

Committees: Corporate Projects Board - <i>for information</i> Projects Sub [<i>for decision</i>] Open Spaces & City Gardens [<i>for decision</i>]	Dates: 31 March 2021 17 May 2021 27 April 2021
Subject: Bunhill Fields Heritage Lottery Fund project Unique Project Identifier: 11944	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular
Report of: Director of Open Spaces Report Author: Madhur Gurjar	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: This project was to deliver works as described in the Cyclical Works Programme (CWP) and bring necessary landscape improvement works required for the site forward if successful at Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) funding application. The proposals included conservation works, tree works, restoration of the 1960s landscape, enhancements to biodiversity and accessibility of the site, refurbishment of toilets and retrofitting the yard to form a public activity space and coffee concession.</p> <p>RAG Status: Red (Amber at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Risk Status: Medium (Medium at last report to committee)</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: None</p> <p>Final Outturn Cost: £56,015</p>
2. Next steps and requested decisions	<p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approve the content of this outcome report. 2. Agree to close this project.
3. Key conclusions	<p>HLF have acknowledged that this was a well- planned project which would offer good quality restoration, learning and training proposals but were unable to fund the Project due to insufficient</p>

	<p>funds. HLF have suggested rescoping the Project to reduce the funding ask that would strike an improved balance with match funding made jointly available by the City and London Borough of Islington. Following this unsuccessful funding application, HLF have made significant changes to their funding programmes in 2019. 2019 was also the year when the City commenced a fundamental review of all its projects, putting a hold on this Project. Considering the ongoing Covid pandemic since 2020, getting external funding has become unfeasible and this Project is no longer a priority project for the Department and hence the request to close the Project.</p>
--	--

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

<p>4. Design into delivery</p>	<p>The design team selected have significant experience in understanding historic sensitive landscapes, therefore the feasibility stage proposals produced following community and stakeholder engagement were effective and HLF thought that they were well planned. A lot of positive comments were also received from the public via the engagement process.</p>
<p>5. Options appraisal</p>	<p>The Project did not progress to options appraisal stage.</p>
<p>6. Procurement route</p>	<p>Design consultants were procured via open tender, with invitations sent to select consultants. (ITT_COL_7690)</p>
<p>7. Skills base</p>	<p>External consultants with specific design skills to work within a historic landscape were engaged. The in-house project team had the necessary skills to ensure the project was delivered satisfactorily. This included appraisal and challenge of the feasibility study and emerging design ideas and managing external stakeholders.</p>
<p>8. Stakeholders</p>	<p>Stakeholders were identified and engaged through regular meetings, emails and site visits. In addition, we produced illustrative site information panels ahead of the HLF application submission.</p> <p>The key stakeholders were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - London Borough of Islington - Heritage Lottery Fund - Historic England - The City Surveyor - The City Gardens Team - Local Primary Schools in Bunhill Ward <p>Other Local stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wesley Chapel and Museum of Methodism

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Friends of City Gardens - Residents from Islington Council-owned social housing in south Islington - City Garden Walks, who have a wealth of knowledge of Bunhill Fields and Burial Ground - Clerkenwell & Islington Guides Association who provide heritage walks and tours of the area - Families First, an Islington Council service who supports families in need across the borough - Bright Start Children’s Centres Golden Lane and Morelands - St Luke’s Community Centre that works with all aspects of the South Islington community focusing on the E1 postcode in which Bunhill sits. - Members of the public who attended the drop in consultation on site. <p>All the organisations and individuals consulted showed great interest in the project. There was a universal enthusiasm about the potential it offers communities to engage more meaningfully with the site through improved environment, programming, interpretation and a learning space.</p>
--	---

Variation Review

<p>9. Assessment of project against key milestones</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">Key Milestones</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">G2</td> <td style="width: 55%;">HLF First Round bid- Aug 2018</td> <td style="width: 30%;">Achieved</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>HLF First Round decision- Dec 2018</td> <td>Received (Unsuccessful)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>At Gateway 2- The project funding was subject to success at securing funding from HLF. If successful it was anticipated that options appraisal would have been presented at Gateway 4 in winter/ spring 2019/20 with the view to submit a second-round bid to HLF in Autumn 2020. With an unsuccessful first round application, further progress on the Project was halted after G2.</p> <p>One of the key deliverables of the Project was to update the Conservation Management Plan for the site, which was completed by the City Surveyor in 2020 and will be reported to the relevant committee in due course.</p>	Key Milestones			G2	HLF First Round bid- Aug 2018	Achieved		HLF First Round decision- Dec 2018	Received (Unsuccessful)
Key Milestones										
G2	HLF First Round bid- Aug 2018	Achieved								
	HLF First Round decision- Dec 2018	Received (Unsuccessful)								
<p>10. Assessment of project against Scope</p>	<p>Feedback from HLF suggests that our ask for funding was high in comparison to the match funding provided jointly by the City and Islington. We had taken a whole-site approach to enable all the proposals to be implemented as one. This is because many of the</p>									

