

Committees: Streets and Walkways Sub [for decision] Projects and Procurement Sub [for information]	Dates: 16 September 2025 14 October 2025
Subject: 150 Aldersgate Street Section 278 Unique Project Identifier: 12348	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Light
Report of: Executive Director Environment Choose an item. Report Author: Stephen Oliver	For Information
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	Project Description: 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
2. Next steps and requested decisions	Requested Decisions: Members are requested to: 1 Note the contents of this report. 2 Authorise return of unused funds to the developer, including any accrued interest as per the Section 278 agreement once the final accounts for these projects are completed. 3 Agree to close this project.

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

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

4 Design into delivery	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. 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. 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.
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 key milestones	9.1 The developers programme slipped by five months and this impacted on FM Conways' programme for repaving Braidwood 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 project against Scope	10.1. The project scope identified at Gateway 5 was completed in full. This was • Aldersgate Street and Braidwood Passage re-laid in York stone and remedial repairs to Cloth Street.
11 Risks and issues	11.1 Two identified risks occurred: • "Delays to works due to late release of highway by 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. • "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 BAU	12.1 From completion of the works the delivered project is now managed through normal highway maintenance activities. A commuted sum has been retained for future maintenance.

Value Review

13 Budget	<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>		Estimated cost £150,000 to £750,000 (including risk):
		<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>
	<i>Fees</i>	£15,250	£0
	<i>Staff Costs</i>	£52,283	£40,077
	<i>Works</i>	£81639	£81639
	<i>Cost Risk Provision</i>	£19,250	£0
	<i>Total</i>	£168,422	£121,717
	The final costings are yet to be ratified for staff costs. An agreed commuted sum will be retained from the remaining funds.		
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	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. 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.
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	