

18 October 2021

Delivered by email

Dave Morris
Manchester City Council
Town Hall
PO Box 488
Manchester
M60 2JT

Ref: JWLM3016

Dear Mr Morris

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING ADDENDUM - THE RED LION, WITHINGTON, MANCHESTER M20 4BT

On behalf of our client, JW Lees and Co (Brewers) Ltd ('the applicant'), I am pleased to submit a supplementary planning addendum in response to comments received from Manchester City Council's ('MCC') conservation officer associated with the following applications:

- *'Erection of a single storey rear extension and entrance following demolition of existing conservatory; removal of existing smoking shelter and erection of a new part covered timber pergola and a covered pergola; introduction of new external lighting; formation of a new customer access; building repairs; removal of existing store and relocation of existing garage; and reconfiguration of existing car park. Open for comment icon (LPA Ref: 130967/FO/2021).'*
- *'LISTED BUILDING CONSENT for erection of a single storey rear extension and entrance following demolition of existing conservatory; removal of existing smoking shelter and erection of a new part covered timber pergola and a covered pergola; introduction of new external lighting; formation of a new customer access; building repairs; removal of existing store and relocation of existing garage; reconfiguration of existing car park; internal refurbishment works; and the installation of external replacement signage. Open for comment icon (LPA Ref: 130968/LO/2021).'*
- *'Advertisement consent for the display of individual letter signs to the north, east and south gable walls of the building; externally illuminated free standing welcome sign; pictorial post and amenity sign; double sided free standing box display sign; together with brass menu box and non-illuminated information building mounted signs (LPA Ref: 130950/AO/2021).'*

Since the submission of the applications in July 2021, the details of the Proposed Development have been amended following review of the comments from MCC's conservation officer. Taking into account the amendments made, a comprehensive response to the comments from the conservation officer is provided at **Appendix 1**.

1 New York Street
Manchester
M1 4HD

T 0161 233 7676 turley.co.uk

Full details of the amended scheme are provided in the following drawings and documentation as prepared by Fusion By Design and Parkinsons Sign:

- Proposed Site Plan (Drawing No. 4007-PL03, Revision E)
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan (Drawing No. 4007-PL04, Revision F)
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan – Demolitions (Drawing No. 4007-PL06, Revision C)
- Existing and Proposed External Elevations (Drawing No. 4007-PL05, Revision E)
- Schedule of Works to accompany Drawing Nos. 4007-PL0D and 4007-PL0F
- Advertisement Details (ref. 20200110 Advertisement Details Rev H),

For clarity, however, the amendments to the proposed scheme can be summarised as follows:

External Works

- The existing rear conservatory with glazed roof will now be retained, adapted and refurbished (the previous proposals involved demolition and replacement of the conservatory). The glazed roof of the existing conservatory will be replaced with a slate tile pitched roof and new replacement windows and new bifold doors will be added.
- The entrance porch to the rear conservatory will be retained.
- The existing outside covered pergola will be retained.
- The large pergola has been removed from the proposals. Instead, three fixed gazebo structures will be added to the rear beer garden area, situated to the immediate west of the beer garden wall. Festoon lights will be included between the gazebos.
- The new entrance gate through the beer garden wall, to the south of the building, is no longer included within the proposals. There will therefore be no changes to the front carparking area
- There are no longer any works to the garage within the rear carpark proposed, and there will therefore be no change to the rear car parking area.

Internal Works

- The raised timber floor within the Bar Dining Area will be retained and subject to localised extension. New fixed seating, timber glazed screens, new flooring and decorations will be added to the non-original raised floor area.
- The 20th century conservatory will be subject to internal refurbishment, including new lighting, electrics, floor finishes and decorations
- The rear entrance lobby will be subject to internal refurbishment including new lighting, electrics, floor finishes and decorations
- The Ladies 1 and Gents 1 customer toilets will be subject to alterations, including removal of internal walls and re-planning of the area to create a larger ladies toilet area including new sanitary ware, walls, doors, electrics, lighting, flooring, wall tiling and decoration

Signage and External Lighting

- The signage and lighting proposals have been adjusted and rationalised in response to Consultee comments.

Appendix 2 provides a comprehensive summary of the original drawings to be superseded through the submission of this response to the comments.

Additionally an addendum to the Heritage Statement, taking account of the comments and revised architectural drawings, has also been prepared. The addendum considers whether the amended proposals have any effect upon the assessment of impacts upon the significance and setting of relevant heritage assets within and in proximity to the Site. The addendum should be read in conjunction with the earlier Heritage Statement, entitled 'Heritage Statement, The Red Lion, Withington' prepared by Turley (Heritage and Townscape) and dated June 2021.

