

Report To: Environment and Regeneration Committee **Date:** 17 June 2014

Report By: Acting Corporate Director Environment, **Report No:** R332/14/AP/IM
Regeneration and Resources

Contact Officer: Ian Moffat / Alan McClintock **Contact No:** 01475 715910

Subject: Advancement of Capital Spend from 2015/16

1.0 PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Committee approval to advance 2 areas of expenditure planned for 2015/16 which are included in approved capital programmes.

2.0 SUMMARY

- 2.1 Property Services have been carrying out investigations into the stability of the sea wall at the Kempock Street Car Park. These investigations indicate that remedial action is required in order to secure the long term future of the wall.
- 2.2 Riverside Inverclyde are carrying out major works within the car park as part of the Gourrock Redevelopment works. This includes resurfacing the car park. In order to minimise the period the car park is shut it is desirable to carry out the sea wall works concurrently with the RI contract which is expected to commence on site in July.
- 2.3 The design work for the project is highly specialised and it is desirable that the Consultants who carried out the feasibility study are appointed to carry out the design work. Given this position and the fact the total spend for both the feasibility and design works fall under £25,000, the Corporate Procurement Manager has indicated his agreement to this direct award, as required in terms of the Council's Procurement Manual.
- 2.4 The Property Capital Allocation 2014/15 includes £250,000 towards this work however the cost for the recommended option is estimated at £500,000. It will therefore be necessary to pre allocate £250,000 from the 2015/16 Property Capital Allocation to fund the project.
- 2.5 The works contract will itself be advertised as required in terms of the Standing Orders Relating to Contracts.
- 2.6 With the ongoing discussions between the Council, COSLA and Scottish Government over support funding for Flooding schemes, the ongoing collaborative procurement exercise with Renfrewshire Council on street lighting, officers anticipate slippage in RAMP capital and are seeking Committee approval to advance the carriageway resurfacing programme to absorb any slippage in these or other areas.
- 2.7 The Committee on 6th March 2014 granted delegated authority to the Head of Environmental & Commercial Services to achieve full spend of the RAMP/Capital Budget through substitution of projects from a reserve list.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 It is recommended that approval is granted to:-

-
- agree the carrying out of reinforcement works to the Kempock Street Car Park Sea Wall concurrently with other major works being carried out to the car park by Riverside Inverclyde subject to suitable contractual obligations being imposed on contractors to minimise any associated risks all to the satisfaction of the Head of Legal and Property Services;
 - approve the pre allocation of £250,000 from the 2015/16 Property Capital Allocation to increase the funding for the project to £500,000 in order to progress with Option 3; and
 - approve the advancement of £600,000 of carriageway resurfacing works from 2015/16 to absorb slippage arising elsewhere in the 2014/15 RAMP capital programme and note that an update on progress will be presented to the next meeting of the Committee.

Ian Moffat
Head of Environment & Commercial Services

4.0 BACKGROUND

Gourock Sea Wall

- 4.1 The sea wall at the Kempock Street Car Park was built in order to form the car park. It is a sheet steel piled wall tied back with steel rods to concrete ballast under the car park. Given its age and exposure the condition of the wall deteriorates over time and Property Services have carried out a number of investigations in recent years to establish the condition of the wall and estimate the effect of future corrosion.
- 4.2 The most recent investigation involved excavating the car park to expose the back face of the pile and the tie rods. This established that the tie rods were in good condition but that there was no tolerance for future corrosion. This meant that remedial work is required.
- 4.3 The Council had engaged a specialist marine civil engineering firm Wallace Stone LLP to examine the condition of the wall. Because of the highly specialist nature of the work, Wallace Stone's knowledge of the project and the value of the fee involved (£13,000) it was desired to appoint Wallace Stone LLP to carry out the design work for the project. Based on this information, including the fact the total value paid to this consultant will fall below £25,000, the Corporate Procurement Manager has indicated his agreement to this direct award, as required in terms of the Council's Procurement Manual. Quantity Surveying Services and on site supervision will be carried out by Property Services.
- 4.4 The 2014/15 Property Capital Allocation includes a contribution of £250,000 towards this work. This was a budget allocation which was made prior to any detailed investigation work being carried out. The recommended option (Option 3) has a cost of £500,000. As the remainder of the 2014/15 allocation has been earmarked for other projects it is necessary, in order to fund the project, to pre allocate £250,000 from the 2015/16 allocation.
- 4.5 The works contract will itself be advertised as required in terms of the Standing Orders Relating to Contracts.

