Committees:	Dates:
Streets and Walkways Sub [for decision]	16 September
Projects and Procurement Sub [for information]	2025 18 September 2025
Subject:	Gateway 6:
150 Aldersgate Street Section 278	Outcome Report Light
Unique Project Identifier:	
12348	
Report of: Executive Director Environment Choose an item.	For Decision
Report Author:	
Stephen Oliver	
PUBLIC	

### **Summary**

1. Status update	<b>Project Description:</b> Section 278 highways works including resurfacing in York stone and associated works in the vicinity of the development at 150 Aldersgate Street.	
	RAG Status: Green (Green at last report to Committee)	
	Risk Status: Low (Low at last report to committee)	
	Costed Risk Provision Utilised: £0	
	Final Outturn Cost: £121,717	
	Requested Decisions:	
2. Next steps and	Requested Decisions:	
2. Next steps and requested decisions	Requested Decisions:  Members are requested to:	

3	Key conclusions	3.1 The project was delivered within its budget (as at Gateway 5), and in line with its main objectives to:	
		<ul> <li>Upgrade existing paving on Aldersgate Street and Braidwood Passage in keeping with adjoining areas.</li> <li>An improved public realm making the City a more attractive place.</li> <li>Meet the needs and objectives of the developer.</li> </ul>	

### **Main Report**

# Design & Delivery Review

	4 Design into delivery	<ul> <li>4.1 Prior to the S278 works and the redevelopment of 150 Aldersgate Street the pavement on the western side of Aldersgate Street was predominantly York stone. The exception was a section in front of 150 Aldersgate Street which was surfaced in mastic.</li> <li>4.2 Braidwood Passage is a laneway between Aldersgate Street and Cloth Street. Existing paving on this laneway was removed by the developers to enable new services to be laid to the building.</li> <li>4.3 The S278 works re-laid paving in York stone on both Aldersgate Street and Braidwood Passage and achieved an overall upgrade to the public realm. Braidwood Passage has particularly been made more attractive as the developers have cladded a wall in high quality tiling and new lighting.</li> </ul>
5	Options appraisal	5.1 The completed project delivered the original objectives by making improvements to the public realm around the new development.
6	Procurement route	6.1 The construction package was prepared in-house by the Highway Engineer and work on site was undertaken by the City's term contractor FM Conway.
7	Skills base	7.1 The project team had the necessary skills, knowledge and experience to manage delivery of this project.
8	Stakeholders	8.1 The project was delivered in close liaison with the developer to ensure the proposals met their needs as far as possible.

### **Variation Review**

9 Assessment of project against	9.1 The developers programme slipped by five months and this impacted on FM Conways' programme for repaving Braidwood	
key milestones	Passage. Instead of delivering the works in two phases FM	
	Conway implemented the works in one phase once the areas	
	to be paved were available.	
10 Assessment of	10.1. The project scope identified at Gateway 5 was completed in	
project against Scope	full. This was	
Scope	<ul> <li>Aldersgate Street and Braidwood Passage re-laid in York stone and remedial repairs to Cloth Street.</li> </ul>	
	Storie and remedial repairs to Cloth Street.	
11 Risks and issues	11.1 Two identified risks occurred:	
	<ul> <li>"Delays to works due to late release of highway by</li> </ul>	
	developer".	
	At G5 a programme was agreed with the developers for FM	
	Conway to deliver the works in two phases with the Braidwood	
	Passage improvements implemented in April 2024 and	
	Aldersgate Street in September 2024. Braidwood Passage	
	was released by the developers after Aldersgate Street. With	
	Braidwood Passage unavailable FM Conway could only implement the works in one phase starting in October 2024.	
	implement the works in one phase starting in October 2024.	
	"Unforeseen technical and/or engineering issues identified".	
	Some of the developers' thresholds on Braidwood Passage	
	were incorrect and therefore some paving had to be lifted and	
	re-laid by FM Conway. There were sufficient funds in the	
	budget to fund the additional works, and no costed risk was	
	utilised. Bespoke tiling has been installed on Braidwood	
	Passage.	
	Not until a sample was produced near to when the Braidwood	
	Passage was due to be resurfaced did the project team realise	
	that the tiling was three dimensional and the laying of the York	
	stone paving would be more complicated with additional cuts.	
12 Transition to	12.1 From completion of the works the delivered project is now	
BAU	managed through normal highway maintenance activities. A	
	commuted sum has been retained for future maintenance.	

### **Value Review**

13 Budget			
	Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)	Estimated cost £15 (including risk):	60,000 to £750,000
		At Authority to Start work (G5)	Final Outturn Cost
	Fees	£15,250	£0
	Staff Costs	£52,283	£40,077
	Works	£81639	£81639
	Cost Risk Provision	£19,250	£0
	Total	£168,422	£121,717
	_	re yet to be ratified fo ed sum will be retaine	or staff costs. ed from the remaining
14 Assessment of project against SMART objectives	14.1 The project delivered against the objectives to prioritise people walking and wheeling by delivering a high-quality pedestrian environment.		
15 Key benefits realised	15.1 Key benefits outlined in the Gateway 2 reports were realised, with the schemes meeting the needs of the new development and providing enhanced public realm around the development.		

#### **Lessons Learned and Recommendations**

16 Positive reflections	16.1 A good working relationship and open communication between the project team and the developers once the site became available.	
17 Improvement reflections	<ul> <li>17.1 The developer should have been more forthcoming with their programme slippage. The tiles installed on Braidwood Passage was an unforeseen issue. The extent of the three-dimensional nature of the bespoke tiles was not realised until a sample was shown to the project team and the implications for laying the York stone paving. A solution was however agreed between the developers and the project team, and the finished quality and budget were not impacted.</li> <li>17.2 Both of these issues can partly be attributed to the developers changing their representative the project team dealt with in the S278 negotiations up to G5.</li> </ul>	
18 Sharing best practice	18.1 Information will be disseminated through the project staff and the department.	

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1	Project Coversheet
Appendix 2	Risk Register
Appendix 3	Finance Table
Appendix 4	Photographs before and after

### **Contact**

Report Author	Stephen Oliver
Email Address	Stephen.oliver@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Telephone Number	