Central House Basement

	COUNCIL COMMENTS / REQUESTS	OUR RESPONSE
1	Typical details of how any building services would be carried from such trays across ceilings and down walls to sockets, switches and so on needs to be understood but the use of round section metal pipes is suggested as a traditional approach within such an 'industrial' context.	Please see drawing A(80)05 - Johnson basement & ground bedrooms typical section proposals
2	The aim should be to: (a) Avoid lowered ceilings by restricting the lowered ceilings within the guest rooms to the bathroom areas above which building services could be accommodated. (b) Avoiding ceilings in the communal areas (such as corridors) and the staff canteen by using minimal, coordinated trays to carry services. (c) A reconsideration of the ceiling in the proposed 'Unit 4'. It remains unclear in the light of the latest revision why this cannot be achieved especially with the insulation and some rationalisation of the routing of those existing building services penetrating the proposed guest room areas.	(a) Guest rooms now only have lowered ceilings in bathroom areas as requested (b) The basement staff room canteen no longer has a dropped ceiling. (c) We need to retain the proposed lowered ceiling in Unit 4 on the grounds of acoustics & fire risk (see technical note and cover letter for justification)
3	Throughout the space the majority of the existing cast iron columns appear to be either embedded in walls or concealed within what appear to be risers or, within 'Unit 4', less visible areas. This layout needs to be reconsidered to ensure all columns remain as free-standing features and not concealed from general view.	The full exposure of the column capital heads will not be possible due to the retained associated soil pipe location that runs adjacent in close proximity to each column and connects below to the existing underground drainage system. The column capital detail has been exposed as much as practically possible given the constraints above and will form a nice 'half on half off detail' which is fairly common.
4	As much of the existing ceiling structure as possible should remain exposed as should the columns and their head details. Typical details of this are required.	See LRW-A(80)04B Central House Bedroom Typical Section
5	The need to box-out the lower sections of the internal faces of the external walls should be avoided to retain the brickwork exposed to view.	See LRW-L(20)01G Basement G.A Plan & LRW-A(80)04B Central House Bedroom Typical Section. We are proposing exposed brick structure and leaving alone the part

		which is already covered with render.
6	Typical detail required for new walls - should have shadow gaps where they abut any original surfaces	Shadow gaps are proposed. See attached LRW-A(80)04B Central House Bedroom Typical Section.
7	The proposed treatment of the existing floor needs to be understood	The existing floor will be overlaid with new floor finishes, as per shown on LRW L(43) code drawings.
8	The proposed need to create a new blockwork enclosure to the 'hung lift pit' needs to be better understood in terms of what exists and what is proposed.	Now that the lift is only being refurbished, the requirement for blocking off the area underneath the lift shaft is no longer required.

Central House Ground and upper floors

	COUNCIL COMMENTS / REQUESTS	**OUR RESPONSE**
9	In general you are proposing to remove some existing ceilings to then replace them with new ceilings at a higher level with the incorporation of a chamfer detail at window heads to enable their full height to be seen. The floor plans should be revised to confirm where this treatment is proposed. While not ideal it is still an improvement over the existing situation and would be acceptable provided the new ceilings can be installed without affecting any remaining original ceiling and associated detailing.	The following drawings indicate the raised ceilings with chamfer detailing at ground and upper floor level: • LRW_7664_L(00)132B Central House Existing, Demolition & Proposed Sections • LRW_7664_L(35)02C Ground Floor RCP • LRW_7664_L(35)03D First to Fourth Floor RCP We seek a condition which requires the submission of a methodology of how the new ceiling is installed.
10	Drawing No. L(00)132A is now showing a proposal for secondary glazing which we do not recall having previously seen. The need for secondary glazing needs to be understood as opposed to, for example, the appropriate replacement of any non-original/non-historic windows or of any failed double glazed units within the existing frames. If the secondary glazing is pursued then full details are required which should confirm how any particular existing architectural details would be accommodated and a proposed system that would include the most minimal metal frame profile and sub-division, a dark grey coloured frame and non-reflective glass.	Secondary glazing currently already exists to bedrooms along this part of the elevation for acoustic reasons. As we are increasing the window height substantially, the need for secondary glazing is even greater to what is the noisiest elevation. We are unable to provide any details until we have been allowed to strip out these rooms. We therefore request that these details are conditioned.

