



Barbican Estate Residents Consultation Committee

Date: MONDAY, 6 JUNE 2022

Time: 6.30 pm

Venue: HYBRID MEETING - VIA TEAMS AND IN COMMITTEE ROOM 3, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members:

Christopher Makin - Chair	Adam Hogg - Chair, Barbican Association
Sandra Jenner - Deputy Chair	Fiona Lean - Ben Jonson House
Jim Durcan - Deputy Chair	Rodney Jagelman - Thomas More
Gordon Griffiths - Bunyan Court	James Ball - Brandon Mews
Jane Smith - Seddon House	Tim Hollaway - Lambert Jones Mews
John Taysum - Bryer Court	Guy Nisbett - Speed House
John Tomlinson - Cromwell	Helen Hudson - John Trundle House
Mary Bonar - Wallside	Andy Hope - Breton House
Sandy Wilson - Shakespeare	vacancy - Andrewes House
Prof. Michael Swash - Willoughby	Dave Taylor - Gilbert House
David Lawrence - Lauderdale	vacancy - Defoe House
Mark Bostock - Frobisher	Monique Long - Mountjoy House

Enquiries: Julie.Mayer@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting

Members of the public can observe this virtual public meeting at the below link:
<https://youtu.be/R3nPPSNW9Lo>.

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one municipal year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES**

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

3. **MINUTES**

To agree the minutes of the Barbican Residents' Consultation Committee (RCC) held on 17th January 2022.

For Decision
(Pages 5 - 12)

4. **WORKING PARTY UPDATES**

To receive the minutes/reports of the various working parties.

For Information

- a) **Service Level Agreement** (Pages 13 - 14)
- b) **Gardens Advisory** (Pages 15 - 16)
- c) **Asset Management** (Pages 17 - 20)
- d) **Underfloor Heating** (Pages 21 - 22)
- e) **Leaseholder Service Charge** (Pages 23 - 24)
- f) **Electric Vehicle** (Pages 25 - 26)

5. **CONCIERGE AND BARBICAN ESTATE OFFICE SERVICE UPDATE**

Assistant Director, Barbican and Property Services to be heard in respect of arranging a Special Meeting of the Barbican Residential Committee (BRC) to consider this matter.

For Information

6. **UPDATE REPORT - BEECH GARDENS (NORTH WEST PODIUM) WATERPROOFING PROJECT**

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

For Information
(Pages 27 - 30)

7. **EWS1 FORMS FOR THE BARBICAN ESTATE**

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

For Information
(Pages 31 - 36)

8. **FIRE SAFETY - AN UPDATE ON THE WORK OF OVE ARUP**
Assistant Director, Barbican and Property Services to be heard.
For Information
9. **BLAKE TOWER - ORAL UPDATE**
Assistant Director, Barbican and Property Services to be heard.
For Information
10. **BARBICAN ESTATE TOWER LIFT REFURBISHMENT - GATEWAY 1-4: PROJECT PROPOSAL AND OPTIONS APPRAISAL**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Information
(Pages 37 - 56)
11. **'YOU SAID; WE DID' - OUTSTANDING ACTIONS LIST**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Information
(Pages 57 - 58)
12. **UPDATE REPORT**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Information
(Pages 59 - 64)
13. **PROGRESS OF SALES AND LETTINGS**
Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
For Information
(Pages 65 - 70)
14. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
15. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

Barbican Estate Residents Consultation Committee (RCC) Monday, 17 January 2022

Minutes of the virtual meeting held at 6.30 pm

A recording of this meeting is available at: <https://youtu.be/gC5KiUxSf50>
for 1 year from the date of the meeting

Present

Members:	Christopher Makin - Chair	Adam Hogg - Chair, Barbican Association
	Ted Reilly - Deputy Chair	Fiona Lean - Ben Jonson House
	Mike Cribb - Deputy Chair	Rodney Jagelman - Thomas More
	Gordon Griffiths - Bunyan Court	James Ball - Brandon Mews
	Jane Smith - Seddon House	Guy Nisbett - Speed House
	John Taysum - Bryer Court	Helen Hudson - John Trundle House
	John Tomlinson - Cromwell	Andy Hope - Breton House
	Mary Bonar - Wallside	Jim Durcan - Andrewes House
	Sandy Wilson - Shakespeare	Dave Taylor - Gilbert House
	Prof. Michael Swash - Willoughby	Sandra Jenner - Defoe House
	David Lawrence - Lauderdale	Monique Long - Mountjoy House
	Mark Bostock – Frobisher	

In attendance:

Susan Pearson	- Ward Member for Cripplegate
Helen Fentimen	- Ward Member for Aldersgate
Jeremy Mayhew, OBE	- Ward Member for Aldersgate

Officers:

Paul Murtagh	- Assistant Director, Barbican and Property Services, Community and Children's Services
Helen Davinson	- Community and Children's Services
Michael Bennett	- Community and Children's Services
Anne Mason	- Community and Children's Services
Jason Hayes	- Community and Children's Services
Mark Jarvis	- Chamberlains
Julie Mayer	- Town Clerk's

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from the Chair and Deputy Chair of the BRC, who had prior engagements this evening and from Tim Hollaway, representative from Lambert Jones Mews.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that – the Minutes of the meeting held on 27th September 2021 be approved.

Matters arising

Members noted that, whilst the government had been somewhat overwhelmed by the number of bids in respect of funding for projects aimed at reducing our carbon footprint, there was no suggestion that its commitment had waived. There had been a delay to the decision in respect of Wave 1 Bids (Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund), from 31 December 2021 to mid-February 2022, but this would not impact on the Barbican Estate at this stage. The Assistant Director and his team continue to work with colleagues in City Surveyors to ensure that all opportunities for grant funding are considered and maximised, and the City Corporation's Climate Action Strategy continues to be implemented.

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

The Committee received the outstanding actions list and during the discussion and questions the following points were noted:

The External Wall Fire Reviews had been added to the Agenda Plan for June 2022.

The next meeting of the RCC would receive a report to the BRC setting out the City Corporation's policy in respect of EWS1 forms. Members noted that the forms are not a statutory requirement however, the Assistant Director is able to provide 'comfort letters' to mortgage providers on request.

There had been a delay to the Gateway 6 - Outcome Report on Beech Gardens Podium Resurfacing Project Phase 1. This is due, in the main, to the re-procurement of a specialist consultant to investigate and advise on the quality of the works undertaken and, the suitability and level of specification. Members were assured that the lessons learned from Phase 1 had been given due consideration in the preparatory works for Phase 2. It is hoped that the Gateway 6 – Outcome Report for Phase 1 will be ready for the next RCC and BRC Meetings. If not, there will be an interim Update Report instead. It was confirmed that, in relation to Phase 2 of the works, there have been several stakeholder meetings between officers and representatives from the relevant residential blocks.

Responsibility for the maintenance of the highwalks (beyond the residential areas) had transferred to the Barbican Estate Office a number of years ago. However, the funding that transferred with it has, over time, proved to be inadequate for the works required. This matter remains the subject of ongoing discussions with the Chamberlain. The Assistant Director agreed to check on progress with gully cleaning on the podium and highwalks across the Estate.

5. **TASK AND FINISH GROUP CONCIERGE SERVICE - ORAL UPDATE**

The Assistant Director, Barbican and Property Services, advised that the work of the original Task and Finish Group was now complete, culminating in the resolution put forward to, and accepted by the Barbican Residential Committee (BRC) at its last meeting.

Members noted that officers were now considering various options in respect of the car park attendants, and possible alternatives in terms of achieving savings targets. This work will be subject to a full consultation with residents. The Leaseholder Service Charges Working Party (LSCWP) is seeking to identify cost savings in the provision of the car park service that does not affect the service itself. The wider remit of the LSCWP to seek reductions in service charges, without compromising services, continues.

The Director of Community and Children's Services and the Assistant Director, Barbican and Property Services, meet regularly with the Chairs of the RCC and the BA to maintain oversight. It is anticipated that the Corporation will be in a position to consult with residents on the various options around the beginning of April. The Assistant Director confirmed that Members of the RCC/BRC would be able to comment on the proposed options for consultation before they go live. Members will receive an update report on the outcome of consultations and preferred options at their next meetings in the Spring/Summer of 2022.

6. BLAKE TOWER - ORAL UPDATE

The Assistant Director, Barbican and Property Services advised that, despite some progress towards the end of 2021, the Corporation is still some way off taking over responsibility for the management of Blake Tower. The Assistant Director had met with some of the residents on 2 December 2021 to view some of the areas of concern. Unfortunately, the following day, on 3rd December 2021, a burst sprinkler pipe caused a serious water leak in the building. The City Solicitor has written to Redrow, setting out the concerns raised during the Assistant Director's visit, and residents' various emails, and they had since responded. Members noted that some residents had independent legal representation, and the Estate Office could not intervene in these cases. However, the City Corporation would continue to exert pressure on Redrow and, whilst not obligated to do so, had paid for the Saville's Fire Safety Survey on the block.

7. FIRE SAFETY UPDATE

The Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services, which provided an update to Members on the progress made in relation to fire safety matters since the last update report submitted to Committee in June 2021.

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

- The Planning Documents in respect of the signage strategy would be submitted within the next couple of weeks.
- The Fire Strategy document had been discussed at the Asset Maintenance Working Party and was ready to be shared with House Groups. The officer agreed to send this to the Chairman for onward circulation and officers were thanked for their thorough communications in this matter. The Cromwell House representative was invited to speak to the officer outside of the meeting, in respect of the design of the notices.

- The Fire Risk Assessors and Arup Survey had picked up on compromised standards of compartmentation, caused by unauthorised structural alterations. Whilst Fire Risk Assessments sometimes made generic comments, they had been considered in detail and the leaseholders affected had been contacted. Members noted that the Home Improvement Approvals process, in respect of final inspections and sign-offs, had been amended to prevent a recurrence.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

8. SERVICE CHARGE EXPENDITURE & INCOME ACCOUNT - ORIGINAL BUDGET 2021/22 & ORIGINAL BUDGET 2022/23

The Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services and the Chamberlain, which set out the original budget for 2021/22 and 2022/23 for revenue expenditure included within the service charge in respect of dwellings.

