

PLANNING COMMENT / CONDITIONS MATRIX

Job No: 8180

Date: 04/08/21

Revision / Date
A - 04/08/21

Description
Updated to address comments received 15/07/21

COMMENT		CONDITION	
Deemed acceptable		Condition deemed to be discharged - no further action required	
Deemed acceptable subject to comments		Awaiting LA Response	
Further info required, no judgement given		Condition Precedent	
Statement, no action required.		Action Required	
Feedback / response required from planning dept			
Deemed unacceptable but may be considered subject to further info			
Deemed unacceptable			

	Comment / Condition	LA Comment / Condition	Responsibility	Design Team Comment	Submission Date	Docs Issued	LA Response / Comments	Action	Further Submission Date	Discharge Date
1		It is understood to have been clear during the site visit that the strip out of non-original fabric has been beneficial. We would normally need a method statement for this work, but had let you go ahead without one due to the need that you expressed to start the works. This has allowed a good understanding of the condition of the original fabric and volume (no works other than the strip out of non-original should have taken place and are not permitted to prior to the grant of listed building consent).								
2		Leaving this uncovered built fabric exposed to view in the condition it is found would evidence the 'journey' of the building, however, that:								
2a		The tidying of existing M&E and installation of new services would include the installation of trays suspended from the ceiling but there are no details on location, routing or detailed design other than the trial example of the Type A guestroom. There are no details on what services the trays would carry and if these include items to be hidden on their top side and features on their visible side (such as lighting fittings, alarms/sensors, and so on). Please add this information to the relevant drawings.		Please find attached photos 2021-07-21 10.02.40, 2021-07-21 10.02.52, 2021-07-21 10.03.17, 2021-07-21 10.03.39 indicating the rationalised services.	26/07/2021	2021-07-21 10.02.40 2021-07-21 10.02.52 2021-07-21 10.03.17 2021-07-21 10.03.39				
2b		The boxing in of the re-exposed vertical services including foul water runs must be the minimum size necessary to achieve the required fire protection and acoustic performance.		Vertical services will be boxed as tightly as possible to ensure the appropriate fire & acoustic performance.	26/07/2021					
3		The currently proposed approach, although not ideal is acceptable provided that regard is had to the following comments and that the proposal would not, in itself, prevent further works in the future that could further (and more accurately) reveal the heritage significance on a more evidence and research led basis								
4		Past detrimental works to the building cannot be used to justify further inappropriate works to the building that would harm the heritage significance such as, for example, the removal of further original/historic built fabric, inappropriate surface treatments, or fixtures that would conceal the re-exposed original/historic built fabric.								
5		We can confirm that it is appropriate to leave the obvious unsympathetic past repairs (where mortar had been used in quantity to infill spaces left by individual missing/badly damaged bricks and previous channels (cabling) unrepaired as currently proposed. This is because they provide evidence of rooms that would previously have originally/historically existed with a plaster finish. This on-site evidence shall be retained so that it is available in the future should a more accurate restoration of the building be possible.		Past repairs / interventions will be retain (unrepaired).	26/07/2021					
6		As previously advised, the exposed masonry walls should not be treated with any form of coating or sealant. Also as previously noted, exposed masonry walls would not have been expected to have skirting boards. Please confirm and amend any relevant information.		No skirtings are proposed to the exposed masonry walls. All reference to sealing or painting the exposed original masonry has been removed from all drawings.	26/07/2021 04/08/21					

