

Our Ref: 04C300199
Your Ref: 136865/FO/2023 and 136865/FO/2023

6th July 2023

Angela Leckie
Planning and Building Control
Manchester City Council
P O Box 532
Manchester
M60 2LA

Dear Angela,

FULL PLANNING AND LISTED BUILDING CONSENT FOR AN OFFICE-LED MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT AT NEPTUNE MILL, CHAPELTOWN STREET, MANCHESTER – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND SUBMISSION OF UPDATED PLANS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Further to recent correspondence and feedback regarding the planning applications (136865/FO/2023 and 136865/FO/2023) at Neptune Mill, Chapelton Street, Capital&Centric (Rush) Limited have prepared necessary additional and updated information to address consultation comments received during the planning application. Details of the information provided and comments that are being responded to is set out in detail in the table below.

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Applicant Response
Cadent Gas 06.06.23	No objection, informative note required, and condition recommended.	The Applicant is happy to agree to the recommended condition.
Greater Manchester Police 23.06.23	Comment that no concerns with the proposals and the majority of the recommendations made in the Crime Impact Statement have been addressed. Recommends a condition.	An appropriately worded condition which recommends compliance with the submitted Crime Impact Statement would be accepted by the Applicant.
Highways 06.06.23	Comment that it is accepted by Highways that the development is unlikely to generate any highway safety, traffic or network capacity concerns. In addition: <i>1. It should be ensured that all doorways located adjacent to the adopted footway open internally in order to ensure no conflict with passing pedestrians</i> <i>2. As it is understood that the courtyard is a service route for the neighbouring Crusader Works, the applicant should demonstrate that the proposed cycle storage and bin presentation location would not impact upon</i>	Submitted drawings clearly show no doors opening outwards adjacent to an adopted highway. The refuge drawing at Crusader is provided with this letter (reference: CW SKM (00) 170 Ref D) and the strategy is that the bins located in the store on the left-hand side (closest to the courtyard

	<i>existing servicing arrangements.</i> <i>3. It is also unclear whether ongoing servicing activities associated with Crusader Works would conflict with pedestrian movement through the courtyard area and so Highways request additional details</i> <i>4. No standard on-site car parking provision is proposed. This is considered acceptable to highways given the highly accessible city centre location. However, the applicant should provide further detail on disabled parking provision.</i> <i>5. The applicant should demonstrate that the proposed level of provision aligns with minimum Core Strategy cycle parking standards.</i>	area at Neptune Mill) are moved through the courtyard onto Chapeltown Street for collection. This is a similar strategy to the one proposed at Neptune Mill. This will not impact the servicing of Crusader or for the neighbouring landowner as the intention is to leave the courtyard as it is. Please see enclosed Refuge Strategy Plan at Crusader (reference: SK21601-006) As above, there will be no conflict through the courtyard area. As demonstrated in the Refuge Strategy Plan at Crusader (reference: SK21601-006) enclosed with this letter. The application does not involve a change of use or increased floor space. Therefore, no car parking is proposed as part of the application. The site however is located in an extremely sustainable location with access to many public transport modes. In addition, there is a number of both on-street car parking and off-street car parking in the form of nearby car parks including: - Parkbee RCP, Baird Street 25m from Neptune): 100 total spaces; - Sheffield Street (35m from Neptune): 220 total spaces; - Manchester Piccadilly Short Stay (125m from Neptune): 44 total spaces including disabled - Manchester Piccadilly Long Stay (125m from Neptune): 711 total spaces including disabled - Store Street (185m from Neptune): 406 total spaces It is noted that Appendix B of the Core Strategy sets out the following cycle parking standards: A1 (Food Retail) = 1 space per 140sqm A1 (non-food) = 1 space per 200sqm A3 (restaurant and café) = 1 space per 50sqm B1 (business) = 1 space per 200sqm
--	--	--

