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MINUTES OF THE BROADWAY THEATRE WORKING GROUP
Friday 4 December 2015 at 6:15 pm

PRESENT: Councillors James-J Walsh (Chair), Liz Johnston-Franklin, Alan Hall

Officers: Group Manager for Asset Operations (Peter Agent), Head of Cultural and Community Development (Liz Dart), Broadway Theatre Operations Manager (Carmel O’Connor), Broadway Theatre Events Manager (Helen Haylett), Committee Support Officer (Emma Aye-Kumi)

1. Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 1 September be confirmed as an accurate record.

2. Declarations

None received.

3. Broadway Theatre - Capital Update

The Head of Cultural and Community Development presented the report.

The Group Manager for Asset Operations explained that collaborative work with Bexley had commenced to deliver a cross-borough flood risk survey which would improve understanding of the areas at greatest risk of flooding. He stated that the survey results would inform work to build resilience into the built environment, safeguard vulnerable buildings and build capacity to deal with flooding.

Councillor Johnston-Franklin asked whether Catford could be prioritised to avoid delay. The Group Manager responded that identifying priority areas formed part of the work, and prioritised works would be fully identified by the end of March. He added that some data was already available to inform operating plans in the event of bad weather. Councillor Johnston-Franklin stressed the importance of ensuring that any works were informed by the flood survey results.

Councillor Hall requested that results of the Theatre survey, which were expected before Christmas, be circulated round the Group as soon as they became available. For the next meeting, he asked for a report on the next stage of the capital works together with cost/financial implications and recommendations for the Group. (Action: Head of Culture and Community Development)

RESOLVED that the report be noted.
3. **Venue Case Studies**

The Head of Cultural and Community Development presented the report. She informed the Group that the Arts Council was unlikely to approve any new grant applications but that project funding may be available.

Councillor Johnston-Franklin stressed the importance of a bar/catering offering. The Operations Manager confirmed that even with the dark period, the actual Bars and Catering income would come in at around £40,000 as projected in the Budget Summary.

Members were keen to exploit the downstairs space in the theatre building. It was felt that tapping into the entrepreneurial ‘foodie’ market might be a way forward, and the success of the Lewisham Model Market was cited by way of example. Members recognised that this could attract a mix of local and non-local users. The Chair was keen to attract people to Catford in order to challenge and change perceptions of the area. His view was that creating a multipurpose space where food could be as much of a draw as the theatre programme was desirable and to achieve that he believed that having a retractable rake was key. The Group acknowledged the importance of developing the income stream from commercial hires and identified large weddings as an untapped local market, but acknowledged that such hires had to be balanced against the need to deliver a commercially viable and culturally relevant arts programme.

The Chair questioned whether the future of the theatre operation best lay within the council. Councillor Hall cautioned against relinquishing full control but broadly concurred that an arms-length management arrangement may be advantageous.

Councillor Johnston-Franklin expressed that the physical approach of the building needed greater impact. The Chair advised that Councillor Curran was a member of both the Broadway Theatre Working Group and the Sustainable Development Select Committee, which was considering the space immediately outside the Theatre as part of wider plans to regenerate Catford.

The Group heard that there was no shortage of bookings for the coming months, including various dance school hires, a photography exhibition celebrating LGBT History Month, a Shakespeare festival named Catford-Upon-Avon, and that staff were costing carefully to ensure that everything that could be charged back to the hirer was charged back. When asked, the Operations Manager revealed that she would prioritise spending on improving the seating in the front stalls. She explained that the existing banks of wooden seats were extremely heavy and took two people considerable time and effort to manually remove them, and consequently opportunities to use the space flexibly were limited. The Chair praised the work of the Theatre Operations Manager and Events Manager, recognising that what limited budget they had, they had used prudently.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.
4. Proposed Public and stakeholder consultation

The following points were noted in discussion:

- Demographic questions would be incorporated into the consultation
- Members wanted an option for Youth events in Q6 (Action – Head of Culture and Community Development)
- Members were impressed with the on-site consultation at PLACE/ Ladywell and wanted a similar model for the theatre consultation
- Officers would monitor the demographic of the responses and would undertake targeted consultation if particular groups were underrepresented
- It would not be possible to publish the consultation in the hard copy of Lewisham Life (due end Feb) as this would delay the Group’s progress
- Everybody on the box office database would be invited to respond to the consultation

RESOLVED that, subject to the comments above, the public consultation go live in January.

The Chair thanked Officers for attending on a Friday evening. Action – Committee Support Officer to identify potential date(s) for next meeting.

Meeting ended: 7:40pm
Dear Sir/Madam

Broadway Theatre, Catford

The enclosed pages are a record of the presentation to the Sustainability Development Committee at Lewisham Civic Suite on Thursday 14th January 2016.

