

Committees: Corporate Project Board Members Hospitality Working Party (for info) Members Privileges Sub (for info.) Policy and Resources Corporate Asset Sub Committee (for info) Projects Sub Committee	Dates: 30 September 2020 19 Oct 2020 Circulated 22 Oct 2020 18 Nov 2020 30 Nov 2020
Subject: Guildhall West Wing – Provision of Upgraded Lavatories and Cloakroom Facilities for Members and Guildhall Guests Unique Project Identifier: 11718	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular
Report of: City Surveyor Report Author: Nicholas Sommerville	For Decision <p style="text-align: right;">CS 052/20</p>

PUBLIC

Summary

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: To provide additional cloakroom and guest facilities to maximise the number of simultaneous events across the Guildhall complex and provide fit for purpose modernised Members facilities (lockers, showers, changing rooms, lavatories).</p> <p>RAG Status: Red (Red at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Risk Status: Low (Medium at last report to committee)</p> <p>Risk Allowance : £409,600 at GW 5</p> <p>Risk Allowance Utilised: £78,509 utilised (£331,091 removed from the allowance).</p> <p>Approved Budget: £1,722,499 (of which £8,100 funded from the Additional Works Programme).</p> <p>Final Outturn Cost: £1,716,298 (of which £8,100 funded from the Additional Works Programme)</p>
2. Next steps and requested decisions	<p>Requested Decisions:</p> <p>It is recommended Members note:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the contents of this report, and close the project with a final outturn cost of £1,716,298; a £102,532 (6%) cost increase since GW5.

<p>3. Key conclusions</p>	<p>The improved facilities for both guests and Members provided under the project maximises the opportunity to hold simultaneous events across Guildhall venues. This has increased income by £197,109 from functions and events for November 2018 to April 2020.</p> <p>The experience from this project was that, despite a constrained programme, an open tender process was successful in procuring an appropriate response and resource for carrying out the main contract works.</p> <p>To mitigate construction risk, in the absence of adequate record information every effort should be made to undertake invasive pre-construction surveys, even if properties are occupied.</p>
----------------------------------	---

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

<p>4. Design into delivery</p>	<p><u>Interior Design</u> The core multidisciplinary team included an architect but not an interior designer. As the internal client team were not satisfied with the selection of the internal finishes proposed by the project architect, the presentation of sample materials to demonstrate the proposed level of quality had to be completed by the separate appointment of an interior designer. The subsequent mock ups and sample boards were approved by the project board and Members.</p> <p><u>Building Services</u> The record information for the lower ground West Wing was poor with only an illegible scanned image of the mechanical plant and ductwork available. As the accommodation to be refurbished was in use by Members it wasn't possible to undertake a full invasive survey, as this required the removal of ceiling tiles to expose the building services and thought to be too disruptive. Therefore, the mechanical and electrical employer's requirements for the works was reliant on partial information and a number of risk allowances. Unscheduled works to adapt existing mechanical services gave rise to additional time and cost under the contract. There were also additional works for powered door openers which would have been better integrated into the main contract works had this requirement been established earlier.</p>
<p>5. Options appraisal</p>	<p>Members were presented with three options under the options appraisal stage. All three options included the cloakroom at Lower Ground floor. These plans did not allow for sufficient circulation space within the Members changing rooms. At technical design stage it was agreed, with representative Members, to move the cloakroom facility from the lower ground floor to the Great Hall</p>