Collectively the information is provided to support the positive determination of the applications.

Notwithstanding the information detailed above, it is pertinent to give consideration to the overarching comment received (as detailed in Paragraph 1.1 of **Appendix 1**) and to reaffirm the appropriateness and contribution of development proposed in the context of the legislation and planning policy which relates to the Red Lion as a listed building. This is set out below.

CONSIDERATION OF OVERARCHING CONSULTTEE COMMENT

The consultee comments focus on a variety of detailed matters, each of which have been addressed in turn in **Appendix 1**. More broadly however, Paragraph 1.1 (detailed in **Appendix 1**) of the comments focusses on avoiding further harm to the significance of the heritage asset, and its special architectural and historic interest as a listed building. Consideration to this overarching comment in the content of relevant Planning Policy and Legislation is set out below.

Under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, MCC has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building, its setting and any features of special interest it may possess (s.16 and s.66 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990). The meaning of 'preservation' in this context, as informed by case law, is taken to be the avoidance of harm and these are matters to be given considerable importance and weight. In this regard, the Heritage Addendum gives due consideration of this context and to the revisions made within the Proposed Development, before ultimately concluding that the revised scheme is not considered to harm nor affect the significance of either the Red Lion listed building, or the Withington Conservation Area. The Heritage Addendum also considers that there is an opportunity to enhance the significance of this part of the conservation area through the above works and the improvements to the listed building itself.

Moreover, Paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') also requires that in determining application, Local Planning Authorities should take account of the

'a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.'

It is considered that the Proposed Development will sustain and enhance the significance of the heritage value of the building (and subsequently the Withington Conservation Area), through the delivery of a suite of works designed to ensure that the Red Lion provides a positive overarching contribution to the economic viability of an integral community facility. The works proposed are therefore clearly desirable and will provide an improved, high-quality environment for both the community and visitors that will help to contribute to, and indeed improve, the existing nature and economic role of the site.

On this basis, the revised Proposed Development will therefore meet the objectives of the NPPF and the requirements of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 can be satisfied if the Council grants planning permission and listed building consent. It also addresses Policy EN3 of Manchester's Core Strategy.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REVISED PROPOSALS

A comprehensive review of the comments has been complete and, where appropriate, aspects of the Proposed Development have been amended in response. A summary of the amendments made is provided within this addendum and a suite of revised architectural drawings has been prepared to accompany the submission.

In addition to the above, the comprehensive response to the comments (Appendix 1) provides clarity on relevant detailed matters, demonstrates how the proposal responds to the comments received and reiterates the acceptability of the Proposed Development.

As with the original Covering Letter (dated 01 July 2021), the revisions made have been considered in the context of relevant planning policy and guidance. In that regard it is considered that the revised Proposed Development continues to ensure the refurbishment works will deliver a significant enhancement to the pub and ensures that the proposal remain consistent with Policy EN1, C 9 and C 10 of the Manchester Core Strategy and the overarching vision of the Withington Village Framework. Likewise, it is also considered that the revisions do not give rise to any additional ecology or residential amenity issues that have not already been assessed. The Proposed Development therefore remains consistent with the policy requirements of Policies DM1, EN9 and EN15.

Moreover, the supporting Heritage Statement Addendum confirms that the revised Proposed Development will not harm the significance of either the Red Lion listed building, or the Withington Conservation Area, as did the earlier Heritage Statement, entitled 'Heritage Statement. The Red Lion, Withington' prepared by Turley (Heritage and Townscape) and dated June 2021. It emphasises that there is an opportunity to enhance the significance of this part of the conservation area through the above works and the improvements to the listed building itself. On this basis, the revised Proposed Development will therefore meet the objectives of the NPPF and the requirements of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 can be satisfied if the Council grants planning permission and listed building consent. It also addresses Policy EN3 of Manchester's Core Strategy.

The revised proposal is therefore considered to remain fully compliant with both local and national planning policy.

CONCLUSION

This response has been prepared in light of detailed comments received from Manchester City Council's conservation officer in response to a trio of applications (as detailed above) which collectively seek to secure consent for a comprehensive suite of internal and external refurbishment works associated with the Red Lion Public House, Withington, Manchester. The Proposed Development has been designed to ensure that the facility provides a high-quality environment consistent with the JW Lees brand that meets consumers' needs in an evolving market and operate viably in the future.

Collectively, the comprehensive suite of information submitted confirms that the details of the Proposed Development have been amended following a review of the comments received, and provides clarity on relevant detailed matters to demonstrate and reiterate the acceptability of the Proposed Development.

