

<p>Committees: Hampstead Heath Consultative Committee – <i>for information (email)</i> Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood & Queen’s Park Committee – <i>for decision</i> Operational Property and Projects Sub Committee – <i>for decision</i></p>	<p>Dates: 07 June 2022 15 June 2022 21 June 2022</p>
<p>Subject: <i>Hampstead Heath Swimming Facilities - Safety, Access and Security Improvements</i></p> <p>Unique Project Identifier: 12265 CS 186/22</p>	<p>Gateway 3/4: Options Appraisal (Regular)</p>
<p>Report of: Joint report of the Executive Director of Environment & the City Surveyor</p> <p>Report Author: Edwin Birch</p>	<p>For Decision</p>
<h1>PUBLIC</h1>	

<p>1. Status update</p>	<p>Project Description: <i>Capital Project to implement safety, access and security works across the four Hampstead Heath Swimming Facilities.</i></p> <p>RAG Status: Amber (Red at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Risk Status: Low (Low at last report to committee)</p> <p>Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): £691,245 or £755,000 (<i>including risk</i>)</p> <p>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk): a decrease of £5,755 since last report to Committee (Gateway 2) which reported a Total Estimated Cost of £697,000, (excluding risk).</p> <p>Funding Source: In principle’ approval of up to £755k of central funding from City’s Cash resources was agreed as part of the 2021/22 annual capital bids.</p> <p>Spent & Committed to Date: £72,284 (<i>current underspend is due to slippage as several consultants are invoicing at the completion or RIBA stages as opposed to monthly</i>)</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: £0</p>
--------------------------------	--

	<p>Slippage: No slippage since last report. Overall slippage: + 27 weeks or 4.8% from the original Gateway 2 programme (as reported and approved in January/February 2022). The programme slippage does not currently affect the original estimated practical completion date of May 2023.</p>																
<p>2. Next steps and requested decisions</p>	<p>Next Gateway: <i>Gateway 5: Authority to Start Work</i></p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed Design (RIBA 4) • Tendering for a main contractor <p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That additional budget of £30,700 is approved to reach the next Gateway 2. Note the revised project budget of £163,700 (excluding risk) 3. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £691,245 (excluding risk) 4. That a Costed Risk Provision of £27,000 is approved to reach the next Gateway (to be drawn down via delegation to City Surveyor) 5. That Option 2 is progressed as the only viable option 6. Note that a minor planning application was submitted on 7th June 2022 																
<p>3. Resource requirements to reach next Gateway</p>	<p><i>For recommended Option 2:</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="528 1200 1390 1666"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item</th> <th>Reason</th> <th>Funds/ Source of Funding</th> <th>Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Professional Fees</td> <td>To support RIBA 4/ procurement</td> <td>City Cash</td> <td>£15,700</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Surveys</td> <td>To support RIBA 4</td> <td>City Cash</td> <td>£15,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><u>£30,700</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway: £27,000 (as detailed in the Risk Register – Appendix 2). This is to cover the risk of the additional surveys or unforeseen delays with the planning application to help reach Gateway 5.</p>	Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)	Professional Fees	To support RIBA 4/ procurement	City Cash	£15,700	Surveys	To support RIBA 4	City Cash	£15,000	Total			<u>£30,700</u>
Item	Reason	Funds/ Source of Funding	Cost (£)														
Professional Fees	To support RIBA 4/ procurement	City Cash	£15,700														
Surveys	To support RIBA 4	City Cash	£15,000														
Total			<u>£30,700</u>														
<p>4. Overview of project options</p>	<p>Due to the non-complex nature of the scope of works, it has not been possible to put forward multiple options. The scope of works was set out in the project brief. Where design options required feedback, these were explored with user groups via</p>																

	<p>online and in person engagement sessions to be able to submit the best option.</p> <p>Since the Gateway 2 report (April 21), the design team have been progressing RIBA 2 & 3 and include:</p> <p>Highgate Men's Bathing Pond</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new light-weight compound on the edge of the water to house additional accessible changing facilities. • WC block to be reconfigured • Installation of a fixed specialist hoist for wheelchair users. • A new, larger window within the lifeguard's hut • Keeping the open plan changing area to maintain accessible changing facilities. <p>Kenwood Ladies' Bathing Pond</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving the layout of the changing facilities to be more accessible. <p>Hampstead Mixed Bathing Pond</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating wheelchair and ambulant accessible changing, showering and toilet facilities by extending the existing WC block • Creating wheelchair access to water via a new ramp • Full rewire (small power and lighting)
<p>5. Recommended option</p>	<p>Option 1 - Do nothing - not recommended</p> <p>Option 2 - Recommended (as per matrix below)</p>
<p>6. Risk</p>	<p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised at Last Gateway: £0</p> <p>Change in Costed Risk: +£5,755 (post-mitigation). Gateway 2 Costed Risk (post-mitigation) was £58,000 whereas the Gateway 3/4 Costed Risk (post-mitigation) is now £63,755</p> <p>Further information available in the Risk Register (Appendix 2)</p>
<p>7. Procurement approach</p>	<p>The current Design team will be retained.</p> <p>The main contractor procurement strategy proposes a single stage traditional, without quantities tender route with elements of Contractor's Design Portion.</p> <p>Framework options such as the minor works framework will be explored initially to find a suitable main contractor. An alternative option will be an open tender approach with the use of a pass/fail question to act a filter.</p>

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
Appendix 2	Cost Book
Appendix 3	Risk Register
Appendix 4	PT4 Procurement Form

Contact

Report Author	Edwin Birch
Email Address	Edwin.Birch@Cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	0207 332 1030

