MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

Planning MCC <planning@manchester.gov.uk>

Fwd: FW: 8-12 Newton Street - app ref no 118677 and 118678

1 message

Angela Leckie <a.leckie@manchester.gov.uk> 18 May 2018 at 11:35
To: Planning MCC <Planning.tst@manchester.gov.uk>

Attached for uploading replacement and additional info

Thanks

Angela Leckie
Senior Planner
City Centre Team

Tel (External) 0161 234 4651
Tel (Internal) 80034651
email a.leckie@manchester.gov.uk
www.manchester.gov.uk
Postal Address
Angela Leckie
City Centre Team
Planning
Growth and Neighbourhoods Directorate
Manchester City Council
Floor 6 Town Hall Extension
Albert Square
P.O Box 532,
Manchester, M60 2LA

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Zlatina Spasova** <zlatina.spasova@ateliermb.co.uk>
Date: 18 May 2018 at 10:55
Subject: FW: 8-12 Newton Street - app ref no 118677
To: Angela Leckie <a.leckie@manchester.gov.uk>
Cc: Andrew Burns <andrew.burns@ateliermb.co.uk>

Ref1665

Dear Angela,

Please accept our apologies for the delay in responding to your queries.

Please find our comments in your email below in blue along with relevant information attached with this email.

Kind regards,

Zlatina Spasova

Architect

Atelier MB
Urban Architects

Atelier MB Ltd.

Suite 1A Amazon House, Brazil Street, Manchester M1 3PJ

www.ateliermb.co.uk

T 0161 236 0051

@ateliermb

Atelier MB Ltd, Registered Number: 08705242

NOTES FOR ELECTRONIC DRAWING DATA

Electronic data does not constitute contract documentation unless issued with an electronic issue sheet

Files without issue sheets are only current on date of issue. Updates will occur.

From: Angela Leckie <a.leckie@manchester.gov.uk>
Date: Thursday, 12 April 2018 at 12:53
To: Andrew Burns <andrew.burns@ateliermb.co.uk>, Zlatina Spasova <zlatina.spasova@ateliermb.co.uk>
Subject: 8-12 Newton Street - app ref no 118677

Hi Andrew

Apologies that it has taken us so long to come back with these comments but you will appreciated how busy we are with the amount of development currently being brought forward in the City Centre. Please see comments below for you to address / respond. I am on leave from 13th April until 23rd April but Paul has said that it is ok for you to contact him if you need to discuss or arrange a further site meeting in my absence.

External

The proposed soft strip of clutter and repairs do not seem to go far enough. The elevations have suffered from incremental clutter and alterations over the years and this provides an opportunity to fully address all of these in one application. The elevation has a number of signs, cables, satellite dishes, roller shutters, painted stonework, boarding up, flue etc that do not seem to be a part of this application and they should be. In addition number 8 and 10 seem to have lost quite a bit of their original detailing and original stonework and it is important that any lost features are fully researched in order that they can be faithfully reinstated, thus reinstating

the heritage significance of the building. This should be dealt with as part of this application in a comprehensive way to all elevations and parts of the building..

It is not our intention to do anything but a comprehensive job on renovating the elevations. Please refer to the revised NBS specification P(802)A, elevation drawings P(212-217) and the Schedule of Works, Section 5.0 attached with this email.

The building could do with a light clean to all of the brickwork to match the cleaning work done around Cottonopollis. The paint should also be removed from all of the stonework - again similar to Cottonpollis to ensure the finish return back to its original stone.

Again, this is the intention and is in the NBS enclosed with the application (section C40). Please also refer to elevation drawings P(212-217) and the Schedule of Works, Section 5.0 attached with this email. As for the stone paint cleaning, the paint is currently being removed from the stonework on the Newton Street elevations at Ground and First floor levels under application 116540/LO/2017, previously approved.

The building may need a comprehensive repointing and it would be sensible to carry this out while the scaffolding is in place. A sample of pointing should be submitted for approval?

Again, this is the intention and is in the NBS enclosed with the application (section C41). Please also refer to elevation drawings P(212-217) and the Schedule of Works, Section 5.0 attached with this email.

Removal of window signs. Is any of the window lettering original or significant? If it is then some attempt should be made to retain this if it relates to an important previous use / occupier.

None of the lettering appears to be original, however some of it carries some historic value and we are now proposing to retain it. Please refer to elevation drawings P(212, 213 and 217) for details.

Repairs to windows - need to see a comprehensive schedule of work to all windows. Any original glass should be retained and any new glass should replicate the original.

As per our application for 86 Princess Street, Manchester House, we will need the scaffold to be erected before we can conduct such a survey. We ask that you consider the enclosed approach (Schedule of Works, Section 3.0) which we have enhanced from the approach noted in the Design and Access statement and condition the actual survey.

Repair methodology and detailed specification for brick and stone repair should be submitted.

Again, this is the intention and is in the NBS enclosed with the application (section C40). Please also refer to elevation drawings P(212-217) and the Schedule of Works, Section 5.0 attached with this email.

Full roof repairs - are these being carried out in a comprehensive way to the whole complex?

