

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Committees:</b><br>Finance and Risk Committee of the Barbican Board <i>for decision</i><br>Barbican Centre Board <i>for information</i><br>Projects and Procurement Sub Committee <i>for information</i> | <b>Dates:</b><br>01 July 2024<br><br>17 July 2024<br>15 July 2024 |
| <b>Subject:</b><br>Car Park & Other Signage Phase 3 (02800100)<br><br><b>Unique Project Identifier:</b><br>11518  | <b>Gateway 6:</b><br><b>Outcome Report</b><br>Light               |
| <b>Report of:</b><br>Barbican Centre<br><b>Report Author:</b><br>Alice Lassey   | <b>For Decision</b>   |
| <b>PUBLIC</b>   |   |

### Summary

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>1. Status update</b>                      | <p><b>Project Description:</b> <i>Phase 3 of the signage project aimed to align the external signage at the Centre's entrances with its new visual identity, introduced in 2012. This was an important part of the centre's brand management strategy, ensuring all audience touchpoints were in keeping with the new look and removing old branding that now looked dated.</i></p> <p><b>RAG Status:</b> Green (Green at last report to committee)</p> <p><b>Risk Status:</b> Low (Low at last report to committee)</p> <p><b>Costed Risk Provision Utilised:</b> CRP had not been introduced to the project when this project entered the gateway process.</p> <p><b>Final Outturn Cost:</b> £96,979.00</p> |
| <b>2. Next steps and requested decisions</b> | <p><b>Requested Decisions:</b></p> <p>To note the lessons learned section of this report and approve formal closure of this project.</p>  |
| <b>3. Key conclusions</b>                    | <p>The project was completed on time and to budget.</p> <p>The success criteria stated in the Gateway 1/2 Report was the 'replacement or modification of specific external signage to align with the Barbican's new visual identity, giving an up-to-date, consistent image across the Barbican Centre and its</p>  |

communication materials. [There is a] clear image of the Barbican brand to patrons across all platforms.' On assessment of the project outcomes, it is fair to say that this criteria has been met, if to a somewhat limited degree.

Of the eight signs identified for replacement in this project, only six were in fact replaced, due to significant objection to the replacement of the historical 4Bs signage outside Silk Street entrance and in the Sculpture Court. As a result, there is significant brand consistency across signage in major public use areas – such as lakeside, the main Silk Street entrance, and the entrance to Beech Street cinemas. However, the heritage branding still remains in prominent areas, and consequently key opportunities to further reinforce the Barbican brand in the minds of visitors are missed.

In addition, it is worth noting that the aim to provide a 'clear image of the Barbican brand to patrons across all platforms' was from the start a goal that was not fully achievable in a project with as limited a scope as this one. Though arguably the most important signage has been replaced, as of 2024, the previous 'orange circle' branding still remains on signage such as the freestanding sign outside Beech Street cinemas and the donation point beside the entrance to the Curve Gallery. The even older '4Bs' branding is visible not only in the signs intended to be replaced, but also on glass doors in Frobisher Crescent, and the brass sign by the Sculpture Court Conservatory entrance.

The six signs that were successfully installed were installed later than the planned dates stated on the Gateway 5 report, which stated works would be completed by June 2017. In fact, the works did not *begin* until approximately 2<sup>nd</sup> November that year, based on the date the Authority to Start on Site form was signed. This is a notable delay, but not one that appears to have had particular negative impact on the project.

For future projects, it is recommended that, where applicable, residents' views are taken into consideration from the very beginning of the project to avoid the setbacks this project encountered. At the least, this would avoid wasting resources on projects or elements of projects that could not gain planning approval, and at best could potentially allow for the creation of a plan that would be agreed upon by all parties. In addition, the repetition in the resident's objection letters of the fact that they do not trust the Centre to stick to the proposed times for the illumination of the Silk Street sign speaks to a serious lack of

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | trust that it would be in the Centre’s interest to fix. This is a long-term issue that requires a long-term solution, but the aforementioned early consultation could tie into any strategy regarding building trust with the Barbican residents. |
|--|---|

