



Community & Children's Services Committee

Date: WEDNESDAY, 28 JANUARY 2026

Time: 1.45 pm

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members:

Deputy Helen Fentimen OBE JP (Chair)	Laura Jørgensen
Steve Goodman OBE (Deputy Chair)	Helen Ladele
Joanna Tufuo Abeyie	Alderman Tim Levene
Munsur Ali	Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP
Matthew Bell	Alderman Christopher Makin
Leyla Boulton	Sophia Mooney
Simon Burrows	Leyla Ostovar
Lesley Cole	Jason Pritchard
Deputy Anne Corbett	Deputy Nighat Qureishi
Aaron Anthony Jose Hasan D'Souza	Beverley Ryan
Deputy John Fletcher	Sushil Saluja
Dawn Frampton	Stuart Thompson
Sarah Gillinson	Deputy James Thomson CBE
Deputy Christopher Hayward	Mark Wheatley
Amy Horscroft	Deputy Ceri Wilkins
Sandra Jenner	David Williams
Shravan Joshi MBE	Philip Woodhouse

Enquiries: Kate Doidge
Kate.Doidge@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting

Members of the public can observe all virtual public meetings of the City of London Corporation by following the below link:

<https://www.youtube.com/@CityofLondonCorporation/streams>

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one civic 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.

Whilst we endeavour to livestream all of our public meetings, this is not always possible due to technical difficulties. In these instances, if possible, a recording will be uploaded following the end of the meeting.

Ian Thomas CBE
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

NB: Certain items presented for information have been marked * and will be taken without discussion, unless the Committee Clerk has been informed that a Member has questions or comments prior to the start of the meeting. These for information items have been collated into a supplementary agenda pack and have been circulated separately

Part 1 - Public Reports

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 previous Committee meeting.

For Decision
(Pages 7 - 14)

4. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

Members are asked to note the outstanding actions report.

For Information
(Pages 15 - 16)

5. **PRESENTATION - GOLDEN LANE LEISURE CENTRE REFURBISHMENT**

The Executive Director of Community and Children's Services to be heard, ahead of receiving Agenda Item 20 (Non-Public).

For Discussion
(Verbal Report)

6. **ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMUNITY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 17 - 20)

7. **GATEWAY 6 REPORTS - CLOSURE OF LEGACY PROJECTS**

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

Note – it is intended to take agenda items 7a – 7c together.

For Decision
(Pages 21 - 24)

- a) Holloway Estate Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations
(Pages 25 - 36)
- b) Sydenham Hill Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations
(Pages 37 - 48)
- c) Windsor House Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations
(Pages 49 - 60)

8. **DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET ESTIMATES 2026/27 - COMMUNITY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES EXCLUDING HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA)**

Joint report of the Chamberlain and Executive Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Decision
(Pages 61 - 74)

9. **HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) AND CAPITAL BUDGETS 2026/27**

Joint report of the Chamberlain and Executive Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Decision
(Pages 75 - 82)

10. ***SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITY (SEND) CITY OF LONDON LOCAL AREA INSPECTION OUTCOME - DECEMBER 2025**

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

For Information

11. ***COMMUNITY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES (NON-HOUSING) REVENUE OUTTURN FORECAST AS AT QUARTER 3, 2025/26**

Joint report of the Chamberlain and Executive Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Information

12. ***HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT POSITION 2025/26**

Joint report of the Chamberlain and Executive Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Information

13. ***CITY OF LONDON STREET HOMELESSNESS OUTREACH AND SUPPORT SERVICE – STAGE 1 PROCUREMENT STRATEGY REPORT**

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

For Information

14. **UPDATES FROM SUB COMMITTEES, ALLOCATED MEMBERS AND PORTFOLIO HOLDERS**

For Information

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

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

17. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION - That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

For Decision

Part 2 - Non-Public Reports

18. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

To agree the non-public minutes of the previous Committee meeting.

For Decision
(Pages 83 - 88)

19. **NON-PUBLIC OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

Members are asked to note the outstanding actions report.

For Information
(Pages 89 - 92)

20. **GATEWAY 2 - DESIGN OPTION APPRAISAL - GOLDEN LANE LEISURE CENTRE (GLLC) REFURBISHMENT**

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

For Decision
(Pages 93 - 170)

21. ***MANAGEMENT UPDATE FOR THE CITY OF LONDON COMBINED RELIEF OF POVERTY CHARITY**

Report of the Acting Managing Director, City Bridge Foundation.

For Information

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

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

COMMUNITY & CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE

Monday, 10 November 2025

Minutes of the meeting of the Community & Children's Services Committee held at Committee Rooms, West Wing, Guildhall on Monday, 10 November 2025 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Steve Goodman OBE (Deputy Chair)
Munsur Ali
Matthew Bell
Leyla Boulton
Simon Burrows
Lesley Cole
Deputy Anne Corbett
Deputy John Fletcher
Dawn Frampton
Sarah Gillinson

Sandra Jenner
Helen Ladele
Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP
Alderman Christopher Makin
Sophia Mooney
Leyla Ostovar
Beverley Ryan
Sushil Saluja
Stuart Thompson
Deputy Ceri Wilkins

Observing Virtually:

Alderman Tim Levene
Deputy Nighat Qureishi
Mark Wheatley
Philip Woodhouse

In attendance:

Gaby Robertshaw
Rory McCallum - City & Hackney
Safeguarding Children Partnership

Officers:

Judith Finlay	- Executive Director, Community and Children's Services
Beverley Andrews	- Community and Children's Services Department
Peta Caine	- Community and Children's Services Department
Simon Cribbens	- Community and Children's Services Department
Chris Lovitt	- Community and Children's Services Department
Chris Pelham	- Community and Children's Services Department
Gregory Wade	- Community and Children's Services Department
Ellie Ward	- Community and Children's Services Department
Frank Marchione	- Comptroller & City Solicitor's Department
Mark Jarvis	- Chamberlain's Department
Ola Obadara	- Chamberlain's Department
Kate Doidge	- Town Clerk's Department

MATTERS ARISING

The Committee agreed to amend the agenda order, to receive Item 21, Investment in Social Housing Stock, following Item 16, Non-Public Outstanding Actions.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Helen Fentimen (Chairman), Joanna Abeyie, Deputy Christopher Hayward, Laura Jørgensen, Jason Pritchard, Deputy Nighat Qureishi, Deputy James Thomson, and Mark Wheatley.

In the absence of the Chairman, the Deputy Chair, Steve Goodman OBE, chaired the meeting.

Alderman Tim Levene, Deputy Nighat Qureishi, Mark Wheatley, and Philip Woodhouse observed the meeting virtually.

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

Dawn Frampton declared an interest as a resident of Fann Street.

There were no other declarations.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED: - that the public minutes and non-public summary of the previous meeting, held on 17th September 2025, be approved as an accurate record.

4. PUBLIC OUTSTANDING ACTIONS

The Committee received the public outstanding actions report.

RESOLVED: - that the report be received, and its contents noted.

5. YORK WAY ESTATE LIFT, LIFT LOBBY AND STAIRWELL REFURBISHMENT AND UPGRADE WORKS

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services, concerning York Way Estate lift, lift lobby and stairwell refurbishment and upgrade works.

A Member queried why consultants were recommended for the works. The response was that the consultants were specialists who could deliver the works on site and to the required specifications. They were also more cost effective, as historically other works had been delivered in-house and had not been the most successful.

To keep residents safe, additional parts had been purchased to keep on site, and the works would be kept under review and practice would be adapted to manage fire risks. The lifts would be registered as out of service with the London Fire Brigade. Information on vulnerable residents was kept on site, and additional staff would be deployed for residents that required extra assistance. This would be during working hours.

Officers could not yet provide information on the s20 process for the cost of recharge to leaseholders, but this could be provided when this information was available.

RESOLVED: - that Members of the Community and Children's Services Committee agree:

- That budget of £60,000 is approved for consultant fees to reach the next Gateway.
- Note the project budget of £60,000 (excluding risk).
- Note the total estimated cost of the project at £3,000,000.
- That a Costed Risk Provision of £0 is approved (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer).

6. **CORPORATE PARENTING STRATEGY 2025-2028**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services, concerning the approval of the Corporate Parenting Strategy 2025-2028, which outlined the refreshed vision, values, strategic priorities, and approach to embedding corporate parenting responsibilities across all departments and services.

A Member requested information on the involvement of young people in the governance and implementation of the strategy. The response was that the Children in Care Council was the main governing body in which the City Corporation consulted with and engaged on an ongoing basis. There was also an annual independent survey which informed the Strategy. Feedback was also provided via case work, social care workers, and complaints and compliments service.

The criterion for care leavers not feeling safe was queried, as the data showed that approximately 1 in 4 did not feel safe. The response that the primary area of safety concerned mental health, and support was provided in those cases. As the annual independent survey was anonymous this did present challenges when these issues were reported via that platform, but officers would work with its providers to help target areas of concern if they could be identified. Officers also met with the Children in Care Council on a regular basis and discussed a range of topics which included safety.

The Committee agreed that the Corporate Parenting Strategy 2025-2028 should be submitted to the Court of Common Council, to raise awareness of the City Corporation and Elected Members statutory duties to act as a corporate parent for children in care and care leavers.

RESOLVED: - that Members of the Community & Children's Services Committee:

- Sign off the draft Corporate Parenting Strategy 2025-2028.
- Submit the Corporate Parenting Strategy 2025-2028 to the Court of Common Council.

7. **ALLOCATED MEMBERS TO THE VARIOUS HOUSING ESTATES**

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk, concerning the endorsement of the appointments made to the Allocated Members Scheme to various housing estates.

A Member raised previous discussions on the options with Mansell Estate, noting that there had not yet been any action in this area, and expressed their concerns on the delay and the impact upon residents. The Committee were reminded that the Mansell Estate was the responsibility of Guinness Partnership, that the City Corporation would meet with to influence and explore the concerns raised by residents. The Committee were also then reminded that the Chairman of Policy & Resources Committee had committed that the Mansell Estate would be part of the remit of the review into housing governance, which would assist with establishing the City Corporation's rights and responsibilities in relation to the Mansell Estate. This review would be due to commence in March 2026.

RESOLVED: - that Member of the Community and Children's Services Committee endorse the appointments to the Allocated Members Scheme to the various housing estates, as set out in the report.

8. **GOLDEN LANE LEISURE CENTRE - UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services, concerning an update on the project to refurbish the Golden Lane Leisure Centre, and a decision on the preferred approach to energy supply. It was noted to the Committee that the achievement of future energy needs was subject to approval by the Resource Allocation Sub Committee for allocation of Carbon Offset S106 funding.

A Member raised a query on whether the consultation on the Golden Lane Leisure Centre would include transportation and access to the Centre for users. The response was that transportation to the Centre was not included in the refurbishment, and if it was required, this would be considered in the operator contract which would need agreement from the Committee for additional funding. Access to the existing Leisure Centre were part of the refurbishment plans. The consultation primarily focused on the design of the Leisure Centre the facilities, use, and to weigh the appetite of its future users.

The study of the running costs of the Citigen network option were analysed against the use of gas boilers and other low carbon options. While it would not necessarily be a lower cost, it was comparatively lower than other low carbon options. There were plans to de-carbonise the Citigen network which could impact upon running costs in the long term. There were additional costs to connect to the Citigen network, and thus the request for the Carbon Offset S106 funding. The recommendation was also consistent with the City Corporation's environmental policies.

RESOLVED: - that Members of the Community and Children's Services Committee:

- Note the report and issues set out.
- Approve the recommendation that the future energy needs of the Centre are met through connection to the Citigen network, noting that the achievement of this will still be subject to approval by the Resource Allocation Sub Committee for the allocation of Carbon Offset S106 funding.

9. **CITY & HACKNEY SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN PARTNERSHIP (CHSCP) ANNUAL REPORT 2024-2025**

The Committee received a report of the City & Hackney Safeguarding Children Partnership Board, concerning their Annual Report for 2024/25 which provided an overview of the partnership's activities, progress, challenges, and future priorities in safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children in the City of London and London Borough of Hackney.

A Member requested that the Annual Report for 2025/26 include comments on the City Corporation's Housing Service. It was also requested that it include reflections on the impacts of Awaab's Law, and actions taken by the City Corporation and London Borough of Hackney. Members were reassured that the City Corporation's response to Awaab's Law had been tested by the Board, and the report next year could look to strengthen the narrative in this area.

The accuracy of the figure of 23.2% of children in primary school in receipt of free school meals was queried, as all children in a primary state school in London were eligible for free school meals. The response was that data was provided by the Board's partners, in this case, from the Aldgate School census. The data likely reflected those children who were eligible for free school meals under a certain criterion, but it was acknowledged that it should be caveated that this figure may be for children who had applied for the free school meals but did not necessarily cover all who were eligible.

It was noted that there had been an increase in contact of the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO), who was responsible for any allegations made against any professional working with children. This was in part consequence of the LADO's extended reach, raised level of awareness, and stronger profile in the City of London, as not all reports resulted in formal action. It was acknowledged that the timescales of some assessments had gone beyond the 45 days, but these were small numbers and had been signed off to go beyond this timeframe given the particular circumstances of the families involved.

RESOLVED: - that the report be received, and its contents noted.