		The net area of the offices amounts to 1,370sqm and therefore 7 cycle parking spaces are required for B1 office use. The net area of the ground floor amounts to 291 sqm. The end use of the ground floor is not yet known other than falling within Use Class E which the parking standards have not been updated against. However, assuming the worst-case scenario requiring 1 space per 50sqm, this would equate to 6 spaces. As such an overall maximum provision of 13 cycle spaces could be required. The proposals incorporate 14 cycle parking spaces within a container in the service yard, and therefore exceeds the minimum standards. The Applicant is happy to agree to a pre-occupation condition for the detail of the container and cycle parking spaces.
	<i>6. No details on deliveries associated with any ground-floor commercial use (or upper-floor office deliveries) have been provided, however it is expected that these could be accommodated within the existing loading bay provision on both Chapeltown Street and Baird Street.</i>	Servicing and delivery information is shown on drawing reference 353 PD 1004 (P2) which is included as an appendix to the Design and Access Statement. It is expected that deliveries will be accommodated within the existing loading bays.
	<i>7. Highways recommend that the development, submission, implementation and monitoring of a full Travel Plan should be included in the conditions of any planning consent.</i>	The application does not involve a change of use or any additional floorspace and therefore a Travel Plan is excessive and not necessary to be conditioned.
	<i>8. Note that a Framework CMP has been submitted. At this stage, Highways require details on any proposed utility connections which may affect the adopted highway.</i>	There are no utility connections that will affect the adopted highway.
	<i>9. A Full CMP should also be provided by the applicant prior to any construction works beginning which would provide further details on utility works and associated traffic management. The plan should detail the phasing and quantification / classification of vehicular activity associated with planned demolition/construction with commentary on types and frequency of vehicular demands</i>	The Applicant is happy to condition a full CMP.

	<i>together with evidence (including appropriate swept-path assessment) of satisfactory routeing both within the site and on the adjacent highway. Contractor parking provision and measures to deal with mud and dust on the highway should also be considered. The document should also consider ongoing construction works and contractor parking in the locality. It is recommended that the above be attached as a condition to any planning consent.</i>	
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit 07.06.23	No objection and recommends a bat and bird assessment prior to determination. Comments also that there are no vegetated habitats on the site and therefore no mitigation is required.	Daytime Bat and Bird Survey has been undertaken by Rachel Hacking Ecology and is submitted with this letter.
TFGM 07.06.23	Comment that there is no requirement for a highway impact review by TfGM, given the proposed development and submitted documents. The Metrolink team have also provided comments and require that a more detailed Construction Management Plan is developed that adequately addresses the proximity of Metrolink. This can be secured by condition.	The Applicant is happy to condition a full CMP.
Case Officer Design Comments 08.06.23	<i>The elevations show mural zones to the inner courtyard and the external facing gable. It is considered that these will contrast with the predominant brickwork material and seems at odds with the elevations and will appear as a distracting and potentially jarring element to the robust and simple and unified brickwork elevations which are part of its industrial appearance and character, and which hold some aesthetic heritage value. Whilst potentially reversible this will cause a level of harm that has not been fully justified and these should be omitted</i>	The murals have previously been discussed as part of the pre-application, following which the number proposed reduced from 3 to 2 to take account of feedback received. We believe that the locations are suitable; the gable end is very prominent but also very plain at present so the mural is to provide a feature to enliven the blank façade and it needs to contrast with the brickwork. The proposal is to use water-based paint to avoid any harm to the brickwork and would be reversible if required. The Heritage Statement does not identify the murals to be harmful and state it would represent an artistic intervention that would contribute to the regeneration of the area. It's prominent location makes it an ideal and suitable location. The Applicant would be happy to discuss an appropriately worded condition for the details and style of the mural.

	<i>In addition, the mural below zone also seems to show the removal of windows and blanking up in front of the lift shaft would not be acceptable. Windows should be retained to maintain the appearance across the elevation. If blocking up is required due to new lift then the windows should still be fitted with backing board or back painted glass and be able to be maintained from the outside.</i> <i>The elevation also shows Juliet balconies to a number of windows along with a Juliet balcony to the South elevation at D3.09. There are no details of the actual balcony to comment on and how this will appear. The alterations to the windows and Juliet balconies don't seem to get a mention in the heritage impact assessment and have not been fully justified. There are concerns that external balustrade will look at odds with the simple elevational treatment and this element should be removed.</i> <i>Can we confirm for definite that the window manufacturer and design is an exact match for Crusader if so then this is acceptable.</i> <i>There seems to be a lot of new signage zones proposed this is considered to be excessive particularly on a listed building. The one on the parapet seems particularly out of place. We will comment further on this when we have the signage applications. As we have these in the system now can the drawings be amended to remove these elements to avoid any ambiguity.</i> <i>There doesn't seem to be much by way of structural alterations drawings can we have more details of the structural works.</i>	The windows need infilling to provide flush internal surface to the lift shaft. Specified windows have internal beading so cannot be maintained from the inside and a different window system here is not suitable. The Applicant does not wish to paint over the windows to achieve the mural. As above, the Applicant would be happy to discuss an appropriately worded condition for the details and style of the mural. Three out of four of these are existing full height openings with different or no balustrades. The intention is for metal perimeter frame with single glazed panel. Drawing 'Doors and Windows Aluminium Door Elevation 2/2' (reference: 353 CD 3005 P3) has been updated and provided as part of this letter to show the Juliet balcony balustrade The window system is an exact match for Crusader but the design is slightly different in that whilst it matches the 3x3 panel arrangement of Crusader, the proportions of the panels are slightly different to reflect the fenestration pattern of the original windows. The signage is just indicative in this application and should be dealt with under the advertisement consent application. As such, the elevation plans have been updated to remove the signage and these are submitted with this letter. Both Structural and Engineering Drawings are provided as part of this submission. All plans are listed in Appendix 1 of this letter. It should be noted that these are not based on detailed investigations as yet and therefore may not reflect the final proposals, however they represent our
--	---	---

