

A Report into The University of Sunderland's  
decision to close and demolish  
The National Glass Centre, Sunderland



Compiled by the Campaign to #Save The National Glass Centre

Version 1 September 2023 <https://savethengc.art.blog/>

## **Who are #Save The National Glass Centre?**

We are a group of people who've come together to campaign against the demolition of The National Glass Centre (NGC) by its owner, The University of Sunderland (UoS). We want to see the NGC survive and thrive and we believe that if the community, politicians, other interested organisations and the UoS work together in a spirit of positive engagement we can create a stronger, sustainable future for the NGC. This report represents our evidence and findings so far.

### **Contents**

1. Precis
2. The Current Functions of the Building
3. The Community Response to the Demolition Plan
4. The Background
5. The UoS Case for Demolition and Our Evidence in Rebuttal
6. In Summary
7. Case Studies
  - The Sill, Northumberland
  - Castlefields Viaduct, Manchester
  - Seaton Delaval Hall, Northumberland
  - The Crooked House, South Staffordshire

### **Disclaimer**

We are all busy people with a wide variety of backgrounds, experiences and professional qualifications. All that we know and understand has been gained from extensive research and collaboration, Freedom of Information requests (FoI), communication from the UoS, and with other professional bodies and politicians. We have endeavoured to work from an evidence base and to be as accurate as possible. As our research is ongoing, we consider this document as a work in progress, and it will continue to develop because for example we are currently awaiting FoI returns. If this report contains unintentional inaccuracies, please bring them to our attention and we will correct them. Most importantly we are more than willing to engage constructively in this debate, share our evidence and explain our findings to any interested parties, please ask.

## 1    **Precis**

The UoS has set about a process with the goal of removing the NGC from the edge of its campus, and of benefitting from use of the site in future years, but without specifying what that future use will be. We are concerned that there has been a lack of,

- a) consultation with the community, staff or users
- b) reasonable care in announcing the UoS's plans which have weakened the offer to current and future students, threatened the livelihoods of staff and caused confusion amongst visitors to the NGC; all of which contributes to managed decline
- c) consideration or weight given to the economic, cultural, educational, societal and historical damage inflicted by the removal of "a world class-cultural asset"
- d) guarantees that any aspects of the many and varied activities and functions of the building will be retained anywhere
- e) a clear rationale articulating as to how the site will be developed if the NGC can be demolished
- f) stewardship and care for the fabric of the building, resulting in a backlog of repairs
- g) due diligence in the process and decision making which currently has been derived from narrow, selective evidence and is based on an assumption its plans are feasible within planning law, this could expose the UoS to risk as its plans are undefined and costs are unquantifiable
- h) consideration by the UoS of the benefits they have accrued from the gift of the ownership and use of the NGC and its resources
- i) guardianship, as the UoS is a Founding Partner of Sunderland Culture (Charity number: 1184073), and an appreciation of the responsibility to act for the 'public benefit' as a charitable enterprise
- j) alignment of their actions with their stated Values and previous statements, with the consequential potential reputational damage to the UoS

## **2 The Current Functions of the Building**

What is the NGC? Defining such a complex, multi-functional organisation with a myriad of experiences and levels of meaning to so many is challenging in itself!

**It is a place...***to inspire our next generation... to experience the results of others' creativity... full of facilities and expertise to support a wide variety of artists and help them create... that connects nationally and internationally through creative practices... to meet friends and family...that acts a hub for a wider creative economy... to stop for a coffee or to grab a bite... to start or finish a walk or cycle to or back from the beach...to relax and watch the boats on the river... to welcome visitors... to have a cheap family day out... to watch the seals and dolphins in the river... to enjoy a trip out from school, whilst learning something new in an exciting environment... to pick up a card or choose a unique gift... for a rainy day visit... to learn something new and create... to start a business... to start a future career... to celebrate a wedding... to meet in conference... to better understand, celebrate, treasure and connect with our history... to connect and share with other people... to make memories... shelter, heal, breathe, and grow.*

