.56	7	
6 - 12 months	£ 6,489.02	2	£ 9,148.80	2	
12 - 24 months	£ 163.00	1	£ 0.00	0	
debts over 24 months	£ 0.00	0	£ 0.00	0	
Total arrears outstanding	£ 34,038.21		£ 17,995.36		
<i>Action taken:</i>					
Amounts subject to arrangement	£ 1,357.71	2	£ 1,882.30	2	
Amounts referred to Comptroller for recovery action	£ 21,785.44	1	£ 14,410.44	1	
Net debt outstanding	£ 10,895.06		£ 1,702.62		

There is a total of 6 tenants in arrears.

5. Former tenants' arrears

Charges raised for period to	N/A	No of former tenants	1		
Target: as flats are surrendered infrequently the target is that action on arrears must be dealt with within 3 months					
	June 20		Dec 19		
<i>Age Analysis of Debt:</i>					
Value of debts 3 - 6 months	£ 0.00	0	£ 0.00	0	
Value of debts 6 - 12 months	£ 0.00	0	£ 0.00	0	
debts between 12 - 24 months	£ 0.00	0	£ 0.00	0	
debts over 24 months	£12,697.75	1	£12,697.75	1	
Total arrears outstanding	£12,697.75		£12,697.75		

Action taken:

Amounts subject to arrangement	£	0.00	£	0.00
Amounts referred to Comptroller for recovery action/in dispute		£12,697.75		£12,697.75
Awaiting write off	£	0.00	£	0.00
Net debt outstanding	£	0.00	£	0.00

There is 1 case in total.

This case is currently being dealt with by the Comptroller and City Solicitor.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Arrears Update (Non-Public)

Anne Mason

Revenues Manager DCCS

T: 020 7029 3912

E: anne.mason@cityoflondon.gov.uk

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) 2 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