



## **Housing Management and Almshouses Sub (Community and Children's Services) Committee INFORMAL MEETING**

**Date:** MONDAY, 20 SEPTEMBER 2021

**Time:** 11.00 am

**Venue:** MICROSOFT TEAMS

**Members:** John Fletcher (Deputy Chairman) Peter Bennett  
Mary Durcan (Chairman) The Revd Stephen Haines  
Randall Anderson Ruby Sayed  
Marianne Fredericks Caroline Haines, Queenhithe  
Susan Pearson Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark  
William Pimlott

**Enquiries:** Julie Mayer, [julie.mayer@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:julie.mayer@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

### **Accessing the virtual public meeting**

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

<https://youtu.be/3K7t80kZmVY>

This meeting will be a virtual meeting and therefore will not take place in a physical location. Any views reached by the Committee today will have to be considered by the Town Clerk after the meeting in accordance with the Court of Common Council's Covid Approval Procedure who will make a formal decision having considered all relevant matters. This process reflects the current position in respect of the holding of formal Local Authority meetings and the Court of Common Council's decision of 15th April 2021 to continue with virtual meetings and take formal decisions through a delegation to the Director of Community and Children's Services after the informal meeting has taken place and the will of the Committee is known in open session. Details of all decisions taken under the Covid Approval Procedure will be available online via the City Corporation's webpages.

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**

## **Part 1 - Public Reports**

1. **APOLOGIES**

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

3. **MINUTES**

To approve the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting on 16 July 2021.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 5 - 10)

4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

Report of the Town Clerk.

**For Information**  
(Pages 11 - 12)

5. **FIRE SAFETY ACT 2021**

Joint report of the Director of Community & Children's Services and The Remembrancer.

**For Information**  
(Pages 13 - 20)

6. **HOUSING COMPLAINTS POLICY REVIEW**

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

**For Decision**  
(Pages 21 - 36)

7. **GATEWAY 6: MIDDLESEX STREET ESTATE LIFT REFURBISHMENT**

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

**For Decision**  
(Pages 37 - 46)

8. **GATEWAY 6: RENEWAL OF ROOF COVERINGS AT 1-48 BLAKE HOUSE,  
WILLIAM BLAKE ESTATE**

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

**For Decision**  
(Pages 47 - 54)

9. **FIRE COMPARTMENTATION - GREAT ARTHUR HOUSE**

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

**For Decision**  
(Pages 55 - 66)

10. **HOUSING MAJOR WORKS PROGRAMME - PROGRESS REPORT**

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

**For Information**  
(Pages 67 - 76)

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

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

13. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION - That under Section 100A(4) 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 Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

**Part 2 - Non-Public Reports**

14. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

To approve the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2021.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 77 - 80)

15. **CHARITIES REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS - THE CITY OF LONDON  
ALMSHOUSES (REGISTERED CHARITY NUMBER: 1005857)**

Joint report of the Director of Community and Children's Services and the Director of the City Bridge Trust.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 81 - 88)

16. **HOUSING SECURITY REVIEW STAKEHOLDER PRESENTATION (SLIDES TO  
FOLLOW)**

Presentation by SGW.

**For Information**

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

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

## HOUSING MANAGEMENT AND ALMSHOUSES SUB (COMMUNITY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES) COMMITTEE Friday, 16 July 2021

Minutes of the meeting accessible remotely at 1.45 pm:

[Housing Management and Almshouses Sub - 16/07/21 - YouTube](#)

**NB. This recording will be available for 1 year from the date of the meeting**

*N.B. This meeting was held as an informal one, with the views reached by the Committee approved formally by the Town Clerk after the meeting, in accordance with the Court of Common Council's Covid Approval Procedure. This process reflects the current position in respect of the holding of formal Local Authority meetings and the Court's decision of 15 April 2021 to continue with virtual meetings, with formal confirmation of decisions provided through a delegation to the Town Clerk (or his nominated representative) after the informal meeting has taken place and the will of the Committee is known.*

### **Present**

#### **Members:**

Mary Durcan (Chairman)  
John Fletcher (Deputy Chairman)  
Randall Anderson  
Marianne Fredericks  
Susan Pearson  
Ruby Sayed  
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark

#### **Officers:**

Mark Jarvis	- Chamberlain's Department
Paul Murtagh	- Assistant Director, Barbican and Property Services, Community and Children's Services
Jason Hayes	- Community and Children's Services
Liam Gillespie	- Community and Children's Services
Julie Mayer	- Town Clerks
Julie Fittock	- City Surveyors

#### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Peter Bennett, Caroline Haines, The Revd. Stephen Haines, William Pimlott and the Chair, Mary Durcan. The Deputy Chair, John Fletcher was in the Chair.

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

There were no declarations.

#### **3. MINUTES**

RESOLVED, That - the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 24 May 2021 be approved as a correct record.

#### **4. OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

The Sub Committee received its Outstanding Actions list.

- Members noted that the Department of Community and Children's Services would be arranging estate visits and all Members of the Court would be invited. The Town Clerk advised that the Committee Calendar was very busy post recess but there were 3 clear slots in October on 1<sup>st</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup>.
- The Town Clerk also reminded Members of the Annual Christmas Hamper visit to the City of London Almshouses in Lambeth on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2021 (departing Guildhall at approximately 10.30 am and returning at 1pm). All Members had received an invitation and a reminder would be sent nearer the time.

## 5. **HOUSING UPDATE & RISK REGISTER**

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services which provided an update on performance and management information on key areas of work in the Housing Service. The Sub Committee received this report twice yearly, and it covered the period from 1st October 2020 to 31st March 2021. Members welcomed the new, clear format of the dashboard.

During the discussion and questions, the following points were noted:

1. The income figure only shows receipts for hall hire, it does not reflect anything else; i.e. - building running costs, which are offset against the receipts.
2. A Voids Group meets regularly to monitor individual properties and those taken out of action for works or pilot projects. The officer agreed to include a Voids KPI in the next report.
3. The Lone Working risk register entry is due for review and officers will action this"
4. Members asked for an annual oversight on the issues which are preventing the repairs targets from being achieved, as they might be able to offer support. The Assistant Director advised that issues are raised at regular contractor meetings but there are occasional access problems, which have been exacerbated by the pandemic.
5. The Deputy Chairman suggested it would be helpful if the issues were broken down into larger groups; i.e. - leakage, damp, electrical etc. The officer agreed to work with the Repairs Service to produce reports in this format and would provide an update on progress at the next meeting.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

## 6. **MAJOR WORKS PROGRAMME (JULY 2021 UPDATE)**

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services which updated Members on the progress made with the

Housing Major Works Programme and advised them on issues affecting progress on individual schemes.

Members noted that the report due to at the next Committee in September 2021 would identify projects added to the plan since 2017, with the new 5-year plan presented in parallel. The Assistant Director advised that it was not possible to provide dates at this stage for the works contained in the new 5-year plan, as the funding had not been identified, but the plan would align with Savill's Stock Condition Survey.

Members also noted that the Establishment Committee would be receiving a resolution this week, from the Barbican Residential Committee, in respect of the recruitment moratorium which limits new appointments beyond 6 months. The Community and Children's Services (CCSC) had raised similar concerns at their meeting last week and the Chair of the CCSC would be speaking on the Resolution, noting that the strongest candidates were likely to be attracted to permanent positions. The Assistant Director and Members commended the team for keeping all major projects on target, despite these difficulties. Additionally, projects recently completed have come in at 14% under the costs projected in the 'Gateway 5' project reports. Members noted that an external project manager had been appointed in respect of Dron House, which would keep the project on track.

In response to a question about the Housing Delivery Programme (new homes), the Assistant Director advised that, there was insufficient funding to achieve the Corporation's objective to deliver 700 new homes on its existing housing estates by 2025. He reiterated however, that funding of the new homes and, funding for the MWP are separate budgets.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

**7. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) COMMERCIAL TENANTS: CURRENT TENANT ARREARS AND TERMS OF REPAYMENT PLANS RELATING TO COVID-19 RENTAL SUPPORT**

The Sub Committee received a report, which had been approved by the Community and Children's Services Committee, in respect of the assistance packages supporting the HRA commercial tenants during the COVID-19 pandemic for five quarters (March 2020 to March 2021). A summary of the assistance provided to tenants to date was set out in the non-public appendices at agenda item 13. The Chair asked for the Sub Committee to receive regular progress reports and for the next update to be added to November's agenda.

The City Surveyor's officer advised that there were in excess of 60 HRA tenants and, when they apply for assistance, they are asked about the other forms of assistance already applied for. Members noted that, if this wasn't the case, then it would be difficult for the City Corporation to offer assistance from the HRA, which has limited resources. The officer further advised that tenants had been reminded to apply, and a link to the web site had been included in communications. Members were asked to note that the process was not being administered by the City Surveyor's Corporate Property Group.

The Assistant Director, Barbican and Property Services had written to all tenants and would be doing so again in terms of the extension of the deadline to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2021. The Assistant Director agreed to work with the City Surveyor's officer in drafting the reminder, to include the points raised above. Members also noted that the Assistant Director had been making personal contact with local businesses but, in many cases, a manager had been on site and not the Leaseholder.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

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

There were no questions.

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

There was no other business.

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

**Items**

11-18

**Paragraph**

3

11. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2021 be approved as a correct record.

12. **ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING POINTS - HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) ESTATES**

The Sub Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

13. **HRA COMMERCIAL TENANTS: CURRENT TENANT ARREARS AND TERMS OF REPAYMENT PLANS RELATING TO COVID-19 RENTAL SUPPORT - NON PUBLIC APPENDICES**

The Sub Committee received 2 non-public appendices in respect of agenda item 7.

14. **HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) OVERVIEW**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

15. **MIDDLESEX STREET ESTATE - COLD WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM - GATEWAY 1-5 - AUTHORITY TO START WORK**

The Sub Committee considered and approved a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.



**16. YORK WAY ESTATE - COLD WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM REPLACEMENT - GATEWAY 1-5 - AUTHORITY TO START WORK**

The Sub Committee considered and approved a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

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

There were no non-public questions.

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

There was no other business.

**The meeting ended at 3.10 pm**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: Julie Mayer**  
**[julie.mayer@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:julie.mayer@cityoflondon.gov.uk)**

This page is intentionally left blank

## Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee (HMASC)

### Outstanding Actions

Date Added	Subject	Action Agreed	Responsible Officer	Target Meeting Date - HMASC	Update
20/11/19	Member Estate Visits	Members to visit North and South Estates preferably before or after HMASC meeting.	Liam Gillespie / Town Clerk	As soon as possible after May 2021	We are looking to arrange visits for Members in October 2021
20/11/19	Great Arthur House – Cladding Works	Members to receive report on next stages in legal process including, legal costs to date and potential future costs.	Comptroller / Paul Murtagh	As soon as possible after decision of Supreme Court on whether to allow appeal.	Report presented to C&CS Committee and subsequently deferred until decision of Supreme Court is received.
30/11/20	Report of Climate Action Strategy - Funding	Following the discussions with the various Chairs, to agree a way forward in terms of reporting to the Committee.	Paul Murtagh	July 2021	Initial report went to C&CS Committee in March. Further report on Action Plan to C&CS Committee in September.
22.3.2021	Major Works Programme	Member requested how the report could be more transparent in terms of the slippage over the last few years, and any additional costs incurred as a result	Paul Murtagh	To be provided once the position is clearer.	Aim to include this in the report to HMASC in September 2021.
22.2.2021	Vehicle charging points at Middlesex Street and Golden Lane	Members noted that it would still be possible to apply for funding this year, and the next meeting of the Sub Committee would receive a progress report.	Paul Murtagh	TBC	Further report to the Committee when Feasibility Study progresses

## Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee (HMASC)

### Outstanding Actions

24.4.2021	Community Centre Policy Review	Members requested that the current Community Centre Policy be reviewed as early as possible next year to reflect the acquisition of the Portsoken Community Centre.	Liam Gillespie	March 2022	To be put on Agenda for March 2022 meeting.
24.04.2021	Repayment of Water Charges	Further report be brought back to the July HMASC meeting.	Liam Gillespie	July 2021	To be considered by the Grand Committee in September.

<b>Committee(s):</b> Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee Community & Children's Services Committee	<b>Dated:</b> 20/09/2021 24/09/2021
<b>Subject:</b> Fire Safety Act 2021	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	1, 2, 12
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>If so, how much?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Joint report of the Director of Community & Children's Services and The Remembrancer	<b>For Information</b>
<b>Report authors:</b> Paul Murtagh, Assistant Director, Housing & Barbican  William Stark Parliamentary Engagement Officer, Remembrancer's Office	

## Summary

This report advises the Committee of the relevant provisions of the Fire Safety Act 2021, which received Royal Assent on the 29 April 2021. The Fire Safety Act amends the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 and is one of several measures introduced following the 2017 Grenfell fire tragedy.

## Recommendation

Members are asked to note the report.

## Main Report

### Background

1. The Fire Safety Act 2021 is part of a series of changes to fire safety and building safety that the Government is making following the Grenfell Tower fire in 2017, with further primary and secondary legislation to follow. The Act seeks to enable the delivery of the recommendations of the Grenfell Inquiry Phase 1 report, published in October 2019, by placing beyond doubt that external wall systems, including cladding and the fire doors to individual flats in multi-occupied residential blocks, fall within the scope of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. In introducing the Fire Safety Bill (as it was then), Ministers made clear that legislation will play a role in tackling delay and inaction by building owners and developers in instigating remediation works.

