

Committees: Corporate Projects Board [for information] Community & Children's Services Committee [for decision] Projects & Procurement Sub [for information]	Dates: 12 November 2025 01 December 2025 28 January 2026
Subject: Sydenham Hill Window Replacement and Common Parts Redecorations	Gateway 6: Outcome Report Regular
Unique Project Identifier: 11548	
Report of: Director of Community & Children's Services Report Author: Rafael Cardenas, Project Manager	For Decision
PUBLIC	

Summary

1. Status update	<p>Project Description: This project addressed the need for the Window Replacements at Sydenham Hill 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.</p> <p>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: £ 1,605,534.95</p>
2. Next steps and requested decisions	<p>Requested Decisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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; resident satisfaction was high due to improved aesthetics and comfort.

- 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.

Reasons for Variance

- Delays caused by a material amendment required to the planning application, due to incomplete window design and a failure to incorporate an appropriate mechanical ventilation strategy. Further complexity relates to the fact that Lammas Green is a Grade II Listed building and Otto Close is located within a conservation area.

Value for Money Assessment

- Estimated NPV: £1,217,610
- Actual NPV: £ 1,605,534.95
- Assessment: The final budget approved after two issue reports was £ 1,719,010. This constituted circa a £390k uplift from Gateway 5 and therefore a significant overspend. This can be attributed to the requirement to revisit the planning application process (as a result of changes in Building Regulations), appointment of relevant external consultants, material cost inflation and changes in site compound locations (due to resident objections). 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	<p>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.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pre-construction Surveys: These could have been undertaken more comprehensively, with due consideration for mechanical ventilation, particularly given the fact that Lammas Green is Grade II Listed and Otto close is within a conservation area. In this regard, the client brief could perhaps have been stronger.• 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.

	Commencement of the works contract was initially delayed in conjunction with residents' opposition to the new development project at the former site of Mais House. A communications consultancy (Comm Comm UK) was utilised to support the team to liaise with local residents, address concerns, and facilitate transparent communication throughout the beginning of the project. Once residents had gained a clearer understanding of the distinction between the two separate projects, resident queries were addressed directly via the City Major Works Team as originally envisaged.
--	--

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 faced delays due to planning complications, particularly with grade listed building and conservation area constraints at Lammes Green and Otto Close respectively. Initial procurement was successful, but the need to revise planning applications and re-engage suppliers caused slippage. Despite these challenges, the project was mobilised in September 2022 and completed by Spring 2024, aligning with revised expectations.
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 mechanical ventilation being overlooked at planning application stage. Furthermore, the omission of some windows resulted in further unforeseen additions during the construction phase.
11. Risks and issues	The main identified risk was leaseholder challenge to service charge recovery, which was mitigated through open tendering and statutory consultations. Unidentified risks included moisture ingress and planning omissions (e.g., mechanical ventilation), which delayed progress. 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 border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="476 348 770 415">Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)</td><td data-bbox="770 348 1389 415">Estimated cost (excluding risk): £618,000</td></tr> </table>	Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)	Estimated cost (excluding risk): £618,000													
Estimated Outturn Cost (G2)	Estimated cost (excluding risk): £618,000															
	<p>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.</p>															
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th data-bbox="770 640 1056 707">At Authority to Start work (G5)</th><th data-bbox="1056 640 1389 707">Final Outturn Cost</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="476 707 770 752">Fees</td><td data-bbox="770 707 1056 752">£ 42,564</td><td data-bbox="1056 707 1389 752">£ 40,243.82</td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="476 752 770 797">Staff Costs</td><td data-bbox="770 752 1056 797">£ 61,580</td><td data-bbox="1056 752 1389 797">£ 61,580</td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="476 797 770 842">Works</td><td data-bbox="770 797 1056 842">£ 1,113,466</td><td data-bbox="1056 797 1389 842">£ 1,503,711.13</td></tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="476 842 770 875">Total</td><td data-bbox="770 842 1056 875">£ 1,217,610</td><td data-bbox="1056 842 1389 875">£ 1,605,534.95</td></tr> </tbody> </table>		At Authority to Start work (G5)	Final Outturn Cost	Fees	£ 42,564	£ 40,243.82	Staff Costs	£ 61,580	£ 61,580	Works	£ 1,113,466	£ 1,503,711.13	Total	£ 1,217,610	£ 1,605,534.95
	At Authority to Start work (G5)	Final Outturn Cost														
Fees	£ 42,564	£ 40,243.82														
Staff Costs	£ 61,580	£ 61,580														
Works	£ 1,113,466	£ 1,503,711.13														
Total	£ 1,217,610	£ 1,605,534.95														
	<p>There is a total overspend of circa £390k in respect of the approved budget at Gateway 5. This relates to the documented issues relating to the planning application.</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	A structured snagging process and clear handover documentation helped close out the project smoothly and maintain accountability.
18. Improvement reflections	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Integrate ventilation strategy and works early in the design stage to avoid delays.• Improve post-installation support and inspections.• Enhance communication with residents during disruption.• 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">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