RAMP Carriageway Programme

- 4.6 Delivery of the 2014/15 carriageway programme will depend on a number of factors including changing priorities due to ongoing changes within the condition of the network, weather, market prices and the work programmes of public utility companies who also require access to the road network. In view of this, Committee granted delegated authority to the Head of Environmental & Commercial Services to achieve full spend of the capital budget through the substitution of projects from a reserve list when necessary.
- 4.7 On 6th March 2014 Committee approved a carriageway investment programme for 2014/15 of £3.366 million. It is anticipated that with the support of third party contractors this scheme can be accelerated by bringing forward funds earmarked for carriageway resurfacing in 2015/16.
- 4.8 Officers from Roads Services are currently reviewing the carriageway reserve schemes along with other essential carriageway resurfacing and major patching works required on A & B class roads up to a value £600,000 and would seek Committee approval to identify and progress carriageway schemes to this value. An update on the schemes identified would be presented to the next Committee meeting.

5.0 OPTIONS – GOUROCK SEA WALL

- 5.1 Following investigation works three options for remedial work were identified.

- Option 1 – Restrict loading on wall by creating a public realm space along the wall 5 metres wide. Replace all waling bolts. Blast clean and paint wall above mid-tide level and install cathodic protection below mid-tide level, and below MLWS if possible.
 - This option would be unacceptable as the public realm space would significantly reduce the area available for parking. This option would be the second most expensive option at £795,000.

- Option 2 - Install new anchor ties, waling and anchor wall and including installation of new waling bolts if original waling is to be retained. This would also require blast cleaning and painting of the wall and installation of cathodic protection. The associated works would involve large scale excavation of the car park and replacement of surfacing, drainage street lighting etc.
 - This option is not viable due to the extensive disruption it would cause to the RI contract. This option would require the work to be carried out after completion of the RI contract which would mean the car park being shut for an additional 8 months. This is the most expensive option at £1.2 million.

- Option 3 - Leave the wall as it is and construct a rock armoured revetment in front of the wall to relieve the load on the wall.
 - This option is the most economic solution and will also match in with the new revetment being formed under the RI contract at the extension to the car park. The cost of this option is £497,000.

Option 3 is the one recommended by the specialist consultant and this view is endorsed by Property Services and Riverside Inverclyde officers.

6.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 One off costs

| Cost Centre | Budget Heading | Budget Years | Proposed Spend this Report £000 | Virement From | Other Comments |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|---------------|--|
| Property Capital Allocation 2014/15 | Gourock Sea Wall | 2014/15 | 250 | | |
| Property Capital Allocation 2015/16 | Gourock Sea Wall | 2015/16 | 250 | | Leaves £750,000 to be allocated in 2015/16 |
| RAMP Capital allocation | Carriageway resurfacing | 2014/15 | 600 | | Brought forward from 2015/16 |

Recurring costs

The proposed Gourock Sea Wall construction is expected to be maintenance free although regular inspections will be required and occasional remedial works. This will be funded as required from existing budgets.

| Cost Centre | Budget Heading | With Effect From | Annual Net Impact | Virement From | Other Comments |
|-------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|----------------|
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

7.0 CONSULTATION

- 7.1 The Head of Finance has been consulted and is in agreement with the recommendations.
- 7.2 The Head of Legal and Property Services has been consulted and has advised that given two contractors will be working on the same car park area at the same time any risks which may arise and the allocation of those risks should be dealt with by imposing appropriate contractual obligations upon the contractors.
- 7.3 There are no HR implications and therefore the Acting Head of Organisational Development, HR and Communications has not been consulted.
- 7.4 The Interim Chief Executive of Riverside Inverclyde has been consulted and is in agreement with the recommendations.

8.0 EQUALITIES

- 8.1 There are no equalities implications.

9.0 REPOPULATION

- 9.1 There are no direct repopulation implications although the work to the sea wall contributes to the improved infrastructure in Central Gourock and the carriageway work improves the roads infrastructure.

10.0 LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 10.1 None.