## **3 The Community Response to the Closure and Demolition Plan**

Over 31000 people have signed the campaign petition to #Save the NGC, and a wide variety of artists, experts and cultural organisations have expressed support. In total the argument for the societal, cultural, educational and economic importance of the NGC has already been well made, if you are in any doubt as to the strength of feeling take a moment and read the comments section contained within the petition (<https://www.change.org/p/save-glass-blowing-in-the-historic-st-peter-s-ward-save-the-national-glass-centre/c>) or the campaign group's blog (<https://savethengc.art.blog/>).

## **4 The Background**

The C20th Society published an excellent piece containing some of the history of the NGC, <https://c20society.org.uk/news/backing-for-campaign-to-save-sunderlands-national-glass-centre>

## 5 The UoS Case for Demolition and Our Evidence in Rebuttal

### 5.1 Responsible Ownership, Guardianship as a Founding Partner of a Charity and the Civic Responsibility of Stewardship of a Community Asset

After owning the NGC for several years, the UoS have now decided they no longer want to be 'proud owners' of 'a world class-cultural asset'; that it is not part of their 'core function', even though the NGC is, and has been since it opened, an education facility for the whole city and the wider community, not just the UoS. Many local schools visit the facility as part of their syllabus allowing the children to learn about the 1350 years of glass making in the city and how forward-thinking St Benedict Biscop was to bring glass making technology to Sunderland from France in the 7th century. The NGC attracts visitors and artists not just from the local area, but from all over the country and, indeed, the world. It should be remembered that when Sunderland was bidding to become the City of Culture, the bid highlighted the NGC as being the jewel in the City's crown.

Recently Vice Chancellor, Sir David Bell, in a letter to Shadow Secretary of State for Education, Bridget Phillipson MP, dated 24/08/23, described the UoS's civic obligations to Sunderland as 'the burden'. This completely at odds with his statement in Sunderland Culture's Annual Review for 2021-22,

*'I was particularly delighted to see emerging research activity around social prescribing – which brings together social and medical approaches to wellness – involving Sunderland Culture and colleagues from the University's Faculty of Health Sciences and Wellbeing. Arts Council England often talks of the partnership approach to culture-led regeneration in Sunderland as unique. That is certainly my experience and so I am delighted that the University of Sunderland is part of the effort to bring outstanding experiences and opportunities to our students, our staff, and those of us who live and work in this fast-changing city.'*

<https://sunderlandculture.org.uk/annual-review/> (13/09/2023)

Surely the commitment to sustain and develop the community asset was made plain when the transfer of ownership took place, the UoS cannot believe that the ownership of the NGC was a licence to do as it wished with a valuable piece of land. Most importantly as Founding Partners of the charity, Sunderland Culture, (set up to deliver the creative programme for

the NGC, the NGCA and other creative venues) the UoS, Sunderland Music, Arts and Culture (MAC) Trust and Sunderland Council have a responsibility to support its remit,

*'Our mission is to improve life for everyone in Sunderland through culture. To do so, we are driving five step changes: improved profile and reputation of the city; a more vibrant creative economy; raised outlook and aspiration of young people; improved health and wellbeing; and a more socially cohesive city.'*

<https://sunderlandculture.org.uk/annual-review/> (13/09/2023)

The actions of the UoS could expose Sunderland Culture to risk as its sole function as a charity is to act 'for the public benefit'. The potential loss of two of five of the charity's assets (the NGC and the NGCA) diminishes its ability to carry out its remit under what The Charities Act 2011 calls the '*public benefit requirement*'. All the Trustees of Sunderland Culture must act '*in accordance with your charity's purpose (so not operating outside of that purpose)*'. <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/public-benefit-rules-for-charities> (13/09/2023).