Taking into account the above, the proposed development will help to contribute to, and indeed improve, the existing nature and economic role of the site, which is identified as important local landmark within the Withington Village SRF area and plays a key role in the local economy. It is considered that the proposed works are consistent with the policies of the adopted Development Plan, as demonstrated above, and on this basis planning permission, listed building consent and advertisement consent should therefore be granted.

I trust the information provided, alongside the responses to the Consultee comments, is satisfactory and helps to expedite the positive determination of this application. However, should you require any further information or have further comments on the revised proposals, please do contact my colleague Daniel Ramsay (daniel.ramsay@turley.co.uk) or me.

Yours sincerely

Adam Buxton
Senior Planner

adam.buxton@turley.co.uk

Appendix 1: Consultee Comments

RESPONSE TO CONSULTEE COMMENTS

General MCC Design / Heritage Comments on the Proposed Development

1.0 General over-arching comments

1.1 The built fabric of heritage significance is understood to extend beyond the "17th century original building" identified on Drawing No.4007-PL02 Rev B. In this respect regard should be had, for example, to the built fabric, spatial character and setting. The building has seen past works that have harmed the heritage significance of this Grade II listed building in all these respects and the proposal offers an opportunity to undertake the proposed works using a conservation-led approach that better reveals the heritage significance by, for example, reversing past inappropriate alterations (including reinstating missing features) and evolving an appropriate design for new works that has a resonance with the heritage significance. This approach is not looking for pastiche design solutions for various elements of the proposal but one based on evidence and research that would not preclude elements of appropriate contemporary design. The proposal focuses on avoiding harm to the heritage significance which is, in itself, a good starting point and should ensure that no further original or historic built fabric (including architectural features or fittings) is removed. However, the proposal should also be seeking a more pro-active approach to better reveal the heritage significance including, for example, by having a greater consideration of materials and finishes.

Response: *The Heritage Statement includes discussion of the historic development of the Site and surrounding area, including the chronology of additions and alterations to the Red Lion, and copies of available historic mapping (Section 3) and an assessment of the special interest of the Red Lion listed building (Section 4).*

As noted in the comments from the conservation officer, the proposed development focusses on preserving the significance of the heritage asset, and its special architectural and historic interest as a listed building, as is the requirement under s16 and s66 the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Case law has confirmed 'preserve' in this context to mean 'to cause no harm.' Accordingly, there is no statutory requirement for the applicant to undertake additional conservation and restoration works beyond those proposed as part of the application and the point for consideration in determining the suite of applications is whether the proposals are acceptable.

The revised proposals are assessed within the Heritage Statement Addendum which concludes that the revised Proposed Development will not harm the significance of either the Red Lion listed building, or the Withington Conservation Area. There is an opportunity to enhance the significance of this part of the conservation area through the above works and the improvements to the listed building itself. On this basis, the revised Proposed Development will therefore meet the objectives of the NPPF and the requirements of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 can be satisfied if the Council grants planning permission and listed building consent. It also addresses Policy EN3 of Manchester's Core Strategy.

2.0 Proposed demolition and Drawing No. 4007-PL06 Rev A

2.1 The "Method Statement of Demolition" on Drawing No.4007-PL06 Rev A is inadequate:

1 New York Street
Manchester
M1 4HD

T 0161 233 7676 turley.co.uk

(a) Any of the proposed demolition is only accepted on the basis that it would be undertaken carefully by hand using only hand-held, non-mechanical tools (in order to avoid any harm to built fabric being retained) unless otherwise agreed with the Planning Service. The remaining built fabric affected by the removal should be made good to an appropriate detailed specification/methodology agreed with the Planning Service and will need to be appropriate to the age and type of material being repaired.

Response: *The revised demolition drawing (Drawing No. 4007-PL06, Revision B) includes greater detail on the proposed demolition methodology. In addition, the method statement for works to the existing building (Drawing No. 4007-PL04, Revision E) has been updated to include additional information on the methodology for internal works.*

If required, a further detailed demolition methodology can be provided once a contractor is engaged, following the application determination.

(b) The annotation regarding the differentiation between the original building and later 20th century additions is, as noted above, misleading and should be reconsidered.

