

Housing and Community Safety Scrutiny Sub-Committee

Tuesday 12 July 2011

7.00 pm

Ground Floor Meeting Room G02B - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

Membership

Councillor Gavin Edwards (Chair)
Councillor Linda Manchester (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Michael Bukola
Councillor Rowenna Davis
Councillor Tim McNally
Councillor Michael Situ
Councillor Martin Seaton
Miriam Facey
John Nosworthy
Jane Salmon
Lesley Wertheimer

Reserves

Councillor Claire Hickson
Councillor Paul Kyriacou
Councillor Darren Merrill
Councillor Wilma Nelson

INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Access to information

You have the right to request to inspect copies of minutes and reports on this agenda as well as the background documents used in the preparation of these reports.

Babysitting/Carers allowances

If you are a resident of the borough and have paid someone to look after your children, an elderly dependant or a dependant with disabilities so that you could attend this meeting, you may claim an allowance from the council. Please collect a claim form at the meeting.

Access

The council is committed to making its meetings accessible. Further details on building access, translation, provision of signers etc for this meeting are on the council's web site: www.southwark.gov.uk or please contact the person below.

Contact

Karen Harris on 020 7525 0324 or email: karen.harris@southwark.gov.uk

Members of the committee are summoned to attend this meeting

Annie Shepperd

Chief Executive

Date: 4 July 2011



Item No.

Title

Housing and Community Safety Scrutiny Sub-Committee

Tuesday 12 July 2011

7.00 pm

Ground Floor Meeting Room G02B - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

Order of Business

Item No.	Title	Page No.
	PART A - OPEN BUSINESS	
1.	APOLOGIES	
2.	NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT	
	In special circumstances, an item of business may be added to an agenda within five clear working days of the meeting.	
3.	DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS	
	Members to declare any personal interests and dispensation in respect of any item of business to be considered at this meeting.	
	DISCUSSION OF ANY OTHER OPEN ITEMS AS NOTIFIED AT THE START OF THE MEETING.	
4.	MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 4 APRIL 2011	1 - 6
5.	CANADA WATER FIRE SAFETY WORKS	7 - 18
6.	CABINET MEMBER DISCUSSION - COUNCILLOR IAN WINGFIELD	
7.	WRITTEN UPDATE ON CCTV	
8.	MEETING DATES AND WORK PROGRAMME FOR THE YEAR	19

Item No.

Title

Page No.

PART B - CLOSED BUSINESS

**DISCUSSION OF ANY CLOSED ITEMS AS NOTIFIED AT THE START
OF THE MEETING AND ACCEPTED BY THE CHAIR AS URGENT.**

Date: 4 July 2011



HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE

MINUTES of the Housing and Community Safety Scrutiny Sub-Committee held on Monday 4 April 2011 at 7.00 pm at Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5 8UB

PRESENT: Councillor Gavin Edwards (Chair)
Councillor Linda Manchester
Councillor Kevin Ahern
Councillor Poddy Clark
Councillor Claire Hickson
Councillor Michael Situ
John Nosworthy
Jane Salmon
Lesley Wertheimer

OFFICER SUPPORT: Gerri Scott, Director of Housing
Simon Godfrey, Resident Involvement Manager
Shelley Burke, Head of Scrutiny
Sally Masson, Scrutiny Project Manager

1. APOLOGIES

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Miriam Facey

2. NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

2.1 There were none.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

3.1 There were no disclosures of interests or dispensations.

4. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 1st February 2011 were agreed as an accurate record.