	<i>The proposed door DG.05 shows a full height louvre. Can the purpose and necessity of this be confirmed. We need to understand all options considered as if absolutely necessary these need to be a non standard design / more discrete. For example, a more interesting and higher quality designed perforated decorative screen with pattern rather than a standardised louvre needs to be looked at.</i> <i>The alterations below do not seem to go far enough in terms of revealing the original full size opening. Crusader has the same feature directly adjacent to this which is fully open with lightweight screen to express the original opening. All modern brickwork should be removed and a lightweight glazed entrance provided. I'm not sure whether there is an opportunity to revisit the main entrance to this point, but this may have other knock on impacts.</i> <i>There doesn't appear to be any detailed sections through the new main entrance to the gable and details of the proposed new lintel including detailed sections and these need to be submitted.</i>	design intent based on the information currently available. As such these should not be conditioned. The door is to serve the bin store and as such, requires substantial ventilation hence the need for louvres. It is not appropriate to have bespoke perforated screens for a refuse store. The design of these is the same as at Crusader. A photograph of the existing bin store door at Neptune Mill and the one currently at Crusader is provided at Appendix 2. It is proposed to copy the exact design and quality at Neptune with what is at Crusader. The opening referred to on Crusader is an open archway with a gate infill, not an access point into the building so it is not relevant to compare to this. It is also not clear what is the original opening as this panel of brickwork also features a stone lintel and stone cills, which appear to be of some age. The Design and Access Statement provides detail about the position of the main entrance, summarising that this is not appropriate due to lack of any disabled access at this point. Consequently, this is an escape only and so provision of a glazed screen to the larger opening is not appropriate as the doorway is to be downplayed rather than enhanced. Furthermore, the staircase is directly behind this wall and part of the elevation is services so glazing this is not considered appropriate. The following drawings from Heyne Tillett Steel provide this and are submitted with this letter for reference: • 2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2310: Proposed Details - Sheet 1 (dedicated to main entrance alterations) • 2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2311: Proposed Details - Sheet 2 (Details 6, 7 and section 7A relate to the main entrance)
--	---	--

	<i>In terms of the proposed new windows to the gable end we have previously indicated that these would not be acceptable as they could compromise the development of the adjacent land. It was suggested that C&C have a right of access across the front of the gable but this has not been evidenced in the application and we need to see evidence of this before we can consider this element further.</i> <i>Notwithstanding the above there is insufficient detail on the sleeves which would have to be well designed, detailed and executed to a high standard with hidden fixings. More detail in this respect needs to be provided.</i> <i>More detail is required in respect of the proposed external repairs. The elevations should be marked to show the areas of repair. The repair specification doesn't detail where each spec is to be used. This should be confirmed particularly in relation to the external building repairs where traditional techniques and products such as lime mortar should be used. We'll need to see samples of repointing and repairs as with Crusader and this can be conditioned. Making good and opening up details, following the removal of the extension, will need to be conditioned.</i>	We do not think this is a planning issue, however we can confirm that Capital&Centric have a right of access from the door on the gable and so it is not possible for development to come forward on the land abutting the building. The Applicant's Solicitor has confirmed that the building has benefited from a fire escape leading on to the adjoining land for a period in excess of 20 years. This right is not documented and has not been exercised by using force or stealth and as such a right of escape acquired by use (prescriptive right) can be claimed. As such, it would not be possible to build on the adjacent land and therefore the windows are acceptable and enliven the building. In addition, the site is located within the Manchester Piccadilly SRF (March 2018), the strategic principles of which include the regeneration of heritage buildings and overall there are guiding principles which support the proposed use. It will make a significant contribution to the regeneration of the Piccadilly Central neighbourhood A new drawing titled 'Doors & Windows Sleeve Details' (reference: 353 CD 3006 P1) is provided as part of this submission to show the projecting sleeves to the windows on the west gable end. The scope of the repairs is already marked on elevations on drawing references 353 CD 2106 – 2108. The specification clauses, including the lime mortar is identified on these. This is as much detail as can be provided at this time from a visual inspection. The Applicant is happy to agree to a condition to provide details at a further point.
--	--	--

