

Listed Building Consent Application Reference 138330/LO/2023
Application For Refurbishment Of Existing Office Space At Ground Floor Level
The Tootal Buildings, Broadhurst House, 56 Oxford Street, Manchester M1 6eu
Application by XLB Property
Addendum Statement

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1** This Statement responds to the comments raised in connection with the above application. The design team has now reviewed all matters and the soft strip has been carried out meaning full final details of due diligence have now been undertaken.
- 1.2** By way of background, the context for the application is to refurbish the existing dated and tired office layouts that don't pay any respect to the historic significance of the building. The works are part of ongoing high quality works by the applicant to the building that have refurbished the building whilst at the same time enhancing its historic and architectural significance as a Listed Building. The essence of the works is that they therefore do not give rise to any harm to the existing Listed Building, and the only effects of the proposal result in a direct benefit to the heritage asset as confirmed in the Heritage Assessment provided with the application. The further context is that the purpose of the works is also to enhance the energy efficiency of a the building. In doing so however, approving the proposal should therefore be afforded significant weight under the terms of Paragraph 164 of the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly as there is no harm and only benefits to the heritage asset.
- 1.3** It is also important to stress that the application only relates to specific works. Whilst we appreciate that some of the requests relate to including additional works, those requests go beyond what the current application proposes and has been assessed to be viable for the works being undertaken to refurbish the building that enhance it as a building of special architectural and historic significance. The package of works proposed have been demonstrated to not result in any harm to the existing building and only benefits. Under those terms, and in the absence of any harm, the proposal therefore accords with the objectives of Part (a) of Paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation and Policy EN3 of the Core Strategy as the proposal enhances the historic environment, the character, setting and accessibility of the building. We consider that the proposal benefits from the support of Policy EN3, which confirms that the re-use of heritage assets will be encouraged where they are considered consistent with the significance of the heritage asset.

2.0 Response to Queries

- 2.1** For ease of reference we have listed your query followed by our comment.
- 2.2** As a precursor point, enclosed in the e-mail provided with this Addendum Statement is a detailed section through all new windows as requested.

Query	Comment
Window 8 is proposed to be replaced with double glazed window. It is currently a modern window with poor proportions and when replaced should be reinstated to the correct original design. Please research and amend this window	The replacement of Window 8 to its original design is not proposed as part of the application. The application seeks to replace the opaque glazing with clear glazing, which are not considered to be works that impact on the character or special architectural interest of the heritage asset, but would conversely improve the window aesthetically, resulting in a heritage benefit.
Please submit detailed sections through all proposed new windows (including window 8) whether they are secondary glazing or	Detailed window sections provided as requested.

completely new replacements. Details to be included are cills, heads, glazing bars, frame etc at a suitable scale.	
Window type 7's for all of the large windows on the Great Bridgewater Street Elevation are inappropriate modern windows with poor proportions that do not match the originals. The first image below shows the existing and the image below that shows the Oxford Street elevation with the original pattern and design. If any windows are being changed then they need to go back to their original pattern and not the current inappropriate design. Please confirm and provide details.	The replacement of Window 8 to its original design is not proposed as part of the application. The application seeks to replace the opaque glazing with clear glazing, which are not considered to be works that impact on the character or special architectural interest of the heritage asset, but would conversely improve the window aesthetically, resulting in a heritage benefit.
The corner window 4 appears to be a modern replacement and rather than add secondary glazing there is an opportunity to reinstate the original design as seen in the historic photo below. The proposal to introduce secondary glazing with a horizontal transom would look poor behind the window. Please advise.	The window isn't proposed to be replaced, but the secondary glazing will provide that appearance of the original design. The window has historically be used for advertising and it is considered that the proposal will result in heritage benefit to this window.
Ideally all of the existing modern aluminium windows should be replaced with suitable appropriately design timber windows to match the originals. Please advise if this is possible.	There are no proposals to replace the aluminium windows with timber windows, but this doesn't detract from the works that are proposed, which result in a benefit to the heritage asset.
It is disappointing that the lowered ceiling in some of the office spaces is not being removed completely back to the full height. In these cases the modern lay in grid ceiling is being removed and the ceiling at higher level is being pulled back from the window rather than lifted completely. If there is simply a void between this and the soffit above then the aim should be to remove the drop down ceiling completely and return to the original height and dimensions as in other spaces. Please advise if they can be removed and if not please explain why.	Significant presence of asbestos above the ceiling. Removing this ceiling would require licensed removal including completely 'tenting' the area which would cause issues to existing tenants and would be a significant cost. When accessed there were no visible original cornicing and features and a concrete ceiling, which is not original exists before what we assume is the original ceiling which cannot be removed as it is not known whether this has been installed for structural reasons and such an undertaking would be significant.
There are many notes on several of the drawings stating that extent of ceiling / condition of columns etc will be reviewed following the soft strip. The soft strip has now taken place so please update the drawings. We will then need to review before issuing a decision. It would be helpful for any changes to be clearly identified.	Following soft strip, there is no original tiling on the columns where information was requested. It was simply layers of plaster and then concrete onto steel column. Column heads within canal side suite are left untouched, except for redecoration where appropriate.

We will need to see a specification for cleaning the paint from the original tiles and cornices , columns and other surfaces. Please make clear on a plan where original decorative tiles, cornices or any original features have been found following the soft strip.	To the area of historic tiling within the canal side suite as detailed on AXI 554, allow to remove the paint build up in full with an alkali based remover that is suitable for historic glazed tiling and will not cause any damage. Paint to be removed in full. Allow to carefully remove existing grouting and re-grout with colour to match the original. There is no requirement to remove paint from cornicing and this would be a refresh for the paint. Until a contractor has been confirmed, we are unable to provide details of paint removing and paint product. We are happy to do so, but this would need to be done in conjunction with a contractor and so request these details are conditioned.
We will need to see a paint analysis on the columns and other painted surfaces / decorative features including cornices. Please submit.	All paint that presently exists is a modern paint. As above, we are presently unable to provide details of new paint products. We are happy to do so, but this would need to be done in conjunction with a contractor and so request these details are conditioned.
The columns are proposed to be reviewed following the soft strip, which has now taken place. Where there is evidence of the original finish then this should be reinstated, we will need to assess samples of the proposed finish. The proposed bespoke metal bars detract from the significance of the columns and should be removed.	As above, there are no original finishes on the columns.

The ceilings in meeting room G23 G25 and G26 are very low in the proposed drawings and should be lifted to the original ceiling height. The glazed partitions should be amended to the highest level possible to maximise the spatial characteristics of the rooms. Please advise if they can be removed and if not please explain why.	G23 is low as it's underneath the area where the original ceiling has been removed and is damaged. Also required to be lower for acoustics of the room. G25 & G26 aren't lower, these are full height as it's the original Boardroom and we want to show the original cornicing and are maintaining the original timber conduit.
The M and E shown on the plans shows the installation very close to the columns. The columns are a key feature and any containment / ducting should not visually intrude and affect any appreciation of the columns. Please revise.	The M&E doesn't affect the columns, but has been moved further away and the updated M&E drawings are included with the application.
There doesn't seem to be any sections through the M and E installation showing the impact in the space. Please submit these.	There is no impact that arises from the M&E as above.
There are proposed external louvres which don't seem to be shown in the pack of drawings, please show these on the drawings and provide details	These louvres already benefit from an earlier planning permission so don't form part of the package of works under the current application.

SLHA are insistent about retaining some of the original Edwardian sprinkler system and have also stated the removal of this needs to be included on the application for LBC	40% of the system is proposed to be retained, which is the maximum that is able to be retained due to fixings to original ceiling.
---	--