5. INFORMAL NOTES OF VISIT TO CCTV CONTROL ROOMS (SOUTHWARK AND LEWISHAM)

- 5.1 The information regarding the committees visit to Lewisham, regarding the CCTV item had not been forthcoming. The committee were informed that this item was not close to appearing on the forward plan in the near future and that there was an opportunity to put more thought into the work before it is listed for a decision.
- 5.2 Councillors said that it was a difficult project to do without considerable money available. The equipment that was currently in use was no longer working effectively and would need replacing in the near future. Concerns were raised that the longer Southwark waited to purchase new equipment, the more expensive it would become. It was felt that a budget was also needed to maintain the current system, which because of its age, was becoming increasingly more difficult to find replacement parts. It was highlighted that VHS equipment is no longer being made.
- 5.3 Councillors said that the quality of the pictures in Lewisham seemed to be clearer in quality, however the ease with which operators can pin point times and actions was an extremely useful facility.
- 5.4 There were concerns that should the new committee return to this review, because of the possible change in membership, there might not be impetus to take this work forward.
- 5.5 The committee might wish to write to Councillor Livingstone, as this matter fell under his portfolio and he might be in a position to push the topic further up the Cabinet agenda.
- 5.6 The committee felt that because Anti Social Behaviour had increased in Southwark that it might be a good opportunity to share this project with Lambeth.
- 5.7 The committee agreed that an email should be written to Eden Geddes and Jonathon Toy to express their disappointment at not receiving the information they had expected.

6. DRAFT REPORT ON UNFINISHED SECURITY WORKS AT THE FOUR SQUARES ESTATE

- 6.1 The committee discussed the way the planned repairs and that here had been eight million pounds in total, allocated for the work. Four blocks of flats were expected to cost six million but the repairs had still not been completed. The Chair read from the committee's draft report:
- 6.2 *"On 30th November 2005 Southwark's Investment Programme Group (IPG) agreed to fund security works on the estate. Since that time, until March 2010, there has been a general expectation that Southwark Council would carry out security works*

on all four squares. The total estimated cost of the scheme agreed in 2005 was £8,025,514. This was allocated funding through £2.34 million from the London Housing Board and £5,685,514 allocated from Southwark.

6.3 *To date the Council has spent £6,606,788 on the security works on New Place and Lockwood Squares with a further £130,000 committed to these projects in for retention payments, giving a grand total of 6,736,788 committed and spent. The completion of the security works in these two blocks has lead to a significant reduction in crime and anti-social behaviour to the benefit of all residents living there.”*

6.4 The committee felt that the likelihood of repairs being completed was an unrealistic expectation because it appeared that there wasn't sufficient money from the outset. There was overspending as a result of poor calculations at management level.

6.5 The Chair went over some of the information contained in the committee's report for the benefit of officers:

6.6 *‘The sub-committee also feels that it is a matter for concern that the scale of this overspend in the early stages of the project was not more widely communicated. It is very surprising that the Executive Member(s) either at the time or subsequently did not take action to either:*

- *ensure a ring-fenced allocation of funds was made to cover the additional costs; or*
- *instruct officers to communicate with residents and ward councillors to alert them to the fact that there was a significant overspend and which may lead to a reduction in the security works which had originally been planned.’*

6.7 Point 7.2 ‘delegated decisions of Southwark Council:’

No formal decision was ever made by the previous Executive to allocate money specifically to the Four Squares Security Works. Instead, the original allocation was made by the Investment Programme Group (IPG) which operates under the delegated authority of the Executive Director for Housing. The decision to re-allocate the money to other projects was taken in 2009 as part of the “Investment Delivery Strategy Major Works Commitments 2010-12.” This decision was also made by the Executive Director for Environment and Housing.

6.8 The Chair said that money was then taken away because no formal decision had taken place. The committee felt that there had been very poor communication between the Council and residents overall with re-allocated money not being passed on.

6.9 *“The sub-committee understands the severe financial restraints under which the current Cabinet is working and the huge amount of investment which is needed in Southwark’s housing stock. However, the sub-committee feels that residents of the Four Squares have been treated extremely poorly during this long-running saga. The sub-committee also recognises the commitment already given by the Cabinet Member for Housing to look at this issue very closely once the stock condition survey is complete and an assessment of the priority of works needed across the*

whole borough is complete”.