During the discussion on this report, the following points were noted:

1. Major works for 21/22 had been around £700k higher than expected, mainly due to asbestos remedial works and the windows replacement programme. The drainage works were itemised and referred to one block.
2. The Projects Team did not expect the water tanks replacement cost of £283k to be as high as set out in the report. Members noted that all works are itemised following surveys. The officer gave assurance of the strict governance procedures in place, across the City Corporation's Gateway Projects Procedure, to protect against variances and underspends were due to stringent budgetary controls. In the case of the water tanks, it was likely that there had been less full replacements than expected. Repair and maintenance works are often the hardest to predict but the project team look at trends over the past 5 years. Similarly, there are variations in heating costs, and these too are based on consumption over a 5 year period.
3. The windows stock condition survey had been discussed at the Asset Maintenance Working Party. The options under consideration, to support the longevity of the Estate, would run alongside the City of London Corporation's Climate Action Strategy.
4. The redecoration works had been scheduled for 2020-25 but were delayed due to the pandemic. It was unlikely that the full £142k would be spent this year and any costs incurred would be billed to leaseholders as part of the balancing adjustment in September 2023.
5. Officers agreed to investigate the asbestos repairs to the bin lockers at Bunyan Court.
6. Departmental Chief Officers are the Director of Community and Children's Services and the Assistant Director, Barbican and Property Services
7. The reference to investment properties in para 2 is an example of Central Risk budgets. This does not apply to the Barbican Estate Service Charge Account

8. A pilot for repair works was underway at Defoe House, which is expected to be more efficient in producing reports and to be potentially rolled out across the Estate. A demonstration of the pilot had been well received by the Service Level Agreement Working party.
9. The car parking reduction has been built into the 2020/21 budget estimate as part of the savings target, however, there was a perception that this could have been made clearer and was being presented as a fait accompli. Members noted the percentage charged to the service charge account in respect of car park charges amounted to 36.8% and the remainder to the car park account. The officer explained that the residential blocks are charged according to the percentages in the Lease. The total of these percentages for the original blocks amounted to 33.3% but the addition of Blake Tower and Frobisher Crescent and the loss of Milton Court led to the revised total of 36.8%.

The Chair thanked everyone for contributing to the discussion and reminded Members that the BRC will receive the minutes from this meeting, ahead of taking a decision on the report on 27th January 2022.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

9. **REVENUE & CAPITAL BUDGETS - ORIGINAL BUDGET 2021/22 AND ORIGINAL 2022/23 - EXCLUDING DWELLINGS SERVICE CHARGE INCOME & EXPENDITURE**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services and the Chamberlain, which set out the annual submission of the revenue and capital budgets overseen by the Barbican Residential Committee (BRC). The report to the BRC, presented to this Committee for information, would seek approval of the provisional revenue budget for 2022/23, for subsequent submission to the Finance Committee. Details of the Committee's draft capital budget were also provided. Members noted that notional capital charges against assets are an accounting convention, but they do not affect service charges.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

10. **BARBICAN AND GOLDEN LANE CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER SUMMARY AND MANAGEMENT STRATEGY SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS FOR THE LOCAL PLAN**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Environment and noted that a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area was issued for public consultation during May, June and July 2021. In response to comments received, several amendments were proposed to the SPD, as set out in appendices B and C to this report and these would be put before the Barbican Residential Committee, Planning and Transportation Committee and the Barbican Centre Board over the next couple of weeks. Members agreed to pass this report on to the Barbican Association Planning Committee for comment, on behalf of the RCC, as they have the relevant expertise in this area. There were no further comments or questions at this meeting.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

11. PROGRESS OF SALES AND LETTINGS

The Committee received a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services, which advised Members of the sales and lettings approved under delegated authority and in accordance with Standing Orders, since the last meeting of the Committee. The report also provided information on surrenders of tenancies received and the number of flat sales to date.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

12. WORKING PARTY UPDATES

The Committee received updates from the following Working Parties:

a) **Gardens Advisory**

b) **Asset Maintenance**

c) **Background Underfloor Heating**

d) **Leaseholder Service Charge**

e) **Electric Vehicle**

f) **SLA** - Members noted that, following the Service Level Agreement Working Party's recent refresh of its membership and terms of reference, there wasn't a regular update report on this agenda. The officer advised that the last meeting of the Working Party, in October 2021, had discussed a variation to the Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) and the next meeting was due to consider these further, together with the Defoe House Pilot for repairs and maintenance, referred to above, and a revision of the original 'Blue' SLA handbook. The next meeting of the RCC would receive a further update.

13. UPDATE REPORT

Members received the regular update report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

RESOLVED, that – the report be noted.

14. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There were no questions.

15. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

Michael Bennett

The Chairman and Members thanked Michael Bennett for his hard work in serving the Barbican Estate Office since 2003, and his attendance at around 100 meetings. Members agreed that Michael's diligence had shaped the Estate and overseen many positive changes.

Canopy over Brandon Mews - The Barbican Residential Committee (BRC) are asked to note the following Resolution of the RCC, which was agreed unanimously:

The RCC regrets the failure of the Barbican Estate Office to undertake cleaning the canopy over Brandon Mews and would ask the BRC to investigate this matter and encourage the BEO to carry out this work promptly.

The residents suggested that the Estate Office had used inadequate cleaning products, as one leaseholder had successfully cleaned part of it. The Assistant Director advised that, whilst it might be possible to spot clean a small part of the canopy, some 40 years of dirt and pollution has accumulated and a complete jet spray clean is likely to damage the polycarbonate materials. However, the Assistant Director welcomed the opportunity for a discussion at the BRC about a long-term maintenance plan, noting that there might be some limitations. Members also noted that the canopy was part of the Listing on the Estate.

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm

Chairman

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

This page is intentionally left blank

NOTES/KEY POINTS ARISING FROM A SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS MEETING

21 FEBRUARY 2022

1 Present

Officers- Michael Bennett, Helen Davidson, Luke Barton

Residents - Averil Baldwin, Tony Swanson, Andrew Tong

2 Estate -wide order data

The Estate Office (EO) had expanded the “order” information Robbie had previously compiled in relation to Defoe. It showed numbers of orders and their value, broken down by priority level, category, block, and whether or not they were included in the service charge (see attached).

It was agreed that this was useful, transparent information to provide to residents and could be valuable in identifying trends and future priorities and projects. The data showed, for example, how big an issue water penetration was proving to be. The information might also assist regular inspections and the identification of problems before they escalated. **Action- EO to produce this information throughout the Estate**

3 Revised KPIs

The EO’s streamlined set of KPI’s was welcomed. However, they focussed on efficiency. More needed to be done to measure satisfaction among residents. The KPIs also needed to be included in the revised SLA booklet and publicised in the monthly residents’ bulletin. In the discussion that followed, it was agreed:

- to consider running a resident satisfaction survey once more;
- to re-introduce customer surveys after jobs were completed;
- “post-covid”, for officers, e.g. House Officers, to be more visible throughout the Estate and reflect changed priorities, e.g., more frequent fire-safely balcony checks;
- to consider how to re-launch and communicate the KPIs.

(The EO pointed out that the new property maintenance system “ Civica”, currently being tested, has built-in questionnaires on quality of service).

Action -EO to report back on the above

4 The SLA Booklet

Although the contents of the booklet might ultimately be affected by future developments, e.g. Estate Office re-organisation, it was agreed that it would be useful to re-issue it as soon as possible. There had been attempts at revision in 2018 so a start had been made. To keep costs down it was agreed that the booklet should be launched on-line in the first instance.

Action -It was subsequently agreed that Nabeela, the EO’s communication’s officer, would take forward the booklet revision with Averil. The two held their first meeting on 23 February and are planning to meet again w.c. 7 March.

5 AoB

Michael would be retiring in two weeks. Resident members thanked him for all he had done for residents and wished him well in retirement. His successor would be announced in due course.

Next meeting 26 May

Members of Working Party

Averil Baldwin, Jane Smith, Juliet McNamara, Tony Swanson, Andrew Tong and Jim Durcan

This page is intentionally left blank

GAG Report to the RCC 6 June 2022

Some good news. As you may recall the Gardens Advisory Group (GAG) has been conducting the area by area inspections of the gardens on its own through the pandemic. In our last report I highlighted our hope that we would be able to resume joint inspections with members of the City Gardens Team.

Those joint inspections have now recommenced. We have conducted three out of the four area inspections with the last one scheduled for May 27th. The willingness of Jake Tibbetts, City Gardens Manager, to make himself available to join each of the inspection teams has been very much appreciated.

Joint inspections produce a much more fruitful dialogue than simply writing and circulating reports. Joint inspections also enable residents to benefit from the knowledge and expertise of City Gardens staff on all matters gardening which is an additional welcome benefit. If a member of the Barbican Estates Office were available to join the next round of inspections they would be very welcome.

Members of the RCC may have noticed the discussion on Barbican Talk about the three year long absence of the fountains and the waterfall on the lake. Inspection of the gardens in the lake revealed a further range of problems: deteriorating brickwork that is admitting water to some beds and a bulge in the weir. According to the discussion on Barbican Talk the Barbican Centre pays 50% of the costs of the lake, the Corporation pays 7.5% and residents, through the service charge, pay 42.5%. This service charge payment - if the Barbican Talk report is accurate – makes the lake's infrastructure a matter for the RCC. Further delays in effecting essential repairs are likely to result in greater deterioration and damage.

Among the joys and difficulties of gardens is that they are not static – they grow, develop, blossom and deteriorate. If we are to have gardens of the quality appropriate to our listed building status, we need a long term plan for their continuing and continuous re-development. It is now widely recognised that there is an overdue need for a comprehensive property maintenance programme to keep our buildings in good condition. In parallel, a comprehensive garden maintenance programme that responds to the challenges of climate change and garden usage as well as the natural development and deterioration of plants, shrubs and trees is also required. The Gardens Advisory Group is proposing to engage in discussion with City Gardens and the BEO on how such a programme might best be developed.

