

Westminster City Council
Hallfield Estate Phase 3
Refurbishment Works Programme

Independent Validation and Assessment of Scope
& Cost Report



City of Westminster

October 2024

Report prepared by:	
Report approved by:	
Job number:	2190
Status:	Final
Date:	18 th October 2024

John Rowan and Partners LLP is a Limited Liability Partnership
Registered in England No. OC 30 20 30
Registered Office. Craven House, 40 Uxbridge Road, London W5 2BS
Head Office. Craven House, 40 Uxbridge Road, London W5 2BS

A list of our directors can be found at www.jrp.co.uk

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Client Brief and JRP Scope of Services	4
3.	Background Information and Supporting Documentation	5
4.	Approach to Audit	7
5.	Desktop Assessment and Detailed Analysis of the Project Information	7
6.	Appendix A Validation & Assessment of Scope and Cost Schedule of Comparison.....	9
7.	Limitations of the Desktop Audit and On-Site Assessments	12
8.	Hallfield Estate Phase 3 – Brief Summary on Condition of Existing Roofs	13
9.	Conclusions & Recommendations	14

Appendix A - X115 Appendix B Validation and Assessment of Scope and Cost Schedule of
Comparison

1. Introduction

1.1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. John Rowan and Partners (JRP) were appointed by Westminster City Council (WCC) to undertake an independent validation and assessment of scope and cost in regard to the proposed refurbishment works programme on the WCC Hallfield Estate London W2 with a Service Provider (SP), Axis Europe Limited (AEL), appointed by WCC under a term framework agreement to carry out the planned refurbishment works.
- 1.1.2. The basis of this assurance approach is an assessment of scope with cost focussed on the priced work schedule notably the Cost Plan v2 dated June 2023, which was submitted by Axis Europe to WCC...
- 1.1.3. The Hallfield Estate Phase 3 consists of three residential block dwellings that are Grade 2 Listed and lie within the Hallfield Estate Conservation Area, and WCC has a designated Project Number X115 for the programme:
- 1- 80 Winchester House W2 6EA- Ten-storey block consisting of 80 No. flat dwellings
 - 1-22 Worcester House W2 6EJ -Six-storey block consisting of 22 No. flat dwellings
 - 1-22 Lynton House, W2 6EW- Six storey block consisting of 22 No. flat dwellings
- 1.1.4. All three blocks have a rectangular footprint within a level site with communal walkways to the front elevations. The construction is comprised of a reinforced concrete frame with brick infill panels and concrete cladding. Common walkways and balcony decks are asphaltic with built-up felt sheeting on the main flat roofs. The windows are single-glazed metal "Crittall" type casement windows.
- 1.1.5. The purpose of the independent assessment of scope and costs for the Hallfield Estate Phase 3 programme of works is to provide WCC with an assurance of both the proposed scope of work and associated costs that Axis Europe submitted with specific regard to the potential Section 20 leaseholder liabilities and services charges that may be applied.
- 1.1.6. We understand that individual leaseholders have been served Section 20 Notices of Estimate in the region of between £21,650.00 and £77,632.00, and understandably, leaseholders are querying these costs.
- 1.1.7. WCC provided John Rowan and Partners with all the project file information that they had to hand, which consisted in the main of the X115 Axis Proposals and Cost Plan, which contained several appendices including site set up plan, drawings, specifications, risk register, CCP, programme, cost plan and Service Providers Proposals.
- 1.1.8. We understand that Axis Europe entered into Term Partnering Agreements, notably the TPC2005 (Amended 2008) contract form for the delivery of the Planned maintenance and cyclical repair programmes with overarching Framework Agreements.
- 1.1.9. We have undertaken this independent assessment and drafted the report based on the information that was made available by WCC and, therefore, have not made any comments

or observations on any information that is made available after the report is issued which may have a bearing on the report finding and recommendations.