Building services and roof

	COUNCIL COMMENTS / REQUESTS	**OUR RESPONSE**
11	It should be confirmed that the proposed building services would replace the existing. The proposed building services would suggest there is an opportunity to remove existing louvres	The M&E strategy submitted previously is based on utilisation of the central plant as opposed to low level louvres.

	from canalside windows and to appropriately repair the original windows and this approach should be confirmed and a detailed specification/ methodology submitted.	
12	Removal of existing louvres welcomed and this should be confirmed on the revised drawings. A repair specification is awaited.	See LRW-L(20)09D G.A Elevations drawing We request that the provision of a repair specification is conditioned.
13	There should be no future expectation/need for the retrofitting of additional equipment such as louvres in windows or wall mounted condenser units.	Noted. See below.
14	The confirmation that some future proofing has been considered is welcomed provided this would meet needs of any future type of occupier that can be reasonably anticipated and that the building owners/operators accept they may need to restrict their choice of possible future tenant. (points 9 and 10)	SACO intends to operate in the long term. A retail unit/A3/A5 is an appropriate use. The proposed kit is sufficiently considered to take account of these uses in future.
15	If I understand the comment correctly, the particular duct referred to can now be removed - which is highly welcome. Unless otherwise stated it is assumed that no such alteration is now proposed to any windows	No windows will incorporate ventilation terminals.

External elevations

	COUNCIL COMMENTS / REQUESTS	**OUR RESPONSE**
16	The proposed general refurbishment of the exterior is welcomed. Detailed specifications / methodologies are awaited.	Prior to occupation, all graffiti to the external façade / fabric of the building will be cleaned by using a brick cleaner and power washing. Unnecessary lighting, CCTV, signage and vegetation will also be removed. This is annotated on the proposed elevation drawings.
17	The proposed refurbishment of the existing grilles is welcomed subject to details.	We request that these details are dealt with under a condition.
18	The proposal for the rainwater goods is welcomed provided it is in cast iron and subject to detailed design including the design and location of fixing brackets	We request that the detailed design request is dealt with by way of condition as this would need to be fully reviewed with the main contractor.
19	Windows replaced in the 1980's - While it is accepted that the windows themselves are not going to be changed any opportunity to tidy past repairs as a part of the general external refurbishment would be welcomed	The approach to the repair / replacement of windows is to be confirmed once a contractor is appointed and we therefore request that this requirement is conditioned.
20	The existing basement opening - details of the proposed refurbishment required.	Please see drawing A(31)01. Any more specific detail could be conditioned.

Atrium structure and space

	COUNCIL COMMENTS / REQUESTS	OUR RESPONSE
21	If there is sufficient justification for an external staircase the spiral solution could reluctantly be accepted but subject to the most minimal design to minimise its visual impact and in order that the structure behind reads as the dominant built form. This would need consideration of the amount of built structure and also the choice and finish of materials for the stair. There would also need to be a means of preventing access from street level as an integral part of this design.	An external staircase is proposed. Please refer to the cover letter that provides justification for this approach. The DAS and plans provide further design detail. Any further detail could be conditioned.
22	The proposed adaptation is considered unacceptable and a more holist approach could be considered to replace the existing Atrium structure with a more fully glazed light-weight structure to a contemporary design. A higher structure would overcome the poor relationship of the existing atrium roof with the adjacent buildings where it cuts across elevation openings and would also be able to accommodate a new and better designed fire escape stair if it proves difficult to accommodate this within Dominion House. The design of the proposed first floor door would need to be reconsidered. Externally the proposed perforated screen has been an idea worth exploring but is felt to be inappropriate within this context. It would be preferable to revert to a scheme that retains the existing end of the atrium (but without the half-dome entrance canopy) with appropriately designed new entrance doors. In this context the design of the proposed doors needs further consideration but in any event appear rather bulky and lacking in finesse. The need for the stepped plan form of the Princess Street elevation is questioned.	The updated DAS and plans provide further design detail and justification. The cover letter provides justification for the approach to the stairs and the vents, and the DAS/plans provide justification for the overall approach to the Atrium entrance. If the principle of the design is agreed, we propose that further details (if necessary) can be conditioned.
24	The treatment of the atrium floorspace should be confirmed. The approach of replacing the existing modern tiled floor with a surface that would replicate that of the original roadway was outlined at the pre-application meetings. This would have been of granite sets possibly with York stone walkways to either side protected by a cast iron kerb. A proposed surface could all be at a single level to assist accessibility but introduce materials laid out to this design.	The plans and DAS confirm the approach and if the principle is agreed, full details can be conditioned.
25	If there is sufficient justification for external flues the proposed upholstered panel/bench solution would be considered appropriate as a means of screening the lower part of the flues.	Please refer to the cover letter and supporting information for the justification for the flues being external: - External Plant Overview Rev C: Paragraph 2.2 explains the reasons