10. ***STRONGER COMMUNITIES FUND - ANNUAL REPORT 2024/25 AND ANALYSIS OF FUND'S IMPACT OVER THE LAST FIVE YEARS**

The Committee received a report of the Interim Managing Director, City Bridge Foundation, concerning the Annual Report 2024/25 for the Stronger Communities Fund and analysis of the fund's impact over the last five years.

A Member wished to express their thanks and highlight the importance of the Stronger Communities Fund to the local community in Portsoken Ward, especially for organisation of events.

RESOLVED: - that Members of the Community & Children's Services Committee:

- Note the criteria for the Stronger Communities Fund at Appendix 1.
- Note the recent grants awarded from the Stronger Communities Fund 2024/25 at Appendix 2.
- Note the analysis of the Stronger Communities Fund over the last five years, 2020/21 to 2024/25 inclusive, and its impact for City of London communities at Appendix 3.

11. UPDATES FROM SUB COMMITTEES, ALLOCATED MEMBERS AND PORTFOLIO HOLDERS

The Committee received a verbal update from the Allocated Member for Middlesex Street. It was noted to the Committee that since the snagging issues that had been raised in their previous report, officers had produced an itemised list that was being worked through, with works being programmed in for the future.

The Committee agreed that future reports from the Allocated Members should be received by the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee.

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

A Member appreciated that it was not cost effective for all repair and maintenance jobs, particularly the smaller ones, to be physically inspected by an officer before the contractors were paid. However, the Member asked if it was a requirement for contractors to send photographic evidence that the task had been properly completed before payment, for works in common parts and flats.

The response was that it was a pre-existing process for all contractors to submit photographic evidence alongside their invoice. The works were then inspected on a desktop using the photographic evidence, which meant that officers did not have to visit the works on site. For cases of non-compliance with this process, officers would return and request the information from the contractor.

13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

There were no public items of urgent business.

14. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED: - that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

15. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
RESOLVED: - that the non-public minutes of the previous meeting, held on 17th September 2025, be approved as an accurate record.
16. **NON-PUBLIC OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**
The Committee received the non-public outstanding actions report.

RESOLVED: - that the report be received, and its contents noted.
17. **INVESTMENT IN SOCIAL HOUSING STOCK**
The Committee received a joint report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services and the Chamberlain, concerning the investment into social housing stock.
18. **GOLDEN LANE INVESTMENT PROGRAMME (PHASE 1: CRESCENT HOUSE)**
The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services, concerning the Golden Lane Estate Investment Programme, for Phase 1 – all Crescent House.
19. **GOLDEN LANE INVESTMENT PROGRAMME (PHASE 2: ALL BLOCKS EXCLUDING CRESCENT HOUSE AND GREAT ARTHUR HOUSE)**
The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services, concerning the Golden Lane Estate Investment Programme, for Phase 2 – all blocks excluding Crescent House and Great Arthur House.
20. **GREAT ARTHUR HOUSE FIRE SAFETY AND INVESTMENT WORKS**
The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services, concerning Great Arthur House fire safety and investment works.
21. **GEORGE ELLISTON AND ERIC WILKINS HOUSES REFURBISHMENT**
The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services, concerning the George Elliston and Eric Wilkins Houses refurbishment.
22. ***REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN**
The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk, concerning details of decisions taken under urgency between Committee meetings.
23. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no non-public questions.
24. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
One item of non-public urgent business was raised.

The meeting ended at 3.13 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Kate Doidge
Kate.Doidge@cityoflondon.gov.uk

PUBLIC OUTSTANDING ACTIONS – COMMUNITY AND CHILDREN’S SERVICES COMMITTEE (CCS) – January 2026

No	Committee Date Raised	Initial Request and Pending Actions	Responsibility	Due Date	Progress Update
1	19/06/2025	<p>Corporation Childcare Policy and Family Service Arrangements: Refer the remainder of the policy back to Officers to thoroughly reflect the requests from this committee as to alternatives - (for example meeting the broad policy objectives set out by a differential pricing model in affordable childcare at the Aldgate School)</p> <p>Seek the presentation at a future meeting of this committee of alternatives in the childcare policy which allow members to vote transparently on the future support for, or withdrawal of funding for affordable childcare to the Aldgate School.</p>	Strategic Education and Skills Director	June 2026	Corporation Childcare Policy and Family Service Arrangements: Policy approved by Members on 19/06/25. City subsidy of 0-2 childcare extended to The Aldgate School until 31/08/27. Meetings to discuss sustainable financial framework and impact of DfE extended childcare offer from 01/09/25 offered between Head Teacher and Education Director. Update on progress to DCCS committee in June 2026.
2	19/06/2025	Golden Lane Leisure Centre Management Options: The Committee endorsed the proposed approach to outsourcing the management of the centre, including the option for a hybrid or internal bid to be evaluated alongside external tenders.	Director of Commissioning and Partnerships	Late 2026	The procurement of a future operator will commence in 2026. The timing is interdependent on wider project elements.
3	17/09/25	Housing Services Asset Management Strategy: To refresh the strategy in early 2026 following completion of the full stock condition survey programme.	Director of Housing	Quarter 1 2026/2027	Once the stock condition is complete (estimated completion is Qtr. 4 2025/2026) we will need to analyse the data received and consider what impact it will have on the asset management strategy. In addition, we will also need to assess the results of the EPC survey and changes indicated by the updated Decent Homes Standard.

PUBLIC OUTSTANDING ACTIONS – COMMUNITY AND CHILDREN’S SERVICES COMMITTEE (CCS) – January 2026

4	17/09/25	Risk Register: It was asked if the following could be included when reporting on the risk register: providing dates when the risks were first recorded; providing the relevant departmental leader against the risks; and risks grouped by theme rather than listed in order of rating.	Business Support Managers	March 2026	This has been noted for the next iteration of the risk register report which will be presented to committee in March 2026.
5	10/11/25	City & Hackney Safeguarding Children Partnership (CHSCP) Annual Report 2024-2025: A Member requested that the Annual Report for 2025/26 include comments on the City Corporation’s Housing Service. It was also requested that it include reflections on the impacts of Awaab’s Law, and actions taken by the City Corporation and London Borough of Hackney.	Director of Housing and CHSCP Senior Professional Adviser	End of September 2026	The 2025/ 2025 annual report will be published at the end of September 2026.

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committee(s): Community & Children's Services Committee – For Decision	Dated: 28 January 2026
Subject: Annual Review of the Terms of Reference of Community and Children's Services Committee	Public report: For Decision
This proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides statutory duties • provides business enabling functions 	N/A
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
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:	Ian Thomas, Town Clerk
Report author:	Kate Doidge, Governance Officer

Summary

As part of the implementation of the 2021 Governance Review, it was agreed that the cycle and process of annually reviewing the Terms of Reference of all Committees/Boards should be revised, to provide more time for Committees to consider and discuss changes before they are submitted to the Policy and Resources Committee.

This will enable any proposed changes to be considered at the Policy and Resources Committee in February 2026, in time for the re-appointment of Committees by the Court of Common Council in April.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Agree that the terms of reference of the Community & Children's Services Committee, subject to any comments, be approved for submission to the Court of Common Council in April, and that any further changes required in the lead up to the Court's appointment of Committees be delegated to the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Court Order 2025/26 – Community & Children’s Services Committee

Kate Doidge

Governance Officer
Town Clerk’s Department

E: kate.doidge@CityofLondon.gov.uk

COMMUNITY & CHILDREN'S SERVICES COMMITTEE

Constitution

A Ward Committee consisting of,

- two Aldermen nominated by the Court of Aldermen
- up to 34 Commoners representing each Ward (two representatives for the Wards with six or more Members regardless of whether the Ward has sides), those Wards having 200 or more residents (based on the Ward List) being able to nominate a maximum of two representatives
- a limited number of Members co-opted by the Committee (e.g. the two parent governors required by law)

Quorum

The quorum consists of any nine Members. [N.B. - the co-opted Members only count as part of the quorum for matters relating to the Education Function]

Terms of Reference

To be responsible for:-

- (a) the appointment of the Executive Director of Community & Children's Services;
- (b) the following functions of the City of London Corporation (other than in respect of powers expressly delegated to another committee, sub-committee, board or panel):-
 - i. Children's Services - to include Corporate Parenting, which is also scrutinised by the Committee's Safeguarding Sub Committee, together with performance data.
 - ii. Adults' Services - noting that performance data is also scrutinised by the Safeguarding Sub Committee
 - iii. Education - to include attendance/admissions for the Aldgate School, Children Centre matters and Special Educational Needs(SEND), which are also scrutinised by the Safeguarding Sub Committee.
 - iv. Libraries - in so far as the library services affects our communities (*NB - the budget for the Library Service falls within the remit of the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee but the Head of the Libraries Service reports to the Director of Community and Children's Services*)
 - v. Social Housing - (i.e. the management of the property owned by the City of London Corporation under the Housing Revenue Account and the City Fund in accordance with the requirements of all relevant legislation and the disposal of interests in the City of London Corporation's Housing Estates (pursuant to such policies as are from time to time laid down by the Court of Common Council) (*NB. The Housing Management and Almshouses Sub Committee has decision making powers in these matters, delegated by the Grand Committee.*)
 - vi. Public Health - as prescribed by the Health and Social Care Act 2022, noting the separate and distinct responsibilities of the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee; the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee.
 - vii. Sport/Leisure Activities
 - viii. Marriage Licensing and the Registration Service

and the preparation of all statutory plans relating to those functions and consulting as appropriate on the exercise of those functions;

- (c) appointing Statutory Panels, Boards and Sub-Committees as are considered necessary for the better performance of its duties including the following areas:-
 - Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee
 - Safeguarding & Special Education Needs Sub-Committee
 - City and Hackney Sub Committee of the North East London Integrated Care Board
 - Integrated Commissioning Sub-Committee
 - Homelessness and Rough Sleepers Sub-Committee
- (d) excepting those matters reserved to the Court of Common Council or which are the responsibility of another Committee, all aspects of City of London Combined Relief of Poverty Charity (registered charity no. 1073660) and City of London Almshouses Charity (registered charity no. 1005857) and day-to-day management and administration of the charities. The Committee may exercise any available powers on behalf of the City Corporation as trustee under delegated authority from the Court of Common Council as the body responsible for exercising the powers of the City Corporation as trustee. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring effective operational arrangements are in place for the proper administration of the charities, and to support expedient and efficient delivery of the charities objects and activities in accordance with the charities annual budget, strategy and policies.
- (e) making recommendations to the Education Board on the policy to be adopted for the application of charitable funds and to make appointments to the Sub-Committee established by the Education Board for the purpose of managing those charities.
- (f) the management of the Aldgate Pavilion.

This page is intentionally left blank

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committee(s): Community & Children's Services Committee – <i>For Decision</i>	Dated: 28/01/2026
Subject: Gateway 6 Reports – Closure of Legacy Projects	Public report: For Decision
This proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides statutory duties • provides business enabling functions 	Providing Excellent Services
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	HRA
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Yes
Report of:	Director of Community & Children's Services
Report author:	David Downing, Asset Programme Manager

Summary

This report introduces the following three Gateway 6 reports on the Committee agenda which seek authority to close off legacy projects as predominantly delivered between 2022-24 by the Housing Major Works Team which still remain live on the City's reporting and financial systems. The Gateway 6 Outcome Report has been a mandatory part of the outgoing project procedure and formed the final part of a project's journey through the City's outgoing governance procedures. With the recent launch of the new P3 Portfolio Management Framework, these are likely be the last Gateway 6 reports submitted to this Committee in this old format.

The Gateway 6s which follow this report present three projects which, despite requiring substantial cost uplifts as already approved by Members, were brought to a successfully conclusion, delivering significant, much needed upgrades for the residents of the City's social housing estates. These projects were among the most impacted by the unprecedented Covid and post-Covid periods where projects were beset by complicated access arrangements and rampant industry cost inflation.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

Note the report and authorise approval of the following three Gateway 6 Reports:

- Holloway Estate Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations
- Sydenham Hill Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations
- Windsor House Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations

Main Report

Background

1. This paper provides an overview and additional context for the three Gateway 6 Outcomes Reports which follow on this Committees agenda.
2. The reports concern:

Holloway Estate Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations, which was predominantly delivered between 2022-24.

Sydenham Hill Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations, which was predominantly delivered between 2022-25.

Windsor House Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations, which was predominantly delivered between 2022-24.

Current Position

3. All three projects have been successfully completed, with final accounts fully settled, and defects liability periods at an end. The projects are now due for formal closure; the Gateway 6 Outcome Reports having been slightly delayed during the recent senior management transformation within DCCS Housing. With the ongoing changes to the City's project procedures and the launch of the new P3 Framework, it is prudent to close off any remaining completed projects without further delay as a housekeeping exercise and to reduce the administrative burden of transferring old projects from one governance framework to another.

Options

None.

Proposals

4. Members are asked to review and authorise the three Gateway 6 Reports which follow relating to the historic projects detailed above. As per the outgoing Project Procedure, each report must be presented individually on the correct project template, with Members asked to note the content ahead of formal project closure.

Key Data

5.

