

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT ADDENDUM NOTE

- 1.1.1. A Heritage Statement has been prepared by WSP to support the recent application for roof top plant, which includes:
- Section 2 - A description of the application site and surrounding area;
 - Section 2 - A review of the application site's planning history;
 - Section 3 – Description of the development proposal;
 - Section 4 – A review of the relevant national and local planning policy guidance
 - Section 5 – A heritage assessment of the proposal against its planning policy context.
 - Section 5 – An assessment of alternative options
 - Section 6 – Planning Balance and conclusions
- 1.1.2. Manchester City Council has requested that additional clarification is provided in relation to Section 5, an assessment of alternative options. This addendum note seeks to address this.
- 1.1.3. An options appraisal has been prepared and is submitted with this application at Appendix C of the Heritage Statement (June 2023). There are three potential options for ventilating the unit:
- Option 1 – Utilising the Existing Lightwell;
 - Option 2 – Utilising the Existing Redundant Goods Lift Shaft; or
 - Option 3 – Utilising Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Rear Louvres.
- 1.1.4 The options are set out within the submitted Kitchen Extract Appraisal Report (GLD REFERENCE: J304/MEP/RP01). Each option is discussed in turn below.

Assessment of Options

- 1.1.4. The impact of the proposal on its individual components and the overall integrity and significance of the listed building may be measured as: adverse; neutral; or beneficial. The key objective is to minimise adverse impact, and, where necessary, to ensure that it is outweighed by the beneficial impact of the development in terms of the delivery of 'public benefits'.
- 1.1.5. The final scheme proposals are a development of earlier options discussed with the local authority and have taken on board the opinions of the Manchester City Council Officers. Greater weight has therefore been placed on the retention of the elements of historic fabric where appropriate.
- 1.1.6. The scale of the overall impact of the proposed works on the significance of the fabric of the building will be evaluated as:
- Negligible – works that result in no material change;
 - Minor - changes that only make a small difference to the public's ability to understand and appreciate the listed building and conservation area, and may be either adverse or beneficial. Such changes will impact on components which are of modest significance and sensitivity which are exposed to change of a slight to minor magnitude.
 - Moderate - a change that makes an appreciable difference to the public's ability to understand the building group or its setting, and may be either adverse or beneficial. Such changes will impact on components of moderate significance and sensitivity which are exposed to an alteration of a large magnitude, or highly sensitive receptors exposed to change of a minor magnitude.
 - Major - these will be changes which have a fundamental impact on our appreciation of the building group and conservation area and/or its setting and maybe either adverse or beneficial. A substantial impact may be defined as the result of highly sensitive components exposed to change of a large magnitude.
- 1.1.7. For each of the Options below, the works that would be involved are included within a table along with an assessment of the scale of impact of those works in accordance with the above scale.

Option 1: Utilising the Existing Light Well

- 1.1.8. The development proposal consists of 650 x 650 mm Kitchen Extract Duct Work and New 750mm Galvanized Cable Tray for Tenants refrigerant pipework & Supplies to be installed within Existing Ceiling Void.
- 1.1.9. This option is the preferred option by Manchester City Council and is presented as the preferred option in the submitted drawing pack.

Item	Works proposed	Scale of impact
Ductwork	650 x 650 mm Kitchen Extract Duct Work and New 750mm Galvanized Cable Tray for Tenants refrigerant pipework & Supplies to be installed within Existing Ceiling Void. Existing access steps and pipework will be reconfigured to accommodate the ductwork. The duct work and cable tray will run vertically through the existing lightwell and emerge at roof level, utilising an established plant route.	Existing steelwork is used where possible and new guide beams will fix to existing steelwork where possible. New penetrations and alterations within the lightwell will be required to support new steelwork and at ground floor to allow new ductwork to enter the lightwell, as shown on the submitted plans. The lightwell is concealed at the centre of the building and is not visible from the surrounding office units of in the common parts of the building. The openings of brickwork at ground floor are above suspended ceilings where there is existing servicing equipment and cabling. The alterations proposed are necessary to support the ductwork and are sensitively positioned to be out of sight. Whilst there will be openings required within original fabric, this will be limited to brickwork. Furthermore, the lightwell and areas concealed above suspended ceilings have a low sensitivity for change. As such, there will be negligible-minor harm.
Cowl	The extract duct work will terminate with a roof cowl with integral rainwater drain to terminate at the height of the existing extract ductwork.	The extract will discharge at within the roof level plant space, with the cowl positioned lower than roof ridge. The central plant area is not visible from street level or any other public vantage points. The plant area is not an area of special architectural or historical significance that is sensitive to change. Due to the position of the cowl and surrounding context, within the roof top plant area, there will be no harm to the significance of the asset.
Condenser units	Five condenser units are proposed that are no larger than 1338mm x 1050mm x 330mm	The condenser will be positioned at roof level, within the roof top plant area. The installation of louvres will result in no harm to the significance of the asset.