The content is an edited extract of a feasibility study which was generated over the past 10 months.

The report describes a collection of thoughts for refurbishing The Broadway Theatre in Catford - and are a summary to a number of conversations (and enthusiastic building tours) with Martin Costello, The Theatres Artistic Director (now retired).

The proposals enclosed have been presented to the key Statutory Consultees: Historic England and The Theatres Trust. Both bodies support the key moves within the proposals, with the finer details needing further clarification in due course.

The proposals are in many ways quite pragmatic and seek to resolve some of the design flaws within the existing building and offer the theatre a more promising future.

The options for improvements to the building can be treated in isolation, or as a package.

They are developed with economy in mind, as the budget for any scheme has not yet been defined.

The building is Grade II listed and we have been mindful of the buildings significant parts within all of the proposals.

This sketchbook is intended as a discussion piece, to assist in: Ongoing conversations, Applications for funding and (possibly) Integration into the wider Catford Area Action Plan - and other masterplan reports which may supersede it.

This sketchbook should be read in conjunction with other briefing memos prepared by the theatre, which identify essential ongoing repairs to the building.

Everything in this sketchbook to date, has been undertaken on a pro-bono basis, by Ian Chalk and Edward Whiteley of Ian Chalk Architects, and with additional input from Conservationist friends at Alan Baxters.

We are based at Farringdon in central London, but I live off Belmont Hill in Lewisham, so have a vested interest in making a meaningful contribution to the area.

We look forward to the opportunity to continue this discussion.

Yours faithfully

Ian Chalk

Ian Chalk RIBA
Ian Chalk Architects
70 Cowcross Street
London
EC1M 6EJ

0203 7807355
07785 973723

web: ianchalkarchitects.com
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Existing ground floor

- Auditorium
- Foyer
- Bar
- Dressing room
- Vestibule
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- Box office
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- Office
Existing lower-ground floor
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Existing second floor
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Existing fourth floor
Existing cross section
Existing cross section through stage
Press release for new town hall extension
1970s - Proposed Pedestrianised Precinct
Improving the studio
Existing studio

- Key constraints:
  - Column positions causing restricted views
  - Seating capacity could be increased
  - Adjoining gallery underused
  - Control room poorly positioned

- Description:
  - Studio
  - Stage
  - Seating
  - Low seating capacity given studio size
  - Gallery underused
  - View restricted
Improved arrival and connection
Proposed studio

- Proposed studio
- Central control room
- Fixed capacity increased to 115
- Improved entrance to studio
- Gallery to act as foyer for studio
- Columns relocated
Proposed studio

- Central control room
- New truss to support lighting equipment
- Amphitheatre seating with unrestricted views
Improving the main auditorium
key constraints:

get-in is remote from stage and includes complicated changes in level

visibility obstructed in places - particularly front circle behind control desk

lack of good disabled facilities

very little backstage and wing accommodation

little flexibility for performance type

Working within the volume
Proposed cross section

Seating proposals

Stage/back-stage proposals

Proposals for both stage and seating are illustrated together for simplicity, however one does not preclude the other and each proposal could be delivered independently.

- Improved seating with unrestricted views
- Disabled seating at front
- Stage brought into auditorium - open stage
- Area for back stage
- Fly tower retained for traditional performance
- Get-in directly from Broadway using lift

Main stalls access via first floor foyer

Foyer

Cloak/storage

Stage/back-stage proposals

Proposed cross section

Ian Chalk Architects: May 2015

Catford Broadway
Proposed ground floor

- Stage/back-stage proposals
- Seating proposals

Proposals for both stage and seating are illustrated together for simplicity, however one does not preclude the other and each proposal could be delivered independently.

- Improved seating with unrestricted views
- Increased backstage and wings
- Stage brought into auditorium - open stage
- Disabled seating at front

Ian Chalk Architects: May 2015
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Auditorium

stalls capacity 340

Bar

Bar

access to circle

access to circle

Foyer
Proposed second floor
Greater audience comfort

Existing seat widths and row depths insufficient
seat width increased to 550mm minimum
depth of stall rows increased from 800mm to 890mm
depth of circle rows increased from 710mm to 800mm
Wider building considerations
A new 2nd entrance....?
A new 2nd entrance....?
Catford Broadway
Ian Chalk Architects: May 2015
Comparison with other venues
Old Vic Theatre, 1818
1,067 capacity

Auditorium 45%
Stage 15%
Wings/Backstage 40%
Royal Opera House, 1858
2,158 capacity
Royal Albert Hall, 1871
4,800-6,500 capacity
Hackney Empire, 1901
1,275 capacity

