

Notes of the Meeting of the Property Subgroup

16th November 2016 – External repairs and related matters

These notes are intended to give an indication of the areas of discussed, to indicate briefly any decisions taken on behalf of the Council and to set out progress and plans as currently understood. (KT)

Present

Deacon Jenny Jones

Mr David Quick (District Property Secretary)

Mr Bernard Neville (LMM Treasurer)

Mr Kenneth Tait (LMMC Secretary)

Mr Stephen Calvert (Pearce Bottomley Architects)

Mr Tim Baldock (Pearce Bottomley Architects)

Mr Trevor Parker (Conference and Property Manager)

Notes

Full inspection of the building

1. This has been completed and detailed drawings are available

External Repairs – stonework, brick work and roofing

2. Providing scaffolding for the whole building would be a significant cost, but it was noted that selecting among the options would be the responsibility of the contractor.
3. The building is complex and the site sloping. Both of these make scaffolding more expensive.
4. For safety and security the scaffolding will be enclosed in a three-metre high hoarding.
5. A small number of scaffolding companies will be approached to give budget figures to obtain a better idea of cost.
6. Drawings of the four elevations of the building were presented showing the areas where brickwork and stonework required repair or cleaning. The areas were grouped (and colour coded) as priority 1 and priority 2.
7. As many of these areas were out of reach and had only been inspected with binoculars or naked eye it was possible that on closer inspection more or possibly less work might be needed.
8. The Oxford Place elevation is more decorative than the others, and this makes some areas which are unsightly rather than in need of repair less noticeable.
9. Consideration is being given to using a 'zip scaffold' or a 'cherry picker' to allow a more accurate picture to be obtained.
10. The tower and cupolas (or whatever they are called) may need to be looked at by a structural engineer.

The Chambers

11. Some photographs have been taken of parts of the roof of the Chambers as part of the investigation of damp in the building. The present judgement is that the whole of the Chambers roof including the link to the main building will have to be replaced.
12. The roof of the Chambers has a complex shape. It was suggested that with the appropriate consents the present roof could be replaced with a flat roof, albeit with a slope.
13. A minimal amount of work is to be contracted to repair that part of the roof in the hope of dealing with the damp. (However, it should be noted that it is not clear that there is only one cause of the damp.)

Decoration - windows woodwork repairing and painting

14. This is urgent and needs to be completed before the winter of 2017/18
15. It is expected that some woodwork will need to be repaired replaced in addition to the painting.
16. The age and type of wood that has been used in the windows seems to vary - the 1835 building was modified at the very end of the 19th century and some external modifications were made in the late 1970s.
17. The architects will investigate the paint that should be used and would consult a conservationist.

Main building roof space

18. It has been discovered during the inspection of the building that the fire separation curtains in the roof space of the main building had been damaged or displaced compromising their effectiveness in preventing fire spreading through the roof space.
19. It was agreed that these separating curtains be repaired or replaced as part of the external repairs project.
20. It was emphasised that the health and safety of all users of the building must be ensured.

Funding

21. A number of sources of funding were mentioned:
 - (a) Heritage Lottery Fund
 - (b) Historic England
 - (c) Yorkshire Historic Churches
 - (d) Bramall Foundation
 - (e) Methodist Insurance
22. Each grant-awarding body has its own procedure. It was agreed that an application to the Heritage Lottery Fund was the most likely to result in a significant sum.
23. The Heritage Lottery Fund prefers an informal approach, followed by a Preliminary Application, followed by an application with tender documents. This whole process could take up to a year.
24. DQ agreed to approach the fund and organise a meeting where we could present (in outline) our project.

Since the meeting DQ has contacted Catherine Boardman (Heritage Lottery Fund) and a meeting has been arranged for 2pm on 2nd December. JJ and KT to be present.
25. Other sources of funding will be approached later if necessary.

Legal issues

26. Is there any documentation we have relating to the joint boundary with No 1 Oxford Place (adjoining the Chambers)?
27. Is there any documentation about the possibility of there being asbestos in the building now or in the past?

The Schedule

28. The architects had a small number of questions relating to the schedule which were dealt with.
29. The disturbance of tenants, particularly those who whose work with clients is confidential was discussed in the contexts of access to their offices and as a consequence of work outside windows. It was agreed that this would need to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis in consultation with TP and might involve (temporary) relocation.

Project management

30. Pearce Bottomley would be the project managers and would undertake any quantity surveying that was necessary.