<i>Project</i>	<i>At Authority to Start work (Gateway 5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost (Gateway 6)</i>	<i>Variance</i>
Holloway Estate Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations	£3,559,919.00	£4,604,242.99	£1,044,323.99

Sydenham Hill Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations	£1,217,610.00	£1,605,534.95	£387,924.95
Windsor House Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations	£1,670,431.00	£2,763,428.90	£1,092,997.90
Total	£6,447,960.00	£8,973,206.84	£2,525,246.84

6. The Gateway 6 outturn costs across all three projects show significant uplifts were required from the Gateway 5 (Authority to Start Work) costs in order to complete the works. A combined total of £2,525,246.84 additional costs were presented to Members for approval via a series Issues Reports in 2023 and 2024 to see the projects through to completion.
7. For the three projects combined, a total of £2,831,718.21 was recovered from leaseholders (£1,569,874.92 from Holloway Estate leaseholders, £796,881.06 from Sydenham Hill leaseholders and £464,962.22 from Windsor House leaseholders).
8. Summary of key lessons learned:
 - Covid pandemic impacts – these three projects were among the worst affected in the DCCS portfolio by the unprecedented Covid-19 public health crisis. Procurement and the initial phases of delivery were carried out in challenging circumstances during a time when industry cost inflation was rampant.
 - Planning issues – delays to the execution of planning consents due to the forced hiatus of the Covid pandemic gave time for Building Regulations to change which resulted in the need to revisit designs and vary delivery contracts at cost.
 - Design issues – incomplete design work saw a small number of windows missed from original proposals and the need to add-in a mechanical ventilation strategy at a late phase of the projects.
 - Insufficient pre-tender surveys – saw the discovery of in-contract additional works, such as unforeseen lead paint and asbestos removal, and lintel replacement which led to delays and contract variation and uplift.
 - Resident engagement – the utilisation of dedicated City resident liaison resources would have greatly eased engagement and access challenges rather than reliance on a sole project manager; the deployment of additional resource being restricted by budgetary pressures.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

Strategic implications – These projects formed part of the Housing Major Works investment programme which commenced in 2014.

Financial implications – The outturn costs for all three projects required significant uplift from the Gateway 5 (Authority to Start Work) approved sums.

Resource implications – All three projects were delivered by the Housing Major Works team.

Legal implications – Leaseholder recovery was completed as detailed above.

Risk implications – None.

Equalities implications – None.

Climate implications – None.

Security implications – None.

Conclusion

9. The Gateway 6 reports submitted for approval form part of a housekeeping exercise ahead of adoption of the new P3 Project Framework. The three projects presented here were completed successfully, albeit requiring need for substantial cost uplifts, in the challenging Covid and immediately post-Covid environments. Works on all three projects were completed under the previous senior leadership regime.

Appendices

None

David Downing

Asset Programme Manager, DCCS Major Works

T: 020 7332 1645

E: david.downing@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committees: Corporate Projects Board [for information] Community & Children's Services Committee [for decision] Projects & Procurement Sub [for information]	Dates: 12 November 2025 28 January 2026 25 March 2026
Subject: Holloway Estate Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations Unique Project Identifier: 11548	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular
Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services Report Author: Rafael Cardenas, Project Manager	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: This project addressed the need for the Window Replacements at Holloway Estate and Whitby Court as well as a basis for establishing a platform for programming the future cyclical redecorations for the internal and external common parts across the Estate.</p> <p>RAG Status: Green (Red at last report to Committee) Risk Status: Medium (Medium at last report to committee) Costed Risk Provision Utilised: N/A Final Outturn Cost: £ 4,604,242.99</p>
2. Next steps and requested decisions	<p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To note the content of this report, 2. To note the lessons learnt, 3. To authorise closure of this project.
3. Key conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All residential units have received upgraded double-glazed windows, enhancing energy efficiency and reducing external noise; this is expected to provide residents with greater comfort within their homes. • The window design also improved the visual appeal of the estate, aligning with broader regeneration goals while complying with planning and building consent approvals.

v.April 2019

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While many residents welcomed the upgrades, feedback has been varied, particularly around communication during works and the quality of some finishes. Any concerns raised were addressed as part of the snagging process with all outstanding matters now fully resolved and completed works verified as meeting the expected standards. <p>Reasons for Variance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delays caused by material amendment due to new Building Regulations, requiring trickle vents in habitable rooms. However, this detail was omitted in the planning permission, creating a potential conflict in terms of statutory approvals which took time to resolve. <p>Value for Money Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimated NPV: £3,559,919 Actual NPV: £4,604,242.99 Assessment: The final budget approved after two issue reports was £4,748,118. Despite the documented overspend from Gateway 5, the project has delivered good value for money, due to long-term maintenance savings and resident wellbeing improvements. <p>Key Learnings and Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated upgrades (e.g., insulation) should be considered alongside window replacements. Future projects should include a holistic building envelope assessment to maximise energy efficiency. Early contractor involvement helped refine specifications and reduce costs. Engage suppliers during design phase to optimise material choices and cost efficiency. Stakeholder engagement was insufficient during design phase. Future projects should include resident consultation and heritage impact assessments to ensure alignment with community expectations.
--	---

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

4. Design into delivery	<p>Design Preparedness</p> <p>The Corporation adopted the correct approach in appointing an external consultant at the outset of the project to undertake design, specification and manage the planning application process. This resulted in detailed specifications for the manufacture and installation of preferred window products.</p>
--------------------------------	---

v.April 2019

	Areas for Improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-construction Surveys: Sequencing of asbestos and lead paint surveys could have been more explicitly integrated into the design phase to avoid delays. • Resident Engagement: Balloting and colour selection processes could have been better structured and documented. • Access Protocols: More detailed planning for contractor access and resident notifications would have improved coordination.
5. Options appraisal	The selected option to procure a contractor to deliver a programme of repairs via open tender successfully delivered the projects objectives. Changes were required during project delivery specially Extension of Time (EOT) basically due to planning permission.
6. Procurement route	Works were procured via open tender advertised on the capital e-sourcing portal.
7. Skills base	The City of London project team had the required skills and experience to manage the delivery of the project. An external QS was employed to assist with the EOT and variations raised by the Contractors in order to ensure accurate assessment of claims, maintain cost control, and provide independent validation of contractual entitlements.
8. Stakeholders	Although it is acknowledged that stakeholder engagement could have been more robust during the early stages, resident liaison was managed well throughout the delivery phase of the project.

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	This project originally formed part of a portfolio-wide programme, with the intention of progressing a single procurement exercise for window replacement to all HRA housing stock. In hindsight, this approach was flawed and resulted in significant delay, as the various estates had to be separated into individual projects and tender packages, with separate consultants appointed. The project experienced delays due to planning complications. However, once Mulalley & Co. Ltd. was appointed, the project progressed largely as planned. Key milestones such as contract award, mobilisation, and completion were achieved within revised
--	--

	timelines. The statutory consultations and tender evaluations were completed successfully.
10. Assessment of project against Scope	This project originally formed part of a portfolio-wide programme, with the intention of progressing a single procurement exercise for window replacement to all HRA housing stock. In hindsight, this approach was flawed and resulted in significant delay, as the various estates had to be separated into individual projects and tender packages, with separate consultants appointed. Although there was not a significant change to the actual scope, the relatively minor change in respect of trickle ventilation impacted the project adversely in terms of programme and cost.
11. Risks and issues	The primary risk identified was the potential for leaseholders to challenge service charge recovery, particularly around whether the works constituted improvements rather than repairs. This risk was mitigated through open tendering and statutory consultations. No unidentified risks significantly impacted the project, and costed risk provision was not applicable.
12. Transition to BAU	The project has a defect liability period of 12 months commencing from the date of practical completion. There is also an additional ten-year warranty covering window frames. At the close of this period, the ongoing maintenance responsibilities will transition to the general Repairs & Maintenance contract, ensuring continuity.

Value Review

13. Budget

Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)	Estimated cost (excluding risk): £1,309,000
-----------------------------	--

The Gateway 2 projected cost was estimated in 2013 with no provision for cost inflation. The officers managing the project at this time are no longer with the City and the estimating methodology they used is not known.

	At Authority to Start work (G5)	Final Outturn Cost
Fees	£ 57,184	£ 88,052.21
Staff Costs	£ 87,095	£ 70,608.10
Works	£ 3,415,640	£ 4,445,582.68
Total	£ 3,559,919	£ 4,604,242.99

	<p>There is a total overspend of circa £1.04m in respect of the approved budget at Gateway 5. This relates to delays with the approval of the planning consent, including the installation of trickle vents within the new windows and the increase in material costs due to late placement of orders for the re-designed units.</p> <p>A total of £1,569,874.92 was recovered by way of service charges from Holloway Estate leaseholders.</p> <p>Final accounts have been subject to an independent verification check, undertaken by a suitably experienced officer within the relevant implementing department.</p>
14. Investment	N/A
15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives	<p>The project met its SMART objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacement of outdated windows with compliant, energy-efficient units. • Improved safety, acoustic performance, and SAP ratings. • Establishment of a cyclical redecorations programme. • Works were managed to minimise disruption to residents.
16. Key benefits realised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced thermal and acoustic performance. • Improved safety and compliance with building standards. • Refreshed communal areas contributing to resident wellbeing. • Long-term maintenance savings and extended building lifespan. • Increased resident satisfaction and property value.

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

17. Positive reflections	Works were carried out to a high standard, satisfying the requirements of the Corporation and fulfilling its pledge to meaningfully engage with residents in respect of major works.
18. Improvement reflections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electrical upgrades must be scoped alongside window works. • Use visual condition reports to guide future maintenance. • Ensure leaseholder coordination for access and compliance. • Provisional sums included within the contract for any additional repairs not identified during the testing contract were required.

v. April 2019

19. Sharing best practice	1. Dissemination of key information through team and project staff briefings. 2. Lessons learned have been logged and recorded on departmental SharePoint.
20. AOB	N/A

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
-------------------	--------------------

Contact

Report Author	Rafael Cardenas
Email Address	Rafael.Cardenas@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	07710 716649

Project Coversheet

[1] Ownership & Status

UPI: 11548

Core Project Name:

Windows Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations: Holloway Estate & Whitby Court

Programme Affiliation (if applicable): N/A

Project Manager: Rafael Cardenas

Definition of need:

To replace the current single glazed timber sash windows which are thermally inefficient and past their life expectancy. To replace with Aluminium powder coated double glazed windows from the Alitherm Heritage 300 & 600 ranges to the same size, colour & pattern as existing windows which conform to current building regulations. Whitby Court will be provided with new double glazed uPVC casement windows to the same size, colour and pattern as the existing. At the same time, we are looking to undertake estate wide internal and external common parts redecorations while scaffolding is in situ, in order to act as a baseline to facilitate future cyclical redecorations programmes.

Key measures of success:

- Increased resident satisfaction.
- Improvement thermal efficiency in the Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) energy performance rating of our housing assets, in line with City of London's Climate Action Strategy.
- Reduction in ongoing repair and maintenance costs.

Expected timeframe for the project delivery: Project Complete.

Original Timescale: Current Estimate: Start Summer 2022 / Estimated Completion January 2023 - **Revised:** November 2022 / January 2024

Key Milestones:

Gateway 5 – April / May 2022

Start on site – Jun 2022

Estimated completion – January 2023

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

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

No

[2] Finance and Costed Risk

Headline Financial, Scope and Design Changes:

‘Project Briefing’ G1 report:

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,309,000
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates:

Initial approval to progress these schemes will be sought through the Corporate Projects Board. As per the project procedure the projects will progress from gateway 2 to gateway 5 as follows.

Gateway 1 – September 2013.

Gateway 2 – September 2013

Gateway 3 – March 2014

Gateway 4 – March 2014

Gateway 5 - as per each individual project.

Scope/Design Change and Impact: N/A

‘Project Proposal’ G2 report (as approved by PSC 26/09/2013):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £4,333,000 (all blocks/estates)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £175,000
- Spend to date: n/a
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 1 – September 2013.
 - Gateway 2 – September 2013
 - Gateway 3 – March 2014
 - Gateway 4 – March 2014
 - Gateway 5 - as per each individual project

Scope/Design Change and Impact: n/a

Issues report (as approved under ‘Urgency’ by PSC 06/06/2017):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £12,610,000 (all blocks/estates)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): n/a
- Spend to date: £43,750
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 3/4: September 2017
 - Gateway 5: To be determined.

Scope/Design Change and Impact: as stated in the Issues report, the scope had changed considerably with the addition of new blocks as well as whole estates which resulted in a considerable uplift in the costs reported at the previous Gateway. At Gateway 2 estimates were £4,333,000, at the time of

writing the Gateway 3/4 report estimates were £12,610,000 for all blocks and estates that had been subsequently added.

