**CDN/24/0096- Former White Moss Road Day Care**

Responses from consultees:
-Highways- received 29/2
-EH- received 7/3
-MCC Flood Risk- received 1/3
-UU- received 13/3

**Condition 6 (CMP)**

Highway Services- 28/2- Subject to the Applicant having discussions with the council's Highway Network Management teams via Email -highwaylicences@manchester.gov.uk and highwaynetworkmanagement@manchester.gov.uk to discuss any requirements for licensing, hoarding / scaffolding and any associated temporary pedestrian/traffic management arrangements, this condition can be discharged.

EH- 7/3- I have reviewed the above and there doesn't look to be anything additional to address our previous comments regarding condition 6 CMP which I have included below for ease.

From a noise and vibration point of view we need the following:
Details of the maximum noise and vibration level at the site boundary during the work the contractor will be working to. Vibration should not exceed 1.0mm/s PPV. Noise and vibration monitoring will be required and details of monitoring locations will need to be provided. We can accept the comments regarding actions taken should the monitoring confirm limits are being approached / exceeded but the comments will need to confirm in such occurrence work will cease until the actions referred to have been implemented. We will also need the receptors confirming in the CEMP

12/3- DS provided information to overcome EH concerns.
Sent to EH 12/3

EH-14/3-
Sorry, its still not sufficient. As previously requested, they still need to include the construction noise limit at the site boundary with residential receptors and also confirm the vibration limit (which should not exceed 1.0 mm/s ppv at the receptors). Also, we still need comment in the actions taken section: should the monitoring confirm noise / vibration limits are being exceeded, work will cease until the actions referred to have been implemented.

27/3- further information sent from Dave to satisfy condition 6. Sent onto EH for review. Asked admin team to add to system.

4/4/24- further comments from EH:
Almost there with this one but not quite. I have reviewed the updated CMP which now includes the vibration limit and comment to confirm that work will case where noise or vibration levels exceed the limit which we can accept.

The last point to address is the noise limit at the site boundary as the submitted CMP suggests a limit of 80-90dB which is excessive although only seems to be based on noise level from the piling rig rather than all construction activities during the work. The noise level will need to be based on ABC

assessment methodology found in BS5228 and it is likely that the noise limit will fall within the 65 to 70dB Laeq over a 10 hour working day.

We just need to noise limit at the boundary amending based on the above comment and then we should be able to discharge the condition so if they can amend that part and get it to back to us I will review as soon as I can.

4/4- revised CMP provided by agent. Sent to EH for review. Doc uploaded to Uniform.

**Condition 10 (drainage)**

LLFA- 1/3:

The information uploaded to the Planning Portal from 13th February 2024 has been considered.

It should be noted that this is a separate application to CDN-23-0803 therefore, the developer must submit all the required documentation under this planning reference number (CDN/24/0096).

Please see our outstanding LLFA comments listed in red below:

o Construction details of flow control and SuDS elements. – The developer needs to provide engineering specification for the proposed Hydro-brake (S4).

o It is recommended that the developer supplies all the information previously provided under application no. CDN-23-0803 for future reference.

INFORMATIVE:

MCC records highlights an underground culverted watercourse (Lionfield Brook) is located within close proximity to the site (approximately 30m north of the site and 60m west of the site), while our records are frequently updated to ensure the highest level of accuracy, the records cannot guarantee 100% accuracy for all MCC underground assets. Therefore, we would request that the applicant informs the onsite contractor to remain observant and to take the appropriate safety precautions during excavation works. If any major unknown drainage assets are found beneath the site, then further investigation works should take place to identify the asset and MCC should be contacted immediately.

11/3- Information supplied from DS sent to LLFA for review. Uploaded to planning system.

13/3- Response from LLFA-

The information attached to this application has been reviewed.

There appears to be a discrepancy between Drainage Layout and S104 Control MH detail. The S104 Control MH detail specifies 2400mm dia PCC and the Drainage Layout specifies 2700mm dia PCC.

Has the S104 been granted technical approval?

Please see our outstanding LLFA comments listed in red below:

O Construction details of flow control and SuDS elements. – Developer to provide confirmation and update engineering specification for the proposed Hydro-brake (S4).

oS104 tech approval details to be provided.

oIt is recommended that the developer supplies all the information previously provided under application no. CDN-23-0803 for reference when rereviewing this CDN.

13/3- Response from UU- no objection to the discharge of condition 10

15/3- Further information from Dave dated 14 March 2024 sent onto LLFA for review.

19/3- LLFA comments- We have no further comments and recommend the discharge of condition 10.

**Condition 12 (noise)**

EH-7/3- I have reviewed the updated E3P acoustic assessment Ref: 50-477-TN1-3, Dated 8th February 2024 which includes comment with regard to internal noise impact from the ventilation system. The assessment indicates that whilst in boost mode the internal night time noise criteria will not be exceeded which we can accept. The validation testing will need to include the ventilation system in operation to address the part b) verification element of the condition.

Just one point to note, as natural ventilation is being relied upon this will need to be considered as part of the assessment of plant noise from the ASHP's outside the properties and consideration to their selection / acoustic housing will bee needed during design.

**Condition 22 (acoustic enclosures for ASHPs)**

22/2- emailed agent to confirm what is happening with condition 22- insufficient information submitted to consider this condition

26/2- agent wishes to remove this condition from any approval granted. Removed from our system.