Vision Developments
Manchester Hall
36 Bridge Street
Manchester
M3 3BT
Tel: 07919 694 129

24th April 2017

RE: Response to comments and objections re: 115200

Dear Jennifer,

Thank you for your email dated 3rd April 2017 outlining comments from the statutory consultees on our application ref 115200 – Bridge Street. I apologise for the delay in responding, however I felt it prudent all the information was gathered from our consultants.

Please see below and attached a full response that I trust addresses all matter raised. If there is anything else you require, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Archaeology

Condition relating to the exploration of the below ground works.

Please can you clarify this point?

Highways

The TS relies on the proposed provision of 18 car parking spaces at the development to demonstrate that no more than 18 vehicles are likely to arrive at the development (or depart from it) during the peak hours. TfGM do not agree that likely traffic generation at the site can be assumed to be 'capped' at the maximum that might be implied by the limited number of car parking spaces: if the main activity at the site, in this case predominantly employment/office space, is attractive, then some people will arrive and depart by vehicle, even if they find they must park at some distance from the development.

Please see Vectos document.

HFAS have carried out additional testing using the TRICS traffic generation database to obtain an estimate of about 50-70 likely peak hour vehicles in the 'tidal' direction, ie arriving in the morning and departing in the evening. (The likely figure depends on what proportion of person-trips is assumed to arrive by car; this proportion can be assumed to be low, given the city-centre location.) Such trips attracted by the development's activities would seek to use nearby public car parking, in addition to the 18 spaces proposed at the development itself.

Please see Vectos document.

TfGM HFAS recommend that the TS include an estimate of total person-trips likely to be generated at the site. A suitable proportion for the share of such trips that would probablyarrive/depart by car can then be applied to the person-trips; this can be obtained from Census 2011, or, probably more appropriate at this site, from data at similar city-centre developments. Depending on the volume of likely new traffic, and how such new traffic may distribute at adjacent car parks, it may then be necessary to consider the likely traffic impacts at nearby junctions.

Please see Vectos document.

A total of 18 car park spaces are to be provided in the basement of the development which is to be accessed from Wood Street and controlled using a barrier system. Due to the city centre location of the development, this proposal is acceptable. However, confirmation is required regarding the positioning of the access barrier to ensure that there is at least a 5m setback from the highway to ensure one car is able to wait off the highway. It is noted that the car park ramp gradient is 1:20 when the ramp meets the adopted highway which is acceptable in principle.

Please see AHR drawing PL(00) 004 rev A showing the car park shutter set back 5010mm from the highway to enable a car to wait. There is also a separate security gate which will be open during the day and then closed at night for additional security.

In relation to the car park layout, there appears to be differences between the layout illustrated in the transport assessment and the plan provided in the design and access statement. Clarification is sought from the applicant how many car parking spaces will be provided and which plan is correct.

Apologies as Vectos used an older drawing. For clarification I attach AHR drawing PL(00) 003 Rev A showing the correct layout.

Details of car park dimensions should also be provided as some parking spaces within the plans appear to be substandard against MCC parking standards.

Please see Vectos document.

Twelve secure cycle parking spaces are proposed at ground floor level within a bike store.

However, the MCC Core Strategy requires 20 cycle stands for the office use and at least 2 cycle stands for the A1-5 class. It is recommended the applicant increases the number of cycle stands within in this development in line with MCC standards. It is noted that shower and changing facilities will also be provided for cyclists.

Please see AHR drawing PL(00) 004 Rev A showing 5 cycle spaces, and drawing PL(00) 003 rev A showing an additional 17 cycle spaces that we have placed under the ramp.

A bin store for the development is proposed to be located at ground floor level, to the rear of the building. Waste collections will be undertaken from Wood Street. It is noted that the plan showing a swept path of a refuse vehicle with a car passing uses an indicative kerbline. As this kerbline is existing, accurate carriageway width measurements are required from the applicant to demonstrate this manoeuvre can be accommodated. It is noted that the refuse vehicle used in the tracking is not the standard vehicle size which is used for waste collection within the city centre. It is recommended the applicant provides swept path analysis of a refuse vehicle (11.5m in length) which is the standard size used by MCC.

Please see Vectos document

No detail has been provided in relation to the number of delivery vehicles expected to access the site. It is recommended that further information is provided in relation to deliveries and the times they are expected. It is also recommended that a Servicing Management Strategy / Schedule is conditioned to ensure the loading vehicles do not impact upon vehicular access along Wood Street.

Please see Vectos document

It is also recommended that servicing takes place outside of peak hours to reduce congestion on the highway network.

This is agreeable.

In all scenarios where servicing takes place, management of the service/delivery vehicles will be required.

This is agreeable.

Given that a basement car park is to be provided at the site, it is recommended that structural drawings and calculations for the temporary and permanent support works be submitted for checking (for a fee) to MCC Bridges/Structures Section in order to obtain an approval in principle.

If this is needed can this be conditioned as part of the consent?

It is noted that access to the basement car park is proposed in the location where there is a full height kerb. The applicant will be required to contact the MCC Environment on Call (0161 234 5004) to discuss the requirement for a dropped kerb.

Noted.