	Comment / Condition	LA Comment / Condition	Responsibility	Design Team Comment	Submission Date	Docs Issued	LA Response / Comments	Action	Further Submission Date	Discharge Date
7		As a part of accepting the above approach (point 2 a) and b) Please provide photographs accompanied by a photo montage or drawing of representative parts of the building to give a clear understanding of how the existing and proposed building services would manifest themselves within the various types of space. This should also include accurate details of the design of the proposed cable tray system to ensure it is not overly obtrusive or utilitarian. Please submit this information.		Please refer to photos provided & referenced in point 2a.	26/07/2021 04/08/21	LRW_8180_L(35)101_ Proposed Upper Ground Ceiling Services Plan				
8		The proposed internal redecoration (including applied finishes such as paint) can provide a means ensuring a contemporary approach nevertheless has a resonance with the heritage significance of the buildings. A redecoration specification is required to be submitted that details the proposal and explains how it would achieve this resonance.		We as a design team have taken extra care, time and money to preserve and protect existing brick walls, timber beams, traditional window proportions and stonework whenever they have been found. Alongside that we firmly believe that juxtaposing new well crafted materials such as terrazzo, solid timber floors and heritage, soft pastel paints elevates the original fabric and makes it relevant again. Pastiche has no place, instead we prefer echoing how the original buildings were built of solid, real materials of their time and doing the same in our work.	04/08/2021	329-700 - Proposed General Internal Redecoration Schedule				
9		The proposed fixtures appear to be a part of providing obviously contemporary features within an historic built form which is accepted. Proposed fixtures should not be attached to the original/historic built fabric that is being uncovered and it is welcomed that this seems to be generally the case. There are, however, two principal exceptions:								
9a		The proposed terrazzo shelves in the guest bedrooms. It is acknowledged these would have a functional purpose in the limited space of the guestrooms and also that they have been designed to stand away from the walls so that walls remain clearly visible around them. Although not ideal they are considered acceptable.								
9b		The extensive lengths of fitted seating proposed on the upper ground floor which is considered unacceptable, in particular where it cuts across features such as windows and doors and damages the original fabric that remains. This should be removed from your proposals and appropriately located free standing furniture should be used instead.		You will note from the details provided and 2021-07-21 10.02.40 attached the fitted seated passes below the window cill height throughout the upper ground floor area and if required would be fixed to the non-original blockwork liner wall in place bridging the upper / lower ground floor fire compartmentation and concealing the cavity wall system, as such there will be no interface with the original fabric.	26/07/2021 04/08/21	2021-07-21 10.02.40				
		Proposed treatment of guestrooms and associated communal/ corridor areas - The trial fitout of a guestroom seen during the site meeting was for the Type A guestroom. This is considered an acceptable approach subject to regard to the above general comments and the following:								
10		Vertical structural metalwork installed as a part of the previous hotel conversion has been exposed to view in certain rooms. This should be left exposed to view with an appropriate intumescent coating. This coating should have a matt finish and ideally be clear rather than in a colour. Such metalwork that remains concealed in other rooms should be similarly exposed to view. Please add confirmation of this to your relevant drawings and any		The existing steelwork from the previously approved conversion is primed to preserve it's lifespan, therefore the steel finish isn't visible and needs to be concealed. The proposed treatment to these is an intumescent paint with a colour to match the adjacent finishes.	26/07/2021					
11		The only services to be boxed-in in these spaces would be the vertical foul water runs through the building. Please also confirm that this boxing-in would be the minimum size necessary to achieve the required fire protection and acoustic performance. Please confirm and show on relevant drawings and amend relevant statements.		There are no statements relevant to this item that require updating. In addition to the vertical foul drainage, the rainwater pipes & grey waste will also be boxed in, in the most minimal fashion	26/07/2021					

