



# OLD BEGA HOSPITAL RESERVE TRUST

PO BOX 382 BEGA NSW 2550

14 October 2012

Mr Andrew Marshman  
Andrew Marshman & Associates Pty Ltd  
PO Box 768  
MERIMBULA NSW 2548

Andrew

The main purpose of your visit is to assess the effect of the intervening six years on the suitability of a roof reconstruction project. I have reviewed the paperwork from our original meetings and have some queries. This is some advance notice of questions I would raise for discussion:

- 1) There was discussion on the matter of mixed metals in roofing materials. NSW Heritage Council specified gal sheeting but later allowed grey colour-bond zinc alum. The matter of gal sheeting/lead flashing/zinc alum gutters relating to electrolysis was discussed but I find no resolution mentioned. We would appreciate some advice on this point.
- 2) There was discussion also on hurricane strapping to secure the roof structure to the building. After it was determined that the brick walls were not cavity constructed, a suggestion was made to pin the timber top plate with resin fixed pins into solid walls. Your recommendation was a chased 30 x 10mm metal straps fixed internally at points and connecting the rafters to the sub-floor at 1m interval. Michael at some point raised the suggestion that the sub-floor connection was not necessary and that fixing the straps to the wall, sopping at mid span, was suitable. Exposed surface strapping presents a problem with finish and chasing at 1m intervals would be labour intensive. Are there alternatives to your original recommendation?

Additionally

- 3) Although I have advised the Trust against it, they would at least like to consider the removal of some internal walls to create larger spaces. NSW Heritage Council specifies that the ornate chimney stacks must remain as features of the architectural fabric, and while it is doubtful that the Trust would ever allow the use of fireplaces, it is obvious that these walls must remain. Your comments on wall section removal and/or enlarged openings to achieve a similar purpose, would be relayed to the Trustees.

- 4) Finally, in your original report it was recommended that the main building be treated as a hazardous demolition site with a security fence to bar public access. The fence would have to be dismantled to allow roof reconstruction. In your opinion would the resulting stability achieved with a successful re-roofing allow the ban to be lifted as to allow volunteer labour access for the purpose of individual room refurbishment? Would the fence need to be returned after re-roofing?

Yours sincerely

Jay Ellard  
Secretary, OBHRT