No Construction Management Plan has been provided. It is recommended that a detailed Construction Management Plan is provided by the applicant prior to any construction works beginning. It is recommended that the Construction Management Plan details the phasing and quantification / classification of vehicular activity associated with planned construction. This should include commentary on types and frequency of vehicular demands together with evidence (including appropriate swept-path assessment) of satisfactory routeing both within the site and on the adjacent highway. The document should also consider contractor parking and ongoing construction works in the locality. It is recommended that the above is conditioned and attached to any planning permission that may be granted.

A Construction Management Plan has now been provided by our planning consultant, and is also attached for ease of reference. [attached CMP.PDF]

Historic England

No view or assessment has been made about the impact on views from Deansgate to the south side of the Library, which is a key view of the Listed John Rylands within the Conservation Area. It is presumed that this because the proposed building, which would be to the rear of the library, would not be seen from this view. It would be useful to confirm this by the submission of a simple wire line image.

These views were supplied as part of the DAS however for ease we have had some additional views done in solid and wireframe which are attached. The wireframes show where the new building will sit and the solids clearly illustrate the new building is not in view.

Environmental Health considerations

Fumes - The information does not state what filter system will be in use. Confirmation is needed as to how this system will be managed to control discharge of fumes, vapours and odours. Confirmation is needed that the exact point will be 1 metre above eaves and further clarification is needed that the extract flue will be capped with a rain resistant terminal and not with a cowl. This is to ensure high velocity vertical discharge.

Please see attached response from our consultants on this matter.

Document reference [QED Fumes Document]

Noise - The noise report has been assessed. Comment is required to address the criteria relating to the limits at 63 Hz and 125 Hz as above as this has not formed part of the assessment. An updated report will be required to include this restriction and details of any additional attenuation required from the facade performance and recommended updated insulation.

Clarification is sought on this point and our acoustic engineers have attempted to contact both yourself and the relevant EHO. It is thought that the information requested has been included within the noise report already submitted.

Confirmation is also required to confirm that only low level background entertainment noise is to be played within the commercial ground floor units. If anything other than low level background music is required, then significant insulation upgrades will be required and recommendation have been provided int he report. These may need to be amended in order to satisfy the limits at 63 Hz and 125 Hz above.

Confirmed

Plant - Further details will be required once the plant is known.

Will be provided as soon as details are available

Refuse - Further information will need to be provided to address the MCC standards. It has been proposed that 1 x 1100 litre receptacle will be provided for the food waste bit the strategy will need to include containers for the storage and disposal of mixed recycling and pulpable waste. Further information will also be required in respect of how many containers will be made available for the mixed recycling and pulpable materials for the office space. At present, only 5 x 1000 litre containers have been proposed.

Please see AHR drawing PL(00) 050 Rev A, showing the refuse calculations and breakdown

Air quality - The report has advised that a dust management plan should be formulated for the purposes of the construction stage of the development. Recommended measures have been included in the report to reduce fugitive dust emissions during the construction activities which can form part of the dust management plan and the applicant will need to confirm these recommendation will be adopted in the development phase.

The recommendation will be adopted and this is covered in the submitted Construction Management Plan

It is noted that 18 car spaces will be provided but no electric spaces provided. It is recommended that 1 electric car charging point should be provided per 10 sqms.

Electric points will be made available in the basement for owners of electric cars to bring their own chargers and plug into

Flood Risk

Surface water drainage - Details of surface water attenuation that offers a reduction in surface water runoff rate in line with the Manchester Trafford and Salford Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, i.e. at least a 50% reduction in runoff rate compared to the existing rates, as the site is located within Conurbation Core Critical Drainage Area

***Comment from our consultant:* "As the site is 100% paved there will be no increase in flows from the site. The building covers the site completely and has an underground car park there is no practical solution to a reduction of flows from the roof drainage within a crowded city centre location. No storage could be introduced below the developments basement without increasing the flood risk to the users and the adjacent building basements."**

- Runoff volume in the 1 in 100 year, 6 hours rainfall shall be constrained to a value as close as is reasonable practicable to the greenfield runoff volume for the same event, but never to exceed the runoff volume from the development site prior to redevelopment;

Comment from our consultant: "The site is a city centre development and 100% impermeable so the greenfield runoff requirement is not appropriate to this development. There should be no increase for the 100 year 6hr rainfall event between the proposed and the existing."

- Evidence that the drainage system has been designed (unless an area is designated to hold and/or convey water as part of the design) so that flooding does not occur during a 1 in 100 year rainfall event in any part of a building;

Comment from our consultant: "This is a single building in a confined site. The only surface water system will be roof drainage."

- Assessment of overland flow routes for extreme events that is diverted away from buildings (including basements);

Comment from our consultant: "There are no surface water drainage systems for storm flows from the single building. The roof drainage will drain to the existing drainage system."

- Hydraulic calculation of the proposed drainage system;

Comment from our consultant: "Not appropriate or required."

- Long and cross sections for the proposed drainage system and finished floor levels.

Comment from our consultant: "Not appropriate or required for roof drainage."

- Construction details of flow control and SuDS elements.

Comment from our consultant: "Not appropriate or required for roof drainage."

- Proposal of surface water management during construction period.

This will be satisfied during temporary works

Public opinion

4 Letters of objection have been received.

These have been responded separately within the 'Objections' folder.

Stephen Cliff

Stephen@visiondevelopments.com