

Environmental Health,
Manchester City Council,
Town Hall,
Albert Square,
Manchester,
M2 5DB

06/01/2025

To Whom It May Concern,

Caritas House – Façade Acoustics

We have undertaken three visits to Caritas House to:

- quantify the environmental noise climate prior to development and specify three façade mitigation options;
- quantify internal noise levels in rooms with Option 1 mitigation, and;
- quantify internal noise levels in rooms with Option 2 mitigation.

The table below summarises the three façade mitigation options specified for the site.

Mitigation Type	Minimum performance required	Indicative Glazing Configuration
Option 1	27 dB $R_w + C_{tr}$	4 mm float glass pane / 12 mm air gap /
	34 dB $D_{ne,w} + C_{tr}$	4 mm float glass pane (i.e. any standard thermal double glazing)
Option 2	27 dB $R_w + C_{tr}$	4 mm float glass pane / 12 mm air gap /
	29 dB $D_{ne,w} + C_{tr}$	4 mm float glass pane (i.e. any standard thermal double glazing)
Option 3	N/A	4 mm float glass pane / 12 mm air gap /
	N/A	4 mm float glass pane (i.e. any standard thermal double glazing)

Miller Goodall Limited

Ashworth House · Deakins Business Park · Blackburn Road · Egerton · Bolton · BL7 9RP

Company Registration No. 5201673

Tel: 01204 596166 · E-mail: info@millergoodall.co.uk

www.millergoodall.co.uk

As can be seen, Options 1 & 2 have explicit minimum performance requirements for glazing, which would be achieved by any standard thermal double glazing configuration, plus an acoustically rated trickle vent. Noise measurements have been undertaken in two rooms; one with Option 1 mitigation (Report 103074-2) and one with Option 2 mitigation (Report reference 103074-3). The specified Internal criteria was met in both cases.

For Option 3, there is no minimum performance requirement. Provided there is double glazing and a trickle vent fitted (rather than straight holes in the façade), the internal noise criteria would be achieved within the rooms. This option was only specified to show that the rooms hadn't been missed or ignored at the design stage, but there is no acoustic requirement for the façade as noise levels are low enough that internal noise levels will be achieved by any glazing and ventilator combination used. It would not, therefore, generally be appropriate to test the spaces where Option 3 mitigation was proposed.

In the context that Option 2 is a minimal acoustic performance, rooms with this performance requirement being subject to higher levels of environmental noise and the measured internal noise levels being significantly below the criteria, the likelihood of noise levels breaching criteria in Option 3 rooms is effectively zero. As a result, we did not consider it appropriate or necessary to undertake testing in those rooms and consider the development to be in compliance with Condition 5 of planning permission ref: *1038910/FO/2023*.

To summarise, noise levels in rooms with minimal acoustic mitigation are significantly below the criteria for those rooms, and all other rooms would be expected to achieve similar façade acoustic performance while being subject to lower levels of environmental noise. As a result, based on measurements at the site and our experience of similar works, it is our professional opinion that noise ingress to these spaces will not exceed the criteria for these rooms and that the development complies with the requirements of Condition 5 of planning permission ref: *1038910/FO/2023*.

Yours Faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jo Lacy', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Jo Lacy
Senior Acoustic Consultant