

Committees: Planning and Transportation Committee <i>[for decision]</i> Projects and Procurement Sub-Committee <i>[for information]</i>	Dates: 5 November 2024 9 December 2024
Subject: Dominant House Footbridge Future Options Unique Project Identifier: 11788	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular
Report of: Executive Director Environment Report Author: Trina deSilva	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: Repair fault on City Walkway footbridge over highway which has led to spalling on footbridge support.</p> <p>RAG Status: Green (Red at last report to Committee)</p> <p>Risk Status: Low (Medium at last report to committee)</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: £0</p> <p>Final Outturn Cost: £433,291</p>
2. Next steps and requested decisions	<p>Requested Decisions: that the project is closed</p>
3. Key conclusions	<p><i>Repairs were made to the southern pier of the bridge, and a new joint provided. The waterproofing to the structure was renewed and all joints were cleaned out and resealed. This work will: allow the bridge to expand and contract more freely, provide better protection to the structure from water, reduce the likelihood of chloride contamination and reduce the likelihood of the concrete spalling in the future.</i></p> <p><i>FM Conway, our term contractor, were the main contractor. The works were carried out to a good standard, but the project</i></p>

	suffered a two month delay as a result of poor management of sub-contractors.
--	---

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

4. Design into delivery	<i>The work was completed almost exactly as designed. The design should have anticipated that the depth of chlorinated concrete and depth of cover to reinforcing bars were similar. To reduce the likelihood of the concrete repair failing, additional concrete had to be broken out so the repair could start behind the reinforcement. This should have been anticipated at the design stage. The designer should also have anticipated the need to repair high level cracks on the pier, so this could have been included in the works from the start.</i>
5. Options appraisal	<i>The option chosen was best value. There are two crossings of Upper Thames St very nearby, one of which is indoors, through a hotel, with level access also provided. These served as diversion routes during the project.</i>
6. Procurement route	<i>The term contractor was used to deliver this project, to allow a faster start on site. Permissions were obtained quickly, and FM Conway made good use of the closures to complete repainting work. However, their management of their subcontractors wasn't good, and the site was then left empty for two months (and unable to be reopened to the public as the stair nosings had been damaged) before they were able to get the sub-contractors on site. As FMC have a presence in the city and delivered other projects from the same site offices, their overheads for the two extra unproductive months on site wasn't punitive as it would be if this had been an independent project.</i>
7. Skills base	<i>The project was managed without the need for external resources. The designers visited site occasionally.</i>
8. Stakeholders	<i>Letters were sent out to neighbouring properties to warn of the works. There were a few complaints about the length of the delay and some letters had to be reissued as the originals were not received.</i>

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	<i>Despite the two month delay on site, the works were completed within the G5 programme and budget.</i>
--	--

10. Assessment of project against Scope	<i>All the work specified was completed. There are two cracks in the pier which will be repaired as separate work. These repairs will require a small scaffold tower and should take a week or less to complete. They weren't included in the original scope of works, and FM Conway were not able to add them into this project without delaying completion.</i>
11. Risks and issues	<i>None of the anticipated risks occurred. No unidentified risks occurred. A costed risk provision of £66,200 was requested at G5. None of this was used.</i>
12. Transition to BAU	<i>N/A</i>

Value Review

13. Budget	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i></td> <td>Estimated cost: £1,078,000 (risk not identified at that stage)</td> </tr> </table>		<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	Estimated cost: £1,078,000 (risk not identified at that stage)																					
	<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>	Estimated cost: £1,078,000 (risk not identified at that stage)																							
<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>£50,746</td> <td>£40,135</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Staff Costs</i></td> <td>£15,500</td> <td>£25,485</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Works</i></td> <td>£416,437</td> <td>£344,065</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Structural Fees</i></td> <td>£15,000</td> <td>£12,852</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Traffic Management</i></td> <td>£10,754</td> <td>£10,754</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Costed Risk Provision</i></td> <td>£66,200</td> <td>£0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>£574,637</td> <td>£433,291</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>The final account for this project has been agreed. The project budget was underspent. The unspent funds will be returned to OSPR for use on other schemes.</i></p>			<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>	<i>Fees</i>	£50,746	£40,135	<i>Staff Costs</i>	£15,500	£25,485	<i>Works</i>	£416,437	£344,065	<i>Structural Fees</i>	£15,000	£12,852	<i>Traffic Management</i>	£10,754	£10,754	<i>Costed Risk Provision</i>	£66,200	£0	Total	£574,637	£433,291
	<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>																							
<i>Fees</i>	£50,746	£40,135																							
<i>Staff Costs</i>	£15,500	£25,485																							
<i>Works</i>	£416,437	£344,065																							
<i>Structural Fees</i>	£15,000	£12,852																							
<i>Traffic Management</i>	£10,754	£10,754																							
<i>Costed Risk Provision</i>	£66,200	£0																							
Total	£574,637	£433,291																							
14. Investment	<i>N/A</i>																								
15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives	<p><i>The G2 SMART objectives were:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully repair the movement joint. • Repairs completed on time (by January 2019) and to budget. <p><i>This was achieved, although there was a delay in completion against the Gateway 2 timescales, as a result of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project on hold because of the fundamental review. • Pricing delayed until the highways term contract commenced in July 2022. 																								