2. Client Brief and John Rowan and Partners Scope of Services

2.1. Client Brief and John Rowan and Partners Scope of Services

- 2.1.1. John Rowan and Partners provided WCC with the Resource and Fee Proposal on 14 February 2024 to undertake an Independent assurance approach and Assessment of the Scope of Works and Associated Costs for the Phase 3 refurbishment works programme on the Hallfield Estate London W2.
- 2.1.2. The John Rowan and Partners Resource and Fee Proposal was duly confirmed as approved by WCC, and arrangements were made to kick start the project and commence with an internal meeting to brief the team on the client brief, requirements, and expectations.

2.2. John Rowan and Partners Scope of Services

- 2.2.1. The scope of services as outlined within Section 5.0 of the John Rowan and Partners proposal document are as follows:
 - Undertake a desktop exercise to review all the project information, including Axis Europe Limited Cost Plan v2 as provided by the client, to gain a thorough understanding of the project aligned to the client brief.
 - Issue a request for project information to the client to support the validation process, including compliance records, asbestos reports, EPC details, and any existing relevant stock condition data.
 - Develop a bespoke project-specific scope validation survey sheet in line with items 5.4 to 5.7 below to capture scope validation, cost information, and any other key items identified during the validation exercise.
 - Undertake a site visit and carry out an independent survey to validate the scope of works proposed under the Hallfield Estate Phase 3 refurbishment works programme consisting of three blocks, notably Lynton House, Winchester House and Worcester House. The scope of works will include external and internal repairs and refurbishment, window replacement, external doors, FRA-type works, M&E and environmental works.
 - Access will not be necessary to the internal flat dwellings to inspect kitchen and bathroom replacement for tenanted properties.
 - In conjunction with the service provider's, Axis Europe Limited, Cost Plan v2, compare the actual condition of the key components and elements included within the programme against the service provider's schedule of works to ensure that a like-for-like comparison of scope can be established, notwithstanding that certain components or elements may have degraded, the condition worsened or defects accelerated from the initial period of time that the service provider built up the Cost Plan.
 - Identify any scope differences from the task order to the task price, including over-quantifying/measuring on the service provider's part.

- Identify and record any key issues or risks, including HHSRS items or statutory or legislative changes that may impact health and safety and life safety matters on site that need addressing.
 - Identify requirements for commissioning specialist professional services, including structural engineers, M&E engineers, and fire engineering services, to support the commission.
 - Provide instruction to Bauder Roofing Limited to undertake site surveys and provide roof condition reports and specifications regarding the three blocks which form part of the phase 3 programme of works.
 - Based on the information obtained from the site validation of scope, undertake a desktop assessment of scope compared to the service provider's Cost Plan, including an assessment of the schedule of rates on which it is based (June 2023).
 - Benchmarking comparison of scope and cost will enable a full validation and assessment to be completed.
 - In addition, we will reprofile the Cost Plan to reflect current market (schedule of) rates and factor in RPI/TPI to establish the likely outturn cost of the programme if it was tendered in the current market.
 - Prepare a draft independent validation and assessment of scope and costs report for client comment and feedback.
 - Finalise and issue reports following any comments received from the client.
- 2.2.2. A copy of the John Rowan and Partners proposal document was shared with all the team members to ensure that there was a full understanding of the client brief and, therefore, remove any uncertainty or ambiguity.

3. Background Information and Supporting Documentation

3.1. Background Information and Supporting Documentation

- 3.1.1. We received a selected amount of the X115 WCC Hallfield Estate Phase 3 Project information via Dropbox
- 3.1.2. Based on the project information provided, we set up the WCC Hallfield Estate Phase 3 Project folder and file hierarchy, which was arranged based on the following folder structure:

Table 1 – Information provided by WCC in connection with the Hallfield Estate Phase 3 Programme of Works.

