

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. CDN/25/1020

Date registered valid: 20 October 2025

Proposal: Discharge of Conditions 4 (Drainage), 6 (Contractors Compound), 9 (Hours of Operation) and 10 (Noise Management Plan) attached to planning permission 141932/FO/2025

Address: Unity Community Primary School, 41 Allesley Drive, Manchester, M7 4YE

Ward(s): Cheetham Ward

Applicant: Ms Hayley Wilson, SIS UK Ltd

Agent (if any): Mr Matthew Druce, Labosport Ltd

Case officer: Sue Wills
Tel: 0161 234 4524
Email: sue.wills@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Split Decision

Date of recommendation: 8th January 2026

Application details

Type of application: Approval of condition application

Development type: Notifications

Standard consultations:

Printed: 23 October 2025 Expired: 13 November 2025

Neighbour notifications

No neighbour notifications have been printed and sent.

Site notice

No site notice has been produced

Press advert

No press advert had been published

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

Listed building: Not applicable

Consultations & Notification Responses

Highway Services- The information provided is sufficient to recommend the discharge of Condition 6 from a Highways perspective.

LLFA – Condition no.4 can be discharged.

Sport England - The submitted Planning Support Addendum provides an explanation of the natural turf reinstatement, however, there appears to be no layout plan to show the location of the construction infrastructure. As such there is insufficient information to assess any impact on the playing field.

(The construction infrastructure was discharged in connection with condition no. 3 (CMP) and condition no.6a (contractors compound) as part of application ref: CDN/25/0703 on 22.09.2025).

MCR Active - The condition of relevance to Manchester Active is 9 (Hours of Use).

The proposed hours of use are supported by Manchester Active. This will allow local residents, especially those identified in underrepresented priority groups to participate in low cost and free physical activities and will enable the PlayZone to be fully activated across the week. This meets the ethos of the Making Manchester Fairer plan that aims to tackle health inequalities across Manchester.

The Noise Assessment shows the highest predicted noise level is within acceptable limits. However, it is noted the Noise Assessment proposes a 3m Noise Attenuation barrier immediately around the PlayZone which will reduce the noise levels further.

It is not clear whether the hours of use are 8am to 21:00pm or 8am to 22:00. The Noise Assessment on p.40 states 08:00 – 22:00 whereas p.5 of the same report states 08:00 –

21:00. The Planning Support Addendum on p.3 states 08:00 – 22:00 Monday. Clarification is required but Manchester would support 08:00 – 22:00 Monday to Sunday.

Environmental Health 12.11.2025

Condition no. 10 – Noise Management Plan

I have reviewed the revised K Acoustic Consultant noise assessment reference 11299/GK dated 29th September 2025 and I have the following comments:

1. The revised report now includes a background noise assessment in proximity to the receptors which they will accept.
2. Based on the assessment, the average noise level at the receptors would fall within the proposed criteria, however they still have concerns about the MAX noise levels during specific events such as raised voices and ball strikes against perimeter fencing which is now predicted to be 63dB at the receptors (reduced from 65dB in the previous report). As previously stated, they are concerned that these events are likely to be frequent during the use of the games pitch throughout the day and likely to impact amenity of nearby receptors as these levels are clearly well above the background noise level, particularly during the later hours as demonstrated by the background noise survey and especially during the summer months when activities are likely to be taking place during the later hours and residents are likely to have windows open.
3. Mitigation measures have been proposed in the form of an acoustic barrier around 3 sides to the pitch of 3m height and 10kg/m² mass. Even with this acoustic mitigation measure the MAX noise events are predicted to be 63dB which as discussed is likely to impact the amenity of nearby receptors. They previously asked if a barrier with a greater mass /better performance or different type of acoustic barrier reduce the max noise levels at the receptors , but further comment has not been provided in the report regarding this so they suggest this is explored with further comments, assessment and recommendations providing.
4. They will still need the distance from the sides of pitch the acoustic barrier is to be installed and confirmation that this distance has been used as part of the assessment in terms of mitigation values from the barrier.
5. They will also still need a maintenance schedule providing for the acoustic barrier which will need to include the inspection frequency, who is responsible, time frame for replacing any damaged or defective panels, information in the schedule of the performance requirements and examples of the suitable acoustic barrier to ensure like for like replacements should they need to be replaced. This is something that needs to be provided and submitted by the applicant / management company rather than the acoustic consultant.
6. Mitigation measures also include neoprene isolators being installed between the fence panels and the posts. It is assumed this is the wire mesh fencing surrounding the sports pitch within the acoustic barrier. Neoprene isolators will need to be installed and compliance will need to be demonstrated at validation stage.
7. It is evident from the noise survey that there is a reduction in background noise level post 20:00 and therefore MAX noise levels could be more noticeable. As previously mentioned, bearing in mind the high max noise level predicted at the receptors, they suggest an additional mitigation measure to reduce the hours during the week and we recommend that as a means of compromise the close time for the pitches during the week is 20:00.
8. Section 9 of the report includes noise mitigation measures to control noise problems from anti social behaviour and it is recommended that the applicant form a plan based on these recommendations in their operational document.
9. Once the above has been addressed and once at the relevant stage, they will need a validation assessment to confirm mitigations measures have been installed to the agreed requirement (once agreed) and actual noise measurements completing from typical use activity from the play zone at the neighbouring receptors to confirm the actual noise level during events. The results may indicate additional mitigation is required which will need to be recommended and installed in this instance