Jim Durcan
Chair
Gardens Advisory Group

This page is intentionally left blank

Minutes of the Asset Management Working Party

Monday, 4 April 2022: 5:30 - 6:15 pm by Zoom.

Officers:

Mike Saunders
Jason Hayes

Residents

Christopher Makin (Chair)
Tim Cox (took the minutes)
Henry Irwig
Tam Pollard
Randall Anderson
Matthew Dendy
Margarita Chiclana

Apologies:

Fiona Lean
Ted Reilly

1. Minutes / Matters Arising

The minutes of the meeting of 21 February 2022 were approved, with no corrections or additional items being raised.

2. Underfloor Heating Working Party

It was agreed at the previous meeting that the AMWP and the Underfloor Heating Working Party (UHWP) should work closely together on matters of common interest. The Chair reported that he and Ted Reilly had now joined the UHWP to ensure alignment.

Mary Durcan has resigned as Chair of the UHWP because of other commitments.

3. Savills Stock Condition Survey

It was reported at the last meeting that officers are creating components to load into the City's asset management system, Keystone, based on the Savills survey. This is a manual process because of the number of different kinds of component that could be recorded in a building.

Jason Hayes reported that this process is on target for completion by the end of May.

4. Window survey

Mike Saunders is awaiting a quote from a surveyor to assess the condition of top-floor windows around the estate.

Henry Irwig reported that, on a recent walk around the estate, he was struck by the different exposures of different facades to the weather. He suggested widening the scope of the survey, as discussed in December, to include sampling of windows in other exposed areas (e.g. at the back of Ben Jonson, where lower level windows are not protected by overhanging balconies).

The survey would also address: (i) The location of currently problematic or suspect elements; (ii) A description and classification of the various types of deterioration found; (iii) An analysis of the various root causes of each type of deterioration; (iv) An evaluation of alternative methods for repair and/or replacement; (v) An indication of the potential costs and benefits involved.

ACTION: Mike Saunders to add sampling of other windows to the survey.

5. Garchey

Ahead of the meeting, Mike Saunders had provided a report from a contractor, which formed the basis for discussion. The report concerned communications with Thames Water (TW).

The Garchey is a combined grey (kitchen waste) water and surface (rain) water system. Building Regulations Approved Document Part H5 requires any system for discharging rainwater to a sewer to be separate from the conveyance of foul water (which includes grey water). See: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/442889/BR_PDF_AD_H_2015.pdf. TW think any Garchey replacement would need to comply.

The balcony drainage connects to the Garchey stack at each level from roof downwards, so separating rainwater and grey water could potentially require redirecting these connections to a separate down service. The installation of separate drops is potentially very problematic in terms of feasibility, cost and disruption and this will need further consideration.

TW have also stated that they would consent to a surface-water connection to a public sewer only when it has been proven that a hierarchy of disposal methods (set out in the report) has been examined and proven to be impracticable. There should also be a preference for green over grey features, in line with a drainage hierarchy”.

The report concluded by recommending that City of London engage a firm of Public Health Consulting Engineers to provide the expert advice required to move this forward to a conclusion.

Tim Cox and Randall Anderson queried TW’s views. Mike Saunders confirmed that, under the existing arrangements, solid waste from the Garchey ends up in a tanker, but all the water passes straight through to the public sewer. The Garchey should no longer be used for much solid waste given the recycling arrangements for residents, and the amount of grey water should reduce if the Garchey is removed because there would no longer be a need to flush the bowls. Since rainwater already flows to the sewer via the Garchey, it is difficult to see why there should now be an examination of other disposal methods (most of which seem clearly impracticable).

In response to a question about interim cost savings, Mike said there were only 3 members of the Garchey staff, which was the minimum required (allowing for holidays, sickness, etc).

[TC Note: On a brief look, Building Regulations Approved Document Part H5 looks as if it “applies only to a system provided in connection with the direction of extension of the building”.]

ACTION: Mike Saunders to revert to TW with our challenges.

6. Fire Signage

Jason Hayes confirmed that the application for listed building consent had been submitted.

In response to a question about the need for signs, Jason confirmed that signs were needed only if there was a risk of confusion about the exit route to take if there is a fire (including whether to go down or up). This meant that some blocks would need signs but possibly not all.

ACTION: Jason Hayes to confirm which blocks will require signs.

7. Fire Door Replacement Programme

Jason Hayes reported that the audit of doors was complete and there were more different types of door than first thought. Work was now starting on a brief for the design team and on identifying whether any types of door should be prioritised for risk reasons. Once designed, each type of door would need to be tested for fire resistance. There may be some scope for conforming doors to reduce the number of different types, but this is likely to be limited for listed building reasons.

ACTION: Jason to confirm number of different door sets, and potential number to be tested.

8. Redecorations

Jason Hayes reported that work is progressing around the estate (and Henry Irwig said that the work in Bryer seemed to be “good and thorough”).

Following the meeting, Jason provided the following report on the cost implications of the delay in starting work and exclusion of the door sets from the programme:

The tender for the Barbican Estate Redecoration Programme 2020-25 closed at the end of October 2019. Post tender negotiations with the successful bidder (K&M McLoughlin) were opened shortly after with a 2% reduction in price secured as a Best & Final Offer in February 2020. Due to the unprecedented circumstances brought about by the global Covid-19 pandemic which took hold in March 2020, execution of the contract was suspended in order to minimise the risk of exposure to residents.

During this period of suspension, the proposed redecoration of residential front doors was omitted from the contract sum as these were scheduled for short term replacement. This saw a reduction in the region of £60k to the contract sum. It is accepted that this reduction would not cover the full balance of the omittance of the front doors, however, during the extended period in which the contract was on hold the construction industry was experiencing cost inflation in advance of 5%. The redecorations contractor would have been well within its rights to request an uplift in line with the cost increases they were facing (as did many of the other contractors the City has been working with during this time).

As a gesture of good will, K&M did not apply a general uplift but will have recovered a small portion of the cost increases against the reductions applied to the front door omittance. A 5% uplift on a £3,500,000 contract would equate to an additional £175k. Officers, in a Progress Report (June 2021), argued that the result negotiated was a good outcome for residents and recommended proceeding with the contract; this view was supported by the RCC and BRC. Contracts were formally exchanged with the contractor in November 2021.

9. Lifts

Jason Hayes reported that Gateways 1 to 4 had been written and would be presented to the next RCC meeting. These Gateways cover the steps from obtaining approval to start the project up to obtaining permission to proceed to tender the work.

Jason was asked about whether other lifts were likely to require work in the near future so that the tender could include them and benefit from economies of scale. This would be covered in the stock condition survey.

10. Roof Working Party

As recorded in previous minutes - *The outcome of the Savills survey would determine the need for, and constitution of this WP.*

11. Dates of Future Meetings

The next meeting is scheduled for 5:30 on Monday, 13 June with Ted to take the minutes.

Meeting (and minute takers) are also scheduled for:

1. 26 September, Fiona
2. 5 December, Henry

RCC June 2022 Underfloor Heating Working Party Report

Seasonal Load

The second seasonal load shift trial concluded satisfactorily at the end of April. Residents will be polled during the summer to determine if the scheme should be made permanent.

Major Interventions

The Working Party has been working with the BA's Climate Change group on several initiatives with the City's Climate Action Group (CAG). We have been fortunate in persuading the CAG to commission and pay for an investigation into potential interventions.

So far, the City's consultants have quantified the thermal savings that might arise from these interventions. The next step is to determine the likely costs of implementing these interventions. This costing is ongoing; several of the City's contractors are providing these cost estimates. Using these two sets of data, we will be able to determine the cost effectiveness of these interventions. The areas under investigation are

- Insulation of soffits
- Insulation of barrel-vaulted roofs
- Modifying the air extraction processes in our flats
- Modifying air flows, particularly in staircase blocks
- Designing potential resident installed insulation
- The perennial investigation of individual controls

Communication with residents

An extensive article has been produced for the June edition of Barbican Life which examines these issues and the potential human factors, surrounding the implementation of these interventions. A discussion forum has been set up on the BA website and a town hall meeting will be jointly hosted by the RCC and the BA to determine a way forward.

This page is intentionally left blank

To RCC members
From: resident members of LSCWP

LSCWP Report

Background

The last six months have seen extensive work undertaken at all levels with the BEO and DCCS Officers, as well as Councillors, on issues of costs, value for money and accountability in relation to the Service Charge and Car Park Concierges.

The original objective was “*to identify efficiencies that will not reduce service but should provide some offset against additional costs we are asked to pay by the City Corporation to maintain our current concierge/CPA service*”. Frequently referred to as “opportunities for quick wins”.

As we approached the end of March we agreed that we needed a major checkpoint not only because we were reaching the end of the financial year but also because residents should be informed of progress. We therefore reported back to the instigators of this piece of work, the BA/RCC Chairs and Vice Chairs. We noted that there were no quick wins although there appeared to be significant savings opportunities without any reduction in services which have been raised with officers and need further follow up. These will be discussed at the RCC meeting.

We also noted that there were a number of other points for follow up, including alternative options for the operation of the Car Parks, although these may be better reviewed by other working parties with a remit for service delivery.

It is important to note that from the start we envisaged that any savings delivered through the Service Charge account should be a suitable offset for any increased Car Park charges to maintain the level of service in the Car parks.

Whilst this work on costs was undertaken there were numerous discussions on the issue of accountability. This issue is well documented in previous LSCWP reports but marks the distinction between the City’s requirement and focus on the full recovery of costs incurred in the Service Charge account and the Leaseholders requirement to have fuller engagement on the costs incurred within the Service Charge with particular regard to value for money.

