---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Paul Mason** <[redacted]>
Date: Wed, 29 May 2019 at 14:32
Subject: Re: Apps. 122890/LO/2019 and 122889/FO/2019 - Royal Exchange Entrance Works
To: Emily Booth <[redacted]>

Hi Emily

Please see my responses. In red

1. Clarification on what will happen to the alarm boxes, cameras and external lights surrounding the existing entrance ways.

The landlord is in the process of assessing which alarm boxes are in the ownership of existing tenants, where they are redundant, existing alarm boxes will be removed. As part of new tenant fit-outs or occupation of units, no new alarm boxes are to be permitted externally on the building.



2. Potentially reassess the design of entrance 5 given that it will contrast with the high quality of the other doors to be replaced.



3. Potentially reassess whether the concertina door on the same elevation as entrance 5 would benefit from being replaced.

Unfortunately for similar reasons as above, these doors and associated scenery hoist (lift) do not form part of the proposals.

4. Why the threshold of entrance 3 has utilised black terrazzo when the other entrances use Yorkshire paving.

The reasoning behind using the different materials was based on an approach taken by the architect to differentiate the different uses present at the Royal Exchange; to ensure a contrast is achieved from the retail and theatre uses. Is Lorraine ok with this finish and contrast?

5. Change the drawing references for entrance 1 as 5 and 6 are the wrong way round and include details of the proposed new recess panel

I have attached an amended version of the architect's Design and Heritage Statement which addresses this error. Noted

To confirm, none of the original stone soffits will be altered and the recessed bronze panels are only where there are more modern soffits present. Noted

The client is content for method statements and other documents to be conditioned as part of the grant in planning permission/listed building consent. Ok - this needs a condition

Please let me know if you require any further information to enable you to issue a decision.

On Wed, 29 May 2019 at 13:58, Emily Booth <e.booth@manchester.gov.uk> wrote:
Hello,

Please let me know what you think of Mark's response as soon as you can. I'm going to be on leave on Friday so will have to determine this tomorrow or on Friday.

Many Thanks,

Emily Booth
Planner
Planning, Building Control and Licensing,
Growth and Neighbourhoods
I♥MCR

Tel 0161 234 4193
internal 800 34193
E-mail:e.booth@manchester.gov.uk

Postal address: Manchester City Council, P.O.Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester,M60 2LA

Location address: Town Hall Extension, Level 6.

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Murphy, Mark (Avison Young - UK)** <[redacted]>
Date: Wed, 22 May 2019 at 11:09
Subject: RE: Apps. 122890/LO/2019 and 122889/FO/2019 - Royal Exchange Entrance Works
To: Emily Booth <e.booth@manchester.gov.uk>, Paul Mason <p.mason@manchester.gov.uk>
Cc: Lowry, Fergus (Avison Young - UK) <[redacted]>

Hi Emily/Paul,

Thanks for sending on this information. I have summarised your points into those identified below and have responded with our comments in green:

1. Clarification on what will happen to the alarm boxes, cameras and external lights surrounding the existing entrance ways.

The landlord is in the process of assessing which alarm boxes are in the ownership of existing tenants, where they are redundant, existing alarm boxes will be removed. As part of new tenant fit-outs or occupation of units, no new alarm boxes are to be permitted externally on the building.

[redacted]

2. Potentially reassess the design of entrance 5 given that it will contrast with the high quality of the other doors to be replaced.

[redacted]

3. Potentially reassess whether the concertina door on the same elevation as entrance 5 would benefit from being replaced.

Unfortunately for similar reasons as above, these doors and associated scenery hoist (lift) do not form part of the proposals.

4. Why the threshold of entrance 3 has utilised black terrazzo when the other entrances use Yorkshire paving.

The reasoning behind using the different materials was based on an approach taken by the architect to differentiate the different uses present at the Royal Exchange; to ensure a contrast is achieved from the retail and theatre uses.

5. Change the drawing references for entrance 1 as 5 and 6 are the wrong way round and include details of the proposed new recess panel

I have attached an amended version of the architect's Design and Heritage Statement which addresses this error.

To confirm, none of the original stone soffits will be altered and the recessed bronze panels are only where there are more modern soffits present.

The client is content for method statements and other documents to be conditioned as part of the grant in planning permission/listed building consent.

Please let me know if you require any further information to enable you to issue a decision.

Kind regards,
Mark

Mark Murphy
Senior Planner

D +44 (0)161 956 4035
M +44 (0)7467 440 480

avisonyoung.co.uk

From: Emily Booth [mailto:e.booth@manchester.gov.uk]
Sent: 15 May 2019 10:16

To: Murphy, Mark (Avison Young - UK); Paul Mason
Subject: Apps. 122890/LO/2019 and 122889/FO/2019 - Royal Exchange Entrance Works

External Sender

External Sender

Good Morning Mark,

I hope that you are well.

We have the following comments on the above applications:

The works in general look to be well considered and of a very high quality and standard.

The existing doors that are being replaced are clearly modern and of a dated design which now look somewhat out of place.

The new bronze doors should enhance the building and the drawings are detailed enough not to require too many further details of the design. There are detailed section through the doors which give a good idea of the fabrication, however can you please advise if these are the final fabrication drawings or will there be further more detailed drawings from the fabricators? If so, we will need to see these, but they can be required by condition if needed.

The changes to entrance 4 on Old Bank Street are welcomed but we note that entrance 5 will remain as a metal concertina door. Although this is functional it is fairly utilitarian in unfinished galvanised steel and will really look out of place when all of works are done. You should reassess changing this entrance for something of a higher quality - but still be robust enough for a service entrance. There is also a smaller concertina door on the same elevation towards Cross Street which would benefit from being changed to a higher quality door.

In addition around entrances 4 and 5 there is a lot of clutter including alarm boxes cameras external lights. You should provide details of the removal/ tidy up and rationalisation of all of this clutter. The removal of a couple of sign is welcomed but we'll need to see a method statement and specification for the repairs. Likewise, please remove other items of clutter including alarm boxes above the other doors also be removed from the elevations especially around the doors and made good.

The materials to the threshold of entrance 3 is proposed in a black Terrazzo with brass strips, which may not be acceptable from an Accessibility aspect. Why isn't Yorkstone paving used as for the rest of the thresholds?

What is being proposed with cameras around entrances and the building?

On entrance 1 the drawing references at 5 and 6 are the wrong way round. Please can you correct this and provide details of the proposed new recess panel?

Please confirm that none of the original stone soffits will be altered and that the recessed bronze panels are only where there are more modern soffits (not stone).

We will need to apply a materials condition to these applications.

Please respond to these comments and provide the requested information as soon as possible.

Please let me know if you need to discuss.

Kind Regards,

Emily Booth
Planner
Planning, Building Control and Licensing,
Growth and Neighbourhoods
I♥MCR

Tel 0161 234 4193
internal 800 34193
E-mail:e.booth@manchester.gov.uk

Postal address: Manchester City Council, P.O.Box 532, Town Hall, Manchester,M60 2LA

Location address: Town Hall Extension, Level 6.

****

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

Please contact internet.administrators@manchester.gov.uk with any queries.

****

--
Paul Mason
Group Manager
Urban Design & Conservation
Planning, Building Control and Licensing
Strategic Development