- 6.10 The chair asked committee Members and residents for comments:
- 6.11 Residents were most concerned that decisions should not be made behind closed doors and that this matter should be referred to the standards committee. It was important that Council protocols should be maintained when making decisions and planning work of this kind.
- 6.12 There had been no consultants to oversee the continuity of the project work. This lack of continuity had been a problem from budgeting to the delivery of the work and residents felt that the Council must acknowledge that this had been a large mistake. It was also felt that a freedom of information request should now be sought as a matter of course.
- 6.13 The Members of the committee said that the report on the Four Squares issue was excellent and contained unbiased facts which highlighted the need for greater transparency, communication and identified areas where apologies were needed.
- 6.14 Members added that they felt the lines of accountability should have been made clearer with both Officers and Councillors understanding their respective roles.
- 6.15 Residents felt that the budget had been miscalculated from the beginning and that Council officers should have shown more restraint when planning and executing the work. It was felt that problems on the estate could have been easily foreseen, had there not been considerable mismanagement. It was recognised that managing contractors is a very difficult thing and it was suggested that perhaps Members should receive training in issues such as contract management. However, the committee felt that Members should feel confident and trust in their officers, with the expectation that they are being provided with comprehensive and good quality information without, necessarily, the need for training themselves. General awareness training regarding the various portfolios might assist with some clarity of roles, which could be helpful for both Members and Officers.
- 6.17 The Vice-Chair thought that the report covered the situation well and that there were no spurious accusations made. The report covered issues of considerable underinvestment in properties in across Southwark, and this was now becoming more apparent. Member's felt that this was a factual report highlighting bad management, inadequate funding and bad planning. For instance, there was work carried out to update security doors which did not need doing and there was the opportunity to make savings there. The lack of management resulted in work taking place that was unnecessary and work that was more vital, overlooked.
- 6.18 Residents had felt that this type of incident was a consistent problem across planning work within Southwark. At the time of the works, there had been concern around there being no forum for tenants to be heard. There were also concerns

around officers involved in the major investment programme not being adequately qualified. Anecdotally, one resident had overheard an officer saying that they did not want to upset the contractors. Then tenants point was that the contractors are employees of the Council and are working to the councils' specifications, not the other way around.

- 6.19 The sub-committee wanted to add an extra recommendation to the report which promoted the idea of tenants being included onto project boards for each work programme. It was thought this could be a useful forum for both disseminating information to residents and to make suggestions to the council as to where work was absolutely necessary and where savings might be made.
- 6.20 The sub-committee agreed the report with the extra recommendation.

7. REPORT ON WORK OF TENANT COUNCIL SPENDING PANEL

- 7.1 Gerri Scott, Strategic Director of Housing, went through a little of the background to this work:
- 7.2 'In September 2011, both Home Owners Council and Tenant Council were asked to consider how best residents could influence the budget agenda given the increasingly apparent need to make significant reductions in funding to housing services. Tenant Council asked that a working party be convened to consider the savings agenda. The first meeting in December was called once the draft HRA budget position had been announced and the reality of the savings process had been confirmed. At this point Home Owner representatives were invited to join the Savings Working Party'.
- 7.3 Currently the group has been meeting fortnightly for long term engagement to examine issues such as where savings might be made during project planning. The group is made up of tenants and home owners and has until recently been led by Margret O'Brien.
- 7.4 Residents expressed concern over the council delegating complaints to contractors. The working party didn't feel that it was in their remit to investigate staff reductions.
- 7.5 The committee were informed that the HRA general fund was split and tenants and leaseholders had effectively been charged twice services. Gerri Scott mentioned that Duncan Whitfield had looked into that issue with Grant Thornton to make further investigations. Residents felt that the working party would operate more effectively with independent advisors which could assist with meeting expectations across the board. It was also thought that the working party would be good for resident engagement, having an input into building proposals and also ensuring a greater awareness of what was going on with the work. The only draw back was that it was expensive for residents to travel to Tooley Street for the fortnightly

meetings.

- 7.6 Residents wanted to know what the complaints procedure was at the moment. They felt that every effort was needed to make the Council procedure work. The Chair said that giving over the duty of dealing with complaints to contractors may not be the best policy in this matter.
- 7.7 Simon Godfrey, Resident Involvement Manager said that the group is looking at other areas building a list of things to look at which may take place later in the year and there would be some thought on how best to consult with residents on what they may feel are priorities.
- 7.8 Members thought that there needed to be more discussions around the individual work areas, with consideration given to voting residents who need clarity on what it is that they're voting for allowing for time limits. Consideration also needed to be given to sensitive areas of work and where there may be any recurring themes, along with the opportunity for residents to see the HRA.
- 7.9 The Vice Chair said that officers of the council needed to remember that members of the public don't always speak, read and understand Council terminology and if meaningful consultation were to go ahead then language needed to be simple to understand. It was felt that this was a valid point to be taken across all meetings that involved members of the public.
- 7.10 The committee discussed the need to have a consistent service area regarding faults and repairs and that there needed to be clear lines of communication, with adequate details, when issues of funding are discussed.