	Ambulatory and allow required space allocation for the Members changing rooms.								
6. Procurement route	<p>The consultancy services were procured through a single source framework in order to meet the programme demands to carry out the works during the 2018 summer recess, in time for Guildhall events in November 2018. This framework procurement allowed the design and project management firm, Aecom to be appointed quickly without tendering, under one multidisciplinary appointment. An independent consultant project manager may have had greater scrutiny and oversight over the design team's proposals.</p> <p>Due to shortcomings in the design, as set out in section 4, a separate interior designer had to be appointed in the technical design phase to complete the finishes specification and presentation of materials.</p> <p>The works were procured using an open tender process. There was good appetite from the market. The contractor appointed QOB Interiors Ltd (QOB) were very diligent in progressing the works, in good time and to the standard expected.</p>								
7. Skills base	<p>The City Surveyors Department, in consultation with City Procurement, procured and appointed an external design and project management team to assist in the project design, planning and contract administration. The project team consisted of-</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Function</th> <th>Consultant</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Multidisciplinary design (including Architecture, MEP service design, structural Engineering and project management)</td> <td>Aecom</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Interior Design (appointed later)</td> <td>Lusted Green</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cost Consultancy</td> <td>Gleeds</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Function	Consultant	Multidisciplinary design (including Architecture, MEP service design, structural Engineering and project management)	Aecom	Interior Design (appointed later)	Lusted Green	Cost Consultancy	Gleeds
Function	Consultant								
Multidisciplinary design (including Architecture, MEP service design, structural Engineering and project management)	Aecom								
Interior Design (appointed later)	Lusted Green								
Cost Consultancy	Gleeds								
8. Stakeholders	The project benefited from a project board with the project sponsor being the Remembrancers Department, responsible for the management of Guildhall events. The Chairman, Deputy and former Chairman of Project Sub Committee and the Chief Commoner represented Members who are the main users.								

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	Construction works were scheduled to be carried out during the summer recess with the intention of minimising disruption to Members and to complete works in time for annual ceremonial events in November 2018. The main construction works overran by two weeks, mainly due to unscheduled works to existing ductwork (see also section 11). The lower ground Members and guest
--	---

	<p>facilities were, however, available for Guildhall events in November as planned. The Ambulatory cloakroom works were prefabricated off site and were phased to be delivered later, these works were completed in Spring 2019.</p>
<p>10. Assessment of project against Scope</p>	<p>As detailed in section 5 additional Guildhall accommodation was added to the original project scope by moving the cloakroom from the lower ground floor to the Great Hall Ambulatory.</p> <p>Under the main contract works there were also additional items of scope including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access control to the Alderman’s Staircase • additional vanity unit (from two to three spaces), • additional stairwell works (decorations, hold open devices and signage). <p>On completion of the scheduled works, a significant variation to the project scope was raised to include automated doors. Prior to the works the project team did consult with Members as well as the City’s access officer. Although powered doors are not mandatory under the building regulations or Equalities Act the current demographic of Members should have been considered and anticipated that there was a need for powered doors.</p>
<p>11. Risks and issues</p>	<p>As the building was in use as Members cloakrooms during the pre construction phase there was limited opportunity for invasive surveys, this was recognised and a risk allowance made.</p> <p>Following demolitions, down-takings and validation surveys, a number of unscheduled works previously identified under the risk register required instruction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existing mechanical services required to be adapted to incorporate motorised smoke and fire dampers where the duct crossed new fire partitions, this required the existing ducts to be measured and new materials ordered resulting in delay. • Existing building fire strategy was not available and compliant smoke venting knock out panels had to be incorporated as the works progressed • The provisional sum for the building management system (which has a preferred supplier as the maintaining contractor) was insufficient and resulted in additional unscheduled cost. <p>These additional activities did result in a delay to the construction works and resulted in a two week delay to handover.</p> <p>There was a risk register and allowance but this project pre-dated the revised Costed Risk Provision governance. The allowance meant the Issue reporting process to Members was streamlined by allowing draw down from the hypothetical allowance in the risk register.</p>

12. Transition to BAU

The maintenance handover procedure was followed and the works were handed over with minor patent defects. In line with 'Softlandings' principles the facilities maintenance team had been on the project board and were consulted prior to and during the works to allow a smooth handover. Since handover there has been a change in personnel and the operations team have resourced the maintenance of the Guildhall plant externally via a term provider, this required the installing contractor (QOB) to demonstrate the operating systems for a second time.

The retro fitting of automated door opening devices has proven to be problematic. Had these works been incorporated earlier there would have been opportunity to –

- contain the wiring within the partitions
- install appropriate ironmongery and
- avoid the need for additional decoration works if the automated doors had been procured with the main contract works.

