

23 May 2024

Application Reference: 139763/FO/2024

Proposal: 117-119 Portland Street

“External alterations comprising alternations to loading bay, main entrance on Portland Street, and refurbishment and inclusion of external louvres associated with the mechanical and electrical system associated with refurbishment of existing offices, change of use of part of the lower ground floor to a gym (Use Class E(d)) and installation of a substation and plant within rear.”

Schedule of Responses

Consultee	Consultee Response / Comments (where actions required)	Project Team Input / Response	Status
MCC Planning	“CYCLE PARKING: In line with MCC recommendations, secure and sheltered cycle parking provision should be made, within the curtilage of the site, for the accommodation of staff/ visitor cycles. It is requested that information on the proposed cycle parking numbers and location are provided. REFUSE AND SERVICING: It is requested that details on the proposed refuse and delivery arrangements are provided. CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT: The applicant is advised that any requirements for licensing, hoarding / scaffolding and any associated temporary traffic management arrangements will need discussion and agreement with the council's Highways	Cycle Parking The applicant would like to note that the application does not include cycle parking provision because there is no existing cycle parking on the site. Conscious the application includes mostly refurbishment works, cycle parking provision would not be considered due to space constraints. To provide maximum level of comfort, the applicant would like to note that there are 10no. cycle parking at 127 Portland Street and 60no. at St James (all Bruntwood-owned building) which 113-119 Portland Street (including the site) currently has access to, and this arrangement is proposed to be continued.	In progress

Deloitte LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC303675 and its registered office at 1 New Street Square, London, EC4A 3HQ, United Kingdom.

Deloitte LLP is the United Kingdom affiliate of Deloitte NSE LLP, a member firm of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee (“DTTL”). DTTL and each of its member firms are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL and Deloitte NSE LLP do not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about to learn more about our global network of member firms. Real Estate Services regulated by RICS.

© 2024 Deloitte LLP. All rights reserved.

Consultee	Consultee Response / Comments (where actions required)	Project Team Input / Response	Status
	Applications and Network Resilience teams via Contact Manchester (Tel. 0161 234 5004). Follow-up comment 160524 Noted on the cycle parking but whilst this is not a change of use it is a rebranding of the space and it would be unusual for there not to be some level of on site cycle parking for this type of office offer. Surely some space could be found in the basement / ground floor noting that showers are being provided. What evidence is there of sufficient capacity within the other building that you mention.	Refuse and Servicing The applicant would like to note that details were not provided with the application as the application includes mostly refurbishment works and that the pre-existing refuse and servicing arrangement will remain unchanged, refuse and servicing will continue to be conducted in a dedicated internal area adjacent to Dickinson Street. Construction Management The applicant acknowledge the comment and would like to note that the scaffolding proposed for the scheme is all to be installed on private land and will not trigger any permitting requirement from Manchester City Council. Follow Up Comment Response There are several on road Sheffield stands along Portland Street, the closest of which are 6 stands sitting on the junction of Portland and Oxford Streets, providing space for 12 bicycles. There are 10 bicycle spaces for each of the four Bruntwood cluster buildings, plus 20 bikes allocated at St James (60 in total). This was sufficient for previous occupier and their pre-covid occupancy which is similar to proposed occupancy in the building. There is no immediate access into the building due to level change across the site, and lifts are not appropriate for bikes. The small room created in the loading bay area as part of the fire escape strategy is not big enough for many bicycles to be stored. All other areas are required for use per the submitted floorplans.	
EHO	General from MCC Note that there is no change of use to the offices so can you just flag that up in the response accordingly - i.e no verification report will be required. But the gym and noise receptors in terms of plant etc need to be taken into account.	Noted.	

Consultee	Consultee Response / Comments (where actions required)	Project Team Input / Response	Status
	Hours of Gym Hours of gym to be agreed. Demolition / construction management plan *The applicant should refer to our noise from building sites webpage for further information/guidance and also IAQM/EPUK Construction Guidance on controlling emissions. [Currently January 2024, Version 2.2] ** (For city centre major developments) In addition to the IAQM guidance, MCC recommends that Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) used on the site of any major development within Manchester city centre for the purpose of construction or demolition works should meet Stage IV of EU directive 97/68/EC, and Stage IIIA as a minimum. Noise (Gym/Office) The submitted acoustic report (Sol Acoustics, 27 March 2024), is sufficient for the assessment of noise/limits for the office part of the development. An addendum report will be required as the detailed design is confirmed. For the gym use a more detailed noise assessment is required which takes into account the ProPG: Gym Acoustics Guidance. The detailed design and mitigation measures also need to be confirmed too before works commence on the gym construction. The proposed changes to the loading bay have not been included in the acoustic report, there are noise sensitive receptors on Harter Street and they may be impacted by any changes to the use/location of the loading bay.	Applicant requests hours: 6am – 8pm, Mon – Fri, in line with office users likely requirements No response required – applicant notes. SOL to provide any response (if required), otherwise, Applicant will accept an appropriately worded pre-occupation condition. Applicant requests further detail on level of detail required. If specific reference to ProPG GAG document is included and the prescribed noise limits to be achieved are presented equivalent G curves in place of the current NR curves, would this be sufficient? The proposed changes to the loading bay located along Dickinson Street are for replacement of roller shutter door with conventional façade treatment and location is significant distance and well screened from residential properties along Harter Street. No assessment/comment is considered necessary.	