Response: *The annotation on has been removed on the revised set of drawings. Section 3 of the Heritage Statement includes discussion of the historic development of the Site and surrounding area, including the chronology of additions and alterations to the Red Lion, and copies of available historic mapping.*

2.2 Regard has been had to the "Demolition Works Schedule" on Drawing No.4007-PL06 Rev A as follows:

(a) The removal of those specifically identified elements provided they are clearly more recent, modern interventions and **of no heritage significance (as indicated by the submitted photographs) would be acceptable in principle**. This would cover:

~~Item 1 (Conservatory).~~

Response: *No longer relevant. The revised proposal seeks to refurbish the existing conservatory. See point 1 of the revised proposed ground floor plan – demolitions (Ref. 4007-PL06 Rev B). Response to the re-design of the conservatory to be captured in response to para 3.2 (a) below.*

~~Item 2 (Entrance porch).~~

Response: *No longer relevant. The revised proposal seeks to retain the existing entrance porch. See point 2 of the revised proposed ground floor plan – demolitions (Ref. 4007-PL06 Rev B).*

~~Item 3 (Smoking shelter).~~

Response: *No longer relevant. The revised proposal now seeks to retain the existing covered pergola structure. See point 3 of the revised proposed ground floor plan – demolitions (Ref. 4007-PL06 Rev B).*

Item 5 (Raised timber floor).

Response: *Proposed is now to retain the raised timber floor and extend. See point 5 of the revised proposed ground floor plan – demolitions (Ref. 4007-PL06 Rev B). Response required in the context 4.2 (a).*

Item 7 (Removal of doors).

Item 8 (Fixed seating).

Item 10 (Carvery/pizza/preparation area).

Item 11 (Glass wash screen).

~~Item 14 (Removal of "dwarf wall"). Item 2 (Entrance porch).~~

Response: No longer relevant. The revised proposal no longer seeks to form a new customer access from the front car park to the rear external beer garden (see point 6 of the previous ground floor plan 4007-PL04 Rev D. The removal of the existing brick dwarf wall is no longer required. See the revised drawing Proposed Ground Floor Plan 4007-PL05 Rev E.

Overarching response – The removal of the remaining elements (7, 8, 10 and 11) identified above are accepted. No further action is required to justify the removal of these features. It is therefore considered that the matters above are resolved.

(b) The removal of certain other elements that could fall within (a) above **but the submitted information is unclear and confirmation is required of any heritage significance.** This would cover:

Item 9 (Part of a masonry wall).

Response: The images below show the part of the masonry wall proposed for demolition, which is of modern date. The non-original, modern length of wall does not contribute to the special interest of the listed building or its significance.



[Response cont.] The part of the masonry wall, proposed for demolition is visible at the left of this image, covered with modern blue ceramic tiling (and indicated with a red arrow). The narrow depth of the wall, its lack of historic architectural features or detailing and its modern coverings demonstrate its modern date.



[Response cont.] The length of wall proposed for demolition is visible in the centre of this image (and indicated with a red arrow), to the rear of the pizza oven, and covered with modern blue ceramic tiling.

Item 12 (Part of backfitting and associated wall)

Response: The image below shows the part of the backfitting and associated wall which is intended to be removed as part of the proposals. The backfitting and wall are of modern date, they do not contribute to the special interest of the listed building or its significance.



(c) Item 4 (Customer toilets): The ladies 2 toilets occupy a part of the original/historic outbuilding extension to the rear of the building. **Confirmation is required that the proposed demolition would not affect any original/historic built fabric.** In this regard this may not be the case if it is proposed to remove, for example, existing wall and floor tiling which could have a considerable impact on the underlying built fabric. The careful removal of non-original/non-historic fittings (such as cubical partitions and sanitaryware) would not be an issue subject to appropriate making good.

Response: *The comment relates to the Ladies 2 toilets (as detailed on the Existing Ground Floor Plan (ref: 4007-PL02). For clarity, these toilets are referred to as Ladies 1 on the proposed drawings.*

Previously, (as detailed on the proposed ground floor plan – demolitions (Ref. 4007-PL06 Rev A), the proposals sought to remove customer toilets (as part of remodelling works) including removal of timber raised floor, walls, doors and sanitary ware. The revised proposals involve remodelling of the toilet area, but retain the existing raised floor area. The proposed works would include removal of modern internal walls, sanitary ware etc and re-planning of the area to create a larger Ladies 1 toilet area, with new sanitary ware, internal walls, doors, lighting, electrics, flooring, wall tiling and decorations. These works would affect only modern finishes, and would not affect the special interest of the listed building.

(d) Item 6 (Door and part of a wall): **The removal of the door is accepted. The part of the wall proposed to be demolished appears to be a part of the original/historic built fabric and/or is a last remaining element of built form that defines the original/historic layout.** It would, therefore, have considerable heritage significance and should not be removed. The proposed door in this location could use the existing opening and the proposed demolition appears unnecessary and so avoidable.

