

**BARBICAN ESTATE RESIDENTS CONSULTATION COMMITTEE**  
**Monday, 26 January 2026**

Minutes of the meeting of the  
Barbican Estate Residents Consultation Committee (RCC)  
held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on  
Monday, 26 January 2026 at 6.30 pm

**Present**

**Members:**

Jo Boait - (Chair)  
Lucy Sisman - Cromwell Tower (Deputy Chair)  
Jan-Marc Petroschka - Chairman of the Barbican Association  
Lionel Meyringer - Andrewes House  
Tam Pollard - Ben Jonson House  
John Taysum - Bryer Court  
Gordon Griffiths - Bunyan Court  
Helen Hudson - Defoe House  
Sally Spensley - Frobisher Crescent  
Jason Symonds - Gilbert House  
Pauline Fasoli - John Trundle Court  
Claire Hersey - Lambert Jones Mews  
David Lawrence - Lauderdale Tower  
Stuart Lynas - Mountjoy House  
Robert Bexson - Seddon House  
Sandy Wilson - Shakespeare Tower  
Frits van Kempen - Speed House  
John Holme - The Postern  
Rodney Jagelman - Thomas More House  
Petre Reid - Willoughby House

**In attendance**

Deputy Anne Corbett – Chair, Barbican Residential Committee  
Adam Hogg – Common Councillor, Cripplegate  
Jim Durcan - Chair, Service Level Working Party and Garden Advisory Group  
Catherine Dixon - Breton House

**Officers:**

Polly Dunn	- Assistant Town Clerk and Executive Director of Governance and Member Services
Judith Finlay	- Executive Director of Community & Children's Services
Dan Sanders	- Director of Property & Estate Management, Barbican Residential Estate
Curtis Bannister-Pond	- Community and Children's Services
Eoin Doyle	- Community and Children's Services
Shruti Sonawane	- Community and Children's Services
Daniel Castle	- Community and Children's Services

1. **APOLOGIES**

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting including Richard Setchim, Chair of the Climate and Zero Carbon Working Party, who observed the meeting online. The Chair noted that Fiona Lean (Ben Jonson House) and Dave Taylor (Gilbert House) had both resigned from the Committee. Tam Pollard and Jason Symonds had been appointed as their respective replacements.

Apologies had been received from Nicola Baker, Andy Hope, Sandra Jenner and Andrew Tong.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED, that – the public minutes of the previous meeting held on 3 November 2025 as a correct record subject to the following amendment:

- the Outstanding Actions section on page 10 should state “section 4c”, not “action 40”.

4. **ANNUAL REVIEW OF TERMS OF REFERENCE – BARBICAN RESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE**

The Committee considered a report of the Barbican Residential Committee (BRC) Terms of Reference.

The Assistant Town Clerk informed the Committee that, in accordance with past precedents, Members views were sought on these Terms of Reference ahead of further consideration by the Barbican Residential Committee.

The Committee was informed of an overall Housing Governance review at the City of London Corporation scheduled to start from March 2026. There were, therefore, no proposed changes at this time.

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

5. **SERVICE CHARGE EXPENDITURE AND INCOME ACCOUNT – LATEST APPROVED BUDGET 2025/26 AND ORIGINAL BUDGET 2026/27**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Community and Children’s Services in respect of the latest approved budget for 2025/26 and the original budget for 2026/27 for revenue expenditure included within the service charge in respect of dwellings.

The Director drew the Committee’s attention to the budget table in Appendix 4 and advised the Committee that the Service Charge Working Party and the Reporting Committee had jointly reviewed the core budget construction. He advised that the figures in the other, internally required, management tables were consistent with the budget table, although the individual lines did not directly map across. In future, these internal management tables would either be removed entirely or displayed in separate reports.

In response to some observations that had been submitted to the Chair in advance of the meeting, the Director advised that, although Wallside residents were freeholders, they paid some of the service charges. He confirmed that these did not include contributions to major works.

A Member thanked those involved for their significant efforts to produce the budget and welcomed the detailed explanations of forecast expenditure. The Director noted the request that future papers included written commentary on the assumptions and calculations used.

In response to a question, a member of the Service Charge Working Party advised that the Working Party had reviewed the 2026/27 budget figures in detail and had been satisfied with the explanations given.

The Director noted that the Barbican Residential Committee would be asked to approve the budget. He explained the term “latest approved budget” was regularly used by the City of London to describe funding changes. This was not applied to the service charge budget, where the actual expenditure was calculated and a balancing charge/credit generated in September.

A Member queried the budget of £150k for the tower lift refurbishments. The Director explained that this figure was based on £50k per tower for consultation fees. Due to the need for Building Safety Regulator approval, it was unlikely that works would commence until 2027/28, so the likely costs had not been included.