**Main Report**

**Design & Delivery Review**

|                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <p><b>4. Design into delivery</b></p> | <p>The design for signs 1-5 and 8 were adequately prepared for the delivery of this project. The designs for signs 6 and 7 were not, as they were considered unacceptable to a significant number of residents, whose complaints eventually led to the withdrawal of the application for listed building consent (LBC). Complaints largely had two themes: a feeling that the original ‘4Bs’ signs were ‘iconic’ and ‘fit the character of the estate,’ and replacing them would take away part of the centre’s heritage; and that the signs being illuminated would contribute to light pollution and shine unwanted light into the flats of Defoe House.</p> <p>It is possible that earlier consultation with residents could have led to the creation of a design more acceptable to them, and that less complaints being received would have allowed LBC to be granted. However, this is far from certain, as the Centre’s attempts to find a compromise – such as keeping the original ‘4Bs’ sign intact and displayed in a different location – were considered unacceptable to the residents; keeping the original sign as the residents wished was diametrically opposed to the project’s aim of unifying the Centre’s branding.</p> |
| <p><b>5. Options appraisal</b></p>    | <p>The Gateway 1/2 report outlined possible options for this project. The recommended and accepted option (Option 2) was to replace only key external signage with the new Barbican branding. Another option was to replace all external signage, which naturally would have fulfilled the project aims more fully. That said, once the key external signage identified in Option 2 were replaced, it is likely the replacement of further signs would have resulted in diminishing returns, due to their lesser prominence throughout the centre. Therefore, the chosen option is considered an efficient compromise to balance fulfilment of the project aims with value for money for the Centre.</p> <p>The effectiveness of this option was decreased by scope change when the LBC application was withdrawn as a result of resident complaints. This outcome would be unchanged had the more comprehensive Option 3 been chosen instead.</p>   |

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>6. Procurement route</b> | <p>Services were procured through a tendering process. Four tenders were received and were assessed on a quality/price matrix of 60:40. Of the four suppliers, John Anthony Signs ranked third of four on price, but were first by a significant lead on quality. Therefore, John Anthony Signs were awarded the contract.</p> <p>No procurement reference number could be found for this project.</p>   |
| <b>7. Skills base</b>       | <p>The City of London project team had the required skills and experience to deliver this project. The consultants and contractors similarly had the required skills and expertise to carry out these works satisfactorily.</p>  |
| <b>8. Stakeholders</b>      | <p>Stakeholders noted in the Gateway 1/2 report were managed well and pleased with the results of the project.</p> <p>Residents of the Barbican Estate were not noted as a stakeholder in the Gateway 1/2 report, but it was the complaints of this group that eventually lead to the project being closed prematurely. It is possible, though far from assured, that a more proactive approach to involving residents may have identified these issues earlier, potentially allowing for mitigation efforts to be undertaken.</p> |

### Variation Review

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>9. Assessment of project against key milestones</b> | <p>The expected completion date at Gateway 5 was November 2017; in actuality, no works were completed <i>after</i> this date, but a significant portion of the planned programme did not go ahead, with two of the eight signs being abandoned after a lengthy planning process. This was a result of the unexpectedly large volume of objections received in response to the application for listed building consent for signs 6 and 7. This application was eventually withdrawn in 2020.</p> <p>This outcome report has been further delayed by approximately four years as a result of staff turnaround, with a number of projects having their final account and outcome reports outstanding at the time of their project manger's departure. This created a backlog of work that was low priority during a time of reduced staff numbers, as well as complicating matters as new project managers have been required to complete these without pre-existing knowledge of the project. This has required extra time to read through reports and correspondence to gain an accurate picture of the project and its outcomes.</p> |
| <b>10. Assessment of project against Scope</b>         | <p>The project was completed to scope with the sizable exception of the eventual exclusion of signs 6 and 7, abandoned after a large volume of complaints from residents made LBC approval unlikely.</p>   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | The result is that the external branding remains inconsistent, though to a lesser extent than before the project.   |
| <b>11. Risks and issues</b>  | <p>When applying for listed building consent, the City of London Planning department raised the likelihood of residents objecting to the new signs, especially in regard to the illumination on some of them. However, though this risk was identified, it was likely underestimated; it was not foreseen that the objections would be of a number to make the application untenable. These complaints led to the application for signs 6 and 7 being withdrawn.</p> <p>The effect was that only six of the originally planned eight signs were installed as part of the project, meaning the original aim of unifying the Centre's branding across the main external signage has not been as fully realised as if these signs were able to be part of the works.</p> |
| <b>12. Transition to BAU</b> | <p>The project had a clear plan for transfer to business as usual. The areas in which works were carried out were available for use immediately after the contractors' departure.</p> <p>The powered lights are to be maintained by the Barbican centre engineering department.</p>   |