Folder Name	File Content	Document Originator / Owner
X115 Axis Proposals and Cost Plan	Appendix 1 – Site Set Up Plan	AEL
X115 Axis Proposals and Cost Plan	Appendix 2 - Waste Management Plan	AEL

X115 Axis Proposals and Cost Plan	Appendix 3 – Specifications	AEL
X115 Axis Proposals and Cost Plan	Appendix 4 – Drawings	AEL
X115 Axis Proposals and Cost Plan	Appendix 5 – Residents Communications Plan	AEL
X115 Axis Proposals and Cost Plan	Appendix 6 – Construction Phase Plan	AEL
X115 Axis Proposals and Cost Plan	Appendix 7 – Risk Register	AEL
X115 Axis Proposals and Cost Plan	Appendix 8 – Programme	AEL
X115 Axis Proposals and Cost Plan	Appendix 9 – Resource Plan	AEL
X115 Axis Proposals and Cost Plan	Appendix 10 – Business Case Proposals	AEL
X115 Axis Proposals and Cost Plan	Appendix 11 – Cost Plan	AEL
X115 Axis Proposals and Cost Plan	Appendix 12 – Cash Flow	AEL
X115 Hallfield Phase 3	Service Providers Proposals	AEL

- 3.1.3. On undertaking the desktop review of all the X115 Hallfield Estate Phase 3 Project file information, which amounted to a substantial number of documents, we considered that for the purpose of the Independent Validation and Assessment exercise, an audit trail gap analysis would not be required on this occasion, as a sufficient level of information was contained in the documents to hand, and in conjunction with the site inspections enabled John Rowan and Partners to fulfil the requirements and expectations of the client brief.
- 3.1.4. The validation, auditing and forensic analysis of the X115 Hallfield Phase 3 Cost Plan v2 as contained within Appendix 11 Cost Plan submitted by AEL is based on a desktop and on-site assessment approach.

4. Approach to Audit

4.1. Approach to Audit

4.1.1. We approached the assessment of scope and costs based on a five-stage methodology consisting of the following stages 1-5 inclusive:

- 1) Desktop assessment and detailed analysis of the project information provided by WCC regarding X115 Hallfield Estate Phase 3 Refurbishment Works Programme subject to the independent auditing and assessment
- 2) On-site assessment and comparison of the AEL X115 Hallfield Estate Phase 3 Cost Plan with actual site conditions and incorporating our onsite findings, observations, and comments
- 3) Development of the X115 Hallfield Estate Phase 3 Appendix A Validation and Assessment of Scope and Cost Schedule of Comparison
- 4) Drafting of the WCC Hallfield Estate Phase 3 Refurbishment Works Programme Independent Validation and Assessment of Scope and Costs Report based on the Client Brief as set out under Section 2.0 above and X115 Appendix B Validation and Assessment of Scope and Cost Schedule of Comparison
- 5) Finalising the independent audit report for a draft issue to the WCC client for review and comment

5. Desktop Assessment and Detailed Analysis of the Project Information

5.1. Stage 1 Desktop Assessment and Detailed Analysis of Project Information

5.1.1. As previously stated above, the desktop assessment was undertaken with the X115 Hallfield Estate Phase 3 project information provided.

5.1.2. We requested copies of the Section 20 Notices of Intent and Notices of Estimate that were served on the leaseholders included within the Hallfield Estate Phase 3 programme of works as we needed to understand the level of leaseholder liability, apportionment of block costs and how these notices related to the leasehold agreements.

5.1.3. WCC duly provided the Leasehold Section 20 Notices dated 25 October 2023 in connection with the three blocks included in the X115 Hallfield Estate Phase 3 programme of work, and these clearly set out a description of the intended works, justification of the intended works and an estimate of the works.

5.1.4. Included within the Section 20 Notices were the Appendix A Statement of Total Estimated Block Expenditure, which provided each leaseholder a breakdown of anticipated costs associated with the qualifying works and included the total estimated chargeable cost of the works and the individual leaseholders estimated contribution.

