Technical Note

Project	Greville Street
Title	Technical Note for Facade Amendments
Ref.	248
Rev.	F
Date	13.08.2021

Introduction

The purpose of this Technical Note is to provide an explanation for the proposed changes to the elevations of the consented scheme (Planning Ref. 2018/0910/P), as amended under non-material amendment planning refs. 2019/1456/P and 2020/2676/P. The proposals looks to replace the following drawings:

- 248-601 rev Zii (2019/1456/P) (whole façade design and massing)
- 248-603 rev S (2019/1456/P) (whole façade design and massing)
- 248-605 rev U (2019/1456/P) (whole façade design and massing)
- 248-607 rev K (2019/1456/P) (whole façade design and massing)
- 248_1100_RevT2 (2020/2676/P) (chimney design to west elevation only)
- 248_1101_RevT2 (2020/2676/P) (chimney design to west elevation only)
- 248_1102_RevT2 (2020/2676/P) (chimney design to west elevation only)

WITH

- <u>248_1100_RevC03</u>
- <u>248_1101_RevC03</u>

This technical note should be read in conjunction with the following drawings:

- 248_650_RevB_North Elevation Comparison
- 248_651_RevB_South Elevation Comparison
- 248_652_RevB_West Elevation Comparison
- 248_653_RevB_East Elevation Comparison

The amendments propose alterations to the façade as listed below:

- 1. Modification of the panel folding strategy to limit material wastage and improve panel installation and maintenance
- 2. Introduction of 'slipped' details
- 3. Modification of areas of the facade to accommodate gutters in accordance with the drainage strategy
- 4. Adjustment of the west elevation window proportions to accommodate louvres in the upper portion of the windows
- Removal of north elevation basement windows due to large existing beam found during stage 4 / 5 site investigations
- 6. Adjustment of south-west colonnade columns in response to slimmed concrete structure
- 7. Minor increase to mesh overrun at roof level
- 8. Minor increase of window sizes at fifth floor level

Before each is fully explained, this technical note will give a brief description of the façade narrative presented during the planning process, under which these alterations have been made.

Façade Narrative

As set out in the original planning application, the Greville Street façade seeks to evoke a feeling of misremembered pasts and does not 'attempt to perfectly mimic the past, instead alluding to memory'. As our own ideas of the past are often edited and adjusted, the façade can bear evidence of this and highlight deviations from the neoclassical rules that govern the original buildings.

The building seeks to interpret the mix of buildings once present on site through abstracting then recreating their details and form in a 'ghost veil' constructed from perforated metal.

The images below have been taken from the original planning document to highlight the projects that inspired the Greville Street facade, and demonstrate how this idea of misremembrance has been approached across a range of precedent projects.



Fig. 1 Home Within a Home - Do Ho



Fig. 2 Upper Street - GROUPWORK



Fig. 3 Barriere Hotel - Edouard



Fig. 4 Naturkundemuseum - Diener and

1 Modification of the panel folding strategy to limit material wastage and improve panel installation and maintenance

1.1 Several repeated column capital details across the façade have been modified in their design to reduce the number of individual folded components they are comprised of. This simplifies the installation and maintenance of these panels, and results in less material wastage as the 'nets' that the panels are folded from can be nested more efficiently. The diagram below highlights a capital detail from the north façade, and demonstrates how a similar aesthetic is achieved by combining four sheet metal elements rather than eight.



Fig. 5 Capital detail comparison

2.1 To develop the theme of misremembrance occasional repeated details have been 'slipped' across the north, west and south facades, which are highlighted in red in the diagrams below. These details retain the full amount of detail from the surrounding panels but proposes to play with the repetition of certain elements. This approach takes precedent from Giulio Romano's Palazzo del Te which uses classical elements and challenges what they mean and how they are used. On occasion, the triglyphs in the entablature over the pilasters are misplaced or falling in order to call attention to the fact these are an illusion and not correct or structural. In Greville Street, we propose to include a similar detail to represent slipping of historic elements to emphasis the screen is in fact an illusion of 'memory' in the form of a veil façade.