It is therefore pleasing to note that following our input, the revised Job Description for the new Head of the Barbican Estate now includes the following within the main duties and responsibilities

- Provide strategic direction and pro-active leadership to managers and front-line staff of the Barbican Residential Estate Office, having accountability and responsibility for all services (and associated budgets) to leaseholders and tenants (including commercial tenants).

We would expect this to be part of a review the interim Head of the Barbican Estate will be undertaking on the operation of the BEO.

David Lawrence

This page is intentionally left blank

Electric Vehicle Charging Working Party

RCC Report for June 2022

Current Provision

There are currently 62 charge points located around the estate. Reliability is generally good, with significant improvement in the Breton carpark. But the provision is poor in Willoughby, where first generation equipment is unreliable, and Lauderdale, where connectivity is poor. Every car park has some provision.

To overcome patchy provision the following protocol has been established.

- Any resident in the Barbican can charge their car in any carpark in the Barbican.
- CPAs have been instructed not to be vigilant in moving vehicles on after the charge cycle is complete.
- In January 2022, the WP set up an EV User Group, which now has 25 members. This user group shares experiences.

Future action

There are connectivity issues in some of our carparks, which means that the BP App (which is the default mechanism for use) does not work. The only solution is for residents to use a card-based subscription service, which despite its many attractions is expensive for users with low demand. We are trying to get BP to modify this approach.

Commercial position

We have to remind ourselves that these chargers are owned and operated by BP Pulse. We have successfully removed the BEO from the payment system (to the relief of both the BEO and residents). This means residents are subject to the commercial pressures of the external market.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s): Residents' Consultation Committee Barbican Residential Committee	Dated: 06/06/2022 17/06/2022
Subject: Update Report – Beech Gardens (North West Podium) Waterproofing Project	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1, 2, 12
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N/A
Report of: Andrew Carter, Chief Officer/Executive Director Community and Children's Services	For Information
Report author: Paul Murtagh Assistant Director Barbican & Property Services	

Summary

The purpose of this report is to update Members on the latest position with the City of London Corporation's (the Corporation) Beech Gardens (North West Podium) Waterproofing Project, the subsequent issues that have arisen and the outcome of the steps taken to facilitate completion of the project.

Recommendations

Members are asked to note the contents of this report.

Main Report

Background

1. The Beech Gardens (North West Podium) Waterproofing Project was undertaken to address on-going issues of water penetration through areas of the Barbican podium including, White Lyon Court, John Trundle Highwalk, Beech Gardens and Bryer Court pond, into the commercial premises below, car parks and the Beech Street tunnel.
2. The on-going water penetration had led to a saturation of the structure of the podium which, could cause corrosion of the reinforcement and subsequent deterioration of the concrete structure over the long term.

3. As part of the preparatory works for this project, all the drains in the vicinity of Beech Gardens were subject to a detailed drainage survey. All blockages were cleared and, the drains were subsequently jet washed. However, further investigations were carried out because of localised 'ponding' and, in one particular area, a burst drainage pipe indicated that the internal diameter of the drainage pipes had been significantly reduced.
4. It had been agreed that a separate proposal to remedy issues with the drainage across the whole of the Barbican Estate would be brought to the respective Committees/Sub Committee but, this did not happen.
5. The scope of this project was essentially the replacement of the waterproof membrane and the replacement of soft landscaping to an area of approximately 10,000m². There was no provision for the replacement of the associated drainage, which was specifically excluded from the project.
6. At the time of the commencement of this project in November 2013, there were some 43 separate leaks into units including Virgin Active (as it was at the time), the GSMD, BUPA and Parking Services. Practical Completion for the works was achieved in June 2015 however, a Gateway 6 (Outcomes Report) has still not been submitted for this project, due to subsequent defects outlined below.

Considerations

7. Shortly after Practical Completion was issued when, the works were substantially completed, isolated leaks developed, mainly around the running track and Studio A in Virgin Active. The contractor that carried out the waterproofing works returned to the site on several occasions to investigate the cause of the leaks and, where appropriate, carried out subsequent remedial works.
8. As a result of further leaks, further investigation works were undertaken to establish whether there were issues relating to the quality of the workmanship, failings in the original design and specification or, if there were any other related issues.
9. Concerns were raised that the Crossrail expansion works that took place across and under the Barbican Estate may have contributed to the problem. However, Crossrail undertook a detailed assessment of its works and, the impact on the Barbican podium and, concluded that this was not the cause of the apparent failure of the recent podium waterproofing works.
10. As the leaks continued, it was agreed with the original contractor to carry out further detailed 'movement' monitoring over a period of 12 months to establish whether there was any evidence to support concerns that there were issues with the design and specification, particularly in relation to the potential inadequate tolerance that had been allowed in the design of the detail of the structural expansion joints.
11. The outcome of the 'movement' monitoring over that 12-month period was that the likely problem was in the original design and specification for the project. Given the potential liability issues and subsequent costs, the Corporation took the decision to commission an independent review of the whole project to advise on whether

the post-contract defects could legitimately be attributed to the design of the project or, the workmanship.

12. The original commission for the independent review was awarded to the Building Research Establishment (BRE). However, with the agreement of the BRE, the commission was subsequently transferred to Sandberg Consulting Engineers to maintain continuity and consistency.
13. Whilst the independent review was thorough and detailed, to some extent, perhaps inevitably, it was somewhat 'inconclusive'. The review did conclude that the waterproofing works undertaken, in the main, are resisting the passage of water to the underside of the floor slab as intended. However, there is some doubt as to whether the decision to leave the existing asphalt coverings in place and 'overlay' with the new chosen waterproofing system was the right thing to do. For the current Phase 2 of this project, the removal of the existing asphalt coverings is recommended.
14. At the time the review was undertaken, there were very few leaks found in comparison to the overall area recovered as part of the original project. Based on the evidence found, Sandberg concluded that "there does not seem to be a widespread failure within the paving layers and this, in our opinion, would inhibit an investigation into potential design or installation liability issues".
15. The Sandberg report does, however, acknowledge that if the quantity of leaks does start to increase and develop into 'clusters', further investigation may be needed to help establish whether more fundamental failures are occurring.

Current Problems

16. At the time of writing this report, the Leisure Centre is suffering from leaks on to the running track, one in Studio A and, a more significant leak into the lobby/office below the running track. Other leaks have been reported but, these have been attributed to leaks from various service pipes that are the responsibility of the service provider.
17. As always, we are responding to these 'new' leaks by carrying out an intrusive investigation before determining what remedial action is required. The larger new leak is directly below an expansion joint but, two floors (more than six metres) down from podium level. Early indications are that we will need to open areas of the wall outside the men's changing room to help us determine the cause and 'route' of the leak.

Way Forward

18. Whilst we are currently awaiting the results of more recent investigation works that we have carried out on the current leaks particularly, relating to the tiling joints and expansion joints, it would seem that there is no merit in pursuing liability claims against either the contractor or, the design consultants. Although we do still retain some of the 'retention' from the original contract for the waterproofing works, we will likely need to release this to the contractor.

19. There are clearly issues with the condition and performance of the podium drainage on Phase 1 and, this needs to be addressed. We are currently carrying out detailed surveys of the drainage and, we will need to decide how and when we tackle the defects that are highlighted.

20. It is extremely important to note that the experiences that we have had with Phase 1 of the waterproofing works on the Barbican podium have been very useful and informative for the current and future phases of the project. With any project, even one as 'uncertain' as this one, it is crucial that the 'lessons learnt' are used to inform and guide future projects. Some key aspects of the lessons learnt have been set out previously in this report but, others include:

- ensuring that the waterproofing membrane is laid to a completely dry substrate and, to enable this, the timing and planning of the works should be given serious thought and consideration to avoid, wherever possible, particularly inclement weather.
- planning, timing and permissions for carrying out 'hot works' associated with the waterproofing works.
- building into the project the scope for the regular review of the existing design and, the scope for design change where necessary and appropriate.
- understanding and planning the works in relation to 'noisy works', the limitations of the Barbican Estate and permitted working hours. This needs to be built into the design and specification of the works to avoid delays and additional costs as a result on permitted working hours and 'noisy works'.
- further consideration of the decision taken at Phase 1 to leave the existing asphalt coverings in place and 'overlay' with the new chosen waterproofing system.
- ensuring that all associated drainage works are carried out as part of the overall waterproofing project to avoid the issues that arose from Phase 1.

21. It should be noted that this report is an update report only and, does not negate the need for a Gateway 6 – Outcomes Report. Following final completion of our outstanding investigations, it is intended that a Gateway 6 report will be submitted to the relevant Committees/Sub Committees including, the Barbican Residential Committee.

Appendices

None

Paul Murtagh

Assistant Director, Barbican & Property Services

T: 020 7332 3015 E: paul.murtagh@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Agenda Item 7

Committee(s): Residents' Consultation Committee Barbican Residential Committee	Dated: 06/06/2022 17/06/2022
Subject: Provision of EWS1 Forms	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1, 2, 12
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N/A
Report of: Andrew Carter, Chief Officer/Executive Director Community and Children's Services	For Decision
Report author: Paul Murtagh Assistant Director Barbican & Property Services	

Summary

The purpose of this report is to seek guidance and instruction from Members on the City of London Corporation's (the Corporation) approach to the provision (or non-provision) of EWS1 Forms across the Barbican Residential Estate.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

1. Consider the various options within this report for the provision (or non-provision) of EWS1 Forms across the Barbican Residential Estate.
2. Accept and agree the recommendation from officers at Option 1 where, the Corporation does not undertake and issue EWS1 Forms but, does provide 'comfort' letters to individual residents upon request or:
3. Agree an alternative option from those set out in this report in relation to the provision (or non-provision) of EWS1 Forms across the Barbican Residential Estate.

Main Report

Background

1. Over the last few months, a very small number of leaseholder residents in the Barbican Residential Estate have written to the Corporation requesting the completion of an EWS1 Form in order, that they can either re-mortgage their home

or, to enable them to sell the lease on their home to a buyer who, in turn, requires an EWS1 Form for its mortgage lender.

