tinberg

design associates limited

PLANNING
ACK'D
REPLIED
RECD 10 JUN 2008
INIT RECD | DATE
M
M
M
EQIL ACTION

Planning Department
Manchester City Council
PO Box 463
Town Hall Extension
Manchester
M60 3NY

4th June 2008

S:\Job List\Bradley House\MCC\08-06-04 Planning 02 Additional Information.doc

Dear Sirs,

RE: Bradley House, 33 Dale Street, Manchester, M1 2HE
Proposed refurbishment of a 19th Century shipping warehouse into luxury office accommodation and retail outlets
Application No: 086601/FO/2008
Planning Application Additional Information

Further to your letter dated 19th May 2008 we have now completed the additional information required to validate the planning application and the various items are attached for your information.

To summarise, our response to the points raised is as follows;

Full Plans Application

1. Environmental Standards Statement – The original schedule of additional information requested an Environmental Standards Statement, in relation to the 'Code for Sustainable Homes'. Clearly this is a commercial development, and the refurbishment of a Grade II Listed Building and we await clarification from Emily Greaves as to what standards (if any) we are expected to comply with and what rating we are to achieve. In the meantime, and in the absence of further guidance, we have met with an Environmental Engineer to discuss the project, and following clarification of these details from MCC we can progress with a BREEAM report and Environmental Standards Statement (if required).

2. There is no external equipment proposed as part of the proposed redevelopment.

3. We have incorporated refuse storage details into our design and you will see this illustrated and annotated on drawings PP01 rev A, PP04 rev A and PP11. The refuse enclosure is to be located on the vacant site adjacent to the main building (also owned by the applicant), and will be accessed by the refuse collection company from Port Street. This provision is in line with advice from Jonathan Sadler, and guidelines provided by Westminster Council, and is based upon 2 no collections per week by a private commercial waste collection company. Although this provision is more than adequate based on guidelines, it allows flexibility to alter the proportion of bin requirements depending on the likely tenants of the building. For example, certain retail activities will generate greater waste than others, and professional commercial activities may well organise to have their paper waste shredded by secure shredding companies etc. Advice from a private collection company confirmed that they operated

collections 6 days a week for general waste and once a week for recyclable goods, which would fit with the proposed strategy.

4. Details of servicing and deliveries are shown on drawing PP12. You will note that the building is surrounded by roads on all sides, and all have double yellow lines. However, it would seem sensible for normal servicing and deliveries to take place from Newton Street. Newton Street is a 2 way street with 2 lanes in each direction, thus temporary parking for vehicles during a delivery will cause minimum disruption. However, we appreciate that Newton Street is a busy arterial route into the city centre, and as such would propose that all servicing and deliveries take place outside peak times, ie not during the hours of 0800 – 1000 and 1600 – 1800 Monday to Friday.

5. We have incorporated secure cycle storage for 6 bikes into our design and you will see this illustrated and annotated on drawings PP01 rev A, PP04 rev A and PP11. This has been calculated based upon BREEM recommendations of provision of 5% of likely building occupancy. (Occupancy calculated based on 1200m2 office space @ 10m2 /person).

6. We have already provided details of the proposed re-instatement of the pavement outside the Newton Street Entrance. As the project is a refurbishment, there should be very little disruption and re-instatement required to surrounding pavements. However, where disruption is unavoidable due to services etc, we would welcome guidance as to MCC's preferred material for re-instatement.

7. During our early discussions with representatives from Manchester City Council Planning and Building Control Departments, the entrance strategy was discussed at length. Although we are proposing to open up the Dale Street Entrance to make it more welcoming and visibly appealing from the city centre (Piccadilly), creating level access from this point is complex due to the structural implications, the loss of additional storage, service and sanitary facilities in the basement. Also, whilst the existing lift can be refurbished for able bodied passengers, the car size would be inadequate for ease by ambulant disabled and wheelchair bound users. Clearly the insertion of a larger lift at this point has massive structural implications to the existing structure and a loss of additional floor area.

   The Port Street entrance is to be used primarily as a fire escape, although building user access control will be provided to allow refuse and cycle store use. Again, the elevation above ground level would have serious structural implications to allow level access to be achieved. Even if level access could be provided into the building at this point, the separation of the lift from the stair would significantly impair the ease of access to the rest of the building for a disabled person.

   It was considered that the second main entrance on Newton Street would provide adequate and convenient level access to the building, and access to the main lift which is adequately sized to satisfy wheelchair disabled user requirements.

8. Crime Impact Statement – We have instructed Greater Manchester Police Architectural Liaison Unit to undertake the Crime Impact Statement. To date we have received part A of the report and incorporated the points raised into the proposals. We have sent copies of these drawings back to the Architectural Liaison Unit allowing them to complete part B of the report, which we will forward to MCC once we have received it. A copy of the Part A report is attached for your information.

9. We shall not be conducting a survey to find out if bats or barn owls are living in Bradley House because of the following reasons:
   - There are no pellets, droppings or stains from either bats or barn owls evident
   - The building is to cold to be used by hibernating bats
   - The surrounding area does not provide a reasonable feeding area for bats
   - The surrounding area does not provide a suitable foraging habitat for barn owls
   - The are no feathers to suggest barn owls are present
   - We believe that the above points adequately explain why a survey is not required, however, in the unlikely event of either bats or barn owls being found at any stage of construction works we shall immediately halt any works on site and a consultant will be contacted and MCC will be informed.

10. Although exact details of shop front signage will be dependant on which companies occupy the building, please find attached drawing PP13 which explains the signage strategy for the building.
11. The change of use was incorrectly entered on the planning application and as your letter correctly stated the change of use should read - From B2 (general industrial) to B1 (offices). We would be happy if you could amend the application forms to illustrate this requirement.

In line with your requirements please find attached copies of drawings;

- 4 copies of drawings EP06 – EP09, PP01, PP03 & PP04 all rev A, and PP07 – PP13.
- 4 copies of Part A of Crime Impact Statement

We trust that the attached information is sufficient for your purposes and the application can now be validated, but should you require anything further please don't hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,
Yours sincerely,

Jon Lingard
Design Director

(m) 07765 246 131