In response to questions from Members about the Building Safety Regulator approval processes, the Director advised that they were taking 10 to 14 months to review an application currently. With regard to the emergency lift replacement work, no major structural changes or alterations were expected and a check was being made as to whether Building Safety Regulator approval would be needed.

In response to a question, the Director advised that some audit firms had been approached regarding the service charge audit. He was waiting for their responses and would then bring a proposal to the relevant committees for review and approval. The audit would cover both 2024/25 and 2025/26 and was expected to be completed within this calendar year.

A Member noted his previous request concerning the statutory obligation to conduct audits. The Director advised he had no further update but would follow this up and provide an email response outside of the meeting.

RESOLVED, that -

- the report was received and its contents noted; and
- the budget for 2026/27 for revenue expenditure included within the service charge in respect of dwellings be recommended to the Barbican Residential Committee.

## 6. **PROCUREMENT REVIEW**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of the Community and Children's Services updating Members on the procurement of reactive repairs contracts, addressing resident concerns regarding the procurement process, and seeking approval to commission an independent external review of the procurement, including the proposed approach to funding and resident involvement.

The Director advised the Committee that the City of London had found no indication of failure or negligence in the Lot 2 (Reactive Repairs – Barbican) procurement activities and so the costs of any review would be service charge payable. The Director advised that, following discussions between the Barbican Estate Office, procurement and the contractors, in which it was noted that it would not be beneficial for the City of London or residents to insist that a non-committed contractor remained on site, a decision was taken to allow their withdrawal. The Director would check and advise the Committee whether there was a contractual clause that could be progressed against the contractors.

There was a wide-ranging discussion amongst the Members, during which the following points were noted:

- Dissatisfaction was expressed that the contractor had been able to withdraw with no penalty incurred.
- It was suggested that the City of London should want to undertake the review themselves, as the early withdrawal of the contractor suggested failures that should be properly addressed.
- There were a number of upcoming large-scale contracts concerning the lifts and building envelopes and, without a proper understanding of this contractor's withdrawal, there was no guarantee that similar issues with other contractors would not arise.
- It was suggested that the focus of the review should be widened, as the contractor's issues might not have been solely due to the procurement process.
- Concerns were expressed about the costs of up to £10,000 to commission a full independent review. It was also noted that the Director could not give a commitment on behalf of other City of London committees that any wider changes proposed by the review would be made.
- Concern was expressed about the time that the Barbican Estate Office would need to spend on this, and it was suggested that their efforts would be better focused on providing solutions for the Barbican Estate.

There was no support for the review as presented. There was some support for a review with a revised remit to be explored; however, when put to a vote a majority of Members elected to recommend that a review not be progressed.

RESOLVED, that – the report was received, its contents were noted and a recommendation should be made to the Barbican Residential Committee that an independent external review of the procurement should not be undertaken.

## **7. REPORT OF THE MAJOR WORKS PROGRAM BOARD**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services that summarised the matters discussed by the Major Works Programme Board (MWPB) at its meetings on 26 November 2025 and 14 January 2026.

The Director highlighted the Appendices 1-5 and provided a brief overview of the respective areas described in the report.

A Member suggested that the charges detailed in the MWPB reports should be reviewed to ensure that the allocations were appropriate.

The Director noted that the Planned Preventative Maintenance (PPM) Schedule (Appendix 1) was effectively the first such schedule that had been produced for the Estate and would be circulated to service charge payers after its review by the RCC and BRC. It provided assurance regarding the maintenance of Estate assets, including who would be undertaking this.

Members welcomed the PPM Schedule, but noted that some maintenance was described as "ad-hoc". The Director advised that, once the relevant procurements had been completed, there would be a named responsibility for each PPM requirement. The report had been updated since its preparation and would be circulated to Members in February 2026.

The Chair noted that the schedule of PPM requirements highlighted whether they related to residential blocks, car parks or the BEO. She requested that requirements that related solely to tenants of the City of London be similarly differentiated in the PPM Schedule and other documents, as appropriate.

The Director advised that progress had been made on planned replacement of internal fire doors in Lauderdale, Shakespeare and Cromwell Towers (Appendix 2). A door mock-up was being produced and would be displayed in the tower lobbies. A Town Hall meeting would also be held for residents of the towers. All residents would be given the opportunity to review the proposed door furniture.

The Director advised that fire safety regulations under the Building Safety Act 2022 had changed in recent years; new requirements had been incorporated into the fire safety signage (Appendix 3) programme. There had been complaints from residents regarding the signage that had been proposed previously and bespoke signage using 5mm thick aluminium and typography close to the original

guidelines was now being proposed to ensure that it was in keeping with the Estate.

Members welcomed the inclusion of the Compliance Report (Appendix 4). The Director noted that this first report detailed the statutory requirements that needed to be complied with across the Estate. He advised that a similar report was being developed to highlight compliance with the lease requirements.

