



**Site Address:** 121 Palatine Road, Manchester  
**Application Description:** Proposed Residential Development  
**Our Reference:** 8235/PR/BL – EHO comments & Reply PR/DO  
**Date:** 17<sup>th</sup> August 2020  
**Planning Ref. Number:** 125235/FO/2019

The following Technical Note has been prepared in response to Karen Williamson, Environmental Health Officer comments included in the Fiona Sharkey Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety correspondence dated 14/05/20 and is to be read in conjunction with Acoustic Consultants Ltd's Noise Impact Assessment Report Ref; 8235/PR/BL dated 09/03/20; the Environmental Health offices comments are in italics and our response in blue below:

*"Application to discharge planning condition (s)*

*Planning Approval Number: 125235/FO/2019*

*Description: Discharge of Condition 3 (acoustic insulation) attached to planning permission 125235/FO/2019*

*Location: 121 Palatine Road, Manchester, M20 3YA*

*I write in response to your memorandum regarding the discharge of condition 3 attached to the above planning approval.*

*We are in receipt of an acoustic report by Acoustic Consultants Ltd, dated March 20, ref: 8235/PR/DO*

*The figures and acoustics suggestion for windows are acceptable, however monitoring position 1 is not nearest to Palatine Road, and is placed in an alley between houses that may not reflect the true value of the traffic noise. Some justification is needed regarding this and may require further monitoring from the front of the premises to demonstrate the figures are truly represented.*

It is acknowledged that this location is not on the front façade of the building facing Palatine Road. However, this was at a location which had a clear view of the road and at which road traffic along Palatine Road was dominant.

The location was selected for practical reasons of security required for a long term survey as access to the building was not permitted by the existing occupiers.

The location of the monitoring location is allowed for in the noise modelling as shown in figures 7-9 of the report. The noise model was calibrated to the noise level measured on site so that the site noise levels are the same as those in the model at this location. This means that the levels to the front of the building are some 7 decibels greater than that at the monitoring location.

This is a common practice and is the same method used for all noise modelling.



As such we have confidence in the validity of the measured data, the method and outcomes of the noise predictions, the resulting noise control measures proposed and the conclusions that the predicted noise levels achieve the required internal noise levels.

However, in addition to the modelling there is also a requirement for noise monitoring prior to first occupation to demonstrate the noise levels are met.

For the reasons stated above it is our view that the measurements and modelling are reliable and no further monitoring prior to the development works are required.

*"Regarding the external area, EH would require MCC criteria to be met due to the sensitive nature of the application."*

Noise levels in the external amenity areas are due to a combination of noise from road traffic on Palatine Road and the Tramline. There will also have been other noise sources such as car park movements on and off site which could not be modelled but were part of the measured noise climate.

An acoustic barrier is proposed around the gardens with a height of 1.8 to 2.1 metres. This was determined by the design team as a reasonable height to provide a degree of sound reduction but also not to be overbearing and adversely affect the restful and calming appearance and feel of the gardens.

An assessment of higher acoustic barriers has been undertaken and it has been determined that to achieve the 2 decibel reduction required to meet the LPA noise limits the barriers surrounding the gardens would need to be in excess of 4 metres. This is not considered reasonable for a reduction in noise levels which would effectively be inaudible to users.

There are areas of the gardens where the LPA noise criteria is achieved and hard landscaping such as shelters will result in further areas of lower noise levels.

We have also been informed that the proposed development will be used mainly by children that are recovering from cancer and will spend most of their times inside the building interacting with other kids and people. They are only likely to spend a few days in the building, and will not live there permanently. The time spent by these children at the external amenity area is likely to be limited for a short period during play according to the applicant.

Whilst it is desirable to achieve the LPA noise limits in the gardens it is not considered practical to do so without having other and greater impact on visual impact and amenity. The noise limits are achieved as far as feasible with the approved scheme.

The noise limits are achieved in the building where occupants will spend most of their time and where the more sensitive activities (such as sleeping and resting) take place.

*"EH also require a post completion report."*

This will be provided later at completion.

I trust this is of assistance. Please contact me should you require any further information or clarification.

Yours sincerely,



**ACOUSTIC CONSULTANTS LTD**  
*noise and acoustic specialists since 1987*

T: 0117 986 2956 | E: [mail@acoustic-ltd.co.uk](mailto:mail@acoustic-ltd.co.uk)

Pedro Rodrigues,  
*MIOA, MSc Civil Engineer (CEng)*  
*Senior Acoustic Consultant*  
**FOR ACOUSTIC CONSULTANTS LIMITED**