8. FOLLOW UP ON COMMITTEE'S VISIT TO CCTV CONTROL ROOMS

8. See minutes for item 5.

NOTE ON FIRE SAFETY WORKS AT CANADA WATER ESTATE

As a result of concerns raised with myself and the vice-chair by the local Tenants and Resident's association in January this year, a short scrutiny review is underway on the Fire Safety Works at the Canada Water estate.

The meeting on 12 July will offer the sub-committee the opportunity to consider issues. I expect representative from the Tenants and Residents Association, Housing Department and Fire Authority to all be present.

I anticipate the main areas to be understood and explored are:

1. Overall contract management
2. Project management and the current state of the works
3. Quality of the works
4. Fire Safety Assessment and timely response
5. Communication between the housing department and local residents.

A copy of the written report received from the Housing Department, and the letter from the Fire Safety authority are attached to this note

Councillor Edwards
Chair, Housing and Community Safety Sub-Committee

	Date: 29 June 2011	To: Chair of Housing and Community Safety scrutiny sub-committee
Report title:	Fire safety works at Canada Estate (1-80 Columbia Point and 1-80 Regina Point)	
From:	Housing Services	

1. The Chair of the Housing and Community Safety scrutiny sub-committee is asked to note this report.

Process of contract award

2. Following fire risk assessments carried out in September/October 2009 it was originally intended to follow a traditional procurement route for the necessary remedial works and tender to a number of companies from the Exor approved list.
3. To this effect a Gateway 1 was drafted and presented to Departmental Contracts Review Board (DCRB) on 18 February 2010. This was approved (subject to minor amendments).
4. Following this the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) served two Notices of Fire Safety Deficiencies indicating fire safety work considered necessary at both blocks to comply with regulations. These were received on 22 February 2010 and required completion by 17 August 2010.
5. Having considered the above completion date and the likely timescale required to complete the traditional procurement it became apparent that the LFEPA deadline could not be met.
6. Therefore it was decided, in order to meet the deadline, to recommend the use of Strategic Director emergency powers and use an existing contract vehicle (the major voids term contract) to undertake the works, as was done in response to Enforcement Notice relating to Perronet House during the last 6 months of 2009.
7. The major voids term contractor, Standage & Co Ltd, provided an initial price against the specification which was comparable to the pre tender estimates.
8. Comments were sought and received from the Head of the Home Ownership Unit, who confirmed that as the original proposed procurement was subject to section 20 consultation under schedule 4 part 2 of the regulations, the notices of intention were correctly served on the leaseholders of both blocks on 1st December 2009, with the observation period ending on 30th December 2009. The notices were

served on 29 leaseholders (21 in Columbia Point and 8 in Regina Point). The notices invited the leaseholders to make observations on the proposed works and to nominate contractors to tender for the works. No observations or nominations were received. Had this procurement route continued, the leaseholders would have received a notice of proposal post tender, which would have detailed the tender process and invited further observations. However, because of the change in circumstances leading to the need to complete the works at an earlier stage, it was proposed to use a term contractor to carry out the work. When a term contractor is used the statutory consultation process with leaseholders falls under schedule 3 of the regulations. This still requires a notice to be served on the leaseholders, giving details of the costs involved. The notice must also give details of the work proposed, and the justification for that work. These details were already included in the notice of intention served in December, but they would be re-iterated in the new notice, with a brief explanation of the change in the procurement route and the reasons why. Ultimately, the only difference to the leaseholders would be that these specific works would not have been tendered out, but would be costed via a previously tendered schedule of rates. This is allowed under the legislation, as long as the overarching agreement has been subject to section 20. Standage was the term contractor for the voids contract, which had not been subject to section 20, but we had previously obtained dispensation from the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal to be able to use this contractor for such works. Should the notices have been challenged in the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal, we would have applied for retrospective dispensation if necessary.