‘Options Appraisal and Design’ G3-4 report (as approved by Court of Common Council 07/12/17):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £16,905,452 (all blocks/estates)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £638,113
- Spend to date: £42,575
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 3/4 - November 2017
 - Procurement of design team - April 2018
 - Detailed design and Planning application – December 2018
 - Gateway 5 – July 2019
 - Works start – Summer 2019

	Golden Lane	Holloway	Southwark	Dron House & Sydenham Hill	William Blake & Windsor House	Tot
Works	£7,497,570	£1,578,788	£2,970,552	£1,270,676	£1,776,569	£15,094,154
Consultancy	£749,757	£157,879	£297,055	£127,068	£177,657	£1,509,415
Staff costs	£149,951	£31,576	£59,411	£25,414	£35,531	£301,883
Total	£8,397,278	£1,768,242	£3,327,018	£1,423,157	£1,989,757	£16,905,452

Scope/Design Change and Impact: *at the time of writing the issues report the estimates were based on the revised estimates received by Pellings in October 2016. For the purposes of the Gateway 3/4 report, we appointed a Quantity Surveyor to review the costs and estimates were revised as £16,905,452 for all blocks.*

‘Authority to start Work’ G5 report (as approved by OPS 01/08/2022):

Appoint Mulalley & Co Ltd – contract sum £3,415,640

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £3,559,919
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £3,515,640. Comprised of £3,415,640 for the tendered works contract, £35,000 for consultancy fees and £65,000 for staff costs.
- Spend to date: £44,279
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 5 – April / May 2022
 - Works Start – June 2022
 - Estimated completion – January / February 2023

Scope/Design Change and Impact:

In terms of scope / design change there has been little change apart from the additional safe working measures introduced as a result of the Covid outbreaks. At the time that the Gateway 3-4 report was submitted the preferred option for replacement was for double glazed uPVC windows, and approval was granted by Islington Council's Planning team.

From a cost perspective, following the tender for the Window Replacements & Redecorations project at Dron House, which was intended as a pilot for the remaining estates, there was a notable increase in the tender prices over the estimates that were reported in 2017.

Having analysed the tendered sums we applied a similar uplift to the estimates across all the remaining estates in February / March 2021.

G5 Holloway Windows & Redecorations Mar 2022-variation summary					
	Gateway 3-4 (Dec 2017)	Revised Estimates (Mar 2021)	Tendered Sum (Mar 2022)	Increase since Mar 2022 (£)	Increase (%)
Works	£ 1,578,788	£ 2,957,100	£ 3,415,640	£ 458,540	16%
Staff fees	£ 31,576	£ 78,939	£ 65,000	-£ 13,939	-18%
Consultancy Fees	£ 157,879	£ 22,449	£ 35,000	£ 12,551	56%
Total	£ 1,768,243	£ 3,058,488	£ 3,515,640	£ 457,152	15%

'Issues Report' post G5 (as approved by CCSC 01/11/2023):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £4,681,409.37 (including spend to date, fees & staff costs)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £1,001,176.62
- Spend to date: £1,900,724.08 (Consultant Fees £ 44,276.21, Staff costs £ 48,566.54)
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates:
Gateway 5 – April / May 2022
Start on site – Jun 2022
Estimated completion – January 2024

Scope/Design Change and Impact:

Delays have been incurred due to the required amendments to the planning permissions. Updated Practical Completion is now 24th January 2024. A further planning application has had to be submitted in order to accommodate changes to building regulations and ventilation requirements to prevent damp and mould.

‘Issues Report’ post G5 (as approved by CPB 08/05/2024):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £4,594,246.00
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £153,871.26.
- Spend to date: £4,539,388.88 (Consultant Fees £ 124,884.01, Staff costs £ 69,438.25).
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A

• Estimated Programme Dates:
Gateway 5 – April / May 2022
Start on site – Jun 2022
Estimated completion – January 2024

Scope/Design Change and Impact:

Delays have been incurred following the requirement to submit a new planning application to include trickle vents in the new windows to comply with recent changes in the Building Regulations which have come into effect after the original planning consent was granted. Practical Completion was achieved on 24th January 2024.

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

Programme Affiliation [£]: N/A – as requested in the issues report, approval was given to separate the estates into separate works packages.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committees: Corporate Projects Board [for information] Community & Children's Services Committee [for decision] Projects & Procurement Sub [for information]	Dates: 12 November 2025 28 January 2026 25 March 2026
Subject: Sydenham Hill Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations Unique Project Identifier: 11548	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular
Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services Report Author: Rafael Cardenas, Project Manager	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: This project addressed the need for the Window Replacements at Sydenham Hill as well as a basis for establishing a platform for programming the future cyclical redecorations for the internal and external common parts across the Estate.</p> <p>RAG Status: Green (Red at last report to Committee) Risk Status: Medium (Medium at last report to committee) Costed Risk Provision Utilised: N/A Final Outturn Cost: £ 1,605,534.95</p>
2. Next steps and requested decisions	<p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To note the content of this report, 2. To note the lessons learnt, 3. To authorise closure of this project.
3. Key conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All residential units have received upgraded double-glazed windows, enhancing energy efficiency and reducing external noise; resident satisfaction was high due to improved aesthetics and comfort. • The window design also improved the visual appeal of the estate, aligning with broader regeneration goals while complying with planning and building consent approvals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While many residents welcomed the upgrades, feedback has been varied, particularly around communication during works and the quality of some finishes. Any concerns raised were addressed as part of the snagging process with all outstanding matters now fully resolved and completed works verified as meeting the expected standards. <p>Reasons for Variance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delays caused by a material amendment required to the planning application, due to incomplete window design and a failure to incorporate an appropriate mechanical ventilation strategy. Further complexity relates to the fact that Lammas Green is a Grade II Listed building and Otto Close is located within a conservation area. <p>Value for Money Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated NPV: £1,217,610 • Actual NPV: £ 1,605,534.95 • Assessment: The final budget approved after two issue reports was £ 1,719,010. This constituted circa a £390k uplift from Gateway 5 and therefore a significant overspend. This can be attributed to the requirement to revisit the planning application process (as a result of changes in Building Regulations), appointment of relevant external consultants, material cost inflation and changes in site compound locations (due to resident objections). Additional budget was sought (and approved) via Issues Reports during the construction phase of the project. Despite the documented overspend, the project has delivered good value for money, due to long-term maintenance savings and resident wellbeing improvements. <p>Key Learnings and Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated upgrades (e.g., insulation) should be considered alongside window replacements. Future projects should include a holistic building envelope assessment to maximise energy efficiency. • Early contractor involvement helped refine specifications and reduce costs. Engage suppliers during design phase to optimise material choices and cost efficiency. • Stakeholder engagement was insufficient during design phase. Future projects should include resident consultation and heritage impact assessments to ensure alignment with community expectations.
--	--

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

4. Design into delivery	<p>Design Preparedness</p> <p>The Corporation adopted the correct approach in appointing an external consultant at the outset of the project to undertake design, specification and manage the planning application process. This resulted in detailed specifications for the manufacture and installation of preferred window products.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-construction Surveys: These could have been undertaken more comprehensively, with due consideration for mechanical ventilation, particularly given the fact that Lammas Green is Grade II Listed and Otto close is within a conservation area. In this regard, the client brief could perhaps have been stronger. • Resident Engagement: Balloting and colour selection processes could have been better structured and documented. • Access Protocols: More detailed planning for contractor access and resident notifications would have improved coordination.
5. Options appraisal	<p>The selected option to procure a contractor to deliver a programme of repairs via open tender successfully delivered the projects objectives. Changes were required during project delivery specially Extension of Time (EOT) basically due to planning permission.</p>
6. Procurement route	<p>Works were procured via open tender advertised on the capital e-sourcing portal.</p>
7. Skills base	<p>The City of London project team had the required skills and experience to manage the delivery of the project. An external QS was employed to assist with the EOT and variations raised by the Contractors in order to ensure accurate assessment of claims, maintain cost control, and provide independent validation of contractual entitlements</p>
8. Stakeholders	<p>Although it is acknowledged that stakeholder engagement could have been more robust during the early stages, resident liaison was managed well throughout the delivery phase of the project.</p> <p>Commencement of the works contract was initially delayed in conjunction with residents' opposition to the new development</p>

v.April 2019

	<p>project at the former site of Mais House. A communications consultancy (Comm Comm UK) was utilised to support the team to liaise with local residents, address concerns, and facilitate transparent communication throughout the beginning of the project. Once residents had gained a clearer understanding of the distinction between the two separate projects, resident queries were addressed directly via the City Major Works Team as originally envisaged.</p>
--	---

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	<p>This project originally formed part of a portfolio-wide programme, with the intention of progressing a single procurement exercise for window replacement to all HRA housing stock. In hindsight, this approach was flawed and resulted in significant delay, as the various estates had to be separated into individual projects and tender packages, with separate consultants appointed. The project faced delays due to planning complications, particularly with grade listed building and conservation area constraints at Lammas Green and Otto Close respectively. Initial procurement was successful, but the need to revise planning applications and re-engage suppliers caused slippage. Despite these challenges, the project was mobilised in September 2022 and completed by Spring 2024, aligning with revised expectations.</p>
10. Assessment of project against Scope	<p>The project scope experienced variance for a variety of reasons. The limited nature of the pre-construction surveys resulted in mechanical ventilation being overlooked at planning application stage. Furthermore, the omission of some windows resulted in further unforeseen additions during the construction phase.</p>
11. Risks and issues	<p>The main identified risk was leaseholder challenge to service charge recovery, which was mitigated through open tendering and statutory consultations. Unidentified risks included moisture ingress and planning omissions (e.g., mechanical ventilation), which delayed progress. Costed Risk Provision was not applicable.</p>
12. Transition to BAU	<p>The project has a defect liability period of 12 months commencing from the date of practical completion. There is also an additional ten-year warranty covering window frames. At the close of this period, the ongoing maintenance responsibilities will transition to the general Repairs & Maintenance contract, ensuring continuity.</p>

Value Review

v. April 2019

13. Budget	<table><tr><td>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</td><td>Estimated cost (excluding risk): £618,000</td></tr></table>		Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)	Estimated cost (excluding risk): £618,000													
	Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)	Estimated cost (excluding risk): £618,000															
	The Gateway 2 projected cost was estimated in 2013 with no provision for cost inflation. The officers managing the project at this time are no longer with the City and the estimating methodology they used is not known.																
	<table><tr><td></td><td>At Authority to Start work (G5)</td><td>Final Outturn Cost</td></tr><tr><td>Fees</td><td>£ 42,564</td><td>£ 40,243.82</td></tr><tr><td>Staff Costs</td><td>£ 61,580</td><td>£ 61,580</td></tr><tr><td>Works</td><td>£ 1,113,466</td><td>£ 1,503,711.13</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>£ 1,217,610</td><td>£ 1,605,534.95</td></tr></table>			At Authority to Start work (G5)	Final Outturn Cost	Fees	£ 42,564	£ 40,243.82	Staff Costs	£ 61,580	£ 61,580	Works	£ 1,113,466	£ 1,503,711.13	Total	£ 1,217,610	£ 1,605,534.95
		At Authority to Start work (G5)	Final Outturn Cost														
Fees	£ 42,564	£ 40,243.82															
Staff Costs	£ 61,580	£ 61,580															
Works	£ 1,113,466	£ 1,503,711.13															
Total	£ 1,217,610	£ 1,605,534.95															
There is a total overspend of circa £390k in respect of the approved budget at Gateway 5. This relates to the documented issues relating to the planning application.																	
A total of £796,881.06 was recovered by way of service charges from Sydenham Hill Estate leaseholders.																	
Final accounts have been subject to an independent verification check, undertaken by a suitably experienced officer within the relevant implementing department.																	
14. Investment	N/A																
15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives	<p>The project met its SMART objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Replacement of outdated windows with compliant, energy-efficient units.• Improved safety, acoustic performance, and SAP ratings.• Establishment of a cyclical redecorations programme.• Works were managed to minimise disruption to residents.																
16. Key benefits realised	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Enhanced thermal and acoustic performance.• Improved safety and compliance with building standards.• Refreshed communal areas contributing to resident wellbeing.• Long-term maintenance savings and extended building lifespan.• Increased resident satisfaction and property value.																

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

17. Positive reflections	A structured snagging process and clear handover documentation helped close out the project smoothly and maintain accountability.
18. Improvement reflections	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Integrate ventilation strategy and works early in the design stage to avoid delays.• Improve post-installation support and inspections.• Enhance communication with residents during disruption.• Provisional sums included within the contract for any additional repairs not identified during the testing contract were required.• The contractor, ETEC Group, demonstrated limited proactivity in working collaboratively with the City's project management team, which impacted cost management and delivery within the agreed budget.
19. Sharing best practice	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Dissemination of key information through team and project staff briefings.2. Lessons learned have been logged and recorded on departmental SharePoint.
20. AOB	N/A

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
-------------------	--------------------

Contact

Report Author	Rafael Cardenas
Email Address	Rafael.Cardenas@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	07710 716649

Project Coversheet

[1] Ownership & Status

UPI: 11548

Core Project Name:

Windows Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations: Sydenham Hill

Programme Affiliation (if applicable): N/A

Project Manager: Rafael Cardenas

Definition of need:

To replace the current single glazed windows at Otto Close and Lammas Green (houses only) which are thermally inefficient and past their life expectancy. The windows on Lammas Green flats had been replaced previously so were not included. Planning approval has been granted to replace windows at Otto Close with Aluminium double-glazed windows, and for the Lammas Green Houses with Steel Crittall windows. At the same time, we are looking to undertake estate wide internal and external common parts redecorations while scaffolding is in situ, in order to act as a baseline to facilitate future cyclical redecorations programmes.

Key measures of success:

- Increased resident satisfaction.
- Improvement thermal efficiency in the Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) energy performance rating of our housing assets, in line with City of London's Climate Action Strategy.
- Reduction in ongoing repair and maintenance costs.

Expected timeframe for the project delivery: Project Complete.

