# GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY

# **REQUEST FOR MAYORAL DECISION – MD2100**

# Title: Replacement of Revolving Main Entrance Doors at City Hall

#### **Executive Summary:**

The main entrance revolving doors have now reached the end of their functional life with one or more units failing on a regular basis. All unit warranties have exhausted their terms with ongoing maintenance resulting in temporary short term problem fixing only. Total reliance on manufacturers for servicing and parts is making repair costly and problematic. There are regular occasions where one or more doors are out of action, with impact to building users and image of City Hall due to frequency of door failure.

#### Decision:

The Mayor approves expenditure of up to  $\pm 150,000$  to replace the main entrance revolving doors at City Hall.

#### Mayor of London

I confirm that I do not have any disclosable pecuniary interests in the proposed decision, and take the decision in compliance with the Code of Conduct for elected Members of the Authority.

The above request has my approval.

2 dro

Signature:

Date:

26/4/17

# PART I - NON-CONFIDENTIAL FACTS AND ADVICE TO THE MAYOR

# Decision required – supporting report

# 1. Introduction and background

1.1 A Mayoral Decision is sought to approve a capital project to replace the revolving main entrance doors at City Hall. The entrance doors are becoming increasingly unreliable due to age and are no longer fit for purpose for the current footfall and usage of the building, and will need to be replaced as soon as possible before they have to be taken out of service due to complete failure.

. .

1.2 The doors were designed and manufactured and installed in 2001. Between September 2015 and September 2016 there were 17 reported failures of the revolving main entrance doors. The doors were also out of service from August to November whilst the Landlord (More London) attempted to repair waterproofing to prevent further water ingress into the building in the future. The unique design and the height of doors do not allow for refurbishment and makes repair difficult. Total reliance on manufacturers for servicing and parts has led to extended out-of-service intervals to the detriment of visitors and building users. In addition, flooding from heavy rain together with the position of the doors at the lowest point of the estate with no waterproofing, has led to pooling of water in the door pit which has affected the doors' mechanism. Although the Landlord has undertaken works adjacent to the doors to prevent water ingress to the lower Ground floors, the existing doors are exposed to the risk of further leaks in the future due to their construction. The Authority is now carrying the insurance risk for further water ingress.

# 2. Objectives and expected outcomes

- 2.1 An independent report recommends replacement of the revolving doors due to their age, the high level of wear and degradation and damage caused by water ingress from the estate. Various options have been considered including manual doors or electric doors with an overhead mechanism to avoid future damage from pooling water in the door pit.
- 2.2 The project will result in improved performance and reliability and will reduce the risk of security breaches by removing the 'summer mode' (the ability to fold away and fully open the entrance. There should be a positive impact on health and safety as the project will eradicate risk and incidents of door panels folding in on building users during periods of high winds as new door panels will be fixed as opposed to flexible.

# 3. Equality comments

- 3.1 The GLA is a public authority which must comply with the Public Sector Equality Duty set out in section 149 (1) Equality Act 2010. This provides that, in the exercise of their functions, public authorities must have due regard to the need to:
  - Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act 2010;
  - Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and
  - Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- 3.2 The obligation in section 149(1) is placed upon the Mayor, as decision maker. Due regard must be had at the time a particular decision is being considered. The duty is non-delegable and must be exercised with an open mind.

3.3 Of particular note is that there is a separate door available for the use of disabled persons and others with accessibility issues and it is not envisaged that the decision will have any adverse impact on any protected group. The accessible door will remain available throughout the works to replace the main revolving doors.

# 4. Other considerations

- 4.1 The City Hall is an iconic building which has significant public footfall during the weekdays Monday to Friday and large numbers of people attending formal events and meetings seven days a week (in total up to up to 18,000 visitors a month). With the current state of the main entrance from time to time there are difficulties getting people into the building during large events and meetings. Door failures also cause major problems during the winter months due to icy winds to the building façade which make the ground floor colder than is acceptable. These front of house issues cause some dissatisfaction for room hirers, visitors and members of staff, and increases the risk of a loss of revenue from room hire and damage to the GLA's reputation.
- 4.2 The GLA occupied City Hall in 2002 on a 25 year full repairing lease (regular landlord inspections ensures compliance with repairing obligations). The lease term is from 2001 to 2026, with a break clause in year 2021. On surrender of the lease the GLA will be responsible for dilapidation costs.
- 4.3 There is an opportunity to install modern equipment which makes energy saving to align with the Mayors manifesto for making London a low carbon beacon, efficient energy consumption and reduction of CO2 emissions will be a deciding factor in the appointment of a suitable contractor. Removed door materials and parts would be fully recycled.
- 4.4 There is the option to continue to carry out reactive repairs as of now. However, this is resource intensive, expensive and presents Health and Safety risks which the GLA, as duty holder, has an obligation to mitigate. The availability of access is business critical and business will be disrupted as a consequence. It is not possible to refurbish the revolving main entrance doors as there are no component parts available and their unique design.
- 4.5 The current closed protocol means extended downtime due to the long wait for parts, replacing the doors will enable an open protocol reactive and planned maintenance regime to be adopted. The cost to replace the doors will be in the region of  $\pounds$ 150,000.