Consultee	Consultee Response / Comments (where actions required)	Project Team Input / Response	Status
	Noise (Plant/Equipment) The submitted acoustic report (Sol Acoustics, 27 March 2024) has not included background noise monitoring near the noise sensitive receptors on Harter Street. These are the nearest receptors to the proposed external plant/substation and they have not been accounted for in the acoustic report. An updated report is required. The noise assessment also needs to include any noise breakout from the proposed external louvres. An addendum report will be required once the specifications for the external plant are known to show that the proposed limits will be achieved (with or without noise mitigation measures).	Noise levels within the courtyard and Linley House car park are affected by existing building services plant, as such noise levels from the surrogate position on Dickinson Street, where a “true” background noise level can be measured have been adopted. Limits set within report applies to louvres as they do the plant; applicant will accept an appropriately worded condition, that avoids pre-commencement wording and is specific to prior to installation of plant.	
Design	Response requested by 23rd May 2024. The proposals on the whole are acceptable but there a couple of issues to be resolved and additional details required which are set out below:		
	1. The grilles to the gable will cause harm but the gable end is more functional and the grilles appear as a considered design intervention. The grilles need to be set further back into the brick to form a brick reveal. A pressed mesh will not have the substance and quality needed. The materials and manufacture needs to replicate that of fabricated metal sections rather than pressed plate to give it more substance to match the existing metal works around the building. The finish should also match the existing metalwork. 2. The new entrance to the archway is acceptable but we'll need to see more detail in the sections and a detailed design and samples of the proposed material.	With regards to the grilles being set back, further recession into the building façade is not feasible as it creates issues such as providing an area for birds to nest, and a cill for water to collect; both of which detract from the proposals. Proposed metal sections are already fabricated metal sections as per drawings – powder coated matte black to match the black metal work elsewhere on the building. Applicant can accept an appropriately worded condition.	

Consultee	Consultee Response / Comments (where actions required)	Project Team Input / Response	Status
	3. Can we please confirm the finishes of the main entrance on Portland Street and how this ties in with the existing / proposed finishes. 4. The scaffolding drawing doesn't show the principle elevations and where fixings are in relation to existing masonry. Fixings should avoid decorative features and be made good when the scaffolding is removed. We'll need to see a sample repair. 5. There doesn't seem to be any fit out drawings / elevations of areas such as the reception or the main office spaces. Key areas like the reception / internal entrance area should be provided. 6. The proposed underdrawing of the ceiling with fireproofing is necessary but harmful as it will conceal the metal fireproofing which is of heritage significance. The new ceiling will also impact on the relationship between the ceiling and existing beams due to the lowering. In pre-app meetings we discussed carefully removing some elements of the metal ceiling and reusing it in certain location for it to be on show. We need to discuss further the exact location of any reused elements including a method statement for the careful removal and further trials. If the removal ends up wrecking the metal panels or this is not achievable then this may need to be reviewed. In addition the fixing of the new fireproof ceiling will need to be carefully controlled so that it doesn't irreversible damage the metal panels. As such fixings should be introduced in a controlled manner and we'll need to agree the fixing details and methods. We will need to retain this finish encapsulated and as undamaged as possible should it need to be revealed in the future. The new ceiling should be as reversible as possible.	The main entrance consists of a powder coated metal door, in a matte black finish and clear glazing set within the frame, all set within existing opening. Applicant can accept an appropriately worded condition. No scaffold proposed on principle elevations - only gable end and courtyard. Where scaffold is proposed, it will be tied into mortar joints so only minor repointing required. To the rear curtain walling, glass will be removed but reinstated as part of the scaffold works. All decorative features avoided. Please find enclosed. The existing metal ceiling is overlapped at every single edge and pinned with multiple pins or clout nails therefore extremely challenging to remove without extensive damage. Panels which have already been removed either have bent on removal (damaging the shape of the metal) or have had to be cut in areas to dislodge from another panel from the floor joists. This also provides an inherent risk while removing the metal sheet as the edges of the metal are extremely sharp and provides a risk to the operatives who are working at height to remove the existing panels. The existing structure of the building is not adequate from a life safety perspective in that inadequate fire resistance is evident to the floor/ceiling of the building. Without installing new fire rated plasterboard to provide the relevant fire resistance to the structure, the scheme will not be feasible as we will not be able to get building control approval for the scheme. Fixings of the ceiling would be completed in a controlled manner and as limited as feasibly possible, fixings would be installed around the perimeter of the existing metal panels where the floor joists are located to provide adequate support for the new fire rated ceiling. Fixings would be through existing holes in the boards or removing some of the clout nails to reuse existing holes to support the new fire rated ceiling.	

