

Committee(s)	Dated:
Planning & Transportation	24 th February 2015
Subject: Millennium Bridge Inclinorator Options Paper	Public
Report of: City Surveyor	For Decision

Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide Members with options to decide on the future of the Millennium Bridge Inclinorator. Members are of the view that the inclinorator is not reliable and the City should be doing more to ensure that it is available to the general public as much as practically possible.

The average availability of the inclinorator over a 22 month period shows that it has been working for 96% of the time which is in line with the majority of other public lifts. However, the data for the inclinorator shows several periods of time when, for instance in April 2014 the availability of the inclinorator was down to 39% for a month. I believe these periods of down time have changed the Members perception of the Inclinorator.

This report provides the following three options:

- Option A – Keep the inclinorator and do nothing.

Available data for the inclinorator highlights the performance of the inclinorator is in line with other public lifts.

- Option B – Keep the inclinorator, but increase store of replacement spare parts. Parts for the inclinorator are only being manufactured outside the UK. Approval is sought to purchase a list of replaceable spares to be held by the City to decrease the down time of the inclinorator when a fault is reported. A one off cost of £20k is required for the initial purchase of these critical spares from the Thames Bridges Repairs and Maintenance & Major Work Fund. Future replacement parts will be funded through the Building Repairs & Maintenance budget.

- Option C – Replace the inclinorator with an alternative. Commission a feasibility survey via the Project Sub Committee to look at replacing the inclinorator with an alternative which is in line with the original planning permissions for the Millennium Bridge.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Note the content of the report.
- Approve that the City Surveyor take forward Option B with our Lift Contractor.
- Approve the £20k requested for the Critical list of spare parts required for Option B from the Thames Bridges Repairs and Maintenance & Major Works Fund.

Main Report

Background

1. The provision of the inclinator was part of the planning conditions for the Millennium Bridge in order to secure disabled access.
2. The original inclinator was manufactured by the Italian company Maspero Elevatori and had a persistent history of breakdowns.
3. At the Planning and Transportation Committee on the 14th October 2010 the City Surveyor provided a report requesting additional fees (£85,000) for a report to evaluate options to improve the performance of the inclinator.
4. Options included:
 - a. Do nothing
 - b. Remedial Work to existing
 - c. Replace with a new inclinator
 - d. Replace with a conventional lift
5. The Policy & Resources committee reduced the level of additional fees agreed to £20,000, hence only options b and c were considered as part of the evaluation report.
6. This committee agreed to complete option c and the new inclinator was awarded its certificate of practical completion on the 25th May 2012.
7. There have been three major breakdowns since the end of the defects period up to November 2013, when these were reported to this Committee. Since then there have been two major breakdowns both of which have required replacement rollers being manufactured and dispatched from Germany.
8. The inclinator is the only one of its kind in the UK and there are no inclinator manufacturers based within the UK.
9. Due to the incline of the inclinator each breakdown is classed under the working at height health and safety regulations, which requires at least two men to work at one time plus sufficient light which due to the inclinator's outside location means enough natural daylight which adds to the amount of time it is out of operation.

Current Position

10. Since the new inclinator was installed in May 2012, it has been used 100,700 times which equates to 3,146 journeys per month on average 100 times per day.
11. The breakdowns for inclinator relate to general wear and tear which isn't helped by the environment within which it is located i.e., in the open air and next to the river.
12. At this committee on the 13th January 2015, Members asked the City Surveyor for an options paper on the inclinator and whether it was fit for purpose as there is a perception by Members that the Inclinitor is not as reliable as it should be.
13. This report provides Members with those options and requests a decision on which option should be taken forward.

Options

Option A – Retain Inclinitor and do nothing

14. The statistics provided in Appendix 1, demonstrate that the inclinator performs well and in line with all of the other public lifts and escalators.