	Comment / Condition	LA Comment / Condition	Responsibility	Design Team Comment	Submission Date	Docs Issued	LA Response / Comments	Action	Further Submission Date	Discharge Date
12		Regard should be had to the above comments regarding the treatment of the exposed brickwork. Please amend your drawings to reflect this		All references to sealing or painting exposed original masonry has now been removed from the drawings.	04/08/2021					
13		Please amend your drawings to accurately show the agreed Type A guest room viewed on site and seen in your photos		Please find revised type A drawings in a dated folder in the link above.	04/08/2021	329-103-T4 329-105-T3 329-106-T3 329-107-T3 329-108-T3				
14		The proposed Type B rooms must follow a similar approach to the Type A to address the previous Planning Service comments. In particular, the proposed floor covering previously being proposed should be revised to match the timber flooring proposed in the Type A rooms.		Please find type B drawings in a dated folder in the link above.	04/08/2021	329-120-T3 329-121-T3 329-122-T3 329-123-T3 329-124-T3 329-125-T3				
15		The approach proposed for corridors and other communal areas on the upper floors and the corridors serving the guestrooms on the upper ground floor is considered to be acceptable provided the floor treatment is revised to the timber treatment proposed in the Type A guest rooms to ensure that these spaces have some resonance with the heritage significance of the building within which they are located. Achieving a consistent timber floor treatment across the guestrooms and communal areas would have a strong resonance with the original timber floor treatment within the building.		Please refer to D. Vince email 30/07/21 referencing a significant increase in proposed timber floor & response 02/08/21.	04/08/2021	Refer to type A & B drawings referenced in points 13 & 14 plus the room mix plans referenced below: 329-171-T4 329-172-T3 329-173-T3				
16		The proposed treatment of the lower ground floor would be considered an acceptable approach subject to regard to the above general comments and the following.								
16a		It is disappointing that works are not being proposed to restore the footway lights serving the basement windows. However, it is welcomed that the one Princess Street footway lightwell where the original glazed bricks have been exposed to view by the removal of the non-original/non-historic staircase as a part of this scheme will be retained exposed to view in an unaltered state. Please annotate and show this on your drawings.		Exposed original pavement light & retention of glazed bricks annotated on the attached lower ground floor demolition plan	04/08/2021	LRW_8180_L(26)100G Demolition Lower Ground Floor Plan				
16b		Confirmation that the hole remaining in the upper part of an original sub-dividing wall following the removal of the staircase referred to in (a) above will be repaired on an exact like-for-like basis as a solid brick wall matching the adjacent existing wall so as to give an 'invisible' repair. Please annotate and show this on your drawings.		The extended opening referred to in the response to item 20b will provide the original brickwork required to infill the opening at high level of the lower ground floor. This is now indicated on L(00)201	04/08/2021					
16c		It is accepted that the existing floor covering and wall lining/tanking would remain in place.								