9. Comments were also sought and received from the Departmental Procurement Manager, Mike Green, who endorsed the strategy suggesting that the Head of Housing Management produced a formal note setting out the need to treat this as an emergency situation because of the change in circumstances. He further advised that in the case of an emergency, the Strategic Director could approve action without a prior written Gateway report, indicating that such action should be limited to dealing with the emergency and it should be subsequently recorded in a written report to the CCRB.
10. An order was subsequently placed on 17 May 2010 through the major voids term contract with Standage Ltd.

Assessment of the quality of work so far

11. In terms of the issues identified by LFEPA on their Notices, these were satisfactorily completed by the deadline. The LFEPA inspected the blocks on 16 August 2010 and confirmed their satisfaction in writing on 08 September 2010.
12. Although the above specific works had been completed, other associated works hadn't been and there have been some technical difficulties in completing all the work to the required standards of the project management team and some residents.
13. At a joint inspection on 07 January 2011, which was also attended by Councillors' Ian Wingfield and Lewis Robinson and the T&RA chair, issues were identified that have now been addressed, although there was some debate as to whether some of these related to the quality of the works delivered or abuse by others.

Details of the cost of the work

14. The following appendices are attached to this report:

Appendix 1 – Current account summary
 Appendix 2 – Columbia block activity costs
 Appendix 3 – Columbia costs by floor
 Appendix 4 – Regina block activity costs
 Appendix 5 – Regina costs by floor
 Appendix 6 – Columbia tender versus current account comparison
 Appendix 7 – Regina tender versus current account comparison

15. The current draft final account for the works is at £1,261,839.93.
16. The original estimate was £1,066,892.00.
17. The main reasons for the increase of £194,947.93 are attributed to the change in works required to address the ventilation of the communal lobbies – one of the LFEPA requirements – and level of replacement required to chute hoppers and meter cupboard doors.
18. To clarify the change in works required to address the ventilation of the communal lobbies, it was originally envisaged to maintain the current configuration using the windows within the manifold rooms on each level to provide the ventilation. Subsequently however, LBS Building Control advised that the only way to do this with their approval would be to fully enclose and fire proof all of the district heating and hot water pipework within. This was considered by the design team to be impractical and very costly. After consideration of the limited options then available it was decided to install doors to the open louvers on the other side of the buildings which would be opened in the event of fire by being linked to communal smoke detection on each level.

Update on current state of the works

19. As in paragraph 14 above, the issues identified at the joint inspection have been resolved. A further joint inspection on 17 May 2011 confirmed this and the works are now considered complete.

Details of communications between LBS and the contractor as the works have progressed

20. As is standard for any major work contract the project team attended monthly progress meetings. On this contract the project team is made up of the Project Manager (LBS), Contract Manager (LBS), Construction Project Manager (consultant working for LBS), Clerk of Works (LBS), Customer Relationship Officer (LBS), Contract Manager (contractor), Site Manager (contractor), Resident Liaison Officer (contractor), and Quantity Surveyor (external consultant). Resident volunteers were also invited to form part of the project team and attend these meetings which were held monthly during the main bulk of the works. Details of these meetings can be made available if required.
21. As is common during major work contracts there have also been ad hoc site meetings involving various members of the project team across the contract period

to discuss and/or resolve technical issues. Details of these site meetings can be made available if required.

Details of the communications between LBS and residents of the estate about any reported problems with the works

22. Apart from some general queries from a small number of residents at the start of the contract, complaints have been received from two residents: one a resident leaseholder of 56 Columbia Point, and the other the Chair of the Tenants and Residents Association, who advised that complaints were being channelled through him.
23. At the initial residents meeting prior to commencement of the works two volunteers were sought to sit on the project team. Two residents volunteered their services but were not always able to attend the progress meetings owing to other commitments. Because of this the two residents were always invited to advise of concerns or complaints prior to the meetings so that they could be raised and addressed at them.
24. A complaints/comments book was available in the contractors site office for residents to record their complaints and/or comments. Seven entries were made, all with positive comments. A copy of this book can be made available if required.
25. A customer satisfaction survey is also underway and whilst not yet complete, nor the results fully analysed, those returned so far show that residents seem to be broadly satisfied with the work.