- 5.1.5. In addition, the estimate of works and leaseholder contribution included the WCC Project Management Costs at 8.85% and the Westminster Billing and Consultation Fee at 5% of the chargeable work costs.
- 5.1.6. The apportionment of block costs that individual leaseholders are liable for are included, and the % applicable is based on the lease agreement related to the individual leasehold property. We will comment on the lease agreements elsewhere within this report.
- 5.1.7. We noted that the Appendix A Statement of Total Estimated Block Expenditure and proposed costs were based on Axis Europe estimates, and within Appendix B, which was incorporated into the Section 20 Notices, the breakdown of chargeable works submitted by Axis Europe for each of the Phase 3 block dwellings was set out.
- 5.1.8. The WCC Appendix B schedule provided a summary of the work element, a description of the works, the reason for the works, and the chargeable block cost. Again, reference was made to the breakdown of chargeable works submitted by Axis Europe.
- 5.1.9. The method for how WCC calculate the service charges is clearly set out and is based on the total cost shared across the building or estate (if applicable) based on the number of bed spaces in each individual leasehold property compared to the number of bed spaces in the block and or the estate.
- 5.1.10. We requested confirmation that leaseholder Front Entrance Doors were not included within the programme of works as previous reports (Appendix 06 Stakeholder Consultation) suggested that Front Entrance Doors were included and that leaseholder liabilities had increased, but this could be justified.
- 5.1.11. WCC has confirmed that leaseholder Front Entrance Doors are not included in the Phase 3 programme and that leaseholders can enter into a private arrangement with AEL and pay a sundry charge to replace the FED.
- 5.1.12. WCC provided the lease agreements for 15 Lynton House, 16 Worcester House, and 2 Winchester House and can confirm that the % "Due Proportion per Annum" compares to the % of block costs as detailed within the Section 20 Notices.
- 5.2. **Stage 2 Site Validation and Assessment of Scope and Cost**
- 5.2.1. JRP undertook a site validation and assessment of scope and cost inspections and the team consisted of Thomas Farrell -Director and Scott Stronach- Quantity Surveyor.
- 5.2.2. We adopted the Axis Europe Limited X115 Cost Plan v2 (deemed to be the AEL Task Price) for the Hallfield Estate Phase 3 programme of works and incorporated additional data collection columns to assist with recording site assessment findings.
- 5.2.3. We inspected all accessible areas across the three blocks, notably Winchester House, Worcester House and Lynton House, including the main roof areas, which are not included in the Phase 3 works programme, but WCC requested that we inspect the roof areas and report back on the condition of the roofs.

- 5.2.4. Following the onsite validation and assessments, we have developed the Appendix A Validation and Assessment of Scope and Cost schedule, which we will discuss in more detail within this report.
- 5.2.5. We approached the site validation and assessment on the same basis as the scope of works as set out in the Axis Europe's Cost Plan schedules and followed the scope of work headings and descriptions sequentially as detailed therein as follows:
- 5.2.6. This section of the report is to be read in conjunction with the John Rowan and Partners Site Validation and Assessment of Scope and Cost Comments and Observations, as it provides a more detailed assessment of the site inspections and resulting findings.
- 5.2.7. From the Cost Plan v2 schedule, it was not entirely clear as to the extent of external decorations and if all previously painted surface finishes were included.
- 5.2.8. Axis Europe included for concrete repairs within the Cost Plan across all of the blocks, and we could not ascertain if the concrete repairs covered the concrete ramp at ground floor level or only where reinforcement is causing damage.

6. Appendix A Validation & Assessment of Scope and Cost Schedule of Comparison

6.1. Development of the X115 Appendix B WCC Hallfield Estate Phase 3 Appendix A Validation and Assessment of Scope and Cost Schedule of Comparison

