

BARBICAN ESTATE RESIDENTS CONSULTATION COMMITTEE
Monday, 1 September 2025

Minutes of the meeting of the Barbican Estate Residents' Consultation Committee
held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Monday,
1 September 2025 at 6.30 pm

Present

Members:

Jo Boait - (Chair)
Sandra Jenner - (Deputy Chair)
Lucy Sisman - (Deputy Chair)
Lionel Meyringer - Andrewes House
Andrew Tong - Brandon Mews
Fiona Lean - Ben Jonson House
Fred Rogers - Breton House
Helen Hudson - Defoe House
Sally Spensley - Frobisher Crescent
Dave Taylor - Gilbert House
Pauline Fasoli - John Trundle Court
Claire Hersey - Lambert Mews
David Lawrence - Lauderdale Tower
Stuart Lynas - Mountjoy House
John Holme - Postern
Robert Bexson - Seddon House
Richard Setchim- Shakespeare Tower
Frits van Kempen - Speed House
Rodney Jagelman - Thomas More House
Nicola Baker - Wallside
Petre Reid – Willoughby House
Jan-Marc Petroschka – Chair, Barbican Association

In attendance:

Deputy Anne Corbett – Chair, Barbican Residential Committee
Dawn Frampton – Councillor, Cripplegate
Jacqui Webster - Councillor, Cripplegate
Jim Durcan - Chair, Service Level Working Party and Garden Advisory Group
Tam Pollard – Chair, Asset Management Working Party

Officers:

Judith Finlay	- Executive Director, Community and Children's Services
Dan Sanders	- Director of Property & Estate Management, Barbican Residential Estate
Eoin Doyle	- Head of Property Services, Community and Children's Services
Dan Castle	- BRE Contracts Manager, Community and Children's Services
	-

Shruti Sonawane	- Service Charge and Revenues Manager, Community and Children's Services
Rhys Campbell	- Town Clerk's

1. **APOLOGIES**

The Chair welcomed Nicola Baker who was now representing Wallside and thanked Mary Bonar, the previous representative.

Apologies had been received from Andy Hope (Breton House), Jane Smith (Seddon House) and Sandy Wilson (Shakespeare Tower). However they had sent representatives in Fred Rogers, Robert Bexson and Richard Setchim, respectively. Apologies had also been received from Gordon Griffiths (Bunyan Court).

2. **MEMBERS DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the Barbican Residents' Consultation Committee (RCC) held on 28 April 2025 be approved as a correct record.

4. **WORKING PARTY UPDATES**

4a Garden Advisory Group

The Working Party Chair advised that there had been consultation with residents and agreement reached with the City Gardens regarding the relocation of trees in Speed Gardens on the Barbican Estate.

4b Service Level Agreement Working Party

The SLAWP Chair informed the Committee that the SLA information had been promised to be delivered shortly and that the postponed meeting would then be rescheduled.

4c Service Charge Working Party

The SCWP Chair highlighted the challenges that had been identified by the Service Charge and Revenues Manager and that the situation was worse than had been expected. It was known that previous service charge spreadsheet calculations had not been peer reviewed or audited, and the Service Charge and Revenues Manager was having to undertake a lot of work to try to understand and resolve the outstanding issues in relation to service charges. The SCWP would continue to work on historic outstanding items and the budget for 2026/27 will be reviewed by the Reporting Committee. She had included the minutes of the previous SCWP meeting so that Members could see the tone and the detail of the outstanding matters that were being dealt with.

There was some discussion on the whether the Reporting Committee should be responsible for the 2026/27 budget. It was noted that this had been agreed in November 2024, with the Reporting Committee timetable presented to the RCC in the relevant report. It was agreed that this matter should be discussed at the next Reporting Committee meeting, with any queries brought to the next RCC meeting.

4d Asset Management Working Party

There were no updates.

5. REPAIRS & MAINTENANCE

The Committee received the report of the Executive Director of Community & Children's Services following Chigwell Group having declared their intent to exit the Barbican reactive repairs / maintenance contract, citing commercial non-viability and the City of London formally accepting their resignation, with a contract end date of 24 December 2025.

The Director of Property and Estate Management advised the Committee that the paper described the rationale for bringing this service in-house and how it would be delivered. The draft business case had been reviewed by the Reporting Committee and Major Works Programme Board and had also been sent to the House Group chairs. Their comments had been incorporated into this report. If approved at the BRC, the Director was planning to hold Q&A sessions at St Giles Church to provide an opportunity for all leaseholders to understand and comment on the proposals. The BRC would be asked to provide in principle approval to the proposed move to an in-house service; more detailed plans would then be prepared and the full proposal refined and finalised.

