Sam Elliott

From: Jamie Lynch [redacted]
Sent: 24 August 2026 19:09
To: Sam Elliott
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: OTH-2026-001003: Land Bound By Dantzic Street. Conditions 21 and 23, Phase 2
Attachments: 28499-CDR-RP4-Rev1-NJM-Condition Discharge Report 21(b) - Tower A & Midrise A.pdf

ALERT This message originated outside of the Manchester City Council network. **BE CAUTIOUS** before clicking any links or opening any attachments. Please remember your Cyber Training and report anything suspicious.

Hi Sam

Please see responses below and an updated report attached

Thanks
Jamie

Jamie Lynch
Consultant

[redacted]

ASTEER
PLANNING

3rd Floor, Calico, 53-55 Mosley Street, Manchester, M2 3HQ
Asteer Planning LLP Legal Disclaimer

From: Sam Elliott <Sam.Elliott@manchester.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 August
To: Jamie Lynch [redacted]
Subject: OTH-2026-001003: Land Bound By Dantzic Street. Conditions 21 and 23, Phase 2

Hi,

MCC Environmental Health have reviewed the submission and have the following comments:

Condition 21b) Plant validation Tower A and Midrise A (phase 2)

Having reviewed the Hann Tucker plant validation assessment reference HT/28499/CDR4 dated 2nd July 2026:

We can accept the validation assessment for the plant to be installed for phase 2 which indicates that the installed plant will meet the criteria, however, plant item HRU-A-02 wasn't assessed because it is 6m above the ground. Efforts will need to be made to assess this item of plant an included within the cumulative plant noise assessment.

Attempts were made to measure this item; however, due to the height of the discharge location, it was considered appropriate not to proceed further as a safety precaution.

For access to elevated measurement positions, all operatives use a BS EN 131-approved platform stepladder, in accordance with Hann Tucker's health and safety procedures. The top platform of the stepladder is approximately 0.6 m above ground level. Taking into account the height and arm reach of the operative, together with the use of an extended microphone pole, the maximum practical measurement height without introducing an unacceptable safety risk is approximately 4.0 to 4.5 m above ground level.

Furthermore, the Condition 21(a) report identified that the predicted noise rating level from the inlet/outlet of HRU-A-02 at Apartment TA-03-002, which represents the nearest and worst-affected receptor, was 6 dB. This is 35 dB below the applicable night-time criterion. On this basis, it can reasonably be concluded that noise from the unit is comfortably within the required criteria, even allowing for a degree of uncertainty over the onsite conditions.

Assessment includes emergency plant which we can accept although there appears to be an error on page 9 for the commentary under the results table of the emergency plant which states the calculated rating is 19dB which looks like a typo and should be 55dB based on the table so this needs revising for completeness.

Yes, this was a typo and has been amended in the updated report.

We will require calculations providing to establish how the plant rating at the receptors has been established including reductions used for screening, distance etc.

We have included the losses in the updated report for the relevant sections re. MEV calculations and the Smoke Extraction systems.

Also, as far as they can tell we still need a testing schedule of emergency plant to confirm testing will only take place between 10:00 and 16:00 on Monday to Friday and that the emergency induction fan will not run on full load during testing. Details of ow occupiers of the development will be informed of the dates of any emergency plant testing should be included within the schedule

This could be included in the tenant handbook.

Finally, any other tenant plant such as plant associated with any commercial / retail use that hasn't been installed yet will still require validation assessment. We had agreed that future tenant plant could be addressed later providing it was assessed against the original ARUP EIS noise limits and be tested when installed building plant was switched off. They advise this was dealt with by NMA application to split the residential plant from the commercial plant so just to be aware, any other tenant plant will still need to be addressed by separate applications and the above validation is for building plant only.

This will need to be assessed by future tenants of any commercial building.

Condition 23b) Tower A and Midrise A Residential Insulation validation

Having reviewed the Hann Tucker assessment reference 28499/CDR6 dated 2nd July 2026:

The document demonstrates that the internal noise criteria has been met and the installed insulation in the residential properties is performing as required in Tower A which we can accept.

However, there isn't any validation measurements for Midrise A which will be required. Initial attempts for this tower were aborted as there was a fire alarm sounding at the time. Additional measurements and an updated validation assessment will be required in Midrise A once the alarm has been repaired to demonstrate compliance with the criteria in this tower.

Measurements were conducted in the Midrise A Tower. Please refer to the results table in Section 5.2. The aborted night-time survey was supplemented by spot measurements and the percentage covered across both Tower A and Midrise A meet the MCC target for 10% of the development. The Midrise A is further away than Tower A, any additional measurements are deemed unnecessary for the compliance of noise break-in.

Can you amend the documents in response to the comments above.

Thanks,

Sam Elliott
Planner
Planning, Building Control and Licensing
Growth and Neighbourhoods
[redacted]

*Upcoming Leave:

07/08/2026
19/08/2026 – 24/08/2026
28/09/2026 – 02/10/2026

****
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender, or dpo@manchester.gov.uk, and then permanently delete the email, attachments and all copies.
The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at: www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer.
Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at: www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy for further information.

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
****