Cheltenham Borough Council
Council – 15 October 2012
Pittville Gates Restoration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountable member</th>
<th>Cabinet Member Finance, Councillor John Rawson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountable officer</td>
<td>David Roberts, Head of Property &amp; Asset Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s) affected</td>
<td>Pittville Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Decision</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive summary**

The Friends of Pittville have raised substantial funds to restore the historic grade 2 Pittville Gates. The intention is that Cheltenham Borough Council will then procure and subsequently deliver the works, in two phases, each of which is a separate stand alone scheme.

In order for the project to progress it is a requirement that the Friends of Pittville enter into a legal agreement with Cheltenham Borough Council which will be subject to proof that sufficient funds have been raised.

On the proviso that the above criteria are satisfied the works will commence in the Autumn this year.

The proposal has the support of Cabinet. CBC will not be exposed to any financial risk, as the works will not be commenced for either phase until CBC is satisfied that all the funds have either been raised or grant funding guaranteed.

As CBC will be overseeing the works and will be effectively responsible for payment, Council needs to allocate the funding as part of its budget.

The restoration will substantially reduce the Council's immediate maintenance liability, and it is the intention that the Friends of Pittville will raise funds for future maintenance of the gates as and when it is required.

**Recommendations**

That Council agrees:

To allocate the funding for this project over the 2 phases as set out in Sections 2.9 and 2.10 of the report.
| **Financial implications** | The full amount of funding should be sourced before the Council begins works. There is a contingency allowed for within the project to ensure works are delivered within budget.  
Officer time to deliver the project has not been costed and accounted for within the project costs.  
Responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of the Gates must be determined as no specific base budget provision has been made.  
**Contact officer:** Nina Philippidis, nina.philippidis@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 775221 |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Legal implications**     | The council’s contract procedure rules must be complied with when procuring the contractor and the project manager.  
As the Council will be employing the contractor and the project manager the agreement with the Friends of Pittville must provide that the cost of the project must be paid to the Council by the Friends prior to the Council awarding the contracts.  
**Contact officer:** Donna Ruck, donna.ruck@tewkesbury.gov.uk, 01684 272696 |
| **Corporate and community plan Implications** | • **Cheltenham’s natural and built environment is enhanced and protected**  
1. The gate piers and metalwork is a listed structure and part of the town’s heritage. Historically they formed a focal point to the Pittville but that is no longer the case and this is partly due to their dilapidated appearance.  
2. Pittville Park and the beautiful architecture of the surrounding area is a tourist attraction. If the gate piers and metalwork were to be restored they could add to this tourist experience.  
3. The restoration of the gates, piers and metalwork will decrease the rapid rate of their current decay, and consequently help to protect them for future generations.  
4. The proposed two new interpretation boards will enable visitors to understand about the history of the Gates and the history of the Pittville area, as well as explaining the conservation of the gate piers and metalwork. |
Environmental and climate change implications

- **Cheltenham has a clean and well-maintained environment**

  The six existing stone gate piers and associated metalwork are in need of repair. It is believed that the piers have not had any maintenance work carried out on them for a long time. They have the following problems:

  1. Stone to the piers is delaminating, and spalling. They have previously been repaired with cement and concrete, which has accelerated the stone decay. The rusting metalwork which is embedded in the stone has also resulted in rust expansion and further stone decay.
  2. The metalwork is very rusty in places, paint is flaking off, and some of the detailed decorative elements are missing.
  3. The immediate landscaped area is also of a poor quality and unattractive appearance.
  4. The existing lighting is unattractive and defective.

  The proposed works will have a significant improvement to this historic structure and its setting.

---

2. **Background**

2.1 In the summer of 2010 the Friends of Pittville group decided to adopt the Gates restoration project as public consultation had judged it the highest priority. Further consultation with organisations such as the Cheltenham Civic Society and with the public, have demonstrated considerable support.

2.2 The project will restore the Grade 2-listed Pittville Gates and their surroundings to their former magnificence as the grand entrance to Cheltenham’s historic Pittville Estate and Park.

2.3 The Gates were constructed in 1833, in order to form an impressive entrance to the Pittville Estate on route from the town centre to the Pittville Pump Room (Grade 1-listed). In 1890 the Estate was acquired by Cheltenham Borough Council in an era of significant growth in the provision of cultural and recreational facilities. The central overthrow was added to the Gates in 1897 in time for the visit of the Prince of Wales in Queen Victoria’s Diamond Jubilee year, displaying the new name of Pittville Park. The Gates were listed Grade 2 in 1972.

2.4 The Gates are approximately 22 metres wide with six Forest of Dean sandstone pillars 3.2 metres high. The 4.3 metre wide central fixed screen is of ornate cast ironwork of a unique design. In the four gaps there were originally two pairs of carriage gates and two pedestrian gates of the same design.

2.5 Currently the Gates and the surrounding area have become somewhat neglected. The six pillars are crumbling with a patchwork of original stone and attempts at repair, and the remaining central screen and overthrow need proper restoration. The surrounding area is an mixture of different styles of paving, asphalt, kerbs and grass with varying levels and inadequate drainage. In addition the original railings along the Prestbury Road have disappeared.

2.6 The proposal is to replace the existing crumbling pillars with new ones of the same stone. The existing ironwork (the central screen, remaining gate posts, a short length of railing and the overthrow) will be stripped of paint and repaired where needed, the missing parts
replaced, and then repainted in the original patinated bronze colour. The missing opening
gates and their posts will be replaced. Four lamps of the original 1833 design will be
placed on the four outer pillars, the central lamp below the municipal coat of arms will be
replaced and the electricity supply restored.