Response: The special architectural and historic interest of the Red Lion is derived from its age and longevity as a public house and as an unusual survival of a 17th century building within Withington which was largely developed within the mid-19th century. The building has undergone successive phases of alteration including a series of substantial extensions to the rear. The interior of the building has also undergone alteration over time, including changes to its plan form, such that its original internal layout can no longer be readily understood. The length of wall under consideration is situated at the rear of the property, and is of modern date.

The image below shows the double door proposed for removals as part of the proposals (at the centre of the image). The proposals would require the infill of the current double door and the creation of a new doorway further to the west (to the left in the image). This change is required for operational reasons. The double door to be removed is of modern date, and its removal has been accepted by the conservation officer. Overall, taking into account the level of internal alteration, and change to plan form which has already occurred to the building, and the reasons that the building is considered to be of special interest, it is concluded that the short length of wall which would be affected by the proposals is not of considerable heritage significance. The proposed change to the wall, which is required for operational reasons, would not affect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building, and is considered acceptable under the terms of the 1990 act.



(e) Item 13 (Area of brickwork): This is the wall shown in Figure 5.1 of the HS which appears (and is stated to be) a modern brick wall. **The loss of a part of this wall to create an opening would be acceptable in principle** but the extent of loss should be to be minimised and leave a visually obvious full height length of the wall still attached to the building so that any new opening is read as being an opening within the wall rather than an opening at one end of the wall and also to maintain the sense of separation between the bowling green area and less than sympathetically treated car park area.

Response: In light of the comments, the proposal has been revised and no longer seeks to form a new customer access from the front car park to the rear external beer garden (see point 6 of the previous ground floor plan 4007-PL04 Rev D. The revision therefore ensure that a full height length of the wall remains attached to the building. This revision is detailed on the revised drawing Proposed Ground Floor Plan 4007-PL05 Rev E and Existing & Proposed External Elevations 4007-PL05 Rev E.

(f) Item 15 (Outside toilet): This feature is annotated as "store" on drawing No. 4007-PL06 A but elsewhere is described as a toilet and drawings indicate fittings consistent with the latter use. **The heritage significance of this structure and its fittings is unknown and should be confirmed before any decision can be made on its demolition.** A toilet facility in this location may have had a relationship to the former bowling green use and its former shelter indicated by the HS including in its Figures 3.4 and 3.12. Figure 3.12 suggests the plan form of the outside toilet has changed since 1974.

Response: The comments made relate to the removal of modern toilet fittings from within a small flat roofed addition at the rear of the building, as shown on the Existing Ground Floor Plan (ref. 4007-PL02) and the proposed ground floor plan – demolitions (Ref. 4007-PL06 Rev A). For clarity, the proposal seeks only to remove existing toilets fittings within the store as they are no longer fit for purpose, nor are they required; this will enable this space to be used as a store. The proposal does not seek to demolish the existing built structure, this will remain in-situ and the space is to be used for storage. This is reflected on the Proposed Ground Floor Plan (ref. 4007-PL04 Rev E).

The photos below show the exterior of the now disused toilet. The proposals would affect only the internal modern toilet fittings.



3.0 Proposed external works

3.1 Regard should be had to the above general comments and comments on the proposed demolition to ensure a proposal is evolved that both avoids further harm to, and better reveals, the heritage significance of the building and its setting.

3.2 The demolition aspects of the Items 1 to 12 on the submitted drawing No. 4007-PL04 Rev D have been addressed above. With regard the new works that would follow on from the demolition:

(a) Item 1 (Proposed extension):

The submitted written information suggests the proposed extension is intended to be to a contemporary design. However, the design does not appear to achieve and sits somewhere between a pastiche 'traditional' design and a contemporary design. **A high quality built form to a contemporary design would be acceptable and it is suggested that this would be best achieved with a visually light weight, highly (or, ideally, fully) glazed structure.** This would

enable the existing, retained one-time external (and now internal) window feature and associated older elevation to be legible from outside. This legibility would be assisted by the proposed double fireplace feature (Internal works Item C) insofar as this would re-establish the line of this elevation where it has been more recently removed. However, this fireplace feature would more convincingly provide this role subject to its detailed design, by having a wall nib of, say, a brick length to either side.

Response: *As identified in the response to 2.2 (a) Item 1 the proposed development has been revised in light of these comments and the proposal no longer seeks to demolish and replace the existing conservatory. Instead the revised proposal now seeks to retain and adapt / refurbish the existing conservatory structure by replacing the glazed roof with a slate finished pitched roof in keeping with the existing roof of the Red Lion, and replacing the existing windows with new windows and bi-fold doors (as detailed on the revised Proposed Ground Floor Plan (ref: 4007-PL04 Rev E) and the Existing & Proposed External Elevations Rev E drawings).*

The revised works proposed are considered appropriate in response to the comments above. The introduction of new windows and bi-fold doors as an alternative to the previously proposed masonry painted walls and bi-fold extension will enable the existing, retained one-time external (and now internal) window features and associated older elevations to remain legible from the outside. The redesign ensures that a visually light weight, high quality built form will be achieved through the retention and refurbishment of the existing structure.