# 5. Financial comments

The paper is seeking approval to spend up to  $\pounds$ 150,000 on replacing the main entrance doors at City Hall. The expenditure will be funded from the provision that has been made in the Facilities Management Capital Budget 2017/18 to fund the project.

# 6. Legal comments

- 6.1 Under section 30 (1) GLA Act 1999 (as amended) the Authority has the power to do anything which it considers will further any one or more of its principal purposes as set out in section 30(2). Under section 34 of the Act, the Authority, acting by the Mayor, may do anything which is calculated to facilitate or is conducive or incidental to the exercise of any functions. As access to City Hall for staff and visitors is fundamental to the operation of the administration and the exercise of all of the Authority's functions, the replacement of the doors falls within the scope of these powers.
- 6.2 The GLA occupied City Hall in 2002 on a 25 year full repairing lease (regular landlord inspections ensures compliance with repairing obligations). The lease term is from 2001 to 2026, with a break clause in year 2021. On surrender of the lease the GLA will be responsible for dilapidation costs. Under the terms of the lease, the Landlord's consent to the works will be required.

6.3 The power to award the contract for the works is covered by the General Delegation in the Mayoral Scheme of Delegation (see paragraph 5.26). It is intended that responsibility for awarding the contract will lie with the Executive Director of Resources. The Contracts and Funding Code will be complied with.

# 7. Planned delivery approach and next steps

7.1 Once Landlord's consent has been agreed, the project will be tendered and project managed by CBRE in accordance with the TfL procurement procedures. Foster and Partners and Arup will support with technical advice.

Activity	Timeline
Procurement of contract [for externally delivered projects]	May 2017
Delivery Start Date [for project proposals]	July 2017
Final evaluation start and finish	June - July 2017
Delivery End Date [for project proposals]	30 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2017
Project Closure: [for project proposals]	31 <sup>st</sup> Oct 2017

7.2 There will be a temporary entrance access available at all times and security measures will be put into place throughout the duration of works to effectively manage access and egress to and from the building.

# Appendices and supporting papers:

None

#### Public access to information

Information in this form (Part 1) is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOI Act) and will be made available on the GLA website within one working day of approval.

If immediate publication risks compromising the implementation of the decision (for example, to complete a procurement process), it can be deferred until a specific date. Deferral periods should be kept to the shortest length strictly necessary. Note: This form (Part 1) will either be published within one working day after approval or on the defer date.

#### Part 1 Deferral

Is the publication of Part 1 of this approval to be deferred? YES

If YES, for what reason: To defer publishing until the tender process is complete.

Until what date: 15 September 2017.

Part 2 Confidentiality: Only the facts or advice considered to be exempt from disclosure under the FOI Act should be in the separate Part 2 form, together with the legal rationale for non-publication.

# Is there a part 2 form – NO

ORIGINATING OFFICER DECLARATION: Drafting officer:	Drafting officer to confirm the following (√)
Adele Casey Facilities Manager – Hard Services has drafted this report in accordance with GLA procedures and confirms the following:	$\checkmark$
<b>Sponsoring Director:</b> Martin Clarke Executive Director – Resources has reviewed the request and is satisfied it is correct and consistent with the Mayor's plans and priorities. <b>Mayoral Adviser:</b>	$\checkmark$
David Bellamy Chief of Staff has been consulted about the proposal and agrees the recommendations.	✓
Advice: The Finance and Legal teams have commented on the proposal	$\checkmark$
<b>Corporate Investment Board</b> This decision was agreed by the Corporate Investment Board on 27 March 2017.	

#### **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, RESOURCES:**

I confirm that financial and legal implications have been appropriately considered in the preparation of this report.

Signature

M. ). ClCe

D. Bellany

Date 20,4.17

# **CHIEF OF STAFF:**

I am satisfied that this is an appropriate request to be submitted to the Mayor Date 26/4/2017.

Signature