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

Options Appraisal Matrix

Option Summary	Option 2	
<p>1. Brief description of option</p>	<p>Following a full review of the Hampstead Heath Swimming Facilities, a series of Capital Works necessary to improve safety, access and security across the Swimming Facilities were identified. The objective is to create inclusive layouts at the Bathing Ponds which will enable ambulant disabled and wheelchair users to enjoy these unique bathing facilities.</p> <p>The locations where works have been considered are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highgate Men's Bathing Pond 2. Hampstead Mixed Bathing Pond 3. Kenwood Ladies' Bathing Pond 4. Parliament Hill Fields Lido & Complex <p>The key project aim across all the locations is that the facilities are fit for purpose, taking account of the increase in visitor numbers, along with ensuring the configuration and layout is adapted to enable bathing load to be managed more effectively while ensuring the swimming facilities are welcoming to a diverse range of visitors.</p>	
<p>2. Scope and exclusions</p>	<p>Highgate Men's Bathing Pond</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various arrival Improvements • Provision of a new, longer window in the lifeguard's hut • New changing facilities and the reconfigure of the accessible Toilet <p>Hampstead Mixed Bathing Pond</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving the male and female changing facilities • Improving lifeguards' facilities including the observation hut and first aid space 	

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

Option Summary	Option 2	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security improvements • Full electrical upgrade including 3-phase power supply <p>Kenwood Ladies' Bathing Pond</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various arrival Improvements • Reconfigure Accessible Toilet <p><i>NB: Exclusions include reported issues of damp/mould, drainage & minor structural work.</i></p> <p>Lido Complex</p> <p>Minor works to male and female showers – M&E works to install better ventilation and minor cable renationalisation to an isolated area above the café roof.</p>	
Project Planning		
<p>3. Programme and key dates</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gateway 3/4 (June 22), • Tender (July 22), • Gateway 5 (October 22), • Practical Completion (May 23) • Gateway 6 (September 23) 	
<p>4. Risk implications</p>	<p>Overall project option risk: Low</p> <p><i>After mitigation actions it is anticipated the remaining major risks will be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost increases. • Work sequence & Access 	

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

Option Summary	Option 2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Stakeholder Engagement</i> • <i>Wildlife and protected species</i> <p>Further information available within the Risk Register (Appendix 2).</p>
<p>5. Stakeholders and consultees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Chamberlains, Town Clerks, Environment & City Surveyor's Department</i> • <i>Heath Swimming Community</i> • <i>Swimming Associations (7)</i> • <i>Hampstead Heath Sports and Wellbeing Forum</i> • <i>Hampstead Heath Consultative Committee</i>
<p>6. Benefits of option</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The facilities being fit for purpose particularly during the summer months, taking account of the increase in visitor numbers, and the impact on Lifeguards managing the bathing load and the facilities.</i> • <i>The perimeter security is of a standard to prevent unauthorised access.</i> • <i>The facilitates configuration and layout is adapted to enable the bathing load to be managed more effectively.</i> • <i>Ensuring the swimming facilities are welcoming to a diverse range of visitors.</i>

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

Option Summary	Option 2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Utilising vacant space at the lido will contribute to the running costs of the charity through new income generation opportunities.</i> • <i>The project contributes to objectives, set out in the Hampstead Heath high level asset management plan 2019-21.</i>
7. Disbenefits of option	<p><i>The only potential disbenefit is a short term one in that during the delivery period, some disruption may be encountered to the swimming ponds. However, the impact is lessened due the delivery being completed in the off-peak season and a 'phasing plan' being considered to allow normal swimming to continue where possible.</i></p>
Resource Implications	
8. Total estimated cost	<p>Total estimated cost (excluding risk): £691,245</p> <p>Total estimated cost: (including risk): £755,000</p>
9. Funding strategy	<p><i>'In principle' approval of up to £755k of central funding from City's Cash resources was agreed as part of the 2021/22 annual capital bids. Further approval of the</i></p>

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

Option Summary	Option 2
	<i>Resource Allocation Sub-Committee is required to draw down the funds.</i>
10. Investment appraisal	N/A
11. Estimated capital value/return	N/A
12. Ongoing revenue implications	<i>Forward maintenance requirements have been identified in conjunction with the design and various M&E standard specification. The ongoing servicing and repair of these items will be incorporated into the existing Building, Repairs and Maintenance and Cyclical Work Programmes as appropriate.</i>
13. Affordability	N/A
14. Legal implications	As the swimming ponds are reservoirs, all work must comply with the Reservoirs Act 1975 and the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. Designs will be developed in consultation with the DBE Engineering Team and supervision of works will be provided as required.”

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

Option Summary	Option 2
15. Corporate property implications	<i>This project aligns with the Corporate Property Asset Management Strategy 2020-25 to ensure that operational assets are maintained in good, safe and statutory compliant condition. Any works will include the need to secure listed building consent, as required, in respect to Parliament Hill Fields Lido.</i>
16. Traffic implications	<i>None</i>
17. Sustainability and energy implications	<i>The design of the new changing facility follows the Mayor of London's energy hierarchy along with be compliant with the City Climate Action Strategy.</i>
18. IS implications	<i>N/A to this project.</i>
19. Equality Impact Assessment	<i>A Test of Relevance was completed in 2021 and a full Equality Analysis was deemed not required at Stage 2. Now that the design has been developed in more detail with further stakeholder engagement, a further test or relevance is being carried out by Natural Environment Division.</i>

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

Option Summary	Option 2
20. Data Protection Impact Assessment	<i>The risk to personal data is less than high or non-applicable and a data protection impact assessment will not be undertaken.</i>
21. Recommendation	Recommended