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Purpose of Report
The Council would shortly be submitting an ‘Application for conservation area consent for demolition’ in respect to the former Chadderton Swimming Baths. In the event that the application is approved, the report seeks approval for the Council to act upon the consent and procure the Unity Partnership who would;

- arrange the permanent disconnection of all statutory services.
- appoint a suitable asbestos surveyor and removal company.
- obtain tenders and appoint a suitable demolition contractor prior to overseeing the successful clearance of the subject property.

Recommendations
In the event that the application for demolition consent is approved, it is recommended that the Council proceed to appoint the Unity Partnership to demolish the property in accordance with the terms and conditions outlined within the course of the report.
Appointment of Unity Partnership – Demolition of Chadderton Sports Centre and Swimming Baths

1 Background

1.1 At the meeting held on 24 November 2010, despite an ongoing listing review by English Heritage, Cabinet resolved that the Council would work in partnership with Greater Manchester Police Authority (GMPA) to market the former Chadderton Swimming Baths, Library and Police Station properties which helped to form part of the Chadderton Town Hall Conservation Area.

1.2 Since this time, officers have been working with counterparts from GMPA and in recent weeks have agreed a mechanism for marketing the properties and agreeing an apportionment from the proceeds of sale. Consequently, in accordance with the agreement with GMPA, Council officers have been preparing marketing literature with a view to securing a development partner at the earliest opportunity.

2 Current Position

2.1 Unfortunately, on the eve of marketing work commencing, Chadderton Sports Centre and Swimming Baths have been broken into, causing the building to become unsafe. In order to minimise any potential risks to health and safety, it has been proposed to demolish the building at the earliest opportunity.

2.2 This information and the importance of demolishing the former Sports Centre and Swimming Baths at the earliest opportunity has been relayed to English Heritage who, because of the potential safety risks, have treated the ongoing listing review as a priority. In recent days, English Heritage have confirmed that the property would not have sufficient merit to warrant listing status.

2.3 An application to the Local Planning Authority seeking Conservation Area consent to demolish the Sports Centre and Swimming Baths has been prepared and would be submitted shortly.

2.4 Council officers have also been speaking with counterparts from the Unity Partnership who, not least due to the lead in time for service disconnections, are keen to order the necessary utility disconnections and asbestos survey work to ensure that the demolition process is not delayed.
3 **Options/Alternatives**

3.1 The Council no longer have the relevant skills to oversee clearance work in accordance with CDM regulations. Consequently, the options available to the Council would be limited.

4 **Preferred Option**

4.1 Due to the previous successes of the Unity Partnership in obtaining competitive tenders from contractors, it would be most preferable that the Councils partners are appointed to procure and oversee the works.

5 **Consultation**

5.1 Ward Members.

6 **Financial Implications**

6.1 The Unity Partnership have provided a budget estimate for the successful clearance of the Swimming Baths and Sports Centre property. The budget estimate is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asbestos Removal (Estimate)</td>
<td>£147,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity Fees</td>
<td>£13,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total – Asbestos Removal</strong></td>
<td><strong>£160,225</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Disconnections (Estimate)</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition (Estimate)</td>
<td>£45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity Fees</td>
<td>£14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat Survey</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total - Demolition</strong></td>
<td><strong>£62,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£222,225</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 It is likely that all expenditure, excluding service disconnections would be incurred in the 2011/2012 financial year. 

   (Mark Prestwich)

6.3 **Capital Implications**

6.3.1 The demolition and associated costs totalling £62,000 are capital expenditure which will be a charge against the Economy, Place and Skills (EPS) – Asset Management capital programme.

6.3.2 There is no provision in the capital programme for this demolition. However, it is proposed that Unity Partnership undertake the service disconnections and advance fees whilst EPS officers identify funding for the demolition contract. If specific funding is not identified for these costs then they will need to be funded by a Revenue Contribution to Capital Outlay (RCCO) from the EPS – Asset Management revenue budget in 2010/11.
6.3.3 The demolition contract cannot be awarded until funding has been identified for the contract costs. This tender acceptance will be the subject of a further report once the information is available. (Phillip Crossley)

6.4 Revenue Implications – Asbestos Removal

6.4.1 The asbestos removal and associated Unity fees totalling £160,225 are revenue expenditure which will be a charge against the Economy, Place and Skills (EPS) – Asset Management revenue budget.

6.4.2 Due to the extent of asbestos it is anticipated that these costs will be incurred in both 2010/11 and 2011/12 financial years. Colleagues in Unity Partnership will provide more details once the specialist term contractor has been consulted.

6.4.3 There is no provision in the revenue budget for these works but due to the significant health and safety implications it is proposed that the asbestos removal is undertaken as soon as possible.

6.4.4 Although there is no specific budget provision EPS officers will endeavour to manage this urgent expenditure within the overall EPS revenue budget. (Phillip Crossley)

6.5 Revenue Implications – Property Holding Costs

6.5.1 The demolition of the property will eliminate the business rates, building related security and ad hoc repair costs which are currently being incurred and funded from Economy, Place and Skills (EPS) – Asset Management and People Communities and Society directorate revenue budgets. These costs are currently £12,700 in the 2010/11 financial year. However, following the break in additional security has been implemented due to the health and safety risk of the building. Any delays in removing the asbestos and demolishing the building will increase the budget pressures on the EPS revenue budget.

6.5.2 It is anticipated that the cost of holding the cleared site after the building has been demolished will be minimal. Any costs incurred will need to be funded from within existing EPS revenue budgets. (Phillip Crossley)

7 Legal Services Comments

7.1 The Council has entered into a partnership agreement with Mouchel Parkman to create the Unity Partnership. In pursuance of the terms of the partnership agreement the Council are obliged to utilise the Unity Partnership for what is considered core work. It is envisaged that the demolition of property would form part of the Unity Partnership core work. (Peter Oliver)

8 IT Implications

8.1 None.
9 Property Implications

9.1 Property implications are addressed in the main body of the report.

10 Environmental and Health & Safety Implications

10.1 The successful demolition of the subject property would ensure that any potential public health and safety hazards are removed.

11 Equality, community cohesion and crime implications

11.1 None.

12 Equality Impact Assessment Completed?

12.1 No.

13 Key Decision

13.1 Yes.

14 Forward Plan Reference

14.1 Sangita Patel, Overview and Scrunity, 0161 770 3932

15 Background Papers

15.1 The following is a list of background papers on which this report is based in accordance with the requirements of Section 100(1) of the Local Government Act 1972. It does not include documents which would disclose exempt or confidential information as defined by the Act:

File Ref : EDU/
Name of File : Chadderton Cultural Buildings
Records held in EPS Directorate, Room 310, Civic Centre
Officer Name : Mark Prestwich
Contact No : 1660

16 Appendices

16.1 Plan
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