Auditorium 40%
Stage 15%
Wings/Backstage 45%
Catford Broadway
Ian Chalk Architects: May 2015

Piccadilly Theatre, 1928
1,144 capacity

Auditorium 35%
Stage 20%
Wings/Backstage 45%
Broadway Theatre, 1932
845 capacity

Auditorium 70%
Stage 20%
Wings/Backstage 19%
Royal Festival Hall, 1951
2,895 capacity
National Theatre, Lyttelton Theatre, 1976
895 capacity

Auditorium 30%
Stage 20%
Wings/Backstage 50%
Barbican Centre, 1981
1,166 capacity

Auditorium 35%
Stage 25%
Wings/Backstage 40%
The Egg, Theatre Royal Bath,  
2005  
120 capacity

Auditorium 45%  
Stage 45%  
Wings/Backstage 10%
Auditorium 30%
Stage 30%
Wings/Backstage 40%

Young Vic Theatre, 2006
550 capacity
Given current provision, in comparison to similar venues, wings and backstage are roughly 25% short on capacity.
1. Purpose of report
1.1 The purpose of this report is to update the working group on the consultation that will take place with residents and stakeholders to inform plans for the future development of the Broadway Theatre.

2. Consultation
2.1 The two main issues the consultation will explore are:
   - What do residents and stakeholders feel about the Broadway Theatre as it is.
   - What do residents and stakeholders most want from the venue in the future.

2.2 A number of different consultation methods will be used in order to capture the views of as broad a range of people as possible. This will include:
   - An online questionnaire on the Council’s engagement platform Uengage.
   - Paper versions of the survey available in libraries, at the theatre box office and in the theatre foyer when performances are on
   - Grafitti wall at Catford Library and when performances are on at the theatre
   - A drop-in day in the theatre bar area including tours of the theatre.

3. Timeline
3.1 The consultation will begin 25 January 2016 and will close 15 March 2015 – a period of 7 weeks. Data will then be analysed and a consultation report completed by early April

4. Publicity
4.1 The survey will be promoted in the following ways:
   - Council website
   - Social media
   - Lewisham Life (will be circulated from 26 January)
   - Targeted emails using contact lists from the Broadway Theatre (theatre goers and user groups), Rushey Green and Catford South Local Assemblies, LBL Culture & Community Development list of voluntary and community sector organisations

5. Conclusion
5.1 The working party is asked to note the proposed plans for consultation and to provide any views on how the consultation could be enhanced.
Appendix 1 – consultation questionnaire

Broadway Theatre Questionnaire

1. Have you visited the Broadway Theatre in the last 5 years?
   Yes □
   No □

2. If yes did you attend (please tick all that apply)
   The main auditorium □
   The studio theatre □
   Bar/café/foyer □

3. Please tell us which event(s) you have attended

4. Please indicate how you would rate your satisfaction with the following aspects of your most recent visit to the Broadway Theatre with 1 being low and 5 high

   Quality of production
   1  2  3  4  5

   Welcoming atmosphere
   1  2  3  4  5

   Comfort of seating
   1  2  3  4  5

   Ticket prices
   1  2  3  4  5

   Price of drinks & snacks
   1  2  3  4  5
5. If you have not visited the Broadway Theatre in the past 5 years, please tell us which of the following factors have deterred you from attending.

- Cost
- Transport issues
- Parking
- No one to go with
- Nothing I wanted to attend
- Did not know what was on
- Location
- Accessibility

Please let us have any further comments about why you have not visited the Broadway Theatre

6. The Council is currently considering how the Broadway Theatre could be best used in the future and what type of venue would be of most value to the local community. Please give us your views by ticking your top 5 priorities from the following list

- A venue to hire for community events
- Live music events
- Children’s/family events
- Drama productions / plays
- Dance performances
- A venue to hire for weddings and other family celebrations
- Classical music events
- Dance events such as tea dances, salsa, Ceilidh
- Pantomime
- Opera
- Film
- Comedy
- Restaurant open to non-theatre goers
- Bar/cafe open to non-theatre goers
- Club nights
- Cabaret/burlesque
- Other (please specify)
Please let us have any further comments about the kind of venue you would like the Broadway Theatre to be.

The survey will also include equalities monitoring information and the option to provide contact details to receive further information about the theatre and a summary of the results from the survey.
1) Purpose of report
   1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide information to the working party about condition surveys undertaken for the Broadway Theatre.

2) Condition Surveys
   2.1 In November 2015 Frankham Consultancy Group undertook a survey of the condition of the internal and external fabric and mechanical and electrical components of the theatre. The survey was undertaken on a visual basis only. It is noted that the building was opened in 1932 and retains many original features which have now reached or exceeded their service life and are beyond economical repair.