Louvres	No changes are proposed to the louvres as part of this application. Please refer to the tenant's application for relevant works.	No impact.
---------	--	------------

- 1.1.10. As set out within the Heritage Statement, there is extensive precedent throughout in Manchester where a similar approach is proposed, including at Royal London House.

Option 2 - Utilising the Existing Redundant Goods Lift Shaft

- 1.1.11. **Option 2** would require a new extract flue and louvre installed into the corner tower. This would materially change the external elevation of the building. It would be visible on the elevation and from adjacent buildings. It would involve the removal of original historic fabric. Overall, there would be harm to the designated heritage assets that could be avoided by pursuing Option 1 or Option 3.
- 1.1.12. Of the three options, this is identified as the most harmful in heritage terms. It also presents the most challenges from an operational, maintenance and safety perspective. As such this option is not being taken forward.

Item	Works proposed	Scale of impact
Lift shaft	Installation of temporary scaffolding / mansafe system to remove redundant lifting gear and ME services from the lightwell. Risk of asbestos means further works may be required. Regular access panels at 3m intervals involving demolition and disturbance of original fabric.	The feasibility of the access panels is challenging and further work would be required to try to find a workable solution. The options that are detailed within the options document would result in many new openings and alterations to the lift shaft which has the potential to impact original fabric within the upper floor offices. There may be minor-moderate harm to the significance of the asset depending on the extent of works required.
Glass roof top turret	Kitchen extract ductwork will need to penetrate through the existing glass roof top turret, located above the top of the existing lift riser, in order to discharge kitchen extract fumes and odours to the atmosphere. Either by a jet cowl and integral rainwater drain terminating at the height of the turret; or via a dedicated louvre built into the side wall of the turret with the ductwork mounted onto its rear.	Alterations to the original building fabric are required on the northern elevation, with existing brickwork/glazing being removed and suitable weatherproofing applied. The alterations would result in minor harm to the significance of the asset as a result of alterations to the turret that would be visible on the elevation and from adjacent buildings. The structural adequacy of the turret is unknown and so additional works may be necessary to the building fabric in order to proceed.

Option 3 – utilising ground floor louvres

- 1.1.13. **Option 3** would involve utilising the existing ground floor louvres with some modifications to openings, to enable new kitchen extract to discharge at ground level.

Item	Works proposed	Scale of impact
Louvres	Existing louvres serving the ground floor plant demise are to be replaced with new to provide the fresh air system to kitchen. Existing glazing and extract fans to be removed and replaced with modern weatherproof louvre serving new tenants general supply and extract.	The changes proposed to the louvres will overall have a neutral impact upon the historic significance of the building.
Ductwork	All ductwork is to be suspended below existing decorative downstand beams. There will be no fixings to cornicing or beams.	The ductwork would have a negligible impact upon the historic significance of the building, and only relating to points of attachments to facilitate the ducting.
Plant room	Existing redundant air conditioning units and M&E to be isolated and sensitively stripped out.	Removal of redundant plant within the plant room will have no impact upon the historic significance of the building.

- 1.1.14. Ground floor louvres have been previously approved by the LPA at Royal London House through application ref: 118382/LO-2017. The supporting assessment concluded that there would be no impact upon the historic significance of the building.
- 1.1.15. As with the approved scheme at Manahatta, louvres are installed within window frames, replacing non-original glazing, to avoid disturbing brickwork and to respect the architecture of the building.
- 1.1.16. Notwithstanding that Option 3 would result in negligible harm to the asset, it is understood that this is less preferable to Manchester City Council. As such, Option 1 is proposed through this application. As set out within this assessment, the impacts of Option 1 are acceptable in heritage terms.

CONCLUSIONS

- 1.1.17. The development proposals are necessary to facilitate occupation of the unit by the new occupier, Flat Iron. This will in turn unlock significant benefits that will sustain and enhance the significance of the heritage asset, putting the unit to viable use, contributing to the economic vitality of Deansgate and in making a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the asset and its setting (NPPF Paragraphs 197, 199).
- 1.1.18. This assessment concludes that the development proposal for new roof top plant and ducting will leave the significance of the building unchanged.

- 1.1.19. The proposal will require alteration and penetrations into original building fabric, as set out above and within the submission documents. However, the alterations are minimal and are located in areas of low sensitivity, that is, in the lightwell where there is existing plant and ducting and above suspended ceilings in the common area. No decorative features will be impacted.
- 1.1.20. There will be minimal harm to the building resulting from the alterations. The significance of the building will be unaffected by the works proposed.
- 1.1.21. Furthermore, there will be no material change to the setting of the Listed Building or the Conservation Area.
- 1.1.22. In accordance with the NPPF, the significance of the heritage assets has been described (Paragraph 194) and the impacts suitably assessed. Whilst this statement concludes that harm will be minimal, if the LPA were minded to conclude that there is harm, this must be at the very lowest end of the 'less than substantial' scale. The proposal is necessary to facilitate occupation of the unit by Flat Iron. As such, the proposal will unlock significant public benefits that will significantly outweigh any such harm.