COLUMBIA POINT & REGINA POINT - FRA WORKS - FINAL ACCOUNT SUMMARY				
Ref	Works	Columbia Point	Regina Point	Total
1	Front entrance doors	101,785.62	101,874.56	203,660.18
2	Lobby screens and doors	251,587.54	251,587.54	503,175.08
3	Renew plant room door	0.00	2,890.45	2,890.45
4	Services risers and ducts	23,676.39	25,324.18	49,000.57
5	Fire stopping	31,714.85	31,920.87	63,635.71
6	Cross ventilation	154,650.33	155,011.64	309,661.97
7	Refuse chute hoppers	19,899.63	19,899.63	39,799.27
8	Smoke alarms	4,292.32	3,902.11	8,194.42
9	Replacement of meter cupboard panels	34,240.71	34,240.71	68,481.42
10	Alterations to staircase windows	4,787.58	4,267.30	9,054.89
11	Works to existing combi meters	933.84	1,045.00	1,978.84
12	Signage	1,122.03	1,185.08	2,307.11
Totals:-		£628,690.85	£633,149.08	£1,261,839.93

COLUMBIA POINT - FRA WORKS - FINAL ACCOUNT SUMMARY		
Ref	Works	TOTAL
1	Front entrance doors	101,785.62
2	Lobby screens and doors	251,587.54
3	Renew plant room door - N/A	0.00
4	Services risers and ducts	23,676.39
5	Fire stopping	31,714.85
6	Cross ventilation	154,650.33
7	Refuse chute hoppers	19,899.63
8	Smoke alarms	4,292.32
9	Replacement of meter cupboard panels	34,240.71
10	Alterations to staircase windows	4,787.58
11	Works to existing combi meters	933.84
12	Signage	1,122.03
TOTAL:-		£628,690.85

COLUMBIA POINT - FIRE WORKS - FLOOR BY FLOOR BREAKDOWN 19 MAY 2011																									
Ref	Works	TOTAL	GF	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6	Level 7	Level 8	Level 9	Level 10	Level 11	Level 12	Level 13	Level 14	Level 15	Level 16	Level 17	Level 18	Level 19	Level 20	Roof plant room	
1	Front entrance doors	101,785.62	0.00	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	5,089.28	0.00	
2	Lobby screens and doors	251,587.54	12,858.64	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	11,936.44	0.00
3	Renew plant room door - N/A	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	Services risers and ducts	23,676.39	969.95	969.95	1,442.43	969.95	969.95	1,442.43	969.95	969.95	1,442.43	969.95	969.95	1,442.43	969.95	969.95	1,442.43	969.95	969.95	1,442.43	969.95	1,442.43	969.95	969.95	0.00
5	Fire stopping	31,714.85	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	1,510.23	0.00
6	Cross ventilation	154,650.33	0.00	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	7,732.52	0.00
7	Refuse chute hoppers	19,899.63	0.00	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	0.00
8	Smoke alarms	4,292.32	0.00	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	214.62	0.00
9	Replacement of meter cupboard panels	34,240.71	0.00	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	0.00
10	Alterations to staircase windows	4,787.58	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	227.98	0.00
11	Works to existing combi meters	933.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	311.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	311.28	311.28	0.00	0.00	
12	Signage	1,122.03	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	53.43	0.00
		£628,690.85	£15,620.24	£30,441.47	£30,913.95	£30,441.47	£30,441.47	£30,913.95	£30,441.47	£30,752.75	£30,913.95	£30,441.47	£30,441.47	£30,913.95	£30,441.47	£30,441.47	£30,913.95	£30,441.47	£30,441.47	£30,913.95	£30,752.75	£31,225.23	£30,441.47	£0.00	