   2.2 The summary report from this survey is attached at appendix 1. The full survey with appendices was made available to members of the working party in early January 2016.

   2.3 The summary of costs include suggested essential works in the region of £530,000 over the next two years.

   2.4 The condition surveys only looked at the fabric of the current building and did not address costs involved in improvements required for the future operation of the theatre such as get-in and seating. Quotes for undertaking these improvements are needed.

   2.5 The report makes reference to the fire doors and arrangements for chaining these doors. This was the subject of detailed discussion with the fire officer in 2015 and the council’s Health and Safety Committee was assured of that the fire officer was satisfied with this procedure. Further upgrading of these doors would however warrant investigation to see if a more efficient arrangement could be made if the buildings listed status would allow this.

   2.6 The report also makes reference to the works to the main auditorium plaster, which has since been completed, together with matters relating to asbestos, water and fire compliance which require ongoing investigation and attention.

   2.7 The report agrees that the heating system requires further, detailed consideration to enable independent operation prior to the closure of the Old Town Hall where the boiler(s) are currently sited.

   2.8 Although there are numerous items listed for short-term attention, a number of these are of a cosmetic nature. The more substantial items such as roof and window repairs will need to be programmed in together to make the most efficient use of extensive and expensive
scaffolding. Consideration will also need to be given to the timing of the works in relation to the impact on the theatre programme.

3) Resources

3.1 The exact capital requirements for the theatre over the next two years are still to be fully determined but it is reasonable to assume that they could be in the region of £1m to £2million when the full cost of roof repairs, heating system and operational improvements are considered. This is beyond the scope of the council’s capital programme and will require investment from other sources. However, an allocation from the capital programme to enable the further studies that are required to be undertaken and some short term remedial works would be beneficial. This allocation could also potentially be used to match external funds.

4) Conclusion

4.1 Significant progress has been made in understanding the condition of the Broadway Theatre and potential costs over the next ten years. Further work is, however, required to understand all aspects of improvement and provide the full costs so an investment plan for securing the necessary funds can then be developed. Although this visual and non-intrusive survey has identified a number of areas for improvement the report overall found no issues with the building that present a significant risk to the longevity of use.
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Frankham Consultancy Group (FCG) has been appointed by London Borough of Lewisham to undertake a condition survey of the building fabric and assets.

1.2 Instructions were received from London Borough of Lewisham to proceed on 21 October 2015, based on FCG’s Fee Proposal and Service Schedule dated 8 October 2015.

2.0 Background Information

2.1 Broadway Theatre (also known as Lewisham Theatre) is a purpose built concert hall constructed in the 1930s and has received Grade II listed status in 1993. The location of the theatre is North of Culver Green Conservation Area situated centrally within Catford on the South Circular Road (A21).

2.2 The facility consists of the building set over three floors and includes a basement area. There are the main concert hall, studio theatre, coffee shop, offices, storage areas and associated non public areas incorporating the heating and electrical service areas.

2.3 The coffee shop area as we understand was refurbished in 2005 bringing facilities up to standards prevailing at that time.

2.4 An Asbestos Management Survey Report was provided prior to the survey being undertaken.

3.0 Project Brief

3.1 The Project Brief was as stated on F. Crossley’s email dated 1 October 2015. This required FCG to undertake a full condition survey and provide a written report itemising repair and replacement costs together with photographic schedules, to internal and external fabric items and mechanical and electrical components.

4.0 Limitations of Survey and Report

4.1 Our survey inspection was undertaken on a visual basis only. No opening up works was undertaken during our inspections. We have not been instructed to conduct a full building survey. Any defects and/ or apparent structural issues should be investigated further.

4.2 Our instruction was limited to public and non public areas of the building and areas that were locked were made available on request at the time of survey.

5.0 Condition Report

5.1 FCG conducted a full condition survey of all accessible areas, including building fabric components and mechanical and electrical installations to ascertain the condition of the building and establish the works required with annotated plans.
providing reference to the areas and their current condition. Appendix D provides annotated plans to reference the location of the condition survey results.

5.2 Appendix A contains a full summary of the Condition Report: Data Capture and Budget Costs.

5.3 FCG have provided outline details of the condition of each building and M&E components, stating its anticipated installation date and life expectancy. We have then generated budget costs for the repair/ replacement of each component/installation where appropriate, based on the life expectancy duration, and have itemised costs for each within designated Year Bands between the next 1-10 Year period, with year bands ranges being Year 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6-10.

5.4 The method of condition reporting has been indicated on the Condition Assessment sheet. This states the Priority Grading and Condition Codes for building fabric items and mechanical and electrical installations (Appendix B).