2.7 It is proposed that the existing hard surfaces will be replaced, with the pathway lines and
the 1830s crossing in front of the Gates marked in setts. The design is fairly simple in
order not to detract from the ironwork of the Gates. It is intended that the grass triangle
will be smartened up and the missing railings along Prestbury Road replaced, using the
original 1833 design. To complete the landscaping, hedging will be planted to hide the
ugly adjoining boundaries and new street furniture and information boards installed. A
granite horse trough will be re-installed in front of the Gates. (See existing and proposed
elevations in Appendix)

2.8 The project will be managed in partnership with CBC, employing a project management
company used to heritage projects. In order to achieve improvement to the site as soon as
possible the project has been divided into separate phases, so that the first phase can
begin when funding is available while fundraising continues for the later phase. The first
phase will involve the replacement of the pillars, the restoration of the existing ironwork
and lighting, and the landscaping work. Phase 2 will cover the replacement of the missing
gates and railings.

2.9 Funding – The total tendered cost of Phase 1 is £193,833; the total cost of the project is
approximately £279,433 and includes contingencies and professional fees. The Friends of
Pittville have so far raised £134,000 and also applied for an additional £20,000 from the
Cheltenham Environmental Fund 2012. An initial Cheltenham Environmental Fund
allocation was made to this project in 2011 of £20,000 which has enabled the design,
planning consent and procurement to progress.

Costings
Phase 1
Works £157,464
Contingency £ 15,000
Professional Fees £ 20,369
Total £193,833

Phase 2
Works £ 71,600
Contingency £ 10,000
Professional Fees £ 4,000
Total £ 85,600

Grand Total £279,433

Funding
GET
CBC Environmental Fund 2011
GCC Community Match
Leche Trust
Cheltenham Civic Society
Other fundraising/donations
Ecclesiastical 125 Fund
Garfield Weston
HLF
Total £134,400
Other applications made are:

Worshipful Company of Masons
CBC Environmental Fund 2012
Steel Charitable Trust
Royal Racing Pigeon Association
Manifold Charitable Trust
PF Charitable Trust
Bodfach Trust
Georgian Group
Pilgrim Trust

2.10 It is a requirement that the Friends of Pittville raise the necessary funds for each phase prior to the commencement of each phase of the restoration works but Cheltenham Borough Council will contract with those undertaking the works and it will be the Council’s obligation to make the payments.

2.11 The Friends of Pittville will be required to enter into a legal agreement prepared by OneLegal, which will set out the obligations of each party.

2.12 It is Cheltenham Borough Council’s intention, subject to consultation and formal written agreement, for the Friends of Pittville to raise funds for any future maintenance works.

3. Reasons for recommendations

3.1 The Friends of Pittville are well advanced in fundraising and the contract for the construction works is currently out to tender. In order to progress the project it is recommended that Cabinet agree to enter into an agreement with Friends of Pittville.

3.2 The prerequisite of the Friends of Pittville’s external funding partners is that the agreement must be in place and for the works to be commenced by the end of November 2012.

3.3 As expenditure is over £100,000 a key decision therefore requires Cabinet and Council approval.

4. Alternative options considered

None

5. Consultation and feedback

5.1 The members of the Friends of Pittville, the public, the Council’s property surveyors, the Council’s Heritage and Conservation Officer, the Council’s Landscape Architect, a specialist stonemason and a specialist metal conservator have all identified the existing poor condition of the stone and metalwork, and the existing poor landscaping.

5.2 Pittville Ward Councillor Hibbert has been supporting this project with the Friends of Pittville.

6. Performance management –monitoring and review

6.1 Contract management, construction activities and expenditure will be monitored by Property & Asset Management.

6.2 Financial monitoring will be carried by Cheltenham Borough Council’s Head of Finances.
| **Report author** | Contact officer: David Roberts, Head of Property & Asset Management | david.roberts@cheltenham.gov.uk, 01242 264151 |
|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Appendices**    | 1. Risk Assessment                                               |
|                   | 2. Drawing indicating existing and proposed elevations           |
## Risk Assessment

### The risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk ref.</th>
<th>Risk description</th>
<th>Risk Owner</th>
<th>Date raised</th>
<th>Impact 1-5</th>
<th>Likelihood 1-6</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Responsible officer</th>
<th>Transferred to risk register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>If the stone to the piers continues delaminating and spalling, this could potentially cause a weakening and collapse of the structure with possibly injury to the public and then this would place CBC at a high risk to a claim for compensation. If this project does not proceed there will be necessary immediate repairs to be carried out by CBC.</td>
<td>David Roberts</td>
<td>Dec 2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Reduce</td>
<td>Repairs to the structure and future monitoring and maintenance will substantially reduce the risk. Stability of the asset will be monitored and if the structure becomes unsafe CBC will fence off and make safe.</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
<td>David Roberts</td>
<td>David Roberts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanatory notes

**Impact** – an assessment of the impact if the risk occurs on a scale of 1-5 (1 being least impact and 5 being major or critical)

**Likelihood** – how likely is it that the risk will occur on a scale of 1-6

(1 being almost impossible, 2 is very low, 3 is low, 4 significant, 5 high and 6 a very high probability)

**Control** - Either: Reduce / Accept / Transfer to 3rd party / Close