



Manchester City Council
Planning Department
P.O. Box 532
Town Hall
Manchester
M60 2LA

70068337
25 January 2021

Dear Sir / Madam,

**APPLICATION TO DISCHARGE CONDITIONS 3 AND 4 OF PLANNING PERMISSION REF:
126207/FO/2020
11 ST JAMES SQUARE, MANCHESTER, M2 6DN
PLANNING PORTAL REF: PP-09443754**

On behalf of St James Estates Limited, please find enclosed an application to discharge Conditions 3 and 4 of planning permission ref: 126207/FO/2020, for the installation of a roof-top smoke extract vent and associated screening, at the above site.

The following documents are submitted to support of this application:

- Application form;
- Wolter Fan Data Sheet and Specification;
- Smoke Extract Fan Set-up Roof System (ref: 2155-P1-01);
- Proposed Roof Plan and Smoke Extract (ref: 432/38(02)021A);
- Noise Emissions Note prepared by Wardell Armstrong (21 January 2021).

The planning application fee of £116 has been paid online via the Planning Portal.

CONDITION 3

Condition 3 states:

"a) Any externally mounted ancillary plant, equipment and servicing needed for the smoke vent to operate shall be selected and/or acoustically treated in accordance with a scheme designed so as to achieve a rating level of a maximum of 10dB (LAeq) above the typical background (LA90) level at the nearest noise sensitive location (due to the fact that this is emergency plant only).

Before development commences, the scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority in order to secure a reduction in the level of noise emanating from the site.

For the avoidance of doubt, the plant shall operate in accordance with the sound level approved in the Technical Note listed in Condition 2 and this noise limit has been based on a testing frequency lasting no longer than 5 minutes during the daytime, between the hours of 10.00 to 16.00 Monday to Friday.

b) Upon completion of the development and before any of the external plant for the smoke vent is first operational, a verification report will be required to validate that the work undertaken throughout the development conforms to the recommendations and requirements in the approved acoustic consultant's report. Once the data is available to the consultant for the selected plant and the assessment finds that the predicted noise level is within 10dB of the agreed noise limit found in table 2 of the Wardell Armstrong Technical Note dated 24 April 2020, reference RC/CMD/GM10442-006, post completion testing will be required to confirm that the noise criteria has been met and the agreed limit not exceeded. Any instances of non-conformity with the recommendations in the report shall be detailed along with any measures required to ensure compliance with the agreed noise criteria. The report and any necessary measures shall be approved in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority and the development shall be implemented in full in accordance with the approved details before the plant is first brought into use."

The dimensions, manufacturer's details, full specification and details of the orientation of the smoke vent are provided in the enclosed documents. The equipment includes long cased axial flow fans with a robust, heavy duty construction, a steelwork frame and DW144 classification ductwork (enhanced smoke specification). The smoke vent also includes two silencers fitted internally for acoustic mitigation purposes.

In order to satisfy the requirements of Condition 3, the manufacturers' spectral noise emission data for the smoke vent were modelled by the appointed acoustic consultant; Wardell Armstrong. The results of the modelling showed that noise from the equipment would exceed the limits set out in Condition 3. However, the noise emission data is based on the smoke vents operating at 100% capacity, which would rarely happen as the smoke vent would be calibrated on-site to provide sufficient air flow. As such, the noise emissions are typically lower than stated by the manufacturer's data. Therefore, the contractor was confident that the smoke vent would meet the required noise limit and proceeded with its installation to enable verification testing to be undertaken; which would demonstrate compliance with Condition 3.

On 6 January 2021, Wardell Armstrong therefore undertook noise monitoring at the site to measure noise emissions from the vent. Noise measurements were taken with the vent operating firstly in an easterly direction, and secondly in a westerly direction. Noise from the smoke vent was dominant at all of the measurement locations. The noise measurements taken were modelled with a worst case scenario approach to determine noise levels from the smoke vent at the nearest residential receptor. The results of the noise model show that noise levels from the vent are lower than the required limit set out in Condition 3 and, as such, no further mitigation measures are required.

Full details of the noise modelling and monitoring, as summarised above, are set out in the enclosed Noise Emissions Note prepared by Wardell Armstrong.

The above and enclosed information demonstrates that the proposal meets the requirements of Condition 3. As such, we respectfully request that the condition is discharged in full.

CONDITION 4

Condition 4 states:

“Once the required external plant and equipment needed for the smoke vent to function have been selected and the exact dimensions of the plant and equipment are known, full details and a specification of the screening to be placed around the smoke vent, including its height, composition, design, appearance and colour, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details for the screening before the plant first becomes operational and the screening shall remain in situ thereafter.”

The enclosed Proposed Roof Plan and Smoke Extract drawing (ref: 432/38(02)021A) is submitted in support of discharging Condition 4. As required by the condition, the drawing provides full details of the proposed screening to be placed around the smoke vent. The screening will comprise louvred screens that will be powder coated in an off white colour (RAL 9010). We consider that the proposed screening is appropriate for the location of the smoke vent; on the roof of a city centre building. It provides suitable visual mitigation in the interest of protecting visual amenity and as such, we consider that Condition 4 can be discharged. The proposed screening will be installed around the smoke extract at the eastern side of the roof as the other vent is located within an existing plant room.

CONCLUSION

I trust the enclosed is sufficient to fully satisfy the requirements of Conditions 3 and 4 and enable them to be formally discharged. However, please let me know if you have any queries or require any additional information.

Yours faithfully



Fraser Dann
Senior Planner

Encl. As noted above.