(b) Item 2 (Replacement rear entrance): This needs to form a part of the coordinated design of the proposed extension considered in (a) above.

Response: *As identified in the response to 2.2 (a) Item 2 the proposed development has been revised in light of this comments and the proposal now seeks to retain the existing entrance. See point 2 of the revised proposed ground floor plan – demolitions (Ref. 4007-PL06 Rev B) and the detail shown on revised Proposed Ground Floor Plan (ref: 4007-PL04 Rev E) and the Existing & Proposed External Elevations Rev E drawings).*

The retention of the entrance is been pursued in light of the revised proposals for the retention and refurbishment of the existing conservatory feature (as detailed in response to para 3.2 (a) Item 1 above. It is considered that the retention of the entrance will ensure that a coordinated design response is maintained.

(c) Item 4 (Part covered pergola) and Item 5 (Covered pergola): In siting/layout terms these appear as randomly located structures without any particular response to each other, the proposed extension, the existing building or the setting of the listed building. There is a lack of detailed design information but what information is available would seem to reinforce the concerns regarding siting/layout. These features represent built features that would further encroach into and diminish the remaining external space that forms the setting to the listed building. To begin to be acceptable the siting/layout needs to be considered so as not to abut the lawn area and to have a simple, coordinated relationship to each other and the existing/proposed built form. Their design should be seen as a coordinated part of the high quality design of the proposed extension but should be seen as subservient to it. Any proposed fixed seating or features such as lighting and heaters would need to form part of the coordinated design and details would be required. It also seems odd that these both structure use different designs and pallets of materials.

Response: *The part covered and covered pergolas have been removed from the proposed development in light of the comments received. The alternative proposed now seeks to retain the existing pergola structure (approved pursuant to LPA Ref: 082715/FO/2007/S1; 08271/LO/2007/S1) and to introduce three gazebo structures in the external beer garden running parallel with the existing beer garden wall, festoon lighting is also proposed to be fitted between the gazebo structures (as detailed on the Proposed Ground Floor Plan (ref: 4007-PL04 Rev E) and the Existing & Proposed External Elevations Rev E drawings).*

Clearly, the grant of planning permission for the existing pergola structure demonstrates that the retention of the structure is acceptable. Therefore, no further consideration is given to this element of the proposal.

The introduction of the three gazebo structures demonstrates that the siting/layout of additional structures within the beer garden has been given due consideration. The features proposed do not abut the lawned area and have been sighted in a linear form to provide a coordinated relationship with the existing pergola structure and to run in parallel with the existing beer garden wall. Detailed specification information for the gazebo features and festoon lighting is detailed on the Existing & Proposed External Elevations Rev E drawing.

~~(d) Item 6 (New customer access): The demolition is covered above and notes that the extent of demolition should be minimised and a part of the wall abutting the building needs to be retained so the new entrance would read as an opening within the wall. **The proposed gates and lantern feature would be acceptable in principle, but the detailed design needs to be understood including in terms of materials, finishes and colours.** The surface treatment of the route to the gate and adjacent areas needs to be reconsidered and, rather than replacing the demolished "dwarf wall" the opportunity should be taken to demarcate either side of the route with some appropriate soft landscaping as a part as an improved wider treatment of the car park. Ideally the treatment of the on-site street frontage to the car park would include some tree planting to reinstate that indicated in the historic maps.~~

Response: *As detailed in response to 2.2 (a) Item 13 (above) the proposal has been revised and no longer seeks to form a new customer access from the front car park to the rear external beer garden (As shown on the revised drawing Proposed Ground Floor Plan 4007-PL05 Rev E and Existing & Proposed External Elevations 4007-PL05 Rev E). The comments are therefore no longer of relevance.*

(e) Item 7 (Render repairs): The building is shown in historic images as being rendered and this would have been achieved in a lime-based render compatible with the underlying brickwork. It is noted that Drawing No. 4007-PL03 Rev C usefully confirms the existing is lime-based render and confirms that the proposed render repairs are patch repairs using an appropriate lime render system after preparing the brickwork. This would be acceptable in principle.

