

## Appendix B

| Item 1: Sauna Coats | Description                             | Contractor | Cost          | Risks  | Pros   | Cons  | Recommendation  |
|---------------------|---|------------|---------------|--|--|---|-----------------|
| Option 1            | Non-Combustible Timber Upstand          | Thamesway  | £2,000-£3,000 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-standard approach</li> <li>Lifespan unknown but may be extended by maintaining with moisture resistant treatments.</li> <li>Currently not warrantable.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Cheapest option and no fire risk as A1 rated/non-combustible</li> <li>•Insurer approval subject to Risk Assessment</li> <li>•Myrtha have confirmed it won't invalidate the warranty for the sauna</li> <li>•Doesn't impact on main construction warranties</li> <li>•Shorter lead in time</li> <li>•Disruption minimised</li> <li>•Warranty/insurance claim reduced</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The upstand is bespoke and cannot be warranted in isolation.</li> <li>•Non-standard fitting and untested. No data to confirm whether heat/humidity will warp/distort timber seats.</li> </ul> | Recommended     |
| Option 2            | Undersheet retrofit and reconfiguration | Myrtha     | £17,000       | Lead in time as Italian firm tbc   | Global brand. Virtual replacement of sauna   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Not much cheaper than replacing the whole sauna</li> <li>•Faults may take longer to rectify as Italian firm</li> <li>•Binger lead in time</li> </ul>  | Not recommended |
| Option 3            | Total replacement of sauna              | Topline    | £23,000       | 1 month lead in time   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Guaranteed for the duration of the contract</li> <li>•Allows reconfiguration to allow greater space between doors to the suite and the sauna</li> <li>•Existing supplier for Places Leisure so they have leverage</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Cost</li> <li>•Cost of delay</li> <li>•Binger lead in time</li> </ul>   | Not recommended |

| Item 2: Grass Protection Barri | Description  | Contractor | Cost  | Risks        | Pros  | Cons  | Recommendation |
|--------------------------------|--|------------|---|--------------|---|---|----------------|
| Option 1                       | Install additional signage and similar steel/galvanized ballustrade up the disabled ramp to deter people from taking a short cut across the grass; and add low profile box hedgerow along the perimeter of the grassed area to deter people from walking on the grass. | TBC        | TBC   |              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complimentary aesthetics.</li> <li>Addition of a hedge row could help to deter people from taking short cuts and help to capture wind blown litter.</li> </ul> | Ongoing maintenance costs for hedgerow      | TBC            |
| Option 2                       | Install additional signage and similar steel/galvanized ballustrade up disabled ramp to deter people from taking a short cut across the grass.   | TBC        | TBC (anticipated to be less than Option 4)            | Lead in time | Complimentary aesthetics  | Cost higher/m2. Users can cut across grass. | TBC            |
| Option 3                       | Extend a ballustrade along the front of the building and add low profile box hedgerow along the front edge adjacent to the pavement.   | TBC        | TBC ( anticipated to be more expensive than option 4) |              | Most aesthetically attractive. Helps wayfinding   | Ongoing maintenance costs for hedgerow      | TBC            |
| Option 4                       | Matching stainless steel balustrade along frontage. No glazing. 81 m   | TBC        | £9,700  |              | Provides barrier for pedestrians. Helps wayfinding  | Could be swung on by kids or sat on         | TBC            |