A Member asked why Chigwell Group had exited the contract. The Director explained that an extensive procurement exercise had been undertaken leading up to their appointment, involving City of London Legal and Procurement colleagues. The Director advised that he was confident that the procurement process would stand up to scrutiny. It had been agreed that a quantity surveyor would be commissioned to undertake a desktop review of the procurement process. The Committee's attention was drawn to the section in the paper that described the reason for Chigwell Group's exit, including the financial analysis. The Director advised that he was not aware of any reason to believe that there was any failing of the City Corporation or BEO for Chigwell Group's exit.

In response to questions from a Member, the Director confirmed that the BEO had considered alternative options but believed it was appropriate to bring this service in-house, especially given that the recent procurement had not worked. This would enable the team to be aligned to the values of the City of London and the Estate Office and the service to residents improved. The Director advised that the number of operatives proposed in the report matched the Chigwell model that had resulted from the full procurement process. This would be reviewed over a period of time, including the demand fluctuation.

Another Member was concerned as to the scope of the planned independent review of the procurement exercise and suggested that Chigwell should be approached as part of this review. The Director agreed that finding out what had gone wrong was important and noted that the terms of reference of the review would be brought to the Major Works Programme Board before being finalised. The Member also asked about the experience of the officers who would be managing the in-house team. The Director confirmed that, in his previous role, he had helped to facilitate a move from an external third-party service to a Direct In-House Team. He also advised that fellow officers within the BEO were well experienced in the industry. He agreed to provide details in the next report.

A Member asked if there was any option to consider the second bidder and if there was any risk of a challenge from other bidders involved in the procurement process. The Director advised that he had asked his legal and procurement colleagues about this and would provide the Committee with further clarity on the options and the risk of a challenge.

In response to a question from a Member the Director advised that it was standard practice to purchase parts via the Estate-wide charging. A schedule of parts purchased would be kept and the charge would be transferred to the relevant block as they were used. He agreed that there needed to be a clear distinction between leasehold and freehold matters, and clarity as to whether the team would be able to undertake private, non-service charge, work. This would be investigated in the further work to refine the implementation plans.

A Member asked for an update on the integration with Civica. The Director acknowledged that the implementation of Civica for the Estate had been difficult, however he did not have any concerns with Civica as a product. Specifically, the workflow management system would be used to assist the repairs and maintenance programme. An IT program and integration manager would be employed to assist with this project to oversee the implementation. The Director agreed to share the timeline for delivery with RCC Members following the meeting.

A Member advised that his House was not against the proposal in principle, but had expressed concern about the amount of work that was needed in the planned timeframe. The Director agreed that the current timeline was ambitious, but advised that conversations were being held with the other third-party provider, Elkins, to explore the support that they might provide during the transition and especially if the timelines were extended as a result of the further refinement of the plans once in principle approval had been obtained.

In response to a question concerning the adaptability of what would be a small workforce, the Committee was advised that Chigwell had made arrangements with other third parties in the event of specialist requirements and contingency planning for emergency scenarios had been noted in the risk register. The budget included an allowance for specialist works undertaken by these third parties. Regarding the workforce, the Director confirmed that the BEO would be guided by HR colleagues regarding the options available and were seeking to retain staff and institutional knowledge after the service was brought in-house.

A Member asked if the Delivery Board was required to oversee this project and the Committee was advised that a discussion had been held with the Reporting Committee and Major Works Programme Board, and it had been agreed that the Delivery Board should be considered to be a Task and Finish Group that would be disbanded when the service had been up and running for a period of time.

A Member referenced the specialist works that would be outsourced and asked if there was any analysis from previous data to outsourced components and whether major capital equipment could be in-sourced as well, given the expected costs. The Director confirmed that the specialist works and risk contingency had been informed by data available, but would be analysed in more detail in a future iteration. The Director highlighted that the BEO believed that the delivery of this programme would provide a better repair service to residents and was not running a cost saving exercise. He also agreed to give further consideration as to what equipment the BEO could have in store and what should be hired when needed.