The Chair was pleased to see that forward actions had been included in the Compliance Report and asked the Director to provide timeframes for these to enable expectations regarding progress to be understood.

The Project Tracker (Appendix 5) was reviewed. The Director advised that work by the independent expert witness in relation to Ben Jonson House was progressing well and the report was expected in March 2026.

Responding to a question on the electrical infrastructure project, the Director advised that substantial electrical works had been undertaken in the past 18 months with respect to communal EICRs. A cyclical programme was now being developed.

A Member asked for the criteria used when designating work to be undertaken as a project (and its inclusion in the project tracker). The Director explained that formal methodology was still being developed. Generally, the MWPB focused on projects relating to the repair and replacement of the building infrastructure and the development of the PPM Schedule, whilst the Reporting Committee focused on the governance, heating studies and similar projects, together with performance reviews such as whether the PPM Schedule was being followed. On the absence of Reporting Committee linked reports, the Director explained this was due to a previously cancelled meeting in December 2025.

The Director advised that the Major Works / Capital Expenditure Plan was being further developed and would be presented to the next Committee meeting.

In response to a question on the terminology used in the reports, the Director agreed to ensure that a glossary was included in future.

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

## **8. REPORT OF THE REPORTING COMMITTEE**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services which summarised the matters discussed by the Reporting Committee at its meeting on 12 November 2025.

The Director advised that the Reporting Committee supported the new approach to block inspections, which would involve a wider range of officers inspecting the blocks, including himself and other members of his senior leadership team. All would undertake the standard inspection and would also add wider perspectives and input to this. Resident representatives would be invited to join the inspections

and it was proposed that the inspections would occur every eight weeks, not six, with the expectation of enhanced inspection quality.

In response to a question, the Director reiterated that House Groups would be asked to join the inspections and he advised that it was hoped that the Barbican App could be used to load photographs of the issues, forward the inspection report to the House Chair and also detail progress up to the next inspection.

Work was underway to arrange the publication of the Reporting Committee and MWPB meeting minutes on the City of London website.

The Director advised that the purchase order for the Governance Review had been sent to Charles Russell Speechlys and Inside the Box Advisory. Engagement had commenced and an initial meeting would be held to discuss the proposal and finalise logistics.

The Director noted the significant water outage in December 2025 and that it had caused the cancellation of the December Reporting Committee meeting. He was very pleased with the way that his team had managed this outage, including the communication with residents.

In response to a question, the Director reminded the Committee that he had committed to producing a gap analysis between the agenda plan and the actual Reporting Committee discussions. He would provide this to the April 2026 Committee meeting, together with the future agenda planning.

In response to a question, the Chair reminded the Committee that it had been noted in previous meetings that the Reporting Committee was not yet fully functional. The intention was for the Reporting Committee to take over specific responsibilities from the relevant Working Party when it was appropriate to do so. An example of this was the budget, which had been reviewed by both the Service Charge Working Party and the Reporting Committee, with future reports regarding the performance against the budget being the responsibility of the Reporting Committee.

The Director noted that, following a recent call for expressions of interest to join the Reporting Committee, four applications had been received for the three available vacancies. All four applicants demonstrated strong engagement, relevant experience and a clear ability to contribute effectively to the work of the Committee. He advised that, following discussions with the Chair, it had been agreed that a proposal should be brought to the Committee that all four applicants be appointed to the Reporting Committee. It was further proposed that, should a future vacancy arise, this position would not be filled, enabling the Reporting Committee's membership to return naturally to its intended size.

RESOLVED, that –

- the report was received and its contents noted;

- Mary Bonar, Roger Braybrooks, Jane Northcote and Richard Setchim be appointed to the Reporting Committee; and
- The next Reporting Committee vacancy would not be filled to enable the Reporting Committee's membership to return to its intended size.

9. **UPDATE FROM THE DIRECTOR OF PROPERTY & ESTATE MANAGEMENT**

The Committee received a report from the Director of Property and Estate Management on progress across key works currently underway throughout the Estate.

The Director drew the Committee's attention to the details of progress with the Building Safety Case for the Towers. The Director expected to be notified shortly whether the Building Assessment Certificate would be awarded or not. The Director advised that, in addition to the Towers, the terrace blocks on the Barbican Estate were also classified as high-risk due to their height and occupation as defined in the Building Safety Act 2022.

The Director confirmed the Barbican App would be piloted at Thomas More House shortly, with the Estate-wide rollout planned for about a month later. The Director advised that the App would be an integral tool for monitoring trends and indicating accountability for residents' repair tickets, as well as being a useful App for residents.

In respect of the Car Park – Review and Options Appraisal, the Director confirmed that work was underway to review the Estate's car parks in a holistic manner, including monitoring financial performance and utilisation of the park spaces, to establish a clear and robust evidence base.