Fig. 6 Giulio Romano's Palazzo del Te

2.2 To further this narrative, occasional details are cut short in small locations on the façade to emphasis the concept that the building is an illusion to site's historic built form which may in fact not be complete. Such slipped details are positioned in areas to also emphasise entrances to the building to act as a double use.

3 Modification of areas of the facade to accommodate gutters in accordance with the drainage strategy

3.1 Small portions of the north, west and south elevations have been modified to provide adequate space for drainage gutters to run behind the perforated façade panels. These changes result in a stepping out of areas at fifth floor level. This has been done in a manner consistent with other details across the facades.

3.2 Without these proposed changes to the elevations, insufficient space will be left between the building and façade, resulting in visible drainage gutters on each elevation. We would suggest that such visible gutters will both detract from the overall form of the building and make a negative contribution to the design.

4 Adjustment of the west elevation window proportions to accommodate louvres in the upper portion of the windows

4.1 The developed M&E strategy for the proposal requires ventilation louvres to be located from the second to fourth floor along the west elevation. These louvres have been coordinated with the windows, to exit through a spandrel panel located above them. The façade has been amended to accommodate this change, reducing the window height and enlarging the string courses above them to allow the louvres to be concealed behind the façade panels.



Fig. 7 Window component drawing showing integration of a louvre into the horizontal spandrel panel, and the reduction in height of the glazing units

5.1 During the planning process, windows into the basement B1C unit were suggested to bring natural daylight into the basement space. During structural site investigations, the retaining wall and ring beam at ground floor/basement level was discovered to be more substantial than originally anticipated. This makes the available size for the window impractically small and as such it is proposed that the window is removed from approved elevations.



Fig. 10 Clip from planning approved elevation showing the basement window removed



Fig. 11 Amended façade model with the window removed

6 Reduced width of corner colonnade column on west / south façade

6.1 Development of the structural design for the Bleeding Heart Yard extension has allowed the size of the columns that form the colonnade to be reduced in size to minimise concrete usage. This has been reflected in the façade design, which takes advantage of the reduced size of the structure to increase the width of the entrance colonnade, maximising the final exit width in the event of an evacuation whereby the full required width of the colonnade is required to meet maximum capacity requirements under fire regulations.

7 Minor increase to mesh overrun at roof level

7.1 The planning drawing set was produced based off 1970's scanned drawn information. An approximate visual survey was undertaken to measure the neighbouring buildings in comparison to the application site for contextual analysis. Post occupation and strip out, a full measured survey was undertaken and the discrepancies identified were absorbed into the design where possible.

7.2 Areas where this was not possible have affected the design and resulted in a marginal height increase at roof level. This can be compared in the following drawings which have been scaled and a scale bar added for clarity.

- 248_650_RevB_North Elevation Comparison
- 248_651_RevB_South Elevation Comparison
- 248_652_RevB_West Elevation Comparison
- 248_653_RevB_East Elevation Comparison

7.3 When compared to the planning approved drawings, the highest point of the mesh overrun in the proposed elevations remains unchanged. Although reduced to accommodate the height discrepancies the staggered mesh roofline is retained and the perception of a visual separation between the buildings has been maintained.

8.1 Post planning analysis was undertaken to test internal levels of daylight and sunlight in comparison to good practice guidelines. The result of this analysis indicated that natural lighting to fifth and sixth floor should be improved where possible.

8.2 In line with the planning approved design and massing, these proposals include for changes to window sizes at fifth floor level to improve internal natural daylight and sunlight levels. The design team have ensured that the proposed increases in window size are still within the visual limits of scale compared to the surrounding buildings and within the wider streetscape. The design team believe that the design of the windows, when read within the surrounding context does not impose on the streetscape or assert a different character or scale to the streetscape and historic setting of the development.