The temperatures to the female Members Cloakroom and sanitary accommodation has been operating lower than acceptable parameters. On further investigation to the low temperature the installing contractor (QOB) identified that this was due to a faulty valve to a secondary air handling unit that was retained and not replaced as part of the work. The valve assembly has now been replaced by the facilities management team. As the female members area was previously car parking space and converted in the 1970's (to relatively inefficient thermal standards) consideration should also be given to upgrading the insulation of the outer walls under any future West Wing accommodation refurbishment project.

Value Review

13. Budget

Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)	Estimated cost £1,200,000.
-----------------------------	-------------------------------

	At Authority to Start work (G5) (A)	Current Budget (B)	Final Outturn Cost (G6) (C)	Variance (C-A)
Fees	£202,800	£207,389	£202,519	-£281
Staff Costs	£30,000	£30,000	£24,500	-£5,500
Main Works	£1,323,166	£1,401,694	£1,399,897	£76,731
Other Works	£50,000	£67,516	£73,482	£23,482
Recharges (District Surv)	£7,800	£7,800	£7,800	£0

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Capital project Sub Total</td> <td>£1,613,766</td> <td>£1,714,399</td> <td>£1,708,198</td> <td>£94,432</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Revenue works</td> <td>0</td> <td>£8,100</td> <td>£8,100</td> <td>£8,100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Cost</td> <td>£1,613,766</td> <td>£1,722,499</td> <td>£1,716,298</td> <td>£102,532</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Risk Register utilised</td> <td>£0</td> <td>-£78,509</td> <td>-£78,509</td> <td>-£78,509</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Superseded risk (removed from register)</td> <td>£0</td> <td>-£96,891</td> <td>-£331,091</td> <td>-£331,091</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Subtotal Risk</td> <td>£0</td> <td>-£175,400</td> <td>-£409,600</td> <td>-£409,600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Risk Register Value</td> <td>£409,600</td> <td>£234,200</td> <td>£0</td> <td>-£409,600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Cost + Risk</td> <td>£2,023,366</td> <td>£1,956,699</td> <td>£1,716,298</td> <td>-£307,068</td> </tr> </table> <p>For an explanation to the reasons for the cost increase of £102,532 please refer to the project coversheet (Appendix 1). The cost increase of £102,532 includes £78,509 which was drawn from the risk register and the remaining amount of £24,023 was requested for additional scope items.</p> <p>The final account values to works was produced by the contractor and verified by the external cost consultant (Gleeds). The City Surveyor confirms the final value aligns to the Certificated amount.</p>	Capital project Sub Total	£1,613,766	£1,714,399	£1,708,198	£94,432	Revenue works	0	£8,100	£8,100	£8,100	Total Cost	£1,613,766	£1,722,499	£1,716,298	£102,532	Risk Register utilised	£0	-£78,509	-£78,509	-£78,509	Superseded risk (removed from register)	£0	-£96,891	-£331,091	-£331,091	Subtotal Risk	£0	-£175,400	-£409,600	-£409,600	Risk Register Value	£409,600	£234,200	£0	-£409,600	Total Cost + Risk	£2,023,366	£1,956,699	£1,716,298	-£307,068
Capital project Sub Total	£1,613,766	£1,714,399	£1,708,198	£94,432																																					
Revenue works	0	£8,100	£8,100	£8,100																																					
Total Cost	£1,613,766	£1,722,499	£1,716,298	£102,532																																					
Risk Register utilised	£0	-£78,509	-£78,509	-£78,509																																					
Superseded risk (removed from register)	£0	-£96,891	-£331,091	-£331,091																																					
Subtotal Risk	£0	-£175,400	-£409,600	-£409,600																																					
Risk Register Value	£409,600	£234,200	£0	-£409,600																																					
Total Cost + Risk	£2,023,366	£1,956,699	£1,716,298	-£307,068																																					
14. Investment	<p>An objective for the project was as a revenue generating opportunity; additional guest sanitary and cloakroom facilities were to allow event spaces to be let concurrently.</p> <p>Since completion the Remembrancer has advised bookings have increased with an additional letting income of £197,109 for November 2018 to April 2020.</p>																																								
15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works to priority areas to be completed for 12 October 2018: not achieved- hand over completed 26 October 2018 under an extension of time due to unforeseen works. • Provide modern, efficient and high quality sanitary and cloakroom facilities for Members and guests using the Guildhall complex: achieved • Maximise commercial returns by increasing room usage of the Guildhall complex: achieved 																																								
16. Key benefits realised	<p>The Key Benefits were set out as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance Guildhall's reputation as a premium venue to stage corporate and private events. • Maximise ability to hold simultaneous events across Guildhall venues, enabling Guildhall to further boost income from functions. • Improve and increase facilities for both guests and Members. 																																								