The Deputy Chair raised some points regarding additions to the risk register, together with mitigations, including those that had already been discussed. She noted that HR had not provided appropriate, helpful or consistent support in previous BEO reorganisations. Also, the risk register should reflect that the BEO had not had particularly good experiences when implementing IT projects, the potential for loss of corporate knowledge and the risk of loss of staff or the inability to attract staff of the appropriate calibre due to the City Corporation remuneration structure. Regarding the remuneration structure, the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services, advised the Committee that she had raised this concern with officers involved in the Ambition 25 programme which related to salary remuneration across the Corporation and was benchmarking against the private and public sectors. She did not think that this would be a problem.

In response to a question from a Member, the Director advised that, if Elkins were used for purchasing items, they would charge a mark-up for delivering that service. If this purchase route was used, the mark-up would be open to discussion.

The Chair asked whether experienced staff who utilised their own tools should be given an allowance, which might help with their remuneration. She also asked why the Asset Condition Survey was being proposed, given the resource that it would take. The Director explained that the asset survey would be conducted to ensure that the City Corporation was comfortable with the condition of assets that would be maintained by the BEO. He advised that the timing could be extended.

The Chair noted that the key aim of the BEO appeared to be to ensure that the service would be delivered appropriately and that, if necessary, the number of employees would be adjusted to ensure this. The Director confirmed that resources would be under continual review.

Noting the concern that had been expressed about the work required from the BEO team to bring this service in-house, the Chair recommended that the Director consider whether any of the other planned programmes would have to be deferred and advise the Members accordingly.

In response to a question from a Member regarding the programming of all the works across the Estate, the Director informed the committee that the Planned Preventative Maintenance Programme, Capital Expenditure Programme and Contracts Matrix had been sent to the MWPB for review and were expected to be provided to this Committee at its next meeting. He expected that these documents would provide a good level of assurance to Members that the BEO were aware of what projects needed to be completed, when they were likely to be programmed and what the costs would be. Projects that were being led by the City of London, such as the fire doors, would also be included. The team were now in a position to start delivering on these projects, with information regarding BRC project approval requests being included in the papers.

A Member raised concerns about the Bunyan Court car park welfare area, which added to routine traffic through common areas of the blocks served by the car park. The transport of materials, tools and equipment to the rest of the estate may cause damage. The Committee was advised that officers had discussed the workshop at Bunyan Court but this would need to be reviewed further.

RESOLVED, that – the report was received and its contents noted.

6. APPOINTMENT OF EXPERT WITNESS

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community & Children's Services which noted the agreement to appoint an expert witness/forensic architect to determine the apportionment of liability with respect to the costs related to the rectification of the problems with the fabric of Ben Jonson House.

The Chair advised that she was pleased that the City Corporation had reached this stage, as it was a key part of the restitution process and should provide an understanding of the work undertaken by the City Corporation on buildings within the estate. She thanked the residents and officers who had played a part in the process.

The Director described the work undertaken with regard to this tender and advised that the decision had been based on a review of the documents provided that detailed the quality and cost, together with their interview performance.

A Member was delighted to hear that the cheapest candidate was also the best in terms of quality evaluation but wanted further assurance that they were the ideal candidate. The Deputy Chair confirmed that the evaluation team comprised of three residents, which included herself, as well as three qualified experts from the BEO. The papers were individually marked and then moderated collectively and all took part in the interviews. They had unanimously agreed that Hawkins were the best candidate before the costs were even reviewed.

RESOLVED, that – the report was received and its contents noted.

7. SERVICE CHARGE LEASEHOLDER UPDATES

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community & Children's Services in respect of an update to service charge leaseholders.

The Director advised that some comments had been received from residents in relation to the figures listed in the report. These would be responded to and the figures amended, where appropriate, before they were sent out to leaseholders. He asked for residents to provide comments to RCC representatives by Friday 12 September. Members noted that it might be difficult to provide comments by this time.

The Service Charge & Revenue Services Manager was thanked for all her hard work to progress the outstanding service charge reports.

A Member noted that the Service Charge Working Party (SCWP) had not had the opportunity to review the report or the 2025/26 figures. She recommended that the SCWP should review the report before it was circulated to residents. The Director agreed to this review.

A Member asked why the increase in supervision and management costs varied between blocks and noted that there was a 99% increase in management and supervision costs for Andrewes House. The Director advised that work had been undertaken concerning the display of items classified as 'Supervision and Management' and acknowledged there could be some confusion as there were two different displays titled "Supervision and Management", with changes in definition since the previous year. He agreed to review this with the SCWP and would then provide the Committee with a definition of the term in each bracket. Following a question relating to the charge for house officers, despite this role no longer existing, the Director explained that the house officer role had been repurposed and in future budgets these costs would be labelled differently to reflect that the position still existed, but the job description had changed slightly due to the BEO restructure.