5.5 The costs stated are for budget purposes only based on our expectation of likely repair, replacement and upgrade costs. Consideration has been given to the potential additional costs for asbestos removal to areas highlighted and in conjunction with the management level asbestos report. However, we would recommend that LBL have a full Refurbishment and Demolition Survey undertaken for a thorough intrusive survey and testing of all components confirming asbestos based materials. This will enable the true extent of all possible asbestos present to be identified and costs for the removal/ encapsulation can be made accordingly.

6.0 Condition Survey Inspection

6.1 Following instruction by London Borough of Lewisham, internal access was gained with the support of Carmel O'Connor (Building Manager). FCG undertook their surveys on Wednesday 11 November 2015. The inspection was a visual inspection only, with no intrusive investigations being undertaken.

7.0 Summary of Building Condition

7.1 General Condition

7.1.1 The building appears to have retained a substantial amount of its original features, with the main entrance and public areas in particular, being honest to the listing status of the building.

7.1.2 Externally, the building has retained almost all of its original features, with the stone work and metal framed windows appearing to be original. The fire exits are chained internally and appear to require substantial maintenance to provide adequate security to the building as well as ensuring appropriate egress routes. This could be a potential breach of regulations that govern egress out of a building in an emergency.

7.1.3 The recommended actions within the Asbestos Management Survey Report appear to have been undertaken to the plant room and service areas. This will need to be verified however with an R&D Survey.
7.2 **Structure (including stairs)**

7.2.1 Lewisham Theatre appears to be of solid concrete construction with internal walls being made of block/brickwork. The assumed construction is in keeping with the construction methods of the period.

7.2.2 It was noted that there were minor structural issues in localised areas mainly to the wall beneath the stage facing the changing rooms, and is assumed that they do not provide any detriment to the building; the areas are noted within the schedule of condition for internal areas. As the structure is mainly covered over with the finishes, it is difficult to comment further. It was noted that shear style cracking was found at high level on the wall that faces Dressing Rooms 1 and 2 to the plaster and painted finish. Further investigations should be undertaken to determine the cause and provide the appropriate remedy.

7.3 **Wall/ Ceiling/ Floor substrates**

7.3.1 The wall and ceiling substrates are predominantly of a plaster finish, with the exception being the exposed corridor to the projection room, where it is assumed to be of a rendered finish. Overall the plaster is of good condition except where there is high traffic both public and movement of fittings (such as seating).

7.3.2 The abrasions and parts missing will be easily remedied and are extensive across the low levels of the walls. The plaster to the ceiling is generally in good condition with localised areas (as noted within the condition survey) that require attention following episodes of water ingress/condensation.

7.3.3 The main area of concern in respect of the plaster is in the basement on the external walls at the junction where the borrowed lights/gas vents are located. Further investigations are required to determine the cause of the moisture damage to these areas to remove the existing defect; though the works required will be similar in nature to make good to the defective area.

7.3.4 The floor substrate is assumed to be a screed, though this could not be evidenced due to the floor coverings in place. There was no visible evidence of any deterioration to the substrate for the floor areas.

7.4 **Internal wall and ceiling finishes**

7.4.1 The wall finishes vary dependent on the intended use of the room. The entrance and foyer areas are predominantly stone finish. As expected with the hard wearing finish, the general condition was good.

7.4.2 The painted finish of the walls was variable dependent on the location. The high levels of the walls within the basement at the junction with the borrowed lights/gas vents show significant signs of deterioration. The low level areas of the walls in high traffic areas showed significant signs of impact damage.
7.4.3 The general age of the painted surfaces is viewed as being more than 8 years old and should be considered for redecoration as part of the cyclical maintenance programme to ensure the relevant standards to ensure safe egress from the building by minimising the potential risk of spread of fire. The damage to the decorations will have had an impact on this issue. Full redecorations have been considered the appropriate method to meet the requirements.

7.4.4 The timber panelling within the auditorium was in good condition. Consideration should be given to the cyclical maintenance and decoration to the timber finish to ensure integrity is maintained for the egress routes.

7.4.5 The ceilings in general were of a good standard, except for the identified localised areas. The ceiling of the long corridor from the coffee shop lobby to the management offices shows that the lining paper has lost adhesion and is in a poor state. This should be attended to as a matter of urgency.

7.4.6 The inlay tile system for the ceilings, as identified, were in good condition generally and require ongoing maintenance and repairs as recorded.

7.4.7 The ceilings in the basement are generally in a fair condition, but with some areas showing significant deterioration with the paint flaking.

7.4.8 The store room in the basement requires additional ventilation to remove the build up of excess moisture so that the formation of mould and damage to the walls is minimised. The extract fan in the store was switched off at the time of the survey.