Again, this is the intention and is in the NBS enclosed with the application (section C40). Please also refer to elevation drawings P(212-217) and the Schedule of Works, Section 2.0 attached with this email.

The new plant enclosure on the roof is quite an intervention. It would be preferable to see all equipment located in the loading bay as discussed on site or possible alternative location that avoids an intervention into the roof. We will need convincing that all other options have been fully explored to our satisfaction before we could support this. If we were to go down this route we will need to see the detailed design of the enclosure and screening and should attempt to get a roof over it in slate, lead or possibly zinc.

Please find attached drawing P(317) showing a revised design proposal for the roof plant room to 14-16 Newton Street, along with a justification report for its location (see P(807)) .

The proposed gates on the loading bay look at odds with the original building in timber - their design and materials need looking at in more detail and the applicants should look at a suitable metal gates influenced by the original design.

Please find attached drawing P(225) showing a revised gate design proposal.

The proposed screeding over the cobbles is not acceptable and should be resisted. The cobbles are a feature of this area.

This is similar to an approach that we adopted and was agreed at the loading bay at Dale house. The separating layer ensures that the sets are protected. Unfortunately, the need to service the building safely and effectively is at odds with the uneven surface. However, we have now revisited our proposal and have limited the screeding only to the substation and the fire escape area within the loading bay – please see drawing P(310).

How will the louvres fit within the existing rooflight. We will need more detailed designs.

Please find attached drawing P(317) showing a detailed design of the proposed louvres.

Internal

The repair strategy for the ceilings show the overboarding of the lath and plaster and the details seem quite bulky and involve plasterboard and battening over original lath and plaster. You need to look at a solution to repair the existing ceiling and minimise the amount of new boarding underneath. Can you look at alternative options and speak with building control regarding this.

Following a consultation with Building Control, we have now revised the proposed ceiling details to reduce the amount and depth of overboarding - see drawing P(402).

There is a proposal to remove large sections of lath and plaster and expose the roof trusses. This was discussed on site and we advised that lath and plaster ceilings should be repaired reinstated on an exact like for like basis.

Some sections of lath and plaster on the 3rd floor, 10-12 Newton Street, are completely missing as they have been removed in the past due to being rotten and dangerous to health and safety. All lath & plaster on this floor will need to be removed to enable thorough structural roof inspection. We have revised our proposal to suggest the reinstatement of lath & plaster following the inspection to most areas of the ceiling, with the exception of areas where the lath & plaster is currently fully missing or where it has been substituted with non-original ceiling. Please see drawing P(153) for details.

The proposal to remove large sections of wall is unacceptable especially where it involves the removal of fireplaces. There needs to be a greater attempt to retain more of the original walls and all of the fireplaces.

We have now reviewed the proposed strip out of fireplaces and are retaining a larger portion. Please see the revised proposed GA and Strip Out plans, along with the attached Fireplace Viability statement for details.

The retention of original partitions is welcomed some are being altered to 'allow more light into the space' can we see the details of how the new glass will be inserted and be detailed. Drawings refer to some original partition are being removed but doesn't appear absolutely clear to me where original partitions are being removed and there are notes referring to them being reused elsewhere. We will need clarity on where and why they are being removed and where they will be re positioned. The preference would be to retain in their original location - why is this not possible?

We have reviewed each partition proposed for removal and labelled it more clearly on our drawings – see P(141, 150, 151) for details. Given the revised lift location, we have retained the original partitions on the 3rd floor and formed a meeting room adjacent to the lift lobby. The remaining original partitions on the 2nd and 3rd floor are to be removed to provide spatial flexibility for future tenants. However, these will be retained, recorded and carefully stored, so that future tenants could reuse them if they need partitioning of their office spaces. Original partitions will also be reused as privacy screens in front of toilet entrances.

Also, WC layouts to the 2nd floor have been revised to make use of the existing partitions in no.8, 10 and 16.

The proposed removal of the concrete stair may be acceptable if it is clear that this is of no significance. Although this is later - are the heritage advisers clear that it is or no heritage value? The proposed staircase in glass and steel could work well if carefully designed. The details of the staircase, lift enclosure and structure will need to be submitted at a much more detailed scale for assessment. There needs to be a method statement for removing the staircase carefully and its disposal including details of how the surrounding fabric is protected including routes out.

Although the staircase is most likely a later addition to the building, after further consideration, and on the basis that we are asking for other changes such as the removal of some of the crosswalls, we are prepared to amend our circulation strategy in order to retain the staircase and the interesting handrail. We still propose to remove the non-original and disused lift shaft in no.14 for reasons outlined in the submitted D&A and Heritage statements, which would bring more natural light and spaciousness to the existing stair core. As a result, the proposed new lift has now been repositioned in the area adjacent to the staircase – see the GA plans and drawing P(430) for details.

The detailed design of M and E has not been submitted. The proposed strategy looks acceptable in principle.

It is proposed to make changes to the light well windows to make them fire rated. What will this involve? The existing glass should be retained where possible.

After consulting with Building Control, we are proposing to construct a fire rated ‘lid’ structure on 1st floor level in the no.10-12 lightwell to separate the retail units from the offices above, which would avoid the need for fire-rating the lightwell windows above. See drawing P(301) for details.