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage high numbers of guests - minimising queuing and reducing the need to build temporary cloakrooms. <p>Which have all been realised.</p>
--	--

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

17. Positive reflections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite a short tender period, the open tender process worked well and delivered a good response and an appropriate resource in QOB Interiors • Post tender value engineering measures allowed some saving to the tender price.
18. Improvement reflections	<p>A multidisciplinary team was appointed through a single source framework. Whilst communications were effective with a single point of contact to the external team (all based in the same office) scrutiny and oversight of the design team may have been more rigorous from an independent external project manager. For example. despite researching the Guildhall complex's existing colour palettes the architects didn't develop this sufficiently to present finishes and materials to the satisfaction of officers to allow a Members presentation. An alternative resource was required and a separate firm of interior designers was appointed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on reflection, separate consultancy firms should be appointed for design and the project management functions. <p>More emphasis should be placed on preconstruction surveys to ascertain building condition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where insufficient record information is not available intrusive surveys should be undertaken even if these are executed out of hours. <p>There were significant scope changes to the project (e.g. retro fitting powered doors).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • user requirements and extent of works should be fully captured and agreed prior to works being carried out. • if existing services are to be retained a full validation report is to be undertaken and retained on file for the duration of the project.
19. Sharing best practice	Lessons will be included in the searchable archive on the City Surveyors Quality Management System, shared with the project team and Property Projects Group.
20. AOB	None

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
Appendix 2	Post Project Review report

Contact

Report Author	Nicholas Sommerville
Email Address	Nicholas.sommerville@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	02073321774

Appendix 1

Project Coversheet

Project Coversheet

[1] Ownership
Unique Project Identifier: 33100010/11718 Report Date: 20 May 2020 Core Project Name: West Wing Cloakrooms Programme Affiliation N/A Project Manager: Nicholas Sommerville Next Gateway to be passed: 6
[2] Project Brief
Project Mission statement: To provide additional cloakroom and guest facilities to maximise the number of simultaneous events across the Guildhall complex. and provide fit for purpose modernised Members facilities (lockers, showers, changing rooms, lavatories) Definition of need: The current provision for Members locker room facilities are some 40 years old and in need of modernisation. Key measures of success: Increased revenue from events hire in the region of £197,000 over a 17 month period
[3] Highlights
Finance: Total anticipated cost to deliver [£]: 1,716,298 Total potential project liability (cost) [£]: £1,716,298 Total anticipated on-going commitment post-delivery [£]: 10,000-40,000 per annum Programme Affiliation [£]: N/A Headline Financial changes: Since 'Project Proposal' (G2) report: ▲ Change in scope to move cloakroom to ground floor, included new mechanical and electrical plant. Since 'Options Appraisal and Design' (G3-4) report: ▲ Change in scope to move cloakroom to ground floor, included new mechanical and electrical plant, increase of circa £415,000. Since 'Authority to start Work' (G5) report: ▲ Issues in relation to security enhancements, fire protection to ducts, BMS, Electrical variations, vanity units, increase of circa £58,750 ▲ Additional access control works, power doors, automated release doors and shower screens £49,983 ▼ Reduction to consultants fee and reduced staff costs, lower final account than estimated Project Status: Overall RAG rating: RED Previous RAG rating: RED
[4] Member Decisions and Delegated Authority

Approval of additional project budget

[5] Narrative and change

Date and type of last report:

GW5 Authority to Start Works (Chief Officer)
Issue report (Feb 2019)

Key headline updates and change since last report.