Response: *The proposed redecoration scheme for rendered areas identified on Drawing 4007-PL03 Rev C should be explained/justified in heritage terms. The proposed use of an off-white colour of some sort in a matt finish to the render areas is likely to be appropriate. The paint would need to ensure the render can continue to 'breathe' and a lime wash would be usual.*

The proposed redecoration of the exterior of the building will use off-white limewash. The drawings specify the use of Little Greene Limewash Slaked Lime in off-white to the render areas. Dulux Heritage DH Slate Green will be used for doors, soffits, fascias and rainwater goods.

(f) Item 8 (Redecoration of features as identified on Drawings Nos. 4007-PL04 Rev D and 4007-PL03 Rev C): Redecoration is welcomed in principle, but the proposed redecoration scheme should be explained/justified in heritage terms including the choice of colours for a building of this age/type. A matt finish should be confirmed as 'gloss' finishes were not available until after the Second World War and so would not be contemporaneous with this building.

Response: *The proposals do not comprise an overhaul of the interior design scheme of the building, but rather are proposals for redecoration as a refresh of the existing interior design scheme, utilising similar colours and materials. There will not be a material change, and as listed building consent is not be considered to be required for such works under section 7 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, it is not considered necessary or proportionate to provide a more detailed explanation of this aspect of the proposals.*

(g) Item 9 (Replacement of window boxes): The historic photographs show no window boxes. The desire to have planting for amenity and possibly sustainability purposes is appreciated. However, the existing boxes should be removed and a more appropriate means of introducing planting into the on-site external areas considered. This would ideally be as a part of a more considered and coordinated treatment of the on-site external areas which could, for example, include suitably located and designed planters. In any event, window boxes should not be used as an advertising opportunity as is being proposed.

Response: *The proposals have been amended and no longer include advertisement details on the window boxes. The proposals include for the refurbishment of the existing window boxes, with replacement parts where necessary. The proposed works would not affect the special interest of the listed building and as such listed building consent is not considered to be required for such works under section 7 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act.*

(h) Item 10 (Jumberellas): The existing jumberellas should be removed and not replaced. They cause considerable harm to the setting of the listed building and to the conservation area giving rise to visual clutter including when closed. Their scale makes them visually dominant including in comparison to the domestically scaled listed building and conceal a significant proportion of the elevation of the modestly scaled listed built form when open.

Response: *The provision of features designed to provide covered external seating forms an integral part of the operation of any Public House, including the Red Lion. Moreover, the inclusion of the jumberellas merely seeks to replace the existing feature that contribute to the overall offer of the Red Lion. In light of the integral nature of the features, the replacement remains part of the proposed development. It is concluded that the replacement will contribute to, and indeed improve the site through the delivery of the high-quality environment.*

(i) Item 12 (External lighting): The proposed external lighting scheme which incorporates the use of high level, highly utilitarian flood lights combined with lower level feature lights, would over-illuminate the building and its setting. It would be excessive and unacceptable in terms of the physical and visual impact on the listed building and does not identify the routing of cabling and other associated external and internal equipment. An appropriate architectural lighting scheme that could include appropriate feature lights to identify and aid the safe use of entrances would be acceptable in principle.

Response: *In light of the comments received, a review of the proposed signage and external lighting scheme has been undertaken. The revised scheme is detailed in the updated Advertisement Details (ref. 20200110 Advertisement Details, Rev H) document prepared by Parkinsons Signs.*

The revised scheme has taken into consideration the comments made above, the revised information demonstrates that the number of lighting features proposed has been reduced (as detail in response to point 3.3 below). The revised proposal reflects a rationalisation of the functional features to reduce the impact of the external lighting scheme. However, the external lighting scheme serves a functional purpose and the revised proposal has been designed to ensure that key features and areas remain appropriately illuminated. It is pertinent to emphasise that the external lighting scheme is fundamentally a functional requirement for the operation of the Red Lion, particularly with regard to the use of the front seating provision and also to light the signage necessary for the Public House. In that regard the proposed scheme is considered to be acceptable.

3.3 The schedule of works on Drawing No. 4007-PL04 Rev D does not include reference to the proposed signage. With regard to proposed signage regard has been had to the submitted 'Red Lion - Signs Overview' document as follows:

(a) The amount of signage is excessive in terms of the number and location of different elements and when seen in conjunction with each other and other proposed additions such as lighting units. Some of the signage would seem gratuitous with even planters and window boxes taken as an advertising opportunity.

(b) The signage proposal needs to be reconsidered to reduce the sense of visual clutter on the building, within its on-site setting, within the streetscene and within the conservation area. A revised signage scheme and revised external lighting scheme should be coordinated to ensure signs are appropriately illuminated rather than illuminated by chance of the harsh, over-illumination of the building as currently proposed.