	The proposed flues appear rather bulky within the atrium space but this may be as a result of their acoustic insulation to enhance the environment within the atrium space - do all require this treatment? It is understood that only one flue would need to extend up to roof level as two of the three are air-intake and air extract rather than carrying cooking fumes. After leaving the atrium the visual bulk of this high-rising flue should be minimised by not boxing it in and the flue should not encroach over architectural details such as window openings and associated detailing. As with the three existing flues it should rise centrally up the affected structural brick pier. The existing three flues that run close and parallel to each other resonate with the original industrial nature of the building but also allow the building behind to be seen and remain. An approach that retains this sense of dominance of the built form and downplays the elevational impact of the new flue is sought. While leaving any new external flue in its metal finish could be seen to be an honest intervention and 'industrial' in character, it may be that a flue coloured to match the brickwork and the treatment of the internal flues would provide a more coordinated approach.	for the ventilation and justification for the current strategy - Drawing 7664 L(00)136 shows the impact if the ducts run vertically within the bedrooms - Drawing number P0001.1 (Basement and Ground Floor – Proposed Alternative Extract Route) shows the impact of the kitchen extract duct running horizontally - Manhire Associates Technical Note explains why the above arrangement wouldn't work from the structural point of view. The exact sizes of the ducts are subject to the details provided by tenants of Dominion House basement and ground floor.
26	The proposed treatment of the masonry walls and the floor appears to be as discussed at the most recent site meeting and is welcomed subject to detailed specifications/materials for their repair.	It is requested that the detailed specification is dealt with under a condition
27	The detailed design for the internal doors to replace the existing non-original/non-historic doors serving this space was discussed at the recent meeting and a possible approach agreed. Details to confirm this approach are awaited.	It is requested that the detailed design is dealt with under a condition

Dominion House and Johnson House

	COUNCIL COMMENTS / REQUESTS	**OUR RESPONSE**
28	You are proposing some improvement. While it is regretted this does not deal with all the ceilings/windows it would, at least represent some improvement and possibly a future refurbishment could continue this approach. A specification/methodology for the works to the windows is required to confirm the refurbishment/'refreshing' that is being proposed.	See LRW-A(31) drawings Any further justification could be conditioned
29	Where existing louvres and vents in window openings are no longer required (such as the	See LRW-A(31) drawings

	Princess Street basement window of the Dominion Building and on the Beaver Street elevation) the windows and any grills should be reinstated on a like-for-like basis - Drawings could be revised to confirm where such features exist and where they will be removed with windows and grilles returned to their original form	
30	All existing doors are confirmed / claimed as replicas. Drawing No. A(31)01 needs to be reviewed regarding door design.	Please see drawing A(31)01. Any more specific detail could be conditioned.
31	A new Beaver Street entrance is no longer proposed and the existing entrance would be "made good" - details required on what is meant by this.	There is no existing entrance here and nothing is therefore being made good.
32	It is assumed - but should be confirmed, that the proposed building services would replace rather than being in addition to the existing.	Old services are to be replaced with new.
33	As with the proposed retail use in Central House, sufficient provision is required for the potential future fume extraction/air handing needs for the proposed (and likely future) basement/ground floor uses. Such provision should include sufficient internal risers and any external plant located as a part of the proposed coordinated rooftop plant facility on Johnson House.	SACO intends to operate in the long term. A retail unit/A3/A5 is an appropriate use. The proposed kit is sufficiently considered to take account of these uses in future.
34	As with the Central Building, the confirmation that some future proofing has been considered is welcomed provided this would meet needs of any future type of occupier that can be reasonably anticipated and that the building owners/operators accept they may need to restrict their choice of possible future tenant.	As above
35	The plant location needs to remain as existing but can be screened - details required.	Light grey louvred screen proposed. Please refer to LRW drawing L(20)12C.