

# Paper L1

The URC Trust

Redevelopment of Church House

United  
Church  
Reformed  
Church  
2016  
Church 2016



# Paper L1

## The URC Trust: Redevelopment of Church House

### Basic Information

<b>Contact name and email address</b>	The Revd Dick Gray, Chair of the Trust <a href="mailto:dickgray643@gmail.com">dickgray643@gmail.com</a>
<b>Action required</b>	Decision
<b>Draft resolution(s)</b>	<b>Mission Council notes the information supplied by the Trust, and accepts the recommendation of the Trust that the redevelopment of Church House proceed on this basis.</b>

### Summary of Content

<b>Subject and aim(s)</b>	Update on plans to redevelop Church House, with particular reference to planning permission and budget.
<b>Main points</b>	Planning permission has been granted. Budgetary estimates are somewhat higher than previously expected.
<b>Previous relevant documents</b>	Mission Council papers from March 2016: Paper L1 and minutes 16/14 and 16/20 (a)
<b>Consultation has taken place with...</b>	Finance Committee, General Secretariat, URC Trust.

### Summary of Impact

<b>Financial</b>	See para 5 of the paper.
<b>External (e.g. ecumenical)</b>	Mission Council has already agreed that the Church's central office should be within reach of our main partner churches.

# Redevelopment of Church House

1. A series of Mission Council discussions and resolutions have directed the URC Trust to draw up plans for the redevelopment of Church House. There are various gains to be made from doing this, among them disability access, closer co-ordination of the work of staff, and the earning of a significant rental income from the part of the building that we shall not need for URC use. This last point is intended to make the building cost-neutral to the Church, with the rental covering upkeep and utility costs. At the last Mission Council meeting in March a budget of £2.5 million was authorised.

2. Over recent months staff and trustees have met frequently with our project manager Third Sector Properties and our selected builder Peldon Rose to refine the plans and costs for the project.

3. Planning permission was granted by the local authority, Camden Council, on 5th September.

4. The latest iteration of the costs, which reflects the agreed design and has been negotiated down through the efforts of Third Sector Properties, is £1,893,034 (including £20,000 contingency), and is rather higher than we were aiming for. It means that the overall project will exceed the approved £2.5m.

5. The cost has stretched beyond the initial tender, and the overall sums involved are now as follows (figures in thousands):

Contract	1,893
VAT	379
Project management	144
Temporary accommodation, and removals	160
Storage	40
Necessary new furniture	<u>40</u>
Total	2,656

There will be ancillary costs for IT and telephone wiring, and for video-conferencing equipment; also some costs for legal advice, insurance and meeting space for certain committees (some meetings are making arrangements which will not cost us; others will incur cost).

6. An additional feature that was considered but is not currently included in the plans was to open up the top floor completely, which would cost an additional £30,000. At the moment we plan to open up the cellular structure on that floor into three large rooms; we believe this gives us some flexibility for multiple tenancy; opening up further would be more costly, less flexible for letting, and would not gain much more working space.

7. The Trust believes that we have dealt carefully and diligently with the assigned task of making Church House more accessible, flexible and future-proof but have been unable to bring the figures within the agreed expenditure. The terms of the March 2016 resolution, and good faith, require us to consult Mission Council again.

8. The Church's Finance Committee has been consulted about these figures, shortly before the last Trust meeting, and has not discouraged the Trust from proceeding.

9. Mission Council was concerned that the Trust address properly the environmental impact of the design. To that end we have discussed at some length with our contractors four possible measures, and following their advice we believe that it is wise to adopt two (listed as c. and d. below):
  - a. Rainwater harvesting for toilets. While this can be effectively designed into a new building, we have been advised that retro-fitting it into a building of our age (60 years) is notoriously problematic.
  - b. Solar panels. The cost and likely repayment period have been quoted to us as £45k and 20-25 years. This does not seem a compelling economic option. Further it would claim the roof-space, which is a possible site for future development, should the Church ever wish to increase again the building's capacity to generate income.
  - c. Zonal automatic lighting. The lighting throughout the building will switch itself off, zone by zone, whenever an area is not being used. This feature of the design is well worth having.
  - d. A VRF (Variable Refrigerant Flow) heating, ventilation and air-conditioning system will meet our legal responsibilities and duty-of-care to staff. It can transfer heat from waste air to enable fresh air to be fed into the building at the correct temperature, thus saving on energy, emissions and expense. It will have a much better coefficient of performance than the current gas heating system (this coefficient being the ratio of the energy you burn to the heat it delivers). The equipment that will do this work, of which more detail can be provided on request, is on the UK's Energy Technology List, as approved kit for businesses to set against tax. That is one sign of its publicly recognised quality and credibility.
10. Subject to Mission Council approval of the increased budget, we now hope to begin the work in early January, and have known for some time that it would take six months to complete.