2. Following a strained passage through Parliament, the Fire Safety Bill received Royal Assent on 29 April 2021. The Fire Safety Act, as it became on 29 April 2021, differs from the original Fire Safety Bill in that, it includes two Government amendments with, a new clause dealing with risk-based guidance for fire risk assessments, and the related commencement of that guidance.
3. Parliamentary interest in the passage of the Act coalesced around backbench amendments, in both the Lords and Commons, on prohibiting the passing of resulting remediation costs on to leaseholders and tenants. Various iterations of amendments to this effect were agreed by the Lords and caused considerable Government rebellions in the Commons. However, these were eventually rejected on the final day of the parliamentary session.

### **Current Position**

4. The Government's explanatory notes for the (then) Bill state that the legislation "will be of particular interest to building owners, leaseholders or managers for multi-occupied residential buildings who are likely to be the responsible persons" in ensuring they have assessed the fire safety risks and taken necessary precautions in the buildings they are responsible for. Furthermore, the legislation "will also affirm Fire and Rescue Authorities have the relevant enforcement powers to hold owners or managers to account".
5. The Act is intended to complement the existing powers that local authorities have to take enforcement action against building owners and managers under the Housing Health and Safety Rating System, provided for in the Housing Act 2004 and the Building (Amendment) Regulations 2018. The latter, banned the use of combustible materials within the external walls, and certain attachments to the external walls, for any new building with a storey at least 18 metres in height where the building contains at least one dwelling or, met other certain criteria.
6. During the passage of the Act, the Government successfully introduced two amendments that saw the introduction of a new clause dealing with risk-based guidance for fire risk assessments, and the related commencement of that guidance. The Act amends Article 50 of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 to ensure that risk-based guidance, to be issued to support commencement of the Act, will have the appropriate status to incentivise responsible persons to comply with such guidance. Furthermore, in line with a report by the "Task and Finish Group" (co-chaired by the Fire Sector Federation and the National Fire Chiefs Council) the Act will be commenced for all buildings at the same time and, Government will issue statutory guidance covering the assessment of buildings with a risk-based approach.
7. It should be noted that the Fire Safety Act is far from a 'quick-fix' intended to deal with a specific identified concern. Moreover, the Act has not yet been brought fully into force in England or Wales and, it would seem reasonable to assume that it will only fully come into force when the new guidance is ready. The Act does however, contain provisions (which came into force two months after the Act) allowing government to make future regulations to change the scope of the premises

covered by the Fire Safety Order and to make concomitant changes to fire safety duties.

## **Implications for Housing**

8. Fire safety has been of critical concern for all local authorities and housing associations since the Grenfell tragedy in 2017. Essentially, the Fire Safety Act, first proposed in March 2020, was introduced to clarify who is responsible for managing and reducing the risk of fire in different parts of multi-occupied residential buildings to help prevent further tragedies.
9. The legislation brings new fire safety obligations to some leaseholders, building owners and managers for the building structure, external walls, common parts and doors between the domestic premises and common parts.
10. The Fire Safety Act 2021 amends the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 (the FSO) with the intention of improving fire safety in multi-occupancy domestic buildings. Crucially, the external walls of a building and, the fire doors to individual flats must now be assessed as part of the requirement for a fire risk assessment. The Act requires the owners and managers of multi-occupied residential buildings to ensure that the fire risk assessments for such buildings are reviewed and updated to encompass the structure, external walls and flat entrance doors.
11. The specific provisions of the Fire Safety Act 2021 include:
  - The Act applies to all multi-occupied residential buildings and is not dependent on the height of the building. The Act further provides English and Welsh Ministers with a regulation-making power to amend the type of buildings the FSO applies to in the future.
  - The FSO designates those in control of the premises as the Responsible Person for fire safety, imposing on them a duty to undertake assessments and manage risks. The Act now requires all Responsible Persons to reduce, as well as to assess and manage, the fire risks posed by the structure and external walls of the buildings and, by individual doors opening onto common parts of the building.
  - The FSO was enforced by fire and rescue authorities but, the Act allows these authorities to enforce against non-compliance in relation to the external walls and the individual doors opening onto the common parts of the premises.
  - The Act also introduces the concept of 'risk-based' guidance in order to support a proportionate approach towards assessing risk.

## **Ongoing measures for addressing the requirements of the Fire Safety Act 2021**

12. Back in July 2017, an initial detailed report was presented to the Community & Children's Services Committee, the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee and the Audit and Risk Management Committee updating Members on the City of London Corporation's (CoLC) approach to fire safety in its social housing portfolio. This report informed Members of the progress we had made with matters such as:

- fire risk assessments,
- communication with residents,
- estate management,
- fire safety maintenance and improvement work,
- inspections by the London Fire Brigade (LFB),
- potential future improvement works.

13. Regular update and review reports have been brought back to the Community & Children's Services Committee and the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee, informing Members of the work that has been and, is being done to enhance the safety of the City of London Corporation's (the Corporation) social housing estates and its residents in the event of fire.

14. As Members will be aware from these reports, there is a significant amount of work that has been/is being done across the Corporation's social housing estates that will address some of the requirements and objectives of the Fire Safety Act 2021 including:

#### Fire Risk Assessments (FRA's)

15. Frankham Risk Management Services Limited completed FRAs for each of our residential blocks of flats in October/November 2017 and, as agreed by Members, these were published on the Corporation's website in June 2018. A subsequent 'Action Plan' was developed in response to the FRA's and, progress against the Action Plan is monitored regularly by the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub Committee.

16. Whilst, understandably, our focus has been on continuing the progress we have made on the improvements identified in the FRA Action Plan, we have recently appointed Turner & Townsend to carry out new Type 3 (with a number of targeted Type 4) FRA's for our housing stock. Turner & Townsend has now commenced this work and, its brief includes a focus on the assessment of external walls and individual flat entrance doors opening onto the common parts of buildings as specifically highlighted in the Fire Safety Act 2021.

#### Fire Doors

17. The Corporation has committed to replacing all front entrance doors in its residential blocks of flats with fire doors that give up to 60 minutes fire resistance (30 minutes as an absolute minimum).

18. GERDA, our specialist appointed contractor, has now commenced work on Phase 1 of this programme (York Way and Holloway Estates) and, has installed several doorsets as 'pilot' installations for the approval of Building Control and the Fire and Rescue Authority. It is expected that this project will be completed within the next 12 to 18 months.



## External Wall Cladding

19. Shortly after the Grenfell tragedy in 2017, the Corporation carried out an assessment of the construction of the external walls to blocks of flats within its social housing portfolio. The blocks of flats are, in the main, traditionally built with no significant areas of wall cladding. Furthermore, there have been no subsequent 'improvement' works carried out to the blocks of flats that has seen the introduction of external wall cladding typically used to improve the level of thermal insulation to traditionally built blocks.

## **Proposals for further measures to address the requirements of the Fire Safety Act 2021**

20. Although the Corporation is taking proactive measures to ensure the continued compliance with relevant fire safety legislation and, wherever possible, pre-empting future legislation, there is still further work to be done. This includes the following:

### Clarification around the role of the Responsible Person

21. Under Article 3 of the FSO, the "responsible person" of a premise (either a building or any part of it) is the person who has control of the premises ("the Responsible Person"), which may include building owners, leaseholders or managers.
22. Since the scope and scrutiny of fire safety obligations have increased significantly, the Responsible Person needs to review and update risk assessment processes accordingly. Once the risk assessment processes are published, the Responsible Person should apply the risk-based guidance (under Section 3 of the Act) in order to comply with his/her duties in Part 2 of the FSO.
23. The clarification provided under the Act, extending the provisions of the FSO set out above, means that the Fire and Rescue Authorities can now better identify the Responsible Person for these parts. This will, by definition, clear the path for enforcement action against and/or prosecution of any Responsible Person who fails to comply with the FSO, which could ultimately lead to unlimited fines and/or criminal prosecutions.
24. To a certain extent, the role of the Responsible Person for the Corporation's social housing estates is currently split between the Estate Managers and technical staff with responsibility for ensuring FRA's are carried out and recommendations acted upon. In view of the extended provisions of the FSO, this is not a sustainable option.
25. Further work is now being done to assess the role of the Responsible Person and, who that named person will be. It does make sense, as is the case currently, that the Responsible Person should be an estate-based manager however, there is a need to provide targeted and specific training for those staff who will officially take on that role. Similarly, there will also be a need to amend Job Descriptions to reflect the additional responsibility that comes with the role. At this stage however,

consideration is also being given to the need for additional specialist resources to carry out the role of the Responsible Person.

#### Commissioning EWS1 Forms for all our housing blocks of flats

26. An EWS1 (External Wall System) form provides independent assurance that a building meets the requirements of the Government's latest standards. It is not a legal requirement however, some lenders are now asking for EWS1 forms before they will consider offering a mortgage. We are receiving an increasing number of requests from our residents for EWS1 forms for this purpose.
27. The Royal Institution of Surveyors (RICS) has produced guidance suggesting that any residential building could require an EWS1 form. For guidance purposes and, for members information:

#### **For buildings over six storeys, an EWS1 form should be required where:**

- there is cladding or curtain walling on the building or,
- where there are balconies that stack vertically above each other and either, both the balustrades and decking are constructed with combustible materials (e.g. timber) or the decking is constructed with combustible materials and the balconies are directly linked by combustible material.

#### **For buildings of five or six storeys, and EWS1 form should be required where:**

- there is a significant amount of cladding on the building or,
- there are ACM, MCM or HPL panels on the building or,
- there are balconies that stack vertically above each other and either, both the balustrades and decking are constructed with combustible materials (e.g. timber), or the decking is constructed with combustible materials and the balconies are directly linked by combustible materials.

#### **For buildings of four storeys or fewer, an EWS1 form should be required where:**

- there are ACM, MCM or HPL panels on the building.

28. Currently, the Corporation does not provide EWS1 forms to residents who request one and, this is creating problems for residents seeking mortgages. The Corporation has very few blocks of flats that fall into the categories set out in Paragraph 27 above and as stated previously, there is no legal requirement for the Corporation to provide EWS1 forms.
29. Officers are currently reviewing the various options around EWS1 forms which include:
- not providing them.

- providing them for all blocks of social housing flats to give independent assurance to the Corporation and its residents on the structure and safety of the external wall construction (estimated cost of £100,000).
- to continue with a risk-based approach based on criteria we gather from our records, surveys and FRA's to allow us to determine the risk level and prioritise those we deem there is a need for an intrusive assessment to be conducted.

30. It should be noted that currently, due to national demand and shortage of skilled professionals who can carry out the required assessments, EWS1 forms are taking a considerably long period of time to acquire.

### **Further Legislation – Building Safety Bill**

31. On 5 July 2021, the Secretary for Housing Robert Jenrick introduced a revised draft of the Building Safety Bill into the House of Commons. The revised Bill follows a three-year scrutiny and public consultation process and represents a wholesale reform of the building safety regime, in line with the recommendations of Dame Judith Hackitt's 2018 Independent Review: Building a Safer Future. The Bill sets out a new regulatory regime aimed at ensuring the safety of residents in residential buildings.

32. The Building Safety Bill establishes a much tighter regulatory regime for buildings above 18 metres high (referred to as 'higher risk' buildings) and includes:

- a new Building Safety Regulator with approval, enforcement and prosecutorial powers.
- mandatory reporting of structural and fire safety occurrences.
- new obligations on Clients, Principal Designers and Principal Contractors, with 'Gateway' points at design, construction and completion to ensure fire and structural safety is considered at every stage of a building's development.
- the creation of new Accountable Person and Building Safety Manager roles to ensure that fire and structural safety continues to be managed throughout a building's lifetime.
- criminal liability for both companies and their directors for breaches – with unlimited fines and imprisonment for up to two years.

33. The Bill is expected to receive Royal Assent in the Spring next year (2022). The Government has indicated that the first round of provisions will come into force within 6-12 months of the Bill receiving Royal Assent (October 2022 to April 2023). The bulk of the new regulatory regime will likely come into force within 12-18 months of Royal Assent (April 2023 to October 2023). Certain obligations will, and have come into force earlier, such as the Gateway 1 process for construction and major refurbishment of higher-risk buildings (1 August 2021).

34. The Building Safety Bill is a much broader piece of legislation than the Fire Safety Act 2021, covering risks over and above fire safety (flooding, wind loading etc). However, the Bill has links to the Fire Safety Act 2021 and, officers will be giving

due regard to the implications for the Building Safety Bill when finalising proposals for dealing with the requirements of the Fire Safety Act 2021.

## **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

### Strategic Implications

35. The proposals contained in this report are consistent with, align with and support the delivery of the Corporate Plan with particular reference to the following:

- Outcome 1 – People are safe and feel safe.
- Outcome 2 – People enjoy good health and wellbeing.
- Outcome 12 – Our spaces are secure, resilient and well-maintained.

## **Conclusion**

36. The new Fire Safety Act 2021 brings significant new fire safety obligations to building owners and managers for the building structure, external walls, common parts and doors between the domestic premises and common parts.

37. This report sets out the work that officers have done and are doing to ensure that the Corporation is best placed to comply fully with the requirements of the new Fire Safety Act 2021.

38. Members should note that further reports will be brought back to the relevant Committees in due course, setting out the progress that has been made and, the subsequent proposals for ensuring compliance with the legislation.