2. EWS1 Forms have been required by members of UK Finance or the Building Societies Association (BSA) since December 2019, for any mortgage applications for leasehold properties in residential buildings over 18 metres in height. They have replaced the numerous liability letters, created by the various mortgage lender members of these organisations, which began to appear around the summer of 2019. The EWS1 Form was created by the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS), who intervened in order to standardise the previous liability letters. The RICS also produced a non-exhaustive list of professional bodies whose full or chartered members could complete the EWS1 Forms.
3. The Corporation does not currently provide EWS1 Forms and, the purpose of this report is to bring this matter to the attention of Members and, to set out a series of options for this Committee to consider for the future provision (or non-provision) of EWS1 Forms across the Barbican Residential Estate.

Considerations

4. The RICS guidance regarding EWS1 Forms states:

“The EWS process, and resulting form, is a set way for a building owner to confirm to valuers and lenders that an external cladding system on residential buildings in scope above 18m in height (approximately 6-storeys) has been assessed by a suitable expert. Not every building in scope above 18m will require an EWS Form – only those with some form of combustible cladding or combustible material on balconies.”

5. It must be noted that completing EWS1 Forms is **NOT** a legal requirement, despite information coming from various lenders insisting that they must be completed. Their completion is a condition being imposed on mortgage applicants by certain lenders. The legislative requirement, under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005, is the completion of a suitable Fire Risk Assessment (FRA). Residents in all blocks on the Barbican Residential Estate have direct access to the FRA's for their respective blocks via the Corporation's website or, on request through the Barbican Estate Office.

Extent of the problem

6. At this stage, the number of requests that we have had from leaseholders for completed EWS1 Forms is very low however, it is possible that the number of requests will increase over time. Many lenders are insisting that an EWS1 Form is completed on ALL buildings – even those below 18 metres in height. As set out earlier in this report, an EWS1 Form is not needed for buildings less than 18 metres in height.
7. There is a serious national shortage of independent professionals that are both suitably qualified to complete an EWS1 Form and, who also have a suitable level of professional indemnity (PI) insurance. This means that most landlords/building owners are unable to get the EWS1 Forms done should they decide to do so.

8. Where it has been possible to find suitably qualified and insured professionals able and willing to do this work, quotations are being received of up to £12,000 per EWS1 Form (especially in cases where a simple visual inspection is not possible). Landlord's including the Corporation, could be faced with significant costs in completing the EWS1 Forms when, there is no legal requirement to do so.

Cost of the works

9. As stated previously, EWS1 Forms are not a legal requirement and, there is no obligation on the Corporation to complete these at its own cost. If the Corporation does decide to carry out EWS1 Forms across the Barbican Residential Estate, it will need to identify and set aside an initial budget to cover the cost of this work and ultimately, determine who will bear the cost.
10. The requirement for the completion of the EWS1 Forms, at this stage, stems directly from the specific needs of individual leaseholder residents on the Barbican Estate. The cost of completing the EWS1 Forms cannot simply be split across all leaseholders in a block for several reasons including:
- there may only be one or, a limited number of leaseholders in the block requiring an EWS1 Form and, as such, the cost of completing the EWS1 Form may be significantly prohibitive.
 - some leaseholders have no mortgage, making the EWS1 Form irrelevant to them.
 - some leaseholders may have a cash buyer for the lease on their flat again, making the EWS1 Form irrelevant to them.
 - some leaseholders may have a long fixed-term mortgage deal so, the term of the EWS1 Form may run out before they get to make use of it.
11. Officers consider that it would be unreasonable to pass the cost of completing the EWS1 Forms on to other leaseholders when, the EWS1 Form is only being carried out to satisfy a limited number of individual mortgage applications.

Options for consideration

12. Members are asked to consider the following options for the provision (or non-provision) of EWS1 Forms across the Barbican Residential Estate and, to agree which option should be pursued.

Option 1

The Corporation does not undertake and issue EWS1 Forms for any of its blocks on the Barbican Residential Estate but, does provide 'comfort' letters to individual residents upon request (a sample 'comfort letter' is included at Appendix 'A' to this report).

There is no additional budget requirement for this option and, Option 1 is recommended by officers for approval.

Option 2

The Corporation commits to carrying out EWS1 Forms on all residential blocks across the Barbican Estate.

The estimated cost of this option (all 21 blocks) is in the region of £100,000 - £150,000 for which, additional funding will need to be identified.

Option 3

The Corporation commits to carrying out EWS1 Forms on all blocks of flats over 18 metres (six-storeys) in height across the Barbican Residential Estate.

The estimated cost of this option (based on 11 blocks) is in the region of £70,000 - £110,000 for which, additional funding will need to be identified.

Option 4

The Corporation commits to carrying out EWS1 Forms on its high-rise blocks of flats (notionally over 10-storeys or more in height) across the Barbican Residential Estate.

The estimated cost of this option (based on three blocks) is in the region of £25,000 - £35,000 for which, additional funding will need to be identified.

Financial Implications

14. There is currently no budget available for the completion of the EWS1 Forms as set out in Options 2, 3 and 4 above. If members of this Committee agree to pursue one of Options 2, 3 and 4, then, it will need to request additional funding from either City Fund or City Cash through the formal channels.
15. Members of this Committee, mindful that this is not a statutory requirement and, at this stage, is entirely for the benefit of a very small number of individual private leaseholders, will need to consider whether this is an appropriate and justifiable use of funds.

Appendices

Appendix A – Sample Comfort Letter

Paul Murtagh

Assistant Director, Barbican & Property Services

T: 020 7332 3015 E: paul.murtagh@cityoflondon.gov.uk

APPENDIX 'A' – SAMPLE COMFORT LETTER

Typical Bank PLC
London

Date

Dear Sir/Madam

Defoe House, Barbican Estate, London EC2Y 8ND

I write regarding your request for and, the applicability of the EWS1 Form for the above building, for which, the City of London Corporation is both the freeholder and manager.

The EWS1 Form itself states the following:

“Objective - This form is intended for recording in a consistent manner what assessment has been carried out for the external wall construction of residential apartment buildings where the highest floor is 18m or more above ground level or where specific concerns exist (Note 1). It should not be used for other purposes”.

In accordance with this objective and, the publicly available guidance on the use of EWS1 Forms, there is no requirement for Defoe House to have an EWS1 Form as:

- it is less than 18m in overall height.
- the recently completed Fire Risk Assessment raised no specific concerns relating to the external components used in the construction of the building.
- the building was constructed in the 1970s and, the external walls have not been modified since construction.
- although there are external balconies in the construction of the building, the decking and balustrades used in their construction are made from non-combustible materials.

We can also confirm that there is no ACM/MCM cladding present anywhere on this building

I trust that you find this letter self-explanatory however, should you require any further information, please contact us via housingfiresafety@cityoflondon.gov.uk, or at the address below.

Yours sincerely

Paul Murtagh
Assistant Director Barbican Estate & Housing

This page is intentionally left blank

Committees:	Dates:
Corporate Projects Board for decision. <u>Operational Property and Projects Sub Committee</u> Barbican Residents Consultation Committee for information Barbican Residential Committee	11 May 2022 30 May 2022 6 June 2022 17 June 2022
Subject: Barbican Estate Tower Lift Refurbishment Unique Project Identifier: TBC	Gateway 1-4 Project Proposal & Options Appraisal Regular
Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services Report Author: Neil Clutterbuck	For Decision
<h1 style="margin: 0;">PUBLIC</h1>	

Recommendations

<p>1. Approval track, next steps and requested decisions</p>	<p>Project Description: This project proposes a programme of works to replace all lifts in Shakespeare, Cromwell, and Lauderdale Towers on the Barbican Estate. There are nine lifts in total, three serving each Tower. It is intended to procure a contractor that will deliver the project to the high standards required and ensure resident satisfaction.</p> <p>Next Gateway: 5 Authority to start work</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appoint design team. 2. Resident Consultation 3. Prepare Procurement Package 4. Pre-tender S20 consultation <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That budget of £50,000 is approved to engage a specialist lift consultant to undertake liaison with internal and external stakeholders, to formulate a specification to tender and cover staff costs. 2. Note the project budget of £50,000 (excluding risk) 3. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £4,600,000(excluding risk);
---	--

	4. That Option 1 is approved to fully refurbish all nine lifts in the three Barbican Estate Towers.																
2. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway	<i>For recommended option 1:</i>																
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Reason</th> <th>Funds/ Source of Funding</th> <th>Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Consultant Fees</td> <td>Resident consultation and specification preparation.</td> <td>Long lessee contributions 95%/ Barbican Res.Local Risk Budget 5%</td> <td>£30,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff Costs</td> <td>Project Management</td> <td>Long lessee contributions 95%/ Barbican Res.Local Risk Budget 5%.</td> <td>£20,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>£50,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)	Consultant Fees	Resident consultation and specification preparation.	Long lessee contributions 95%/ Barbican Res.Local Risk Budget 5%	£30,000	Staff Costs	Project Management	Long lessee contributions 95%/ Barbican Res.Local Risk Budget 5%.	£20,000	Total			£50,000
	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)													
	Consultant Fees	Resident consultation and specification preparation.	Long lessee contributions 95%/ Barbican Res.Local Risk Budget 5%	£30,000													
	Staff Costs	Project Management	Long lessee contributions 95%/ Barbican Res.Local Risk Budget 5%.	£20,000													
Total			£50,000														
Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: £0 (as detailed in the Risk Register – Appendix 2)																	
3. Governance arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service Committee: Barbican Residential Committee • Senior Responsible Officer: Paul Murtagh, Assistant Director Barbican Estate & Property Services • The Project will be monitored by the Housing Programme Board 																

Project Summary

4. Context	<p>Following a feasibility study, completed by Butler and Young Lift Consultants, it has been determined that the nine lifts that service the three tower blocks on the Barbican Estate, are now past their life cycle. Equipment utilised during the lift installation in the 1960's, and then updated in 1997, and then again in 2002, is now obsolete and parts are no longer readily available. Each tower has a designated firefighting lift which complied with the regulations at the time of installation, however, these</p>
-------------------	---