REGINA POINT - FRA WORKS - FINAL ACCOUNT SUMMARY		
Ref	Works	Total
1	Front entrance doors	101,874.56
2	Lobby screens and doors	251,587.54
3	Renew plant room door	2,890.45
4	Services risers and ducts	25,324.18
5	Fire stopping	31,920.87
6	Cross ventilation	155,011.64
7	Refuse chute hoppers	19,899.63
8	Smoke alarms	3,902.11
9	Replacement of meter cupboard panels	34,240.71
10	Alterations to staircase windows	4,267.30
11	Works to existing combi meters	1,045.00
12	Signage	1,185.08
Totals:-		£633,149.08

REGINA POINT - FIRE WORKS - FLOOR BY FLOOR BREAKDOWN 19 MAY 2011																									
Ref	Works	TOTAL	GF	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6	Level 7	Level 8	Level 9	Level 10	Level 11	Level 12	Level 13	Level 14	Level 15	Level 16	Level 17	Level 18	Level 19	Level 20	Roof plant room	
1	Front entrance doors	101,874.56	0.00	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	5,093.73	0.00	
2	Lobby screens and doors	251,587.54	10,783.60	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	12,040.20	0.00
3	Renew plant room door	2,890.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,890.45
4	Services risers and ducts	25,324.18	1,025.92	1,498.40	1,025.92	1,498.40	1,025.92	1,498.40	1,025.92	1,025.92	1,498.40	1,025.92	1,025.92	1,498.40	1,025.92	1,025.92	1,498.40	1,025.92	1,025.92	1,498.40	1,025.92	1,498.40	1,025.92	1,025.92	0.00
5	Fire stopping	31,920.87	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	1,520.04	0.00
6	Cross ventilation	155,011.64	0.00	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	7,750.58	0.00
7	Refuse chute hoppers	19,899.63	0.00	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	994.98	0.00
8	Smoke alarms	3,902.11	0.00	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	195.11	0.00
9	Replacement of meter cupboard panels	34,240.71	0.00	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	1,712.04	0.00
10	Alterations to staircase windows	4,267.30	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	203.20	0.00
11	Works to existing combi meters	1,045.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	209.00	0.00	209.00	0.00	209.00	0.00	209.00	0.00	209.00	0.00
12	Signage	1,185.08	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	56.43	0.00
Totals:-		£633,149.08	£13,589.20	£31,064.71	£30,592.23	£31,064.71	£30,592.23	£31,064.71	£30,592.23	£30,592.23	£31,064.71	£30,592.23	£30,592.23	£31,064.71	£30,592.23	£30,801.23	£31,064.71	£30,801.23	£30,592.23	£31,273.71	£30,592.23	£31,273.71	£30,801.23	£2,890.45	

COLUMBIA POINT - FRA WORKS - FINAL ACCOUNT SUMMARY

Ref	Works	Tender	Final AC	Difference	Comment
1	Front entrance doors	94,914.11	101,785.62	6,871.51	Change in specification of letter boxes, preliminaries reallocated
2	Lobby screens and doors	246,114.50	251,587.54	5,473.04	Minor revisions
3	Renew plant room door	3,642.05	0.00	-3,642.05	Door omitted
4	Services risers and ducts	11,156.27	23,676.39	12,520.12	Change from MFD to supalux, construction details changed
5	Fire stopping	44,135.06	31,714.85	-12,420.22	Remeasure of approximate quantities
6	Cross ventilation	82,994.66	154,650.33	71,655.67	Complete redesign including AOV
7	Refuse chute hoppers	5,496.19	19,899.63	14,403.44	Renewal instead of overhaul
8	Smoke alarms/electrical testing	23,574.02	4,292.32	-19,281.70	Electrical testing omitted
9	Replacement of meter cupboard panels	3,366.14	34,240.71	30,874.57	Panels and cupboards renewed
10	Alterations to staircase windows	0.00	4,787.58	4,787.58	Works not included at tender stage
11	Works to existing combi meters	0.00	933.84	933.84	Works not included at tender stage
12	Signage	1,103.65	1,122.03	18.38	Minor adjustments
13	Additional redecorations	10,294.32	0.00	-10,294.32	Works omitted
14	Asbestos removal	5,518.26	0.00	-5,518.26	No works required
Totals:-		£532,309.24	£628,690.85	£96,381.61	

