

COMMITTEE: EXECUTIVE REF NO: E/19/37
DATE: 29 OCTOBER 2019
SUBJECT: 4 COLLEGE STREET
PORTFOLIO HOLDER: COUNCILLOR DAVID ELLESMERE
HEAD OF SERVICE: MARTYN FULCHER

Short description of report content and the decision requested:

4 College Street is a recently acquired Council owned heritage asset, which is in need of repair and refurbishment. It is the only property in the Council's ownership on the Building at Risk Register.

Executive are requested to agree and note the proposed plan of works for bringing the building back into a viable state of repair, in order to enable the property to be removed from the Building at Risk Register.

Ward(s) affected:

Alexandra

List of Appendices included in this report:

- a) Site plan (including suggested curtilage).

This report has been prepared by Mark Hunter, Tel: 01473 43 3330,

Email: mark.hunter@ipswich.gov.uk

This report was prepared after consultation with:

*Internal consultees
Head of Development
Legal Services
Financial Services
Conservation
Planning*

The following policies form a context to this report:

(all relevant policies must also be referred to in the body of the report)

Building a Better Ipswich 2017

LIST OF BACKGROUND PAPERS AS REQUIRED BY LAW

(papers relied on to write the report but which are not published and do not contain exempt information)

--

OTHER HELPFUL PAPERS

(papers which the report author considers might be helpful – this might include published material)

E/19/09 & E/18/33 Ipswich Town Centre and Waterfront Public Realm Strategy (SPD)
--

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Ipswich Borough Council owns the freehold title of 4 College Street, a Grade II listed 16th or 17th Century timber framed two-storey building, which has been vacant since 1981.
- 1.2 This property has only relatively recently fallen within the control of the Council, having formed part of the purchase of the wider site by the Council. The building was inherited in a poor state of repair and had laid vacant for many years prior to the Council acquiring the property. As a result, the building is currently listed on the Council's 'Buildings at risk register'. It is one of only 5 buildings on the Register – along with 1-5 College Street, St. Michael's Church, County Hall and The Tolly Brewery.
- 1.3 This report requests Executive to consider and agree an amount (from the existing budget within the approved Capital Programme) to repair and refurbish the building and to authorise officers to enter into negotiations with prospective tenants.

2. Background and Proposal

- 2.1 4 College St is a C16-C17 timber-framed and plastered house with a cross wing at the west end, comprising 2 storeys and attics, the upper storey is jettied on the whole front supported on curved brackets. The roof is tiled, with one gabled dormer. The Church of St Peter, the gateway to Wolsey's College of St Mary, Nos 1 to 5 (odd) and No 4 form a group of listed buildings within the immediate vicinity.
- 2.2 Ipswich Borough Council bought the property from a private owner. The property comprises a relatively small part of the wider site that was purchased for £660,000 on 19th October 2016
- 2.3 The Council has acquired two other sites within the wider block – having identified, with Ipswich Vision partners, this area as being the critical gateway within the town, most in need of regeneration.
- 2.4 Work is underway on developing plans for the rest of the site, as can be seen from the recent submission of a hybrid planning application (reference: 19/00624/FPI3) for:

Full application for change of use and associated external works to the brick warehouse building to D1 (Non-residential Institutions) and D2 (Assembly and Leisure) uses.

Outline application for change of use and associated external works to the concrete-framed building (including link section) to increase the height of the building by 3 storeys, to provide A3 (Restaurant and café) / A4 (Drinking Establishment) / A5 (Hot Food Take-away) at Basement and Ground Floor; B1 (Office) at 1st and 2nd Floors; and C3 (Residential) for up to 14 self-

contained flats with roof terrace amenity area and ancillary plant at 3rd to 7th Floors at Burton Son And Sanders Warehouse, St Peters Wharf.

- 2.5 In relation to 4 College Street, the Council has undertaken a detailed conservation condition survey of the existing building and as such, possesses a detailed list of the works required to protect and repair the building. This survey was carried out by the local conservation architect, Nicholas Jacobs. A detailed topographical survey has also been carried out.
- 2.6 The proposed works are likely to:
- a) make the building water-tight, and secure;
 - b) provide appropriate utilities to the site;
 - c) lay out the upstairs as two small rooms for potential use as office / meeting space and the downstairs with a toilet, kitchenette and flexible use space, and
 - d) provide for principal access from the rear of the building and a small curtilage around the building (see plan at Appendix A).

The works described will require listed building consent.

- 2.7 It is intended that works will be undertaken in three phases – firstly, initial site clearance works will be undertaken in the coming months (under officer delegation). Alongside that, a listed building application will be submitted before the end of the calendar year and then a main works contract will be reported to Executive, hopefully before the end of the financial year with a recommendation to appoint a contractor. It is also hoped that that final report will also set out a proposal to lease the building to a 3rd party (this may be on a relatively temporary let).
- 2.8 Once a contract has been let with the winning contractor works are expected to take up to six months on site to complete. The aim is for the building to be in use by the time of 'Maritime 2020'.

3. Options Considered

3.1 ***Option 1: Bring the building back into a viable state as soon as practically possible***

Comment: Progression of this option is recommended as it shows the biggest commitment on behalf of the Council and would not have the disadvantages associated with Options 2, 3 and 4.

3.2 ***Option 2: Do minimal works but enough to justify its removal from the Building at Risk Register***

Comment: A smaller extent of works could arguably be undertaken (e.g. making the building water-tight) to get it to a stage where it would be taken off the Building at Risk Register. However, this would still leave it in an un-occupiable state and would mean further works would need to be funded in

the future – probably in a costlier manner (i.e. doing it all in ‘one-go’ is likely to be more costs effective than doing it over multiple phases).

