

Copy of email

Wed 10/03/2021 13:43

Reynolds, Hannah <Hannah.Reynolds@HistoricEngland.org.uk>

Melvyn, Daniel, et al,

Thank you for your time today, that was a really useful discussion. As a summary of our discussion and actions needed as an outcome;

We all agree that Options 3 and 6 in the Conisbee report, are most appropriate for conservation of the 1910/1920 historic building whilst allowing potential to provide new or upgraded space/facilities required by SGS to remain in situ. However, we all acknowledge this is not guaranteed to arrest movement in the earlier portion of the building, although, we all hope this will be the case. Thus, monitoring will be needed for minimum 12 months post-completion of any works, before then reviewing the need for intervention by way of underpinning the existing building. Actions needed:

- a. A Cost comparison is required between the two favoured options; demolition of rear and rebuild (Option 6) or underpin rear and retain/refurbish (Option 3). **SGS** are to obtain costs from Specialist demo companies (who are to be National Federation of Demolition Contractors member, with demonstrable heritage experience. **Daniel** is to provide names for SGS to approach in this.
- b. We agreed that we will conclude the existing grant at this point, **Daniel** is to submit Conisbee's final invoice asap, to allow SGS to submit their final payment claim forms and supporting information to HE, ideally by the end of next week.
- c. **Hannah** is to review findings and implications 'at risk' status of the building.
- d. Listing upgrade? – **SGS** to investigate and approach HE Listing team directly if needed.

On the subject of the cost comparisons, I wanted to clarify my understanding of the figures that will need to be considered in the comparison. However, in looking back at your previous costings, I need to also clarify my understanding of the costs you have obtained so far. These all seem to include the purchase of the adjacent site and undertaking of the approved residential development as a matter of course; is this due to the fact that it was not considered demolition and rebuild could be facilitated or viable without it? Or due to costs not stacking up, and/or the space needed by the society not achievable without this additional land and enabling development?

Cost to be considered in comparison:

- Option 3:
 - a. Cost of underpinning retained rear building as set out in Conisbee's report.
 - b. Cost of refurbishment and upgrade/addition to rear building required to ensure workable long-term solution for SGS to remain in situ (or justification as to why this is not feasible/viable long-term solution)
 - c. Cost of any associated repair/refurbishment works to the 1910/20s portions, not including later possible underpinning.
- Option 6:
 - a. Cost of demolition (to extent acceptable to Local Authority; 1920 and 1960 indicated in current costings?)
 - i. without purchase of adjacent site
 - ii. with site purchase of new site

- b. Cost of building new facilities to ensure workable long-term solution for SGS to remain in situ
 - i. As new building to the rear, if adjacent site is not purchased. (or justification as to why this is not feasible/viable long-term solution on space requirement basis)
 - ii. As new building to the rear, if adjacent site is purchased. (presumably including associated purchase and development on costs for site)
- c. Cost of any associated repair/refurbishment works to the 1910 portion, not including later possible underpinning.
- Other costs to consider in forward planning, irrespective of option taken forward:
 - i. Cost of 12 to 24 months post-completion monitoring.
 - ii. Possible cost of subsequent underpinning works being required to 1910 portion, including costs to SGS of facilitating them.

Some of these cost can be obtained from your existing costed Options Appraisal, Conisbee's Report, or by way of experience with costs thus far for monitoring. However, as noted in the meeting, if SGS feel that obtaining all of the information and costs required for the above comparison is more involved/onerous and costly than first thought, once you have had time to consider, please do come back to me and we may be able to support this by way of further Development Phase Grant. We could possible fund a thorough Costed Options Appraisal and Feasibility Study, building on the work you have already commissioned, but reviewing it on the basis of the above two options. This include supporting your commissioning of a suitably accredited Architect to work with you to establish a much clearer picture of the minimum space and facility requirements you have, and how you might achieve this in each scenario. Along with necessary Quantity Surveyor and/or others to provide the required information and expertise. I understand all you have had commissioned thus far has been generously donated pro-bono work and does not include this detailed study, but I may be mistaken?

I hope this helps and look forward to receiving further information in due course. If you want to meet again with just me to discuss the possibility of a 'Stage 2' Development Phase Grant, please do let me know.

Kind regards

Hannah Reynolds, RIBA AABC
 Heritage at Risk Architect for Historic England
 Midlands Region | Partnerships Team
 The Axis Building, 10 Holliday Street, Birmingham, B1 1TF
 M: 07557 827971

Historic England's Covid-19 (Coronavirus) Statement can be found
 here: <https://historicengland.org.uk/coronavirus/>