	proposals depend on another aspect of the project to succeed. This was also in line with the HLF funding programme which required specific outcomes for communities (activity and a learning based programme in the refurbished existing maintenance yard space), environment (improvements to the 20 th C landscape/ public open space) and the heritage (conservation of memorials) to be achieved all at once.
11.Risks and issues	<p>One of the identified risks was failure to secure HLF funding- which materialised and as such the project could not be implemented without this level of external funding.</p> <p>An unidentified risk in the form of the City's Fundamental Review came into force in 2019 when the Project was put on hold. It would have been possible to rescope the project in line with HLF comments for a funding bid resubmission. Immediately following the decision on our application HLF undertook a review of their funding programmes and effectively put applications for funding on hold for one year. This was also an unidentified eventuality. Conservation works to the memorials are being carried out by the City Surveyor. Issues with the landscape remain i.e. restricted access, lack of accessible interpretation, worsening of shade problems, poor drainage of the paths, inaccessible toilets.</p>
12. Transition to BAU	N/A

Value Review

13. Budget	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i></td> <td>Estimated cost (including risk) to reach next Gateway: £68K</td> </tr> </table>		<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	Estimated cost (including risk) to reach next Gateway: £68K										
	<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	Estimated cost (including risk) to reach next Gateway: £68K												
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><i>Funds approved at (G2) to progress to next G3</i></th> <th><i>Final Outturn Cost*</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Fees</i></td> <td>£50K</td> <td>£38K</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Staff Costs</i></td> <td>£18K</td> <td>£18K</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Total</i></td> <td>£68K</td> <td>£56K</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<i>Funds approved at (G2) to progress to next G3</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost*</i>	<i>Fees</i>	£50K	£38K	<i>Staff Costs</i>	£18K	£18K	<i>Total</i>	£68K	£56K
		<i>Funds approved at (G2) to progress to next G3</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost*</i>											
	<i>Fees</i>	£50K	£38K											
<i>Staff Costs</i>	£18K	£18K												
<i>Total</i>	£68K	£56K												
* A Final Account for this project has not been verified by the Chamberlain's Financial Services division.														
14. Investment	N/A													

15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives	<p>The Project did not progress beyond feasibility stage and identified Smart objectives for landscape conservation and improved learning and interpretation of the site remain unrealised. However, memorial conservation and updating the Conservation Management Plan have been progressed by the City Surveyor.</p>
16. Key benefits realised	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feasibility study produced as a part of the Project remains relevant and landscape issues remain outstanding. If funding is available in the future, outcome of the Feasibility Study can be revisited.

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

17. Positive reflections	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Joined up working with Islington Council as a financial project partner worked well on paper where a portion of match funding was agreed as a contribution. This made the project attractive to HLF funding programme. However, there was tension in setting the objectives of the project to deliver needs of the local Islington residents, meet City's aims and at the same time deliver outcomes as expected by HLF. Agreement on the objectives was sought by consistent engagement with Islington and HLF. 2. One of the key aims of the Project was to reduce future maintenance liabilities of the City by completing the necessary improvement works all at once. Rescoping the project in the future to only deliver the landscape improvements funded by the City could be advocated. This will not only reduce maintenance liabilities but also improve physical and intellectual accessibility of the site to the benefit of the community. Other outcomes for communities as required by HLF and Islington by way of a learning programme could be rescoped due to lack of funding and other resources. This outcome required refurbishing the existing yard building to create a classroom/ rentable space for community use. This refurbishment to building that resulted in a large grant ask to HLF is a non-urgent improvement to the quality and offer of the site. 3. The quality of consultants procured to produce the feasibility works had excellent understanding of the site and experience in dealing with stakeholders. They were procured via open tender but invitations sent to a shortlist. 4. A high level of support was provided to the project team by the City Surveyor and City Solicitor officers
---------------------------------	---

18.Improvement reflections	Our funding bid was thought to be well planned but refused due to lack of funds. Reducing/ modifying the scope of the project outcomes and improving the balance between the grant request to match fund available could have enhanced our chances of success if a resubmission was possible.
19. Sharing best practice	Experience from this project exercise will be useful in any future National Lottery Grant bids and can be widely shared with other City Open Spaces future bids.
20. AOB	None

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
Appendix 2	Feasibility Study for restoring Bunhill Fields Burial Ground
Appendix 3	

Contact

Report Author	Madhur Gurjar
Email Address	Madhur.gurjar@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	