3.3 Option 3: Await resolution of all issues associated with the redevelopment of the wider site before resolving the future of this building

Comment: Whatever happens to the rest of the site it is clear that this building will need investment and that it will require a different set of specialist skills. There is not considered to be any advantage of waiting an unknown amount of time for the wider site issues to be resolved particularly as the building will continue to deteriorate.

3.4 Option 4: Do nothing

Comment: This is not feasible as it would mean that the building would continue to deteriorate and the Council would not be delivering on its responsibilities towards the built heritage of the town or set any form of example to other property owners.

4. Relevant Policies

4.1 Building a Better Ipswich 2017:

Priority	Contribution
Priority 2 – A high quality sustainable environment	Use our expertise and powers to protect the town’s historic environment.

5. Consultations

5.1 Internal consultations have taken place with finance and procurement, legal, planning, conservation and property services.

5.2 An application for listed building consent will be required during the design and procurement phase. Therefore, through the normal planning application process, there will be an additional opportunity for consultation with interested parties.

6. Risk Management

6.1 The risks outlined below are in relation to the project above.

Risk Description	Consequence of risk	Risk Controls	Probability of risk occurring taking account of controls (scale 1-6) 1 – almost impossible 6 – very high	Impact of risk, if it occurred taking account of actions (scale 1 – negligible; 4 – catastrophic)	Actions to mitigate risk
Nature of listed building when works commence unforeseen issues arise.	Increase in project costs.	Ensure appropriate levels of contingency are included within the budget build up.	4	2	Monitor contract expenditure closely and employ suitably qualified contractors.
Contractor enters liquidation during works phase.	Retender of works required with increase in costs and programme.	Financial checks.	2	3	Ensure robust financial health checks are carried out during tender phase, prompt payment to contractors at all times.

7. Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 7.1 Under the general equality duty as set out in the Equality Act 2010, public authorities are required to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimization as well as advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. The protected grounds covered by the equality duty are age, disability, sex, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, and sexual orientation. The equality duty also covers marriage and civil partnership, but only in respect of eliminating unlawful discrimination.
- 7.3 The law requires that this duty to have due regard be demonstrated in decision-making processes. Assessing the potential impact on equality of proposed changes to policies, procedures and practices is one of the key ways in which public authorities can demonstrate that they have had due regard to the aims of the equality duty.
- 7.4 An Equalities screening concluded that there is no need for a full Equality Impact Assessment.
- 7.5 The Tender Evaluation process will ensure that the recommended contractors have robust equal opportunities policies and procedures in place.

8. Financial Considerations

- 8.1 The budget estimate for the project total (i.e. Option 1) is broken down below:

Condition survey works estimate	£210,000
Refurbishment to office fit out @ £600 / m ²	£108,000
External works and improvements	£35,000
Contingency and fees @ 20%	£70,000
Total	£423,000

- 8.2 The current approved capital programme has £1,312,302 provision for this site. In addition, the Suffolk Business Rates pool is making £500,000 available to Ipswich Borough to help enhance the regeneration and growth of Ipswich. This is a similar scheme to that introduced at the start of 2018/19 (when the figure then was £2m). Following discussions with Suffolk County Council it is proposed to allocate this funding to support the wider St Peters Dock regeneration.
- 8.3 The £423,000 for the works to the cottage will be taken from the £1,812,302 (i.e. £1,312,30 + £500,000) leaving a balance of £1,389,302 for further works on the wider site.
- 8.4 It is noted that, in isolation from the rest of the wider site, this small plot will not generate an income that would cover the return on the £423,000 (plus purchase costs), that it is estimated this refurbishment will cost. However, it is envisaged that, whilst the area was purchased to aid regeneration rather than make a profit, the redevelopment of the entire area should break-even over time.
- 8.5 It should also be recognised that further funding opportunities will continue to be sought in order to bring forward regeneration in the area i.e. via the LEP, the (awaited) Towns Fund and the like.

9. Legal Considerations

- 9.1 The Tender process will comply with Contract Standing Orders and with the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.
- 9.2 In accordance with the Regulations, following Executive's decision on the award of the contract, the Council will notify all unsuccessful tenderers of the identity of the successful contractor, the scores they achieved and the characteristics and relative advantages of the successful tender.
- 9.3 The property remaining on the Buildings at Risk Register places the Council in a difficult position as both the owner of the property and the enforcement authority

10. Performance Monitoring

- 10.1 Major Capital Schemes, via an appointed project manager, will monitor the work to ensure it is completed in accordance with the specification and contract, on time and to budget. The Council's expectations will be clearly communicated to the contractor at the beginning of the contract. Throughout

the contract, the project team will monitor the quality of the works and materials used.

- 10.2 Officers within the Major Capital Schemes team will manage the overall expenditure of the contract and monitor overall costs and progress. Monthly team meetings will be held to ensure that the contractors design progresses and a final sign off meeting will be held prior to works commencing on site.
- 10.3 Property Services will be responsible for finding a suitable tenant for the site which is likely to be from summer 2020 onwards.

11. Conclusions

- 11.1 The repair and refurbishment of this important site will show that the Council is committed to (a) developing the rest of the remaining waterfront sites; (b) leading by example when it come to protecting and enhancing the standing of key buildings in the town – i.e. providing a lead for other building owners whose properties are on the Council Building at Risk Register.

12. Recommendations

- 12.1 That Executive authorises the Head of Development, in consultation with the Head of Governance, to take all necessary steps to deliver the project as set out in this report.**

Reason: To redevelop the property to a condition which enables a letting to be agreed.

- 12.2 That Executive agrees that the estimated cost of £423,000 for this scheme will be funded via the existing capital programme allocation.**

Reason: To allow the project to be taken forward with appropriate budget provision.

Appendix A