The closure of the NGC and NGCA would meet the requirements for what the Charity Commission describes as a reportable 'serious incident', defined as,

*'...an adverse event, whether actual or alleged, which results in or risks significant:*

- harm to your charity's beneficiaries, staff, volunteers or others who come into contact with your charity through its work (who are collectively referred to throughout this guidance as people who come into contact with your charity through its work)*
- loss of your charity's money or assets*
- damage to your charity's property*
- harm to your charity's work or reputation*

*For the purposes of this guidance, "significant" means significant in the context of your charity, taking account of its staff, operations, finances and/or reputation.'*

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/how-to-report-a-serious-incident-in-your-charity#what-to-report> (13/09/23)

The lack of any commitment by the UoS and Sunderland Council to the future of the NGC and the NGCA is in direct contradiction with Sunderland Culture's legally defined purpose,

*'For the benefit of the public to advance the arts and culture and to advance education in the arts of performance, music, drama, poetry reading, sculpture, painting, photography, handicrafts, literature, glassmaking, history, film and all other associated arts (The Arts) in particular but not exclusively by:*

- 1. Encouraging public participation in The Arts and by the presentation of concerts, performances, exhibitions and festivals, provided that the promotion of such festivals and events is undertaken solely for the public benefit;*
- 2. Developing new and innovative ways of delivering The Arts;*
- 3. Participation in and, where appropriate, management and oversight of, cultural operations, venues and activities primarily in the City of Sunderland to ensure maximum benefit and return, provided that such participation and management is undertaken solely for the public benefit;'*

<https://register-of-charities.charitycommission.gov.uk/charity-search/-/charity-details/5115589/governing-document> (13/09/23)

## **5.2 The Long-Term Plan**

There has been a lack of reasonable care as there has been no substantive plan or guarantees that any aspects of the many and varied functions of the NGC and the NGCA, under the stewardship of the UoS, will be retained anywhere: the galleries, the collections, the public engagement and educational activities, the visitor facilities, the academic courses, the specialist artists' facilities, the tenanted studios, all could be lost.

In failing to define their desired outcome for the site we are struggling to understand how they have exercised requisite effort. This could lead to exposing the UoS to risk; plans are yet unspecified, cited as being due to current workload,

*'I know that some of your constituents are concerned about what will happen to the land on which the NGC is located, given that demolition will be necessary in due course. I cannot answer this question at the moment for three principal reasons.*

*First, our priority must be on the relocation of the existing activities within the NGC. As you know, Andrea is leading a number of 'workstreams' to ensure that we adopt a comprehensive approach to this priority and that is currently consuming the majority of our time.*

*Second, the NGC sits adjacent to the St Peter's campus of the University where we are planning to undertake significant capital works over the next five years. As yet, we*

*have not begun any kind of ‘master planning’ for what the whole area – including the NGC – might look like. Such work is not likely to commence for a few months yet. And third, the NGC is not likely to close its doors to public activities until at least 2025 at the earliest. It is also highly unlikely that demolition would begin immediately either. Whatever is proposed for the site though would be subject to the normal planning process but, to repeat, the University has not yet identified any future options and, for the reasons, noted above, is unlikely to do so in the immediate future.’* (Our highlighting, letter from Vice Chancellor, Sir David Bell to Julie Elliott MP dated 14<sup>th</sup> May 2023, released under a FoI request.)

### **5.3 Clarity of Intent**

The opacity of the UoS’s plans, even if they are successful in emptying the building and demolishing, further increase the community’s lack of confidence with their actions. Aside from the catastrophic loss of a much-loved cultural destination and the subsequent economic damage to Sunderland’s visitor and cultural economy, what will the community see in its place; is the site earmarked to be developed as part of the St Peter’s Campus expansion, as lucrative student accommodation or is the intent to sell to developers to realise it’s potential as a valuable, serviced prime riverside location for further development, commercial or housing? Are we really to believe that no thought has been put into this?