C9 - Hours

Based on previous correspondence and there concerns with regard to LA MAX noise events which are likely to be frequent, they suggest a 1 hour reduction in final hour during the and we ask for the following hours

Monday to Friday – 08:00 to 20:00

Saturday 08:00 to 20:00 (as previously agreed)

Sunday 09:00 to 17:00 (as previously agreed)

Further comments 24.12.2025

C9 – Hours

They recommend close time is 20:00 Monday to Friday

C10 – Noise management plan

They have reviewed the revised K Acoustic Consultant noise assessment reference 11299/GK dated 29th September 2025 and have the following comments:

1. They can accept the further comment and justification regarding LAMax noise levels
2. They can accept the response regarding the mass of the barrier which confirms that a barrier with greater density will not provide additional attenuation for those receptors higher than the barrier or have line of site. With this in mind, if the barrier is not providing full line of site screening, has the assessment taken into consideration the noise impact at windows which have line of site or is the assessment just based on the receptor points behind the barrier? If the barrier does not provide full screening then they will need impact assessment at the windows of those residential properties which have line of site of the pitches and do not have the benefit of mitigation from the barrier.
3. Location and distance to the pitch of the barrier has been provided which they can accept.
4. Information has been provided regarding maintenance and that school grounds staff will have responsibility for monitoring the condition of the barrier. However, they still need an actual/ formal maintenance management document which should include the inspection frequency, time frame for replacing any damaged or defective panels, information in the schedule of the performance requirements and examples of the suitable acoustic barrier to ensure like for like replacements should they need to be replaced. This is something that needs to be provided and submitted by the applicant / management company rather than the acoustic consultant.
5. Mitigation measures also include neoprene isolators being installed between the fence panels and the posts. It is assumed this is the wire mesh fencing surrounding the sports pitch within the acoustic barrier. Neoprene isolators will need to be installed and compliance will need to be demonstrated at validation stage.
6. Notwithstanding the comments and justification regarding the LAMax levels to address point 1 above, it is evident from the noise survey that there is a reduction in background noise level post 20:00 and therefore MAX noise levels will be more noticeable. As previously mentioned, bearing in mind the high max noise level predicted at the receptors, we suggest an additional mitigation measure to reduce the hours during the week and we recommend that as a means of compromise the close time for the pitches during the week is 20:00.
7. Once the above has been addressed (points 2 and 4) and once at the relevant stage, they will need a validation assessment to confirm mitigations measures have been installed to the agreed requirement (once agreed) and actual noise measurements completing from typical use activity from the play zone at the neighbouring receptors to confirm the actual noise level during events. The results may indicate additional mitigation is required which will need to be recommended and installed in this instance

Further comments 06.01.2026

Have no comments in respect of condition no.6.

