

Appendix 1 - Ely Archives Centre: Chronology of Events

No.	Event	By who	When	Notes
	First identification of the Strikes building	LGSS/Strategic Assets	February 2014	CHC Project Board commissioned an options appraisal from Strategic Assets to identify a new site for archives accommodation. Making Assets Count (MAC) partners were consulted to determine whether there are any opportunities for co-location but none was identified. The brief for Strategic Assets required premises that could be delivered quickly in order to comply with timescales imposed by TNA (the imposed deadline for commitment to a specific site was December 2014). These timescales (and the need to contain costs) ruled out new build. Strategic Assets identified a number of sites and the Strikes site was mentioned as a possibility, among others on the market at the time. At this stage the capital attributed to the project in the ETE capital scheme was £6 million
	Options report recommends Strikes	LGSS/Strategic Assets	April 2014	Strategic Assets' options report scored the Strikes building higher than the other properties identified. Approval for expenditure on a full feasibility study is granted, to assess whether the Strikes building could be converted to meet the archives accommodation summary specification drawn up by the Archives Manager.
	Feasibility Study	Arcus, John Onslow	August 2014	In July the contract for the feasibility study was awarded to Arcus, the lowest tenderer. The study was submitted in August and reported that it would cost £2.6 M to convert the building to an archives repository. The report estimated £4 million for the entire project (including property acquisition and other costs).

				<p>IMO Service Director John Onslow requested officers to look at expanding the scope of the building, so that it could become a council services hub and thereby become greater value for money; services identified for possible inclusion included Archaeology, Registration and CFA staff from Noble House.</p>
	Report to HCI and GPC committee	Christine May	23 September and 7 October 2014	<p>H&CI Committee approved a recommendation to relocate the Archives Service to the Strikes building, subject to GPC. Strategic Assets' recommendation of the Strikes building was agreed, but the budget was now set at a maximum of £4M as identified in the Arcus report. GPC authorised the Director of Finance to acquire the Strikes Bowling Alley for an archives centre, subject to a satisfactory structural survey and to planning permission being granted. Atkins are appointed to carry out the structural survey.</p> <p>TNA lifted the deadline in December 2014 on condition that the Ely project continued to be progressed.</p>
	Structural survey	Atkins	January 2015	<p>The structural survey identified that the existing ground floor slab would require reinforcement in order to take the loadings imposed by a second floor of archives storage. It was not possible to predict the actual cost of this work, however, until CCC had possession of the premises. A cost of £100-120K was suggested but there could be other unknown costs. John Onslow confirmed that this should not hold up the project, which was now expected to be about £4.2 M. Atkins were instructed to move to the design stage.</p>

				The summer of 2015 saw meetings between Atkins and officers to create an outline design for a two-storey council services hub building.
	Result of initial design work	Atkins	August 2015	Following design work, Atkins reported that the project would cost £6.2 M rather than Arcus's £4 M.
	Report to HCI and GPC committee	Christine May	1 September 2015, 6 th October 2015 and 20 th October 2015	<p>A report went to HCI Committee on 1 September 2015 identifying the increase in estimated cost and explaining that this was due to the revised scope of the building, to become a hub for other Council services. Committee was asked to agree the expansion of the scheme so that it could then be referred to GPC for approval. Members expressed concern over the increase and instructed officers to submit a report addressing concerns on the costings and justification for increase, for an additional H&CI Committee meeting on 6 October.</p> <p>A report went to H&CI Committee on 6th October 2015 which outlined three Options, Option A (continue the scheme but for Archives only), Option B (continue scheme and include Ely Registration Office) and Option C (continue scheme and include both Ely Registration Office and CFA staff offices). All three Options were costed. H&CI recommended that Option A, costed at £4.2 M, should be put to GPC for approval.</p> <p>A report went to GPC Committee on 20th October 2015 requesting an increase in budget from £4 M to £4.2 M in order to pursue Option A. GPC agreed this increase and agreed that the project should be progressed through planning and acquisition to completion. The budget was derived from the MS1 cost plan provided by Atkins</p>

				(option 4). The risks were covered by a 5% plus VAT risk allowance in the cost plan. This was to cover known risks relating to the building substructure requirements to meet PD5454, potential Building Control requirements and potential Flood Risk mitigation. At the time it was not considered necessary to cover this level of detail in the reports that went to HCI and GPC committee.
	Planning prepared and submitted	Atkins	Nov 2015	
	Planning permission obtained for building change of use		10 th December 2016	
	Strategy for procurement and delivery agreed and Atkins novated as lead designer up to MS3 stage	LGSS/Property	February 2016	Due to the technical nature of the project, and in order to allow for continuity in design and technical spec, it was agreed that Atkins would be novated as designers to the project. The view at the time was that it was better to bottom out technical design issues before bringing a contractor on board. If at this point value engineering was required, then a contractor could be appointed to add further value to the design process.
	CCC acquire Strikes Bowling Alley	LGSS/Strategic Estates	March 2016 and took possession on 13 th April 2016	The building was acquired and CCC took possession.
	Flood risk mitigation confirmed following receipt of survey		April/May 2016	Following receipt of technical advice and CCC possession of the building, Atkins confirmed the extent of the flood mitigation works required and substructure requirements.