	<i>There is a proposal to clean all of the timber and brickwork and ironwork inside the building. However there doesn't seem to be a detailed specification for the cleaning or each surface which will need submitting at application stage although trialling through samples on site to avoid damage to the listed building could be conditioned. As all evidence of original paint will be removed samples of paint on CI columns, timbers and walls should be taken.</i>	The sandblasting method will be used as this is the only way to completely remove the existing paint coatings with the least damage as possible. The compressor air output and blast pot grit flow will be regulated to do a very light gentle clean that will carefully polish off the existing painted coatings to all the painted areas, on the brick and timber. A soft recycled fine glass will be used as this is the correct method to remove on this type of work glass breaks down really easy making it a soft clean. This is the same method Capital&Centric are using at Eyewitness Works in Sheffield which is a listed building. Would you be willing to accept the brickwork/timber which has already been cleaned on the 3rd floor as a sample? The Applicant will then ensure the same finish is matched throughout the rest of the building.
	<i>There is a soft strip of internal modern fittings, proposed but no method statement for their careful removal or building protection and this is required. The building will need to be recorded when the soft strip is complete. Any original features or features of interest will need to be identified and recorded and retain in place. There doesn't seem to be any record or description of any of the existing original features or comprehensive and annotated photographs which should be provided.</i>	This seems excessive detail to provide at this stage therefore the Applicant is happy agree to condition it.
	<i>Detailed sections through the roof highlighted as P1 to P5 showing the rooflights and roof build up are required.</i>	Relevant plans were submitted as part of the application. See drawing reference 353 CD1014 (P2)
	<i>M and E drawings and a strategy or details to assess any impacts are required</i>	Relevant drawings are provided as listed in Appendix 1. It should be noted that these represent the design intent, based on the information currently available, however are subject to detailed investigation. As such these plans should not be conditioned and are for reference only.

	<i>The landscape drawings show tarmac being retained in the courtyard which is a low quality finish which needs to be looked at in detail and proposed high quality landscaping scheme proposed instead to suit the setting of the heritage assets. The proposal is to introduce tarmac where the extension is being removed which is also unacceptable in the context and setting of both Crusader and Neptune Mills.</i> <i>The existing roof covering is noted as being concrete tile with the proposal being to replace in slate which is welcomed. The spec states Welsh Slate Ffestiniog blue grey slate or equivalent this would need to be conditions within any consent with a view to ensuring the use of a high quality natural slate.</i> <i>The spec also details cast aluminium gutters and rainwater pipes which should be in cast iron and this should be confirmed.</i> <i>Clarification of all of the proposed floor finishes are across the building are required.</i> <i>There also doesn't seem to be a partition detail and interface with existing surfaces in the drawings submitted which should include a</i>	The service yard is currently used as part of the existing building and as part of the Crusader Works site and therefore its use will continue on the current tarmac courtyard. The neighbours have an access right over the courtyard for goods / services in / out and therefore this area cannot be landscaped and restrict this access. As such, it is not appropriate or feasible to provide a high quality landscaping scheme here given its current and proposed usage. The Applicant is happy agree to condition this detail. It is not possible to deliver cast iron gutters and rainwater pipes. Heritage style aluminium details are proposed and will be appropriate. The Applicant is happy agree to condition the detail of the heritage style aluminium gutters and rainwater pipes. A brochure is provided with this letter showing the specified rainwater goods in cast aluminium. The proposed floor finishes are provided with this letter: Floors and Stairs – Ground Floor (reference: 353 CD 2301 (P1)) Floors and Stairs – First Floor (reference: 353 CD 2302 (P1)) Floors and Stairs – Second Floor (Reference: 353 CD 2303 (P1)) Floors and Stairs – Third Floor (reference: 353 CD 2304 (P1)) Floors and Stairs – Ground Floor (reference: 353 CD 2305 (P1)) These were issued as part of the planning application. Please refer to drawing references: 353CD 1014 and 1015
--	--	---