- 6.1.1. Based on the data collection from both the desktop and site assessments, the X115 WCC Hallfield Estate Phase 3 Appendix A Validation and Assessment of Scope and Cost Schedule of Comparison was developed.
- 6.1.2. The Appendix A Validation and Assessment comparison schedule comprises six separate excel tabs with reporting columns for each of the individual blocks, notably Winchester House, Lynton House, and Worcester House, included under the Phase 3 programme of works.
- 6.1.3. The schedule comprises the following tabs to present the scope and cost information in line with the validation and assessment processes we undertook.
- Summary tab- Providing a summary of the X115 Phase 3 scope and cost assessment.
 - X115 Phase 3 Cost Plan for 1-80 Winchester House Comparison
 - X115 Phase 3 Cost Plan for 1-80 Winchester House
 - i) Breakdown of scope and costs based on current AEL Cost Plan ii) Breakdown of scope and costs based on JRP validation and assessment of scope and costs

iii) X115 AEL Cost Plan with TPI % Adjustment iv) JRP
Comments

- X115 Phase 3 Cost Plan for 1-22 Worcester House
 - i) Breakdown of scope and costs based on current AEL Cost Plan ii)
Breakdown of scope and costs based on JRP validation and assessment of
scope and costs
 - iii) X115 AEL Cost Plan with TPI % Adjustment iv) JRP
Comments
 - X115 Phase 3 Cost Plan for 1-22 Lynton House
 - i) Breakdown of scope and costs based on current AEL Cost Plan ii)
Breakdown of scope and costs based on JRP validation and assessment of
scope and costs
 - iii) X115 AEL Cost Plan with TPI % Adjustment iv) JRP
Comments
- 6.1.4. It must be noted that the rates applied at ii) and iii) above may be negligible and that there are no cost differences between the rates established, but the key undertaking of value engineering the Axis Europe Cost Plan, we will establish that Value for Money (VfM) and Best Value is/has not been provided to WCC for the Phase 3 programme of works and only by site validation and remeasure of the proposed works will a true reflection of costs be ascertained.
- 6.1.5 Within Appendix A, we will provide comments, observations and assumptions on the key work package headings as set out in the Axis Europe Cost Plan.
- 6.1.6 To ensure consistency of reporting and undertaking benchmarking on a comparative basis to ascertain if VfM and Best Value have been offered by AEL, we will include the same level of Preliminaries, design costs, OH&P % and costs allocated to risk items on a like for like basis directly linked to the Axis Europe X115 Cost Plan v2 (June 23), which JRP deem as the Axis Europe Cost Plan.
- 6.1.7 We have retained the level of Provisional Sums / Quantities that AEL included within the X115 Cost Plan v2 (Task Price) across all three blocks as these relate in the main to work elements such as concrete repairs, which are difficult to ascertain from a visual on the ground inspection and until the extent of concrete repairs are determined on-site by means of full scaffold access, measured and quantified, the Provisional Sum will be expended in whole or in part under contract instruction.
- 6.1.8 From both the desktop and on site assessment and validation , we have identified the following items which we consider require further clarification from Axis Europe in respect of the proposed scope of works on the Phase 3 blocks:
- There is an allowance for a CCTV drainage survey however there is no allowance for any remedial works to be carried out if required.

- Why is there a separate item for “Upfront purchasing of vents for the windows”. Is this cost not included within the lump sum cost of the windows?
- Within the Electrical works there is a provisional sum allowance for Builders Work which will need to be firmed up.
- There are a number of provisional quantities included within the “Fire Risk Works” which will need to be firmed up on completion of the FRA.
- The rate for the timber flat entrance doors appears higher than the current market rate.
- The rates for the Metal Landlord & Communal doors appear considerably higher than the current market rates.
- The rate for carrying out concrete testing to all external exposed concrete appears extremely low when compared to the market rate.
- A lump sum has been allowed for the concrete repair system but not knowing the quantities involved , we cannot comment any further on this item.
- Provisional quantities have been allowed for the concrete patch repairs and these will need to be firmed up on completion of the testing although provisional quantities appear reasonable.
- The rate for insulation works appears high compared to the current market rate.
- The rate allowed for external tile replacement around the windows on the tiled elevations appears extremely high. The item requires “Specialist to ensure they include for an adequate amount of tiles for the replacement” which makes this item difficult to quantify. However, the rate allowed is extremely high. Note this item only refers to Winchester House
- The rates for Building Works in Connection for the window installation appear extremely high which includes for Corex protection, hacking off existing render/plaster and renewing render/plaster.
- The quantity allowed for decorating railings, balustrading and gratings appears high.
- The provisional sum allowed for removal of any asbestos appears relatively low.
- The provisional sum allowed for scaffold adaptation appears relatively low.

