

Sam Elliott

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December 2025 17:04
To: Sam Elliott
Subject: Re: FW: FW: CDN/25/0871: New Islington Marina
Attachments: Aluminium Kustomfold Folding Sliding Doors datasheet 170816.pdf; NeoTimber-Cladding-Slatted-Product-Info-1.pdf; DuraPost VENTO® COMPOSITE FENCE SLATS – Birkdale.pdf; 1053 Material Boards rev A.pdf

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Sam,

Comments in **red** for clarity below.

I have had to go through them quickly as leaving office now for childcare reasons.

Hopefully this is now sufficient.

Kind regards

Thomas Mann

Director | Architect



The Repeater Station | Norman Cross

Peterborough | PE7 3TB

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

On Tue, 2 Dec 2025 at 15:54, [REDACTED] > wrote:

Hi Thomas,

Materials Board

P3

- This indicates only the doors are opening and all windows are fixed. Can you confirm this? **I confirm this is correct and the window page also notes all windows are fixed.**

P4

- Does not include the previously shared specification sheet/detail showing the depth of the slats? Can this be appended. **Added**
- This shows two different reference images for the Elson Point - Black Hit and Miss timber effect cladding/fencing Birkdale - DuraPost VENTO. No specification has been provided. Is this to be open with gaps as per the approved drawings or to be a solid fence as now indicated on the proposed plans rev B drawing? We require the design to be as approved, with gaps. **During detailed design, the area needed screening and gaps was not practical, therefore the front will remain with an opening, but will be hit and miss. There will still be some vision through this area when looking from an angle as you see in the image in the attached updated document.**
- We require the specification for the product to be appended. **Attached the specification, they dont provide product data sheets, so this printed from their website literature.**

P5

- The section drawings for the window do not show the depth of the frame mullions. As requested can you specify how far they project from the glazing within the document. **Window manufacturer has confirmed 5mm**
- The product specification has been reissued with no clarification on which options have been selected regarding cill depth. As requested can this be specified. **Window frame will be set back 130mm from face of Neo cladding as our details sheet I sent and have projecting cill will is a further 20mm out, 150mm in total.**

- The previously submitted window details have not been included. Instead cross sections have been submitted. One of these cross sections (horizontal section) references a window with vertical mullions – but based on the approved drawings this is not a relevant section as no proposal window contains a vertical mullion. Can the horizontal cross section drawing be removed as it does not reflect the proposal. **Removed, just left the outer frame**
- The cross sections then also indicate a 73mm total thickness for the frames, which correlated to opening windows shown in the previous window detail drawing. However fixed frames have now seemingly been confirmed on p3 implying that the thickness should be 48mm, and we support the thinner frames. **These are the manufacturers standard details, which are PDF and I cant edit. I confirm they are fixed windows and will be 48mm frames.**
- The cross section therefore conflicts with the 48mm thickness indicated on the window detail drawing for fixed panel windows, which have now seemingly been confirmed. **48mm will be the frame - fixed - confirmed**
- Do these cross sections accurately reflect the proposal? We were of the understanding that the 48mm frame was the design goal to achieve the ultra thin frames as per the approved plans, and we had queried how many windows were opening to ascertain how many would have a 48mm thickness vs a 73mm thickness. **All 48mm thickness.**
- Can the vertical cross section be amended to reflect the 48mm thickness for fixed windows. The document should also include a window detail elevation drawing representing the proposal in its current form, showing the thickness of the frame, be included. These will need to correlate and show the same 48mm thickness. **No as I dont have the manufacturers details in CAD**
- The document similarly does not clarify if the 40mm recommended setback as shown in the vertical section is to be applied across all windows. **Can the document specify this. Set back as our details sheet I sent seperatly - 130mm from face of Neo cladding**

P6

- We have now got partial clarification that the fixed window frame will have a 48mm thickness. As per the door detail drawing (as it relates to the double door), where the frames meet in the middle the width would be 139mm. This is significantly chunkier than the window frames and appears much bulkier and out of keeping with the overall design. This would still be the view in the case of a frame thickness of 73mm. We would require a reversion to the sliding door which will help achieve a much closer manifestation to the 48mm window frames. **Sliding door is not an option for the client, the french doors need a handle and some sort of frame, this is as slim as they manufacturer them. A sliding door is not practical.**

Please note that we will need the elevations on p3 revised to reflect the sliding door design. **We are not installing a sliding door. This building is used by public and this is not practical.**

P6 should include a detailed door detail drawing which specifies the frame thickness. **It does, there are dimensions all over it.**

P6 should include a cross section through the door that specifies the depth of the frame and clarifies any setback. **Shown on previously issued details sheet, detail number 8. The door frame is set back same as window 130mm from cladding face.**

- Please note that in the current door detail drawing, a single door detail drawing features but a single door doesn't feature within the scheme. Please ensure the new drawing correlates to the proposed scheme and only shows relevant information. **Removed single door. As noted these are manufacturers standard drawings. Until an order is placed we wont have exact drawings from manufacturer. But we cant place orders until you have aproved condition discharge.**
 - Please include an appended product specification for the doors, and if there are multiple options displayed on the information sheet please specify which is being opted for. **Attached but it covers the entire range so includes the sliding option, so please take product data sheet with pinch of salt.**
-

Proposed Plans Rev B

This drawing seemingly shows a solid fence with no gaps – can this be amended to reflect the irregular space approach as per the approved drawings. **No, client does not want gaps and not practical to build.**

We are not realistically in a position to discharge the materials condition and still require plans with correlating information, the requested appendices and a revision of the chunky double door design which is out of step with the thinner window design.

We will require any amendments by 3pm tomorrow and will assess the scheme on the basis of the next submission (providing it is received before 3pm).

Thank you for your time,

Sam

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December 2025 13:48
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: FW: FW: CDN/25/0871: New Islington Marina

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Afternoon Sam,