Consultee	Consultee Response / Comments (where actions required)	Project Team Input / Response	Status
	7. We don't seem to have detailed sections of the how the new ceiling and build up will impact on existing beams. The build up of the ceiling seems quite deep and if this conceals a lot of the depth of the beam then the height should be lifted. If the plasterboard is the protecting layer than can the insulation be omitted or reviewed to keep the ceiling as tight as possible. 8. The finishes plans shows painted plasterboard to the perimeters, can you confirm if this is existing plaster or a plasterboard lining. If it is original plaster on brick then the repainting is acceptable, however the paint specification needs to be compatible with the existing paint and plaster and paint should be breathable. I'm not clear if the paint spec considers this for all original surfaces and needs querying. If the walls have a plasterboard lining over original brick then if the original walls were exposed brick then can we explore returning these to brick.	Existing timber beams have also been assessed in the existing condition (e.g. exposed primary timber beam and metal ceiling) and with the new proposed ceiling construction (new fire rated plasterboard with metal ceiling concealed and element of exposed primary timber beam) by the project fire and structural engineer. To note, in the current condition and applying standard office loads, the existing timber beams would not be able to be left exposed as in a fire scenario under 60minutes the floor construction would collapse. This would therefore mean additional fire protection to the exposed timber beams would be required by adding further fire rated materials to achieve relevant fire resistance to provide a safe means of escape for the occupants in the building and for the local fire brigade to enter the building to fight the fire. The proposed depth of the timber beams after the installation of a new fire rated ceiling is shown in the drawing: 20820-DWC-XX-ZZ-DR-S-00001 (attached). As determined in the report: PortlandStreet Report P127368 - Rev1 (attached) by BRE Group after reassessing the existing timber beams with newly introduced fire rated ceiling, the SE concluded that post installation of the new fire rated ceiling, the existing timber beams can provide the relevant support to the loading of the building to remain unprotected as noted in the reports: DW2444 - 117-119 Ex Beam Fire Check Calcs (attached). If the ceiling was raised any higher, the timber beams would likely need to be treated with the same fire resistant plasterboard to provide the necessary fire resistance and not remain exposed as currently proposed. Most walls are modern plaster throughout. Plaster board will be reskimmed where required and painted. Where exposed brick is existing, this will remain as is - no existing exposed brickwork is proposed to be painted.	

Consultee	Consultee Response / Comments (where actions required)	Project Team Input / Response	Status
	9. There are notes on the finishes drawings referring to exposing brick finishes with notes stating that these will be reviewed to see if they can be exposed - we'll need to agree this and expose as much original brick as possible if it was originally exposed. We shouldn't be painting over exposed brickwork if it is currently unpainted, but happy to review further on site. 10. The finish to the plant enclosure has been proposed as black, but this seems to only be captured in the email. Do we need to have this confirmed as part of the submission as well. 11. We will need to see samples of repairs and making good. Where fixtures and fittings are being removed such as the plant and M and E equipment then the fixtures, fittings and cable all need to be removed and the surfaces made good with matching material. 12. The repair specifications are helpful but the final detailed repairs of elements such as repointing will need a detailed spec with precise mortar mix and the agreement of samples on site. When the scaffolding is erected and the elevations are available for inspection then more repairs could become apparent - we'll need a condition to cover final detailed elevational repairs. We'll need to see samples of all repair items to assess quality and finish and new materials generally. 13. Have details of the external colours proposed for decorating the railings and windows and how this has been informed by the paint analysis been submitted?	Details drawings submitted in support of the proposals show intention to remove plaster to expose brickwork where possible. Confirmed, matte black. Potential repair to ceilings along existing M&E routes and potential fixings – replaster where required. Modern light fittings removed and where necessary made good. New install per drawings. Applicant will accept an appropriately worded condition, that avoids pre-commencement wording and is specific to prior to detailed elevation repairs. No decoration proposed to railings - windows painted like for like (green – per fabric repair report) (113-115 Portland St not included) No external windows paint analysis conducted.	