In response to a question, the Director advised that the Police Storage proposals had been withdrawn from the RCC and BRC papers for the current reporting period. An update would be brought to the Committee for review once it was available.

On the Redecorations Project - Full Review and Wash-Up, the Director noted that this would be brought to the next RCC and BRC meetings. He advised Members that extensive work had been undertaken to date, particularly by Finance, and noted that this project was awarded six years ago and ended in May 2025. A Member noted that a complaint in respect of the internal redecorations in Willoughby House had been outstanding for a year to date.

On the Building Envelope - Strategic Approach, the Director highlighted that this would mean a shift from works undertaken in isolation to a more holistic approach with each building assessed and considered as a complete system to ensure it was made fully wind and water-tight.

On Repairs and Maintenance - In-house, the Director informed the Committee that the transition to an in-house maintenance resident repairs service was progressing well. He drew the Committee's attention to the Progress Tracker



(Appendix 1) that highlighted the steps completed, in progress and outstanding. He would arrange for timelines to be added to the next report.

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

## **10. WORKING PARTY UPDATES**

### **(A) CLIMATE AND ZERO CARBON WORKING PARTY (CWP)**

The Chair, Richard Setchim, introduced himself to the Committee. He referenced the Ambue Heating Review and asked that the CWP be given the opportunity to engage with Ambue and be involved in the review of their report when it was available. The Director advised that the Ambue report was expected later in the year and would not be finalised in time for the next Committee meeting.

### **(B) SERVICE CHARGE WORKING PARTY**

There were no questions on the report.

### **(C) GARDENS ADVISORY WORKING PARTY**

The Chair of this Working Party advised that no meeting had been held since the previous RCC meeting. However, a full programme of quarterly meetings, along with an inspection schedule for March 2026, had been forwarded to the BEO.

### **(D) SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENT WORKING PARTY (SLAWP)**

The Chair of the SLAWP advised that there were elements of service delivery which worked well for residents and noted that there had been a marked improvement in complaint response rates. He expressed frustration with other areas and requested that information on completed repairs should be supplied to residents and for every effort to be made to ensure that urgent repairs were addressed within the agreed timeframes. A Member asked for residents to be given repair reference numbers as part of the standard communication when reporting repairs.

The Chair of the SLAWP thanked the BEO for their response to the Aldersgate water incident and noted the excellent communication and interaction with residents. He suggested that similar urgency should be applied to other serious issues, such as lift breakdowns in staircase blocks.

In response to a query from a Member, the Director advised the Committee that there was no preferential treatment arrangement for individual residents. The Chair of the SLAWP noted that the solution should be to fix the reactive repairs system. The Director agreed and informed the Committee that much of the BEO's focus and energy was geared to the long-term benefit of residents and leaseholders. The new organisational structure, added resources and the Barbican App, when implemented, were each designed to improve overall service delivery.

The Director reassured Members that scheduled inspections still occurred, covering the statutory requirements.

In response to a question about standard operating procedures, the Director advised that previous discussions had been in respect of service level agreements. He explained that service level agreements and KPIs should govern what was being monitored, and that standard operating procedures supported back-office processes. Due to the sensitivities of certain complaints, the Director did not support making the standard operating procedures generally available.

#### **(E) ASSET MAINTENANCE WORKING PARTY**

No report was presented and no questions raised.

#### **11. OUTSTANDING ACTIONS**

The Committee noted the actions tracker for the Barbican Estate Residents' Consultation Committee.

The Chair noted that actions 14, 17, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27 and 28 had been closed at the previous RCC meeting on 3 November 2025 and that actions 30, 31 and 32 related to the BRC and not to the RCC.

The Chair further noted that the RCC actions from the meeting held on 3 November 2025 had not been included in the report. She advised that she had reviewed these and that none were of particular concern at present. Should would be meeting with the Director in March to review and update the actions tracker before the next Committee meeting.

The Committee agreed that actions 9, 15 and 19 should be closed and that action 24 should remain open until the requested terrace lift papers were presented to the Committee for consideration.

The Chair of the SLAWP noted the action on repair invoices (action 8) that remained outstanding. The action questioned whether leaseholders would receive an invoice for any repairs undertaken. The Director agreed to check and bring a response to the next Committee meeting.

#### **12. QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

No questions were raised.

#### **13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**

In response to a question, the Director noted that there was a disagreement currently concerning whether the cost of the work required in respect of the Brandon Mews Canopy should be recoverable through the service charge. As advised at the previous Committee meeting, the Project Tracker Report reflected the current legal position, which was that it should be included in the service charge.

There was no other business.

**The meeting ended at 8.40 pm.**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: Phil Brown**  
**[phil.brown@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:phil.brown@cityoflondon.gov.uk)**