## **Appendices**

None

### **Paul Murtagh**

Assistant Director, Housing & Barbican

T: 020 7332 3015

E: [paul.murtagh@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:paul.murtagh@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

### **William Stark**

Parliamentary Engagement Officer, Remembrancer's Office

T: 07522 216 802

E: [william.stark@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:william.stark@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

<b>Committee:</b>	<b>Dated:</b>
Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee	20/09/2021
<b>Subject: Housing Complaints Policy Review</b>	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>If so, how much?</b>	<b>£</b>
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services</b>	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author: Liam Gillespie, Head of Housing Management</b>	

## Summary

The Housing Division's Complaints Policy has been redrafted and several changes made to bring it in line with the provisions of the Housing Ombudsman's Complaints Handling Code of 2020.

In accordance with the Complaints Handling Code, officers now propose to adopt a two-stage complaints process and extend the timescale for Stage Two responses. These changes are intended to encourage early resolution of complaints and make the complaints process more accessible and straightforward for residents.

## Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Approve the draft Housing Complaints Policy for use by the Housing Division

## Main Report

### Background

1. The Housing Division has a well-established complaints process, supported by a Complaints Policy, which was last approved by Committee in May 2017. This currently involves a three-stage process. Once these stages are exhausted,

residents may escalate their complaint to the Housing Ombudsman if they remain dissatisfied.

2. The current three stages are:

- Stage One: investigation by a Senior Manager or Head of Service (reply within 10 working days)
- Stage Two: Assistant Director (reply within 10 working days)
- Stage Three: Town Clerk's Department (normally allocated to an Assistant Director outside DCCS; response due within 10 working days)

3. The Corporation is a mandatory member of the Housing Ombudsman Scheme and residents may escalate their complaint to the Ombudsman if they remain dissatisfied once our complaints process is exhausted. The Ombudsman may investigate complaints referred to them and recommend a resolution. If the Ombudsman believes that we are at fault, or we have not done enough to put things right, it can make recommendations for the resolution of the complaint.
4. The Ombudsman may make findings of service failure or maladministration against a landlord, impose a requirement to pay compensation, or require the landlord to take other steps to conclude the complaint.
5. Most complaints are resolved successfully at Stage One, though some escalate through the process and end up with the Ombudsman each year. In 2020/21, we received a total of 52 complaints across Housing and Repairs, of which eight went to Stage 3 and five were referred to the Ombudsman.
6. In 2020, the Ombudsman issued a new Complaints Handling Code ("the Code"). The Code sets out best practice for the handling of complaints by social landlords which are members of the Ombudsman scheme. It is intended to ensure that landlords have an easily accessible and resident-focused complaints procedure, which is fair to complainants and geared towards resolving complaints at an early stage.
7. The Code is intended to make it easier and quicker for residents to seek redress for their landlords' service failures. Non-compliance with the Code on the part of a landlord can result in a finding of "complaints handling failure", which may result in the landlord being ordered to provide redress, including financial compensation, to the complainant. It may also refer the matter to the Regulator for Social Housing. These findings are published on the Ombudsman's website.
8. One significant change set out in the Code is that landlords are expected to have a two-stage complaints procedure unless it is absolutely necessary to offer three stages. This supports the aim of ensuring the timely resolution of complaints.
9. Another change recommended in the Code is the adoption of standard timescales for complaints responses. For Stage Two, the maximum

recommended time is 20 working days. This balances the need to provide a timely response with allowing landlords the time to provide a meaningful response which has been properly investigated.

## Current Position

10. Landlords are required to complete a self-assessment against the Code. The Housing Division's self-assessment shows that we are largely compliant with it, however we currently do not meet the recommendation that we offer a two-stage process.

11. The Code states:

***3.6: A landlord's complaints procedure shall comprise of two stages. This ensures that a resident has the opportunity to challenge any decision by correcting errors or sharing concerns via an appeal process.***

***3.8: The Ombudsman does not believe a third stage is necessary as part of a complaints process but if a landlord believes strongly it requires one, it should set out its reasons as part of the self-assessment. A process with more than three stages is not acceptable under any circumstances in the Ombudsman's view.***

12. The two-stage process outlined in the Complaints Code is intended to:

- Give complainants redress within a reasonable timeframe
- Allow them to appeal an initial decision internally and for any mistakes at stage one to be corrected
- Encourage landlords to adopt a constructive approach to early complaints resolution rather than sticking rigidly to a formal process

13. The rationale behind having a third stage, dealt with elsewhere within the Corporation, is presumably to demonstrate impartiality. However, there are controls in place to ensure that complaints are effectively and fairly investigated within the Housing Division, such as asking managers from different teams to investigate if needed, and complaints investigations being reviewed by a senior manager, who was not involved in the investigation, before completion.

14. All complaints responses at Stages 1 and 2 are also reviewed by the Quality and Performance Manager before being issued, to ensure that they answer the complaint in full and demonstrate that a comprehensive investigation has taken place.

15. Bearing in mind the spirit of the Complaints Code, it is considered that there is no compelling reason to retain a third stage and it cannot be said to be absolutely necessary as required by the Ombudsman.

16. Having two stages, with proper checks and balances to ensure impartiality and quality, will better serve residents and ensure that a higher quality of service is provided to complainants.
17. With the upcoming changes to housing regulation and the need for landlords to become more transparent, responsive and accountable to residents about their performance, moving to a two-stage process will demonstrate a commitment to trying to resolve complaints more efficiently and show a willingness to be held to account by residents and the Ombudsman.
18. A brief search of information available about other local authority landlords' procedures shows that many have already adopted two-stage processes for housing complaints, including Westminster, Southwark, Islington, Lambeth, Brent, Hackney, Enfield and Lewisham.
19. Regarding standard timescales, it is proposed that Stage One remains at 10 working days and Stage Two is changed to a maximum of 20 working days, in line with the Code. This will ensure that adequate time is given to conduct in-depth reviews at Stage Two.
20. Officers will of course attempt to resolve complaints as quickly as possible and any variance with these timescales will be communicated to the complainant.

## **Proposals**

21. To bring the new Housing Complaints Policy in line with the Ombudsman's expectations, it is proposed that:
  - The Housing Division adopts a two-stage complaints process to comply with the Complaints Handling Code
  - The current Stage 3 (Town Clerk's) is discontinued
  - The timescale for responding at Stage Two is set at 20 working days

## **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

### **Strategic Implications**

22. The revised Housing Complaints Policy supports the aims of our Corporate Plan and Housing Strategy, in that it contributes to the effective management of our housing estates.

## **Conclusion**

23. The Housing Complaints Policy has been re-written and has been changed to reflect the provisions of the Housing Ombudsman's Complaints Handling Code for social landlords.



24. It is proposed that the current Stage Three is removed in line with the Ombudsman's recommendations. It is also proposed to align the timescales for complaints responses with the maximums provided for in the Code.

**Appendices:**

- Appendix One: Draft Housing Complaints Policy (version two – 2021)
- Appendix Two: Housing User Board Consultation Feedback

**Liam Gillespie**

Head of Housing Management, DCCS

**E:** [liam.gillespie@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:liam.gillespie@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

**T:** 020 7332 3785

This page is intentionally left blank



**City of London Corporation**  
**Department of Community & Children's Services**  
**Housing Service**

## **Housing Complaints Policy**

---

Approved by:	<i>Housing Management &amp; Almshouses Sub-Committee</i>
Approval Date:	
Next Review Date:	

## **1. Purpose and scope**

1.1 We have this policy because we want our residents and service users to know about our approach to complaints. We aim to provide good quality services but sometimes we get it wrong. When this happens, we want to make it as easy as possible for residents to tell us and know that we will respond positively, quickly and fairly.

1.2 This policy applies to:

- City of London tenants, leaseholders and freeholders who receive services from the Housing Service
- Those affected by the City of London Housing Service
- Those applying for services delivered by the City of London Housing Service

## **2. Policy aims and objectives**

2.1 Our priority is to put things right when they go wrong. To help us do this, we aim to deliver an excellent complaint handling service that puts the complainant at the heart of what we do and gives them the chance to express their point of view and the outcome they are seeking.

2.2 A key objective of this policy is to help us better understand the resident experience. We will use this insight as an opportunity to learn and continually improve our services.

## **3. Definitions**

3.1 We have adopted the following definition of a complaint from the Housing Ombudsman's Complaints Handling Code:

*A complaint is an expression of dissatisfaction, however made, about the standard of service, actions or lack of action by the organisation, its own staff, or those acting on its behalf, affecting an individual resident or group of residents.*

3.2 Regardless of the definition that we adopt, if a resident tells us that they are not satisfied with a service we will take steps to resolve the issue as quickly as possible.

## **4. Exclusions**

4.1 We cannot always accept a complaint. Sometimes we will have valid reasons such as the following:

- **Age** – The issue giving rise to the complaint occurred more than 6 months ago, unless it is a recurring problem.
- **Legal action** – A complainant pursues the issue through a legal route. This will not stop us trying to resolve the issue.
- **Previous complaints** – A matter has already been considered and reviewed using the complaints service
- **Not within our control** – Complaints about services, people or bodies over which we have no control.
- **Insurance claims** - A claim for damages or personal injury which will be dealt with as an insurance claim.
- **Alternative appeals or review procedures** – Issues over which there is an alternative redress process.

If we cannot accept a complaint, we will explain the reasons to the complainant.

## 5. Service standards

5.1 When we provide a complaints service, residents can expect the following from us:

- To be provided with information about our complaints service in a variety of formats
- If we do not accept a complaint, we will explain the reasons why
- Use plain language and make clear the outcome of the complaint
- Acknowledge a complaint within 2 working days
- Provide a response at Stage 1 of our process within 10 working days
- Provide a response at Stage 2 of our process within 20 working days of the complaint being escalated.
- When we offer a remedy, we will set out what we intend to do and the timescales
- If we decide not to escalate a complaint, we will provide an explanation

## 6. Legislation and regulation

6.1 This policy will have regard to the following requirements of the Regulator of Social Housing:

Value for Money Standard – We will make the best use of our resources by learning from complaints and minimising mistakes.

Tenant Involvement and Empowerment Standard - We will adopt an approach to complaints that is clear, simple and accessible and ensure that complaints are resolved promptly, politely and fairly.

- 6.2 In July 2020 The Housing Ombudsman published a Complaints Handling Code. In addition, the November 2020 Social Housing White Paper proposed a new charter for social housing which includes an expectation that residents will have their complaints dealt with promptly and fairly. This policy will ensure we comply with the Code and that we are able to meet the expectations of the White Paper and subsequent legislation.

## **7. Our approach to complaints**

### **7.1 Access**

We will make the complaints service accessible to all residents using a range of channels through which residents can make a complaint, including our website and any official social media platforms. We will comply with our Equality Act duty and tailor our service to meet an individual's needs, making whatever adjustments are required.

We will accept complaints made by a resident's representative and fully engage with representative when we handle the complaint. We will also encourage and signpost residents to advice and advocacy services as appropriate.

We will ensure that all staff understand the difference between a service request and a complaint and are aware that complaints can be received verbally.

### **7.2 Awareness**

We will raise awareness of our complaints service. We will use our website, newsletters and leaflets to ensure residents know how to complain.

As part of the information that we make available to residents we will include contact information for the Ombudsman. We will explain the role of the Ombudsman and ensure residents are aware that they can contact the service at any point for help and advice throughout their complaint.

### **7.3 Complaints handling**

We want to make complaint handling a resident friendly experience. Our Housing Complaints Team will take responsibility for a complaint and work with colleagues to find a speedy resolution. Complaints will be acknowledged and recorded, and early contact made to ensure we understand the issues and the outcome the resident is seeking.

Our priority will be to resolve the complaint at the earliest opportunity. We will ask residents to allow us the opportunity to find a speedy resolution. Where the complaint requires formal consideration, we have a two-stage process.

The first stage will be a full and fair investigation. The investigation will be carried out by a senior manager who will be impartial and seek the information they need to find an outcome that would resolve the matter for the resident.

When it is not possible to find a resolution, we have a second stage in our process that allows residents to request a review of their complaint. The review will give residents the opportunity to challenge the earlier decision.

We will not unreasonably refuse to escalate a complaint to the next stage. If we refuse to allow escalation, we will explain the reasons for our decision.

When a resident is not satisfied with our response, we will ensure that are aware of how to contact the Housing Ombudsman. We will fully co-operate with the Ombudsman and continue to look to resolve the complaint.

### **7.4 Communication**

We will make information about our complaints service available in clear and accessible formats. All our communications will use plain language. When we respond to complaints, we will make the outcome clear and explain the reasons for any decision made. We will keep residents regularly updated using methods of communication agreed with the resident.

Where a resident's expectation is unrealistic or unreasonable, we will explain this to the resident. If we consider that it may help to resolve a complaint, we seek the complainant's permission to engage with professional mediators as an alternative means of finding an effective resolution.

We will report back to our involved residents on our performance and ensure that information is regularly provided to all residents on how well we are delivering

our complaints service and improvements that have come about as a result of complaints.

### **7.5 Putting things right**

We know that for most complainants when we have failed to provide a service the priority is to put things right. We will apologise and set out the actions we will take to resolve the complaint. Any remedy that is offered by us will reflect the extent of the service failure and the impact on the resident. When needed we will exercise appropriate discretion to find a remedy.

We recognise that finding a remedy may not in itself repair our relationship with our resident. In order to build confidence, we may at times engage the services of an independent third party to investigate or review a complaint.

### **7.6 Learning and improvement**

We will ensure that we learn from complaints to keep improving. We will look beyond individual complaints to identify where our processes or policies need to change. We will ensure that this approach is part of our service planning framework and informs staff training.

