

Emily Booth

From: Paul Mason
Sent: 07 October 2024 14:14
To: Emily Booth
Subject: 58 Richmond Street App. No. 140957/LO/2024

140957/LO/2024

Listed Building Consent for remedial work of the existing concrete structure and a 5 storey side extension to accommodate 5 residential dwelling houses (Use 3Ca) on the ground and upper floors and ancillary facilities within the basement.

58 Richmond Street Manchester M1 3WB

Hi Emily, comments below - I would suggest you take Jen through the design of this as it pre-dates her involvement and I'm also not sure how detailed I got involved in the first scheme, hence a more detailed assessment especially on the LB. I think we need more details generally on both the repairs /alts to the LB and the new build, which maybe weren't as fully scrutinised last time.

The design has changed from what I recall from the original and i'm aware that they want to make changes through the discharge of conditions, to some detailing and the brick choice which I don't think we were convinced about and were questioning and eventually I think the apps eventually ran out of time.

It would also be worth meeting the architects on site to have another look around the building to discuss the proposals and the repairs. I'll return on 16th so you could arrange for then, preferably PM or 11.30 am if that's preferred, or maybe you would like to discuss with Jen before arranging.

The listed building is a very early form of this type of construction and as such needs very specialist input from a heritage specialist architect and structural engineer with particular experience of this type of early concrete structure. This will ensure that the proposed repairs are carefully considered and appropriate to the specific nature of this construction and do not cause harm to historic fabric. We need to ensure that the repairs follow Historic England's guidance of the repair of historic concrete structures and that strengthening and use of epoxy is suitable from a heritage perspective.

A lot of the information is out of date and perhaps needs updating. Reports including the Sika specification is from March 2017 and over 7 years old as is the Structural Engineers report and there may now be further works required to repair the structure. We would require a final detailed updated survey, schedule and specification.

Input from a heritage engineer / conservation architect is advised to ensure works are appropriate and heritage led. No specifics appear to be mentioned in the engineers report over the type of concrete construction and its significance and the approach to the repair techniques proposed.

Heritage statement extract:

It is likely that the method of construction adhered to for No 58 Richmond Street was one of the various patented reinforced concrete systems, of which Hennebique's was the most commonly adopted in Britain in the early 20th century. François Hennebique first patented shear reinforcement to concrete beams in Britain in 1892, and had built an estimated 100 reinforced-concrete framed buildings in England by 1908. Only around 25 per cent of early concrete-framed buildings in England are thought also to have had concrete walling in preference to infill or an

external skin of other materials. A comparable example of a reinforced-concrete building in Manchester, however, is provided by a warehouse on Dyche Street, which was also built in 1911 on the Coignet system. This building still survives, but has brick infill.

We need to query if the beams can be repaired without using additional steel strengthening? Carbon fibre strengthening is suggested by Sika as an alternative and this may be more desirable aesthetically and we'll need to explore this?

The engineers specification states that chemical cleaning may be needed to remove water stains. We'll need to know the specification and what the impact of a chemical wash may have on the fabric? We'll need to see samples.

Also water blasting techniques have been suggested and i'd query if this will introduce more moisture and cause further corrosion. Also is it the intention to remove internal paint finishes - will the concrete be cleaned? Was the concrete painted or a naturally finish surface, either way we need to know to establish the correct approach. If cleaning is proposed we'll need to agree a methodology, products and then a small sample clean.

There needs to be a render analysis to ensure any new render matches the original specification. We also need an analysis of the painted finish to establish if was it originally painted or a naturally finished and if painted what was the original colour.

We'll need to see a detailed repair specification for the windows of the LB. We'll also need to look in detail at the rear windows and new window specification. We'll need a paint analysis of the original windows to ensure there is evidence of this as both a record and to inform the colour choice. Also the plans show the rear windows to be restored but the materials schedule shows them as being replaced. If they are original or significant then they need to be retained.

Any proposed new secondary glazing should follow the pattern of the existing glazing bars - we'll need to see full details of the proposed including their position in the reveals to ensure they have slim frames and align with the originals.

Need to look at material for rear roof? What is existing? The proposed should match the original.

We will need method statements for the approach to works from a specialist heritage contractor with experience of this type of work and on heritage buildings and samples of each item repair. This could be conditioned when a specialist contractor is appointed.

We'll also need examples of where products have been used as the links in the products in the Sika document do not work.

Internal works drawings show Option A and Option B type treatments to deal with either the ceiling or the floor. Option B is to deal with from above and proposes a more exposed concrete which will ensure the character of the interior is more preserved, with acoustic flooring above. Option A will cover the concrete and be more harmful. There needs to be clarity on which Option is being proposed as A is too harmful. Also need to look at the proposed lining works internally and the justification for this work.

The heritage statement extract below states:

A significant feature of the building is its reinforced concrete construction, which comprises a reinforced concrete frame of columns and beams, with cast floor slabs and roof. The wall panels to the front and rear façades are also of concrete, tied to the structural frame with steel reinforcement. The two side walls consist of brick infill panels which, although not load-bearing,

act to stiffen the frame. The grid of concrete beams is visible throughout the interior of the building, with some beams exhibiting shuttering marks, particularly in the basement. Interestingly, one of the beams in the basement is chamfered, mimicking a timber beam (Plate 8). Localised spalling of the concrete on some of the beams has exposed corroded reinforcing bars.

It is therefore important to expose these elements as much as possible.

There doesn't appear to be any MEP drawings showing electrics, servicing etc and how it will appear.

We'll need details of new staircases.

The sections at roof level do not show the proposed window surround.

As the design has been modified from the original submission we should ask for detailed bay studies of brick detailing, window surrounds and window frames as its difficult to appreciate on the scale of the drawings submitted and the detailing could make or break the design.

We will need to see upto date CGI's using the proposed different brick and more details of the facade design as we need to be convinced that this is going to be a high quality addition to the listed building and the streetscene. The current CGI's do not currently demonstrate this to be a high quality modern design that is carefully detailed.

Brick detailing to the gable seems better but adding the 1911 date to the top of the gable end could be confusing as it is on the modern element. It would be better to remove the date completely.

Kind regards,

Paul Mason
Heritage & Urban Design Manager
Planning, Building Control & Licensing,
Growth & Development Directorate,
Manchester City Council

email: paul.mason@manchester.gov.uk
tel: 0161 234 4585

Upcoming leave from 4pm on 4th October returning on 16th October.

Postal address: Planning Service, Manchester City Council, PO Box 532, Town Hall Extension, 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 sender, or dpo@manchester.gov.uk, and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.

The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