	<p>firefighting features should be fully updated in compliance with the latest regulations and standards.</p>
<p>5. Brief description of project</p>	<p>The modernisation of entire lift installations, with the replacement of obsolete lift components. Provide a compliant lift installation with a minimum twenty-year lifecycle to current codes and standards, whilst incorporating the current recommendations with regards to providing improved accessibility to lifts for persons with disabilities, and firefighting and evacuation provision in existing lifts.</p>
<p>6. Consequences if project not approved</p>	<p>A major failure of any of this equipment would mean timescales to source an equivalent or compatible part would be excessive, expensive and result in a long period of lift down time. Periods of four to six weeks are not uncommon for these types of component failure</p>
<p>7. SMART project objectives</p>	<p>The nine Tower block lifts are refurbished to the current regulatory standards and updated compliancy codes. They will also meet the requirements of the London Fire Brigade and City of London's Fire Safety Advisor. The refurbished lifts to have a life span of twenty years.</p> <p>Works are managed to minimise disruption to residents.</p>
<p>8. Key benefits</p>	<p>Benefits deriving for the new refurbishment of all of the towers' lifts are as follows:</p> <p>1. Reliability- the lift control panel, traction drive system, shaft switching/positioning system, door operating systems and running gear will be replaced with compliant and state of the art components that will provide reliability and third-party serviceability not currently available.</p> <p>2. Performance- It is the intention to replace the existing Gearless DC machines, with new AC gearless machines, which operate with an increased efficiency of 25 -35%, dependent on the loading of the lift, which would increase the speed for the Towers' lifts and reduce overall average waiting times and also time to travel to the destination floor. Provisional theoretical studies indicate that for the towers, during the high demand morning peak, the average waiting time would reduce from 137 seconds to 44 seconds, and the time to destination reduced from 218 seconds to 93 seconds.</p> <p>With the additional use of "ECO" modules that would dim down car lighting, including indicator dimming feature, these would both utilise less power and aid the lowering of the carbon footprint, as outlined in the Climate Action Strategy. Working with the COL Energy Team, we are also exploring the</p>

	<p>use of a regenerative drive on each lift that generates power during use and feeds this back into the national grid. To implement this would cost approximately £6,000 per lift, but it is unsure, at this time, whether this would be redeemed over the life span of the new lifts.</p> <p>The new push buttons will conform to height, identification and colour as required for Disability Discrimination Act compliance.</p> <p>3. Firefighting- the lifts would be equipped with the functions and features necessary to provide adequate protection for the fire service to access any given level in an emergency situation.</p>
9. Project category	7a. Asset enhancement/improvement (capital)
10. Project priority	A. Essential
11. Notable exclusions	All other residential lifts on the Barbican Estate.

Options Appraisal

12. Overview of options	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Procure a single contractor to complete the Tower lift refurbishment project via a compliant open tender process. 2. Undertake major repairs to all lifts, would be cheaper in the short term again, however, as highlighted earlier this would certainly lead to lengthy lift outages, causing severe disruption to residents and possible firefighting services, and would most definitely be less cost effective in the long run. 3. Doing nothing is not an option. Failure to undertake full lift refurbishment would cause severe disruption to residents and possibly firefighting services due to issues highlighted earlier.
13. Risk	<p>Overall project risk: Low</p> <p>Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 2) and Options Appraisal</p> <p>Key risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any delay to project start will increase the risk of significant failure of existing lift installations. • S20 challenge could undermine project funding. • Economic uncertainty raises the risk of cost inflation running above current estimates.

Resource Implications

14. Total estimated cost	For recommended option 1 Total estimated cost (excluding risk): £4,600,000 Total estimated cost (including risk): N/A									
15. Funding strategy	Is funding confirmed: No funding confirmed Recommended option	Who is providing funding: Mixture - some internal and some external funding <table border="1" data-bbox="533 629 1351 846"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="533 629 1161 685">Funds/Sources of Funding</th> <th data-bbox="1161 629 1351 685">Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 685 1161 736">Long lessee contributions 95%</td> <td data-bbox="1161 685 1351 736">4,370,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 736 1161 788">Barbican Res. Local Risk Budget</td> <td data-bbox="1161 736 1351 788">230,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 788 1161 846" style="text-align: right;">Total</td> <td data-bbox="1161 788 1351 846">4,600,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)	Long lessee contributions 95%	4,370,000	Barbican Res. Local Risk Budget	230,000	Total	4,600,000
Funds/Sources of Funding	Cost (£)									
Long lessee contributions 95%	4,370,000									
Barbican Res. Local Risk Budget	230,000									
Total	4,600,000									

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Briefing
Appendix 2	Risk Register
Appendix 3	PT4 Procurement Form

Contact

Report Author	<u>Neil Clutterbuck</u>
Email Address	<u>Neil.clutterbuck@cityoflondon.gov.uk</u>
Telephone Number	<u>07712 234438</u>

Options appraisal table.

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>
1. Brief description	Procure a single contractor to complete the Tower lift refurbishment project via a compliant open tender process.	Undertake major repairs to all lifts again, would be cheaper in the short term, however, as highlighted earlier this would certainly lead to lengthy lift outages, causing severe disruption to residents and possible firefighting services, and would most definitely be less cost effective in the long run. In addition, some specialist parts will become obsolete or may not be fully compatible with existing older technology.
2. Scope and exclusions	Full refurbishment, replacement of obsolete equipment to all nine Barbican Tower lifts. The lifts would be equipped with the functions and features necessary to provide adequate protection for the fire service to access any given level in an emergency situation.	Existing lift installations will remain and be repaired to extend service as far as is practically possible.
<i>Project Planning</i>		
3. Programme and key dates	Tender process to start winter 2022. Works to commence spring 2023 with a duration of approximately three years.	Tender process to start winter 2022. Works would commence spring 2023 and continue as required.

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>
4. Risk implications	<p>Low</p> <p>Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 2).</p>	High significant risk of major component failure and inability to obtain obsolete materials and parts.
5. Benefits	<p>1. Reliability- the lift control panel, traction drive system, shaft switching/positioning system, door operating systems and running gear will be replaced with compliant and state of the art components that will provide reliability and third-party serviceability not currently available.</p> <p>2. Performance- It is the intention to replace the existing Gearless DC machines, with new AC gearless machines, which operate with an increased efficiency of 25 -35%, dependent on the loading of the lift, which would increase the speed for the Towers' lifts and reduce overall average waiting times and also time to travel to the destination floor. Provisional theoretical studies indicate that for the towers, during the high demand morning peak, the average waiting time would reduce from 137 seconds to 44 seconds, and the time to destination reduced from 218 seconds to 93 seconds.</p> <p>With the additional use of "ECO" modules that would dim down car lighting, including indicator dimming feature, these would both utilise less power and aid</p>	In the short term there would be less capital expenditure required.

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>
	<p>the lowering of the carbon footprint, as outlined in the Climate Action Strategy. Working with the COL Energy Team, we are also exploring the use of a regenerative drive on each lift that generates power during use and feeds this back into the national grid. To implement this would cost approximately £6,000 per lift, but it is unsure, at this time, whether this would be redeemed over the life span of the new lifts.</p> <p>The new push buttons will conform to height, identification and colour as required for Disability Discrimination Act compliance.</p> <p>3. Firefighting- the lifts would be equipped with the functions and features necessary to provide adequate protection for the fire service to access any given level in an emergency situation</p>	
6. Disbenefits	This would be a large capital expenditure.	<p>A major failure of any of this equipment would mean timescales to source an equivalent or compatible part would be excessive, expensive and result in a long period of lift down time. Periods of four to six weeks are not uncommon for these types of component failure.</p> <p>This could also be catastrophic in the event of a fire, as access for firefighters would be severely restricted/limited.</p>

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>
7. Stakeholders and consultees	Residents, including leaseholders through Section 20 consultation where they stand to incur service charges. Departments of Town Clerks, Planning and Chamberlain's (including CityProc) & City Solicitors. Members and Ward Members.	
Resource Implications		
8. Total estimated cost	Total estimated cost (excluding risk): £4,600,000 Total estimated cost: (including risk): £5,060,000	This cannot be quantified as the lifts are now at the end of their expected life span, and key components are now obsolete and not replaceable.
9. Funding strategy	The project is funded by the City Fund, the majority (circa 95%) of the cost is recoverable by way of service charges from leaseholders, the remainder (circa 5%) is funded from ongoing annual Barbican Residential local risk revenue budgets.	
10. Estimated capital value/return	N/A	
11. Ongoing revenue implications	Regular cyclical service requirements, and repairs outside existing warranties.	
12. Investment appraisal	N/A	
13. Affordability	Approximately 95% is recoverable from Long Lessees (approximately £13,000 each, subject to terms of the lease).	