### **7.7 Unacceptable complainant behaviour**

If a complainant behaves unreasonably at any stage of the complaints process, we will apply our policy on unreasonable behaviour. Unacceptable or unreasonable behaviour could include:

- making numerous complaints about minor matters or matters which staff cannot change, which take up an unreasonable amount of staff time
- contacting multiple officers to complain about the same issue
- being abusive or offensive to staff or using inappropriate language
- making unfounded or unsupported complaints that may be malicious in nature.

If we consider a complainant to be unreasonable, we may close an existing complaint down or limit the means by which the resident can communicate with us. Once a decision has been made, we will inform the complainant and explain the reasons for our decision.



## **8. Responsibilities, monitoring and performance**

- 8.1 Overall responsibility for this policy and its implementation rests with the Head of Housing Management. The Head of Housing Management will ensure that staff receive the appropriate training and support to achieve the aims of this policy. Where needed we may establish appropriate operational procedures.
- 8.2 Monitoring of the implementation of this policy and our performance in handling complaints will be the responsibility of the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee. We will carry out regular self-assessments against the Complaints Handling Code and ensure that our performance measures drive improvements.

## **9. Associated policies**

- Compensation Policy

**10. Document Management**

Policy title	Housing Complaints Policy
Date created	
Policy owner	Head of Housing Management
Authorised by	Housing Management and Almhouses Sub-Committee
Date authorised	
Review period	3 years
Date of next review	

Consultation and assessment	
Resident consultation	
Equality Analysis	
Data Protection Impact Assessment	Not required. Minimal risk of data breaches. Use of personal data covered by Privacy Notice.

Document review history			
Version	Date amended	Date approved	Key changes
1.0			

## APPENDIX 2

### Results of consultation – Housing User Board (HUB)

#### Housing Complaints Policy

	Comments	Response
1.	Thank you for asking me to read through your updated Housing Complaints Policy. I've read through it and understood content and have no additional comments to make.	
2.	I have read this though and it is clear and easy to understand.	
3.	Thank you for sending this document over. It seems to cover all aspects of the complaint procedure, including the right to ask for an Ombudsman to become involved. In extreme cases where you are clearly at fault, I feel monetary compensation should be awarded if distress is caused to the resident.	We have a separate policy on paying compensation for service failures, which would cover situations where distress was caused to a resident

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Committees:</b> Corporate Projects Board <i>[for information]</i> Housing Management & Almshouses Sub <i>[for decision]</i> Projects Sub <i>[for decision]</i>	<b>Dates:</b> 1 September 2021 20 September 2021 20 October 2021
<b>Subject:</b> Gateway 6: Middlesex Street Estate Lift Refurbishment <b>Unique Project Identifier:</b> 11759	<b>Gateway 6:</b> <b>Outcome Report</b> Regular
<b>Report of:</b> Director of Community & Children's Services <b>Report Author:</b> David Downing, Asset Programme Manager	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>PUBLIC</b>	

## Summary

<b>1. Status update</b>	<b>Project Description:</b> Guideline Lift Services Ltd were contracted to comprehensively refurbish the six residential lifts at the Middlesex Street social housing estate with the previous equipment having reached the end of its operational life. The works included the installation of new lift stops to previously unserved floors to make all flats accessible without the use of a staircase. <b>RAG Status:</b> Green (Green at last report to committee) <b>Risk Status:</b> Low (Low at last report to committee) <b>Costed Risk Provision Utilised:</b> N/A <b>Final Outturn Cost:</b> £1,367,674
<b>2. Next steps and requested decisions</b>	<b>Requested Decisions:</b> 1. To note the content of this report, 2. To note the lessons learnt, 3. To authorise closure of this project.

<b>3. Key conclusions</b>	<p>1. The project was completed under the Gateway 5 budget with a three month delay to the delivery programme that was solely attributable to the first wave of the Covid 19 health crisis.</p> <p>2. Lifts are fully modernised and fitted with up-to-date fire safety features (the two lifts serving Petticoat Tower are fully BS EN 81-72 compliant, the relevant standard for firefighting lifts).</p> <p>3. All residential floors of the Middlesex Street Estate are now fully accessible without the use of a staircase.</p>
---------------------------	--

## **Main Report**

### **Design & Delivery Review**

<b>4. Design into delivery</b>	<p>The project design worked well. A detailed specification for the lift refurbishment works was drafted by industry specialists Butler &amp; Young Lift Consultants &amp; verified by City Officers.</p> <p>Following Gateway 4 approval, the procurement phase was delayed following a request from the leaseholders association (supported by Ward Members) to reconsider the design to include reversing the entry into the lifts serving the ground floor of Petticoat Tower to give a more coherent layout to the Tower lobby area. This delayed conclusion of the design phase by twelve months; the proposed changes were deemed unaffordable and would have necessitated reduction in the size of the lift cars.</p> <p>The project design is recommended for future projects of this nature.</p>
<b>5. Options appraisal</b>	<p>The selected option to refurbish the six lifts on the Middlesex Street Estate successfully delivered the projects objectives. Due to the age and obsolescence of key components either doing nothing, or attempting ongoing repair were not deemed viable options.</p> <p>No changes were required during project delivery.</p>
<b>6. Procurement route</b>	<p>Works were procured via open tender advertised on the Capital Esourcing portal and produced a suitable and manageable number of qualifying bids for the contract.</p>

v.April 2019

<b>7. Skills base</b>	The City of London project team had the required skills and experience to manage the delivery of the project. An external specialist lift consultant was employed to provide expert independent advice and to provide quality assurance.
<b>8. Stakeholders</b>	Leaseholder engagement was challenging as there was some dispute as to whether the refurbishment works were necessary during the early phases of the project. Two independent condition surveys were commissioned that were unequivocal in recommending full refurbishment as certain key components were over fifty years old and others now obsolete.

### **Variation Review**

<b>9. Assessment of project against key milestones</b>	<p>The project progressed as expected throughout the early development period with Gateway 4 achieved in the timescales anticipated.</p> <p>Post Gateway 4, during the statutory S20 consultation with long leaseholders held in March 2017, a change of scope was requested by the Petticoat Square Leaseholders Association (supported by Ward Members) to reverse entry to the Ground Floors Lifts in Petticoat Tower and reconfigure the lobby area to create a more coherent entry to the building. A feasibility study was commissioned and carried out which revealed that reversing the entry to the lifts would necessitate a reduction in lift car size to accommodate the additional equipment required. Furthermore, the cost of the requested works could not be recovered from leaseholders as they were clearly defined as works of improvement, not repair and no available budget was identified for these non-essential additional works. This process delayed the procurement of the project by approximately 12 months.</p> <p>There was a further delay to programme post procurement as the successful tender submission was in advance of the approved budget at Gateway 4. An Issues Report was submitted and approved to uplift the budget. This process resulted in a further 4 month delay to programme.</p> <p>The main works contractor was appointed in early 2019 as anticipated at Gateway 5 with a forecast completion date of Summer 2020. During the delivery phase, the works were progressing to programme until halted by the onset of the Covid 19 public health crisis. Works were suspended for 3 months, resuming</p>
--	---

v.April 2019

	as soon as was deemed safe to do so. The final lift was brought back into full service on 20/08/2020.
<b>10. Assessment of project against Scope</b>	<p>An Issues Report was approved in January 2017 to increase the project scope to include for the installation of new lift stops to previously unserved floors to make all flats accessible without the use of a staircase.</p> <p>The project was delivered to the tendered scope without significant variation.</p>
<b>11. Risks and issues</b>	<p>The risk of delay during leaseholder consultation was realised.</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision was not applicable to this project.</p>
<b>12. Transition to BAU</b>	The ongoing maintenance of lifts will transfer to the general HRA Lift Maintenance contract.

### Value Review

13. Budget

<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	Estimated cost (including risk): £1,012,500
------------------------------------	--

The Gateway 2 projected cost was estimated in 2015 with no provision for cost inflation.

	<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>
<i>Fees</i>	£110,000	£21,536
<i>Staff Costs</i>	£62,500	£46,156
<i>Works*</i>	£1,382,500	£1,299,982
<i>Total</i>	£1,555,000	£1,367,674

\* Works (further breakdown):

<i>Current Actuals</i>		£1,280,482
<i>Retention Held</i>		£19,500
<i>Final Account Sum</i>		£1,299,982

There is a total underspend on the approved Gateway 5 budget of £187,326. Of this sum, £88,464 is accounted for by unused provision for professional fees; the project management and clerk



	<p>of works roles for the project were filled using internal City resources minimising the expense of external consultants. A further £82,518 is accounted for savings realised during the delivery of the works contract via unused provisional sums. The remaining £16,344 is attributable to unused provision for staff costs. At the time of writing, payment of the final retention sum is imminent (this sum is indicated in the totals presented above).</p> <p>Final accounts have been subject to an independent verification check, undertaken by a suitably experienced officer within the relevant implementing department.</p>
<b>14. Investment</b>	N/A
<b>15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives</b>	<p>No SMART objectives were set for this project at the time of inception (2015). However, in retrospect these would be as follows:</p> <p>Specific &amp; Realistic: all lifts included in the programme to be modernised to a high standard with a 25 year life expectancy. This was achieved.</p> <p>Measurable &amp; Achievable: the specification of the refurbished lifts meets or exceeds that prescribed by legislation (within the limitations of the structural constraints of the buildings). This was achieved.</p> <p>Timely: works programme to be structured to minimise disruption to residents as far as possible. This was achieved.</p>
<b>16. Key benefits realised</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The installation of new equipment will improve service for residents in terms of a reduction of out of service time as maintenance requirements are reduced.</li> <li>2. Lift car sizes have been maximised to the limitations of the lift shafts and car travel speeds have improved (Petticoat Square lifts from 0.5m/s to 1m/s, Petticoat Tower lifts from 1m/s to 1.6m/s).</li> <li>3. Lifts are fitted with up-to-date fire safety features (the two lifts serving Petticoat Tower are fully BS EN 81-72 compliant, the relevant standard for firefighting lifts).</li> <li>4. All residential floors of the Middlesex Street Estate are now fully accessible without the use of a staircase.</li> <li>5. Increase to capital value of the blocks through improved services.</li> </ol>

## **Lessons Learned and Recommendations**

<p><b>17. Positive reflections</b></p>	<p>1. Works were delivered under budget. The robust cost control measures as employed by the City's Project Team, supported by the consultant lift specialist, Butler &amp; Young Lift Consultants, maintained a tight grip on project finances throughout the delivery phase.</p> <p>2. Although not delivered to the Gateway 5 programme, this was entirely attributable to the unprecedented global public health crisis. The contractor, in conjunction with the City's Project Team, performed well in remobilising quickly to complete the works when deemed safe to do so minimising the delay to completion wherever possible.</p>
<p><b>18. Improvement reflections</b></p>	<p>1. The change request received post Gateway 4 to reverse entry into the ground floor Petticoat Tower lifts and reconfigure the lobby entrance to the building delayed the procurement of the project by 12 months as additional feasibility studies had to be commissioned. The studies revealed that reversing entry at ground floor level would necessitate a reduction in lift car size which would have implications for accessibility, and as would be classified as works of improvement rather than repair, costs would not be recoverable from leaseholders. No funding source for the requested changes was identified. Change requests significantly altering a projects scope should properly be considered during, or even prior to, the Gateway 4 options appraisal. Any late request for significant scope change will always likely have a detrimental effect on project timelines.</p> <p>2. Cost estimates made at the beginning of the project did not adequately allow for cost inflation throughout the development period to delivery which resulted in the requirement for a post tender Issues Report to gain approval for a budget uplift. Gateway 2 estimates for future projects where a lengthy development period is also expected should better present a more conservative cost range to reflect the increased cost uncertainty that arises when forecasting costs over a longer term.</p> <p>3. Although utilising the same contractor as at the successfully delivered Golden Lane, Collinson Court and William Blake Estate project which was delivered on time and under budget in 2017/18, a different sub-contractor was employed by Guideline to fit the Middlesex Street Estate lifts. In this instance the replacement sub-contractor did perform</p>

v. April 2019

	adequately but was a timely reminder that sub-contractor selection can be critical to the successful delivery of a project and yet remains largely out of the control of the client.
<b>19. Sharing best practice</b>	<p>1. Dissemination of key information through team and project staff briefings.</p> <p>2. Lessons learned have been logged and recorded on departmental SharePoint.</p>
<b>20. AOB</b>	N/A

### **Appendices**

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Project Coversheet
-------------------	--------------------

### **Contact**

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

This page is intentionally left blank

# Project Coversheet

## [1] Ownership & Status

**UPI:** 11759

**Core Project Name:** Middlesex Street Estate Lift Refurbishment

**Programme Affiliation** (if applicable): None

**Project Manager:** David Downing

**Definition of need:** The six residential lifts at the Middlesex Street social housing estate had reached the end of their operational life with key components over 50 years old and others now obsolete.

**Key measures of success:**

- 1) Modernise all six lifts on the Middlesex Street Estate.
- 2) Ensure full compliance with current fire safety standards.
- 3) Improved accessibility by extending lift provision to previously unserved floors.
- 4) Improved service for residents via increased capacity and travel speed where possible.

