



Your Ref: 130446/FO/2021

Norfolk House
7 Norfolk Street
Manchester
M2 1DW

T: +44 (0)161 228 1001

avisonyoung.co.uk

9 August 2021



Ms Angela Leckie
Planning Building and Licensing
Manchester City Council
P.O. Box 532
Town Hall
Manchester, M60 2LA

Dear Angela

DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO THE FORMER RENAISSANCE HOTEL, DEANS_GATE (LPA REF: 130446/FO/2021) – APPLICANT RESPONSE TO CONSULTEE COMMENTS

On behalf of our client, Deansgate SOF Alliance LeaseCo Limited (the Applicant), please find below and enclosed our responses (in blue) to each of the consultee comments provided in respect of current pending planning application ref: 130446/FO/2021, which seeks full permission for:

“Development comprising external alterations to the existing hotel building including new building entrance, creation of a rooftop bar and outdoor terrace, modifications to the conference suite mezzanine block, creation of a rooftop kitchen garden, modifications to the building facades, public art installations and other works”

Please note we have not provided responses to each and every comment made including recommended conditions. Rather we have responded where a specific query has been raised or where the LPA has specifically asked for more detail.

CONSULTEE COMMENTS AND APPLICANT RESPONSES

1) ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

a) Fumes

Two conditions are recommended in respect of fumes/ odours. The EHO also provides additionally commentary clarifying the actions that will need to be undertaken by the applicant when it comes to addressing the conditions.

Regarding fume extraction, AY previously clarified by email that we were reviewing the EHO's comments, but it is likely we will need to accept a condition as not all the requested detail is (or will be) available before determination of the application. The LPA subsequently asked by email dated 1 July, 'can it be confirmed that all extraction equipment will be routed internally and that there is capacity to accommodate any requirements in this respect but otherwise can deal with by condition in any approval.'

Applicant Response

Having liaised with the applicant and design team we can confirm that all extract ductwork will be routed internally and will discharge at roof level, other than areas where we will have localised heat recovery units such as the mezzanine, extracted air will then discharge through the louvres located around the building perimeter.

b) Hours of Operation

The EHO recommends a condition restricting the opening hours of the premises. The supporting comment states: *'Hours to be confirmed. Also, hours for the roof top terrace and roof bar to be agreed once the comments in the noise conditions have been addressed'.*

Applicant Response

As a hotel, the hours of operation are required to be 24/7, 365 days a year. Is the EHO seeking to restrict hours of operation to the rooftop terrace and bar only?

If so the applicant has proposed the following opening hours for the 13th floor bar and restaurant, and also the 14th floor rooftop terrace and bar:

- Monday to Sunday 08:00 to 03:00 – 13th floor bar and restaurant (no external elements)
- Monday to Sunday 08:00 to 23:00 – 14th floor external rooftop terrace
- Monday to Sunday 08:00 to 02:00 – 14th floor internal rooftop bar

c) Noise (NSE1): Breakout of Noise

Recommends two conditions, to limit the break out of noise, and requiring a verification report prior to occupation. The EHO goes on to state:

'I have reviewed the Sandy Brown acoustic assessment dated 21st April 2021 and I have the following comments:

1. *The assessment includes recommended noise levels for the roof top bar. However, we would not look to agree any music or speakers on the external terrace*
2. *The report also includes recommended maximum internal noise levels for the internal bar in section 8.2.2 but doesn't seem to include an assessment with calculations to demonstrate how the recommended internal levels have been calculated. We will require further comment with calculations providing*
3. *The report includes comment to recommend that internal doors leading out to the external terrace are kept closed except for during use in order to ensure the criteria is not exceeded. Doors are likely to be frequently opened so we will either require a lobbied door system installing to ensure that noise from the internal bar will not escape when doors leading to the external terrace are opened or internal music noise levels reducing accordingly. If a lobbied door set is to be included to address this point, recommendations will be required for the acoustic performance of the door set and installation requirements.*

4. *The glazing acoustic performance and specification should be recommended based on the noise assessment along with recommended examples of required glazing systems for the roof top bar.*
5. *We will also require a full patron noise assessment of the roof top terrace based on the proposed maximum occupancy levels. Comment as to whether the nearest noise receptors have line of site of the external terrace, will there be any screening or barrier to the NSR or mitigation measures? The assessment should also consider the hours of use (which we would look to control to 23:00 closure time)'*

Applicant Response

The Applicant has prepared an updated acoustic report (dated 6 August 2021) which addresses each of the EHO's comments in respect of noise breakout. The report is enclosed with this letter for the attention of officers. However, in summary:

- *Assessment of representative background noise levels has been carried out based on a statistical analysis of the background noise levels and also in accordance with the calculation method provided within Manchester City Council's (MCC) Planning and Noise Technical Guidance document dated December 2015. Given the reduced levels of activity as a result of COVID restrictions in place at the time of the survey it is considered that the levels described from the statistical analysis are a more appropriate basis for the determination of plant noise limits.*
- *Based on the requirements of the MCC and on the results of the noise survey, all plant must be designed such that the cumulative noise level at 1 m from the worst affected windows of the nearby noise sensitive premises does not exceed LAeq 48 dB during the daytime and LAeq 42 dB during the night. A scheme of mitigation has been developed to ensure these limits are achieved with the proposed plant.*
- *As assessment of the noise impact from patrons for the daytime use of the roof terrace has been undertaken. The predicted noise levels, based on the proposed seating arrangement, are below the adopted criterion.*
- *An assessment of music playback during the daytime on the terrace has been undertaken and limiting noise levels determined to achieve the MCC entertainment noise criterion. The MCC criterion will ensure inaudibility outside the nearest noise sensitive receiver. The limiting noise levels for music on the terrace are consistent with the use of low level background music.*
- *Music noise egress from the internal areas of the proposed Bar and restaurant areas on level 13 and 14 of the hotel has been assessed. Maximum allowable noise levels and minimum sound insulation performance standards have been determined for these spaces to achieve compliance with the MCC entertainment noise criteria.*

d) Noise (NSE2): External Terrace

The EHO states MCC: 'Shall only allow use of external areas within the application site in accordance with a schedule of days and hours of operation along with a management strategy submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority, and shall not allow for the use of amplified sound or any music in these external areas at any time.'

Applicant Response

The Applicant is satisfied to agree a schedule of days and hours of operation for use of the external areas. However, we do not consider prohibiting the use of amplified sound or any music in external areas to be justified or supported by policy or any adopted technical guidance. An assessment of patron noise for the rooftop terrace has been undertaken and limiting noise levels for music have been set for internal and external areas of the proposed hotel on levels 13 and 14, to ensure that the limits for activity noise egress are achieved at the nearest noise sensitive premises. Accordingly, the proposed use of the terrace including patron noise and music within the external areas can be suitably managed as part of any permission without the requirement to prohibit amplified sound or music as requested by the EHO.

e) Noise (NSE6): External Equipment Insulation

Recommends two conditions, one requiring external plant and equipment to achieve a specific noise rating, and the second requiring a verification report prior to occupation. The EHO goes on to state (applicant responses provided in blue text straight after each comment):

I have reviewed the plant noise assessment provided by Sandy Brown in the report dated 21st April 21 and I have the following comments:

- 1. We can accept the plant noise limits proposed (43dB day and 38dB Night)*
- 2. The assessment has stated that there are only 2 roof top condenser units proposed with the remaining 10 located within the plant room. However, reviewing another document submitted with the application it would appear that there are also 3 gas fired water heaters to be placed at roof level with water heating flues at roof line along with 4 roof mounted extract ducts which are all expected to discharge noise. It is likely that this information was not made available to the consultant at the time of producing the assessment, but these will need to be included within an updated assessment with cumulative rating at the NSR providing in a rating table. Comment and the addition of any feature correction penalties should be included where required for intermittency or tonality from the plant.*
- 3. An assessment of noise from the Kitchen extract fan will also be required which is likely to be located at roof level. It is expected this has not been selected at this stage*
- 4. A 2.85metre high acoustic barrier around the perimeter roof top plant deck has been proposed along with performance and construction requirements as mitigation. This may need to be reviewed once the above comments have been addressed for the additional plant items not included in the assessment. We will also require comment to confirm whether the barrier will break the line of site of the upper floors of any nearby receptors.*
- 5. Alternative proposals have been recommended to allow air flow if required. The applicant will need to confirm which of the proposed mitigation barriers will be installed. Our preferred option is a solid screen*
- 6. Details of barrier maintenance strategy will be required and how this will be conveyed to any future owners / occupiers of the building should it be sold. This may need to be partially addressed by the applicant rather than the consultant.*
- 7. Performance requirements for the plant room louvres have been provided along with the required performance of the access door to the plant room which will need to be complied with*
- 8. There will be a process of validation once the plant has been installed in accordance with part b) of the condition*

Applicant Response

The Applicant has prepared an updated acoustic report (dated 6 August 2021) which addresses the EHO's comments in respect of noise breakout. The report is enclosed with this letter for the attention of officers. Please note the final plant selection is still under design development and therefore yet to be confirmed. Accordingly, plant noise limits are proposed but we consider final details of plant could be dealt with post-determination of the planning application by a suitably worded planning condition.

f) Air Quality

Recommends two conditions, the first a pre-commencement condition requiring a scheme of mitigation measures to be submitted in respect of air quality. The second requires the implementation of said measures prior to occupation.