	Comment / Condition	LA Comment / Condition	Responsibility	Design Team Comment	Submission Date	Docs Issued	LA Response / Comments	Action	Further Submission Date	Discharge Date
17		The proposed treatment of the upper ground floor would be considered generally an acceptable approach subject to regard to the above general comments and the following.								
18		The proposed seating to be affixed to the now re-exposed original internal elevations is considered unacceptable both in terms of the concealment of these walls and features, but also due to the possible damage that the installation may cause to these walls and original floor structure. The proposal should be revised to remove this fitted furniture. It also unacceptably cut across the internal face of an original Princess Street external doorway. Please amend your drawings and any relevant statements.		The proposed fixed seating abuts an existing non-original internal blockwork liner wall, so there is no risk of damage to the original wall behind. There is significant change of level between the internal floor and street level where the existing door is located, and as such the door straddles the upper & lower ground floor levels. There is an existing non-original blockwork liner wall in place concealing the door as this was formerly a guestroom ensuite, and due to the compartmentation required between the floors there is no intention to remove this. The removal of the non-original plasterboard liner wall has however revealed an existing glazed fanlight over the existing door which we are looking to expose	26/07/2021					
19		The removal of the seating sought under (a) above would address this issue. The existing floor now cuts across the lower part of this door and this should be reconsidered at least in a localised manner to re-expose the full height of the door including for maintenance purposes. Please amend your drawings and any relevant statements.		Exposing the full height of the door is not possible due to the reasons stated in the point above.	26/07/2021					
20		At the front of the building the large central space of the hotel reception is separated from spaces to either side by some - if not all - of the last remaining elements of original internal wall in the building. The space on the left (at the Princess Street/George Street corner of the building) is proposed as a bar area and the space on the right (at the Princess Street/Back George Street) is proposed as a restaurant with a large exposed kitchen area. The submitted drawings are inconsistent as to the treatment of these remaining walls with Drawing No. 329-202 Rev T7 showing them completely removed and Drawing No. L(00)202 Rev B showing the left hand wall retained but the right hand wall (to the proposed restaurant) having an existing opening substantially enlarged and a further wholly new opening created. The on-site meeting suggested that Drawing No. L(00)202 Rev B better reflects the current proposal without alteration of the left hand wall and this should be confirmed and consistent drawings submitted. With regard to the right hand wall the following points are noted:		All drawings have been reviewed and updated to reflect the current & agreed proposal.						
20a		Any remaining original/ historic built fabric should be retained given the extent of loss already experienced by the building.								
20b		During the site meeting it was agreed that the increase in the width of one of the existing openings in this wall would be avoided if a new opening of the same width could be formed in the area of wall between the existing opening and the Princess Street elevation. This can be accepted provided that: i.It would need to match the width of the existing adjacent opening. ii.A lintel detail would need to be agreed with natural stone rather than blockwork pad stones. iii.The new opening would have at least a brick length nib from the side of an existing thicker element of masonry (seen from the reception side of the wall). iv.The bricks should be carefully removed by hand keeping the facing bricks separate. The salvaged bricks must then be re-used to close the existing opening that would become redundant due to the location of the proposed kitchen area with solid brickwork. The existing facing bricks should be re-used as the facing bricks for the new infill wall. Mortar would need to match the existing including composition (by chemical analysis), colour, texture and worked/finished appearance. The result should be an 'invisible' repair with the original bonding pattern carried through from the existing to new work so avoiding the outline of the existing opening. The result would be to avoid a net loss of original built fabric and to main a strong sense of the wall dividing the restaurant from the reception area.		The compromise discussed on site has been further reviewed by the operational & client team and the opening provisionally agreed is in an area of original wall apparently untouched by the previously approved works (i.e. wall made up of original masonry units). In addition the opening discussed as highlighted above offers very little benefit operationally and as such following a detailed review of the existing condition of the "original" wall we feel the least best solution to preserve the "original" elements of the original wall would be section described in item 20b, and extend the previously approved opening by 1500mm. This would provide enough original masonry to infill the adjacent existing opening to 1150mm AFFL and also the opening at lower ground floor referred to in item 16b. Please see attached LRW_8180_L(00)215 Proposed Amendments to Existing Opening on Original Wall & LRW_8180_L(00)03 Upper Ground Floor Masonry Opening. Proposed upper & lower ground floor plans have been amended to indicate the infills proposed with the reclaimed masonry from the proposed opening.	26/07/2021 04/08/21	LRW_8180_L(00)03 Upper Ground Floor Masonry Opening LRW_8180_L(00)201C Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan_LBC LRW_8180_L(00)202D Proposed Upper Ground Floor Plan_LBC				

