

| | |
|--|---|
| Committees: Corporate Projects Board [for information] Community & Children's Services Committee [for decision] Projects & Procurement Sub [for information] | Dates: 12 November 2025 28 January 2026 25 March 2026 |
| Subject: Holloway Estate Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations Unique Project Identifier: 11548 | Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular |
| Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services Report Author: Rafael Cardenas, Project Manager | For Decision |
| PUBLIC | |

Summary

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Status update | Project Description: This project addressed the need for the Window Replacements at Holloway Estate and Whitby Court as well as a basis for establishing a platform for programming the future cyclical redecorations for the internal and external common parts across the Estate. RAG Status: Green (Red at last report to Committee) Risk Status: Medium (Medium at last report to committee) Costed Risk Provision Utilised: N/A Final Outturn Cost: £ 4,604,242.99 |
| 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All residential units have received upgraded double-glazed windows, enhancing energy efficiency and reducing external noise; this is expected to provide residents with greater comfort within their homes. The window design also improved the visual appeal of the estate, aligning with broader regeneration goals while complying with planning and building consent approvals. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While many residents welcomed the upgrades, feedback has been varied, particularly around communication during works and the quality of some finishes. Any concerns raised were addressed as part of the snagging process with all outstanding matters now fully resolved and completed works verified as meeting the expected standards. <p>Reasons for Variance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delays caused by material amendment due to new Building Regulations, requiring trickle vents in habitable rooms. However, this detail was omitted in the planning permission, creating a potential conflict in terms of statutory approvals which took time to resolve. <p>Value for Money Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimated NPV: £3,559,919 Actual NPV: £4,604,242.99 Assessment: The final budget approved after two issue reports was £4,748,118. Despite the documented overspend from Gateway 5, the project has delivered good value for money, due to long-term maintenance savings and resident wellbeing improvements. <p>Key Learnings and Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated upgrades (e.g., insulation) should be considered alongside window replacements. Future projects should include a holistic building envelope assessment to maximise energy efficiency. Early contractor involvement helped refine specifications and reduce costs. Engage suppliers during design phase to optimise material choices and cost efficiency. Stakeholder engagement was insufficient during design phase. Future projects should include resident consultation and heritage impact assessments to ensure alignment with community expectations. |
|--|---|

Main Report

Design & Delivery Review

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| 4. Design into delivery | <p>Design Preparedness</p> <p>The Corporation adopted the correct approach in appointing an external consultant at the outset of the project to undertake design, specification and manage the planning application process. This resulted in detailed specifications for the manufacture and installation of preferred window products.</p> |
|--------------------------------|---|

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| | Areas for Improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-construction Surveys: Sequencing of asbestos and lead paint surveys could have been more explicitly integrated into the design phase to avoid delays. • Resident Engagement: Balloting and colour selection processes could have been better structured and documented. • Access Protocols: More detailed planning for contractor access and resident notifications would have improved coordination. |
| 5. Options appraisal | The selected option to procure a contractor to deliver a programme of repairs via open tender successfully delivered the projects objectives. Changes were required during project delivery specially Extension of Time (EOT) basically due to planning permission. |
| 6. Procurement route | Works were procured via open tender advertised on the capital e-sourcing portal. |
| 7. Skills base | The City of London project team had the required skills and experience to manage the delivery of the project. An external QS was employed to assist with the EOT and variations raised by the Contractors in order to ensure accurate assessment of claims, maintain cost control, and provide independent validation of contractual entitlements. |
| 8. Stakeholders | Although it is acknowledged that stakeholder engagement could have been more robust during the early stages, resident liaison was managed well throughout the delivery phase of the project. |

Variation Review

| | |
|--|--|
| 9. Assessment of project against key milestones | This project originally formed part of a portfolio-wide programme, with the intention of progressing a single procurement exercise for window replacement to all HRA housing stock. In hindsight, this approach was flawed and resulted in significant delay, as the various estates had to be separated into individual projects and tender packages, with separate consultants appointed. The project experienced delays due to planning complications. However, once Mulalley & Co. Ltd. was appointed, the project progressed largely as planned. Key milestones such as contract award, mobilisation, and completion were achieved within revised |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| | timelines. The statutory consultations and tender evaluations were completed successfully. |
| 10. Assessment of project against Scope | This project originally formed part of a portfolio-wide programme, with the intention of progressing a single procurement exercise for window replacement to all HRA housing stock. In hindsight, this approach was flawed and resulted in significant delay, as the various estates had to be separated into individual projects and tender packages, with separate consultants appointed. Although there was not a significant change to the actual scope, the relatively minor change in respect of trickle ventilation impacted the project adversely in terms of programme and cost. |
| 11. Risks and issues | The primary risk identified was the potential for leaseholders to challenge service charge recovery, particularly around whether the works constituted improvements rather than repairs. This risk was mitigated through open tendering and statutory consultations. No unidentified risks significantly impacted the project, and costed risk provision was not applicable. |
| 12. Transition to BAU | The project has a defect liability period of 12 months commencing from the date of practical completion. There is also an additional ten-year warranty covering window frames. At the close of this period, the ongoing maintenance responsibilities will transition to the general Repairs & Maintenance contract, ensuring continuity. |

Value Review

13. Budget

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Estimated Outturn Cost (G2) | Estimated cost (excluding risk): £1,309,000 |
|-----------------------------|--|

The Gateway 2 projected cost was estimated in 2013 with no provision for cost inflation. The officers managing the project at this time are no longer with the City and the estimating methodology they used is not known.

| | At Authority to Start work (G5) | Final Outturn Cost |
|-------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| Fees | £ 57,184 | £ 88,052.21 |
| Staff Costs | £ 87,095 | £ 70,608.10 |
| Works | £ 3,415,640 | £ 4,445,582.68 |
| Total | £ 3,559,919 | £ 4,604,242.99 |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>There is a total overspend of circa £1.04m in respect of the approved budget at Gateway 5. This relates to delays with the approval of the planning consent, including the installation of trickle vents within the new windows and the increase in material costs due to late placement of orders for the re-designed units.</p> <p>A total of £1,569,874.92 was recovered by way of service charges from Holloway Estate leaseholders.</p> <p>Final accounts have been subject to an independent verification check, undertaken by a suitably experienced officer within the relevant implementing department.</p> |
| 14. Investment | N/A |
| 15. Assessment of project against SMART objectives | <p>The project met its SMART objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacement of outdated windows with compliant, energy-efficient units. • Improved safety, acoustic performance, and SAP ratings. • Establishment of a cyclical redecorations programme. • Works were managed to minimise disruption to residents. |
| 16. Key benefits realised | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced thermal and acoustic performance. • Improved safety and compliance with building standards. • Refreshed communal areas contributing to resident wellbeing. • Long-term maintenance savings and extended building lifespan. • Increased resident satisfaction and property value. |

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| 17. Positive reflections | Works were carried out to a high standard, satisfying the requirements of the Corporation and fulfilling its pledge to meaningfully engage with residents in respect of major works. |
| 18. Improvement reflections | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electrical upgrades must be scoped alongside window works. • Use visual condition reports to guide future maintenance. • Ensure leaseholder coordination for access and compliance. • Provisional sums included within the contract for any additional repairs not identified during the testing contract were required. |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 19. Sharing best practice | 1. Dissemination of key information through team and project staff briefings. 2. Lessons learned have been logged and recorded on departmental SharePoint. |
| 20. AOB | N/A |

Appendices

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

Contact

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Report Author | Rafael Cardenas |
| Email Address | Rafael.Cardenas@cityoflondon.gov.uk |
| Telephone Number | 07710 716649 |