**Expected timeframe for the project delivery:** Project Complete

**Key Milestones:** Project Complete

**Are we on track for completing the project against the expected timeframe for project delivery?** Yes

**Has this project generated public or media impact and response which the City of London has needed to manage or is managing?** No

## [2] Finance and Costed Risk

**Headline Financial, Scope and Design Changes:**

**'Project Briefing' G1 report (as approved by Chief Officer 23/02/2015):**

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,012,500
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: 2017-2018

*Scope/Design Change and Impact: None*

**'Project Proposal' G2 report (as approved by PSC 23/02/2015):**

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,012,500
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £0
- Spend to date: £0
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: 2017-2018

*Scope/Design Change and Impact: None*

**'Options Appraisal and Design' G3-4 report (as approved by PSC 29/06/2016):**

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,012,500
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £8,000
- Spend to date: £0
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A

- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: 2017-2018

*Scope/Design Change and Impact:* None

**Issues Report (as approved by PSC 31/01/2017):**

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,032,500
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £8,000
- Spend to date: £8,000
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: 2017-2018

*Scope/Design Change and Impact:* Change of scope approved to include creation of new lift stops to bring lift service to previously unserved floors accessible by staircase only.

**Issues Report (as approved by PSC 12/12/2018):**

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,555,000
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £0
- Spend to date: £14,600
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: 2019-2020

*Scope/Design Change and Impact:* Issues Report approved to uplift budget following procurement of works contract.

**‘Authority to start Work’ G5 report (as approved by Chief Officer 17/12/2018):**

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,555,000
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £0
- Spend to date: £14,600
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates: April 2019 – Summer 2020

*Scope/Design Change and Impact:* None

**Total anticipated on-going commitment post-delivery [£]: £0**  
**Programme Affiliation [£]: N/A**

<b>Committees:</b> Corporate Projects Board (for information) Projects Sub (for decision) Housing Management & Almshouses Sub (for decision)	<b>Dates:</b> 01 September 2021 15 September 2021 20 September 2021
<b>Subject:</b> Gateway 6: Renewal of Roof Coverings at 1-48 Blake House, William Blake Estate	<b>Gateway 6:</b> <b>Outcome Report</b> Light
<b>Report of:</b> Director of Community & Children's Services <b>Report Author:</b> Paul Murtagh, Assistant Director Housing & Barbican	<b>For Decision</b>
<h2>PUBLIC</h2>	

### Summary

<b>1. Status update</b>	<b>Project Description:</b> This project provided for the removal and repair of defective asphalt roof coverings to the main roof of 1-48 Blake House and the installation of a 'Paraquartz' liquid membrane waterproofing (complete with 20-year, insurance backed warranty). The work also included for the removal and replacement of defective patio roof slabs and associated building repairs. <b>RAG Status:</b> Green (Green at last report to committee) <b>Risk Status:</b> Low (Low at last report to committee) <b>Costed Risk Provision Utilised:</b> Not applicable <b>Final Outturn Cost:</b> £396,237
<b>2. Next steps and requested decisions</b>	<b>Requested Decisions:</b> 1. To note the content of this report. 2. To note the lessons learnt. 3. To authorise closure of this project.
<b>3. Key conclusions</b>	1. The works to install a new liquid waterproofing membrane to the main roof at 1-48 Blake House were completed as planned,

v.April 2019

	<p>within the agreed timescales and, in accordance with the detailed specification. The work has now been issued with a 20-year insurance backed warranty.</p> <p>2. During the execution of the project, there were several issues that arose which, subsequently impacted on the final cost of the project. These included the application of an additional liquid membrane layer to overcome adhesion problems, reinstatement of areas damaged by residents, repairs to the asphalt sub-strata and associated additional scaffolding costs. However, the effect of most of these additional costs were mitigated by cost savings in other areas of the project. The final cost of the works of £393,737 represents an increase of £9,232.45 on the original cost of the works of £384,504 approved at Gateway 5. This increase was approved under Chief Officer and Chamberlain delegation.</p> <p>3. The successful contractor, M H Goldsmith &amp; Sons Limited, performed well throughout the project and, was proactive in working with the City's project management team and, the nominated supplier, Langley Waterproofing Systems Limited, to successfully deliver the works.</p> <p>4. This project was intended as a 'pilot project' for further larger re-roofing projects across the City's housing portfolio and, it has demonstrated that the waterproofing system selected is suitable and appropriate for similar roof coverings.</p> <p>5. The procurement and contractor selection processes for this project appeared to have worked well and contributed to its successful delivery.</p>
--	---

## **Main Report**

### **Design & Delivery Review**

<b>4. Design into delivery</b>	<p>The project design has worked well. This project was intended as a 'pilot project' for further larger re-roofing projects across the City's housing portfolio and, it has served its purpose.</p> <p>The independent regular inspection process undertaken by the warranty provider provided an additional layer of assurance around the quality of delivery and, allowed for direct project management costs to be reduced. The project design is recommended for future projects of this nature.</p>
<b>5. Options appraisal</b>	As set out in the Gateway 1-4 Report approved by the relevant Committees, there was only ever one practical option for dealing

v.April 2019



	with the poor condition of the roof at 1-48 Blake House, which was to install a new liquid membrane waterproofing system. This was the option pursued and has enabled the successful delivery of the objectives of the project. No changes were required during project delivery.
<b>6. Procurement route</b>	Works were procured via a restricted tender process through the Capital Esourcing portal. This approach produced a suitable number of robust and competitive bids for the project.
<b>7. Skills base</b>	The City of London project team had the required skills and experience to manage the delivery of the project. The introduction of the independent regular inspection process undertaken by the warranty provider provided an additional layer of assurance around the quality of delivery and, allowed for direct project management costs to be reduced. This approach is recommended for future projects of this nature.
<b>8. Stakeholders</b>	Stakeholders were engaged and managed well throughout the delivery of the project especially, in relation to the City's statutory obligations around leaseholder consultation as part of the Section 20 process. Collaboration between the City's Project Manager, the contractor and the Estate Management Team was critical to the successful delivery of the project.

### **Variation Review**

<b>9. Assessment of project against key milestones</b>	<p>The commencement of the project was delayed by three months from the anticipated start date at Gateway 1-4. This was due, in the main, to dealing with queries from leaseholders relating to the Section 20 process. Similarly, the completion date was also delayed by three months. However, the work was completed within the stipulated contract period.</p> <p>One of the key milestones for this project was the completion of the works to the standard required to enable the issue and implementation of the 20-year insurance backed warranty. This was achieved successfully.</p>
<b>10. Assessment of project against Scope</b>	The scope of the project summarily, was the removal and repair of defective asphalt roof coverings to the main roof of 1-48 Blake House and the installation of a 'Paraquartz' liquid membrane waterproofing system (complete with 20-year, insurance backed warranty) to the whole of the main roof. The scope of the project was achieved successfully and, the works were completed as specified and planned.

v.April 2019

<b>11.Risks and issues</b>	<p>The project proceeded largely as planned with no significant risks realised during the delivery phase. During the execution of the project, there were several issues that arose which, subsequently impacted on the final cost of the project and caused some minor disruption. However, these were dealt with swiftly and efficiently and, will serve as lessons learned for future similar projects.</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision was not applicable to this project.</p>
<b>12.Transition to BAU</b>	<p>In order to maintain the 20-year insurance backed warranty, it will be necessary to implement a maintenance regime comprising annual inspections, clearing and cleaning rainwater pipes and gullies etc. This is estimated at a cost of £750 per annum and will be the responsibility of the Housing Repairs Team and funded from the Housing Revenue Account.</p>

### Value Review

13. Budget	<b>Estimated Outturn Cost at Gateway 1-4</b>		
	Works Costs		£350,000
	Staff Costs		£10,500
	<b>Total Project Cost</b>		<b>£360,500</b>
		<b>At Authority to Start Work (G5)</b>	<b>Final Outturn Cost</b>
	Staff Costs	£10,500.00	£2,500.00
	Works	£384,504.00	£393,736.45
	<b>Total</b>	<b>£395,004.00</b>	<b>£396,236.45</b>
	<p>The Final Outturn Cost represents an overall increase of £1,232.45 on the costs reported at Gateway 5. Whilst this is a relatively modest increase, there were several issues that arose during the execution of the project that subsequently, impacted on the final cost of the works. However, the effect of most of these additional costs were mitigated by cost savings in other areas of the project and, a realignment of the staff costs.</p>		
	<p>The overall nett increase in the cost of the works from Gateway 5 was approved under Chief Officer and Chamberlain delegation.</p>		
14. Investment	N/A		

<b>15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives</b>	<p>The SMART objectives for this project have been met as set out below:</p> <p><b>7.1 Specific</b> The project was targeted at an identified main flat roof to the flat block 1-48 Blake House on the William Blake Estate. The works to the roof were completed successfully.</p> <p><b>7.2 Measurable</b> The successful completion of the works will eliminate all roof leaks and provide new, modern and efficient roof coverings warranted for a period of 20 years.</p> <p><b>7.3 Realistic</b> By assigning the necessary resources, the City is ensuring that its housing stock continues to meet the Decent Homes Standard and its statutory obligations to tenants and leaseholders are being met.</p>
<b>16. Key benefits realised</b>	<p>9.1 The works will eliminate all roof leaks, preventing further internal structural damage and damage to property.</p> <p>9.2 The provision of new roof coverings with improved insulation complete with a comprehensive 20-year insurance backed warranty has been achieved.</p>

### **Lessons Learned and Recommendations**

<b>17. Positive reflections</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The works were done to a high standard, satisfying the requirements of the warranty provider. The work was carried out within the envisaged timescales and, close to the budget provisions approved at Gateway 5.</li> <li>2. The project design worked well. This project served as a 'pilot project' for further larger re-roofing projects across the City's housing portfolio and, it has served its purpose.</li> <li>3. The contractor, M H Goldsmith &amp; Sons Limited, performed well and worked collaboratively with the materials supplier and the Estate Management Team to ensure the success of the project. As a specialist SME, this project was a key one for the contractor in demonstrating its commitment and diligence in delivering the works and, its desire to continue to work with the City in the future.</li> <li>4. The independent regular inspection process undertaken by the warranty provider provided an additional layer of assurance around the quality of delivery and, allowed for direct project management costs to be reduced. The</li> </ol>
---------------------------------	---

v. April 2019

	project design is recommended for future projects of this nature.
<b>18.Improvement reflections</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With the benefit of this completed pilot project, we now know that the sub-strata to roofs of a similar age is likely to require specific elements of repair. Provision can subsequently be made in future specifications for this work to prevent additional costs.</li> <li>2. Regarding future programmes, greater consideration should be given to fitting out the scaffolding with an alarm system to deter trespass and potential break-ins.</li> <li>3. Although several precautions were put in place to prevent access to the roof for the duration of the works, damage to the new roofing system resulted from residents accessing the roof before completion. Greater consideration will be given in future as to how we can prevent such incidences.</li> <li>4. By ensuring that the maintenance and inspection provisions required by the 20-year insurance backed warranty are met, the lifespan of the new roof coverings will be extended.</li> </ol>
<b>5. Sharing best practice</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dissemination of key information through team and project staff briefings.</li> <li>2. Lessons learned have been logged and recorded on departmental SharePoint.</li> </ol>
<b>3. AOB</b>	N/A

## Appendices

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Project Coversheet
-------------------	--------------------

## Contact

<b>Report Author</b>	Paul Murtagh
<b>Email Address</b>	paul.murtagh@cityoflondon.gov.uk
<b>Telephone Number</b>	0207 332 3015

# Project Briefing

Project identifier			
<b>[1a] Unique Project Identifier</b>	TBA	<b>[1b] Departmental Reference Number</b>	
<b>[2] Core Project Name</b>	Renewal of Roof Coverings at 1-48 Blake House, William Blake Estate.		
<b>[3] Programme Affiliation</b> (if applicable)	N/A		

Ownership	
<b>[4] Chief Officer has signed off on this document</b>	Andrew Carter
<b>[5] Senior Responsible Officer</b>	Paul Murtagh
<b>[6] Project Manager</b>	Paul Murtagh

Description and purpose					
<b>[7] Project Mission statement / Elevator pitch</b>					
To provide for the removal and repair of defective asphalt roof coverings to the main roof and the installation of a 'Paraquartz' liquid membrane waterproofing system (complete with 20-year, insurance backed warranty). The removal and replacement of defective roof patio slabs to the main roof area and, associated building repairs including cleaning and repair of rainwater goods and gullies, brickwork repairs and repairs to parapet walls.					
<b>[8] Definition of Need: What is the problem we are trying to solve or opportunity we are trying to realise (i.e. the reasons why we should make a change)?</b>					
This work will eliminate the risk of further water ingress through the flat roof, which is causing internal structural damage and damage to property. The work will ensure that City is not failing in its duty to maintain its homes in a decent standard of repair and avoids further deterioration in the value of a City asset.					
<b>[9] What is the link to the City of London Corporate plan outcomes?</b>					
[1] People are safe and feel safe. [2] People enjoy good health and wellbeing. [4] Communities are cohesive and have suitable housing and facilities.					
<b>[10] What is the link to the departmental business plan objectives?</b>					
This proposal relates to the Department of Community and Children's Services' Business Plan (2017-22), which lists a priority objective as "Supporting Homes and Communities", specifically "developing strong neighbourhoods and ensuring people have a decent place to live".					
<b>[11] Note all which apply:</b>					
<b>Officer:</b> Project developed from Officer initiation	Y	<b>Member:</b> Project developed from Member initiation	N	<b>Corporate:</b> Project developed as a large scale Corporate initiative	N
<b>Mandatory:</b> Compliance with legislation, policy and audit	Y	<b>Sustainability:</b> Essential for business continuity	N	<b>Improvement:</b> New opportunity/ idea that leads to improvement	Y

<b>Project Benchmarking:</b>	
<b>[12] What are the top 3 measures of success which will indicate that the project has achieved its aims?</b>	
1) The completion of the works to deliver a new roof system with a comprehensive 20-year insurance backed warranty.	
2) Improved condition of City asset, increased levels of resident confidence and satisfaction.	
3) Elimination of water ingress from roof and elimination of subsequent structural damage and damage to property.	
<b>[13] Will this project have any measurable legacy benefits/outcome that we will need to track after the end of the 'delivery' phase? If so, what are they and how will you track them? (E.g. cost savings, quality etc.)</b>	
No	
<b>[14] What is the expected delivery cost of this project (range values)[£]?</b>	
Lower Range estimate: £360,000	
Upper Range estimate: £390,000	
<b>[15] Total anticipated on-going revenue commitment post-delivery (lifecycle costs)[£]:</b>	
Total £750 per annum maintenance costs to ensure warranty is maintained.	
<b>[16] What are the expected sources of funding for this project?</b>	
HRA funding for maintenance works with approximately 30% recoverable from leaseholders.	
<b>[17] What is the expected delivery timeframe for this project (range values)? Are there any deadlines which must be met (e.g. statutory obligations)?</b>	
Lower Range estimate: March 2019 – October 2019	
Upper Range estimate: January 2020 – December 2020.	