In respect of the service charge audit, a Member asked when the process would be concluded. The Director advised that the audit would be conducted on an annual basis and the appointment of an auditor was on the agenda for the next SCWP meeting. Once completed, the results of the audit would be shared. A Member asked for it to be noted that Wallside was not represented on the SCWP and that reports had not yet been provided for Wallside and the Postern. The Wallside representatives had scheduled a meeting with the Director and would discuss the issues with him.

A Members asked to receive an organisation chart and the Director confirmed that this was on the agenda for the next Reporting Committee meeting and would be provided to the Committee in due course.

Members noted that there were no figures for 2024/25 within the report. The Director advised that these were not due until the end of September.

RESOLVED, that – the report was received and its contents noted.

8. BARBICAN RESIDENTIAL ESTATE LIFT REFURBISHMENT

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community & Children's Services in respect of the Barbican Residential Estate Lift Refurbishment Programme.

A Member asked why consultancy fees had increased for the complete design solution. The Director advised that ancillary costs of professional services, such as project management and the Building Safety Regulator, had now been included in the consultancy fees and added to the original estimates of the costs to repair each lift. The Director explained that the Barbican Residential Committee (BRC) were being asked to approve the initiation of phase one which would include the design specification, open market tendering and legal and procurement input.

A Member noted that the report advised that it was not yet certain whether the work would fall within the purview of the Building Safety Regulator. The Director advised that this would be determined when the consultant was preparing the detailed design specification.

A Member quoted the £6.312 million project budget mentioned in the report and asked about the BEO's confidence in this figure. The Director explained that this figure had been taken from initial asset overviews and that the full costs would not be known until the design and specifications were completed.

A Member referenced the expected savings on maintenance costs following the replacement of lifts and encouraged officers to quantify the benefits to residents. The Director advised that this should be possible once the full design specification and timeline had been prepared. Regarding the tendering process, the Committee was advised that Ilecs would be invited to tender, but it would be an open tender exercise.

In response to a question, the Director confirmed that that relevant Houses would be consulted fully before approval was requested in respect of the Terrace Lifts. The Director reminded the Committee that this report was specifically relating to Gateway 2 approval for Phase 1, the Tower Lift refurbishment, and the costs which required approval only related to the Barbican Estate Towers. He apologised for any confusion in the report wording. The Chair noted the reference to the 'Housing Programme Board' that had been included in error and noted that it would be changed to the 'Major Works Programme Board'. A Member asked for the Terrace Lifts report to be included in the action tracker, given that it had not yet been provided to the RCC.

RESOLVED, that – the report was received and its contents noted.

9. **BARBICAN ESTATE ROOF AND BALCONY RENEWAL PROGRAMME AND BARBICAN ESTATE WINDOW REPAIRS PROGRAMME**

Item 9a, was received in conjunction with items 9 and 10.

During the discussion of this item the Committee also agreed to extend the meeting by 30 minutes, as per standing order 39.

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community & Children's Services in respect of two Gateway 2 reports (Roof and Balcony Renewal Programme and Window Repairs Programme) for consideration. The Director advised Members that separate reports had been prepared to facilitate specialist procurement. However, they formed part of a single coordinated Building Envelope strategy that would be overseen by a lead architect. The existence of both programmes would retain the ability to appoint separate specialist contractors for windows, roofs, water ingress and drainage, if required.

The Director further noted that, whilst the reports suggested that the work would be funded through the service charge, this might be impacted by the work of the Expert Witness that the BRC were being asked to approve. He also apologised for some of the wording used in the reports that had suggested that the sole reason that the work was required was because they had reached the end of their lifecycle; he acknowledged that past management failures in the maintenance of these roofs in previous years was also likely to be a factor.

