

**From:**  
**Sent:** 15 May 2023 14:47  
**To:**

**Subject:** George Hotel - HE Consultation Response

**CAUTION:** External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Richard

Further to our e-mails and ref. HE's structural concerns (copy attached) we respond to the further comment contained in the HE report as follows:

Response to HE comments. See attached doc ref. L01555367

1. Floor replacement vs. strengthening. "We would wish to see the ground floor structure and the second floor structure above the first floor conference room retained and recommend a design solution is explored for these areas" *doc L01555367*

- Please see attached commentary by separate cover.
- 2. "Furthermore it is not clear if the existing joists are "failing" due to over-stressing or due to serviceability criteria (i.e. deflection)." Additional comment from NH dated 10.05.23
  - The joists fail on both counts - Please see attached commentary by separate cover.
  - "An alternative approach could be to undertake a non-invasive dynamic testing assessment of the floors in-situ" Additional comment from NH dated 10.05.23
  - With reference to the attached commentary we would argue that the alternative approach suggested by the HE structural engineer is perhaps unnecessary
- 3. Material choice
  - Please can this point be conditioned
- 4. Details of the method of fixing the canopy to the building should be provided prior to determination
  - The canopy principle is as per application drawings and shown on the elevations
  - We would request that the detail is conditioned prior to construction of the canopy. The fixing detail will be contractor designed. We also need to resolve drainage, any flashing detail, lighting and signage.
- 5. Rugby league representation
  - Noted not a planning matter however there is likely to be reference within the interior design and choice of artworks
- 6. Financial viability report
  - Report submitted to Kirklees separate to application. KC to advise how to proceed on this item.
  - Kirklees to advise whether further independent report is required and to procure as required.
  - Note timeframes and whether this is necessary. We suggest not as the viability assessment was carried out by a relevant professional company
- 7. "we are not satisfied that there is a convincing justification for the removal of *all* the floor structures in block A" doc L01555367
  - Corridor floors and some room floors are *not* being replaced. See drawings.
  - Please see attached commentary by separate cover.
- 8. "The remaining less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme" doc L01555367
  - For LPA to determine based on the evidence submitted.

Kind regards



**James Ross** (he/him)  
Senior Architect

Leeds • London • Skipton • [www.bowmanriley.com](http://www.bowmanriley.com)

