

Date	25 February 2015	Subject	60 Carey Street – External Repairs & Redecoration Works
Location	60 Carey Street, London	Reference	The Law Society/25713
Present	Bradley Plummer-Darling (BPD) of Tuffin Ferraby Taylor Michelle O'Doherty (MOD) of Camden Council Gary Theobald (GT) of Theobalds Limited Perry Arnold (PA) of Theobalds Limited		
Copies to	Michael Keary-Smith (MKS) of The Law Society Anthony Beasley (AB) of The Law Society		

Item	Action	
	Whom	When
1.0 Introductions		
1.1 BPD outlined the works subject of Listed Building Consent and Planning Permission. BPD explained the reason for the site meeting was to understand Camden's concerns regarding the submitted applications (raised in a letter dated 11 February 2015, ref: 2014/6191/PRE) in order for these issues to be adequately addressed.	Note	-
2.0 Scope of Works		
The following issues regarding the specification were discussed on site by those present.		
2.1 Scaffolding; BPD confirmed that scaffolding will be required on the front elevation of the building and that this was required to be mechanically fixed to the elevation. GT confirmed that 12no. fixings in total would be required, and advised that the fixings could be concealed behind leadwork flashings so as not to affect the appearance of the front elevation. Furthermore, these fixings would be recorded and information provided within the Operation and Maintenance Manual for use in future external repair works by The Law Society. MOD confirmed this was acceptable.	Note	-
2.2 Roof re-covering; BPD confirmed that the existing paviors comprised a bonded insulation and cement board, not heavy concrete paviors, which had previously raised concern. BPD confirmed that the paviors could be replaced, removed or reinstated upon completion of the roof works. MOD confirmed that they should be removed. BPD confirmed that the revised Bauder specification (see Appendix A) comprises a warm deck roof system with 100mm insulation overlaid with bitumen felt, which would result in an acceptable appearance on completion. GT presented completion photographs of similar Bauder	Note	-

Item		Action	
		Whom	When
	<p>projects that Theobalds had recently completed using the same system, and the finished appearance was deemed acceptable.</p> <p>MOD confirmed that the existing roof covering was not of architectural or historical importance, and therefore the proposals were acceptable.</p>		
2.3	<p>Railings to lower roof; MOD confirmed that Camden would not permit railings to be installed to the lower roof as shown on the application drawings. The reasons for this were the detrimental effect of cutting into the structure, and the negative impact on the streetscape from Star Yard. BPD confirmed that the railings would be omitted from the scheme. BPD will discuss other methods of fall restraint with The Law Society albeit, this would not form part of the current contract or application.</p> <p>Note: The application for planning permission is to be withdrawn.</p>	Note	-
2.4	<p>Re-building the parapet wall; BPD confirmed that re-building was recommended by a structural engineer (Clarkbond) and is necessary to safeguard the stability of the parapet to the south east corner. The method of working would involve dismantling the parapet walls by hand (with hand tools) to salvage any bricks which are capable of being reused. The parapet wall would then be constructed plumb and salvaged bricks would be used for the external face to obtain the best possible match to the existing facade. It was agreed that all replacement bricks will be salvaged London brown stocks and these would be used or concealed in the centre of the wall as appropriate, and all new pointing will be in lime (colour to match existing).</p>	Note	-
2.5	<p>Parapet strengthening; the proposed steel ties to strengthen the south parapet wall was discussed. BPD outlined that Clark Bond have inspected this wall as it is visibly undulating along its length. Clarkbond recommend that the parapet is strengthened with steel ties rather than rebuilding, and this solution has been adopted within the specification. MOD was satisfied with this approach, but indicated the number of ties specified appear to be excessive. It was agreed that the minimum amount of ties should be used, notionally one tie every 2m instead of every 1m as shown on the application drawings.</p>	Note	-
2.6	<p>Brickwork repairs; these are required at ground floor to the south-eastern corner, and to the west flank elevation at high level to the south-west corner. BPD confirmed that all replacement bricks would be reclaimed London brown stocks to closely match existing. Furthermore, all re-pointing is to be completed with lime mortar, colour to match existing.</p>	Note	-
2.7	<p>Window repairs; BPD confirmed that provisional quantities of Windowcare epoxy resin repairs had been specified, and that a full window repair schedule would be compiled upon completion of scaffolding. The basis of repair would be to minimise loss of historic fabric in all circumstances. Windowcare was agreed to be an acceptable repair method; splicing in new timber (with resultant loss of historic fabric) must be avoided if possible.</p>	Note	-

Item	Action	
	Whom	When
2.8 Pavement lights; BPD confirmed that TFT had reviewed their position on the replacement of the pavement lights and were now of the opinion that these can be retained and refurbished. Two repair methods were discussed – option 1 involves replacing only broken and missing lenses and cleaning the cast iron frame, while option 2 involves replacing all lenses to achieve a uniform finish. MOD confirmed that the preferred method was option 1, in accordance with the principles of minimal intervention. Option 1 will be the adopted method within the contract.	Note	-
2.9 BPD confirmed that no works were proposed to the rear elevation of the main building, as it is in better condition due to its sheltered location.	Note	-
3.0 Programme		
3.1 BPD confirmed that the client's intention was to start works on site as soon as possible; however this is dependent on receiving Listed Building Consent. It was agreed that conditional approval was not advisable given the short contract duration and potential for delays in submitting condition applications. MOD confirmed that the meeting minutes and agreements made therein could be appended and form part of the Listed Building Consent to overcome this issue.	Note	-