The representative for Brandon Mews wanted it noted that his House Group believed that the inclusion of Brandon Mews in the scope of the resolution in agenda item 9 was an error. The House Group had been alarmed to see that the Brandon Mews Canopy was included in the Barbican Estate Roof Programme and had presented a motion just ahead of this meeting to remove Brandon Mews' association with agenda item 9 and to reject the proposal. The Member also highlighted that the ongoing Avanti review of the canopy had not yet been concluded, and that the canopy was not a roof but instead a piece of architecture which also served as waterproofing. The Director noted the Members' concern and explained that the reports sought to ask for the approval to procure architectural services which meant that, once the Avanti consultation had been completed, the BEO would be able to appoint a lead architect to undertake the work necessary on the canopy without causing any further delay. He agreed to discuss this further with the representative of Brandon Mews outside of this meeting. The Member noted that the report stated that 95% of the liability for costs of this programme would be ascribed to leaseholders and that it was instead expected that the City Corporation would be responsible for the costs of maintaining and, if appropriate, replacing the Brandon Mews canopy. The Director confirmed that the liability costs of the roofs, per the lease agreements, was recoverable under service charge. However he noted that this funding strategy was subject to change as both programmes progressed. The Member advised that it was not acceptable for Brandon Mews to be included in the proposal, especially given the proposed liability for costs. He noted the potential for delay.

A Member noted the £9 million allocated to the total cost of the delivery of phase one and that this had not been submitted to the MWPB for prior consideration. He asked how these costs were going to be apportioned to residents. Another member asked about the timings. The Director highlighted that the reports contained indicative costs and timings and that the BEO would refine these as the programme progressed through Gateway 2 to Gateway 3. They were also planning to review the options the City Corporation could provide to leaseholders, if any, in respect of the costs.

A Member wanted the push back from several RCC Members at this meeting in respect of the 95% liability costs to be noted at the BRC. The Director confirmed that several BRC Members were in attendance at this RCC meeting and that the RCC Chair is invited to speak at BRC meetings. The BRC were aware of the work of the Expert Witness and that it might impact the liability for costs. However, the Director reminded the meeting that the legal position was that the leaseholders were liable for these costs.

The Director confirmed that the allocation of costs to leaseholders would be discussed at the relevant Committee or Working Party and would become more block specific as the figures were known.

In response to a question from a Member, the Director advised that warranties would be sought for the work, balancing cost against quality and the length of the warranty. Processes regarding potential claims on the warranties would also be put in place.

RESOLVED, that – the report was received and its contents noted.

10. REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF PROPERTY AND ESTATE MANAGEMENT

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services informing Members of the RCC on the work of the BEO.

The resignation of Chigwell had meant that the focus of the work of the BEO had changed and there had also been resource challenges in the past three to six months, including the need to ensure that Chigwell continued to undertake the work required. The Director introduced the officers present, including his new PA and advised that the new Head of Resident Services would join on 1 October 2025, which would mean that the BEO would then be fully resourced. He did not expect to have to defer any other MWPB, Reporting Committee or tower lift meetings.

The Planned Preventative Maintenance Programme, Contracts Matrix and Capital Expenditure Plan had been submitted to the MWPB for consideration at their next meeting and these documents would be available at the next RCC meeting.

The submission for the Governance Review would be reviewed at the next Reporting Committee.

The Chair thanked officers for the work undertaken by the whole team in relation to the Chigwell Group's exit.

RESOLVED, that – the report was received and its contents noted.

11. REPORT OF REPORTING COMMITTEE AND MAJOR WORKS PROGRAM BOARD

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services which sought to inform members of the RCC/BRC on workstreams that are considered at the Major Works Program Board and Reporting Committee.

RESOLVED, that – the report and its contents be noted.

12. OUTSTANDING ACTIONS

At the outset of this meeting, the Chair requested that Item 4 (Outstanding Actions) be received following item 11.

The Committee noted the actions tracker for the Barbican Estate Residents' Consultation Committee (RCC) and the Barbican Residential Committee (BRC). The Chair noted that the comments for actions 18 onwards related to the action above. The Chair proposed that action points 26, 27 and 28 be closed.

13. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

There was no other business that the Chair considered urgent.

14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

A Member advised that groups on roller blades were coming onto the Estate late at night and asked for details of the actions that were being undertaken. The Director advised that he would meet the Member to discuss this and that he was working on an anti-social behaviour and security strategy that would be brought to a future meeting.

The representative for Brandon Mews advised that, further to his earlier comments, he noted that the Avanti report would be produced soon and that Brandon Mews residents had been happy with the process of engagement in the selection and appointment of Avanti, but were concerned about the lack of engagement since then. Brandon Mews were looking forward to further engagement in respect of the results of the Avanti review and the scoping of the next steps. The Director confirmed that, as detailed in Avanti's work specification, they were due to undertake consultation with leaseholders. This had not yet taken place, but he understood that Avanti would start the process shortly.

There were no other urgent items of business.

The meeting ended at 20:50pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Rhys Campbell
Rhys.Campbell@cityoflondon.gov.uk