

Progress Report received from Stephen Calvert (Pearce Bottomley) on 9th June 2016

I am disappointed that the physical survey by Benchmark has been prolonged. I believe the interruptions during the interior phase have resulted in this commission overlapping with others. For that reason we started a visual condition survey before receiving any drawings from Benchmark.

We received the roof plan which is partial as certain areas were unsafe to survey without additional equipment. I came to the opinion that we could work from the partial survey and our inspection notes and photographs for the purposes of the Schedule of Work and Specification.

We now have the floor plans and are informed we will receive the remainder next week.

Our survey informed us of the following

Roofs are generally in good order – there are some slates that need attention but this is ad hoc repair

Leadwork is generally in good order except for on the northern section of the chamber roofs. We can describe what needs to be done but cannot detail it until we get closer access (during the repair stage). It is these defects that are the cause of the damage of the interior of the ‘Chambers’ office.

Stonework is generally in good condition – there are a number of stones that would benefit from dentistry repair and it would be helpful to discuss this with you as the matters are to a degree cosmetic.

Brickwork pointing is varied. The majority is serviceable and as the joints are particularly fine I would recommend that we concentrate on those areas that are vulnerable and would need attention within the next ten years.

Joinery. The overall appearance is that the decorations are in dire need of complete replacement, thankfully most of the timber we could access appeared reasonable sound and thus I think the regime of pre-painting repairs will not be as onerous as first thought.

Structure appears generally sound, although I am still unsure of the reasoning for the structural strapping on the tower. Hopefully this will become clearer as our understanding improves.

Programme

Our intention is to have the draft documentation together for the repair works by the end of the month and subject to approvals we could go out to tender in July

Approvals

I propose to discuss the approval process/requirements with Joanne Balmforth in Manchester as it is pretty clear that the works are like for like repair. It is the extent that may necessitate a formal application. That said I can see nothing at this stage which is in any way contentious.

Would it be appropriate for me to discuss the matter with David in the first instance?

Miscellaneous

There are two internal matters that I already aware of that do require addressing, both relating to the roof voids

Firstly that the insulation with the roof voids has been disturbed to varying degrees and thus heat loss is greater than it need be.

Secondly, and more importantly, from our vantage point in the Chapel roof void it is clear that the fire resistance of the ceiling is compromised by ill-fitting tiles and displaced insulation. My concern is spread of fire in the roof void.

All of the above could be included in the specification if the Trustees wish.

I trust this is clear and helpful, if there are any queries please give me a call