The EHO goes on to comment: *'The application site is within Manchester's Air Quality Management Area (map available at: <https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/aqma/maps>) and future residents may be exposed to air pollution. A clean air intake is therefore required. Details of clean air intake maintenance and replacement will be required.'*

Applicant Response

Regarding air quality mitigation, having reviewed the EHO's comments the project team has determined we will need to accept a condition as not all the requested detail is (or will be) available before determination of the application.

FLOOD RISK TEAM

Consultee Comment

'I have had some feedback from our Flood Risk Team and they have commented as it is such an extensive refurb, an FRA would help the JV to make an informed decision on whether they want to incorporate any resilience into their refurb design, e.g. raised sockets, materials, layout etc as the Hotel is in FZ3/2 and 10m from the river. Is this something that can be looked at for them to assess?'

Our Response

AY submitted a letter response from the appointed drainage consultants (BG&E) to this comment on 12 July 2021. We understand from subsequent discussions that this matter has been suitably addressed.

HIGHWAYS

Consultee Comment

'In principle MCC Highways have no objection to the proposed development however it would be useful if the following can be confirmed to better understand existing and proposed development operations and potential impacts:

1. *The existing/proposed staffing numbers*
2. *Any proposed change to hotel room numbers, facilities/activities that could result in an increase in visitors/trips (some detailed provided on hotel changes).*
3. *Is there a site travel plan?*
4. *The existing cycle parking arrangements*
5. *The existing number of car parking spaces including number of accessible spaces and electric vehicle charging points. Any information on car park utilisation.*

Our Response

We have reviewed these queries in conjunction with the client and project team and provide summary responses below. It is, however, worth reiterating that this application is principally for *external* works to the existing hotel building and it has been agreed with planning officers that internal changes to the hotel (including any additional rooms) are not part of this application and do not need planning permission.

1. Staffing numbers - the property is currently vacant so there are no existing staff. I understand from the Applicant that there will be approximately 220 no. FTE staff once the hotel is operational.
2. Change to hotel room numbers, facilities, activities – as above, any internal changes to the existing hotel (including increases in room numbers) do not need planning permission. However, for clarity there are currently 206 bedrooms (keys) within the hotel. The proposed internal re-configuration of the building would result in a modest increase of 10 rooms, taking the total number to 216 rooms.
3. Existing site travel plan – there is currently no existing site travel plan for the hotel that we are aware of.
4. Existing cycle parking arrangements - we're not aware there is any existing cycle parking provision serving the hotel. There are however three Sheffield bicycle stands located within the footway (public highway) at Blackfriars Street close to the car park access.
5. Existing number of car parking spaces - there is obviously an existing multi-storey car park at the site providing c. 360 spaces. We don't believe there is any dedicated parking provision serving the hotel. There are some accessible spaces within the multi storey car park although we do not have a count. There is no EV charging provision presently.

Further to the above it is worth emphasising that the existing multi storey car park at the site is owned by MCC. The current application proposed external works to the existing hotel building only. The internal works to the hotel do not require planning permission and therefore are not applied for as part of this planning application. Accordingly no changes are proposed to the existing parking situation at the site as part of this application.



MANCHESTER WATER SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

Consultee Comment

I have attached the MWSP Proforma for completion - This should also be submitted with the application for the Residential Scheme.

Our Response

The first point to note is that the riverside area to which the Manchester Water Safety Partnership are referring is not subject to any proposed revisions as part of the current hotel application (or indeed included within the red line boundary). In any case, having discussed with the Applicants, it is not yet clear which party will be responsible for management of the riverside public realm and amenity areas therefore we are unable to complete the proforma presently. This area will however be included as part of the residential application, at which time we should be able to provide a completed proforma as requested.

SUMMARY

We trust the responses set out about and the additional information enclosed is sufficient to address the comments of officers and consultees. However, should you have any queries or wish to discuss any of the information provided with this letter then please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'E. Harvey'.

Ed Harvey
Associate Director
07831 402681
ed.harvey@avisonyoung.com

For and on behalf of Avison Young (UK) Limited

Enc: Updated Acoustic Report (dated 6 August 2021)