7.4.9 The tiled walls in the cloakrooms were generally in fair condition. There was a substantial area of missing tiles in the Studio Foyer male cloakroom which should be attended to as a matter of urgency to prevent further damage occurring.

7.5 **Floor Finishes**

7.5.1 The stone flooring, as expected, is a hard wearing surface and was generally in fair condition. It was noted that there were localised areas of cracking that travelled across the corridors, and typically would be attributable to a lack of expansion cracks allowed when originally laid.

7.5.2 Generally the carpeted areas were in fair condition. Areas where there has been damage to the carpet had been attended to with the use of heavy duty tape. This type of repair is not seen as a suitable method of maintaining the carpet and minimising trips. There were a number of carpeted staircases that had not received suitable nose coverings and demonstrate a significant trip hazard to those with sight impairment and physical mobility issues. It is expected that as the carpet ages the number of repairs will increase. A sensible approach to repairs and maintenance must be considered with the carpet being replaced when it becomes uneconomical to repair.

7.5.3 Timber flooring in the main auditorium showed signs of damage that require attention before it becomes a trip hazard.

7.5.4 The sheet vinyl finish to the wet areas was in fair condition overall. Regular inspection and maintenance is required to attend to the arising repair obligations.
7.5.5 Painted surfaces are generally worn where there is high traffic, most notably on the stairwells to either side of the stage and the seating area within the dress circle. The worn finish provides a smoother surface to that of the painted finish and increases the potential for slips and falls and should be considered a priority to minimise claims.

7.6 Cloakroom facilities

7.6.1 Generally the cloakrooms were in fair condition. The welfare facilities for performers was generally older than the public facilities but in serviceable order. The Studio Foyer facilities appear to have received a facelift; with the facilities servicing the coffee shop being approximately 10 years old.

7.6.2 The washbasins, WC pan and cisterns were all serviceable, ongoing maintenance of high level cisterns may become uneconomical to maintain with age.

7.6.3 The partitions between the WCs appear modern with wear and tear noted that is not out of the ordinary. Regular inspection and maintenance will be required.

7.7 Dressing Rooms

7.7.1 There are several dressing/store rooms that surround the stage below and to the side on different floors. Whilst the use of the rooms varies, the general condition appears consistent with the current use. The current condition is similar to that of the corridors that surround the auditorium and require attention to the painted finish and plaster work. Consideration should also be given to the carpet to these rooms.

7.8 Auditorium

7.8.1 The auditorium retains many original features and is in keeping with the listed status. Reports were received from Carmel O’Connor of outstanding repairs following a water leak to the ornate mouldings to the wall. There is evidence that the repairs are still outstanding and should be considered a priority to ensure the safety of patrons from any falling material. The seating appears to be maintained and regular inspection and repairs will be ongoing.

7.9 Fire doors and fire exit doors

7.9.1 We were unable to determine whether the doors meet current requirements and further undertakings are required to ensure they meet current standards.

7.9.2 The fire exit doors were all chained and padlocked internally, which causes us concern that they are not fit for purpose and require repairs and maintenance to ensure that they provide adequate security as well as ease of egress in case of an emergency. A review of the fire plan should also be undertaken to ensure that the current risk has been assessed, by way of a Fire Risk Assessment.

7.9.3 The Council should satisfy themselves that the current arrangement fully satisfies means of escape regulations for continuing safe use of the theatre

7.10 Electrical Installations

7.10.1 Refer to Appendix E for full Summary Condition Report.


7.11 Mechanical Installations

7.11.1 Refer to Appendix F for full Summary Condition Report.

7.12 External Masonry

7.12.1 The external masonry is generally in good condition. Localised areas require attention mainly at low levels. The main entrance to the theatre will require more attention due to the vegetation growth and staining that has been noted. The masonry to the rear of the building in the car park area is showing signs of expansion cracking and further investigations will be required to ascertain the cause of the damage as well as establishing a suitable remedy.

7.12.2 The ornate reliefs and items noted within the listing status of the building are generally in good condition.

7.12.3 Consideration should be given to additional funds being set aside for any additional repairs required to the masonry should scaffold be erected and close inspection of the masonry to determine the volume of repair works needed. This should include the possible repairs to the heraldic reliefs and ornate architecture at higher levels of the main facade of the building.

7.13 Windows and glazing

7.13.1 The windows are in keeping with the age and design of the building and appear to not have received cyclical decorations of 5 yearly periods as expected.