Original Timescale: Current Estimate: Start Spring 2022 / Estimated Completion Autumn 2022 - **Revised:** September 2022 / March 2024

Key Milestones:

Gateway 5 – February 2022

Start on site – April 2022

Estimated completion – Autumn / Winter 2022

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

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

No

[2] Finance and Costed Risk

Headline Financial, Scope and Design Changes:

‘Project Briefing’ G1 report:

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £2,605,000 (as part of a wider programme of window replacement projects; a sum of £618,000 was estimated for Sydenham Hill)
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates:

Initial approval to progress these schemes will be sought through the Corporate Projects Board. As per the project procedure the projects will progress from gateway 2 to gateway 5 as follows.

Gateway 1 – September 2013.

Gateway 2 – September 2013

Gateway 3 – March 2014

Gateway 4 – March 2014

Gateway 5 - as per each individual project.

Scope/Design Change and Impact: N/A

‘Project Proposal’ G2 report (as approved by PSC 26/09/2013):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £4,333,000 (all blocks/estates)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £175,000
- Spend to date: n/a
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 1 – September 2013.
 - Gateway 2 – September 2013
 - Gateway 3 – March 2014
 - Gateway 4 – March 2014
 - Gateway 5 - as per each individual project

Scope/Design Change and Impact: n/a

Issues report (as approved under ‘Urgency’ by PSC 06/06/2017):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £12,610,000 (all blocks/estates)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): n/a
- Spend to date: £43,750
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 3/4: September 2017
 - Gateway 5: To be determined.

Scope/Design Change and Impact: as stated in the Issues report, the scope had changed considerably with the addition of new blocks as well as whole estates which resulted in a considerable uplift in the costs reported at the previous Gateway. At Gateway 2 estimates were £4,333,000, at the time of

writing the Gateway 3/4 report estimates were £12,610,000 for all blocks and estates that had been subsequently added.

‘Options Appraisal and Design’ G3-4 report (as approved by Court of Common Council 07/12/17):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £16,905,452 (all blocks/estates)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £638,113
- Spend to date: £42,575
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 3/4 - November 2017
 - Procurement of design team - April 2018
 - Detailed design and Planning application – December 2018
 - Gateway 5 – July 2019
 - Works start – Summer 2019

	Golden Lane	Holloway	Southwark	Dron House & Sydenham Hill	William Blake & Windsor House	Tot
Works	£7,497,570	£1,578,788	£2,970,552	£1,270,676	£1,776,569	£15,094,154
Consultancy	£749,757	£157,879	£297,055	£127,068	£177,657	£1,509,415
Staff costs	£149,951	£31,576	£59,411	£25,414	£35,531	£301,883
Total	£8,397,278	£1,768,242	£3,327,018	£1,423,157	£1,989,757	£16,905,452

Scope/Design Change and Impact: *at the time of writing the issues report the estimates were based on the revised estimates received by Pellings in October 2016. For the purposes of the Gateway 3/4 report, we appointed a Quantity Surveyor to review the costs and estimates were revised as £16,905,452 for all blocks.*

‘Authority to start Work’ G5 report (as approved by OPS 01/08/2022):

Appoint ETEC Contract Services Ltd – contract sum £1,113,466

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,217,610 (Sydenham Hill only)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £1,217,610 (this includes estimated staff fees of £55,674).
- Spend to date: £28,470
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 5 – February 2022
 - Works Start – April 2022
 - Estimated completion – Autumn / Winter 2022

Scope/Design Change and Impact:

Cost estimates at Gateway 3/4 were based on the overall preferred option for replacement with double glazed uPVC across all estates. However, from initial advice received during the pre-planning stages for Sydenham Hill the planning application was submitted to replace windows with Aluminium double glazed units.

The planning application for the Houses on Lammas Green had to be amended following advice received back from the Conservation officer during the Planning Application, and a new application was re-submitted for replacement with Crittall windows. As a result of the change in scope we had to re-engage with suppliers and had to ask them to re-submit their pricing proposals.

Furthermore, due to the Covid-19 outbreaks we also had to ask bidders, during the tender process, to make an allowance within their pricing proposals to facilitate enhanced safe working and social distancing measures for the works to be undertaken. During this time the material prices had raised significantly which affected the original pricing the bidders submitted.

'Issues Report' post G5 (as approved by CCSC 01/11/2023):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,664,370.08 (including spend to date, fees & staff costs)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £350,450.20
- Spend to date: £1,196,212.50 (Consultant Fees £39,131.82, Staff costs £45,231.06)
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A

- Estimated Programme Dates:

Gateway 5 – February 2022

Start on site – April 2022

Estimated completion – Proposed January 2024.

Scope/Design Change and Impact:

Work has been delayed for several months due to planning delays with Lewisham local authority, site compound changes and building regulation changes.

'Issues Report' post G5 (as approved by CPB 08/05/2024):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,804,024.65 (including spend to date, fees & staff costs)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £139,654.57
- Spend to date: £1,524,000.28 (Consultant Fees £42,214.82, Staff costs £58,286.46)

- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A

- Estimated Programme Dates:
Gateway 5 – February 2022
Start on site – April 2022
Estimated completion – March 2024.

Scope/Design Change and Impact:

Delays have been incurred due to the extent of time in obtaining the additional planning approval required for the mechanical ventilation for Otto Close. Practical Completion was achieved on 14th March 2024.

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

Programme Affiliation [£]: N/A – as requested in the issues report, approval was given to separate the estates into separate works packages.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committees: Corporate Projects Board [for information] Community & Children's Services Committee [for decision] Projects & Procurement Sub [for information]	Dates: 12 November 2025 28 January 2026 25 March 2026
Subject: Windsor House Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations Unique Project Identifier: 11548	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular
Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services Report Author: Rafael Cardenas, Project Manager	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	Project Description: This project addressed the need for the Window Replacements at Windsor House in conjunction with full cyclical redecorations for the internal and external common parts across the Estate. RAG Status: Green (Amber at last report to Committee) Risk Status: Medium (Medium at last report to committee) Costed Risk Provision Utilised: N/A Final Outturn Cost: £2,763,428.90
2. Next steps and requested decisions	Requested Decisions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To note the content of this report, 2. To note the lessons learnt, 3. To authorise closure of this project.
3. Key conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All residential units have received upgraded double-glazed windows, enhancing energy efficiency and reducing external noise; this is expected to provide residents with greater comfort within their homes. • The window design also improved the visual appeal of the estate, aligning with broader regeneration goals while complying with planning and building consent approvals. • While many residents welcomed the upgrades, feedback has been varied, particularly around communication during

v.April 2019

	<p>works and the quality of some finishes. Any concerns raised were addressed as part of the snagging process with all outstanding matters now fully resolved and completed works verified as meeting the expected standards.</p> <p>Reasons for Variance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delays: A culmination of issues throughout the design phase (insufficient exploratory surveys due to a lack of detail in the client brief), planning (a small number of windows were inadvertently missed from the original application), procurement (intermittent resourcing deficiencies) and delivery (slow contractor mobilisation, persistent access issues and the Coronavirus pandemic), led to a significant delay in completion. <p>Value for Money Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated NPV: £1,670,431 • Actual NPV: £ 2,763,428.90 • Assessment: The final budget approved after two issue reports was £ 2,914,460.00. This constituted circa a £1.1m overspend from Gateway 5 and a significant overspend. This can be attributed to the discovery of lead paint, additional asbestos removal and the requirement for additional unforeseen dormer window repairs. Additional budget was sought (and approved) via Issues Reports during the construction phase of the project. Despite the documented overspend, the project has delivered good value for money, due to long-term maintenance savings and resident wellbeing improvements. <p>Key Learnings and Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated upgrades (e.g., insulation) should be considered alongside window replacements. Future projects should include a holistic building envelope assessment to maximise energy efficiency. • Early contractor involvement helped refine specifications and reduce costs. Engage suppliers during design phase to optimise material choices and cost efficiency. • Stakeholder engagement was insufficient during design phase. Future projects should include resident consultation and heritage impact assessments to ensure alignment with community expectations.
--	--

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

4. Design into delivery	<p>Design Preparedness</p> <p>The Corporation adopted the correct approach in appointing an external consultant at the outset of the project to undertake design, specification and manage the planning application process. This resulted in detailed specifications for the manufacture and installation of preferred window products.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-construction Surveys: Sequencing of asbestos and lead paint surveys could have been more explicitly integrated into the design phase to avoid delays. More in-depth structural surveys at an early stage would have highlighted the potential for lintel replacement above window openings, instead of this only becoming apparent much later during construction. • Resident Engagement: Balloting and colour selection processes could have been better structured and documented. • Access Protocols: More detailed planning for contractor access and resident notifications would have improved coordination.
5. Options appraisal	<p>The selected option to procure a contractor to deliver a programme of repairs via open tender successfully delivered the projects objectives. Changes were required during project delivery specially Extension of Time (EOT) basically due to structural complications.</p>
6. Procurement route	<p>Works were procured via open tender advertised on the capital esourcing portal.</p>
7. Skills base	<p>The City of London project team had the required skills and experience to manage the delivery of the project. An external Quantity Surveyor was employed to assist with the Extension Of Time and variations raised by the Contractors in order to ensure accurate assessment of claims, maintain cost control, and provide independent validation of contractual entitlements</p>
8. Stakeholders	<p>Although it is acknowledged that stakeholder engagement could have been more robust during the early stages, resident liaison was managed well throughout the delivery phase of the project.</p>

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	This project originally formed part of a portfolio-wide programme, with the intention of progressing a single procurement exercise for window replacement to all HRA housing stock. In hindsight, this approach was flawed and resulted in significant delay, as the various estates had to be separated into individual projects and tender packages, with separate consultants appointed. A lack of sufficient exploratory surveys at the feasibility stage of the project, resulted in additional cost and delay during the construction phase, due to unforeseen variations. The inadvertent omission of a small number of windows from the original planning application led to further delays in terms of having to obtain statutory approvals out of sequence with the main works. These challenges were compounded by both the Coronavirus pandemic and persistent access issues during the construction phase. Despite these challenges, the majority of key milestones were achieved within the revised timelines, and the project was successfully closed out with verified final accounts.
10. Assessment of project against Scope	The project scope experienced variance for a variety of reasons. The limited nature of the pre-construction surveys resulted in additional works relating to lead paint and asbestos removal, in addition to lintel replacement. Furthermore, the omission of some windows at the planning application stage resulted in further unforeseen additions during the construction phase.
11. Risks and issues	Identified risks included leaseholder challenges to service charge recovery, with a potential financial impact of approximately £513,312. This was mitigated through transparent procurement and consultation processes. Unidentified risks included access restrictions and heritage sensitivities, which led to design adjustments and resident dissatisfaction in some cases. Costed Risk Provision was not applicable.
12. Transition to BAU	The project has a defect liability period of 12 months commencing from the date of practical completion. There is also an additional ten-year warranty covering window frames. At the close of this period, the ongoing maintenance responsibilities will transition to the general Repairs & Maintenance contract, ensuring continuity.

Value Review

13. Budget	<table><tr><td>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</td><td>Estimated cost (excluding risk): £624,000</td></tr></table>		Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)	Estimated cost (excluding risk): £624,000													
	Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)	Estimated cost (excluding risk): £624,000															
	The Gateway 2 projected cost was estimated in 2013 with no provision for cost inflation. The officers managing the project at this time are no longer with the City and the estimating methodology they used is not known.																
	<table><tr><td></td><td>At Authority to Start work (G5)</td><td>Final Outturn Cost</td></tr><tr><td>Fees</td><td>£ 31,807</td><td>£ 12,050.26</td></tr><tr><td>Staff Costs</td><td>£ 43,438</td><td>£ 43,437.00</td></tr><tr><td>Works</td><td>£ 1,595,187</td><td>£ 2,707,941.64</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>£ 1,670,431</td><td>£ 2,763,428.90</td></tr></table>			At Authority to Start work (G5)	Final Outturn Cost	Fees	£ 31,807	£ 12,050.26	Staff Costs	£ 43,438	£ 43,437.00	Works	£ 1,595,187	£ 2,707,941.64	Total	£ 1,670,431	£ 2,763,428.90
		At Authority to Start work (G5)	Final Outturn Cost														
Fees	£ 31,807	£ 12,050.26															
Staff Costs	£ 43,438	£ 43,437.00															
Works	£ 1,595,187	£ 2,707,941.64															
Total	£ 1,670,431	£ 2,763,428.90															
There is a total overspend of circa £1.1m in respect of the approved budget at Gateway 5. This relates to unforeseen variations, which largely arose as a result of the documented limitations in pre-construction surveys.																	
A total of £464,962.22 was recovered by way of service charges from Windsor House leaseholders.																	
Final accounts have been subject to an independent verification check, undertaken by a suitably experienced officer within the relevant implementing department.																	
14. Investment	N/A																
15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives	The project met its SMART objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Replacement of outdated windows with compliant, energy-efficient units.• Improved safety, acoustic performance, and SAP ratings.• Establishment of a cyclical redecorations programme.• Works were managed to minimise disruption to residents.																
16. Key benefits realised	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Enhanced thermal and acoustic performance.• Improved safety and compliance with building standards.• Refreshed communal areas contributing to resident wellbeing.• Long-term maintenance savings and extended building lifespan.• Increased resident satisfaction and property value.																