### **5.4 A Future Unknown**

Gaining planning permission to demolish and redevelop the site is not guaranteed, which will result in the UoS being exposed to additional, unquantified costs as they will be left with an empty building they will still need to secure, repair and maintain and find an alternative function for, with resultant cost implications; have they exercised requisite care, risk assessed, and costed this as part of their strategic planning or reviewed what will they do in those circumstances? We remain deeply concerned that the answer is no from the evidence we have received,



*'As yet, we have not begun any kind of 'master planning' for what the whole area – including the NGC – might look like. Such work is not likely to commence for a few months yet.'* (letter from Vice Chancellor, Sir David Bell to Julie Elliott MP dated 14<sup>th</sup> May 2023, released under a FoI request.)

## **5.5 The Given Cost of Repairs**

The UoS understand that repairs are required and have published the cost of those works as a prohibitive £45 million as one of the key factors in its decision to close and demolish the NGC; on closer examination, however, comparative costs stated for other local projects leads to us questioning the basis for that costing, for example, approximately £42 million for the new City Hall, an estimated £25 million for The Culture House, both completely new buildings with new foundations, structure, and state of the art facilities. Unfortunately, the publicity surrounding the figure of £45 million will have been extremely off-putting to any interested parties able to assist with capital investment, we hope that that was not the desired intention.

## **5.6 The Age of the Building and Liabilities**

We have struggled to comprehend that a building which is less than 25 years old is in such a bad state of repair as is reported, and if it is this begs the question - has the building been adequately looked after and maintained over those years. The UoS commissioned a 126 page Feasibility Report (dated July 2022) which looks at various options for the future of the building. In the report each of the consultants giving input into it highlight that, in their opinion, original specifications were inadequate in some areas and the construction was not carried out in accordance with the specifications to some extent, leading to a building which was not fit for purpose. Under these circumstances surely there should be recourse to the original team. If the UoS has looked at this and, taken the statements in the report at face value, their conclusions should be that there is a way of gaining some sort of recompense from the original parties for repairs because of the highlighted failings. This report lists specific design life span for elements of the building as follows:

- a) Concrete – 100 years

- b) Steel – 60 years
- c) Glazing - 30 years

We note that the almost 25 year old building is easily within each of these timescales, and wonder if this has not been raised as an issue with the relevant responsible parties? We have requested, though not received, through a FoI Request, access to the building Operation and Maintenance Manuals, and the maintenance records so we can take a view on this.

### **5.7 The Maintenance Regime**

The UoS has stated that the NGC has cost them £14 million over the years, (without stating the income for the same period) however it has enjoyed the economic benefit of use of the NGC facilities for example, by siting academic courses in the building and in the process freeing up space in its other buildings for other usage; ownership and usage brings with it the responsibility to run an appropriate maintenance regime. There is strong evidence that over ten years the UoS has identified and understood that there has been a failure to adequately maintain the building, in 2013 the then university head of estates stated, *'the centre has suffered as a business and its maintenance regime hasn't been as robust as it could have been'*, as reported by the C20th Society, <https://c20society.org.uk/news/backing-for-campaign-to-save-sunderlands-national-glass-centre> (23/08/23)

Ten years later the same situation still exists, in the UoS's current documentation they identify,

*'a previously identified strategic risk (SR8) that we fail to plan, invest and maintain the University's physical estate to ensure that its size, shape and structure are aligned to the University's strategic ambitions, is environmentally sustainable and compliant with relevant health and safety legislation.'*

<https://www.sunderland.ac.uk/images/external-websites/www/about/strategic-plan/Environmental-Sustainability-Plan.pdf> (21/08/23)

This lack of maintenance is further confirmed by eyewitness accounts of specific health and safety incidents. When matters were brought to their attention NGC staff responded promptly and reported concerns to UoS staff, however from that point onwards critical infrastructures requiring immediate maintenance were not attended to in a timely manner or with the required additional control methods put in place to ensure people's safety (source emails). Even a simple visual survey of the external facade reveals the poor condition of the paintwork and steelwork. The consequence of this inaction is inevitably increased repair costs as deterioration has occurred unchecked, and the opportunity to carry out vital work to improve sustainability has also been missed.