6.1.9 The total preliminaries when compared to the total works value equates to 16.82%. This is on the high side, but combined with the OHP of 5.5% ,we deem this acceptable and within the market range,

7. Limitations of the Desktop Audit and On-Site Assessments

7.1. Limitations of the Desktop Audit and On-Site Assessments

- 7.1.1 This audit report is based on the project file information that was provided to JRP. We cannot comment or make assumptions on any issue, concern, event or occurrence where we do not possess any evidential or substantive detail. We have made reference to specific documents that were not provided within this report.
- 7.1.2 This audit report is based upon a visual inspection only and describes the condition of the building fabric at the time of the survey. We have not exposed or opened up any areas of the building(s) and, therefore, cannot comment upon those elements or components that are concealed or inaccessible.
- 7.1.3 We have not undertaken any structural surveys nor inspected any woodwork or other parts of the structure that were covered, unexposed or inaccessible. We are therefore unable to report as to whether these areas are free from defects.
- 7.1.4 We have not undertaken any soil testing to establish ground conditions or the sulphate content of the subsoil.
- 7.1.5 Unless specifically stated, we have not undertaken any specific inspections for dampness or insect infestation, and we are therefore unable to confirm that the properties are free from such defects.
- 7.1.6 We have not undertaken any diagnostic assessments to establish the cause of any defects noted during the course of our inspection, and any such defects reported should be subject to further investigation by the client.
- 7.1.7 It was not part of our instruction to undertake any specialist surveys, including above or below-ground drainage surveys, asbestos surveys, structural surveys or gas-safe or electrical installation testing.
- 7.1.8 We have not carried out any testing of mechanical, electrical, water supply or drainage installations. Furthermore, we have not tested lifts, air conditioning or the functionality of any photovoltaic or solar water heating installations.
- 7.1.9 We have not undertaken fire risk assessments and are, therefore, unable to confirm whether improvements are required to comply with the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 or the Building Safety Act 2022.
- 7.1.10 Any data recorded in respect of the Housing Health and Safety Rating System 2006 (HHSRS) has been captured on an abridged and indicative basis using a limited risk recording methodology of 'severe', 'moderate' and 'typical'. The methodology utilised does not constitute a full HHSRS survey as may be undertaken by an Environmental Health Officer. Therefore, where we have recorded 'severe' risk ratings, these may not actually constitute a Category 1 hazard when the

full system risk weightings and scores are applied. Nevertheless, our 'severe' ratings are designed to be an early warning trigger for further investigations and remedial works to prevent harm to residents, visitors to the property and the general public.

- 7.1.11 We have not undertaken asbestos surveys or collected samples to establish the presence or indeed the condition of any asbestos-containing materials (ACMs). Any components recorded as 'asbestos' should be deemed to have a 'suspected' asbestos content, and the client shall be required to arrange for specialist surveys and sampling to establish the type, nature, extent and condition of the materials.
- 7.1.12 This audit report is confidential to the instructing client for the specific purpose to which it refers. It may be disclosed to other professional advisers assisting in respect of that purpose, but we cannot accept liability to any third party who are not identified as the user/beneficiary of this report who may act upon it.
- 7.1.13 This report has been prepared for WCC on a private and confidential basis. It should not be reproduced in whole or in part or relied upon by any third party for any purpose without the express permission of JRP LLP.
- 7.1.14 Unless specifically stated, we have not undertaken any specific inspections for dampness or insect infestation, and we are therefore unable to confirm that the properties are free from such defects.