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

17. Positive reflections	Works were carried out to a high standard, satisfying the requirements of the Corporation and fulfilling its pledge to meaningfully engage with residents in respect of major works.
18. Improvement reflections	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Early contractor engagement improves planning.• Clear FAQs and contact points reduce complaints.• Secure scaffolding and delivery coordination essential.• Provisional sums included within the contract for any additional repairs not identified during the testing contract were required.• The contractor, ETEC Group, demonstrated limited proactivity in working collaboratively with the City's project management team, which impacted cost management and delivery within the agreed budget.
19. Sharing best practice	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Dissemination of key information through team and project staff briefings.2. Lessons learned have been logged and recorded on departmental SharePoint.
20. AOB	N/A

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
-------------------	--------------------

Contact

Report Author	Rafael Cardenas
Email Address	Rafael.Cardenas@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	07710 716649

Project Coversheet

[1] Ownership & Status

UPI: 11548

Core Project Name:

Windows Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations: Windsor House

Programme Affiliation (if applicable): N/A

Project Manager: Rafael Cardenas

Definition of need:

To replace the current steel and timber single glazed windows which are thermally inefficient and past their life expectancy. To replace with Aluminium double-glazed windows which conform to current building regulations. At the same time undertake estate wide common parts redecorations while scaffolding is in situ, to facilitate future cyclical redecorations programmes.

Key measures of success:

- Increased resident satisfaction.
- Improvement thermal efficiency in the Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) energy performance rating of our housing assets, in line with City of London's Climate Action Strategy.
- Reduction in ongoing repair and maintenance costs.

Expected timeframe for the project delivery: Project Complete.

Original Timescale: Current Estimate: Start Spring 2021 / Estimated Completion Autumn 2021 - **Revised:** November 2022 / June 2024

Key Milestones:

Gateway 5 – November / December 2020

Start on site – Spring 2021

Estimated completion – Autumn 2021

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

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

No

[2] Finance and Costed Risk

Headline Financial, Scope and Design Changes:

'Project Briefing' G1 report:

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £2,605,000 (as part of a wider programme of window replacement projects; a sum of £624,000 was estimated for Windsor House)
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates:

Initial approval to progress these schemes will be sought through the Corporate Projects Board. As per the project procedure the projects will progress from gateway 2 to gateway 5 as follows.

Gateway 1 – September 2013.

Gateway 2 – September 2013

Gateway 3 – March 2014

Gateway 4 – March 2014

Gateway 5 - as per each individual project.

Scope/Design Change and Impact: N/A

‘Project Proposal’ G2 report (as approved by PSC 26/09/2013):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £4,333,000 (all blocks/estates)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £175,000
- Spend to date: n/a
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 1 – September 2013.
 - Gateway 2 – September 2013
 - Gateway 3 – March 2014
 - Gateway 4 – March 2014
 - Gateway 5 - as per each individual project

Scope/Design Change and Impact: n/a

Issues report (as approved under ‘Urgency’ by PSC 06/06/2017):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £12,610,000 (all blocks/estates)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): n/a
- Spend to date: £43,750
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 3/4: September 2017
 - Gateway 5: To be determined.

Scope/Design Change and Impact: as stated in the Issues report, the scope had changed considerably with the addition of new blocks as well as whole estates which resulted in a considerable uplift in the costs reported at the previous Gateway. At Gateway 2 estimates were £4,333,000, at the time of

writing the Gateway 3/4 report estimates were £12,610,000 for all blocks and estates that had been subsequently added.

‘Options Appraisal and Design’ G3-4 report (as approved by Court of Common Council 07/12/17):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £16,905,452 (all blocks/estates)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £638,113
- Spend to date: £42,575
- Costed Risk Against the Project: n/a
- CRP Requested: n/a
- CRP Drawn Down: n/a
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 3/4 - November 2017
 - Procurement of design team - April 2018
 - Detailed design and Planning application – December 2018
 - Gateway 5 – July 2019
 - Works start – Summer 2019

	Golden Lane	Holloway	Southwark	Dron House & Sydenham Hill	William Blake & Windsor House	Tot
Works	£7,497,570	£1,578,788	£2,970,552	£1,270,676	£1,776,569	£15,094,154
Consultancy	£749,757	£157,879	£297,055	£127,068	£177,657	£1,509,415
Staff costs	£149,951	£31,576	£59,411	£25,414	£35,531	£301,883
Total	£8,397,278	£1,768,242	£3,327,018	£1,423,157	£1,989,757	£16,905,452

Scope/Design Change and Impact: *at the time of writing the issues report the estimates were based on the revised estimates received by Pellings in October 2016. For the purposes of the Gateway 3/4 report, we appointed a Quantity Surveyor to review the costs and estimates were revised as £16,905,452 for all blocks.*

‘Authority to start Work’ G5 report (as approved by OPS 01/08/2022):

Appoint ETEC Contract Services Ltd – contract sum £1,598,187

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,598,187 (Windsor House only)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £1,574,441.
- Spend to date: £23,742
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A
- Estimated Programme Dates:
 - Gateway 5 – November / December 2020
 - Works Start – Spring 2021
 - Estimated completion – Autumn/Winter 2021

Scope/Design Change and Impact:

Cost estimates at Gateway 3/4 were based on the overall preferred option for replacement with double glazed uPVC. However, planning permission for Dron House was granted with the stipulation that replacements should be Aluminium.

Furthermore, due to the Covid-19 outbreak we also had to ask bidders, following the tender in 2019, to resubmit pricing proposals in order to facilitate enhanced safe working and social distancing measures for the works to be undertaken.

The intended approach to planning applications and tender was also reviewed and it was decided to treat Dron House Estate as a pilot from which we could use the lessons learned during the planning and tender stages and apply them to the subsequent tenders.

Planning Applications and the Tenders for Dron House have been carried out independently and the lessons learned from the Dron House Tender has been applied across the remaining Estates. This is covered in more detail in section 3 of the Gateway 5 report.

‘Issues Report’ post G5 (as approved by CCSC 01/11/2023):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £2,260,938.97 (including spend to date, fees & staff costs)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £590,507.97
- Spend to date: £1,573,396.55 (Consultant Fees £11,092.26, Staff costs £23,015.06)
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A
- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A

• Estimated Programme Dates:
Gateway 5 – November / December 2020
Start on site – Spring 2021
Estimated completion – Proposed January 2024

Scope/Design Change and Impact:

Unforeseen variations have occurred due to the discovery of lead paint, additional asbestos and further dormer window repairs than originally anticipated.

‘Issues Report’ post G5 (as approved by CPB 08/05/2024):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £2,914,459.55 (including spend to date, fees & staff costs)
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £653,520.55
- Spend to date: £2,211,868.52 (Consultant Fees £24,112.76, Staff costs £30,260.96)
- Costed Risk Against the Project: N/A

- CRP Requested: N/A
- CRP Drawn Down: N/A

- Estimated Programme Dates:

Gateway 5 – November / December 2020

Start on site – Spring 2021

Estimated completion – June 2024

Scope/Design Change and Impact:

Due to a formulae error, some of the variations for the additional dormer windows works were not included in the first Issue Report calculations. This has now been amended.

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

Programme Affiliation [£]: N/A – as requested in the issues report, approval was given to separate the estates into separate works packages.

This page is intentionally left blank

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committee: Community and Children's Services	Dated: 28/01/2026
Subject: Departmental Budget Estimates 2026/27 – Community and Children's Services excluding Housing Revenue Account (HRA)	Public report: For Decision
This proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • delivers Corporate Plan 2024-29 outcomes • provides statutory duties • provides business enabling functions 	Statutory duties for a balanced 2026/27 budget
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
Report of:	The Chamberlain and the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services
Report author:	Mark Jarvis, Head of Finance, and Beatrix Jako, Finance Business Partner – Chamberlain's Department

Summary

This report presents the budget estimates for the Department of Community and Children's Services (DCCS) for 2026/27 for approval and subsequent submission to the Finance Committee.

Overall, the proposed revenue budget for 2026/27 totals (£21.531 million), a significant increase in net expenditure of (£1.752 million) compared to the 2025/26 original budget of (£19.779 million) agreed by your Committee on 16 January 2025.

The proposed budget for 2026/27 has been prepared within the resource envelope allocated to each Chief Officer by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, incorporating the adjustments outlined in paragraph 3.

Appendix 1 includes the budget estimates for 2026/27 for the DCCS excluding Housing Revenue Account (HRA). A summary is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Appendix 1

	Original budget 2025/26 £'000	Original budget 2026/27 £'000	Movement original 2025/26 to original budget 2026/27 £'000
Expenditure	31,897	33,700	1,803
Income	(15,443)	(15,771)	(328)
Support services and capital charges	3,325	3,602	277
Total net expenditure	19,779	21,531	1,752

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- i) review and approve the DCCS (excluding HRA) proposed revenue budget for 2026/27 for submission to the Finance Committee
- ii) review and approve the DCCS (excluding HRA) proposed capital and supplementary revenue projects budgets for 2026/27 for submission to the Finance Committee
- iii) authorise the Chamberlain, in consultation with the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services to revise these budgets to allow for any further implications arising from Corporate Projects and changes to the Cyclical Works Programme
- iv) agree that minor amendments for 2025/26 and 2026/27 budgets arising during the corporate budget-setting period be delegated to the Chamberlain.

Main Report

Background

- The Community and Children's Services Committee oversees four main service areas:
 - People Services (which includes Adult Services and Children and Families Services)
 - Commissioning and Partnerships (which includes Commissioned Services)
 - Housing Services (including the HRA)
 - Education and Skills.

Assumptions for 2026/27

- The estimate for 2026/27 includes a net 3% uplift to the net local risk budgets, noting that this includes pay, prices and income.
- While the final pay offer was agreed at 3.2%, the provisional 2026/27 budget was based on an assumed 3% increase, reflecting the position at the time the budget was calculated, prior to confirmation of the final settlement. The budget will be revised during the financial year to incorporate these changes.
- Support services budgets reflect the attribution and cost of central departments. All support services are based on time or use of services and were reviewed during 2025/26 with the method of apportionment update to reflect the latest up-to-date corporate information.

Departmental budget estimates for 2026/27

1. This report presents, at Appendix 1, the budget estimates for 2026/27 for the Community and Children's Services Department analysed between:
 - **Local Risk budgets** – these are budgets deemed to be largely within the Chief Officer's control.
 - **Central Risk budgets** – these are budgets comprising specific items where a chief officer manages the underlying service, but where the eventual financial out-turn can be strongly influenced by external factors outside of his/her control, or budgets of a corporate nature (such as interest on balances and rent incomes from investment properties).
 - **Support Services and Capital Charges** – these cover budgets for services provided by one activity to another. The control of these costs is exercised at the point where the expenditure or income first arises as local or central risk. Further analysis can be found in Appendix 2.

Proposed Revenue budget for 2026/27

2. The provisional 2026/27 budgets – under the control of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services – being presented to your Committee, have been prepared in accordance with guidelines agreed by the Policy and Resources and Finance Committees.
 - Homelessness is a demand-led statutory service that continues to experience significant and ongoing pressure. As set out in the Medium Term Financial Plan, additional funding of £953,000 has been included in the 2026/27 Estimates for Homelessness.
 - To ensure that the budgets remain within the overall resource envelope and central risk limits, an unidentified savings requirement of £450,000 has been

included within central risk, comprising £398,000 for homelessness and temporary accommodation costs and £52,000 for the asylum seekers service.

3. Overall, the 2026/27 provisional revenue budget totals £21.531 million, an increase of £1.752 million when compared with the original budget for 2025/26. The main reasons for this increase are:
 - 3% inflation uplift of £375,000 added to local risk budgets
 - July 2024 pay award and National Insurance contribution adjustment of £71,000
 - an additional £165,000 funding for an expanded Community and Safety team agreed by the Chamberlain's to address evolving demands and risks
 - £953,000 central risk grant allocation for homelessness support, fundamentally a demand-led statutory service budget that is under significant pressure
 - increase in central support and capital charges – £277,000
 - reduction of (£87,000) in the apprenticeship budget following the correction of prior misallocations
 - mobile phone savings (£2,000).
4. An analysis of service expenditure is provided in Appendix 1. The presentation has been revised so that expenditure and unfavourable variances are shown without brackets. Only significant variances (generally those greater than £150,000) have been commented on in the following paragraphs.
5. Following a budget realignment exercise, the 2026/27 budget shows a reduction in Supplies and Services compared to the prior year, with resources redirected to Third Party Payments to better align with current and future service pressures.
6. The increase in central risk within Supplies and Services is due to anticipated contract inflation uplifts for services supporting homelessness, ensuring that budgets remain aligned with expected costs.
7. The central risk budget contains a total unidentified savings requirement of £450,000, of which £52,000 is due to pressures on the asylum seekers service. These pressures are arising from the number of individuals turning 18, who then attract little or no funding from the Home Office. The remaining £398,000 relates to contract inflation uplifts, rising temporary accommodation costs, and ongoing service pressures resulting from the increase in rough sleeping numbers in the City of London. Work is underway to mitigate these pressures, while recognising that the scale of the challenge is influenced by wider national factors.