<b>Project Impact:</b>	
<b>[18] Will this project generate public or media impact and response which the City of London will need to manage? Will this be a high-profile activity with public and media momentum?</b>	
No.	
<b>[19] Who has been actively consulted to develop this project to this stage?</b>	
<(Add additional internal or external stakeholders where required) >	
Chamberlains:	Officer Name: Mark Jarvis, Dianne Merrifield
Finance	
Chamberlains:	Officer Name: Michael Harrington
Procurement	
IT	Officer Name: N/A
HR	Officer Name: N/A
Communications	Officer Name: Chandni Tanna
Corporate Property	Officer Name: N/A
External	N/A
<b>[20] Is this project being delivered internally on behalf of another department? If not ignore this question. If so:</b>	
Please note the Client supplier departments.	
Who will be the Officer responsible for the designing of the project?	
If the supplier department will take over the day-to-day responsibility for the project, when will this occur in its design and delivery?	
Client	Department:
Supplier	Department:
Supplier	Department:
Project Design Manager	Department:
Design/Delivery handover to Supplier	Gateway stage: <Before Project Proposal>, <Post Project Proposal>, <Post Options Appraisal>, <Post Detailed design>, <Post Authority to start work>

# Agenda Item 9

*This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.*

<b>Committees:</b> Corporate Projects Board <i>[for information]/[for decision]</i>  Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee <i>[for decision]</i>  Projects Sub <i>[for decision]</i>	<b>Dates:</b> 01 September 2021 20 September 2021 15 September 2021
<b>Subject:</b> Fire Compartmentation – Great Arthur House  <b>Unique Project Identifier: 11983</b>	<b>Gateway 3/4 Regular Issue Report</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of Community & Children's Services  <b>Report Author:</b> Jason Crawford	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>PUBLIC</b>	

<b>1. Status update</b>	<p><b>Project Description:</b> Replacement of front doors to meet statutory requirements for fire safety as laid out in Part B of the Buildings Regulations 2010.</p> <p>The scope of this project was expanded at G3/4 to include the replacement of all panel compartmentation surrounding the front doors, replacement of internal/external common area fire doors and internal fire escape doors to achieve compartmentation requirements.</p> <p>With the introduction of the sprinkler systems project the fire compartmentation project was temporarily put on hold, as the sprinkler installations will have a direct bearing on the scope and requirements for the fire compartmentation works.</p> <p>In the interim, we have looked at additional requirements for further detailed cost consultancy and the need to appoint a dedicated Communications Consultant to undertake resident consultations.</p>
-------------------------	--

*This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.*

	<p><b>RAG Status:</b> Amber (Green at last report to Committee)</p> <p><b>Risk Status:</b> Low (Low at last report to committee)</p> <p><b>Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk):</b> =</p> <p><b>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk):</b> Increase of £57,665 (3%) since last report to Committee to cover the tendered submission and appoint a dedicated Communications Consultant.</p> <p><b>Spend to Date:</b> £34,036.32</p> <p><b>Costed Risk Provision Utilised:</b> n/a</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> HRA Capital Funding</p> <p><b>Slippage:</b> With the introduction of the sprinkler installations project the fire compartmentation project was temporarily deferred whilst the works for the sprinklers project were being tendered.</p>												
<b>2. Requested decisions</b>	<p><b>Next Gateway:</b> Gateway 5 - Authority to Start Work (Regular)</p> <p><b>Requested Decisions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That <b>£101,665</b> is approved to cover the remainder of Studio Partington's design fees.</li> <li>2. That an additional budget of <b>£10,000</b> is approved to cover the Communications Consultant's fees.</li> <li>3. Additional Costs are added for staff time (<b>£20,000</b>).</li> <li>4. Note the revised project budget of <b>£2,050,665</b> (excluding risk);</li> </ol> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th><th>Cost (£)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Works</td><td>£1,856,000</td></tr> <tr> <td>Consultancy (Design Team)</td><td>£147,665</td></tr> <tr> <td>Consultancy (Communications)</td><td>£10,000</td></tr> <tr> <td>Staff Costs</td><td>£37,000</td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Total (excl. spend to date)</b></td><td><b>£2,050,665</b></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	Cost (£)	Works	£1,856,000	Consultancy (Design Team)	£147,665	Consultancy (Communications)	£10,000	Staff Costs	£37,000	<b>Total (excl. spend to date)</b>	<b>£2,050,665</b>
Item	Cost (£)												
Works	£1,856,000												
Consultancy (Design Team)	£147,665												
Consultancy (Communications)	£10,000												
Staff Costs	£37,000												
<b>Total (excl. spend to date)</b>	<b>£2,050,665</b>												
<b>3. Budget</b>	<p><b>Design Team:</b></p> <p>At Gateway 3/4 the estimate for the consultant's fees was £90,000 and this was based on a requirement up to Gateway 5.</p>												



	<p>However, further consideration has been given to the nature of the works and it was felt that the appointment should be extended to cover the works delivery period, as there will be a requirement for the consultants to work alongside the contractors and provide on-going professional design advice and guidance during the works.</p> <p>The tender included provision for the contract period to cover up to RIBA stages 5-7, and for a multi-disciplinary design team to be appointed. The winning tender was submitted by Studio Partington Architects and the tendered sum was £130,165.00.</p> <p>Whilst the tender allowed for some cost advice, it didn't include a specific requirement for a Quantity Surveyor appointment as it was felt at the time that that the Design Team and City of London Officers could undertake this role.</p> <p>However, as we've investigated the requirements further it has become apparent for the need to include Quantity Surveying services to undertake a detailed cost analysis, prepare specifications for the works tender packages and evaluation of the technical and cost submissions throughout the tender process.</p> <p>The Design Team remit has been expanded to incorporate the services of a Quantity Surveyor.</p> <p>The final sum for the Design Team is £147,665 which is an increase of £17,500 (12%). However, this increase reflects the additional requirements to cover the lifespan of the project and for additional communications consultancy.</p> <p>£46,000 was approved at Gateway 3/4 and we are now seeking approval to draw down the budget of £111,665 to cover the remaining fees.</p> <p><b>Communications Consultant:</b></p> <p>At G3/4 we had not incorporated the need for a dedicated Communications consultant.</p> <p>It was initially felt that the Asset Programme Manager and Project Manager in conjunction with the Design Team (Studio Partington Architects) could undertake much of this through face to face resident consultation events, which were intended to take place at key milestones within the programme.</p> <p>However, it has quickly become apparent that expectations around the level, detail and frequency of consultations far exceeds the minimum statutory requirements and the available internal resourcing to undertake this level of work.</p> <p>The amount of internal resourcing required to meet these expectations is limited and isn't sustainable in the long term. As</p>
--	---

	<p>such, having taken advice from colleagues in Procurement we have procured the services of a Communications Consultant (the appointment also covers the Golden Lane Windows Project).</p> <p>Working with the communications consultants we will continue to consult with City of London Planning as part of the planning requirements and develop a statement of community involvement as part of the Planning process, as well as a detailed stakeholder engagement strategy as part of the consultations.</p> <p>We are now seeking approval for £10,000 to cover their services for the Great Arthur House fire compartmentation project. Their costs for the Golden Lane Windows project is covered in a separate issues report.</p> <table><tr><th>Item</th><th>Reason</th><th>Funds/ Source of Funding</th><th>Cost (£)</th></tr><tr><td>Design Team Fees</td><td>To create cost plan</td><td>HRA</td><td>£147,665</td></tr><tr><td>Communications Consultant</td><td>To support the Major Works Team</td><td>HRA</td><td>£10,000</td></tr><tr><td>Staff Costs</td><td>To cover increased programme length</td><td>HRA</td><td>£20,000</td></tr><tr><td><b>Total</b></td><td></td><td></td><td><b>£177,665</b></td></tr></table> <p><b>Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: n/a</b> (however a Risk Register has been included at Appendix 2)</p>	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)	Design Team Fees	To create cost plan	HRA	£147,665	Communications Consultant	To support the Major Works Team	HRA	£10,000	Staff Costs	To cover increased programme length	HRA	£20,000	<b>Total</b>			<b>£177,665</b>
Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)																		
Design Team Fees	To create cost plan	HRA	£147,665																		
Communications Consultant	To support the Major Works Team	HRA	£10,000																		
Staff Costs	To cover increased programme length	HRA	£20,000																		
<b>Total</b>			<b>£177,665</b>																		
<b>4. Issue description</b>	<p>The installation of the sprinklers and the fire suppression mean that we may not have to include such extensive measures in terms of the fire compartmentation that was previously being envisioned at Gateway 3/4. This could have an impact on the overall value of the work (decrease).</p> <p>We have been in consultation with the Design team and specialist Fire Engineers to assess how the sprinkler installations will inform the current project scope and requirements around fire compartmentation.</p>																				

*This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.*

	<p>Now that the tender for the sprinklers has been completed, we are reviewing the scope of works, the programme and the associated costs going forward. These will be further defined once we have oversight of the agreed final design for the sprinkler installations.</p> <p>We are intending to programme the fire compartmentation works to follow on from the sprinkler installations which for Great Arthur House are currently expected to complete at the end of May 2022. This is considered to be the best approach for two main reasons.</p> <p>Firstly, the installation and final design of sprinkler systems will have a direct bearing on the scope and requirements of the fire compartmentation works.</p> <p>Secondly, considering the nature of the works the best approach would be for the Sprinkler Installations to be undertaken first and for the compartmentation works to follow. This will avoid the need for rework to the fire compartmentation works, as the sprinkler installations may require drilling through areas already addressed under the fire compartmentation works.</p> <p>1. Design Team Fees (including provision to incorporate communications consultancy services): £101,665  2. Communications Consultant Fees: £10,000  3. Staff Costs £20,000</p>
<b>5. Options</b>	Not applicable.

## **Appendices**

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Project Cover Sheet
<b>Appendix 2</b>	Risk Register

## **Contact**

<b>Report Author</b>	Jason Crawford
<b>Email Address</b>	<a href="mailto:Jason.Crawford@cityoflondon.gov.uk">Jason.Crawford@cityoflondon.gov.uk</a>
<b>Telephone Number</b>	020 7332 3010

This page is intentionally left blank

# Project Coversheet

## [1] Ownership & Status

**UPI: 11983**

**Core Project Name:** Fire Compartmentation - Great Arthur House

**Programme Affiliation** (if applicable): Great Arthur House Sprinkler System

**Project Manager:** Jason Crawford

**Definition of need:** to meet statutory requirements for fire safety as laid out in Part B of the Buildings Regulations 2010

**Key measures of success:**

1. Compliance with Building Regulations Approved Document B Fire Safety.
2. Increased level of fire safety / protection for residents
3. Better accessibility for residents in compliance with Equality Act 2010.
4. Improved security, acoustics and thermal efficiency.

**Expected timeframe for the project delivery:** Start on site was previously expected July 2021. The scope of works and programme is currently being reviewed based around the Sprinkler System project which has recently been procured. The scope of works for the Sprinkler Project will determine to a greater extent the scope of works required for the Fire Compartmentation works and we are currently realigning the programme. A revised programme is being developed and compartmentation works are likely to take place on completion of the Sprinkler installations. Great Arthur House Sprinkler Installations are due to complete end of May 2022 and works to the Compartmentation will be programmed accordingly.

**Key Milestones:**

- Review / Final Design – Jan 2022 (dependent upon Sprinkler programme)
- Tender for works – May 2022 (dependent upon Sprinkler programme)
- Gateway 5 – June 2022 (dependent upon Sprinkler programme)
- Start on site – August 2022 (dependent upon Sprinkler programme)

Note: the above dates are subject to the Sprinkler Installations and any slippage to that programme will have a bearing on the Fire Compartmentation programme.

**Are we on track for completing the project against the expected timeframe for project delivery?** N

The Fire Compartmentation project is now being realigned to complement the works being undertaken as part of the Sprinkler Installation project. We are currently reviewing the scope and programme as the works being undertaken on the Sprinkler Installations will determine the additional Fire Compartmentation requirements for Great Arthur House.

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

Not so far, but due to the listed status it's likely that members, senior officers and residents will be keenly interested. We are aware that Leaseholders have been very active in expressing their concerns and this is normal for most of the projects being managed on this estate.

