---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: White, Maria (UK - Leeds) <mariwhite@deloitte.co.uk>
Date: 3 January 2018 at 13:30
Subject: RE: Application ref: CDN/17/0591 - Royal Exchange - Discharge of condition 3 app. 116165/LO/2017
To: Paul Mason <p.mason@manchester.gov.uk>
Cc: Emily Booth <e.booth@manchester.gov.uk>, "Grant, Eve (UK - Manchester)" <evgrant@deloitte.co.uk>

Hi Paul,

I hope you had a good Christmas and New Year.

I would be grateful if you could review the information attached and below in relation to the additional information requested following the meeting on site on 7 December.

The architect has produced a drawing (please see attached, ref: SK622) to show the extent of the additional supporting structure required for the curved frame option discussed on site. The drawing refers to "Window detail as subcontractor detail", this is shown on the previously submitted drawing ref: SK621, also attached.

The architect also provided the following commentary:

"In principle I imagine it would require one horizontal steel work to fix back to the slab. Fixings would be through the horizontal beam below the concrete slab (please see the attached photograph showing the underside of the slab). The horizontal beams in between clay pots are the only elements to fix to. These run at something like 400mm centres. From this horizontal beam would be approximately three vertical columns, then a further horizontal steel fixed into the base of the window. Essentially creating a rectangle of steel work below the window.

The skirting, floor finishes and raised access flooring would require striping back to fit this. The raised access floor pedestals will then require re-positioning around the new steel work. The steel structure then requires either MDF boarding or 70mm plasterboard frame to conceal (unless ADT can propose a more suitable way in which British gypsum frame is not required). The skirting and floor finishes then require replacing."

Further considerations include:

· There is a potential issue with condensation between the units due to the differing thermal properties compared to the aluminium.

· The proposed opening pivot system of the steel frames will make maintenance increasingly difficult compared to the proposed lift out system.

· The budget cost for the aluminium curved option is circa £440k (see request summary attached for a breakdown of costs) which is nearly the double the value of the original proposal put forward.

· This solution has not had any input to date from a structural engineer into the design/extent of the steels required to support the curved frames, hence we still need to determine whether the slab (photo attached) could physically take the weight of the windows (which are 400kg each).

It is clear there are a number of difficulties in terms of feasibility and cost with the curved solution - a solution which we feel would ultimately result in a more significant impact to the internal building fabric both visually and physically (given that the flooring and skirting would need to be altered for this solution).

On this basis, the rectangular secondary glazing solution submitted with the condition discharge application is considered by the design team to be the best solution in both heritage and functional terms for the introduction of secondary glazing at the first floor.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Kind regards,

Maria

Maria White

Planner | FA - Real Estate | Deloitte LLP

1 City Square, Leeds, LS1 2AL

D: +44 113 292 1675 | M: +44 788 000 4576

mariwhite@deloitte.co.uk | www.deloitte.co.uk

cid:image001.png@01D2818F.60283580cid:image002.png@01D2818F.60283580
cid:image003.png@01D2818F.60283580