7.13.2 Internal inspections and external (from ground level) found that the metal framed (Crittal style) windows are in fair condition and will require servicing and maintenance as well as being redecorated. Due to the high costs of scaffolding to undertake these works, taking the frames back to metal and undertaking the necessary repairs will provide the most economically advantageous method of ensuring longevity to the windows. Costs shown against the windows have included for scaffold access.

7.14 Roof coverings

7.14.1 In the main the roof is as stated in the listed status of the building, with a pitched tiled roof covering to the main building and projections. The roof covering has a life expectancy of 50+ years and there are signs that it is coming to the end of its serviceable life.

7.14.2 It was noted that there are slipped, damaged and missing tiles as well as tangs in place to support tiles that have previously slipped. The covering has a build up of lichen/ moss that support the age and condition of the tiles. Costs have been allowed for a full roof replacement to coincide with the cyclical decorations and repairs to the windows to maximise the use of the scaffold with its incumbent high costs.

7.14.3 The asphalt walkways to the inside of the roof pitch show signs of slumping and have recently received a liquid coating to provide weather protection. Consideration should also be given to the replacement of the asphalt walkways at the same time as the roof covering.
7.15 Rain water goods and box gutters

7.15.1 The vertical rain water pipes appear to be the original installation with some hoppers having the year of manufacturer cast into them. Overall, these are in fair condition with the downpipes near the main theatre entrance being in the worst condition. The previously painted metal pipe work requires redecoration.

7.15.2 The box gutters provide the surface water runoff from the pitched roof to the downpipes and are hidden behind the top part of the wall that can be seen from the street level. Vegetation can be seen from street level at some locations and is indicative of a build up of silt and debris where the falls may not be adequate.

7.15.3 The box gutters will require clearing out and any repairs identified at this time will need to be undertaken immediately to prevent water penetration into the building. The damage found to the side of the main theatre entrance as well as apparent water damage to the high level ceilings to the foyer stair case and adjacent stairwells could be attributed to the potential blockages to these areas.

8.0 Cost Analysis

8.1 Along with the condition survey, budget costs have been allowed for the repair and maintenance as well as replacement of the identified elements within the condition survey findings (Appendix A).

8.2 A cost analysis based on the total budget costs as generated within the condition survey summary sheets between the year bands 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6-10 (refer to Appendix C), may be summarised as follows, including mechanical and electrical costs, and also the overall extra over cost of the alteration/conversion works (refer to Table 1 on page 12).

8.3 Our budget costs have allowed to bring the building up to a higher standard of repairs part of London Borough of Lewisham’s strategic view of regeneration to the area. Table 1 below has allowed for foreseeable works to the building fabric and elements and is set out in 3 phases. Year 1- 2 has been smoothed for budgeting and allowed for works to be undertaken as a priority and inclusion of works being brought forward to maximise economies of scale (use of scaffolding).

8.4 Years 3 to 5 has allowed to undertake works that is required but not essential at this time along with repairs and maintenance to elements that has not been viewed as essential as well as the replacement of elements. Years 6- 10 for ongoing maintenance and elements that will require replacement that is not viewed as essential at this time along with replacement of elements that are not detrimental to the building at this time.

8.5 All costs are based on Year1 of the Budget Cost Summary (Appendix B) and have not included for professional fees, VAT, or inflation. Costs should be reviewed annually and revised as necessary.

8.6 Year1-2 budget costs

8.6.1 Due to the high costs of scaffolding, it has been viewed that all works reliant on suitable access externally, have been brought into this category to maximise the use of scaffolding and minimise the incumbent cost of accessing high levels in
future years. The budget costs are indicative only and closer inspection at high levels will be required to firm up the scope and potential cost of works.

8.6.2 Included within the Mechanical and Electrical items are those elements that require immediate attention and has been smoothed to provide economy of scale and continuity for the use of the building.

8.6.3 In summary the condition survey has resulted in essential works to the building totalling £530,000. Table 1 on page 12 provides the budget cost summary for the condition survey output of works.

8.7 Year 3-5 budget costs

8.7.1 The works included in this section are for required works deemed not essential for the use of the building at this time. If the works are not undertaken within the time period it is expected that the risk of failure increases which will increase future maintenance costs as well as the overall repair costs indicated.