	<i>shadow gap where it meets existing original surfaces and this needs to be provided.</i>	
EHO 14.06.23	Comments from EHO included recommended conditions in relation to: - Fume/odours - Construction Management Plan - Construction hours - Deliveries / Hours - External Plan / Equipment	The Applicant is happy to agree to these conditions with the exception of the condition relation to delivery hours which states: <i>Deliveries, servicing and collections, including waste collections shall not take place outside the following hours: 07:30 to 20:00, Monday to Saturday and 10:00 to 18:00 on Sundays/Bank Holidays.</i> The Applicant is not agreeable to the above hours as they are unrealistic. The Applicant is happy to agree to a condition that sets out the delivery hours will be secured once a servicing strategy is in place.

On behalf of our client, Capital&Centric (Rush) Limited I trust the above provides sufficient detail and justification as part of the proposals. The Application has a willingness to start onsite as soon as possible so would be grateful if the application could move to an approval at the earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely



Rachel Jones
Associate
+44 0786 714 1398
rachel.jones@avisonyoung.com
For and on behalf of Avison Young (UK) Limited

Appendix 1 – Schedule of Plans and Information

Document / Plan	Reference/ Date	Author
To form part of the submission		
Doors and Windows Aluminium Door Elevation	353 CD 3005 P3 <i>This supersedes revision P2 which was submitted with the application</i>	Jonathan Davidson Architects
Doors and Windows – Window & Door Sleeve Details	353 CD 3006 P1 <i>This is a new plan.</i>	Jonathan Davidson Architects
Proposed South Elevation	353 CD 1008 (P3) <i>This supersedes revision P2 which was submitted with the application</i>	Jonathan Davidson Architects
Proposed North Elevation	353 CD 1009 (P3) <i>This supersedes revision P2 which was submitted with the application</i>	Jonathan Davidson Architects
Proposed East & West Elevation	353 CD 1010 (P3) <i>This supersedes revision P2 which was submitted with the application</i>	Jonathan Davidson Architects
Floors and Stairs – Ground Floor	353 CD 2301 (P1) <i>This is a new plan.</i>	Jonathan Davidson Architects
Floors and Stairs – First Floor	353 CD 2302 (P1) <i>This is a new plan.</i>	Jonathan Davidson Architects
Floors and Stairs – Second Floor	353 CD 2303 (P1) <i>This is a new plan.</i>	Jonathan Davidson Architects
Floors and Stairs – Third Floor	353 CD 2304 (P1)	Jonathan Davidson

	<i>This is a new plan.</i>	Architects
Floors and Stairs – Ground Floor	353 CD 2305 (P1) <i>This is a new plan.</i>	Jonathan Davidson Architects
Daytime Bat and Bird Survey	RHE.3860.01	Rachel Hacking Ecology
For Reference:		
Alumasc Rainwater Systems – Tradition Cast Iron Aluminium Brochure	n/a	Alumasc
Refuse Plan (Crusader)	CW SKM (00) 170 d	Shedkm
Refuge Strategy Plan (Crusader)	SK21601-006	SK Transport Planning
Mechanical and Electrical Plans - these represent the design intent, based on the information currently available, however are subject to detailed investigation. As such these plans should not be conditioned and are for reference only:		
Electrical:		
Lighting Layout, Ground Floor	WECE-353-E-100 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Lighting Layout, First Floor	WECE-353-E-101 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Lighting Layout, Second Floor	WECE-353-E-102 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Lighting Layout, Third Floor	WECE-353-E-103 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Lighting Layout, Fourth Floor	WECE-353-E-104 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Small Power & Communications Layout, Ground Floor	WECE-353-E-200 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Small Power & Communications Layout, First Floor	WECE-353-E-201 Rev T2	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers

Small Power & Communications Layout, Second Floor	WECE-353-E-202 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Small Power & Communications Layout, Third Floor	WECE-353-E-203 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Small Power & Communications Layout, Fourth Floor	WECE-353-E-204 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Fire Alarm & Security Layout, Ground Floor	WECE-353-E-300 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Fire Alarm & Security Layout, First Floor	WECE-353-E-301 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Fire Alarm & Security Layout, Second Floor	WECE-353-E-302 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Fire Alarm & Security Layout, Third Floor	WECE-353-E-303 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Fire Alarm & Security Layout, Fourth Floor	WECE-353-E-304 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Containment Layout, Ground Floor	WECE-353-E-400 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Containment Layout, First Floor	WECE-353-E-401 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Containment Layout, Second Floor	WECE-353-E-402 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Containment Layout, Third Floor	WECE-353-E-403 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Containment Layout, Fourth Floor	WECE-353-E-404 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Mechanical:		
Above Ground Drainage Layout, Ground Floor	WECE-353-M-100 Rev T2	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers

Above Ground Drainage Layout, First Floor	WECE-353-M-101 Rev T2	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Above Ground Drainage Layout, Second Floor	WECE-353-M-102 Rev T2	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Above Ground Drainage Layout, Third Floor	WECE-353-M-103 Rev T2	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Above Ground Drainage Layout, Fourth Floor	WECE-353-M-104 Rev T2	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Above Ground Drainage Layout, Roof Level	WECE-353-M-105 Rev T2	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Domestic Services Layout, Ground Floor	WECE-353-M-200 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Domestic Services Layout, First Floor	WECE-353-M-201 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Domestic Services Layout, Second Floor	WECE-353-M-202 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Domestic Services Layout, Third Floor	WECE-353-M-203 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Domestic Services Layout, Fourth Floor	WECE-353-M-204 Rev T1	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Ventilation Layout, Ground Floor	WECE-353-M-300 Rev T2	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Ventilation Layout, First Floor	WECE-353-M-301 Rev T3	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Ventilation Layout, Second Floor	WECE-353-M-302 Rev T3	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Ventilation Layout, Third Floor	WECE-353-M-303 Rev T3	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Ventilation Layout, Fourth Floor	WECE-353-M-304 Rev T3	Watt Energy and

		Consulting Engineers
Ventilation Layout, Roof Level	WECE-353-M-305 Rev T3	Watt Energy and Consulting Engineers
Structural Plans – these represent the design intent, based on the information currently available, however are subject to detailed investigation. As such these plans should not be conditioned and are for reference only:		
General Notes	2909-HTS-XX-ZZ-DR-S-0001 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Existing Isometric Site View	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-0002 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Existing Isometric Sections	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-0003 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Existing Isometric Floor Plates	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-0004 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Existing Ground Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-00-DR-S-0100 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Existing First Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-01-DR-S-0110 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Existing Second Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-02-DR-S-0120 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Existing Third Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-03-DR-S-0130 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Existing Fourth Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-04-DR-S-0140 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Existing Roof Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-05-DR-S-0150 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Existing Long Sections	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-0200 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Existing Elevations - Sheet 1	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-0250	Heyne Tillet Steel

	Rev P1	
Existing Elevations - Sheet 2	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-0251 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Demolition Isometric Site View	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-1002 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Demolition Isometric Sections	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-1003 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Demolition Isometric Floor Plates	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-1004 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Demolition Ground Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-00-DR-S-1100 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Demolition First Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-01-DR-S-1110 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Demolition Second Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-02-DR-S-1120 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Demolition Third Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-03-DR-S-1130 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Demolition Fourth Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-04-DR-S-1140 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Demolition Roof Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-05-DR-S-1150 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Demolition Long Sections	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-1200 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Demolition Elevations - Sheet 1	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-1250 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Demolition Elevations - Sheet 2	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-1251 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed Isometric Site View	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2002 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel

Proposed Isometric Sections	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2003 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed Isometric Floor Plates	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2004 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed Ground Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-00-DR-S-2100 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed First Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2110 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed Second Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2120 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed Third Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2130 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed Fourth Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2140 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed Roof Floor Plan	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2150 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed Long Sections	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2200 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed Elevations - Sheet 1	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2250 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed Elevations - Sheet 2	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2251 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed Typical Details - Sheet 1	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2300 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed Typical Details - Sheet 2	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2301 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed Typical Details - Sheet 3	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2302 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Proposed Details - Sheet 1	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2310	Heyne Tillet Steel

	Rev P1	
Proposed Details - Sheet 2	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2311 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Main Roof Opening - Existing Details - Sheet 1	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2350 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Main Roof Opening - Demolition Details - Sheet 1	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2351 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel
Main Roof Opening - Proposed Details - Sheet 1	2909-HTS-XX-XX-DR-S-2352 Rev P1	Heyne Tillet Steel

Appendix 2 – Photographs



Existing bin store door at Neptune Mill



Current bin store door at Crusader which is the same proposed at Neptune.