

CVCS Building Decision Arguments

<p>Option 1: Completely eradicate the abandoned County Hospital building and start from scratch. Materials from the old building shall be salvaged and re-used wherever possible. At a minimum, concrete slabs will be recycled as retaining terraces and bricks will be incorporated into the landscape (though not as pavers).</p>	<p>Option 2: Re-use, to the maximum extent possible, the old County Hospital Building's existing foundation and front façade. No mechanical systems, electrical systems or interior walls will be salvaged. The rear and side walls and roof will be removed. The new building resurrected from the remaining parts will house administrative offices as well as other spaces not dedicated to classrooms. Classrooms will be located in new buildings separated from the administrative offices by a central outdoor assembly area.</p>
<p>Pros: No constraints to overcome in achieving energy efficiency. No constraints in achieving ADA compliance (foundation). Some materials will be saved from the landfill.</p> <p>Cons: Greater landfill impact. More embodied energy lost.</p>	<p>Pros: Material savings by re-using concrete foundation and façade wall. Less material will be sent to the landfill. Less pollution generated to create and ship new materials. Building is one step closer to LEED certification.</p> <p>Cons: More design effort required to tie new structure into existing pieces. Design will have to overcome 3' grade change to meet ADA. Higher demolition cost to salvage façade.</p>

Additional Comments:

A building that emerges from either option would be innovative, energy efficient, and beautiful. This would be clearly described in the programming document, and CVCS would need to thoroughly vet prospective architects to ensure they are up to the challenge. A good architect's imagination will not be constrained by re-using the foundation and front facade.

Cost (at this point, these statements are conjenctural) :

There may be some cost savings by re-using the existing foundation. However, given that it is 3 feet above grade, more cost may be involved in making it ADA compliant. Additionally, more costs may be involved in achieving energy efficiency given that the foundation is not insulated.

There may be some material cost savings by retaining the front façade. However, given the degree of of work necessary to rehabilitate it to meet energy efficiency criteria and achieve an acceptable level of aesthetic appeal, the cost savings may be overridden by the extra materials needed to remedy the shortcomings.

A cost-benefit analysis would tell us which option would be more cost-efficient, if there turns out to be any difference at all.

I have not included the emotional factor into the argument for the following reasons:

1. The emotions behind keeping or demolishing the building factor each other out.
(i.e.The emotion behind "the building is ugly and has no merit" appears to be as equally represented as the emotion "my mother was born there".)
2. If option 2 is chosen, the new building will not resemble in any way what stood there before.
3. I have struggled with if "it just makes sense to use what you've got" is an emotional factor or not...I think it belongs here.