Headline Scope/Design changes, reasons why, impact of change:

Since 'Project Proposal' (G2) report:

.

Since 'Options Appraisal and Design' (G3-4 report):

Change in scope to move cloakroom to ground floor, included new mechanical and electrical plant- increased cost as approved under issue report

Since 'Authority to Start Work' (G5) report:

Following demolitions, down-takings and validation surveys a number of unscheduled works require instruction.

Inclusion of powered doors as requested by Members

Timetable and Milestones:

Expected timeframe for the project delivery: Construction works to be completed October 2018

Milestones: <Top 3 delivery and planning milestones (upcoming) >

- 1) Building regulations final certificate
- 2) Agreement of Contractors final account
- 3) Gateway 6.

Are we on track for this stage of the project against the plan/major milestones? Yes

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

Risks and Issues

Top 3 risks: <things that have not come to pass>

<i>Risk description</i>	<i>Missing Comprehensive MEP survey information</i>
<i>Risk description</i>	<i>Construction risk leading to additional project cost eg. late instruction of additional works impacting delivery programme</i>
<i>Risk description</i>	<i>Employer Change</i>

See 'risk register template' for full explanation.

Top 3 issues realised <risks which have come to pass:>

Issue Description	Impact and action taken	Realised Cost (£)
Additional fire dampers	Surveys instructed, solution designed materials on order.	25,500
Missing CoL's fire strategy operational management	Surveys undertaken and agreed strategy with building control officer	10,250

Electrical Variations	Additional works instructed in order to progress with scheduled works	5,000
Employer change and other risks lead to increased costs	Materials ordered	2,300
Building Control	Smoke Extract	10,250
Employer Change-DDA improvement	Powered doors to Members changing and DDA toilet in addition	32,516
Additional door controller works		5,966
Employer Change-Maintenance Improvement	Shower Screens x 5	3,470
Employer Change	Tambour Door	3,000
Employer Change	Access control variations	8,100
Delay	Additional QS Fees	4,589
Reductions to final fee account		-2,910
Reduction to staff costs		-5,500
Total		102,532

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

No

Appendix 2
Post Project Review report

West Wing Cloakrooms

Lessons Learnt

November 2019

Contents

1	Introduction & Overview	3
1.1	Introduction	
1.2	Overview	
1.3	Workshop Format	
2	What went well?	4
2.1	Positive reflections	4
3	What went badly?	4
3.1	Negative reflections	5
4	What would you do again	4
5	What wouldn't you do again	4
6	Scope Requirements	
6.1	Introduction	4
6.2	Positive	4
6.3	Negative	4
6.4	Lessons Learnt	4
7	Summary	5
7.1	Pertinent Issues	17
7.2	Lessons learnt	17

1.1 Introduction & Overview

Under best practice the City of London Surveyors Department undertook a Lessons Learnt workshop on 14 November 2019 for the West Wing Cloakrooms project. Whilst this is a best practice action, the lessons learnt on this project are of importance to bring forward into the collective team and wider organisation.

Aecom had been appointed by City of London (CoL) to act as Project Managers and design consultants. Gleeds are appointed as cost consultants and have concluded the final account for the post project review.

Following an open tender process QOB Ltd were appointed utilising a JCT Design & Build 2016 contract with client specific amendments to undertake the construction works. QOB were also appointed as Principal Designer.

Baily Garner were appointed as the CDM Advisor.

The Works were to provide additional cloakroom and guest facilities to maximise the number of simultaneous events across the Guildhall complex and provide fit for purpose modernised Members facilities (lockers, showers, changing rooms, lavatories). With the following contract details:

- Was based on a JCT Design and Build 2016 (with relevant contract amendments).
- The contract start date was 26 July 2018 and the original contract completion date was 19 October 2018
- The practical completion date was 26 October 2018 following an extension of time for additional unscheduled works.
- The contract sum total is £1,323,165.34 and the anticipated final account is to be agreed after negotiations.