Details of all new platform lifts needs providing.

A platform lift manufacturer has not been contacted specifically for this job yet. However, we have used Terry Lifts Melody platform lift on another Grade II listed building (Chatham Mill, Manchester) and intend to use the same or similar lifts (see attached details).

Repair methods and detailed specifications for all fabric needs to be submitted including decorative plasterwork. The notes refer to repairing and reinstating covings. It needs to be made clear on the reflected ceiling plans (RCP's) where the existing covings are and where they will be repaired / reinstated. We might want to see more reinstatement than is currently being proposed, but its currently not clear on the extent of these works. We will need to see samples of the repair works.

We have revised the RCPs to make the coving locations more apparent and have added some further details on the proposed extent of repairs. Refer to drawings P(123, 133, 143) for details.

Detailed specifications and samples of brick cleaning internal and external as well as metal cleaning. Shot blasting may cause harm and we need to ensure that this will not damage the cast iron columns.

Again, this is the intention and is in the NBS enclosed with the application. Please also refer to elevation drawings P(212-217) and the Schedule of Works attached with this email.

Repairs to the patent glazing involve changing the glass. If the glass is damaged or not the original then this is acceptable.

The glass is not believed to be original.

A survey of the floors and a plan showing the areas of flooring to be repaired / replaced will need submitting.

Please refer to the attached Schedule of Works, Section 4.0 for a detailed method statement. However, we will need to remove some of the floor covering before we can incorporate this. The detail of this may have to be the subject of a condition.

The steel repairs to the timbers seem comprehensive but very obvious and quite intrusive. Is there any alternative that reduces the amount of visible steel but still provides a suitable structural solution?

This has been looked at in great detail by the structural engineers, who have confirmed that it is not possible to retain or repair as existing without significant intervention. This is due to the structural inadequacy of the timbers and the poor original connection details. This has been proven by the alarming movement in this area. Originally the structural engineers had proposed a a replacement with a new steel structure in this location. However, our preference is to strengthen the existing timbers thereby retaining a lot of the original structure in situ. This is the reason behind our strengthening proposal as described in our submission. Also please refer to Clancy's report providing further detail on the above.

Regards

Angela

Angela Leckie

Senior Planner

City Centre Team

Tel (External) 0161 234 4651

Tel (Internal) 80034651

email a.leckie@manchester.gov.uk

www.manchester.gov.uk

Postal Address

Angela Leckie

City Centre Team

Planning

Growth and Neighbourhoods Directorate

Manchester City Council

Floor 6 Town Hall Extension

Albert Square

P.O Box 532,

Manchester, M60 2LA

****

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 http://www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

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.

****

56 attachments

Chatham Mill Proposed (REV)[2].pdf
145K

Melody 3 UL Structure Detail_XB00461_orig.pdf
67K

Melody-3-Brochure.pdf
3389K

1665 8-16 NEWTON STREET NBS P(802)A.pdf
230K

1-20289-REP-003-B Unit 8.pdf
4389K

1665 E(130)C.pdf
108K

1665 E(140)C.pdf
113K

1665 E(160)C.pdf
115K

1665 E(150)C.pdf
115K

1665 E(120)C.pdf
123K

1665 P(151)D sm.pdf
187K

1665 P(217)A.pdf
138K

1665 P(216)A.pdf
145K

1665 P(215)A.pdf
166K

1665 P(214)A.pdf
149K

1665 P(213)A.pdf
161K

1665 P(212)A.pdf
158K

1665 P(225)A.pdf
137K

1665 P(405).pdf
141K

1665 P(402)B.pdf
134K

1665 P(324)A.pdf
145K

1665 P(316).pdf
99K

1665 P(315) a.pdf
178K

1665 P(314)A.pdf
176K

1665 P(310)E.pdf
148K

1665 P(304)A.pdf
189K

1665 P(301)A.pdf
192K

1665 P(430).pdf
116K

1665 P(110)C.pdf
265K

1665 P(111)A.pdf
208K

1665 P(113)A.pdf
243K

1665 P(115)B sm.pdf
145K

1665 P(120)M.pdf
315K

1665 P(121)C.pdf
214K

1665 P(123)A sm.pdf
234K

1665 P(125)F.pdf
386K

1665 P(130)Q.pdf
395K

1665 P(131)C.pdf
111K

1665 P(133)A sm.pdf
351K

1665 P(140)R.pdf
220K

1665 P(141)D sm.pdf
233K

1665 P(143)A.pdf
332K

1665 P(153)B.pdf
312K

1665 P(163)B.pdf
114K

1665 P(170)F.pdf
106K

1665 P(171)C.pdf
101K

1665 P(161)D.pdf
124K

1665 P(160)N.pdf
165K

1665 180518 P1.pdf
215K

1665 180518 E.pdf
221K

1665 P(805) Schedule of works.pdf
147K

1665 P(806) Fireplace viability statement.pdf
38K

1665 P(807) Location of plant deck at 16.pdf
435K

1665 P(317).pdf
119K

1665 P(150)Q.pdf
219K

1665 180518 P.pdf
199K