	Property Core Team Meeting start	Core Team	May 2016	<p>The following was confirmed at the first Core Team meeting on 16th May:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design had progressed and that a concrete structure within the building was required in order to meet the 4 hour four rating requirements. • Floors would need to be raised in order to meet advice provided by the Flood Risk Assessor. • A sprinkler approach would be suitable for all records (It was later confirmed that sprinklers were not acceptable for the Registration service and that Registration records required either gas fire suppression or nothing.) • In order to progress the design and help with likely VE, it would be necessary to have a contractor on board.
	Engagement with East Cambs District Council takes place	LGSS Property & client/end user	June 2016	To agree the position in relation to the footpath at the rear and the treatment of boundaries
	Building contractor mini tender return	Coulson. F&G	June 2016	<p>Only one tender from Coulson Building Contractors returned. Based on revised design and the Framework rates submitted the cost plan increased by £860k (not including the requirement for gas suppression). The Coulson tender was priced on their framework rates and not against the design, and was considered to be value for money by Atkins. Atkins highlighted that VE could be identified by Coulson but only once the contract had formally been awarded. CCC officers however could not sign the contract because the estimate was higher than the budget authorised by Committee.</p>

	Property Core Team Meeting	Core Team	June 2016	<p>The following was confirmed at the Core Team meeting on 20th June:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the biggest contributions to the increase in budget is due to the superstructure and substructure elements. • At MS1 the design team progressed the design on the basis that the existing building had been designed to comply with the level of flood risk. The changes resulting from the advice received had an impact on cost. • There was limited scope within the building for VE. • It was agreed that Atkins would approach Coulson to see if they had further ideas regarding VE.
	Meeting with IMO Service Director and Acting Head of Libraries and Archives	LGSS Construction Programme Manager	29 th June 2016	<p>LGSS Programme Manager and Atkins Project Manager set out the reasons why there has been an increase in costs since MS1 stage. Christine May and Jill Terrell later confirmed in an email that they were happy to authorise the following in order to provide more information on which to conduct value engineering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey to determine steelwork sizes • Survey to determine the fixing of cladding panels • Survey to determine the build-up of the existing ground floor slab • Condition survey of the existing rising main and pumping station • Bore hole survey • Coulson site attendance cost • Coulson costs should they not be appointed post MS3 report.

	Report to Spokes on LGSS Internal investigation of this project – 2 nd August 2016	LGSS Construction Programme Manager	August 2016	<p>LGSS Programme Manager drafted a report for H&CI Spokes on the history of LGSS Property's engagement with the archive centre project and on lessons learned. (This report was delivered by James Wheeler.) The key lessons identified that the following were needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate timescales to allow for management of construction risk and to allow for risk associated with the condition of the building to be realised. • Improved risk management, communication and escalation protocol, including aligning of all risks for one master risk register for the project. • Improved governance arrangements and clarity around who is leading on key aspects and workstreams within the project. • Involve all key parties (Service Client/End User, Property Services and Estates) at outset to assess whether buildings have the capability of meeting service user's requirements.
	Property Core Team Meeting		23 August 2016	<p>Coulson had agreed to assist Atkins with VE option work although no contract for construction had been signed. This work reported on 23 August. A full range of options had been considered, including those which were unacceptable to the client/end user as they would have resulted in an archives repository which would not meet TNA approval. It was confirmed that the ground investigation survey was complete and that the final</p>

				<p>report was likely to confirm the strength of the ground slab, thereby allowing some cost savings in the structure; that the survey of the existing steelwork was complete and results were satisfactory; that Coulsons were awaiting access gates to be installed prior to pumping out the foul pumping station and undertaking the required survey.</p> <p>It was confirmed that a report would be submitted to H&CI Committee for 11 October which would outline the new estimated costs, why the costs had risen, the potential for VE work to reduce costs, and to request a decision on the way forward.</p>
--	--	--	--	--