### **5.8 The Feasibility Report and Cost Estimate**

It is also worth noting that the Feasibility Report covers three options for the building refurbishment, none of which equate to the £45m option which the UoS constantly refers to. The cost estimate produced by Identity Consult has four options, one of which is the UoS's preferred £45m option. We have struggled to understand as there is no design report to go with this costing, even though the report indicates that it is based on an RIBA Stage 2 design. As this is not covered by the Feasibility Report, clarification from the UoS for the information on which this cost estimate is based would be appreciated. It is difficult to comment in too much detail on a cost estimate without the design information.

### **5.9 Building Costs**

The rates used appear to be extremely robust, understandable if Identity did not have a Stage 2 design to base the price on. In our opinion an example of this robustness is the work to the steelwork priced at over £1m (inc VAT). The structure is mainly concrete, with steelwork at the southern end. Whilst the external steelwork is in poor condition, with the worst part of this being the overhang at roof level, this is a minor part in quantity terms of the overall structure. Therefore, the cost of £1m, to clean off the rust, repair any degradation of the steelwork and apply a suitable finish appears excessive. It is worth noting that the Feasibility report states that the existing paint build up to the steelwork is inadequate for the location due to the marine environment. This highlighted failing goes

back to the specifications given by the original design team. A further item to highlight at this stage is the Mechanical, Electrical and Process systems price. This is based purely on £850/m<sup>2</sup> for the stated floor area which also appears very robust.

### **5.10 Net Carbon Zero**

An overall uplift in cost of 25% has been added across the board to achieve Net Carbon Zero. This adds in excess of £4m (incl VAT) to the construction costs. Whilst we acknowledge sustainability should be built into the design of any building, the question remains whether adding a blanket 25% to the construction costs is realistic and warranted. If Net Zero Carbon really is adding 25% to construction costs on all new projects, then many projects across the country will falter due to funding issues. It would be interesting to know what extra elements Identity believe are required which make up this 25% uplift.

### **5.11 Preliminaries and Main Contractors Oncost and Profit**

Any contractor would be extremely happy to work for the rates quoted. Identity Consult does make the point that the UoS has a framework agreement in place which we are sure has much more competitive rates than those included in the cost plan. Surely this is what should have been used in the estimate?

### **5.12 Project/Design Fees**

A 10% addition has been made for design fees adding £2.5m (inc. VAT) to the construction costs. This is high, particularly bearing in mind that the structure already exists, so structurally the Engineer needs to check loadings from any revised layouts and check subcontractors' design where applicable, so there is a much-reduced scope to what would be expected on a new build project. It would be interesting to know how this percentage looks in relation to the UoS's existing framework fees arrangements.

### **5.13 Other Development/ Project Costs**

A further 15% addition has been made for this adding a further £4.2m (inc. VAT) to the construction costs. We have struggled to understand what other project costs will be incurred which will amount to such a high figure for the refurbishment of an existing, well understood building. It is worth noting that the UoS advised Identity to add in this figure.

### **5.14 Risk Allowance**

A further £6.4m (inc. VAT) has been added to seemingly already robust figures for additional risk. The level of pricing already includes a healthy amount of risk allowance without adding such a large sum. It should be remembered that there is an existing team in place who understand how the current building works, what its limitations are and what needs to improve. This team would have input into the design from an early stage which would help eliminate much of the risk.

### **5.15 Market Testing**

It appears that through a lack of information, an extremely conservative view has been taken throughout which has led to the final projected cost being so high. We would urge the UoS to carry out some market testing, and a review of costs against the existing framework which it already has in place to see what savings against the £45m can be made at this stage. We believe they would be significant, particularly if a value engineering exercise was carried out, and a cost/value analysis was carried out on any proposed enhancements to the building.

