

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: Windsor House 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 Windsor House in conjunction with full cyclical redecorations for the internal and external common parts across the Estate. RAG Status: Green (Amber at last report to Committee) Risk Status: Medium (Medium at last report to committee) Costed Risk Provision Utilised: N/A Final Outturn Cost: £2,763,428.90
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	- 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. - 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. Reasons for Variance • Delays: A culmination of issues throughout the design phase (insufficient exploratory surveys due to a lack of detail in the client brief), planning (a small number of windows were inadvertently missed from the original application), procurement (intermittent resourcing deficiencies) and delivery (slow contractor mobilisation, persistent access issues and the Coronavirus pandemic), led to a significant delay in completion. Value for Money Assessment • Estimated NPV: £1,670,431 • Actual NPV: £ 2,763,428.90 • Assessment: The final budget approved after two issue reports was £ 2,914,460.00. This constituted circa a £1.1m overspend from Gateway 5 and a significant overspend. This can be attributed to the discovery of lead paint, additional asbestos removal and the requirement for additional unforeseen dormer window repairs. Additional budget was sought (and approved) via Issues Reports during the construction phase of the project. Despite the documented overspend, the project has delivered good value for money, due to long-term maintenance savings and resident wellbeing improvements. Key Learnings and Recommendations • 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	Design Preparedness 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. Areas for Improvement • Pre-construction Surveys: Sequencing of asbestos and lead paint surveys could have been more explicitly integrated into the design phase to avoid delays. More in-depth structural surveys at an early stage would have highlighted the potential for lintel replacement above window openings, instead of this only becoming apparent much later during construction. • 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 structural complications.
6. Procurement route	Works were procured via open tender advertised on the capital esourcing 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 Quantity Surveyor was employed to assist with the Extension Of Time 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. A lack of sufficient exploratory surveys at the feasibility stage of the project, resulted in additional cost and delay during the construction phase, due to unforeseen variations. The inadvertent omission of a small number of windows from the original planning application led to further delays in terms of having to obtain statutory approvals out of sequence with the main works. These challenges were compounded by both the Coronavirus pandemic and persistent access issues during the construction phase. Despite these challenges, the majority of key milestones were achieved within the revised timelines, and the project was successfully closed out with verified final accounts.
10. Assessment of project against Scope	The project scope experienced variance for a variety of reasons. The limited nature of the pre-construction surveys resulted in additional works relating to lead paint and asbestos removal, in addition to lintel replacement. Furthermore, the omission of some windows at the planning application stage resulted in further unforeseen additions during the construction phase.
11. Risks and issues	Identified risks included leaseholder challenges to service charge recovery, with a potential financial impact of approximately £513,312. This was mitigated through transparent procurement and consultation processes. Unidentified risks included access restrictions and heritage sensitivities, which led to design adjustments and resident dissatisfaction in some cases. 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	<table><tr><td>Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</td><td>Estimated cost (excluding risk): £624,000</td></tr></table>	Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)	Estimated cost (excluding risk): £624,000													
	Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)	Estimated cost (excluding risk): £624,000														
	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.															
	<table><tr><td></td><td>At Authority to Start work (G5)</td><td>Final Outturn Cost</td></tr><tr><td>Fees</td><td>£ 31,807</td><td>£ 12,050.26</td></tr><tr><td>Staff Costs</td><td>£ 43,438</td><td>£ 43,437.00</td></tr><tr><td>Works</td><td>£ 1,595,187</td><td>£ 2,707,941.64</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>£ 1,670,431</td><td>£ 2,763,428.90</td></tr></table>		At Authority to Start work (G5)	Final Outturn Cost	Fees	£ 31,807	£ 12,050.26	Staff Costs	£ 43,438	£ 43,437.00	Works	£ 1,595,187	£ 2,707,941.64	Total	£ 1,670,431	£ 2,763,428.90
		At Authority to Start work (G5)	Final Outturn Cost													
Fees	£ 31,807	£ 12,050.26														
Staff Costs	£ 43,438	£ 43,437.00														
Works	£ 1,595,187	£ 2,707,941.64														
Total	£ 1,670,431	£ 2,763,428.90														
There is a total overspend of circa £1.1m in respect of the approved budget at Gateway 5. This relates to unforeseen variations, which largely arose as a result of the documented limitations in pre-construction surveys.																
A total of £464,962.22 was recovered by way of service charges from Windsor House leaseholders. 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 met its SMART objectives: • 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	• 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	• Early contractor engagement improves planning. • Clear FAQs and contact points reduce complaints. • Secure scaffolding and delivery coordination essential. • Provisional sums included within the contract for any additional repairs not identified during the testing contract were required. • The contractor, ETEC Group, demonstrated limited proactivity in working collaboratively with the City's project management team, which impacted cost management and delivery within the agreed budget.
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