(1) PLANNING APPROVED NORTH ELEVATION (248-601-ZII)



(2) PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION

									0 1	2 3 4	5		10M
Purpose of las	ue; I=Information, C=Comment, P=Planning, T=Tender, S=Construction		1. Contractors are not to directly scale off this drawing. Dimensions should be photoed from the Engineer or		CLIENT:	PROJECT:	DRAWING TITLE	PURPOSE	SCALE A1	SCALE A3 DE	3	СВ	DATE
REVISION:	PURPOSE:	DATE:	Architect, site checked and any discrepancy between drawings reported.	GROUPWORK	SEAFORTH LAND	20 – 23 GREVILLE STREET.	NORTH ELEVATION	P	1:100	1:200	AC	AT	AUG 21
В	ISSUED FOR PLANNING	13.08.21	2. The design and these drawings are the sole	15A CLERKENWELL CLOSE,	HOLDINGS LTD	LONDON, EC1N 8SS	COMPARISON	DRAWING NO.					REVISION
			copyright of Amin Taha Architects Ltd	LONDON, ECTH DAA		,				248–650			B





(1) PLANNING APPROVED SOUTH ELEVATION (248-603-S)



(2) PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION

Purpose of Is	sue; I=Information, C=Comment, P=Planning, T=Tender, S=Construction		1. Contractors are not to directly scale off this drawing. Dimensions should be obtained from the Ecologies or		CLIENT:	PROJECT:	DRAWING TITLE	PURPOSE	SCALE A1	SCALE A3	DB	CB	DATE
REVISION:	PURPOSE:	DATE:	Architect, site checked and any discrepancy between drawings reported.	GROUPWORK	SEAFORTH LAND	20 – 23 GREVILLE STREET.	SOUTH ELEVATION	P	1:100	1:200	AC	AT	AUG 21
В	ISSUED FOR PLANNING	13.08.21	2. The design and these drawings are the sole	15A CLERKENWELL CLOSE,	HOLDINGS LTD	LONDON, ECIN 8SS	COMPARISON	DRAWING NO.				-	REVISION
			copyright of Amin Taha Architects Ltd LONDON, ECTR 0AA	LONDON, ECTH UAA						248–651			B

0 1 2 3 4 5

-----F

10M



(1) PLANNING APPROVED WEST ELEVATION (248-605-U)







(2) PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION

4	3	2	1	0
	4	34	2 3 4	1 2 3 4

10M

Purpose of Issue; I=hformation, C=Comment, P=Pfamiling, T=Tender, S=Construction			1. Contractors are not to directly scale off this drawing.		CLIENT:	PROJECT:	DRAWING TITLE	PURPOSE	SCALE A1	SCALE A3	DB	CB	DATE
REVISION:	PURPOSE:	DATE:	 Dimensions should be obtained from the Engineer or Architect, site checked and any discrepancy between drawings reported 	GROUPWORK	SEAFORTH LAND	20 – 23 GREVILLE STREET.	WEST FLEVATION	P	1:100	1:200	AC	AT	AUG 21
В	ISSUED FOR PLANNING	13.08.21	2. The design and these drawings are the sole	15A CLERKENWELL CLOSE,	HOLDINGS LTD	LONDON, EC1N 8SS	COMPARISON	DRAWING NO.			•		REVISION
			copyright of Amin Taha Architects Ltd	LONDON, EUTH UAA						248–652			В



① PLANNING APPROVED EAST ELEVATION (248-607-K)



	(2) PROPOSED E	AST ELEVATION						10M
Purpose of REVISION B	Iteue: Le Normadan. C = Comment, P = Plandra, T = Tender, S = Construction N: PURPOSE: ISSUED FOR PLANNING	1. Contractions are notice detectly assist of the detection DATE: The interface starts of a contract from it is general or Architectular detected and any discrepancy between tracking regrotect. 10.08.21 2. The design and these detections are the ode copyright of Arnih. Tank Architects Lid	GROUPWORK 15A CLERKENWELL CLOSE, LONDON, ECIR 0AA	SEAFORTH LAND HOLDINGS LTD	PROJECT: 20 – 23 GREVILLE STREET, LONDON, EC1N 8SS	EAST ELEVATION	PURPOSE SCALE A1 SCALE A3 DB CB DA DA P 1:100 1:200 AC AT AI DRAWING NO. 248–653 RE RE RE RE	TE UG 21 VISION B

Conclusion

This technical note has explained how proposed changes to the elevations are considered to form nonmaterial amendments to the approved scheme. Each proposed modification has been developed by the project architects Groupwork / Amin Taha Architects and ensure the building's future performance is improved and construction issues are prevented whilst staying true to its narrative and overall design.