

Committees: Corporate Projects Board [<i>for information</i>] Housing Management & Almshouses Sub Committee [<i>for decision</i>] Projects and Procurements Sub [<i>for information</i>]	Dates: 10 September 2025 21 October 2025 18 November 2025
Subject: Decent Homes Call-backs 2020-22 Unique Project Identifier: 12074	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular
Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services Report Author: David Downing, Asset Programme Manager	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	Project Description: A contractor, Abbott Property Solutions Ltd, were appointed on a fixed budget, 3-year term contract, comprised of an agreed schedule of rates, to supply and install replacement kitchen, bathroom and WC facilities on an ad hoc basis to City of London tenanted properties to bring them up to the Decent Homes standard. RAG Status: Green (Green at last report to Committee) Risk Status: Low (Low at last report to committee) Costed Risk Provision Utilised: £0 (of which X amount was drawn down at the last report to Committee); Final Outturn Cost: £476,572.67
2. Next steps and requested decisions	Requested Decisions: 1. To note the content of this report, 2. To note the lessons learnt, 3. To authorise closure of this project.
3. Key conclusions	The project was successfully delivered with kitchens to 41 homes and bathroom/WC facilities to 33 homes being brought up to the Decent Homes standard across the contract period.

	A sum of £58,427.33 of the allocated project budget remained unspent at the close of the contract.
--	--

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

4. Design into delivery	The project design, repeating that of the previously successful Decent Homes projects again worked well. Tightly defined 'all-inclusive' specifications were drawn up setting a maximum upper price limit on all components that could be scaled down on instruction but not exceeded. This was a large factor in the successful delivery of the project and a significant aid to overall cost control and is a recommended approach for future projects of this nature.
5. Options appraisal	The selected option to procure a contractor to deliver the works as required on an ad hoc basis via open tender successfully delivered the projects objectives. This was repeated from the two preceding Call-backs projects where project objectives were also successfully delivered. No changes were required during project delivery.
6. Procurement route	The works contract was successfully procured via open tender. The tender generated an appropriate and manageable number of competitively priced bids for evaluation. This procurement route can be recommended for future projects of this nature. Procurement reference: itt_COL_17964
7. Skills base	The City of London project team had the required skills and experience to deliver the project. All aspects of project management for this project were handled internally.
8. Stakeholders	As the majority of works under this contract were carried out to properties as they fell void between tenancies, the extent of external stakeholder engagement required to successfully develop and deliver this project was minimal.

Variation Review

9. Assessment of project against key milestones	The project progressed as expected throughout the design period with a main works contractor appointed as anticipated at Gateway 5. During the delivery phase, the fixed term contract ran as expected throughout its duration without variation.
10. Assessment of project against Scope	The scope of the project remained unchanged throughout both the design period and project delivery.
11. Risks and issues	This project is a repeat of a previously successful Decent Homes Call-backs contract which was procured and delivered in the same way. As such, the project proceeded as planned with no significant risks realised. This is largely attributable to the successful

	<p>application of lessons learnt from previous Decent Homes projects which were incorporated into the project design, specification and procurement which greatly aided the management of the resultant contract.</p> <p>Costed Risk Provision was not applicable to this project.</p>
12. Transition to Business As Usual	<p>The new installations have a defect liability period of 12 months commencing from the date of practical completion. At the close of this period, the ongoing maintenance of these new installations will transfer to the general Repairs & Maintenance contract.</p>

Value Review

13. Budget	<i>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</i>		Estimated cost (including risk): £535,000 Estimated cost (excluding risk): £535,000
		<i>At Authority to Start work (G5)</i>	<i>Final Outturn Cost</i>
	<i>Staff Costs</i>	£35,000	£12,940.70
	<i>Works</i>	£500,000	£463,631.97
	Total	£535,000	£476,572.67
There is a total underspend on the approved Gateway 5 budget of £58,427.33.			
Final accounts have been subject to an independent verification check, undertaken by a suitably experienced officer within the relevant implementing department.			
14. Investment	N/A		
15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives	The project was successfully delivered with kitchens to 41 properties and bathroom/WC facilities to 33 properties being brought up to the Decent Homes standard across the contract period. A term contractor was successful appointed bringing cost assurance through the contract duration and ensuring market tested value for money.		
16. Key benefits realised	1. Improved and modernised facilities for qualifying properties were completed. 2. The value of the City’s Housing assets was maintained. 3. Compliance with statutory measures. 4. Newly installed kitchens have expected lifespans of 20 years. 5. Newly installed bathrooms have expected lifespans of 30 years.		

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

17. Positive reflections	<p>1. The Call-backs contract remains a vital resource in ensuring the timely upgrading of key components to previously hard to access properties as they fall void between other large scale Decent Homes programmes allowing the costs to be capitalised.</p> <p>2. The fixed term schedule of rates contract allowed accurate financial monitoring and a high degree of cost certainty.</p> <p>3. The flexibility of the contract allowed works to proceed as required at fixed rates over a pre-defined period of time rather than subject to multiple procurements.</p> <p>4. The contractor, Abbott Property Solutions Ltd, performed well over the period of the contract and can be recommended for future works of this nature.</p>
18. Improvement reflections	<p>1. As a recurring term contract, some consideration could perhaps be given at Corporate level as to whether such repeat pieces of work should be treated as Business as Usual and not required to go through the project development cycle as each term contract nears expiry. In project management terms a repeat piece of work cannot by definition be a project.</p>
19. Sharing best practice	<p>1. Dissemination of key information through team and project staff briefings. A standard approach to Decent Homes work has been adopted by the Property Services team reflecting industry best practice.</p> <p>2. Lessons learned have been logged and recorded on departmental SharePoint.</p>
20. AOB	None.

Appendices

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

Contact

Report Author	David Downing
Email Address	David.Downing@cityoflondon.gov.uk