We have appointed a dedicated communications consultant to work alongside the appointed Design Team on both the Great Arthur House Fire Compartmentation and the Golden Lane Windows projects. The communications consultant will be drawing up a statement of community involvement to help discharge planning requirements and developing a stakeholder engagement strategy to support the consultation process.

The procurement is complete, and we are seeking authorisation for the budgets to be released.

## **[2] Finance and Costed Risk**

### **Headline Financial, Scope and Design Changes:**

#### **‘Project Briefing’ G1 report (as approved by Chief Officer 19/01/2018):**

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £675,000
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
  - February 2018 – Gateway 1 & 2 approved.
  - June 2018 – Gateway 3-4 report.
  - September 2018 – Procurement
  - November 2018 – Works commence.

*Scope/Design Change and Impact: n/a*

#### **‘Project Proposal’ G2 report (as approved by PSC 14/02/2018):**

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £675,000
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £39,000
- Spend to date: n/a
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates: As above

*Scope/Design Change and Impact:*

#### **‘Options Appraisal and Design’ G3-4 report (as approved by PSC 20/09/2019):**

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,993,000
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £119,000
- Spend to date: £6,000
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
  - Gateway 3/4 - September 2019
  - Tender/appoint design team – November 2019
  - Interim Design – January 2020
  - Manufacture & Interim Installation – May 2020
  - Removal & Destructive Testing – July 2020
  - Review / Final Design – September 2020
  - Destructive testing / Final Planning Approval – December 2020

- Tender for works – February 2021
- Gateway 5 – April 2021
- Start on site – June 2021

*Scope/Design Change and Impact:*

The original scope was to replace door sets, side and top window lights and door panels. However, ongoing investigations and a fire risk assessment carried out by the fire safety consultant Frankhams, made it apparent that the amount of work required to achieve the full compartmentation of the apartments (in line with the guidance in Approved Document B) was likely to be much more considerable than previously anticipated. It could well mean that the entire screen, including its hardwood framing may need to be removed.

As such the original scope was expanded to include replacement of all panel compartmentation as well as replacement of internal and external common area fire doors as well as individual fire escape doors. Impacts are on cost and programme dates.

Milestones were amended to take into account the requirement to test the additional doors included in the expanded scope, re-design, achieve planning and listed building consent on the new designs, and undertake destructive testing of the new design before achieving final planning & listed building consent prior to tendering for the works & undertaking new installations.

**Issues report (pending approval by PSC 15/09/21):**

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £2,050,665
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk):
  - £111,665 to cover remainder of Design team fees
  - £10,000 to cover appointment of Communications Consultant
  - Additional £20,00 to cover staff fees
- Spend to date: £34,036.32
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates (currently being reviewed in line with Sprinkler installation programme):
  - Review / Final Design – Jan 2022 (dependent upon Sprinkler programme)
  - Tender for works – May 2022 (dependent upon Sprinkler programme)
  - Gateway 5 – June 2022 (dependent upon Sprinkler programme)
  - Start on site – August 2022 (dependent upon Sprinkler programme)

*Scope/Design Change and Impact:*

With the advent of the Sprinkler System Projects we are now reviewing the scope of works for the Fire Compartmentation project as the requirements may no longer be as extensive as previously anticipated at Gateway 3/4.

We are currently reviewing the scope of works required, which will largely be determined by the works being undertaken on the Sprinkler installations. Once we

*This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.*

have oversight of the final agreed designs we will re-define the scope of works required around the Fire Compartmentation project.

Furthermore, we are also reviewing the programme and aligning the works so that they can be undertaken following the sprinkler installations.

**‘Authority to start Work’ G5 report (as approved by PSC xx/yy/zz):**

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk):
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk)
- Spend to date:
- Costed Risk Against the Project:
- CRP Requested:
- CRP Drawn Down:
- Estimated Programme Dates:

*Scope/Design Change and Impact:*

**Total anticipated on-going commitment post-delivery [£]:** unquantifiable general repairs & maintenance will be undertaken as and when required

**Programme Affiliation [£]:** n/a



**City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register**

 Project name: Fire Safety Doors - Great Arthur House

 Unique project identifier: PV11983

 Total est cost (exc risk) £2050665

Corporate Risk Matrix score table

PM's overall risk rating

Low
5.1
3.0
0
6
3

Avg risk pre-mitigation

Avg risk post-mitigation

Red risks (open)

Amber risks (open)

Green risks (open)

	Minor impact	Serious impact	Major impact	Extreme impact
Likely	4	8	16	32
Possible	3	6	12	24
Unlikely	2	4	8	16
Rare	1	2	4	8

Costed risks identified (All)

£0.00	0%
£0.00	0%
£0.00	0%
£0.00	0%

Costed risk as % of total estimated cost of project

" "

" "

Costed risk pre-mitigation (open)

Costed risk post-mitigation (open)

Costed Risk Provision requested

CRP as % of total estimated cost of project

- (1) Compliance/Regulatory
- (2) Financial
- (3) Reputation
- (4) Contractual/Partnership
- (5) H&S/Wellbeing
- (6) Safeguarding
- (7) Innovation
- (8) Technology
- (9) Environmental
- (10) Physical

Number of Open Risks	Avg Score	Costed impact	Red	Amber	Green
1	8.0	£0.00	0	1	0
4	4.8	£0.00	0	3	1
1	3.0	£0.00	0	0	1
1	6.0	£0.00	0	1	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
0	0.0	£0.00	0	0	0
2	5.0	£0.00	0	1	1

Issues (open)

0
0

All Issues

Open Issues

All Issues

Extreme	Major	Serious	Minor
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0

 Cost to resolve all issues  
(on completion)

£0.00

Total CRP used to date

£0.00

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name: Fire Safety Doors - Great Arthur House			PM's overall risk rating: Low								CRP requested this gateway		£ -		Average unmitigated risk		5.1		Open Risks		9			
Unique project identifier: PV11983			Total estimated cost (exc risk): £ 2,050,665								Total CRP used to date		£ -		Average mitigated risk score		3.0		Closed Risks		0			
General risk classification											Mitigation actions								Ownership & Action					
Risk ID	Gateway	Category	Description of the Risk	Risk Impact Description	Likelihood Classification pre-mitigation	Impact Classification pre-mitigation	Risk score	Costed impact pre-mitigation (£)	Costed Risk Provision requested Y/N	Confidence in the estimation	Mitigating actions	Mitigation cost (£)	Likelihood Classification post-mitigation	Impact Classification post-mitigation	Costed impact post-mitigation (£)	Post-Mitigation risk score	CRP used to date	Use of CRP	Date raised	Named Departmental Risk Manager/ Coordinator	Risk owner (Named Officer or External Party)	Date Closed OR/ Realised & moved to issues	Comment(s)	
R1	3	(10) Physical	Residents refuse access.	Should residents refuse access to their homes in order to complete works, it would cause cost and time delays to the project.	Unlikely	Serious	4	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	To mitigate against this, early engagement will be carried out with residents to make them aware of the upcoming works. Explanation will be provided of the benefits of the works, and any queries or concerns that residents may have will be answered.	£0.00	Rare	Serious	£0.00	2	£0.00		N	14/05/2019	Jason Crawford		Communications Consultant will support this role with direct resident engagement.	
R2	3	(2) Financial	Increase in pricing during works	A contractor may attempt to re-price for the works during the contract causing increase in project costs.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	A clear contract will be used in the first instance, and contract management will be carried out throughout the project to keep a focus on cost and delivery to budget. Project Managers will be alert to delays to the project, particularly those caused by the City of London as these can be used by contractors as leverage for increases in cost.	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00		N	14/05/2019	Jason Crawford			
R3	3	(2) Financial	Challenge to tender awarding process	An unsuccessful contractor may challenge the tender process.	Rare	Minor	1	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	A robust tendering process will be put in place in conjunction with the CLPS. Should a challenge arise, advice will be sought from CLPS and legal services to ensure the dispute is resolved rapidly and successfully.	£0.00	Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00		N	14/05/2019	Jason Crawford			
R4	3	(4) Contractual/Partnership	Contractor Financial Viability	A contractor may cease to be financially viable during the progression of the project. At a minimum, this would cause delays to the project, it could also cause a temporary suspension to the project. These impacts would cause the cost of the project to increase.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Advice will be sought from CLPS when assessing and appointing a contractor to ensure they have a sound financial position and track record. Should a contractor cease to be viable, assistance will be sought from legal services to protect the City of London's interests.	£0.00	Rare	Serious	£0.00	2	£0.00		N	14/05/2019	Jason Crawford			
R5	3	(2) Financial	Significant Change in sustainability sector	Should there be a significant change in the sustainability sector between the design and construction of the project this may lead to out-of-date installations being put into our properties where better solutions are available.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Care will be taken to stress the importance of longevity of design when the scheme is being planned.	£0.00	Rare	Serious	£0.00	2	£0.00		N	14/05/2019	Jason Crawford			
R6	3	(3) Reputation	Section 20 Challenges.	Leaseholder(s) may challenge the Section 20 process or appointment of contractor on the grounds of price, quality or any other reason.	Possible	Minor	3	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	This was reported at Gateway 3/4 on as these works are considered improvements it is unlikely that we can recharge Leaseholders for the works.	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00		N	14/05/2019	Jason Crawford			
R7	3	(10) Physical	Works more extensive than planned for	Should the extent of works required be greater than planned for, the project would be delayed and costs would increase.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Detailed surveys will be carried out early in the project to determine the level of works required, and enable the costing to be as specific as possible.	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00		N	14/05/2019	Jason Crawford			
R8	3	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	Recommendations not approved	The consultant is being appointed to make recommendations for the works that could be carried out to these properties. Should none of the recommendations be approved by planning / heritage england this could delay the project.	Likely	Serious	8	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	Early engagement with Col, planning and Heritage England to seek advice on planning restrictions, and co-ordination with design consultant to ensure appropriate options are considered.	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£0.00	6	£0.00		N	14/05/2019	Jason Crawford			
R9	3	(2) Financial	Delay to works completion leads to project overrunning	Should works overrun, this will have an impact upon the budget of the project.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N	B – Fairly Confident	No actions can currently be taken, care will be taken when assessing works contractors bids to ensure realistic timescales are set. Strong contract monitoring will be undertaken to ensure that the works are progressing as planned.	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00		N	14/05/2019	Jason Crawford			
R10								£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R11								£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R12								£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Dated:</b>
Housing Management & Almshouses Sub Committee	20 September 2021
<b>Subject:</b> Housing Major Works Programme – Progress Report	<b>Public</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Director of Community & Children’s Services	<b>For Information</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Paul Murtagh Assistant Director Barbican & Property Services	

## Summary

The purpose of this report is to update Members on the progress that has been made with the Housing Major Works Programme and to advise Members on issues affecting progress on individual schemes.

## Recommendation

Members are asked to note the report.

## Main Report

### Background

1. At its meeting on 27 November 2017, the Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee received a presentation from officers in Housing Property Services on the scope of, and progress with, the Housing Major Works Programme. Members subsequently agreed that it would be useful if further updates and progress reports be brought to future meetings of this Sub-Committee.
2. The first update and progress report was presented to this Sub-Committee at its meeting on 12 February 2018. This latest update report highlights specific areas of ‘slippage’ or ‘acceleration’ since the last meeting of the Sub-Committee on 22 March 2021 as well as, progress against the programme as originally reported in November 2017.

### Considerations

3. The City of London Corporation (City Corporation) is committed to investing around £75million on a Major Works Programme for the maintenance, refurbishment and improvement of its social housing portfolio. The works, in the main comprise:
  - Window replacements;
  - Re-roofing;

- Decent Homes (new kitchens and bathrooms);
  - Electrical rewiring and upgrades;
  - Heating replacements;
  - Concrete repairs;
  - Fire safety improvement works.
4. The funding for these extensive works, which is intended to bring all the City Corporation's social housing stock up to, and beyond, the Decent Homes Standard, comes from the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), which is ring-fenced solely for housing. The HRA is made up of:
- Income from rents;
  - Income from service charges.
5. The Housing Major Works Programme was originally intended to be a 5-year programme however, the size and complexity of some of the projects included, along with initial staff resourcing issues, has meant that it is more likely to take 7 or 8 years to complete.
6. The Housing Major Works Programme is monitored and managed at several levels both corporately and within the department. This includes:
- Gateway Process;
  - DCCS Committee;
  - Projects Sub-Committee;
  - Housing Management & Almshouses Sub-Committee;
  - Housing Programme Board.
7. The Housing Programme Board (HPB) is a cross-departmental group, chaired by the Director of Community & Children's Services and comprising senior officers from:
- Housing Management;
  - Housing Property Services;
  - City Surveyors;
  - Planning;
  - Finance;
  - Town Clerks;
  - City Procurement.
8. For the purpose of the HPB, officers have developed detailed report templates that show progress of the various works programmes and these are analysed and discussed monthly. At its meeting on 27 November 2017, following a presentation from officers in Housing Property Services on the scope of, and progress with the Housing Major Works Programme, Members agreed that a simplified version of the progress reports be brought to future meetings of this Sub-Committee.
9. Attached at Appendix 1 to this report, for Members consideration, is the latest version of the progress report for the Housing Major Works Improvement

Programme. This progress report was submitted to and considered by the HPB at its meeting on 26 August 2021.