	Comment / Condition	LA Comment / Condition	Responsibility	Design Team Comment	Submission Date	Docs Issued	LA Response / Comments	Action	Further Submission Date	Discharge Date
21		The proposed floor treatment caused concern as noted in the previous comments. The terrazzo floor is acceptable in the proposed reception area, however the proposed restaurant and bar areas to either side should be in a timber finish to match the appearance of that being used in guestroom Type A. This would give some resonance with the possible mix of original floor treatments which on this floor would have been expected to be mostly timber but to have possibly had tiling, stone or terrazzo in the entrance hall. The proposed use of terrazzo would be much greater in extent than any original area of such material if it was used at all. It is noted that the proposed ground floor treatments could incorporate the layout of the original building within the floor pattern. It is understood that you have started to lay these tiles. These are unauthorised works to the listed building. Please amend.		We assume this is accepted in consideration of the acceptance of the email 30/07/21 & response of 03/08/21.	30/07/21 04/08/21	329-103-T4 329-120-T3 329-171-T4 329-172-T3 329-173-T3				
22		The proposed window blinds should be avoided to ensure intervisibility is retained between the interior and exterior of the building at all times		There are no window blinds proposed	26/07/2021					
23		The previously proposed works to the internal main entrance steps have been removed from the proposal but are still shown on some of the submitted drawings. Please amend.		Red Deer drawing 329-202-T8 references no amendments to the existing non-original entrance stairs.	26/07/2021					
24		The exposure of the original timber downstand beams and the careful existing paint carefully removed and natural timber finish is welcomed. Details of the appropriate clear intumescent coating (if fire protection is required) would need to be agreed. The existing paint should be analysed by an appropriately qualified person prior to removal to ascertain any evidence of the painting history of the building. The results of such an analysis should be shared with the Planning Service and used to inform the approach towards the proposed internal redecoration. Please confirm and add annotation to your drawings.		As confirmed or email exchange 22/07/21 we propose a certified clear matt intumescent finish from Nulfire or Envirograf as specified on other listed developments. We expect sample photos from the contractor in the coming days once the existing paint has been stripped.						
25		Details are required of the location and design of the proposed fire curtain fittings to ensure they do not introduce incongruous features into the upper ground floor area. Please submit.		The location of the proposed fire curtains are highlighted on LRW_8180_L(00)202B Proposed Upper Ground Floor Plan_LBC. L(00)202B was provided 30/06/21, revision C provided 14/07/21 and a further revision D included in the dated link along with the fire curtain sub-contractors drawing (UKS-PFA108621-001).	26/07/2021	LRW_8180_L(00)202D Proposed Upper Ground Floor Plan_LBC LRW_8180_L(00)202C Proposed Upper Ground Floor Plan_LBC UKS-PFA108621-001				
26		The proposed signage would be considered acceptable provided: a)That the depth/thickness of the projecting signs is no more than 30mm. b)Ideally the projecting signs should not appear as fully illuminated signs with applied lettering.		30mm may be difficult to achieve due to the diameter of bulbs, housing & box frame. We discussed this perhaps not being perceived correctly and include a precedent image of the intent. We await feedback from your team leader.	26/07/2021					
27		A CCTV installation would be acceptable subject to detail. The existing CCTV installation does not have the benefit of Listed Building Consent. The current proposal needs to consider more than just the external cameras and their mountings. It is understood the proposal would retain existing cabling routes (please confirm). Details of the installation need to be submitted for approval but may well be acceptable if cabling is appropriately routed/concealed. Externally mounted junction boxes as a part of the cabling must be avoided. The number of cameras should be kept to a minimum and their locations and detailed design of the works (including the cameras and their fixings/mounts) should be unobtrusive including through the use of appropriate a matt finish in a colour to match the adjacent elevation material. It is not evident that the proposed installation would achieve this and alternative options should be considered.		Please find attached LRW_8180_L(00)103B Proposed Elevation-Princess St, LRW_8180_L(00)104B Proposed Elevation-George St & LRW_8180_L(00)105B Proposed Elevation-Back George St with the CCTV locations added as discussed & requested. The camera specification previously submitted remains the proposal as this is the smallest the market can offer at the quality required.	26/07/2021					
28										
29										
30										
31										
32										
33										
34										
35										
36										
37										
38										
39										

	Comment / Condition	LA Comment / Condition	Responsibility	Design Team Comment	Submission Date	Docs Issued	LA Response / Comments	Action	Further Submission Date	Discharge Date
40										
41										
42										
43										
44										
45										
46										
47										
48										
49										
50										
51										
52										
53										
54										
55										
56										
57										

	Comment / Condition	LA Comment / Condition	Responsibility	Design Team Comment	Submission Date	Docs Issued	LA Response / Comments	Action	Further Submission Date	Discharge Date
58										
59										
60										