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>
14. Procurement strategy/Route to Market	Traditional Approach. Sub OJEU.	
15. Legal implications	Maintaining the assets in a compliant way discharges the City's legal and statutory legal obligations.	Not maintain expired equipment could put City in legal jeopardy.
16. Corporate property implications	None	
17. Traffic implications	To be agreed with nominated contractors where the works have any impact on highways. Implications are expected to be virtually nil.	None
18. Sustainability and energy implications	Replacement lifts would be "ECO" modules that would dim down car lighting, including indicator dimming feature. They would also be fitted with alternating current gearless machines with a variable voltage, variable frequency control which would make lifts 30 to 40% more efficient.	None
19. IS implications	None	
20. Equality Impact Assessment	An equality impact assessment will not be undertaken.	N/A

	<i>Option 1</i>	<i>Option 2</i>
	The replacement lift specification will have a positive impact only on those with protected characteristics and will be fully compliant with all up to date regulations and guidelines.	
21. Data Protection Impact Assessment	The risk to personal data is less than high or non-applicable and a data protection impact assessment will not be undertaken	N/A
22. Recommendation	Recommended	Not recommended

This page is intentionally left blank

Project Briefing

Project identifier			
[1a] Unique Project Identifier	TBC	[1b] Departmental Reference Number	TBC
[2] Core Project Name	Barbican Estate Tower Lift Refurbishment		
[3] Programme Affiliation <i>(if applicable)</i>	N/A		

Ownership	
[4] Chief Officer has signed off on this document	TBC
[5] Senior Responsible Officer	Paul Murtagh
[6] Project Manager	Neil Clutterbuck

Description and purpose					
[7] Project Mission statement / Elevator pitch					
This project proposes a programme of works to replace all lifts in Shakespeare, Cromwell and Lauderdale Towers on the Barbican Estate. There are nine lifts in total, three serving each Tower. It is intended to procure a contractor that will deliver the project to the high standards required and ensure resident satisfaction.					
[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)?					
The three lifts serve each Tower were originally installed by Otis Lifts in the 1960's, and then received an extensive refurbishment in 1997 and 2002 again by Otis Lifts. All lifts require extensive refurbishment, with the replacement of all major components. The original equipment installed and then updated later, is now obsolete and parts are no longer readily available. A major failure of any of these components would require a lengthy design and repair process, with the possibility of lifts being out service for a considerable amount of time. Each tower has a designated firefighting lift which complied with the regulations at the time of installation. These firefighting features should be fully updated in compliance with the latest regulations and standards.					
[9] What is the link to the City of London Corporate plan outcomes?					
[4] Communities are cohesive and have suitable housing and facilities. [9] Our spaces are secure, resilient and well-maintained.					
[10] What is the link to the departmental business plan objectives?					
Tenants and leaseholders live in well maintained and managed homes and estates.					
[11] Note all which apply:					
Officer: Project developed from Officer initiation	Y	Member: Project developed from Member initiation	N	Corporate: Project developed as a large scale Corporate initiative	N
Mandatory: Compliance with legislation, policy and audit	Y	Sustainability: Essential for business continuity	N	Improvement: New opportunity/ idea that leads to improvement	N

Project Benchmarking:	
[12] What are the top 3 measures of success which will indicate that the project has achieved its aims?	
1) Barbican Estate Tower block lifts are refurbished to the high standards required.	
2) Works are managed to minimise disruption to residents and impact on the general public and wider public realm.	
3) Resident satisfaction above City's corporate targets.	
[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.)	
N/A	
[14] What is the expected delivery cost of this project (range values) [£]?	
Lower Range estimate: £4,300,000 Upper Range estimate: £4,700,000	
[15] Total anticipated on-going revenue commitment post-delivery (lifecycle costs) [£]:	
N/A	
[16] What are the expected sources of funding for this project?	
The project is funded by the City Fund, the majority of the cost (circa 95%) is recoverable by way of service charges from long leaseholders.	
[17] What is the expected delivery timeframe for this project (range values)? Are there any deadlines which must be met (e.g. statutory obligations)?	

Project Impact:	
[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?	
No	
[19] Who has been actively consulted to develop this project to this stage?	
<(Add additional internal or external stakeholders where required) >	
Project Board	Housing Programme Board
Chamberlains: Finance	Officer Name: Mark Jarvis
Chamberlains: Procurement	Hirdial Rai
IT	Officer Name: N/A
HR	Officer Name: N/A
Communications	Officer Name: N/A
Corporate Property	Officer Name: N/A
Estate Management	Officer Name: Michael Bennett, Helen Davinson
Property Services	Officer Name: Jason Hayes

[20] Is this project being delivered internally on behalf of another department? If not ignore this question. If so:

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: N/A
Supplier	Department: N/A
Supplier	Department: N/A
Project Design Manager	Department: N/A
Design/Delivery handover to Supplier	Gateway stage: N/A

This page is intentionally left blank

City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name: Barbican Estate Towers' Lift Refurbishment		PM's overall risk rating: Low	CRP requested this gateway: £ -	Average unmitigated risk: 5.0	Open Risks: 7
Unique project identifier: TBC	Total estimated cost (exc risk): £ 4,600,000	Total CRP used to date: £ -	Average mitigated risk score: 3.0		

General risk classification										Mitigation actions										Ownership & Action			
Risk ID	Gateway	Category	Description of the Risk	Risk Impact Description	Likelihood Classification in pre-mitigation	Impact Classification in pre-mitigation	Risk score	Costed impact pre-mitigation (£)	Costed Risk Provision requested Y/N	Confidence in the estimation	Mitigating actions	Mitigation cost (£)	Likelihood Classification on post-mitigation	Impact Classification on 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	4	(2) Financial	Lack of interest from contractors at tender stage.	Limited tender returns may not be value for money.	Possible	Minor	3	£0.00	N		Pre-tender contractor engagement	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00		16/03/2022	Jason Hayes	Neil Clutterbuck		
R2	4	(2) Financial	Cost inflation	Budget may be insufficient in uncertain market	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		Existing budgets should have an allowance built in to tender price.	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£0.00	3	£0.00		16/03/2022	Jason Hayes	Neil Clutterbuck		
R3	5	(2) Financial	Contractors financial viability of a greater risk during times of economic uncertainty	Impact of economic uncertainty on sector financial viability is unknown.	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	N		None at present	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£0.00	6	£0.00		16/03/2022	Jason Hayes	Neil Clutterbuck		
R4	4	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	Challenge to tender awarding process	An unsuccessful contractor may challenge the tender process.	Unlikely	Minor	2	£0.00	N		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		16/03/2022	Jason Hayes	Neil Clutterbuck		
R5	4	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	listed status of Barbican estate may complicate design process.	Potential programme delay.	Unlikely	Minor	2	£0.00	N		Early engagement with COX planning team.	£0.00	Rare	Minor	£0.00	1	£0.00		16/03/2022	Jason Hayes	Neil Clutterbuck		
R6	4	(1) Compliance/Regulatory	Challenge to the S20 process by lease holders.	Delay due to legal process and potential budgetary implications.	Unlikely	Serious	4	£0.00	N		Comprehensive condition survey carried out to demonstrate requirement for the works.	£0.00	Unlikely	Minor	£0.00	2	£0.00		16/03/2022	Jason Hayes	Neil Clutterbuck		
R7	4	(6) Safeguarding	Delay to start of project could seriously enhance the likelihood of a failure to the existing machinery.	Lengthy loss of service to residents and increased risk in the event of an emergency.	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	N		Robust project management to ensure project time scales are met.	£0.00	Possible	Serious	£0.00	6	£0.00		16/03/2022	Jason Hayes	Neil Clutterbuck		
R8							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R9							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
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						
R13							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R14							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R15							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R16							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R17							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R18							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R19							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R20							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R21							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R22							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R23							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R24							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R25							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R26							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R27							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R28							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R29							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R30							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R31							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R32							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R33							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R34							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R35							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R36							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R37							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R38							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R39							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R40							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R41							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R42							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R43							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R44							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R45							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R46							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R47							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R48							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R49							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R50							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R51							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R52							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R53							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R54							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R55							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R56							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R57							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R58							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R59							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R60							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R61							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R62							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R63							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R64							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R65							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R66							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R67							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						
R68							£0.00				£0.00				£0.00		£0.00						

PT4 - Committee Procurement Report

This document is to be used to identify the Procurement Strategy and Purchasing Routes associated with a project and only considers the option recommended on the associated Gateway report.



Introduction

City Procurement Project Reference:	22/01/DCCS		
Project / Contract Title:	Barbican Estate Tower Lift Replacement		
Project Lead & Contract Manager:	Neil Clutterbuck	Lead Department:	DCCS
Category Manager:	Hirdial Rai	Other Contact:	
Total Contract Value (excluding VAT and inc. extension options):	£4,000,000	Contract Duration (inc. extension options):	36 months
Budget approved Capital/Revenue:	No Capital	Capital Project reference (if applicable):	
Gateway Approval Process - Is this project subject to the Gateway process? Yes - If so, what was the last Gateway report, and date of approval, and what is the next Gateway report and scheduled date for recommendation for approval? Gateway 1 – 4 to be approved.			
Opportunity for Inter-City Collaboration (is there another site/department that could benefit from this project)?			

Procurement Strategy Recommendation

City Procurement team recommended option
Option 1 – Traditional Approach

Route to Market Recommendation

City Procurement team recommended option
Option 1 – Sub OJEU

Specification and Evaluation Overview

Summary of the main requirements: This project proposes a programme of works to replace all lifts in Shakespeare, Cromwell, and Lauderdale Towers on the Barbican Estate. There are nine lifts in total, three serving each Tower. It is intended to procure a contractor that will deliver the project to the high standards required and ensure resident satisfaction.	
Technical and Pricing evaluation ratio 60% (Technical) / 40% (Price) TBC	
Overview of the key Evaluation areas (if known at this stage): N/A	
Does contract delivery involve a higher than usual level of Health & Safety, Insurance, or Business risk to be allowed in the procurement strategy? No.	
Are there any accompanying documents with this report? e.g. PTO/outlined project plan identifying roles and responsibilities as appropriate If yes, please include information in the appendices section below.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will this project require the winning supplier(s) to process personal data on our behalf?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is there a requirement for a Performance Bond on this Project and if so, on what grounds? No.	
Will the procurement process require a financial assessment? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> If yes, please indicate recommended assessment: Financial Check <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial Appraisal <input type="checkbox"/>	

This page is intentionally left blank

“You Said; We Did” - Action List – June 2022

Actions from September 2022 Residents Consultation Committee (RCC) & other outstanding issues (*updates appear in bold italics*)