### **5.16 Architectural Merit**

The UoS's solution is based on a speculative premise that permission will be given to demolish the building and redevelop the site; there are several hurdles to overcome before demolition could take place, not least because The NGC is housed within a building of

outstanding architectural merit, as internationally renowned architect, Piers Gough commented,

*'The National Glass Centre does so many things so right. It exploits the sloping topography between Roker Terrace and the Wear by inviting the visitor straight onto the roof to first get a sense of the panoramic setting. Whilst entry to the building, signalled by two soaring chimneys, is invitingly sliced into the slope [in the manner of the great Oscar Niemeyer] The roof of course turns out to be a tour de force of glazing giving a unique birds' eye view of the spaces below. The multi function interiors are inviting, spectacular, well lit and flexible enough to allow for many existing and future uses. The lowest level space opens seamlessly onto the quayside from where the whole building can be perceived as akin to a glass aircraft carrier including its quirky below deck control turret. This reference to Sunderland's ship building heritage as well as glass making past makes this unique building special to its particular location. It is the best and most apposite 21st century building of the region.*

*'Sunderland cannot afford to lose such an icon. It would seem ideal for a forward looking university to use or repurpose but should it be superfluous another more appreciative owner should be found.'* Supplied by the C20 Society

<https://savethengc.art.blog/tag/piers-gough/> downloaded on 23/08/23

### **5.17 Building Preservation Order**

The presence of *'the best and most apposite 21st century building of the region'* in a city keen to conserve its heritage and capitalise on it could result in Sunderland City Council (SCC) issuing a Building Preservation Order (BPO).

### **5.18 Environmental Impact**

The NGC was built on a site previously used for heavy industry, any demolition and redevelopment risks exposure and release of contamination potentially impacting the local area, River Wear and North Sea. Has the UoS considered, and risk assessed the potential hazard with disturbing ground which is currently stable?

## 5.19 Listed Buildings

A successful application could be made to list the NGC. Whilst it is a relatively young building, it meets many of the criteria set by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport's criteria as laid out 'Principles for Selection of Listed Buildings',

*'Architectural Interest: To be of special architectural interest a building must be of importance in its design, decoration or craftsmanship. Special interest may also apply to particularly significant examples of building types or techniques (e.g. buildings displaying technological innovation or virtuosity) and significant plan forms. Engineering and technological interest can be an important consideration for some buildings. For more recent buildings in particular, the functioning of the building (to the extent that this reflects on its original design and planned use, where known) will also be a consideration. Artistic distinction can also be a factor relevant to the architectural interest of buildings and objects and structures fixed to them.'*

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/757054/Revised Principles of Selection 2018.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/757054/Revised_Principles_of_Selection_2018.pdf) downloaded 23/08/23

## 5.20 A Recently Rejected Planning Application

We are struggling to determine how the UoS will address demolishing (releasing huge amounts of embodied carbon in the process) and redeveloping a site in an "environmentally sustainable" manner. The landmark decision by Secretary of State, Michael Gove, to refuse permission for M&S to demolish and redevelop its Oxford Street store, which is thought would generate almost 40,000 tonnes of embodied carbon, marks a shifting in the balance in favour of retrofitting existing buildings rather than demolition and new development. Mr Gove, in overturning the planning decision, contended that this strategy conflicted with policies on heritage and design, specifically highlighting the embodied carbon impact and waste from demolition. The refusal stated that:

*'He does not consider that the applicant has demonstrated that refurbishment would not be deliverable or viable and nor has the applicant satisfied the secretary of state that options for retaining the buildings have been fully explored, or that there is compelling justification for demolition and rebuilding.'*

## 6 In Summary

Assembling evidence of this kind can be somewhat dispiriting. Like so many we see the NGC as a wonderful place which has, perhaps in some respects through neglect, still to fully adapt to changing times but certainly as a place which, with the right input and leadership, will grow and thrive and be placed on a much more sustainable footing for the future. The strength of community feeling, the skill and commitment of the staff, the stunning location, the importance of the tradition and heritage it protects, the vital role it plays in educating future generations, these factors should be relevant to a reimagining of the NGC as a unique, multi-functional destination which plays a full part in the local visitor and culturally driven economy.