Further comments 08.01.2026

Have reviewed the comment provided and the fence maintenance management plan along with the examples of replacement fencing and accept the response and the maintenance plan but the examples of replacement fencing need to be included within plan and referenced, along the lines of; "examples of the required replacement acoustic fencing are provided in appendix 1 / or provided below and any replacement must meet these examples as a minimum"

Hours – They are satisfied they have accepted 8pm close time in the week.

Issues

Other Legislative Requirements

Equality Act 2010

Section 149 (Public Sector Equality Duty) of the Equality Act 2010 requires due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act and; Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The Equality Duty does not impose a legal requirement to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment. Compliance with the Equality Duty involves consciously thinking about the aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making.

Human Rights Act 1998 considerations

This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have a right to a fair hearing and to this end the local planning authority must give full consideration to their comments.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Core Strategy and saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan, the Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing has concluded that some rights conferred by these articles on the applicant(s)/objector(s)/resident(s) and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. She believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the recommendation given is proportionate to the wider benefits of and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Recommendation: Approve

Article 35 Declaration

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

Condition no. 4 (Drainage)

4) The content of the following documents and plans has been reviewed.

Surface Water Drainage Design R -00227 -001 SWD -A July 2025 as amended by

-Planning support addendum ref: 24-0479_PSA_V1

-Proposed Drainage Layout plan ref: 00227 - E02 rev.B

-Below Ground Drainage layout plan ref: 3205 - 1.05 rev. T4
-Oriflo OFCP450 Data Sheet
-Unprotected Orifice Plate flow control chamber OFCP450 rev.B Product drawing
On the basis that the development is implemented in accordance with the information referenced above condition no.4 is discharged.

Condition no. 6 (Contractors Compound)

6) The content of the following documents and plans have been reviewed and were considered to be satisfactory in relation to part a of condition no.6 on 22nd September 2025.

-Planning agent email dated 26th August 2025
- Construction Management Plan (CEMP) ref: 020925 received 2nd September 2025
-Site Traffic Management Plan ref:24-6150 001 rev. B received 3rd September 2025
- Content of planning agent email dated 16th September 2025 and Swept Path Analysis plan ref:
30748 SK01 received 16th September 2025.

The content of the planning support addendum ref: 24-0479_PSA_V1 has been considered in respect of condition no.6 part b.

On the basis of the details referenced above being implemented condition no.6 is discharged.

Condition no. 9 (Hours of Operation)

9) The content of the planning support addendum ref: 24-0479_PSA_V1;
Noise Impact Assessment ref: 11299/GK Rev.B in relation to the hours of operation being sought - 08:00-22:00 Monday to Sunday has been noted, and it is not considered that sufficient information has been provided in respect of noise matters to enable the condition to be discharged on the basis of the hours of operation being sought.

However, account has been taken of the email from the planning agent on 7th January 2026 outlining hours of use sought being 08:00-20:00 Mondays to Fridays.

On the basis that the hours of operation are 08:00-20:00 Mondays to Saturdays, and 09:00 to 17:00 on Sundays, condition no.9 is discharged.

Condition no. 10 (Noise Management Plan)

10) The content of the planning support addendum ref: 24-0479_PSA_V1;
Noise Impact Assessment ref: 11299/GK Rev.B received 1st December 2025 have been reviewed in conjunction with the fencing maintenance management plan ; Reflective Sound Screen technical data and Reflective Sound Screen screens elevational images received 7th January 2026. On the basis that the development is implemented in accordance content of the documentation referenced above including the fencing maintenance management plan, Reflective Sound Screen technical data and Reflective Sound Screen screens elevational images; that the measures are retained whilst the PlayZone is in use, and subject to the hours of operation set out in the Noise Impact Assessment ref: 11299/GK Rev.B being revised by the hours of operation approved in condition no.9 , condition no.10 is discharged.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

Highway Services
Environmental Health
MCC Flood Risk Management
MCR Active
Sport England

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Coal Authority - Development Low Risk - Name: DEVELOPMENT_LOW_RISK_AREA
Historic Landfill Site 50m Buffer -
Area Team Boundary - Name: NORTH AREA