8.7.2 In summary the condition survey has resulted in required works to the building totalling £82,250.

8.8 Year 6-10 budget costs

8.8.1 Non essential works as well as routine maintenance costs of £390,915.00 should be budgeted for in this phase.
London Borough of Lewisham  
Broadway Theatre Condition Survey  
Table 1 Budget Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance / Replacement Cost</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
<th>YEARS 6-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY TOTAL FOR INTERNAL BUILDING FABRIC COMPONENTS</td>
<td>£84,240.00</td>
<td>£75,450.00</td>
<td>£1,750.00</td>
<td>£9,250.00</td>
<td>£2,650.00</td>
<td>£6,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY TOTAL FOR EXTERNAL BUILDING FABRIC COMPONENTS</td>
<td>£14,950.00</td>
<td>£43,000.00</td>
<td>£750.00</td>
<td>£9,050.00</td>
<td>£1,500.00</td>
<td>£75,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY TOTALS MECHANICAL SERVICES</td>
<td>£28,600.00</td>
<td>£12,250.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£215,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY TOTALS FOR ELECTRICAL SERVICES</td>
<td>£71,630.00</td>
<td>£45,750.00</td>
<td>£1,950.00</td>
<td>£5,300.00</td>
<td>£10,930.00</td>
<td>£93,765.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COSTS</td>
<td>£199,420.00</td>
<td>£176,450.00</td>
<td>£4,450.00</td>
<td>£23,600.00</td>
<td>£15,080.00</td>
<td>£390,915.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smoothing of work for budgeting

TOTAL COST OF WORKS (AS ABOVE) | £375,870.00 | £43,250.00 |
Asbestos removal (Provisional and subject to R&D Survey) | £50,000.00 | £20,000.00 |

SUB TOTAL | £426,570.00 | £63,250.00 |
ALLOW 5% CONTINGENCY FOR UNFORESEEN WORKS | £21,300.00 | £3,250.00 |

TOTAL | £447,870.00 | £66,500.00 |
ADD FOR CONTRACTOR OH&P (@ 6%) | £27,000.00 | £5,250.00 |
ADD FOR CONTRACTOR PRELIMINARIES (@ 12%) | £52,500.00 | £10,500.00 |

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST OF WORKS (EXC. VAT) | £530,000.00 | £82,250.00 |
9.0 Statutory Consultations

9.1 Due to the listed status of the building the relevant planning approval and listed building consent, along with English Heritage consultation will need to be granted prior to undertaking works to the building. Proposals, including structural works, services alterations and fire precautions will also require approval under the Building Regulations 2010.

9.2 The undertaking of the electrical works is not perceived as requiring the statutory undertaker (UK Power Networks) involvement, as the incoming electrical service head has been replaced with all recommended works being on the client side.

9.3 The undertaking of the mechanical works is not perceived as requiring the statutory undertakers involvement, as the recommended works are on the client side. Consideration for consultation with the statutory undertakers maybe necessary should London Borough of Lewisham move forward with the option of installing a dedicated heating plant system for the theatre in the medium to long term.

10.0 Conclusion

10.1 Lewisham Theatre has retained many of its original features as described in the listing status and it is of significant importance that these are retained and suitably maintained for the life of the building. Elements of the building have reached or exceeded their serviceable life and are now beyond economical repair, as such the condition survey results provides a breakdown of works that are essential to be undertaken within the next 1-2 years, required works in 3-5 years, as well as planned works in 6-10 years.

10.2 A standardised assessment of condition has been used to ascertain the assumed year of installation along with an acceptable life span to determine which elements require attention and when these should be attended to as part of planned and cyclical maintenance.

10.3 The project brief was to consider the current condition of the building and provide a proposal for London Borough of Lewisham to consider as part of a strategic regeneration of the local area and be considerate to the value to building provides the local community in terms of community, visibility, and aesthetics.

10.4 On considering the scope of expected works to Lewisham Theatre, the planned approach and smoothing of works to provide an estimated budget has been undertaken and provides clear presentation of the works required in the immediate, short term and medium term of the building.

10.5 The option of the Theatre installing its own dedicated heating system in the medium to long term which can be operated when the council office are shut should be considered. The budget cost for the heating system would be in the region of £250-350K based upon industry standard costs. However, due to the complexity of the existing installation and listed status of the building these costs could increase and would be subject to a separate detailed Feasibility Study should this option require further consideration.
10.6 Consideration should be given to the building’s electrical installation services receiving a full electrical test & inspection. Based on the subsequent results the installation can be reviewed and circuits designed and altered accordingly. All final distribution circuits should then be identified accurately as to the service it serves, supported by relevant documentation.

10.7 Further tests and inspection should be undertaken with all actions being completed so the the distribution boards supplying final circuit have residual current circuit breakers throughout the building. This would provide additional shock protection to users & occupants of building as well as allowing electrical services to comply with latest recommendations of BS: 7671.

10.8 There were no issues found with the building that present a significant risk to the longevity of use, though there are large elements within the building (roof and windows) that will require significant costs to ensure it maintains a weather tight envelope to protect the original features within the building.

10.9 We have set out our analysis of costs for essential works (1-2 years) and have included for associated access costs, and included for assumed additional cost for any associated asbestos removal required.