8. Hallfield Estate Phase 3 – Brief Summary on Condition of Existing Roofs

- 8.1 As part of the commission, WCC requested that JRP inspect the existing main roofs to Winchester House, Worcester House and Lynton House and provide our assessment of the current condition of the main roof areas to the aforementioned blocks and this request formed part of the client brief and JRP Proposal.
 - 8.1.1 Detailed within the Playle & Partners condition report dated 13/01/21, it stated that safe access to inspect the roofs could not be achieved by the surveyor and WCC had confirmed therefore, that the roofs would not form part of the scope of the survey and report.
 - 8.1.2 In addition, there is no allowance within the AEL Cost Plan for roof repair or renewals on any of the Phase 3 block dwellings and within a WCC document labelled X115 Stakeholder Consultation, it states that Asset Strategy have removed proposed roof works from scope due to high lessee liabilities and inconclusive justification for their replacement assurances (Meeting with Capital Programme 19/07/2021 - EC and MV)
 - 8.1.3 We were made aware that prior to our site inspections, Bauder Roofing Limited had been instructed by WCC to undertake roof surveys including a moisture mapping survey on the three Phase 3 block dwellings.

- 8.1.4 We contacted Bauder Roofing and they advised that they had undertaken the roof survey at Lynton House and that they were in the process of arranging the inspection for Winchester House and Worcester House.
- 8.1.5 On the basis of the above, we arranged to meet with the Bauder Roofing technical surveyor on the same day that JRP were on site in order that we could inspect the roofs both independently and jointly.
- 8.1.6 From our visual inspection of the three main roof areas, we can report that the condition of the roof areas are in a poor condition, beyond economic repair and service life with typical flat roof defects present
- 8.1.7 In addition, existing key elements and components associated with the roof areas are in a poor condition including brickwork to upstand, render finishes, coping stones, doorsets, metal handrails and insulation to pipework
- 8.1.8 It was also noted that the existing roof areas to the single storey lift motor and tank rooms housings were in a poor condition across all three blocks.
- 8.1.9 We are in receipt of the Bauder Roofing roof survey reports including the moisture mapping surveys to the three Phase 3 blocks, the report findings confirming the JRP visual inspection observations and comments.
- 8.1.10 We will provide copies of the Bauder Roofing reports for the three Phase 3 blocks and would recommend that the reports are reviewed and that the recommendations and proposals are considered and that as major works are taking place under Phase 3 in the replacement and repair of key elements and components and with a full access scaffold been erected , WCC would benefit from the economies of scale of undertaking the roof works in the upcoming phase.

9. Conclusions & Recommendations

9.1. Conclusions and Recommendations

- 9.1.1 This independent validation and assessment report should be read in conjunction with Appendix A Validation & Assessment of Scope and Cost Schedule of Comparison
- 9.1.2 We can confirm that, we that we have undertaken all of the items included for under section 2.2 JRP Scope of Services
- 9.1.3 Our approach to the assessment of the Axis Europe Cost Plan was based on the desktop and on site value engineering of costs in order to realise the maximum potential for cost savings and in some instances, we have had to make certain assumptions and use our best endeavours to reconcile the Cost Plan.

- 9.1.4 Through the process of assessment, we can evidence that Value for Money and Best Value , has been provided by Axis Europe in delivering the WCC Hallfield Estate Phase 3 Programme of Works
- 9.1.5 In regard to Items included under 6.18 , we would recommend that a value engineering exercise be undertaken to firm up the provisional costs and quantities and that those items which we consider on the high side of costs when compared and benchmarked to similar type, however we acknowledge that these quantities may be based on the historical experience of the previous two phases, moreover items should be discussed further with Axis Europe and an open book approach be adopted to provide more visibility and transparency of cost related to these specific items.
- 9.1.6 We cannot comment on the level of any potential costs saving that may be derived following a value engineering exercise on the items noted under item 9.15 but would consider this recommendation worthwhile.
- 9.1.7 Through this process of validation and assurance, we can evidence that Value for Money and Best Value, is being provided by Axis Europe Limited in delivering Hallfield Estate Phase 3 programme of works.