

Committees: Corporate Projects Board <i>[for information]</i> Streets & Walkways Sub Committee <i>[for decision]</i> Projects Sub Committee <i>[for decision]</i>	Dates: 9 February 2021 18 February 2021 23 February 2021
Subject: 60 – 70 St Mary Axe Unique Project Identifier: 11545	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular
Report of: Director of the Built Environment Report Author: Tom Noble	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	Project Description: Creation of a new public space and wider improved public realm in the vicinity of the 60-70 St Mary Axe development. RAG Status: Green Risk Status: Low Costed Risk Provision Utilised: Not applicable Final Outturn Cost: £1,055,532 (excluding CRP)
2. Next steps and requested decisions	Requested Decisions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Note the contents of this report and authorise closure of the project, and; 2. Authorise the return of £94,030 to the developer under the terms of the Section 278 agreement, subject to verification of final accounts.
3. Key conclusions	3.1 Four key objectives were established in the Gateway 2 report and served as a base for the concept design: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To deliver an enhanced public realm in the vicinity of 60-70 St Mary Axe; • To reflect the objectives of the City Cluster Vision; • To ensure that the required functions of the street are maintained, and; • To improve accessibility for all throughout the area.

	<p>3.2 The project has delivered against all of the objectives. The project has improved the public realm in the vicinity of the development, particularly on St Mary Axe where a new public space has been created in place of a former section of carriageway.</p> <p>3.3 Pedestrian and cyclist priority has been improved and greenery was introduced, meeting some of the objectives of the City Cluster Vision and ensuring accessibility through the project area was improved. Impacts on other user groups has been neutral.</p> <p>3.4 The project has been delivered within budget and with an overall delay to substantial completion of approximately two months. The delay was due to a slightly late handover of the site from the developer, and the presence of structures beneath the footway which had not been identified. Final carriageway resurfacing works to Bevis Marks were carried out after substantial completion in order to coordinate with other project and utility works, thereby minimising disruption to the highway network.</p>
--	--

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

4. Design into delivery	<p>4.1 Preliminary design options were produced by a landscape architect in liaison with the developer. The detailed design was conducted in-house and incorporated the initial proposals, and the final scheme retained the design principles as set out at Gateway 3.</p>
5. Options appraisal	<p>5.1 Three options were presented at Gateway 3. These ranged in scale, from relatively simple repaving of the existing layout, through to partial and full pedestrianisation of St Mary Axe. The option of full pedestrianisation was recommended and approved, ensuring that the main project objectives could be fully achieved.</p> <p>5.2 This option contributed to successful, early delivery against wider objectives set out in the City Cluster Vision and the Transport Strategy. It was also the preferred option of the key project stakeholders, and on reflection was the correct option to select.</p>
6. Procurement route	<p>6.1 The landscape architect was procured via an open tender, conducted through the City's established procurement procedure, and was selected based on quality and value for money. This</p>

	proved to be a useful and worthwhile appointment, generating new ideas that could be progressed to detailed design and delivery.
7. Skills base	7.1 Aside from the initial concept designs, the project was largely delivered using existing in-house resources. The project team was led by the Transportation & Public Realm Division and included officers from the Open Spaces department. The works were undertaken by the City's term highways contractor.
8. Stakeholders	8.1 The key external stakeholders (i.e. developer and architect) were involved throughout the project via regular design & progress meetings. 8.2. Other stakeholders consisted of local occupiers, who were engaged during the design process and throughout the construction phase. Fortnightly e-bulletins were circulated during the construction works.

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	Key dates (planned)	Key dates (actual)
	Practical completion of development: December 2018	February 2019
	Construction of St Mary Axe: October 2018 – January 2019	October 2018 to March 2019
	Construction of Goring Street: December 2018 – January 2019	December 2018 to March 2019
	Construction of Houndsditch and Bevis Marks: December 2018 – March 2019	December 2018 to March 2019. The resurfacing element was delayed to late 2020 in order to coordinate with other nearby works.
10. Assessment of project against Scope	10.1 The project successfully delivered against the criteria set out at Gateway 2. No significant changes to scope were required during the design or implementation stages; this can be attributed to coherent project governance, which meant that key decisions were taken collectively and decisively.	
11. Risks and issues	11.1 The majority of project risks were mitigated and did not materialise. One risk which did become an issue related to sub-surface structures; whilst the discovery of redundant basement structures did cause a small delay the delivery of one phase of the works, officers were able to reconfigure certain elements of the	

	works which meant that the issue did not impact on the overall programme. 11.2 Costed risk was not utilised during this project.
12. Transition to BAU	12.1 Not applicable.