In Sunderland Culture's Annual Review 2021-2022 Sir David Bell describes how the *'University's partnership with Sunderland Culture has gone from strength to strength in the past year'* presumably due to the *'single, independent, and resilient delivery model'* established by the Founding Partners, (MAC Trust, UoS and Sunderland Council). The reality is that the future of the NGC and the NGCA is completely dependent on the whims of the UoS, whilst Sunderland Council stands by repeating that it is the responsibility of the UoS as they own it and completely ignoring the opinion of over 31000 people, the delivery model they put in place and the responsibility it places on them. As Sir David Bell said in Sunderland Culture's Annual Review, *'Arts Council England often talks of the partnership approach to culture-led regeneration in Sunderland as unique'*. There is a strong case for revisiting the thinking behind that statement as the missing elements currently appear to be resilience, understanding, leadership and dynamism on the part of the UoS and Sunderland Council.



## 7 Case Studies

Luckily there are plenty of other instances where people are getting it right. The following are three of many inspirational projects where owners, the community, politicians and other organisations have worked together creatively to safeguard, enhance and create culturally vital and historically important assets. The final example illustrates the devastating consequences of the failure to protect our heritage, but also the strenuous efforts of the community and local council to prevent its complete destruction and possibly its renewal.

### **The Sill, Northumberland**

An ambitious and innovative partnership between Northumberland National Park and YHA England and Wales to create an iconic, multi-functional, environmentally sustainable building and visitor attraction. Funded by several supporters, see website for more details.

*'We hosted a series of open events and workshops where we discussed site layout, materials and architectural style. The participative design process gave the local community a chance to get involved, voice their opinions and feel some ownership of the project. It also allowed us to draw on a vast wealth of local knowledge and expertise. The whole team at JDDK are incredibly proud of what we achieved at The Sill. Our brief was for a landmark building which would become the hub of visitor activities, welcoming visitors and supporting communities throughout the Northumberland National Park. Sustainability and public consultation were at the core of the design process with the finished building inspired by the rugged Northumbrian countryside.'*

*Alison Thornton-Sykes, project architect, JDDK Architects*

<https://www.thesill.org.uk/>

### **Castlefield Viaduct, Manchester**

A groundbreaking phased project focussed on community engagement to reimagine part of the city's industrial heritage, under the management of National Trust and supported by National Highways Historical Railways Estate Team, Manchester City Council, Greater

Manchester Combined Authority, Transport for Greater Manchester, People's Postcode Lottery and the local community, businesses and supporters.

<https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/visit/cheshire-greater-manchester/castlefield-viaduct>

### **Seaton Delaval Hall**

Acquired by National Trust in 2009 after a concerted £6.3 million fundraising campaign which was fully supported by the local community, now restored as a much loved and highly successful visitor attraction.

<https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/visit/north-east/seaton-delaval-hall>

### **The Crooked House, South Staffordshire**

A highly treasured pub, destroyed by arson and subsequent demolition without permission, centre of a determined campaign to protect the remains from further damage,

*'Roger Lees, the leader of South Staffordshire district council and local councillor for Himley, said: "The council is continuing to work behind the scenes with the relevant organisations and it's important our focus is on a robust and thorough investigation. I would ask that we are given time to do so and I can reassure the public that we are doing everything in our power to investigate the matter thoroughly."*

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2023/aug/22/paranormal-society-nights-watch-crooked-house-pub-site> (24/08/23)