8. The Government grant for 2026/27 is currently projected to increase, reflecting the rise in the Public Health Grant for 2025/26, on which the 2026/27 draft figures are based. However, the final allocation for 2026/27 has not yet been confirmed and may be subject to change once allocations are announced.
9. The Government grant within central risk included £843,000 of additional funding from DCCS reserves in 2025/26 in relation to Homelessness. For 2026/27, as agreed in the Medium Term Business Plan, £953,000 has been incorporated as an increase to the growth budget rather than recorded as additional income.
10. The £426,000 increase in Customer and Client Receipts primarily reflects income from full-cost clients within Older People's services, where the additional receipts serve to offset the associated service expenditure.
11. The Housing Benefit Administration central risk budget for 2026/27 includes a £300,000 transfer from the DCCS reserves to cover the shortfall between housing benefits payments for temporary accommodations and the amounts reimbursed by the Department for Work and Pensions.
12. Technical Services recharge costs within the fund have increased in comparison to previous years as a result of a forecast increase in the headcount required to support delivery of the Housing Improvement Plan.
13. Analysis of the movement in total manpower and related staff costs are shown in Table 2 below.

14. Staffing Statement

Analysis of the movement in staff-related costs is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Staff-related costs

	Original budget 2025/26		Original budget 2026/27	
	Manpower full-time equivalent	Estimated cost £000	Manpower full-time equivalent	Estimated cost £000
People Services	50	3,952	56	4,505
Partnership Services (including Central Directorate)	26	1,972	28	2,495
Housing Services	7	572	7	587
Education and Skills	43	2,048	43	2,334
Total Community and Children's Services	126	8,544	134	9,921

Staffing levels, as reflected in the above statement, show an increase in full-time equivalents. The increase is mainly attributable to additional posts within the Community and Safety team, the Homelessness team, and Other Housing services,

in response to service pressures and demand. The overall increase in estimated cost also reflects provision for the pay award and incremental progression.

Potential Further Budget Developments

15. The provisional nature of the 2026/27 revenue budget recognises that further revisions may be required, including in relation to:

- decisions on funding of the Additional Works Programme by the Resource Allocation Committee
- budget adjustments relating to the Surveyors Repairs and Maintenance projects
- budget adjustments relating to central and departmental support services apportionments.

Revenue Budget 2025/26

16. The current forecast local risk out-turn for 2025/26 indicates a potential overspend of up to £477,000, primarily arising from Other Housing and Children's Social Care services. Work is underway across the Department to reduce this pressure.

17. The central risk budget is projected to overspend by £132,000, largely due to a one-off dilapidation cost of £120,000 for the Youth Hostel at Carter Lane within Homelessness services.

Appendix 3 shows the movement between the Original Budget 2025/26 and the Approved Budget 2025/26.

Table 3: Draft Capital and Supplementary Revenue budgets

Service	Project	Latest approved budget £'000	Commitments £'000	Prior year actuals £'000	Current year actuals 2025/26 £'000
Commissioning & Partnership	Golden Lane Leisure Centre Podium Waterproofing	750	525	-	11
Commissioning & Partnership	Golden Lane Leisure Centre Refurbishment	1,750	1,166	-	164
Housing City Fund	Disabled Facilities Grant	135	8	59	54
Total Community and Children's Services excluding HRA		2,635	1,699	59	229

18. The latest estimated costs of the Committee's current capital and supplementary revenue projects are summarised in Table 3.
19. Pre-implementation costs comprise feasibility/option appraisal expenditure which has been approved in accordance with the project procedure, prior to authority to start work.
20. The latest Capital and Supplementary Revenue Project forecast expenditure on approved schemes will be presented to the Court of Common Council for formal approval in March 2026.

Business Planning for 2026/27

21. A separate report will be presented to this Committee at a later date containing the high-level business plan.

Corporate & Strategic Implications – none

Security implications

22. There are no specific security implications in relation to the budget or business plan, but many of our workstreams contribute to the departmental priority 'safe' with the aim of people of all ages living in safe communities, our homes are safe and well maintained and our estates are protected from harm.

Public sector equality duty

23. Promoting equality, fostering good relations and reducing discrimination are all integral elements of the work of the department, as demonstrated in some of the work included in the high-level summary business plan. The department specifically considers this in service and policy development through Tests of Relevance and Equality Impact Assessments.

Conclusion

24. This report presents the 2026/27 budget estimates for the Department of Community and Children's Services for Members to consider and approve.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Committee Summary Budget – City Fund
- Appendix 2 – Support Services and Capital Charges from/to Community and Children's Services Committee
- Appendix 3 – Original 2025/26 Budget to Approved 2025/26 Budget
- Appendix 4 –Original 2025/26 Budget to Original 2026/27 Budget

Mark Jarvis

Head of Finance – Chamberlain's Department

E: Mark.Jarvis@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Beatrix Jako

Finance Business Partner – Chamberlain's Department

E: Beatrix.Jako@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendix 1: Community and Children's Services Summary – City Fund

Analysis of Service Expenditure	Local or Central Risk	Actual 2024/25 £'000	Original budget 2025/26 £'000	Approved budget 2025/26 £'000	Original budget 2026/27 £'000	Movement 2025/26 OR to 2026/27 OR £'000	Para ref
EXPENDITURE							
Employees	L	9,635	6,721	6,899	7,863	1,142	14
Employees – mainly social workers dealing with Asylum Seekers, Homelessness and staff paid by Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)	C	2,771	1,823	4,204	2,058	235	14
Premises Related Expenses (see note i)	L	604	382	387	373	(9)	
Premises Related Expenses (SRP)	C	130	55	193	15	(40)	
City Surveyor – R&M	L	46	5	5	5	0	
Transport-related Expenses	L	17	16	16	16	0	
Home to School Transport (met from DSG)	C	110	81	87	81	0	
Supplies and Services (mainly professional fees which are largely met from grant income plus expenses relating to contracts)	L	8,248	5,221	4,961	4,159	(1,062)	5
Supplies and Services (mainly costs of our private, voluntary and independent childcare providers which are met from DSG)	C	457	2,218	3,610	2,533	315	6
Third Party Payments (mainly social care clients plus contract costs and providers of adult learning)	L	9,009	5,683	5,683	6,718	1,035	5
Third Party Payments (mainly agency costs relating to asylum seekers plus costs that are met from DSG)	C	3,634	6,545	4,867	6,557	12	
Transfer Payments (mainly payment to Fusion Lifestyle funded by income from London Marathon Charitable Trust)	L	139	110	110	111	1	
Rent allowances – funded by Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) rent benefit rebates)	C	5,150	3,561	3,561	3,661	100	
Transfer to Reserves	L	70	0	0	0	0	
Transfer to Reserves	C	1,846	0	0	0	0	
Unidentified Savings	C	0	(524)	(524)	(450)	74	7
Total Expenditure		41,866	31,897	34,059	33,700	1,803	
CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE							

CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE							
Analysis of Service Expenditure							
	Local or Central Risk	Actual 2024/25 £'000	Original budget 2025/26 £'000	Approved budget 2025/26 £'000	Original budget 2026/27 £'000	Movement 2025/26 to 2026/27 £'000	Para ref
INCOME							
Government Grants (mainly Public Health and Skills Funding Agency grant income)	L	(8,466)	(3,975)	(4,000)	(4,139)	(164)	8
Government Grants (mainly DSG, DWP rent benefit rebates, Home Office funding)	C	(10,944)	(8,058)	(9,866)	(7,372)	686	9
Other grants, reimbursements and contributions (mainly B&B rent allowances, S256 Monies and London Marathon Charitable Trust)	L	(2,618)	(334)	(334)	(338)	(4)	
Other grants, reimbursements and contributions (City's Cash contributions towards Toynbee Hall contract and Strings project at The Aldgate School)	C	(492)	(1,155)	(1,262)	(1,275)	(120)	
Customer, client receipts (mainly fee income and client contributions towards their social care packages), and rent income for the community centres)	L	(1,628)	(1,319)	(1,400)	(1,745)	(426)	10
	C	(400)	(20)	(99)	(20)	0	
Transfer from Reserves (Public Health, Healthwatch & Proceeds of Crime Act POCA reserves)	L	(81)	0	0	0	0	
Transfer from Reserves (Parking Meter Reserves in relation to concessionary fares and taxi cards & housing benefits)	C	(641)	(582)	(582)	(882)	(300)	11
Total Income		(25,270)	(15,443)	(17,543)	(15,771)	(328)	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE BEFORE SUPPORT SERVICES AND CAPITAL CHARGES		16,596	16,454	16,516	17,929	1,475	
SUPPORT SERVICES AND CAPITAL CHARGES							
Central Support Services and Capital Charges		3,082	3,381	3,381	3,496	115	App 2
Recharges within Fund		(32)	(56)	(56)	106	162	App 2 & 12
Total Support Services and Capital Charges		3,050	3,325	3,325	3,602	277	
TOTAL NET (EXPENDITURE) / INCOME		19,646	19,779	19,841	21,531	1,752	

Notes – Examples of types of service expenditure:

- (i) Premises Related Expenses – includes repairs and maintenance, energy costs, rates, and water services

Appendix 2: Support Service and Capital Charges from/to Community and Children's Services Committee

Support Service and Capital Charges	Actual 2024/25 £000	Original budget 2025/26 £000	Approved budget 2025/26 £000	Original budget 2026/27 £000
Administrative Buildings	227	228	228	388
City Surveyor's Employee Recharge	2	1	1	1
Insurance	84	67	67	85
IS Recharges – Chamberlain	598	665	665	702
Capital Charges	558	518	518	469
Support Services, including Chamberlain's, Comptrollers & Town Clerks	1,613	1,902	1,902	1,851
Total Support Services and Capital Charges	3,082	3,381	3,381	3,496
Recharges Within Funds				
Corporate and Democratic Core – Finance Committee	(32)	(32)	(32)	(32)
Technical Services – DCCS	25	0	0	164
Barbican Residential Committee	(25)	(24)	(24)	(26)
Total Support Service and Capital Charges	3,050	3,325	3,325	3,602

Support services budgets reflect the attribution and cost of central departments. All support services are based on time spent or use of services and were reviewed during 2025/26 with the method of apportionment updated to reflect the latest up-to-date corporate information.

Appendix 3: Movement between 2025/26 Original Book Budget and 2025/26 Approved Budget

Community and Children's Services	£000
Original Net Local and Central Risk Budget (Executive Director Community and Children's Services & City Surveyor)	16,454
Executive Director Community and Children's Services	
Pay Award – July 2024 & National Insurance contribution	71
Transformation Fund carry forwards from 2024/25 in relation to the Operational Property Review	80
Reduction in the Apprenticeship budget following the correction of prior misallocations	(87)
Mobile phone savings	(2)
Approved Net Local and Central Risk Budget (Executive Director Community and Children's Services & City Surveyor)	16,516

Appendix 4: Movement between 2025/26 Original Book Budget and 2026/27 Original Book Budget

Community and Children's Services	£000
Original Net Local and Central Risk Budget (Executive Director Community and Children's Services & City Surveyor)	16,454
Executive Director Community and Children's Services	
3% inflation uplift	375
Pay Award – July 2024 & National Insurance contribution	71
Reduction in the Apprenticeship budget following the correction of prior misallocations	(87)
Mobile phone savings	(2)
Additional funding for an expanded Community and Safety team to address evolving demands and risks	165
Central risk grant allocation for homelessness support	953
Original Net Local and Central Risk Budget (Executive Director Community and Children's Services & City Surveyor)	17,929

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9

Committee(s): Community and Children's Services	Dated: 28 January 2026
Subject: Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and Capital Budgets 2026/27	Public
This proposal: • provides statutory duties	The report includes decision on the City Corporation's statutory CCS function.
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	NO
Report of: The Chamberlain and the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services	For Decision
Report author: Goshe Munir, Senior Accountant, Chamberlain's Department	

Summary

1. This report is the annual submission of the revenue and capital budgets overseen by your committee. This report seeks approval for the provisional revenue budget for 2026/27, for subsequent submission to the Finance Committee. The budget does not include funding for potential new health & safety staffing and repairs costs to comply with new legal requirements of up to £2.6m. These are subject to a capitalisation determination agreement from MHLGG or alternative funding arrangements. Details of the HRA draft capital budget are also provided.
2. The provisional nature of the revenue budgets particularly recognises that further revisions might arise from the necessary budget adjustments resulting from corporate projects.
3. There is a significant planned investment in the next year in the major works capital programme to upgrade the fabric of existing HRA social housing. However, the Revenue Reserve position remains tight in the short term but delayed income from new build projects at Black Raven Court, Sydenham Hill and York Way is expected to start in 2026/27. This uplift is partly offset by higher Repairs and Maintenance and salary costs.
4. The General Housing Revenue Reserve position is summarised below: -

Table 1 General Housing Revenue Reserve	<i>Original Budget 2025/26 £000</i>	<i>Original Budget 2026/27 £000</i>	Movement
Service Expenditure	15,996	17,604	1,608
Service Income	(18,591)	(20,702)	(2,111)
Other Movements	363	9	(354)
Transfer to Major Repairs Reserve	2,190	2,095	(95)
(Surplus) in year	(42)	(994)	(952)
Balance brought forward	(212)	(325)	(113)
Balance carried forward	(254)	(1,319)	(1,065)

5. Overall, the 2026/27 provisional budget indicates a surplus for the year of £994k and Revenue Reserves at 31 March 2026 are now expected to be £1319k.
6. The overall Major Repairs Reserve (MRR) position is summarised below: -

Table 2 Major Repairs Reserve	Original Budget 2025/26 £000	Original Budget 2026/27 £000	Movement
Transfer from General Housing Revenue Reserve (see contra Table 1)	(2,190)	(2,095)	95
Net capital expenditure after / grant funding	(13,216)	(2,095)	11,121
City Fund Loan	11,026	0	(11,026)
Movement in MRR in year	0	0	0
Balance brought forward	(591)	(591)	0
Balance carried forward	(591)	(591)	0

- The Major Repairs Reserve (MRR) funds a very significant investment in the capital programme for major works across the 5-year asset management plan, including the decent homes program, window renewal and roof replacements. In order to do so the MRR will start to borrow using a planned loan from City Fund. This borrowing requirement has been forecast and included in the Corporations Medium Term Financial Plan for a number of years.