10. Members will note from the progress report at Appendix 1 that, currently, with the exception of H39 – Window Replacement and External Redecorations (Multiple Estates), there has been no significant change to the status of the various projects since the last meeting of this Sub-Committee. Members are asked to specifically note the following updates:

***Slippage in relation to timing of contract***

**H39 – Window Replacement and External Redecorations (Multiple Estates)**

Works continue on our first site in this project at Dron House, with our external consultant, Playle & Partners LLP carrying out the Project Manager function on behalf of the City Corporation. Final financial clarifications for tenders received for Southwark, Holloway, Windsor House and William Blake are being undertaken with colleagues in City Procurement. Gateway 5 reports have been drafted and once the winning bids have been confirmed with City Procurement, these will be updated and submitted for the relevant approvals.

***Progress of note on key projects***

**H40 – Golden Lane Estate Window Refurbishment/Replacement**

An Issues Report is being drafted for Members to update on progress and to seek approval for additional funds to facilitate further complex design work required by planning and other stakeholders to advance this project.

**H45 – York Way Estate Communal Heating Replacement**

Following approval at the previous Committee cycle to award the contract for the Replacement of the Cold Water Distribution system to TSG Building Services PLC and, to integrate the works with the renewal of the heating system, the installation of the distribution pipework has now commenced. Good progress has been made with the internal surveys and, in-flat installations are due to start at the beginning of November.

**H46 – Middlesex Street Estate Communal Heating Replacement**

Following approval at the previous Committee cycle to award the contract for the Replacement of the Cold Water Distribution system to TSG Building Services PLC and, to integrate the works with the renewal of the heating system, the installation of the distribution pipework is due to commence early in September. The internal surveys for the in-flat installations are also due to start at the same time.

**H53 – Play and Ball Games Area Refurbishment (Multiple Estates)**

Our contractor, Kompan Limited, has now started work at Windsor House and, the newly refurbished playground should be completed and ready for use by mid-

September. Work on the other four playgrounds (three on the Avondale Estate and one on the Middlesex Street Estate) will commence in September after the start of the new school term. It is expected that works to all five playgrounds will be completed by the end of October this year.

#### H54 – Fire Door Replacement Programme (Multiple Estates)

Pilot installations have now been completed on all blocks on the Holloway and York Way Estates to address issues raised by Building Control about the ability of the new door sets to meet the required width tolerances and to comply with the requirements of Building Regulations Approved Document M – Access to and Use of Buildings. Reports have subsequently been submitted to the Building Control Team for review and feedback.

11. As Members will appreciate, there will always be problems with contracts and projects such as those contained within the Housing Major Works Programme. The COVID-19 situation has had a significant impact on service delivery in the last 18 months or so but, with the easing of restrictions, we are seeing most of our projects picking up gradually.
12. Members will also recognise that progress with any of the projects included in the Housing Major Works Programme can change at short notice. It is often the case that notable changes in projects will have occurred from the time that reports are written to the time that they are presented to this Sub-Committee. Where appropriate, Officers will provide further updates to Members when presenting this report.

#### Staffing Resources

13. As highlighted at the previous meeting of this Sub-Committee, the Major Works Team is currently significantly under-resourced as, two of its Project Managers recently left the City Corporation to pursue other opportunities. One of those two Project Managers was appointed specifically to manage the delivery of the Window Replacement Programme at Dron House, Holloway Estate, William Blake Estate, Windsor House, Southwark Estates and the Sydenham Hill Estate.
14. The recruitment process is well underway to find suitable replacements but, it may still be six to eight weeks before we have new Project Managers in place. As a result of this resourcing issue, there is currently a two-month delay with the delivery of the Window Replacement Programme at the Holloway Estate, William Blake Estate, Windsor House, Southwark Estates and the Sydenham Hill Estate. This delay is at significant risk of increasing should there be any problems with the current recruitment process (inadequate number and/or quality of applicants, lengthy notice periods etc).

## **Appendices**

### Appendix 1: Delivery Schedule

## **Background documents**

Housing Major Works Programme Progress Report (July 2021)

Paul Murtagh

Assistant Director, Barbican & Property Services

T: 020 7332 3015 E: [paul.murtagh@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:paul.murtagh@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank



GOLDEN LANE ESTATE INVESTMENT PROGRAMME - DELIVERY FORECAST SEPTEMBER 2021

WORKS TYPE	REF	PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	EXPENDITURE TO DATE	CURRENT STATUS	SLIPPAGE SINCE LAST REPORT	TIMELINE																																		
							2018/19								2019/20								2020/21								2021/22										
							Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4				
A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M						
INVESTMENT PROGRAMME	H18	Great Arthur House - Replacement windows and cladding	£11,262,538	£10,948,500	works complete																																				
	H21	Lift Refurbishment	£1,300,000	£1,002,010	works complete																																				
	H16	Golden Lane - Heating Replacement (Phase 1 - All blocks excluding Crescent/Cullum)	£465,000	£415,458	works complete																																				
	H5	Decent Homes - Phase II (multiple estate programme)	£625,400	£605,011	works complete																																				
	H14	Golden Lane - Concrete Testing & Repairs (all blocks exc. Cullum Welch)	£1,050,000	£975,675	works complete																																				
	H15	Cullum Welch House - Concrete Balustrade Replacement & Concrete Repairs	£820,000	£696,700	works complete																																				
	H20	Redecorations (Int & Ext - in conjunction with Avondale Square, York Way & Middlesex St Estates)	£416,700	£299,086	works complete																																				
	H38	Electrical Testing - Phase II (Tenated flats GLE & MSE)	£441,000	£441,000	works complete																																				
	H26	Water Tank Replacement/Repairs (multiple estate programme)	£31,174	£10,000	works complete																																				
	H47	Electrical Testing - Phase IV (landlords electrics multiple estates)	£355,567	£229,500	works complete																																				
	H60	Electrical Testing - Phase V (tenants electrical testing & smoke alarms - multiple estates)	£420,000	£35,000	on site																																				
	H17	Golden Lane - Heating Replacement (Phase 2 - Crescent House & Cullum Welch House)	£2,000,000	£75,000	design																																				
	H40	Window Refurbishment/Replacement (All blocks excluding reclad sections of Great Arthur House)	£8,400,000	£181,800	design																																				
	H41	Great Arthur House - Front Door Replacement	£675,000	£38,000	design																																				
	H54	Fire Door Replacement Programme (multiple estate programme)	£1,160,000	£4,800	design																																				
	H55	Installation of Sprinklers (Great Arthur House as part of a multiple estate programme)	£4,000,000	£130,000	contractor mobilising at MSE																																				
	H61	Golden Lane Area Lighting & Accessibility	£500,000	£0	specification																																				
	H62	Golden Lane Estate - Re-roofing Programme	£5,000,000	£0	project initiation																																				

Page 73

MIDDLESEX STREET ESTATE INVESTMENT PROGRAMME - DELIVERY FORECAST SEPTEMBER 2021

WORKS TYPE	REF	PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	EXPENDITURE TO DATE	CURRENT STATUS	SLIPPAGE SINCE LAST REPORT	TIMELINE																																			
							2018/19								2019/20								2020/21								2021/22											
							Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4					
							A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M
INVESTMENT PROGRAMME	H22	Concrete Testing & Repairs	£160,000	£170,099	works complete																																					
	H20	Redecorations (Int & Ext - in conjunction with Avondale Square, Golden Lane, York Way Estates)	£222,314	£199,069	works complete																																					
	H38	Electrical Testing - Phase IIa (Tenated flats GLE & MSE)	£440,000	£421,000	works complete																																					
	H24	Petticoat Tower - balcony doors and windows	£450,000	£339,000	works complete																																					
	H23	MSE Lift Refurbishment	£1,555,000	£1,277,580	works complete																																					
	H26	Water Tank Replacement/Repairs (multiple estate programme)	£14,003	£560	works complete																																					
	H46	Communal Heating	£3,125,639	£1,068,000	on site																																					
	H42	Petticoat Tower - Front Door Replacement	£326,429	£152,330	on site																																					
	H25	Petticoat Tower stairwell	£435,000	£411,140	works complete																																					
	H12	Electrical Remedial Works (non-urgent)	£385,890	£363,825	works complete																																					
	H58	Electrical Remedial Works (Phase IIb - Landlords electrics)	£368,800	£140,000	works complete																																					
	H55	Installation of Sprinklers (Petticoat Tower as part of a multiple estate programme)	£4,000,000	£130,000	contractor mobilising																																					
	H53	Play and Ball Games Area Refurbushment (multiple estate programme)	£272,000	£19,130	on site																																					

- works delivery baseline (as forecast November 2017)
- works on site/complete
- works programmed (current forecast)
- testing/preparatory/offsite works
- programme slippage from previous report (length of arrow denotes length of delay)
- programme brought forward from previous report (length of arrow denotes extent)

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

- works delivery baseline (as forecast November 2017)
- works on site/complete
- works programmed (current forecast)
- testing/preparatory/offsite works
- programme slippage from previous report (length of arrow denotes length of delay)
- programme brought forward from previous report (length of arrow denotes extent)

YORK WAY ESTATE INVESTMENT PROGRAMME - DELIVERY FORECAST SEPTEMBER 2021

WORKS TYPE	REF	PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	EXPENDITURE TO DATE	CURRENT STATUS	SLIPPAGE SINCE LAST REPORT	TIMELINE																																															
							2018/19												2019/20												2020/21												2021/22											
							Q1			Q2			Q3			Q4			Q1			Q2			Q3			Q4			Q1			Q2			Q3			Q4														
							A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M												
INVESTMENT PROGRAMME	H5	Decent Homes - Phase II (multiple estate programme)	£608,000	£574,297	works complete																																																	
	H20	Redecorations (multiple estate programme)	£596,000	£541,000	works complete																																																	
	H26	Water Tank Replacement/Repairs (multiple estate programme)	£130,653	£49,000	works complete																																																	
	H48	Electrical Testing - Phase III (tenanted flats multiple estates)	£555,266	£467,000	works complete																																																	
	H47	Electrical Testing - Phase IV (landlords electrics multiple estates)	£355,567	£229,500	works complete																																																	
	H45	Communal Heating	£3,087,990	£1,606,000	on site																																																	
	H60	Electrical Testing - Phase V (tenants electrical testing & smoke alarms - multiple estates)	£420,000	£35,000	on site																																																	
	H54	Fire Door Replacement Programme (Lot 1 - Holloway & York Way)	£1,112,500	£20,000	pilot replacements																																																	

SYDENHAM HILL ESTATE INVESTMENT PROGRAMME - DELIVERY FORECAST SEPTEMBER 2021

WORKS TYPE	REF	PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	EXPENDITURE TO DATE	CURRENT STATUS	SLIPPAGE SINCE LAST REPORT	TIMELINE																							
							2018/19					2019/20					2020/21					2021/22								
							Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4	
							A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M
INVESTMENT PROGRAMME	H5	Decent Homes - Phase II (multiple estate programme)	£173,315	£46,472	works complete																									
	H48	Electrical Testing - Phase III (tenanted flats multiple estates)	£555,266	£467,000	works complete																									
	H47	Electrical Testing - Phase IV (landlords electrics multiple estates)	£355,567	£229,500	works complete																									
	H39	Window Replacements & External Redecoration (Sydenham Hill)	£466,500	£23,000	procurement	2 months																								
	H60	Electrical Testing - Phase V (tenants electrical testing & smoke alarms - multiple estates)	£420,000	£35,000	on site																									
	H54	Fire Door Replacement Programme (multiple estate programme)	£192,500	£4,800	procurement																									

SMALL ESTATES (DRON, WINDSOR, ISLEDEN, COLA, GRESHAM) INVESTMENT PROGRAMME - DELIVERY FORECAST SEPTEMBER 2021

WORKS TYPE	REF	PROJECT	ESTIMATED COST	EXPENDITURE TO DATE	CURRENT STATUS	SLIPPAGE SINCE LAST REPORT	TIMELINE																							
							2018/19					2019/20					2020/21					2021/22								
							Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4	
							A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M
INVESTMENT PROGRAMME	H5	Decent Homes - Phase II (Dron & Windsor as part of multiple estate programme)	£686,216	£451,412	works complete																									
	H26	Water Tank Replacement/Repairs (multiple estate programme)	£15,810	£15,810	works complete																									
	H48	Electrical Testing - Phase III (tenanted flats multiple estates)	£555,266	£372,000	works complete																									
	H10	Door Entry (Dron House in conjunction with William Blake)	£120,000	£120,000	works complete																									
	H56	Re-Roofing at Dron House	£404,000	£363,000	works complete																									
	H47	Electrical Testing - Phase IV (landlords electrics multiple estates)	£355,567	£229,500	works complete																									
	H39	Window Replacements & External Redecoration (Dron)	£1,600,000	£25,000	on site																									
	H39	Window Replacements & External Redecoration (Windsor)	£890,000	£21,000	procurement	2 months																								
	H60	Electrical Testing - Phase V (tenants electrical testing & smoke alarms - multiple estates)	£420,000	£35,000	on site																									
	H54	Fire Door Replacement Programme (multiple estate programme)	£890,000	£4,800	procurement																									
	H53	Play and Ball Games Area Refurbishment (multiple estate programme)	£272,000	£19,130	contractor mobilising																									
	H44	COLA & Gresham Refurbishment	£838,669	£210,000	on site																									

- works delivery basline (as forecast November 2017)
- works on site/complete
- works programmed (current forecast)
- testing/preparatory/offsite works
- programme slippage from previous report (length of arrow denotes length of delay)
- programme brought forward from previous report (length of arrow denotes extent)

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