Value Review

13. Budget	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i></td> <td>Estimated cost (including risk): £650,000 - £700,000</td> </tr> </table>		<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	Estimated cost (including risk): £650,000 - £700,000																																		
	<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	Estimated cost (including risk): £650,000 - £700,000																																				
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i></th> <th><i>Final Outturn Cost</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Pre-evaluation</i></td> <td>£195,430</td> <td>£106,617</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Highways Staff Costs</i></td> <td>£91,000</td> <td>£122,444</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>CT & CPR Staff Costs</i></td> <td>£40,000</td> <td>£83,305</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Open Spaces Staff Costs</i></td> <td>£5,102</td> <td>£5,102</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Hard Landscaping</i></td> <td>£437,786</td> <td>£449,703</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Soft Landscaping</i></td> <td>£8,782</td> <td>£9,567</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Fees</i></td> <td>£36,547</td> <td>£29,959</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Lighting</i></td> <td>£24,000</td> <td>£23,524</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Utilities</i></td> <td>£167,500</td> <td>£81,897</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Maintenance*</i></td> <td>£143,414</td> <td>£143,414</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>£1,149,561</td> <td>£1,055,532</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>	<i>Pre-evaluation</i>	£195,430	£106,617	<i>Highways Staff Costs</i>	£91,000	£122,444	<i>CT & CPR Staff Costs</i>	£40,000	£83,305	<i>Open Spaces Staff Costs</i>	£5,102	£5,102	<i>Hard Landscaping</i>	£437,786	£449,703	<i>Soft Landscaping</i>	£8,782	£9,567	<i>Fees</i>	£36,547	£29,959	<i>Lighting</i>	£24,000	£23,524	<i>Utilities</i>	£167,500	£81,897	<i>Maintenance*</i>	£143,414	£143,414	Total	£1,149,561	£1,055,532
		<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>																																			
	<i>Pre-evaluation</i>	£195,430	£106,617																																			
	<i>Highways Staff Costs</i>	£91,000	£122,444																																			
	<i>CT & CPR Staff Costs</i>	£40,000	£83,305																																			
	<i>Open Spaces Staff Costs</i>	£5,102	£5,102																																			
	<i>Hard Landscaping</i>	£437,786	£449,703																																			
	<i>Soft Landscaping</i>	£8,782	£9,567																																			
	<i>Fees</i>	£36,547	£29,959																																			
	<i>Lighting</i>	£24,000	£23,524																																			
	<i>Utilities</i>	£167,500	£81,897																																			
<i>Maintenance*</i>	£143,414	£143,414																																				
Total	£1,149,561	£1,055,532																																				
<p>The final account for this project has not been verified.</p> <p>Increases in staff costs since G5 resulted from additional work required on site to address unidentified structural issues beneath the surface, coordination with other works in the area, addressing detailed design issues and managing the extended works programme. The majority of the increase was made available from an underspend in the pre-evaluation stage.</p> <p><i>*The maintenance figure is not included in the financial tables at Appendix 4 as this relates to revenue expenditure.</i></p>																																						
14. Investment	14.1 Not applicable.																																					
15. Assessment of project against	15.1 Specific SMART objectives were not established for the project. However, as noted in Section 3 of this report, the project																																					

SMART objectives	<p>successfully delivered against the four main objectives as set out at Gateway 2.</p> <p>15.2 The project did successfully contribute to DBE Business Plan Key Performance Indicators, specifically the addition of green infrastructure and an increase in pedestrian-priority street space.</p>
16. Key benefits realised	<p>16.1 The project delivered a new, pedestrian-priority space at the northern end of St Mary Axe. This space is a gateway into the City Cluster and has therefore contributed to the delivery of key objectives of the City Cluster Vision and the Transport Strategy – namely increasing the amount of pedestrian-priority street space, and encouraging pedestrian movement away from the main north-south axis (i.e. Bishopsgate).</p>

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

17. Positive reflections	<p>17.1 The successful delivery of the project was founded on a positive relationship with the developer, who fully funded the works through a Section 278 agreement. By involving the developer from the outset and demonstrating the added value that could be achieved, the scope of the project was expanded to include full pedestrianisation of St Mary Axe, which was beyond the requirements established in the associated Section 106 agreement. The completed scheme has since been used by the developer as a key selling point of the new building.</p> <p>17.2 Although the project pre-dates the adoption of the Transport Strategy, the design broadly adheres to the Healthy Streets principles. The space was also designed to incorporate public art as part of the Sculpture in the City initiative (the developer is a partner of SITC), and the existing artwork within the planters has subsequently been purchased by the developer.</p> <p>17.3 As noted above the scheme has been delivered within the agreed budget. Agreeing the design principles and objectives at an early stage helped to focus the project team, which in turn reduced the need for lengthy negotiations on items such as scope, design details etc.</p>
18. Improvement reflections	18.1 None.
19. Sharing best practice	19.1 Best practice is shared routinely through internal design review meetings.
20. AOB	20.1 None.

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
Appendix 2	Plan of project area
Appendix 3	Before & after photographs
Appendix 4	Finance tables

Contact

Report Author	Tom Noble
Email Address	tom.noble@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	07597 425 907