Issue	Source	Officer
Barbican Highwalks – Planned Maintenance of the Public Realm		
This relates to additional funding for the Walkways, for the inspection and maintenance for a number of items; i.e. smoke vents, drainage gulleys, railings, planters, benches and signage. There are currently no funds available but Officers will continue to review if there are any savings to progress any of these works.	RCC March 20	Paul Murtagh
Leaseholder Service Charge Working Party		
The Assistant Director had been working with residents on the Working Party in respect of a detailed review of service charges; looking at efficiency savings that could protect and possibly reduce charges in the future. This would be an extensive piece of work, likely to take about six months, and the findings would be reported to both the RCC and BRC. It was stressed that any benefits from the findings of the Working Party would not become apparent until the next financial year. <i>A special BRC committee meeting will be held in June/July 2022 to review the paper BEO and Concierge Service Update. This will follow consultation with RCC.</i>	RCC September 20	Anne Mason Paul Murtagh
External Wall Fire Reviews (EWS1 Forms)		
The EWS process and resulting form, is a set way for a building owner to confirm that an external wall system (typically insulation, filler materials and cladding) on residential buildings has been assessed for safety by a suitable expert, in line with government guidance. As EWS1s are not a legal requirement, there is no obligation on landlords to complete (lenders may refuse a mortgage application where one cannot be produced). The EWS process involves an assessment by a suitably qualified professional who completes the EWS1 form. The EWS1 forms have been completed for Andrewes, Breton, Defoe and Gilbert House. Quotations are being sought for the remainder of the Estate which will be detailed in a future report to Committee. <i>A report will be presented to June committee. Item complete.</i>	RCC Chair June 2021	Paul Murtagh
Barbican Podium Waterproofing Beech Gardens Phase 1		
In respect of the Gateway 6 (Outcome/Lessons Learnt Report) for Phase 1, as there were issues outstanding with this project, officers have commissioned Sandberg to undertake a review of the project from design to completion. The new Project Team would be taking the lessons learnt into Phase 2.	RCC June 21	Paul Murtagh Mike Saunders

<p>Meetings between Officers and Sandberg are ongoing and an interim report is expected to be presented to a future Committee.</p> <p>The white staining on the tiling around the water feature by Bunyan Court had been inspected. There is currently no update on a proposed solution.</p> <p><i>A report will be presented to June committee. Item complete.</i></p>		
Condition of the play areas.		
<p><i>A resident has raised concern about the condition of the play area including the soft play surface. The roundabout was removed, but unfortunately was found to be beyond repair. The BEO is currently waiting for quotes for a replacement and well as quotes for the repair and renewal of the soft play surfaces. This is an area of property maintenance where significant delays have been encountered due to supply chain issues.</i></p>	RCC and BRC June 22	Helen Davinson
Brandon Mews Canopy		
<p><i>A report detailing options for cleaning is planned for September committee.</i></p>	RCC and BRC Jan 22	TBC.
<p>Contact: Helen Davinson, Resident Services Manager E: helen.davinson@cityoflondon.gov.uk</p>		

Committee:	Date(s):
Residents' Consultation Committee Barbican Residential Committee	Item no. 6 June 2022 17 June 2022
Subject: Update Report	For information
Report of: Director of Community and Children's Services	Public
Summary	
<p>Barbican Estate Office</p> <p>1. Agenda Plan</p> <p>Property Services – see appendix 1</p> <p>2. Public lift availability</p> <p>3. Asbestos inspections</p> <p>Recommendations that the contents of this report are noted.</p>	

Background

This report updates members on issues raised by the Residents' Consultation Committee and the Barbican Residential Committee at their meetings in January 2022. This report also provides updates on other issues on the Estate.

1. Agenda Plan

The table below includes a list of pending committee reports:

Residents' Consultation Committee & Barbican Residential Committee

Report Title	Officer	RCC Meeting Date	BRC Meeting Date
Concierge and BEO Service Update	Paul Murtagh		Special meeting, date TBC
"You Said; We Did" Actions (Separate list for RCC & BRC)	BEO	20 Sept	30 Sept
Service Level Agreement Review	BEO		
Annual Residents' Survey	Helen Davinson		
Brandon Mews Canopy	TBC		
DCCS Business Plan for 2022/23	TBC		
Car Park Charging TBC	Barry Ashton		
Fire Safety Update	Paul Murtagh		
Blake Tower - Oral Update	Paul Murtagh		
2021/22 Revenue Outturn (Excluding the Residential Service Charge Account)	Anne Mason/Chamberlains		
Relationship of BRC Outturn Report to Service Charge Schedules – RCC Only	Anne Mason		
Progress of Sales & Lettings	Anne Mason		
Arrears Report (BRC Only)	Anne Mason		
Working Party Updates (RCC Only) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gardens Advisory • Asset Maintenance • Background Underfloor Heating • Leaseholder Service Charge • Electric Vehicle 	Working Parties		
Update Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main update - Agenda Plan 2022 • Property Services Update (Appendix 1) 	BEO		

"You Said; We Did" Actions (Separate list for RCC & BRC)	BEO	28 Nov	9 Dec
Service Level Agreement Review	BEO		
Fire Safety Update	Paul Murtagh		
Blake Tower - Oral Update	Paul Murtagh		
Service Charge Expenditure & Income Account - Original Budget 2022/23 & Original Budget 2023/24	Chamberlains		
Revenue & Capital Budgets – Original Budget 2022/23 and Original 2023/24 - Excluding dwellings service charge income & expenditure	Chamberlains		
Progress of Sales & Lettings	Anne Mason		
Arrears Report (BRC Only)	Anne Mason		
Working Party Updates (RCC Only) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gardens Advisory • Asset Maintenance • Background Underfloor Heating • Leaseholder Service Charge • Electric Vehicle 	Working Parties		
Update Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main update - Agenda Plan 2023 • Property Services Update (Appendix 1) 	BEO		

Contact:

Tel:

E:mail:

Helen Davinson, Resident Services Manager

020 7029 3963

barbican.estate@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

3. Public Lift Availability

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

Lift	From April 2020 to March 2021	From April 2021 to March 2022
Turret (Thomas More)	99.92%	97.61%
Gilbert House	99.67%	99.85%

4. Asbestos Re-inspections

Asbestos re-inspections for 2022 are underway and will continue through to July 2022. Any non-urgent remedial works as a result of these inspection will be programmed during the autumn.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s): Residents' Consultation Committee - For Information	Dated: 06062022
Barbican Residential Committee – For Information	17062022
Subject: Progress of Sales & Lettings	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	4
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	£
What is the source of Funding?	
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	
Report of Andrew Carter Director of Community and Children's Services	For Information
Report author: Anne Mason Community and Children's Services	

Summary

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

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Note the report.

Main Report

Background

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

Current Position

SURRENDERS/TERMINATIONS

2.

Case No	Type	Floor	Rent Per Annum	Tenancy commenced/ expired	Reason for Surrender	Date of Surrender
1	23	7	£25,550	Periodic	Moved to nursing home	05/04/22
2	52	01	£21,250	30/03/2020 29/03/2023	Moved to sheltered housing	10/02/22

RIGHT TO BUY SALES

3.

	06 May 2022	01 December 2021
Sales Completed	1080	1080
Total Market Value	£96,348,837.21	£96,348,837.21
Total Discount	£29,830,823.62	£29,830,823.62
NET PRICE	£66,518,013.59	£66,518,013.59

OPEN MARKET SALES

4.

	06 May 2021	01 December 2021
Sales Completed	867	867
Market Value	£164,784,271.97	£164,784,271.97

5. Fifteen exchanges of sold flats have taken place with the sum of £720,254 being paid to the City of London.
6. The freeholds of 14 flats in Wallside have been sold with the sum of £35,000 being paid to the City of London.
7. A 999 year lease has been completed with the sum of £43,200 being paid to the City of London.

APPROVED SALES

8.

CASE	Block	Floor	Type	Price	Remarks as at 06/05/2022
1	Ben Jonson House	1/2	M2B	£677,500	proceeding
2	Defoe House	1	20 (1 bed)	£870,000	proceeding
3	Andrewes House	4	20 (1 bed)	£850,000	proceeding

COMPLETED SALES

9. No sales have completed since the last report.

SALES PER BLOCK

10.

BLOCK	TOTAL NO. OF FLATS	TOTAL NO. SOLD	NET PRICE £	% NO. OF FLATS SOLD
ANDREWES HOUSE	192	186	18,238,760.00	96.88
BEN JONSON HOUSE	204	196	14,877,454.83	96.08
BRANDON MEWS	26	24	1,057,460.00	92.31
BRETTON HOUSE	111	110	8,869,412.50	99.10
BRYER COURT	56	55	2,307,338.50	98.21
BUNYAN COURT	69	68	6,484,280.00	98.55
DEFOE HOUSE	178	173	17,414,782.50	97.19
FROBISHER CRESCENT	69	69		100.00
GILBERT HOUSE	88	87	11,046,452.50	98.86
JOHN TRUNDLE COURT	133	133	5,467,527.50	100.00
LAMBERT JONES MEWS	8	8	1,400,000.00	100.00
MOUNTJOY HOUSE	64	63	5,925,723.50	98.44
THE POSTERN/WALLSIDE	26	22	5,959,130.00	84.62
SEDDON HOUSE	76	75	8,445,677.50	98.68
SPEED HOUSE	114	109	13,589,848.50	95.61
THOMAS MORE HOUSE	166	163	14,483,455.00	98.19
WILLOUGHBY HOUSE	148	147	14,972,670.50	99.32
TERRACE BLOCK TOTAL	1728 (1728)	1688 (1688)	150,539,973.33 (150,539,973.33)	97.69 (97.69)
CROMWELL TOWER	112	103	27,005,801.00	91.96
LAUDERDALE TOWER	117	114	24,553,779.63	97.44
SHAKESPEARE TOWER	116	111	30,001,185.60	95.69
TOWER BLOCK TOTAL	345 (345)	328 (328)	81,560,766.23 (81,560,766.23)	95.07 (95.07)
ESTATE TOTAL	2073 (2073)	2016 (2016)	232,100,739.56 (232,100,739.56)	97.25 (97.25)

Key Data

Strategic implications –

Financial implications – Receipts from sales are credited to the City Fund.

Resource implications - None

Legal implications - None

Risk implications - None

Equalities implications – None

Climate implications - None

Security implications - None

Appendices

None

Anne Mason

Revenues Manager

T: 020 7029 3912

E: anne.mason@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank