Kennedy Woods Architecture
Cable Street

19/05/17

List of amendments

Grey: comments from Council on initially submitted scheme
Green: How we have addressed this

1. Basement - internal face of external walls

· Please provide an explanation of the need for the proposed rendering/dry lining. We would advocate that the brickwork is cleaned in accordance with an appropriate heritage methodology, and the brickwork left exposed. Any underlying issues, ie. damp, need to be resolved. It should be confirmed that the proposal is not a tanked system requiring floor treatment, drainage and pump.

· If it is shown such treatment is required it should be minimised and avoid covering features, including, for example, glazed tiles and the timber shute.

After consulting with a specialist waterproofer, it is impossible to create a habitable space in the basement whilst keeping the bricks exposed. See attached correspondence from specialist for confirmation and a suggested compromise, essentially involving a free standing membrane which covers the bricks but does not damage the existing fabric. Drainage can either be via sump pump or connect to existing drainage. Heritage features will be avoided.

2. Basement floor

· Appropriate investigation is required to ascertain whether the original floor remains under the existing screed. Ideally any flagged floor would be restored and exposed to view.

After investigation of the two existing trial pits, it was found that there is no original flooring below the screed, screed has been laid directly onto hardcore ground. It is therefore it is proposed to cast a new slab with insulation below, and new screed floor finishing at current finished floor level.

· Accepted that the installation of a minimally raised floor may be required. As a compromise the ceiling should be restored to its original appearance with exposed structure retained on view, in order that the ceiling can be appreciated.

All ceilings to be retained and exposed throughout. Coated in clear intumescent varnish to provide fire protection. New raised floors to be timber to match existing in appearance and increased by exactly 1 step to avoid altering existing stair cases.

· The implications where a raised floor meets existing stairs, lifts and doors need to be understood.

Please see attached drawing set showing where the floor is to be raised by exactly 1 step so that stair cases can remain unaltered. New lift will be installed to match new levels. The steps have been located in order to preserve head heights through existing doorways, resulting in retaining as much of the existing fabric as possible.

3. Basement windows and pavement lights

· The reopening of basement window openings and restoration of the above features is highly welcomed in principle.

· A need to retain/repair any existing original/historic fabric and use this as a template for new like-for-like features where missing. The removal of any original/historic fabric needs to be justified on the basis of appropriate specialist advice.

Understood

· The comment in Paragraph 4.6 of the D&AS is not accepted.

Understood

· The design of the proposed secondary glazing needs to be revised to avoid intervention on the glazed brickwork.

Due to the need to tank the basement(installed to retain the glazed tiles), the secondary glazing can be fixed to timber battens, avoiding intervention on the glazed brickwork. See detail drawing 504.

· The proposed raking of the basement ceiling structure in the vicinity of the basement windows is accepted in principle as a typical feature. Unless based on the existing structure, the detailed design needs to be reconsidered so the structure meets the existing wall above the window head and without creating the currently proposed drop-down feature. It has been the case in other schemes that fire rated exposed beam and floor boarding in a intumescent coating has been acceptable for ceilings, due to the design and resistance in the above floor.

Detail revised to finish the panelling above the window head. Exposed timber structure to be coated in clear intumescent varnish

4. Existing basement chute

· This retention of this rare surviving feature is required and welcomed. The design/materials of the proposed new adjacent wall structure needs to be understood to ensure the continued visibility of this feature. It is not clear from drawing 110 Rev A as to how the chute and the bedroom wall would work/appear in reality.

Original drawings had conflicting information on drawings. What was previously labelled as timber chute was in fact a timber panelled enclosure. The flat has been re-laid out to avoid putting a new wall through this heritage detail, instead, making this a feature in the main space. The actual timber chute, now clearly labeled on the plans and exists at high level infant of the window coming down from the soffit, is also to be retained.

5. Internal face of external walls from the ground floor upwards

· With reference to Historic England guidance on the thermal insulation of historic buildings the proposal to panel-out such walls is unacceptable. We would advocate that the brickwork is cleaned in accordance with an appropriate heritage methodology, and the brickwork left exposed.

Drawings have been amended to show exposed brickwork throughout from ground floor upwards.

· A detailed specification/methodology for their appropriate treatment is required. The approach outlined in Paragraph 4.4 of the D&AS should not be accepted without first understanding the existing finishes and fittings to be removed and then - if/where removal is appropriate - how it would be achieved without damaging the underlying fabric. The Statement, for example, refers to cleaning off and removing fixtures and fittings - this is too general, and we will need specific methods and details.

A detailed specification for the treatment of the brickwork, internally and externally, has been prepared. See attached report from specialist.

6. Stairways

· Both the core stairways should be retained in full up to the top (third) floor rather than one being truncated - please see drawing 214 Rev. A.

Plans have been amended to show both staircases fully retained and extending to the 3rd floor

· The over-cladding of the existing stairs and landings is unacceptable. They should be left exposed with appropriate repair. A step/ramp up to the level of the new floor proposed elsewhere should not be within the landing spaces.

Both staircases are to be cleaned, repaired and left exposed. See attached plans 117 to 122 for locations of the steps up

· The redecoration of stairways to match the existing would be acceptable, please confirm proposed product and RAL colour(s) but an area of the existing should be retained as a feature and for future reference (possibly under a glazed panel).

Site investigations have shown many different paint layers over the life time of the building. The proposed strategy is to strip the finishes back to expose the structure to remain in keeping the strategy of the rest of the scheme. Sample tests will be carried out prior to works to ascertain best way to clean without damaging existing fabric.

· The proposed new stairways involve intervention.They would be acceptable in principle provided they do not require the loss of existing fabric other than floor boards and subject to their detailed design.

See detailed drawing 507 for stair design.

7. Floors and ceilings

· The usual approach is required:

(i) To retain and restore the original/historic floor structure (including floor boards and plaster ceilings) removing non-original/non-historic ceilings.

(ii) No further change to the ceiling except possibly for an appropriate intumescent coating. The under-drawing/covering of the ceilings/underside of floorboards would be unacceptable.

(iii) The installation, as proposed, of a raised floor to accommodate fire protection, acoustic measures and building services.

· The junction of any raised floor with existing retained features (walls, doorways, lift doors and so on) needs to be understood.

Existing timber ceiling joists and floorboards cleaned and coated in intumescent varnish. Existing steel work cleaned and painted in intumescent paint to match original windows. Raised floor to be new floorboards to match existing in style. Please see attached drawing set showing where the floor is to be raised by exactly 1 step so that stair cases can remain unaltered. New lift will be installed to match new levels. The steps have been located in order to preserve head heights through existing doorways, resulting in retaining as much of the existing fabric as possible. See drawing 506 for various detail junction details

8. Internal walls, structure, fixtures and fittings

· The careful removal of non-original/non-historic walls is not an issue subject to the appropriate repair of the retained structure.

· The scheme should be evolved to retain original/historic walls (including timber/glazed screens) in situ. Please identify and justify screens to be retained and to be removed.

Non-original walls to be carefully removed, avoiding damage to existing original structure. Existing internal walls cleaned, repaired and retained where suitable. See attached plans for details.

· The existing structure (including metal columns) should be retained exposed to view and new walls located to enable this to be achieved. As shown in drawing 111 Rev. A,

currently it is proposed to enclose columns/downstand beams within walls. Even if unoriginal, walls should be located to be off-set from columns/downstand beams. As a compromise, party walls could be set behind columns/downstand beams.

All new walls have been offset to expose original steel columns as internal features. See attached plans for details. The new structure required to stabilise the building is to remain concealed within the new partition walls as it is a supporting element, in order to enable the layouts to work and not to detract from the original structure.

· Any existing non-original/non-historic boxing-in should be removed unless there is a heritage justification to retain. New boxing-in or concealing of features should be avoided unless there is an appropriate justification.

Unoriginal boxing in of columns on ground floor to be removed to expose original structure. All original structure to be exposed throughout.

· Proposed finishes/colours need to be understood particularly to retained structure.

All brickwork from ground to first to be exposed. All timber ceiling structure coated in clear intumescent varnish. All steels painted in dark grey intumescent paint to match existing windows. New floor boards to match existing in style, colour and finish.

· The removal of original/historic features should be avoided. They should be retained in situ (with appropriate restoration) unless there is a heritage justification for relocation with restoration.

Removal of original features has been reduced to the absolute minimum. See attached plans for details.

· The retention of the existing walls of the toilet accommodation is welcome. The loss of internal partitions is accepted to enable their re-use as bathrooms. The opportunity should be taken to retain re-use sanitary ware/signage in situ or elsewhere in the proposal. Regarding the lift, please confirm as to what is to be removed and retained? If to be retained, please confirm where?

All original sanitary ware will be carefully inspected as to whether the fitting can be retained before removal by a qualified person and will be integrated into the scheme, either in-situ or elsewhere, if it is found to be serviceable.

Specialist lift manufacturer has stated that the existing lift is beyond repair and must be replaced with new in order to function. A new lift should be quieter in operation to avoid disturbance to residents, will require less maintenance and can be installed with appropriate security measures.

Drawing 111 Rev. A states "reinstate post in line with original" - please confirm as to why it is to be moved?

Error in drawing note. Post is to to be retained in place.

9. Windows including secondary glazing from the ground floor upwards

· A limited number of the original windows are understood to have been replaced in the past to match the existing except designed to fully pivot and being in double glazing. This causes inconsistency across the building (including when open) and is driving an inappropriate response to the installation of secondary glazing. These windows should be replaced to match other windows. A consistent approach, which meets acoustic requirements is necessary.

Replacement tilt-and turn windows have been identified and are to be replaced with like-for-like windows to match originals.

· The need to avoid the currently proposed panelling-out of the internal face of external walls necessitates a reconsideration of the detailed design of the proposed secondary glazing. Sliding secondary glazing may be appropriate.

Secondary glazing detail has been revised with the now exposed brickwork. See detail drawing 505.

· The secondary glazing needs to be reconsidered to achieve minimal framing and sub-division. This suggests a metal framed sliding solution rather than a timber side-hung solution. Any sub-division should correspond to the sub-division in the existing external windows. The impact on the external appearance of the building should be further minimised by a dark grey colour applied to the outward facing side of the secondary glazing frame and avoiding tinted glass.

We have redesigned the windows with high-end steel window supplier Secco System who specialise in high end, slim profile heritage projects. As the secondary glazing is required to meet acoustic and thermal requirements, a steel window is the best solution to get the slimmest profiles possible. Due to the size of the structural opening, a subdivision is required however this has been designed to line through with existing mullions. See detail drawing 505 for revised design. See also attached email and product brochures from supplier.

· External grills on the ground floor windows are inappropriate.

Toughened/laminated glass rather than bars/grilles are to be used where appropriate.

10. Mezzanine areas

· Appropriately located and sized mezzanine areas may be acceptable. We would query the current approach, as there may historically have been limited deck areas associated with the gable taking-in doors but there is no evidence that these deck areas were enclosed or so substantial that the sense of space from one end of the building to the other could not be appreciated.

Mezzanine floor plan has been revised to allow the full span of the building end to end to be appreciated, whilst maintaining the functionality of the wcs. See drawing 115 "Mezzanine plan" for details

· The cross section drawings appear to show (parts of) the mezzanines would be open to the larger living space and borrow light from this space. Is this correct?

This is correct. The "bedroom" spaces of the mezzanines are open to the main space, the wc's being walled off to remain practical.

11. Rooflights & roof

· The two proposed large roof lights are inappropriate. Whether or not they are seen from street level is not the guiding principle in terms of minimising the impact on heritage significance.

We accept this point.

· Additional roof lights that better correspond to the existing may be appropriate depending on the location and layout of the proposed mezzanines.

Additional roof lights to bring light into wc and dressing area have been amended to line through with the existent roof lights, and to match in size, style and finish.

· Please specifically confirm as to whether it is proposed to insulate the roof?

Roof installed previously as part of the scheme is insulated, we are not proposing further changes.

12. Floorspace around the lift

· Albeit limited in scale and possible use, the area on each floor between the lift shaft and adjacent Chadderton Street window should form part of, and be open to, the adjacent flat so as to ensure these spaces can be maintained and given some sort of positive use.

Space between lift and wall has been opened up on all floors. Although limited in size, these spaces can be maintained and given positive use, for example open display shelving.

13. Possible cycle store/refuse store on the internal ground floor

· This is not a positive use of this prominent corner floorspace and should be avoided by ensuring the proposed facilities in the basement are adequate in size to meet the needs of all the apartments.

This space has been removed and absorbed into the ground floor flat. The new basement layout is sufficient to provide adequate refuse and bike parking space for the whole building.

14. Building Services

· Some detail is given and suggestive of an acceptable approach - accommodating new services within the new walls and new floor void.It should be confirmed that:

(i) No services would be applied to the existing walls.

(ii) Any services required at ceiling level such as smoke detectors would implemented in a sensitive manner to an agreed detail.

We can confirm that no services including telecoms wires and sockets will be applied to existing walls, only new walls.

Any services at ceiling level will be implemented in a sensitive manner and to an agreed detail.

· Information is required proposed on how services would be taken vertically through the building.

Services will be taken vertically through the building via 2 small risers, one behind the lift where usability of the space is minimal, and one adjacent to the main stair core. These risers will be designed to be as small as is feasible to minimise loss of existing fabric. Smaller cabling etc can travel through the new walls and floor voids.

· Any external manifestation of internal services needs to be understood. This would include soil pipes and other vents (such as from bathrooms/kitchens).

All soil pipes and vents required will be designed to travel through risers internally and terminate at roof level. New drainage to connect into existing system where possible to avoid new openings at roof level. No new openings in the existing facade are to be made.

Please see attached air quality assessment which states a mechanical ventilation system is mandatory for the future residents health, and extracts can be placed either through the facade or the roof. We have proposed the option which, we are sure you will agree, would have the least impact on this heritage asset.

15. External works

· Windows, window grilles, roof lights have been considered above.

· The proposed entrance doors are understood to be replacing non-original/non-historic doors. The materials and finishes needs to be considered. Drawings contain contradictory information - one stating timber another finish metal finish - former preferred. Either well researched replacement as original or well designed contemporary. Outward opening doors are an issue. A revised Application site edged in red will be required if the full extent of the doors when open is not currently within the Application site edged in red.

See drawing 503 for revised entrance door design, to be timber. Both of the entrance doors have been amended to swing inwards. See Ground floor plan drawing 111 Rev B.

· The re-opening/re-use of the access to the lift and fitting of industrial concertina doors may be appropriate from a heritage stance but this feature may raise issues in terms of building security/personal security.

Lift is not to open out to the street, to remain bricked up as existing. No change proposed externally.

· The proposal to remove/replace existing timber structural elements should be reconsidered. Any continued proposal to remove them needs to be justified in heritage terms including details of the proposed replacement.

All existing timber structural elements are to be retained.

· Full details/methodology for works are required as regards the proposed treatment/works to the existing chimney.

See attached proposed brick treatment methodology report from specialist.

· General repairs are welcomed in principle. This could, for example, include external redecoration, repointing, repair of brickwork and stone work, gentle elevation cleaning, and so on. The detailed specification/methodology needs to be agreed with the Planning Service before any are undertaken.

Please see attached proposed brick treatment methodology report from specialist.

· No masonry - including stone or concrete cills - should be painted unless this treatment can be appropriately justified.

All cills to be carefully cleaned, not painted.

Please confirm the appearance of the proposed patress plates.

See drawing 210. All new proposed patress plates are to be heritage standard. Centrally they are to be custom cast iron to match existing. On the periphery they are to be 8" Heritage machined mild steel circular patress plates from Redgwick who specialise in heritage patress plates.

16. Specialist contractors

· All works should be undertaken by appropriate conservation-accredited, contractors with a proven track record of dealing with listed buildings of this type.

Understood. All specialists who we have approached this far have experience with sensitive heritage projects and will continue to consider this a necessity when engaging people to carry out work.

17. Heritage Statement (HS) and Design & Access Statement (UD&AS)

The following general comments are noted:

(a) The HS provides a good assessment of heritage significance but is of limited value in terms of fully explaining/justifying the proposal in terms of the impact on heritage significance including the cumulative impact.

(b) There is an over-reliance in the HS on the approach of recording features as a means of justifying their removal, alteration or concealment. This is not a conservation-led approach as should be applied to the historic built environment (as outlined briefly in Appendix A) and is only used in particular circumstances. This emphasis on recording reflects an archaeology-led approach (most likely as the author is following guidance from the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists) and is not appropriate in this instance.

(c) Both the HS and D&AS require careful review as they highlight more proposed change to the listed building than is apparent from the drawings alone.

(d) The HS identifies instances where the existence of features is possible but uncertain. A scheme of investigation - and possibly a limited agreed 'soft-strip' - could be agreed with the Planning Service to clarify the situation and enable the proposal to be evolved and move forward with greater certainty.

(e) The submitted photographs are really useful but their locations should be identified, for example, on the submitted "existing" plans.

Understood. We hope you agree the scheme has been carefully thought through in great detail and significantly improved, as outlined in this document, to be in line with a more conservation-led approach.

18. Initial conclusions including regard to harm, legislation, policy and guidance
The proposal has considerable merit in principle and in terms of the general approach being taken. There are, however, a number of elements which are unacceptable in terms of the harm they would cause - or would potentially cause - to the heritage significance of the building. As it stands cumulative impact would also be harmful. This harm is not justified in terms of the requirements of the NPPF.

This note highlights both instances of inappropriate works and where there is a lack of information to reach a view. However, it is believed that an appropriate reconsideration of the scheme and submission of additional information should be able to address the points raised to the point at which the scheme could meet statutory requirements, accord with national and local policy (including where any residual harm can be seen to meet the NPPF tests) and follow guidance including regarding best practice.
We believe the amended plans of the reconsidered scheme and additional attached information along this summary of changes satisfactorily addresses these concerns.

Layout:
1. The basement, ground floor and lift (drawings 110 Rev. A and 111 Rev. A) need to be revisited/reconfigured in order to provide secure and level pedestrian access in and out of the building, provision for postal deliveries, and accessible, secure and cleanly waste management and cycle storage.
The basement and ground floor layouts have been amended to address concerns. In summary, all waste and cycle storage is now contained in one location at basement level, accessed by lift. New lift now opens up into a secured lobby at ground level with level access from the street. Secure post boxes, that can accessed internally by residents, are to be provided within the secure lobby. Please see drawings 110 Rev B and 111 Rev B for details.
2. We and GMP Design for Security advise that, in the interests of security, the lift cannot open onto Addington Street. It is accordingly recommended that in terms of access, the lift is revisited, and level access proposed through the doorways, perhaps enabled through an internal ramp/gradient?
We have re-arranged the lift so that it no longer opens out on to the street. Ramped access was considered, however it was calculated that, due to the rise in floor level and subsequently length of ramp, a ramped solution would result in a disproportionally large amount of original fabric to be lost.

3. A secure post/entrance lobby really needs to be included in the proposed ground floor plan.
Secure lobby with post boxes has been incorporated. See drawing 111 Rev B.
4. Drawing 110 Rev. A (basement) shows a plant and bike store in the basement without lift access, and a waste management area and bike store in the basement with lift access. It is unclear as to how the cycle store would work without lift access. It is queried as to how it would be ensured that odour and any waste residues in the waste store and lift will be managed? As discussed above, there is unused space adjacent to the lift on all floors that should be incorporated and utilised.
Drawing 110 Basement plan has been revised to show one space with combined waste and cycle store to serve the whole building, with access to lift. A rigorous

cleaning schedule will be put in place before occupancy to ensure control of odours/residue.

5. Drawing 111 Rev. A (ground floor) shows a possible secondary bike/waste store. This floorplan needs to be reconsidered with the basement floorplan to provide secure and level pedestrian access in and out of the building, provision for postal deliveries, and accessible, secure and cleanly waste management and cycle storage. The revised plan needs to be exact.

See comments above. All points addressed in revised plans.

Security:

I will forward the responses from GMP Design for Security now, and I would ask that you respond to the points raised, together with those in parts 3.3 and 4 of the Crime Impact Statement (CIS) you submitted. If you are to propose the measures, including, for example, lighting, door security, and CCTV, we will need full locational and product/appearance details in order to assess the impacts of the proposed measures upon the significance of the listed building. As discussed, we do not advocate bars or obscure glazing to windows, due to the impact on the heritage asset, as discussed above, and toughened glass rather than bars/grilles should be used. Please provide full details of proposed ground and basement window and glazing bar profiles including toughened glass, as applicable.

Security bars are not proposed. We will use toughened glass/clear laminated class on basement and ground floor windows.

Waste and recycling:

1. Two waste strategies have been submitted. Please submit one strategy, including a combination of the two, with some extra bins (due to the three 3 bed apartments needing more bin capacity). According to our calculations the following provision is needed: General - 1380l (1 x 1100 and 2 x 240), Pulpable (blue) - 1 x 1100, Mixed (brown) - 1 x 1100 and green - 9 x 5l caddies (with a 240l bin). Please show each proposed individual bin to scale within the bin store(s). http://www.manchester.gov.uk/downloads/download/6048/waste_management_strategy,

A single waste strategy is proposed. Full provision for all flats is provided at basement level.

2. The Council would not enter a building to find the bins on collection day, therefore, we need to understand as to how the bins will be managed and brought to and from the kerbside? Please also confirm on a location plan as to where each bin will be collected from, ensuring the pavement is not obstructed. Highway Services recommend that waste be collected from Chadderton Street, as the less trafficked route. (I will now forward the full Highway Services comments for information and response, as applicable).

It is proposed that a private waste collector be commissioned, who will move the bins via the lift from basement level to Chadderton Street for collection, and then return the bins to basement level.

Acoustics:

Mitigation measures are required to the windows to ensure that the internal noise levels are achieved (main noise is traffic noise). You have recommended secondary glazing, in combination with trickle vents or mechanical ventilation (so windows do not need to be opened). We need full details of the proposed mitigation measures, including impact on the heritage significance. It may be that trickle vents will be inappropriate. The scheme

will need to meet our guidance - http://www.manchester.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/19841/environmental_and_public_protection_information_for_developers_gd03
We are proposing secondary glazing, along with mechanical ventilation. The windows specified perform extremely well in terms of noise mitigation(up to 43dB RW) and have been specced with this in mind. See attached documentation for details on windows and air quality assessment for mechanical extraction.

Air Quality Management:
As you are proposing to introduce new residential accommodation in the Air Quality Management Area, we will need you to submit an air quality assessment (especially with the recommendations for alternative ventilation as a clean air supply will need to be guaranteed), to make sure the occupants are not being exposed to poor air quality.
Please find attached air quality assessment.

Strategic Development:
Strategic Development support the scheme within the context of the New Cross Neighbourhood Development Framework and Masterplan. It is considered that the scheme needs to contribute to improve the setting of the building and delivery of public realm improvements, which could include contributions to implementation of on-street parking, improvements to the highway and pedestrian crossing facilities etc.... I am aware that you will have abnormal costs associated with delivering this scheme, and it is not proposed to impose additional costs, which are not viable. We propose that a condition of approval would be to require the renewal of pavements surrounding the building.
Noted

Panel comments:
The Manchester Conservation Areas and Historic Buildings Panel comments are reported as follows:
The Panel welcomed the proposals which should bring this vulnerable building back into use and were pleased that the building was being retained and preserved.
The Panel observed that the building was in a very poor structural condition and needed a conservation engineer to look very carefully at how the structural problems should be dealt with to avoid any major loss.
The Panel welcomed the open plan nature of one of the floors which gave a good feeling for the former warehouse use.
The Panel noted the very thin existing glazing bars on the original windows and also that the proposed had very crude and thick glazing bars. The Panel asked for the existing thin sections to be retained and the use of secondary glazing if necessary.
The Panel commented that the lift opening out into the street is not good.
The Panel felt that the design of the proposed security bars is inappropriate and too delicate.
The Panel questioned the size of the large roof lights which looked overly large on plan.
The Panel also commented that the ceiling profile seemed to affect the ability to open the windows.
All points noted and, where actionable, have been dealt with above. The last point about ceilings and windows I believe to be a representation issue in the drawings and can confirm that no ceilings will be blocking the ability to open windows.

I hope that this email is of assistance. I appreciate that the email raises many issues. If you would like to meet John and I, and anyone else, please contact me with availability,

and I will arrange a meeting. We look forward to receiving amended plans and details via email.
A decision is due by 4th April, and clearly we cannot recommend approval by 4th April, given the changes and info required, together with a re-consultation period. I would ask that you accordingly agree, in writing via email before 4th April, to an extension of time on the decision date to an appropriate future date.