REGINA POINT - FRA WORKS - FINAL ACCOUNT SUMMARY

Ref	Works	Tender	Final AC	Difference	Comments
1	Front entrance doors	94,914.11	101,874.56	6,960.45	Change in specification of letter boxes, preliminaries reallocated
2	Lobby screens and doors	246,114.50	251,587.54	5,473.04	Minor revisions
3	Renew plant room door	3,642.05	2,890.45	-751.60	Roof top plant door renewed and others overhauled
4	Services risers and ducts	12,908.32	25,324.18	12,415.86	Change from MFD to supalux, construction details changed
5	Fire stopping	44,135.06	31,920.87	-12,214.19	Remeasure of approximate quantities
6	Cross ventilation	82,994.66	155,011.64	72,016.98	Complete redesign including AOV
7	Refuse chute hoppers	5,496.19	19,899.63	14,403.44	Renewal instead of overhaul
8	Smoke alarms/electrical testing	23,574.02	3,902.11	-19,671.91	Electrical testing omitted
9	Replacement of meter cupboard panels	3,887.62	34,240.71	30,353.09	Panels and cupboards renewed
10	Alterations to staircase windows	0.00	4,267.30	4,267.30	Works not included at tender stage
11	Works to existing combi meters	0.00	1,045.00	1,045.00	Works not included at tender stage
12	Signage	1,103.65	1,185.08	81.43	Minor adjustments
13	Additional redecorations	10,294.32	0.00	-10,294.32	Works omitted
14	Asbestos removal	5,518.26	0.00	-5,518.26	No works required
Totals:-		£534,582.76	£633,149.08	£98,566.32	

Housing and Community Safety Scrutiny Sub-Committee meetings 2011/12

Tues 12 July 2011	(paper despatch Monday 4 July 2011)
Tues 11 October 2011	(paper despatch Mon 3 October 2011)
Tues 29 November 2011	(paper despatch Monday 21 November 2011)
Mon 30 January 2012	(paper despatch Friday 20 January 2012)
Weds 14 March 2012	(paper despatch Tuesday 6 March 2012)
Weds 2 May 2011	(paper despatch Tuesday 24 April 2012)

This page is intentionally blank.

DISTRIBUTION LIST**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2011/12****COMMITTEE:** HOUSING AND COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE**NOTE:** Please notify amendments to Scrutiny Team (0207 525 0324)

<u>OPEN</u>	<u>COPIES</u>	<u>OPEN</u>	<u>COPIES</u>
<u>MEMBERS/RESERVES</u>		<u>DEPARTMENTAL OFFICERS</u>	
Councillor Gavin Edwards (Chair)	1	Local Studies Library	1
Councillor Linda Manchester (Vice-Chair)	1	Scrutiny Team SPARES	10
Councillor Michael Bukola	1	Nicki Fashola/Debbi Gooch, Legal Services	1
Councillor Rowenna Davis	1	Gerri Scott, Strategic Director of Housing Services	1
Councillor Tim McNally	1	Shelley Burke, Head of Overview & Scrutiny	1
Councillor Martin Seaton	1	Steven Gauge, Opposition Group Office	1
Councillor Michael Situ	1	Paul Green, Opposition Group Office	1
Councillor Kevin Ahern (Reserve)	1	John Bibby, Principal Cabinet Assistant	1
Councillor Claire Hickson (Reserve)	1	Alex Doel, Cabinet Office	1
Councillor Paul Kyriacou (Reserve)	1		
Councillor Darren Merrill (Reserve)	1		
Councillor Wilma Nelson (Reserve)	1		
<u>CO-OPTED MEMBERS</u>			
John Nosworthy (Homeowners Council)	1		
Jane Salmon (Homeowners Council Reserve)	1		
Miriam Facey (Tenants' Council)	1		
Lesley Wertheimer (Tenants' Council Reserve)	1		
<u>OTHER MEMBERS</u>			
Councillor Catherine Bowman	1		
		TOTAL HARD COPY DISTRIBUTION	35

HARD COPIES OF THIS AGENDA ARE AVAILABLE ON REQUEST FROM THE SCRUTINY TEAM Tel: 0207 525 0324