Response: *In light of the comments received, a review of the proposed signage and external lighting scheme has been undertaken. The revised scheme is detailed in the updated Advertisement Details (ref. 20200110 Advertisement Details, Rev H) document prepared by Parkinsons Signs.*

The revised scheme has taken into consideration the comments made above, with the following changes made:

- *A reduction in the size of signage features proposed on the North, East and South elevations – the revised features are detailed on Pages 3, 5 and 7. The update Advertisement Details document includes visual illustrations of the signage proposed.*
- *Removal of advertisement from the planter features adjacent to the building entrance;*
- *A reduction in the number of high level LED Floods proposed. The former proposed 10 no. LED lights, the revised now proposes 6 no. features that will serve a functional purpose.*
 - *North Elevation: The former proposed included the introduction of 3 no. high level LED Flood lights. The revised now seeks to include 1 no. high level functional LED light above the proposed signage.*
 - *East Elevation: The former proposed included the introduction of 6 no. high level LED Flood lights. The revised now seeks to include 4 no. high level functional LED light, situated above the proposed signage and along to façade to light the adjacent seating area.*

The revised proposal reflects a rationalisation of the functional features to reduce the sense of visual clutter. The revised signage and external lighting scheme reflect a coordinated approach designed to ensure that key features and areas are appropriately illuminated. The proposal sees to replace signage currently in-situ and deliver a scheme consistent with the JW Lees Brand. Additionally, it is considered that the gold pin lettering is sympathetic and helps to improve the overall appearance of the buildings.

MCC Highways also highlighted that the proposed illumination level which would exceed the MCC maximum of 600 cd/m w. The signage scheme proposed will comply with MCC maximum illumination level and this can be secured via an appropriate compliance condition.

It is concluded that signage and external lighting proposal has taken into consideration the comments made above which is reflected in the revised approach put forward. In that regard the proposed scheme is considered to acceptable.

4.0 Proposed internal works

4.1 Regard should be had to the above general comments and comments on the proposed demolition to ensure a proposal is evolved that both avoids further harm to, and better reveals, the heritage significance of the building and its setting.

4.2 The demolition aspects of the Items A to T on the submitted Drawing No. 4007-PL04 Rev D have been addressed above. With regard the new works that would follow on from the demolition there are a number of general comments:

(a) Floors: A number of the items involve proposed works to the existing floors including where revealed by the removal of non-original/non-historic raised timber floors and other floor coverings. The proposed approach outlined in Items O and P, for example, needs to be reconsidered with regard to the following advice. In each case the underlying floor to be revealed and its condition and heritage significance needs to be understood and an appropriate treatment agreed in advance of any of the wider works taking place. In general, the approach should be to reveal and restore original/historic floors (including to appropriately address any existing damage) where they exist and to keep them on view. In certain locations (such as in the toilet areas and in food preparation areas) it may be necessary to agree the installation of a hygienic floor covering such as tiles in a manner that would allow the hygienic flooring to be readily reversed in the future without damage to the underlying floor.

Response: *Under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Manchester City Council has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building, its setting and any features of special interest it may possess. The meaning of 'preservation' in this context, and as informed by case law, requires the avoidance of harm. Whilst it is appreciated that it could be desirable to reveal and understand any surviving historic floorings which may currently be hidden from view within the building, this work is not required by the 1990 Act.*

(b) A number of the items of proposed work involve the installation of new fixed seating. In general this should be avoided where it would require fixings to and would conceal original/historic built fabric.

Response: *The revised proposals include for the removal and replacement of existing fixed seating within two parts of the front bar area, this change will have no effect upon the historic fabric and special interest of the building, as it involves like for like replacement. All other proposals in relation to fixed seating relate to minor alterations to existing modern fixed seating.*

Contact

Adam Buxton
adam.buxton@turley.co.uk

October 2021

JWLM3016

Appendix 2: Schedule of Architectural Drawings

Drawing Title	Original Drawing Ref.	Proposed Drawing Ref.
Existing Site Plan & Location Plan	4007-PL01	Retain existing
Existing Ground Floor Plan	4007-PL02	Retain existing
Proposed Site Plan & Photographs	4007-PL03 Rev C	4007-PL03 Rev E
Proposed Ground Floor Plan	4007-PL04 Rev D	4007-PL04 Rev F
Existing & Proposed External Elevations	4007-PL05 Rev C	4007-PL05 Rev E
Proposed Ground Floor Plan – Demolitions	4007-PL06 Rev A	4007-PL06 Rev C

1 New York Street
Manchester
M1 4HD

T 0161 233 7676 turley.co.uk

"Turley is the trading name of Turley Associates Limited, a company (No. 2235387) registered in England & Wales. Registered office: 1 New York Street, Manchester M1 4HD."