### Value Review

| <b>13. Budget</b>  | <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>Fees</i></td> <td><i>£56,415</i></td> <td><i>£44,439</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Works</i></td> <td><i>£68,088</i></td> <td><i>£52,540</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b><i>Total</i></b></td> <td><b><i>£124,503</i></b></td> <td><b><i>£96,979</i></b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Staff Costs</i></td> <td><i>£12,000</i></td> <td><i>£0</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |  |                           |  | <i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i> | <i>Final Outturn Cost</i> | <i>Fees</i> | <i>£56,415</i> | <i>£44,439</i> | <i>Works</i> | <i>£68,088</i> | <i>£52,540</i> | <b><i>Total</i></b> | <b><i>£124,503</i></b> | <b><i>£96,979</i></b> | <i>Staff Costs</i> | <i>£12,000</i> | <i>£0</i> |
|--|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------|
|  |   | <i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i> | <i>Final Outturn Cost</i> |  |  |                           |             |                |                |              |                |                |                     |                        |                       |                    |                |           |
|  | <i>Fees</i>   | <i>£56,415</i>                         | <i>£44,439</i>            |  |  |                           |             |                |                |              |                |                |                     |                        |                       |                    |                |           |
|  | <i>Works</i>  | <i>£68,088</i>                         | <i>£52,540</i>            |  |  |                           |             |                |                |              |                |                |                     |                        |                       |                    |                |           |
|  | <b><i>Total</i></b>   | <b><i>£124,503</i></b>                 | <b><i>£96,979</i></b>     |  |  |                           |             |                |                |              |                |                |                     |                        |                       |                    |                |           |
|  | <i>Staff Costs</i>  | <i>£12,000</i>                         | <i>£0</i>                 |  |  |                           |             |                |                |              |                |                |                     |                        |                       |                    |                |           |
| <p>This projects was funded from City Fund as part of the Capital Cap Programme. Staff costs were not recorded for this project.</p> <p><b>Please confirm whether or not the Final Account for this project has been verified.*</b></p> <p>The Final Account for this project has been verified.</p> |   |  |                           |  |  |                           |             |                |                |              |                |                |                     |                        |                       |                    |                |           |
| <b>14. Investment</b>  | N/A   |  |                           |  |  |                           |             |                |                |              |                |                |                     |                        |                       |                    |                |           |
| <b>15. Assessment of project against</b>   | No SMART objectives were identified in the Gateway 2 report.  |  |                           |  |  |                           |             |                |                |              |                |                |                     |                        |                       |                    |                |           |

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>SMART objectives</b>          |   |
| <b>16. Key benefits realised</b> | Much of the key external signage now aligns with the Barbican's new visual identity, meaning there is a more consistent image across the Barbican Centre and its communication materials. However, this is not to the extent expected at the beginning of the project due to the cancellation of signs 6 & 7. |

### Lessons Learned and Recommendations

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <b>17. Positive reflections</b>    | <p>The procurement route allowed for numerous suppliers to submit a tender, increasing the chances of being able to find a supplier capable of delivering the project.</p> <p>The overall performance of the specialist contractor chosen was good.</p>   |
| <b>18. Improvement reflections</b> | Having a better general understanding of residents' priorities, views, and issues before the project started could have at the least saved the time and work put into the design and planning application for two signs that ultimately the project could not go ahead with. At best, being able to anticipate residents' concerns could have allowed for those efforts to be directed into creating a proposal able to achieve planning approval.  |
| <b>19. Sharing best practice</b>   | Considering residents' perspectives earlier on in the project process would help create a better understanding of the ways residents are invested in the outcomes of projects and have some level of power over those outcomes in certain situations. In addition, to make this level of conflict with residents less likely, thought should be put in to how we can build trust between them and the Centre – many objections to the planning application spoke of not trusting the Centre to stick to the given times for illumination of the signs. Them believing we mean what we say would go some way to preventing unwarranted complaints and perhaps a greater willingness to accept compromises. |
| <b>20. AOB</b>                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The staff costs noted in this report are estimates as there is currently no way to record these with accuracy.</li> <li>• Due to staff turnover, the writer of this report was not involved in the project until the final account stage.</li> </ul>   |

## Appendices

|                   |                    |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Appendix 1</b> | Project Coversheet |
|-------------------|--------------------|

## Contact

|                         |                              |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Report Author</b>    | Alice Lassey                 |
| <b>Email Address</b>    | alice.lassey@barbican.org.uk |
| <b>Telephone Number</b> | 02038341266                  |