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G5 committee approval needed because of increase in works cost. <p>Work was completed in November 2023.</p>
16. Key benefits realised	<i>No key benefits were listed in the G2 report. The project has achieved its objectives.</i>

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

17. Positive reflections	<i>The quality of the finished work was high.</i>
18. Improvement reflections	<p><i>The delay to the works had a greater impact on the City and local residents than it did on FM Conway. The cost of the two months with no-one on site was not punitive for FM Conway, given that they are operating several sites throughout the City at the same time.</i></p> <p><i>TfL funding was agreed for this project. An offer to fund £269k was made in September 2022, dependent on the works being completed by March 2023. However, FM Conway's quotation for the works came in at £410k. Committee approval for these increased costs was required and would have increased the programme – preventing completion by 31 March 2023. We therefore missed out on TfL funding. We were able in the end to bring FM Conway's works costs down, e.g. by working from mobile platforms rather than a full scaffold of the structure, but we did miss out in the TfL funding as the timescales were quite short and our procedures too lengthy to comply.</i></p>
19. Sharing best practice	<i>The engineering team discusses progress on projects, sharing what has worked or failed and what we would do differently for future projects. These discussions are held with other teams where required.</i>
20. AOB	<i>None.</i>

Appendices

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
-------------------	--------------------

Contact

Report Author	Trina deSilva
Email Address	trina.desilva@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	020 7332 3049

Appendix 1 – Project Coversheet

[1] Ownership & Status

UPI: 11788

Core Project Name: Dominant House Footbridge Future Options

Programme Affiliation (if applicable): none

Project Manager: Trina deSilva

Definition of need: Repair fault which has led to spalling on footbridge support

Key measures of success: No further spalling of concrete

Expected timeframe for the project delivery: Project put on hold with the fundamental review. Pricing delayed until term contract commenced in July 2022. G5 approval needed with increase in works cost. Work completed in November 2023.

Key Milestones:

Gateway 5 *October/November 2022*

Completion *November 2023*

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

Has this project generated public or media impact and response which the City of London has needed to manage or is managing? Yes, we were in contact with neighbouring properties, particularly with the delay to the works.

[2] Finance and Costed Risk

Headline Financial, Scope and Design Changes:

‘Project Proposal’ G1/2 report (approved by Projects Sub Committee 31/01/2017):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £1,078,000
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £33,000
- Spend to date: none
- Costed Risk Against the Project: none
- CRP Requested: none
- CRP Drawn Down: none
- Estimated Programme Dates: completion January 2019

‘Issues Report’ (as approved by Projects Sub Committee 16/05/2018)

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): no change reported
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £54,257
- Spend to date: £24,410
- Costed Risk Against the Project: none
- CRP Requested: none
- CRP Drawn Down: none
- Estimated Programme Dates: no change reported

High chloride levels were discovered in the bridge. Further concrete tests were required to determine the extent of the high chloride levels.

Project put on hold due to Fundamental review

'Options Appraisal and Design' G3-4 report (as approved by PSC 23/07/2021):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £340,864
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £18,000
- Spend to date: £60,011
- Costed Risk Against the Project: none
- CRP Requested: none
- CRP Drawn Down: none
- Estimated Programme Dates: completion expected December 2022

Scope/Design Change and Impact: none

'Authority to start Work' G5 report (as approved by OPPSC 06/03/2023):

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £508,437
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £436,183
- Spend to date: £58,471
- CRP Requested: £66,200
- CRP Drawn Down: £0
- Estimated Programme Dates: works on site August – November 2023

Scope/Design Change and Impact: none

Total anticipated on-going commitment post-delivery [£]: no additional impact. The structure will continue to be maintained within the usual highway structure inspection and maintenance programmes.