Option B – Retain Inclinitor but improve the availability of spare parts to reduce down time

15. It is clear that one of the key elements leading to a longer downtime on the inclinitor compared to the other public lifts is the lack of spare parts available in the UK.
16. The manufacturer, Huetter, who are based in Germany, have confirmed that all parts for the inclinitor are made to order and there are no off the shelf parts available, hence why we currently have to wait for parts to be sent from Germany.
17. We currently have no direct relationship with Huetter, the manufacturer, as the majority of correspondence with them has been through our Lift contractor, Apex. It is therefore essential we improve our relationship with them to ensure that we achieve the best quality service possible.
18. To try and alleviate the need to order parts from Germany in coordination with our Lift contractor we have sought alternative UK manufactured parts to install in the inclinitor. Unfortunately these parts are incompatible, hence the situation of requiring a stock of critical spare parts.

19. I have compiled an extensive list of replaceable spare parts and it is proposed that we purchase these replacement parts which would total in the region of £20k. These parts would remain under the ownership and control of the City and be centrally stored at the Guildhall which would allow easy access for our Lift contractor to access when required. The parts would be replaced as used and be funded out of the BR&M budget. Members are asked to approve the initial capital investment of £20k to be funded from the Thames Bridges Repairs and Maintenance & Major Works Fund. This will significantly reduce the downtime of the inclinator when a repair is required.
20. The parts would be ordered through our Lift contractor to ensure compliance with procurement regulations.
21. In addition to the replaceable spare parts, I am proposing that we increase the level of service cover provided by our Lift contractor, this increase in service will ensure that dedicated engineers will be available at all times to respond quickly to a breakdown. Whilst access to the inclinator can only take place in natural daylight, the expectation is that the engineers would respond in darkness to ensure that the inclinator is left in a safe state before being repaired the following morning. This additional service will come at an annual cost of £10k for the City which will be funded through the BR&M budget; a similar service has recently been introduced for the lifts at the Barbican Centre.
22. In addition to the above the lift engineer within my team will ensure the improvement in the quality of the Planned Preventative Maintenance (PPM) carried out on the inclinator. This will involve ensuring the scheduled of PPM works due at each visit is fully and correctly carried out which will form part of a reoccurring quality control maintenance programme.
23. It must be noted that whilst the above will assist with reducing the down time of the inclinator when it needs repairing, it will not completely exclude the potential of future breakdowns that cannot be fixed within a short length of time. Option B will allow us to do all we can to mitigate the length of down time.
24. This is our recommended option.

Option C – Replace the Inclinator

25. The City Surveyor would commission a project to look at the feasibility of replacing the inclinator with an alternative product such as a lift, travelator or ramp for example. Any change would be subject to planning permission.
26. The inclinator for the Millennium Bridge was proposed to provide access for people with disabilities without impinging on the view of St. Paul's from the Thames and the bridge. A conventional lift would have an impact on these views.
27. The current inclinator has only been in situ for 2 years and 9 months; there would be a risk to the City's reputation if this option was chosen. The original

- inclinator was in place for a more significant period of time circa 10 years before the decision was taken to replace it.
28. Any solution for the replacement of the inclinator will take time to develop and implement. Option 2 would probably be needed in the interim period to provide better support.
 29. Without a doubt this option would be the most costly. Funding would have to be sought and justified from constrained overall capital resources. Initial fees would have to be sought for the feasibility study followed by the actual costs to provide the suggested solution.
 30. This project would have to be reported and agreed via the Gateway Process with value for money consideration and the need for full committee approvals.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

31. The maintenance of the City's operational property portfolio sets out to deliver two of the key objectives in the Corporate Property Asset Management Strategy 2012-16.
 - SO.1 -Operational assets remain in a good, safe and statutory compliant condition.
 - SO.2 -Operational assets are fit for purpose and meet service delivery needs

Conclusion

32. The City Surveyor is presenting three options to Members to approve one in relation to the future of the Millennium Bridge Inclinator, those options are:

Option A – Keep the inclinator and do nothing

Option B – Keep the inclinator but increase store of spare parts

Option C – Replace the inclinator with alternative

33. Option B is the recommendation of the City Surveyor.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Graphs demonstrating inclinator availability compared to the other public lifts
- Appendix 2 – List of Replaceable Spares

Alison Hurley

Assistant Director – Corporate Property Facilities Management
City Surveyor's Department

T: 020 7332 1069

E: Alison.Hurley@cityoflondon.gov.uk