

**Decision Session – Executive Member for  
Transport and Planning**

**9 June 2016**

Report of the Director of City and Environmental Services

**Review of the York City Walls Restoration Programme Phase 1**

**Summary**

1. This report presents a review of how the following approach will place us on an evidence-based 5 year programme for managing repair and restoration on York City Walls (2016/17 to 2020/21). This approach represents best practice in conservation of complex monuments and is used extensively in the management of ecclesiastical properties and National Trust properties.

**Recommendations**

2. The Executive Member is requested to note the findings of the report, and approve the scheme programme.

Reasons:

Council officers and the appointed structural engineer have identified and ranked the urgent structural defects affecting the Bar Walls. In particular three schemes have been identified for repairs this financial year, Micklegate Bar Roof, Monk Bar Steps, Tower 32.

**Background**

3. The monitoring programme has identified 10 locations where urgent repair and restoration works are required. The team have been working with Robert Thorniley Walker, Robert was the appointed structural engineer, employed to monitor the extent of the defects and the direction of movement.
4. Following approval at Full Council on 25 February 2016, the CES Capital Programme budget for the Bar Wall's 2016/17 has been

confirmed as **£90k.** + allocation through the Cram Bid of **£260K** In total **£350K** allocation.

5. This bid in effect forms Phase 1 of what will be a 5 year programme. The content of the Phase 2 bid of this 5 year programme will arise from the continuing programme of monitoring and inspection of the City Walls.
6. For the Executive Member's information Council officers are also currently reviewing a longer term approach to public realm funding which would include the Bar Wall asset. The review is exploring third party funding options alongside CYC funding. The team will be seeking to speak with all interested parties in the future of the Bar Walls and the public realm later in the year. A separate Executive report that will address these issues is in preparation.
7. The allocations shown in Table 1 below include funding for schemes identified in previous years and an allowance for over programming. Over programming is used in the capital programme to ensure the funding allocation is fully spent within the year. It allows reserve schemes to be developed and delivered if other schemes are delayed due to unforeseen circumstances.

**Table 1: Proposed 2016/17 Restoration Programme Phase 1 are shaded below.**

<b>Proposed BW Programme</b>	<b>£1,000s</b>
Micklegate Bar Roof	75
Monk Bar Steps	75
Tower 32	190
Red Tower Utilities	10
Tower 2	75
Bootham Bar to Robin Hoods Tower	350
St Marys Abbey Wall	70
Mint Yard (City Wall, Roman Wall, Anglian Tower)	50
Road Arch / Station Rise	10
Deans Garden Wall	30
Grays Court Pier	15

8. The proposed programme for 2016/17 has been developed to target identified structural failures within the Bar Walls and Tower Buildings. It includes schemes which have continuing monitoring to assess the level of movement from the 2015/16 programme. Schemes which were identified 2015/16 will continue to be monitored to assess for the hierarchy of implementation in future years.
9. York City Walls are a key symbol of the city. With in excess of 1million users, the walls are enjoyed by residents and visitors. Protecting the integrity of this asset for users and for the image of the city is a critical objective. These works arise from an initial 15 month programme of inspection and monitoring undertaken between 2014 and 2015. This programme builds on the baseline 1991 Condition Survey of York City Walls. Monitoring and inspections have identified 3 priority locations on York City Walls where there is a clear and urgent need for restoration works (Micklegate Bar roof; Monk Bar Steps; Tower 32). These schemes will address service and Council Plan objectives of creating jobs and protecting the Environment. All schemes will require scheduled monument consent from Historic England.
10. Funding has been proposed to be allocated for the repair of Micklegate Bar Roof; existing issues are four sets of vertical cracks in the SE and NW corners exceeding 3mm wide. Vertical movement has been recorded in the gatehouse. Extensive internal timber work in the roof space and exterior lead replacement is required to keep the weather out and overall Strengthening of the structure.
11. Funding has been proposed to be allocated for the repair to Monk Bar Steps; the steps are migrating down the embankment. These steps will have to be safely lifted and temporary re-sited to allow the construction of a supportive structure, and waterproof the structure as there is considerable seepage through the road arch.
12. Funding has been proposed to be allocated for the repair and restoration to Tower 32, Substantial movement has occurred along the wall at Tower 32 the previous year has seen in excess of 25mm vertical cracking. Some of the movement could be apportioned to the trees. The restoration will require underpinning, masonry consolidation, tower restoration, and a new door.

13. Funding has been proposed to be allocated to install utility connections into Red Tower. This will enable the Red Tower to be leased with maintenance obligations and has the potential to be used as match funding for further investment in upgrading the Red Tower.

## **Consultation**

14. The capital programme is decided through a formal process, using a Capital Resource Allocation Model (CRAM). CRAM is a tool used for allocating the council's scarce capital resources to schemes that meet corporate priorities.
15. Funding for the capital programme was agreed by the council on 25 February 2016. Whilst consultation is not undertaken on the capital programme as a whole, individual scheme proposals do follow a consultation process with local councillors and residents.

## **Options**

16. The options for the Executive Member to consider in relation to the proposed scheme are as follows:

**Option 1** - Approve the identified programme of works

**Option 2** - Amend the current programme of works.

## **Analysis**

17. Option 1 – the proposed programme of work has been ranked in terms of structural failing, pedestrian safety and impact on city tourism and the wider national and international image of the city.
18. Option 2 – the programme could be altered so that the works are spread out over a longer time frame. However delaying these works will have a financial and structural impact and may lead to closure of sections of the wall due to safety concerns.

Based on the review findings, and the analysis above, Option 1 is recommended.

## **Council Plan Priorities**

19. This report contributes to two of the three key Council Plan priorities: A prosperous City for all and A Council that listens to residents. The walls are a key Council asset that underpins the tourist industry in York; in 2013 70% of Residents rated the Council as doing “Well” in ‘Conserving York’s heritage’.

## **Implications**

### **Financial/Programme Implications**

20. The cost of the repair and restoration programme in 2016/17 will be £350k which includes survey costs and staff fees. This can be accommodated with in the 16/17 Capital Programme.
21. If the scheme were to be altered, there could be significant additional costs, for which there is currently no budget provision as deterioration could accelerate. Therefore, consideration would need to be given to allocating increasing funding from the 16/17 and future Capital Programme and reviewing other spending priorities.

### **Human Resources**

22. There are no Human Resources implications.

### **Equalities**

23. There are no Equalities implications.

### **Legal**

24. There are no Legal implications.

### **Crime and Disorder**

25. There are no Crime and Disorder implications.

### **Information Technology (IT)**

26. There are no Information Technology implications.

### **Property**

27. There are no Property implications.

## Risk Management

<b>Risk Category</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Likelihood</b>	<b>Score</b>
Organisation/Reputation	Medium (3)	Possible (3)	3x3=9

28. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, the main risk that has been identified in this report is the potential damage to the Council's image and reputation if effective safety improvements for pedestrians, along the Bar Walls and Towers are not achieved.

### Contact Details:

#### Author

Bill Manby  
Tel No: (01904) 553233

John Oxley  
City Archaeologist  
Tel No: (01904) 551346

#### Chief Officer Responsible for the report

Neil Ferris  
Director for City and Environmental Services

**Report  
Approved**



**Date** 24.05.16

### Specialist Implications Officer(s)

There are no specialist officer implications.

**Wards Affected:** Guildhall and Micklegate



**For further information please contact the author of the report.**

**Background Papers:** None