1.2 Workshop Format

The Lessons Learnt workshop was focussed around four key headings, these were:

- What went well?
- What went badly?
- What would you do again?
- What wouldn't you do again?
This was supplemented by a questionnaire focused on different delivery stages of the project
(see Appendix A)
- Start-Up and Design
- Procurement and Construction
- Handover, Operation and User Perspective

The workshop was attended by members of both the Client and Contractor team. All those in attendance discussed and reflected on the above four headings.

Once all parties collectively reviewed and discussed each heading's positives and negatives in terms of priority and means of improving these elements in future projects

which are put forward here as key lessons learned to aid the delivery of future projects.

2.0 What went well?

- Good communication on the project between consultant team, client and contractor
- QOB worked in a collaborative manner and were not adversarial
- Generally, the works progressed well and it was useful having single point of contact on the client team with quick decision making

3.0 What went badly?

- Unexpected services upon demolition: information on the services would have been useful prior to starting work. As a consequence of coming across the existing services there was delay to the works
- Existing building fire strategy was missing which meant the proposed measures had to be incorporated as the works progressed.
- Despite researching and precedent colours to the Guildhall complex the architects didn't present finishes to the satisfaction of officers to allow a Members presentation and an alternative resource was required.

4.0 What would you do again?

- Despite tight tender period the open tender advertisement worked well and delivered a good response and an appropriate resource in QOB
- Post tender value engineering measures allowed some saving to the tender price.

5.0 What wouldn't you do again?

- Retro fitting the powered doors wasn't a straight forward operation and would have been better captured as a requirement before the works.
- The project manager and design team were from the same multi-disciplinary consultant firm whilst there was good communication between the disciplines the project manager lacked oversight and control with the design consultants.

6.0 Scope Requirements

Introduction

As there were significant scope changes in the project a focus of the lessons learned was on scope change this section reviews the project scope detailed

within the Employers Requirements, its suitability to the scheme and how the scope was developed as the project was delivered.

6.1 Positive

- Change control was employed during the project.
- Allowances were included in the project budget which were included in contract by instruction for changes

6.2 Negative

- Prior to works and following delivery of works input from stakeholders resulted in scope changes to the staircase works and powered doors which is linked to the major scope changes.
- Requirement to use clients preferred suppliers, such as Luke Hughes for ambulatory furniture and need to tie into existing BMS supplier resulted in additional cost.
- There was a decision early in the process to retain an existing air handling unit. Following works there have been reported problems with temperature to the female Members changing room and sanitary accommodation.

6.3 Lessons Learnt

- Stakeholder engagement is very important ensure that the scope is well defined in the early stages. A robust scope needs to be fully agreed before proceeding with the project and to be communicated with all project stakeholders. User requirements and extent of works should be fully captured and agreed prior to works being carried out.
- More emphasis should be placed on preconstruction surveys to ascertain building condition. Obtrusive surveys should always be undertaken even if these have to be out of hours.
- If existing services are to be retained a full validation report is to be undertaken and retained on file for the duration of the project.

7.0 Summary

7.1 Pertinent Issues

Below is a summary of the salient issues that were identified on the project which were either considered extremely important or may be a reoccurring problem.

7.2 Lessons learnt

Ref	Issue	Lesson Learnt
1.	Insufficient information on building services	If no accurate or legible information exists and services to be retained MEP services should be surveyed, even if premises occupied, with information stored and managed to inform the later stages of the project.
2.	Retro fitting of powered doors following main works	Capture all user requirements prior to construction.
3	Increasing scope of project	Capture all user requirements prior to construction.
4	Inappropriate finishes specification	Appoint appropriate consultant with specialist services as required.
5	Cold temperature due to retained services	Full validation report to existing services to be commissioned and held on file for the duration of the project.
6	Control and oversight of design team	Appoint project manager independent of the design team.