Recommendation(s)

7. The Committee is asked to:
 - Review the provisional 2026/27 revenue budget to ensure that it reflects the Committee's objectives and, if so, approve the proposed budget for submission to the Finance Committee.
 - Review and approve the draft capital budget.
 - Authorise the Chamberlain to revise these budgets to allow for further implications arising from departmental reorganisations and other reviews.

Main Report

Management of the Housing Revenue Account

8. The HRA is ring-fenced by legislation which means that the account must be financially self-supporting. Although the "capital account" is not ring fenced by law, the respective financial positions of the HRA and the City Fund have meant that capital expenditure is financed without placing a burden on the use of City Fund resources. HRA related capital expenditure continues to be funded from the HRA, including the Major Repairs Reserve, a city fund loan and homeowners making their appropriate contributions.

Business Planning Priorities

9. A number of development opportunities and major works projects will require considerable resource input but will result in increased social housing capacity and improvements to our properties, particularly in terms of energy efficiency.

Proposed Budget Position 2025/26 and 2026/27

10. The detailed budgets are set out in table 3.

Actual 2024-25 £000	Table 3 - HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT	Original Budget 2025-26 £000	Latest Budget 2025/26 £000	Original Budget 2026-27 £000	Movement 2025-26 to 2026-27 £000	
	LOCAL RISK Expenditure					
5,002	Repairs, Maintenance & Improvements	4,496	3,937	4,876	380	Appendix 1
61	Supplementary Revenue Budgets	224	0	25	(199)	12
2,343	Technical Services and City Surveyor's Costs	1,794	2,215	2,447	653	13
4,739	Employee Cost	5,183	5,375	5,852	669	14
41	Premises & Other Support Cost	657	786	624	(33)	
3,632	Specialised Support Services	3,642	3,630	3,780	138	15
15,818	TOTAL Expenditure	15,996	15,943	17,604	1,608	
	Income					
	Rent					
(12,735)	Dwellings	(14,257)	(13,539)	(16,219)	(1,962)	16
(387)	Car Parking	(430)	(430)	(430)	0	
(128)	Baggage Stores	(128)	(128)	(128)	0	
(1,461)	Commercial	(1,614)	(1,563)	(1,606)	8	
	Charges for Services & Facilities					
(175)	Community Facilities	(123)	(142)	(142)	(19)	
(3,158)	Service Charges	(2,029)	(2,338)	(2,167)	(138)	17
(45)	Other	(10)	(10)	(10)	0	
(18,089)	TOTAL Income	(18,591)	(18,150)	(20,702)	(2,111)	
(2,271)	NET INCOME FROM SERVICES	(2,595)	(2,207)	(3,098)	(503)	
0	Loan Charges – Interest	218	0	0	(218)	
210	Interest Receivable	0	0	9	9	
(2,061)	NET OPERATING INCOME	(2,377)	(2,207)	(3,089)	(712)	
0	Loan Charges – Principal	145	0	0	(145)	
2,062	Transfer to Major Repairs Reserve	2,190	2,190	2,095	(95)	
1	(Surplus) / deficit FOR THE YEAR	(42)	(17)	(994)	(952)	
(309)	Surplus brought forward	(212)	(308)	(325)	(113)	
(308)	SURPLUS CARRIED FORWARD	(254)	(325)	(1,319)	(1,065)	

11. Members should note that income and favourable variances are shown in brackets which is a change from previous reports. This change shifts focus to adopting the new SAP system instead of adapting. Only significant variances (generally those greater than £50,000) have been commented on in the following paragraphs.
12. The Supplementary Revenue decrease in cost of £199k is based on a smaller number of projects being charged to revenue for supplementary works in 2026/27.
13. The increase of £653k in Technical Services and City Surveyor costs is due to the technical recharge cost, which is based on time spent (worked) on setting up HRA Projects, expecting to increase in the forthcoming years due to the increased programme of capital works
14. The increase in Employee Costs of £669k includes a 2% uplift for inflation and the full year impact of pay increases to staff arising from the pay deal effective from July 2025, and increased agency support staff cost.
15. Specialised Support Services Cost have increased by £138k due to higher Energy cost unit prices (tariffs) and standing charges than previously allowed for.
16. The Rent Increase of £1,962m reflects the CPI + 1% (total 4.8%) uplift which has been applied to existing dwellings for 2026/27. Further increases in rent income is attributed to the expected additional income in year from the 66 new flats at Black Raven Court, as well as the budgeted income for the 110 new flats at Sydenham Hill and the 91 new flats at York Way.
17. The Service Charge has an increase of £138k compared to the original budget profiled, this is mainly due to additional reimbursements from long lessees charged for major works.

Actual 2024/25 £'000	Table 4 - HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT	Original Budget 2025/26 £'000	Latest Budget 2025/26 £'000	Original Budget 2026/27 £'000	Movement 2025/26 to 2026/27 £'000	Paragraph Ref
	MAJOR REPAIRS RESERVE (MRR)					
(2,062)	Transfer from HRA (depreciation agreed by HRA)	(2,190)	(2,190)	(2,095)	95	
46,792	Capital Expenditure	44,247	47,559	11,735	(32,512)	
(39,752)	Section 106 / Grants	(6,442)	(38,622)	(2)	6,440	
(1,296)	Reimbursements from homeowners	(5,914)	(1,392)	(1,688)	4,226	
(500)	RTB Receipts	(500)	(500)	(500)	0	
(114)	GF Contributions	0	(3,405)	(7,450)	(7,450)	
(209)	GLA Grant	(3,660)	0	0	3,660	
0	City Fund Loan	(11,026)	0	0	11,026	
(3,450)	City Fund Capital Receipt	(14,515)	(1,450)	0	14,515	
(591)	Transfer from/to reserve for year	0	0	0	0	
0	Balance Brought Forward	(591)	(591)	(591)	0	
(591)	MRR BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD	(591)	(591)	(591)	0	

18. Analysis of the movement in manpower and related staff costs are shown in Table 5 below. These costs are spread across Direct Employee Cost, Technical Services and Specialised Support Services.

Table 5 Manpower statement	Original Budget 2025/26		Original Budget 2026/27	
	Manpower Full-time equivalent	Estimated cost £0	Manpower Full-time equivalent	Estimated cost £0
Supervision and Management	33	2,189	31	2,178
Estate Officers	11	548	11	603
Porter/Cleaners	26	1,132	25	1,148
Gardeners	6	264	6	279
Wardens	0	20	0	20
Technical Services	40	3,043	46	3,723
TOTAL HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT	116	7,196	119	7,951

Potential Further Budget Developments

19. The provisional nature of the 2026/27 revenue budget recognises that further revisions may be required.

Revenue Budget 2026/27

The forecast outturn for the current year is in line with the Latest Approved Budget.

1. The latest estimated costs for the Committee's draft capital and supplementary revenue projects are summarised in the tables below.

2. Pre-implementation costs comprise feasibility and option appraisal expenditure which has been approved in accordance with the project procedure, prior to authority to start work.
3. The anticipated funding of this major works programme is indicated above, with the 2025/26 and 2026/27 financial impact on HRA resources being reflected in the revenue estimates figures included elsewhere in this report. In addition, the HRA will need to borrow from the City Fund in order to finance its current capital programme.
4. The latest Capital and Supplementary Revenue Project budgets will be presented to the Court of Common Council for formal approval in March 2026.

Draft Capital and Supplementary Revenue Projects

Estate	Exp. Pre 01/04/25 £'000	2025/26 £'000	2026/27 £'000	2027/28 £'000	2028/29 £'000	2029/30 £'000	Later Years £'000	Total £'000
Schemes at pre-implementation stage								
L4-Avondale Square	130	201	20	11	-	-	-	362
L4-Golden Lane	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L4-Dron House	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L4-Holloway Estate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L4-York Way Estate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L4-Housing General HRA	1,113	5	-	-	-	-	-	1,118
L4-Middlesex Street	-	88	5	-	-	-	-	93
L4-Isleden House	36	-	-	-	-	-	-	36
L4-Southwark Estates	281	440	601	-	-	-	-	1,322
L4-Sydenham Hill	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L4-William Blake	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L4-Windsor House	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sub-total schemes at Pre-implementation stage	1,560	734	626	11	-	-	-	2,931
Authority to start work granted	Exp. Pre 01/04/25 £'000	2025/26 £'000	2026/27 £'000	2027/28 £'000	2028/29 £'000	2029/30 £'000	Later Years £'000	Total £'000
L4-Avondale Square	6,575	543	2,237	1,763	-	-	-	11,118
L4-Dron House	1,878	4	-	-	-	-	-	1,882
L4-Golden Lane	12,760	1,724	1,094	2,237	8,716	10,817	80,200	117,548
L4-Holloway Estate	5,124	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,124
L4-Housing General HRA	35,199	1,423	6,193	3,652	3,073	-	-	49,540
L4-Isleden House	3,146	1,092	-	-	-	-	-	4,238
L4-Middlesex Street	5,663	1,159	14	13	-	-	-	6,849
L4-Southwark Estates	5,878	106	134	-	-	-	-	6,118
L4-Sydenham Hill	37,126	17,920	-	-	-	-	-	55,046
L4-William Blake	675	118	2,061	800	-	-	-	3,654
L4-Windsor House	2,790	118	-	-	-	-	-	2,908
L4-York Way Estate	33,851	23,351	-	-	-	-	-	57,202
Sub-total Authority to Start Work	150,665	47,558	11,733	8,465	11,789	10,817	80,200	321,227
	Exp. Pre 01/04/25 £'000	2025/26 £'000	2026/27 £'000	2027/28 £'000	2028/29 £'000	2029/30 £'000	Later Years £'000	Total £'000
TOTAL COMMUNITY & CHILDREN'S SERVICES - HRA	152,225	48,292	12,359	8,476	11,789	10,817	80,200	324,158
Of this,								
Capital	150,665	47,559	11,735	8,465	11,789	10,817	80,200	321,230
Supplementary Revenue	1,560	733	624	11	-	-	-	2,928
	152,225	48,292	12,359	8,476	11,789	10,817	80,200	324,158
Funded by								
Long Lessee contributions		1,392	1,688	2,109	3,543	3,943		12,675
External contributions (S106, grants.)		39,151	601	-	-	-		39,752
GF Contributions		3,405	7,450	3,772	5,651	874	75,190	96,342
Borrowing		-	-	-	-	6,000	-	6,000
Right to Buy Receipts		500	500	500	500	-	-	2,000
HRA balances		204	25	-	-	-	-	229
Major Repairs Reserve		2,190	2,095	2,095	2,095	-	5,010	13,485
Capital Receipt		1,450	-	-	-	-	-	1,450
		48,292	12,359	8,476	11,789	10,817	80,200	171,933

Caroline Al-Beyerty Chamberlains
Judith Finlay Executive Director of Community & Children Services

Contacts:

Goshe Munir

Senior Accountant – Chamberlains Department

T: 020 7332-1571 E: Goshe.Munir@Cityoflondon.gov.uk

Mark Jarvis

Head of Finance–Chamberlains Department

020 7332-1223 E: Mark.Jarvis@Cityoflondon.gov.uk

Peta Caine

Assistant Director Housing - Community and Children's Services

T: 020 7332-3015 E: Peta.Caine@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendices

Appendix A: Schedule of Repairs, Maintenance and Improvements.

Appendix A

REPAIRS, MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENTS		<i>Original Budget 2025/26 £000</i>	<i>Revised Budget 2025/26 £000</i>	<i>Original Budget 2026/27 £000</i>
Responsible Officer is the Director of Community and Children's Services				
GENERAL				
BREAKDOWN AND EMERGENCY REPAIRS				
Building	E	2,315	1,507	2,651
Electrical	E	250	290	146
Lifts	E	100	170	200
Heating and Ventilation	E	151	151	175
Recharge and Insurance Claims	E	75	75	75
		2,891	2,193	3,247
CONTRACT SERVICING				
Building	E	91	178	270
Electrical	E	150	290	80
Lifts	E	166	193	189
Boilers	E	240	0	0
Heating and Ventilating	E	425	425	500
		1,072	1,086	1,039
CYCLICAL WORK AND MINOR IMPROVEMENTS				
Elderly/Disabled - Internal Redecorations	E	12	12	0
Asbestos Management Contingency	E	60	116	60
Stock Condition Survey	E	0	0	20
Energy Performance Certification Work	E	5	5	5
Water supply works	E	80	80	130
Asset Management plan	A	28	28	30
Safety Measures	E	195	100	175
Fire Alarm System	E	153	317	(70)
		533	658	590
TOTAL GENERAL		4,496	3,937	4,876

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank