Victoria House, Great Ancoats Street

Environmental Statement Addendum

August 2021

Turley
Planning

Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Site Location and Description	6
3.	Background and Context	7
4.	The Revised Scheme	8
5.	EIA Methodology	12
6.	Alternatives and Design Evolution	14
7.	Construction Programme	15
8.	Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment	16
9.	Built Heritage	26
10.	Archaeology	31
11.	Transport	37
12.	Air Quality	43
13.	Noise and Vibration	48
14.	Ground Conditions	51
15.	Water Environment	59
16.	Ecology	64
17.	Television Interference	67
18.	Wind Microclimate	72
19.	Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing	75
20.	Socio-Economics	78
21.	Human Health	83
22.	Climate Change	87
23.	Environmental Management and Conclusions	91

Contact
Amy Gaskell
amy.gaskell@turley.co.uk

Thomas Lord
thomas.lord@turley.co.uk

August 2021

1. Introduction

1.1 This Environmental Statement Addendum ("ESA") has been prepared by Turley and the wider project consultant team on behalf of Forshaw Land and Property Group ("Forshaw") and Salboy Ltd ("the Applicants") in support of an application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) 1990 to amend the scheme at Victoria House, Great Ancoats Street, Manchester, M4 7AB.

1.2 This ESA seeks to assess the likely significant environmental effects arising from proposed changes to the design of the consented scheme and should be read in conjunction with the original Environmental Statement ("ES") prepared to support the original application in February 2020.

Background

1.3 Full planning permission was granted by Manchester City Council ('MCC') on 26 August 2020 for the redevelopment of Victoria House, including the demolition of the existing building and the construction of residential apartments with ground floor commercial space (LPA ref. 122000/FO/2018). The full wording of the approved development is as follows ["the Consented Scheme"]:

Erection of a part 25 part 3 storey residential tower (Use Class C3) for 177apartments comprising 59 x 1 bed (34 x 1 bed 1 person and 25 1 bed 2 person), 113 x 2 bed (44 x 2 bed 3 person and 69 x 2 bed 4 person) and 5 x 3 bed (3 bed 5 person) with ground floor commercial space (Use Class A1, A2, A3, A4 and D1) above partial basement level associated shared amenity spaces at 3rd floor level, realm enhancements following demolition of existing buildings

1.4 The application was supported by an ES completed in February 2020 ("ES 2020") which assessed the likely significant impacts of the scheme on the environment including, townscape and views, built heritage, archaeology, transport, air quality, noise and vibration, ground conditions, water environment, ecology, TV interference, wind microclimate, daylight and sunlight, human health, and climate change.

Proposed Amendments

1.5 Since the approval of the planning application, the design of the Consented Scheme has moved into RIBA Stage 4 where the need to incorporate a number of amendments has been identified.

1.6 These changes are, individually, minor in nature and are proposed to improve the operational efficiency of the Consented Scheme without diluting the applicants commitment to a scheme of the highest quality. These changes, in summary, comprise:

- Amendments to the basement design and extents, to accommodate plant, cycle parking, refuse storage and five parking spaces (three of which are accessible spaces) at this level.

- Minor reconfiguration of the ground floor layout to provide an additional commercial unit, improving the activation to Great Ancoats Street.
- Relocation of the residents' gym to level 1, and minor modifications to level 02 residents' garden layout.
- Improvements to apartment layouts and associated minor elevational amendments to coordinate with associated wall and window interfaces.
- Minor facade amendments resulting from detailed technical coordination.
- Reconfiguration of upper level and roof to provide five duplex three bedroom apartments, with roof terraces.
- Associated reduction in the total number of apartments proposed from 177 units to 175 units.
- Amendments to public realm and landscaping to facilitate introduction of access to basement car park from Longacre Street.

1.7 These changes proposed to the Consented Scheme are referred to as the "Revised Scheme". Further details of the Revised Scheme are provided in Chapter 4 of this ESA and in the Design and Access Statement Addendum and amended plans which have been submitted to MCC as part of this Section 73 application.

Purpose of this Environmental Statement Addendum

1.8 The extent of the changes, whilst minor, result in the need for there to be consideration of the likely impact on the environment and / or any implications for the previous findings as recorded in the ES 2020.

1.9 This ESA has been prepared in line with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended) ("EIA Regulations 2017").

1.10 The structure of the ESA is as follows:

Table 1.1: Structure of ESA

Chapter Number	Chapter	Author
1	Introduction	Turley
2	Site Location and Surrounding Area	Turley
3	Background and Context	Turley
4	The Revised Scheme	Turley
5	EIA Methodology	Turley
6	Alternatives and Design Evolution	Turley
7	Construction Programme	Turley

Chapter Number	Chapter	Author
8	Townscape and Visual Impact	Chris Burnett Associates
9	Built Heritage	Turley Heritage
10	Archaeology	Nexus
11	Transport	Curtins
12	Air Quality	Hydrock
13	Noise and Vibration	Hydrock
14	Ground Conditions	Curtins
15	Water Environment	Curtins
16	Ecology	Penny Anderson Associates
17	TV Interference	GTech
18	Wind Microclimate	GIA
19	Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing	GIA
20	Socio-Economics	Turley Economics
21	Human Health	Turley Economics
22	Climate Change	Turley Sustainability
23	Environmental Management and Conclusion	Turley

1.11 This ESA does not repeat the information presented in the ES 2020 where that information is unaffected by the Revised Scheme described in Chapter 4.

1.12 Chapter 5 provides further information on the scope of this ESA; however, in the majority of cases, the technical assessments presented within the ES 2020 are unaffected by the Revised Scheme.

1.13 This ESA is intended to be read alongside the ES 2020. Together, they present an assessment of the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme.

2. Site Location and Description

2.1 The Revised Scheme does not affect the contents of Chapter 2: Site Location and Description of the ES 2020.

3. Background and Context

3.1 The Revised Scheme does not affect the contents of Chapter 3: Background and Context of the ES 2020.

4. The Revised Scheme

4.1 The description of development provided at Chapter 4: The Proposed Development of the ES 2020 is subject to the minor amendments described below.

4.2 The Consented Scheme in summary comprises:

- 177 residential apartments for the private rental market, comprising a mixture of one (59 units, 33%), two (113 units, 64%) and three (5 units, 3%).
- Basement level: plant equipment (221sqm) and associated service lifts;
- Ground floor level: a retail unit (161sqm), residents entrance and lounge, co-working space, post and welfare room, residents gym, refuse area, substation, and lifts and lobby area;
- Level 1: cycle storage for 177 spaces and residential apartments;
- Level 2: residential apartments and residential garden (external terrace);
- Levels 3 – 8: residential apartments comprising 1 bed and 2 bed apartments;
- Levels 9 – 18: residential apartments comprising 1 bed and 2 bed apartments;
- Levels 19 – 23: residential apartments comprising 1 bed, 2 bed, and 3 bed apartments; and
- Roof: green roof and maintenance access zone.

4.3 Since the approval of the Victoria House Planning Permission, and as the scheme progresses to delivery phase, a number of design amendments have been identified which are required to achieve a development which makes the best use of space and which achieves a high quality market product ("the Revised Scheme").

4.4 These changes are summarised below and are detailed further in the accompanying Design and Access Statement (DAS) Addendum and submitted plans.

Design

4.5 The following minor adjustments to Floor Plans have been carried out:

- **Basement level:** the basement extents have been increased from 280sqm as consented to 992sqm (increase of 712sqm), to include for the provision of a refuse store (142sqm), storage for 175 cycles (154sqm), plant (254sqm), store room (13sqm), substation, five car parking spaces (including three accessible spaces), and an access ramp from Longacre Street. The refuse and cycle stores have been relocated from the ground and first levels of the Consented Scheme respectively.

- **Access:** The principles of access for servicing and deliveries remains as indicated in the Consented Scheme. A new 3m wide vehicle access and ramp off Longacre Street to provide access into the extended basement, which will include five car parking spaces, comprising two standard and three accessible parking bays. To maintain safe access/egress and prevent conflict between vehicle movements, a one-way traffic system will be in operation, controlled by signals at the top and bottom of the ramp and activated by an access card/fob system. Swept path analysis has been undertaken to ensure that vehicles can successfully negotiate the proposed car park arrangement. The cycle store will be accessed via stepped pedestrian access which incorporates a wheel ramp for users to push their bikes alongside the steps. The bin store will also be located within the basement and on collection days, the building Facilities Management team will transport bins from the basement ready for kerb side and return them to the bin store accordingly.

- **Ground level:** An additional commercial unit (129sqm) is proposed in the space created by moving the refuse store to the basement and the gym to level 01 (in place of the cycle store), which will provide improved activation and passive surveillance to Great Ancoats Street. Vehicular and cycle access ramp and stairs are proposed, accessed from Longacre Street, and the cycle lift previously serving level 01 has been omitted, enabling the existing retail unit to be expanded by 17sqm. Minor modifications are also proposed to improve the reception and residents' amenity spaces.

- **Levels 01 – 02**: the residents' gym will be relocated from the ground floor to occupy the area vacated by moving the cycle storage area from level 01 to the basement, enabling it to enjoy panoramic views over the new public space. The layout of the shared residents' garden space at level 02 has been adjusted slightly to incorporate discrete ventilation equipment serving the gym below, which will be visually screened by the adjacent planters. Minor improvements to the layout of residential apartments on levels 01 and 02 are also proposed.

- **Levels 03 – 22:** minor improvements to the layout of the residential apartments.

- **Levels 23 – 24:** the top levels are proposed to be reconfigured to enable the formation of five duplex three bedroom penthouse apartments with access to private terrace gardens at the roof level. The upper levels to the proposed duplexes are set back from the building perimeter so as not to impact on the external appearance of the building.

- **Roof:** The amended roof design includes the introduction of roof terraces to the duplex units at level 24. No amendments are proposed to the story height brick parapet of the Consented Scheme. However, the proposed height to this element is c.200mm higher than the lift overrun space in the Consented Scheme. A green roof is proposed to the roof of the level 24 upper duplex spaces, which is equivalent in area to the green roof area of the Consented Scheme.

- **Façade & Elevations:** As a result of the above layout alterations, a number of minor amendments are proposed to certain façade and elevation details:

– The Consented Scheme included mechanical extract vents to the brick soffits above apartment windows. The detail has now been developed to incorporate a discrete ventilation slot detail within the head of the window frame. This change will improve the appearance of the soffits as part of the expressed primary brick grid, and facilitate a better connection for the apartment ventilation detail.

– The ground floor glazing design has been developed, and the proposed detail includes a horizontal transom detail to facilitate the construction and maintenance of the glazed units. The glazing system proposed is a capless system, as shown within the Consented Scheme.

– Minor changes to the distribution of glazed and perforated metal panels within the primary brick grid on all elevations, resulting from coordination of minor alterations to improve internal apartment layouts. In all cases, the principles and materiality of the elevation design remain as indicated in the Consented Scheme.

– A small number of panels at ground floor level and level 24 are proposed to be changed from laminated glass-faced solid panels to metal faced solid panels. This change is to ensure that the façade complies with Building Regulations. The metal panels will be dark grey and high gloss to enable them to bend visually with the adjacent clear panels.

- **Landscape:** To facilitate the basement level vehicular access from Longacre Street, the landscape scheme has been amended to incorporate a macadam surface access with edging to the building.

Other Amendments

4.6 **Amount –** the proposed minor amendments to the design and layout described above result in the following amendments being made:

- A reduction in the total number of residential units provided from 177 to 175. The mix of one (58 units, 33%), two (112 units, 64%) and three (5 units, 3%) bedroom apartments within the Revised Scheme remains the same as the Consented Scheme, which still includes 16 adaptable units (10%) to meet the requirements of Building Regulation Part M4(2).

- The Revised Scheme also includes 307sqm of commercial floorspace, which represents an increase of 146sqm from the Consented Scheme.

4.7 **Description of development** – in light of the changes described above, a separate non-material amendment application, pursuant to Section 96a of the Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) 1990, is submitted concurrently with this Section 73 application, to seek approval for a consequential adjustment in the formal description of development as follows:

"Erection of a part 25 part 3 storey residential tower (Use Class C3) for 175 apartments comprising 58 x 1 bed (34 x 1 bed 1 person and 24 1 bed 2 person), 112 x 2 bed (36 x 2

bed 3 person and 76 x 2 bed 4 person) and 5 x 3 bed (3 bed 5 person) with ground floor commercial space (Use Class Ea, Eb, Ec, Ee, Ef, F1 and Sui Generis Drinking Establishment or Hot Food Takeaway); basement level, including plant, refuse storage, cycle parking and car parking for five vehicles; shared amenity spaces at 2nd and 3rd floor level; and public realm enhancements, following the demolition of existing buildings".

4.8 The description of the commercial space has been updated to reflect the amendments to the use classes following the introduction of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020.

5. EIA Methodology

5.1 The Revised Scheme does not affect the contents of Chapter 5: EIA Methodology of the ES 2020.

5.2 This ESA identifies the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme as now proposed relative to the Consented Scheme as assessed in the ES 2020. In doing so it takes into account the following:

- The proposed amendments;
- Updates to the baseline environment; and
- Any other changes in circumstances (such as changes to legislation and guidance documents).

5.3 This ESA only presents the changes in circumstance and the resulting changes to assessment outcomes where required. It does not repeat the information that remains relevant from the ES 2020.

5.4 A review has been undertaken of the cumulative schemes surrounding the site of the Revised Scheme. Updates to the list of cumulative schemes is presented at **Appendix 5.1**. The updated list of cumulative schemes has been taken into account to complete this ESA.

5.5 **Table 5.1** identifies the assessments undertaken during the ES 2020 and outlines whether the conclusions of the original assessments have changed as a result of the Revised Scheme.

Table 5.1: Identification of whether the proposed amendments have resulted in changes to the conclusions of the ES 2020

Chapter	Author	Any change to the ES 2020 conclusions? (Y/N)
8. Townscape and Visual Impact	Chris Burnett Associates	N
9. Built Heritage	Turley Heritage	N
10. Archaeology	Nexus	N
11. Transport	Curtins	N
12. Air Quality	Hydrock	N
13. Noise and Vibration	Hydrock	N
14. Ground Conditions	Curtins	N
15. Water Environment	Curtins	N
16. Ecology	Penny Anderson Associates	N

Chapter	Author	Any change to the ES 2020 conclusions? (Y/N)
17. TV Interference	GTech	N
18. Wind Microclimate	GIA	N
19. Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing	GIA	N
10. Socio Economic	Turley Economics	N
21. Human Health	Turley Economics	N
22. Climate Change	Turley Sustainability	N
23. Environmental Management and Conclusion	Turley	N

5.6 This ESA is intended to be read alongside the ES 2020. Together, they present an assessment of the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme.

6. Alternatives and Design Evolution

6.1 The Revised Scheme does not affect the contents of Chapter 6: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES 2020.

7. Construction Programme

7.1 The Revised Scheme does not affect the majority of the contents of Chapter 7: Construction Programme of the ES 2020.

7.2 The only amendment is to the anticipated construction year, which will now be 2021 (rather than 2020 as presented in the ES 2020).

7.3 All other information presented in Chapter 7 of the ES 2020 remains the same.

8. Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment

Introduction

8.1 This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme on Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment. It compares the changes in circumstance and the resulting changes to assessment results compared to the ES 2020. This chapter does not repeat the ES 2020 where the information remains relevant.

8.2 This Chapter of the ES has been prepared by Chris Burnett BSc,BLD,CMLI, Landscape Architect and Principal of Chris Burnett Associates. Technical appendices also support this assessment and consist of the following:

- Appendix 8.1: Maps
- Appendix 8.2: Viewpoint and townscape photographs including AVR and wireline images.
- Appendix 8.3: Visualization of Development Proposals

Legislative Framework

Legislation

8.3 The legislative framework and Planning Policies remain the same as those in the ES 2020 and are unchanged at the present time.

Guidance

8.10 With the exception of guidance on Visual Representation of Development Proposals all remaining guidance referred to in the ES 2020 remain the same. The changes resulting in guidance on Visual Representation of Development Proposals are explained in more detail in **Appendix 8.3**.

Assessment Methodology

8.4 The assessment methodology remains the same as that set out in the ES 2020.

Study Area

8.5 The study area remains the same as that set out in the ES 2020.

Baseline Surveys

Desk Based Research

8.6 The research carried out for the Consented Scheme ES 2020 remains valid for the Revised Scheme.

Field Surveys

8.7 A further field survey was carried out in April 2021 and 3 baseline photographs taken from 3 key viewpoints to reflect the minor changes of the baseline since 2020. These

are incorporated into a revised Appendix 8.2 Viewpoint and townscape photographs including AVR and wireline images.

Consultations

8.8 No further consultations have been carried out as part of the 2021 assessment.

Significance Criteria

8.8 The significance criteria remains the same as the criteria set out in the ES 2020.

8.9 The methodology used in defining the significance of effect remains the same as that set out in the ES 2020. Any effects that are Moderate and above are judged to be Significant in EIA regulation terms. Decisions made in this regard are derived from professional judgement and professional guidance.

Baseline Conditions

Townscape Baseline

8.10 The Townscape Baseline remains essentially unchanged apart from a few buildings which were under construction in 2020 such as the Oxygen Development are nearing completion. This is reflected in the updated Appendix 8.2.

Predicted future baseline conditions

8.11 Developments are under construction and are progressing in the Study Area. The additional schemes are presented at Appendix 5.1 and Appendix 8.2. Those schemes predicted to have an effect on the baseline are described and assessed in the Cumulative Effects section.

Assessment of Effects

Matters Scoped Out

8.12 No matters have been scoped out, as per the ES 2020.

Embedded Mitigation

8.13 The embedded mitigation stays the same as the ES 2020.

Limitations and Assumptions

8.14 The Limitations and Assumptions remain the same as set out in the 2020 ES.

Demolition and construction effects

8.15 The likely significant environmental effects that are likely to occur during the construction of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Assessment of Operational Phase Effects

Effects of completed Development on Townscape Character and Views

8.16 The likely significant environmental effects that are likely to occur during the construction of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020. The effects are summarised at Table 8.2 below.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

Intra- project cumulative effects

8.17 The likely significant cumulative environmental effects remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Inter-project cumulative effects

8.18 In terms of inter- project cumulative effects, there are developments which, cumulatively, are considered to affect the significance values for townscape and views. There are a further 4 schemes which may have an effect in cumulative terms (as listed at Appendix 5.1). Table 8.1 summarises these schemes which are similar in scale to the Revised Scheme and lie within a 1km radius of the Site.

Table 8.1: Cumulative schemes

No.	Planning reference	Cumulative Scheme	No of storeys
33	124495/FO/2019	Meininger, Great Ancoats St	12
36	121099/FO/2018	Portugal Street East Plot A and B	29,23
37	122599/FO/2019	Portugal Street East Plot G	13
38	127317/FO/2020	Heyrod St	25
41	126261/FO/2020	Pollard St	11
43	128191/FO/2020	Pollard St	8, 5
47	126608/FO/2020	Mill St	11

8.19 The most significant cumulative effects will be during the operational phase when the Revised Scheme has been completed. Before that time, during the construction phase, the cumulative effects are likely to be infinitely variable as they are reliant on the construction programme of each of the relevant cumulative schemes identified in Table 8.1, in relation to the construction programme of the Revised Scheme. The same applies to the decommissioning phase.

8.20 The developments listed in Table 8.1 above will not have a universal effect on all of the selected viewpoints, or the townscape character.

8.21 Table 8.2 below records the likely assessment of effects based on the assumption that the Revised Scheme along with all cumulative developments are complete and represents the ultimate effect. As the cumulative schemes come forward visual receptor sensitivity is likely to increase as many of the developments contain apartments. However, the magnitude of effect is likely to decline as the Revised Scheme will now be seen in the context of a greater number of similar developments of equivalent scale.

Table 8.2: Victoria House TVIA Cumulative Impact Assessment operational phase summary table 2020 / 2021

Location	Development only	Relevant cumulative scheme	Cumulative impact ES 2020	Cumulative Impact ES 2021
1 Longacre Street				
Sensitivity (VR)	Low	Plot G		Plot A and B
Sensitivity (Townscape)	Low			Plot G
Magnitude (VR)	Moderate Beneficial			Heyrod St
Magnitude (Townscape)	Moderate Beneficial		Minor Beneficial	Minor Beneficial
Significance of effect	Minor Beneficial		Not significant	Not significant
Significance	Not significant			
2 Piccadilly Village				Plot A and B
Sensitivity (VR)	High	Plot A		Plot G
Sensitivity (Townscape)	High	Plot G		Heyrod St
Magnitude (VR)	Moderate Beneficial			
Magnitude (Townscape)	Moderate Beneficial		Minor Beneficial	Minor Beneficial
Significance of effect	Moderate Beneficial		Not significant	Not significant
Significance	Significant			
3 Ashton Canal Tow Path	Medium	Plot A		No 43. Pollard St
Sensitivity (VR)	Medium	Plot G		
Sensitivity (Townscape)	Moderate Beneficial			
Magnitude (VR)	Moderate Beneficial		Minor beneficial	Negligible
Magnitude (Townscape)				

Location	Development only	Relevant cumulative scheme	Cumulative impact ES 2020	Cumulative Impact ES 2021
Significance of effect	Moderate Beneficial		Not significant	Not significant
Significance	Significant			
4 Ashton Canal Tow Path				
Sensitivity (VR)	Medium	Plot A		No 43. Pollard St
Sensitivity (Townscape)	Medium	Plot G		
Magnitude(VR)	Moderate Beneficial			
Magnitude (Townscape)	Moderate Beneficial		Minor beneficial	Negligible
Significance of effect	Moderate Beneficial		Not significant	Not significant
Significance	Significant			
5 Carruthers Street				
Sensitivity (VR)	Medium	Plot A		Plot A
Sensitivity (Townscape)	Low			No. 43 Pollard St
Magnitude(VR)	Minor Beneficial			
Magnitude (Townscape)	Minor Beneficial			
Significance of effect	Negligible (T)		Negligible	
	Minor beneficial (VR)		Not Significant	Negligible
Significance	Not significant			Not Significant
6 Old Mill Street				
Sensitivity (VR)	Medium			
Sensitivity (Townscape)	Low			
Magnitude(VR)	Negligible			
Magnitude (Townscape)	Negligible		Negligible	Negligible
Significance of effect	Negligible Not significant		Not Significant	Not Significant
Significance				
7 Old Mill Street				

Location	Development only	Relevant cumulative scheme	Cumulative impact ES 2020	Cumulative Impact ES 2021
Sensitivity (VR)	Medium	Plot A		Plot A and B
Sensitivity (Townscape)	Low			Plot G
Magnitude (VR)	Negligible			Heyrod St
Magnitude (Townscape)	Negligible		Negligible	Negligible
Significance of effect	Not significant		Not Significant	Not Significant
Significance				
8 Merrill Street				
Sensitivity VR	Medium	Plot A		Plot A and B
Sensitivity Townscape	Low			Plot G
Magnitude VR	Minor Beneficial			Heyrod St
Magnitude Townscape	Minor Beneficial			Ni.41 Pollard St
Significance of effect	Negligible (T)			
Significance	Minor beneficial (VR)		Negligible	Negligible
	Not significant		Not Significant	Not Significant
9 A662 Ring Road				Plot A and B
Sensitivity (VR)	High	Plot A		Plot G
Sensitivity (Townscape)	High			Heyrod St
Magnitude (VR)	Moderate Beneficial			No.43 Pollard St
Magnitude (Townscape)	Moderate Beneficial		Minor Beneficial	Negligible
Significance of effect	Moderate		Significant	Not significant
Significance	Significant			
10 A665 Ring Road				Plot A and B
Sensitivity (VR)	Low	Plot G		Plot G
Sensitivity (Townscape)	Low			Heyrod St
Magnitude (VR)	No impact			No.43 Pollard St
Magnitude (Townscape)	No impact			
	Negligible		Negligible	
	Not significant		Not significant	Negligible

Location	Development only	Relevant cumulative scheme	Cumulative impact ES 2020	Cumulative Impact ES 2021
Significance of effect Significance				Not significant
11 A665 Ring Road Sensitivity (VR) Sensitivity (Townscape) Magnitude (VR) Magnitude (Townscape) Significance of effect Significance	 Low Low Minor Beneficial Minor Beneficial Negligible Not Significant		 Negligible Not Significant	Plot A and B Plot G Heyrod St No.43 Pollard St Negligible Not Significant
12 Cotton Fields Park Sensitivity (VR) Sensitivity (Townscape) Magnitude (VR) Magnitude (Townscape) Significance of effect Significance	 Medium High Negligible Negligible Minor Beneficial (T) Negligible (VR) Not significant	Plot A	 Negligible Not Significant	Plot A and B Plot G Heyrod St No.47 Mill St Negligible Not Significant
13 A665 Ring Road Sensitivity (VR) Sensitivity (Townscape) Magnitude (VR) Magnitude (Townscape) Significance of effect Significance	 Low Medium Minor Beneficial Minor Beneficial Negligible (VR) Minor beneficial (T) Not Significant		 Minor beneficial Not Significant	Plot A and B Plot G Heyrod St Negligible Not Significant
14 A665 Ring Road Sensitivity (VR)	 Low	-	-	-

Location	Development only	Relevant cumulative scheme	Cumulative impact ES 2020	Cumulative Impact ES 2021
Sensitivity (Townscape)	Low			
Magnitude (VR)	No impact			
Magnitude (Townscape)	No impact			
Significance of effect	Negligible			
Significance	Not significant			
15 Fairfield Street				Plot A and B
Sensitivity (VR)	Low	Plot A		Plot G
Sensitivity (Townscape)	Low	Plot G		Heyrod St
Magnitude (VR)	Minor Beneficial			
Magnitude (Townscape)	Minor Beneficial			
Significance of effect	Negligible		Negligible	Negligible
Significance	Not significant		Not significant	Not significant
16 Manchester Piccadilly	Low			Plot A and B
Sensitivity (VR)	Low	Plot A		Plot G
Sensitivity (Townscape)	Minor Beneficial	Plot G		Heyrod St
Magnitude (VR)	Minor Beneficial			
Magnitude (Townscape)	Negligible		Negligible	Negligible
Significance of effect	Not significant		Not significant	Not significant
Significance				
17 Old Mill Street				
Sensitivity (VR)	High	-	-	
Sensitivity (Townscape)	Low			
Magnitude (VR)	No impact			
Magnitude (Townscape)	No impact			
Significance of effect	Negligible		Negligible	Negligible
	Not significant		Not significant	Not significant

Location	Development only	Relevant cumulative scheme	Cumulative impact ES 2020	Cumulative Impact ES 2021
Significance				
18 Lever Street				
Sensitivity (VR)	High	-	-	-
Sensitivity (Townscape)	High			
Magnitude (VR)	No impact			
Magnitude (Townscape)	No impact			
Significance of effect	Negligible		Negligible	Negligible
Significance	Not significant		Not significant	Not significant
19 Red Hill Street				Plot A and B
Sensitivity (VR)	Medium			Plot G
Sensitivity (Townscape)	Medium	Plot A		Heyrod St
Magnitude (VR)	Minor beneficial	Plot G		
Magnitude (Townscape)	Minor beneficial			
Significance of effect	Minor beneficial		Negligible	Negligible
Significance	Not significant		Not significant	Not significant
	Low	Plot A		Plot A and B
20 Baird Street	Medium	Plot G		Plot G
Sensitivity (VR)	Minor beneficial			Heyrod St
Sensitivity (Townscape)	Minor beneficial			
Magnitude (VR)	Minor beneficial			
Magnitude (Townscape)	Negligible			
Significance of effect (T)	Minor beneficial		Negligible	Negligible
Significance of effect (VR)	Not significant		Not significant	Not significant
Significance of effect (VR)				
Significance				

(T = Townscape; VR = Visual Receptor)

Mitigation Measures

8.22 The mitigation identified in the ES 2020 remains valid for the Revised Scheme.

Residual Effects

8.23 The residual effects identified in the ES 2020 remain valid for the Revised Scheme and there remain no Significant effects.

References

Ref 8.1 The European Landscape Convention (ELC, 2000)

Ref 8.2 National Planning Policy Framework 2019 Dept Communities and Local Government

Ref 8.3 Manchester City Council Core Strategy 2012

Ref 8.4 Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition 2013 landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment

Ref 8.5 Historic England note on tall building 2014

Ref 8.6 Manchester Residential Quality Guidance MCC 2017

Ref 8.7 History in the View LUC 2011

Ref 8.8 Victoria House Methodology Statement Ambiente 2018

Ref 8.9 Op cit 8.4

Ref 8.10 Landscape Institute TG 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals

Ref 8.11 Op. cit. 8.4

Ref 8.12 HS2 Strategic Regeneration Framework 2014

9. Built Heritage

Introduction

9.1 This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme on Built Heritage. It compares the changes in circumstance and the resulting changes to assessment results compared to the ES 2020. This chapter does not repeat the ES 2020 where the information remains relevant.

9.2 This assessment and chapter has been completed by Katy Lightbody, Turley Heritage (MA (Hons) PG Dip CHE MRTPI).

9.3 A Heritage Assessment prepared in connection with the ES 2020 (ES 2020 Appendix 9.1) remains valid.

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance Documents

9.4 There have been no changes to legislation, national planning policy, local planning policy or guidance relevant to assessment of the effects of the Revised Scheme on built heritage.

Assessment Methodology

The Study Area

9.5 The study area remains the same as that set out in the ES 2020.

Baseline Surveys

Desk Based Research

9.6 The research carried out for the ES 2020 remains valid.

Field Survey Work

9.7 The field survey work carried out for the ES 2020 remains valid.

Consultations

9.8 No further consultations have been carried out as part of the Revised Scheme for this assessment.

Significance Criteria

9.9 The 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges' has been revised/updated since the ES 2020 ((LA 104 Environmental Assessment and Monitoring) and (LA 106 Cultural Heritage Assessment)), however the significance criteria remains the same as set out in the ES 2020.

Baseline Conditions

9.10 The construction of cumulative schemes within the Study Area has progressed since 2020 (such as the Oxygen development), however the built heritage baseline, as set out in the ES 2020 remains unchanged.

Anticipated Future Baseline Conditions

Construction (2021) and Operation (2022)

9.11 It is predicted that by the construction year of 2021 and the operational year of 2022 a number of cumulative developments identified later in this Chapter, and at Appendix 5.1, will be under construction or operational. The townscape of the area surrounding the site and the setting of a number of the heritage assets identified within this Chapter will be changed as a result of additional new development, including tall buildings.

Assessment of Effects

Matters Scoped Out

9.12 Matters scoped of the ES 2020 remain the same. Designated and non-designated heritage assets beyond the identified Study Area have not been assessed, with the exception of those captured by the existing and proposed verified views described in the Heritage Assessment provided in the ES 2020 at ES 2020 Volume 4: Appendix 9.1.

Embedded Mitigation

9.13 Embedded mitigation has not changed since the ES 2020. The Revised Scheme has been designed in detail and this has been taken into consideration in assessing the effects of the operational phase.

Limitations and Assumptions

9.14 The Limitations and Assumptions remain the same as set out in the ES 2020.

Assessment of Construction Phase Effects

9.15 Likely environmental effects that are likely to occur during the construction of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

9.16 The effects of the construction phase will be short term and temporary and involve typical construction activities such as traffic movements, noise, vibration, hoardings and cranes.

9.17 The construction phase of the Revised Scheme will have a **no change** magnitude of impact on the majority of designated and non-designated heritage assets identified, resulting in a **neutral** significance of effect (**Not Significant**). This is due to the significance and setting of these heritage assets, the separation distances and intervening built development.

9.18 The site is relatively close to the grade II listed former Co-operative Warehouse and the grade II listed Crusader Works. Given the position and orientation of Crusader Works and the fact that the site is only clearly visible beyond the listed works at the north eastern end of Chapeltown Street, it is not considered that the construction phase of the Revised Scheme would have an adverse effect on the asset.

9.19 The site has a closer relationship with the former Co-operative Warehouse and is clearly visible in direct views from Pollard Street where construction activity on the site

will be visible in conjunction with the former Warehouse. It is therefore concluded that there would be a **temporary minor adverse** effect, resulting in a **minor adverse** significance of effect (**Not Significant**) for the duration of the construction works of the Revised Scheme. The non-designated Vulcan Works is located further north beyond the former Co-operative Warehouse and due to this greater degree of separation it is not considered that the construction phase would result in an adverse effect on the asset. The magnitude of effect in relation to Vulcan Works is defined as **no change**, resulting in a **neutral** significance of effect (**Not Significant**).

9.20 There are no significant effects arising from the construction phase of the Revised Scheme on built heritage assets. This takes into consideration the fact that the construction phase will be temporary and will only last for the duration of construction activity.

Assessment of Operational Phase Effects

9.21 Environmental effects that are likely to occur during the operation of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

9.22 The Revised Scheme will be clearly visible from a number of the heritage assets within the Study Area, it is however the effect on the significance of these assets that is judged rather than the extent of change. Having taken into consideration the significance of the identified assets, the contribution made by their setting, the relative distance between them and the PDS, the extent of intervening development and the nature of the Revised Scheme, it is concluded that their significance would be sustained. There will be a **no change** magnitude of impact on the designated and non-designated heritage assets identified, resulting in a **neutral** significance of effect (**Not Significant**) for the operational phase.

9.23 There are no significant effects arising from the operational phase of the Revised Scheme on built heritage assets.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

9.24 There are no intra-project cumulative effects in relation to built heritage, and this does not alter from the ES 2020.

Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

9.25 Likely significant cumulative environmental effects remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020 unless stated otherwise. Consideration of cumulative environmental effects in relation to schemes not previously considered is set out below:

126261/FO/2020 Pollard Street

9.26 No heritage effects were identified in a Planning Statement submitted with the planning application. There will be no cumulative effects in combination with the Revised Scheme.

128191/FO/2020 Pollard Street

9.27 A Heritage Statement submitted with the planning application concluded there would be a neutral impact on the significance of identified heritage assets. There will be no cumulative effects in combination with the Revised Scheme.

126608/FO/2020 Store Street

9.28 A Heritage Statement submitted with the planning application concluded that the development would enhance the significance of the grade II* Store Street aqueduct. This asset is not affected by the Revised Scheme and there are no cumulative effects.

126669/FO/2020 Old Mill Street

9.29 A Planning and Consultation Statement submitted with the planning application concluded there would be no harm to heritage assets. There will be no cumulative effects in combination with the Revised Scheme.

127317/FO/2020 Plot E, 2 Heyrod Street

9.30 A Heritage Assessment and Built Heritage ES Chapter submitted with the planning application also concluded there would be a temporary minor adverse effect on the grade II listed Former Co-operative Warehouse, resulting in a minor adverse significance of effect (Not Significant) for the duration of the construction works. It was concluded that there would be no significant effects arising from the operational phase of the proposed development on built heritage assets.

9.31 It has been identified that the Revised Scheme would also cause a temporary minor adverse effect on the grade II listed Former Co-operative Warehouse, resulting in a minor adverse significance of effect (Not Significant) for the duration of construction works. Should the construction phases of both developments coincide it is concluded that due to distance and the level of anticipated screening, the level of adverse would remain minor and not significant.

Mitigation of Effects

9.32 Mitigation identified in the ES 2020 remains valid for the Revised Scheme. A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) should be prepared and implemented which should include standard construction methods.

Residual Effects

9.33 The residual effects identified in the ES 2020 remain valid. The only residual effect is in relation to the former Co-op Warehouse during the construction phase. This is a minor and short term effect that will only last for the duration of the construction phase and is not significant.

References

Ref 9.1 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (1990)

Ref 9.2 DCLG (2019) 'National Planning Policy Framework'

Ref 9.3 Manchester City Council (2013) 'Manchester Local Plan'

Ref 9.4 DCLG (2016 and 2018) 'National Planning Practice Guide'

Ref 9.5 Historic England (2017) 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets'

Ref 9.6 Historic England (2015) 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment'

10. Archaeology

Introduction

10.1 This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme on archaeology. It compares the changes in circumstance and the resulting changes to assessment results compared to the ES 2020. This chapter does not repeat the ES 2020 where the information remains relevant.

10.2 This assessment and chapter has been completed by Anthony Martin BA MA MIFA of Nexus Heritage.

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance Documents

10.3 The legislative framework for archaeology remains unchanged, as does the Manchester City Council planning policy. With respect to guidance documents, the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists issued a new edition of its document *Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment* in October 2020. This new edition post-dated the compilation of the original ES. The 2020 update to the *Standard and guidance* included for minor formatting changes and there were no material changes to the guidance which superseded the spirit, intent and definition of good practice for the execution and reporting of desk-based assessments as set out in the 2017 edition, with reference to which the original environmental impact assessment was undertaken. The methodology described in the ES 2020, therefore remains valid and reliable.

Assessment Methodology

The Study Area

10.4 The Study Area remains unchanged from the ES 2020.

Baseline Surveys

Desk Based Research

10.5 In order to identify and examine any newly identified archaeological assets within the Study Area the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record (GMHER) was re-consulted to obtain the latest information on known sites and features of archaeological interest. The GMHER confirmed that no archaeological assets had been identified within the Proposed Development Site up to 23 April 2021 (e-mail from Historic Environment Record Officer of GMAAS 23 April 2021). With respect to the Study Area the GMHER confirmed that one additional archaeological asset had been identified within the Study Area (but outside the Proposed Development Site) up to 23 April 2021. The asset takes the form of column bases, stone settings, flagstone surfaces and brickwork associated with the Crusader Works, a 19th century cotton spinning mill *c.* 135m to the west of the Proposed Development Site.

Field Survey Work

10.6 No additional field-survey work has been undertaken.

Consultations

10.7 In line with good practice, the GMHER was re-consulted to obtain the latest information on known sites and features of archaeological interest as described above.

Significance Criteria

10.8 The methodology described in the ES 2020 remains the same and is still valid for the Revised Scheme.

Baseline Conditions

10.9 The Proposed Development Site remains as reported in 2020, i.e. no archaeological assets recorded within the Proposed Development Site on the GMHER.

10.10 In the Study Area there has been a minor change to the baseline scenario compared to the ES 2020. The site of the Crusader Works on Chapeltown Street, *c.* 135m to the west of the Proposed Development Site has received planning permission for conversion of the listed buildings for residential purposes and the erection of a new block on the western side of Fair Street. The planning application was supported by a desk-based assessment (Salford Archaeology Centre for Applied Archaeology University of Salford 2016). The results of this assessment have been included in the GMHER as Event EGM4380.

10.11 A post-determination condition applied to the permission required a scheme of archaeological investigation to be undertaken as part of the development. That scheme of archaeological works included the excavation of two evaluation trenches. The results obtained from the trenching (Salford Archaeology Centre for Applied Archaeology University of Salford 2018) concluded that the building had not incorporated any steam-power plant and, that it was likely that the building was used initially as a textile warehouse, prior to being absorbed into the Crusader textile-machinery works. The archaeological investigations also revealed traces of 18th/early 19th century farming processes, and it was concluded that no further archaeological investigation was merited in advance of the redevelopment of the site.

10.12 These archaeological works demonstrated the scope for the preservation of sub-surface archaeological remains dating to the 18th and 19th centuries in the form of column bases, stone settings, flagstone surfaces and brickwork associated with the Crusader Works. Whilst the archaeological signal of a cotton mill/warehouse is likely to be different in specific character from that of a site with potential archaeological remains related to domestic occupation and light industry (which is the archaeological potential pertaining at the Proposed Development Site), the basic building blocks of the structures such as brickwork and stonework are similar, if not identical, in fundamental physical composition and the survival of such remains at the site of the Crusader Works act as an indicator for the potential for such archaeological survival in the general area, including the Proposed Development Site. This indication, however, does not alter the assessment outcome or conclusions of the 2020 ES with respect to the topic of archaeology.

Anticipated Future Baseline Conditions

10.13 With respect to the future baseline of the area in which the Proposed Development is located, there are 48 major developments which have the potential to impact on

known and hitherto unknown archaeological assets and which will alter the settings of those assets. At the time of the 2020 ES there were 37 major developments which have the potential to impact on known and hitherto unknown archaeological assets and which will alter the settings of those assets. Therefore, there are an additional 11 major developments (as presented at Appendix 5.1A). The statutory and regulatory framework in which these committed developments and proposed developments are determined include for assessment of archaeological assets and, where relevant, include for appropriate mitigation which may lead to a better perception, understanding and appreciation of the assets.

Construction (2021)

10.14 The baseline conditions at the commencement of construction of the Revised Scheme are predicted to be identical to the existing baseline conditions. This remains as presented in the ES 2020.

Operation (2022)

10.15 The baseline conditions at the commencement of the operation of the Revised Scheme are predicted to be changed from the existing baseline conditions in that any archaeological remains within the footprint of the Revised Scheme would have been impacted upon by the construction of the Revised Scheme. This remains as presented in the ES 2020.

Assessment of Effects

Matters Scoped Out

10.16 The Matters Scoped Out of the ES 2020 still remain relevant.

10.17 The environmental effects of the proposed development on the settings of archaeological assets within the Study Area, but outside the physical limits of the Revised Scheme are considered to be less than significant and, as assessed and reported in the ES 2020, there is no reason to believe that environmental effects of the Revised Scheme on the settings of identified archaeological assets would be significant.

Embedded Mitigation

10.18 The proposed development includes no embedded mitigation for archaeological assets, as presented in the ES 2020.

Limitations and Assumptions

10.19 The assessment of archaeological assets to inform the environmental effects of the Revised Scheme has been undertaken within the framework of the confidence, limitations and assumptions pertaining to the ES 2020.

Assessment of Construction Phase Effects

10.20 The likely significant environmental effects that are likely to occur during the construction of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020. That is, in the footprints of the basement and the ground floor of the Revised Scheme there would be a major impact to archaeological assets of medium sensitivity (should they be present), leading to a moderate adverse effect (see table 10.1 below). This corresponds to an environmentally significant effect.

Table 10.1: Significance of Effect Matrix for the Construction Phase

SENSITIVITY OF ASSETS	MAGNITUDE OF IMPACT TO ASSETS				
	No Impact	Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major
Very High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / Large	Large / Very Large	Very Large
High	Neutral	Slight	Moderate / Slight	Moderate / Large	Large / Very Large
Medium	Neutral	Slight / Neutral	Slight	Moderate	Moderate / Large
Low	Neutral	Neutral / Slight	Slight / Neutral	Slight	Slight / Moderate
Negligible	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral / Slight	Slight / Neutral	Slight
Unknown	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral / Slight	Slight / Moderate	Moderate / Large

Assessment of Operational Phase Effects

10.21 The operational phase of the Revised Scheme would have no direct or indirect effects on archaeological assets, as presented in the ES 2020.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

10.22 The likely significant cumulative environmental effects remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

10.23 Cumulative effects have been reviewed in line with additional consented schemes since submission of the ES. The cumulative environmental effects remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Mitigation of Effects

10.24 As the construction phase effects of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020 and identical suite of mitigation actions is recommended.

10.25 It is proposed that a detailed programme will be prepared for mitigation works for those archaeological assets that would be impacted upon as part of the process of discharge of conditions accompanying any planning consent.

10.26 This programme would form a component part of the project's Construction Environmental Management Plan and its implementation could be secured by means of appropriately worded conditions applied to any planning consent for the proposed

development. The proposed mitigation for the archaeological assets on which impacts have been identified has been configured with reference to archaeological best practice and the relevant standards and guidance published by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists.

10.27 The proposed mitigation takes the form of an archaeological evaluation configured with reference to the standard and guidance published by the Institute for Archaeologists (Institute for Archaeologists 2020b) with a contingency to respond to findings with a second phase of mitigation measures, as appropriate, which would be configured as the in response to the location, and condition of any archaeological remains found to be present and can only be determined once the presence and character of such remains is identified. However, the second phase of mitigation would likely take the form of a combination of archaeological excavation and/or archaeological watching brief, to be followed by analysis of the findings and publication and dissemination of the results in line with archaeological practice. It is recommended that consideration is given to community engagement during the archaeological mitigation works.

10.28 The scope, terms and details of any archaeological works implemented as mitigation should form a component part of the Construction Environment Management Plan for the proposed development.

Residual Effects

10.29 The residual effects identified in the ES 2020 remain valid. The residual environmental effect of the Revised Scheme on archaeology is, therefore, not significant.

Table 10.2: Summary of Residual Effects

Environmental Receptor	Description of Impact and Significance	Duration	Mitigation	Residual Impact and Significance	Duration of Residual Impact
Archaeological assets	Moderate-large and significant	Permanent	Archaeological fieldworks, followed by analysis of the findings and publication and dissemination of the results in line with archaeological practice	Slight-moderate and not significant	Permanent

References

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2020a, Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment

Chartered Institute for Archaeologists, 2020b, Standard and guidance for archaeological field evaluation

Salford Archaeology Centre for Applied Archaeology University of Salford, 2016, Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment Report, Crusader Works, Chapeltown Street, Manchester. (unpublished report, doc. ref.2016/16)

Salford Archaeology Centre for Applied Archaeology University of Salford, 2018, Archaeological Evaluation, Crusader Works, Chapeltown Street, Ancoats, Manchester. (unpublished report, doc. ref. SA/2018/23)

11. Transport

Introduction

11.1 This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme on Transport. It compares the changes in circumstance and the resulting changes to assessment results compared to the ES 2020. This chapter does not repeat the ES 2020 where the information remains relevant.

11.2 This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) has been completed by Aaron Tilley CMILT FCIHT (Associate, Curtins) to assess the likely significant effects of the Project with respect to Traffic and Transportation.

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance Documents

11.3 The following legislation, policy and guidance documents referred to in the ES 2020 remain relevant to the Revised Scheme.

- National Planning Policy Framework (2019)
- Manchester City Council: Core Strategy
- Institute of Environmental Assessment (IEA) Guidance
- Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic (1993)

11.4 The following document referred to in the ES 2020 has been updated.

- Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040

11.5 In January 2021, Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) published a 2040 Vision for Transport to develop flexible and customer-focused travel choices, supported by smart information, ticketing and payment systems, across a truly integrated Greater Manchester transport network. This Transport Strategy outlined that road transport is responsible for 80% of NO2 pollution at the roadside, where it is most damaging to health, and that the cost of congestion in Greater Manchester has been estimated by TfGM to be £1.3 billion per year. The Transport Strategy states an ambition for a well-connected, zero carbon Regional Centre at the heart of the North.

11.6 Under Policy 3, the Transport Strategy states that TfGM will "maintain a programme of interventions encouraging people to make sustainable journeys, supported through journey planning tools, and information to encourage travel behaviour change and mode shift, in order to make the most efficient use of available capacity (particularly during peak periods)". Such interventions comprise:

- "Reducing the carbon and environmental cost of journeys;
- New ways of working which make the best use of the transport network;
- Delivering public health benefits through enabling more active travel;

- Improving access to key services and jobs;
- Maximising sustainable travel in new developments; and
- Becoming more resilient to disruption."

11.7 Measures and additional initiatives in line with the above have also been provided in greater detail in the accompanying ITP.

11.8 Under Policy 4, TfGM will also "work with developers to ensure that new developments are accessible by sustainable modes, and to reduce transport emissions and impacts on the highway network". This will be in accordance with the principles of:

- "Reducing the need to travel;
- Reducing the need to travel by car, and the distance travelled;
- Maximising accessibility by sustainable modes;
- Making the best use of existing infrastructure, particularly through increasing the density of development close to public transport nodes;
- Maximising opportunities to provide additional public transport; and
- Designing to encourage active travel."

11.9 It is considered that the Revised Scheme will not adversely impact the transport network, and instead would support the Transport Strategy by enhancing opportunities for sustainable travel by integrating into existing infrastructure.

11.10 The following document referred to in the ES 2020 is no longer relevant to the Revised Scheme.

- Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) 2019 (Draft)

Assessment Methodology

11.11 Given the consistent policy, guidance and very limited traffic flows which the Revised Scheme is forecast to generate, the assessment methodology remains the same as the ES 2020.

Baseline Conditions

11.12 The existing baseline conditions remain the same as presented in the ES 2020.

Existing Access Arrangements

11.13 The existing access arrangements remain the same as presented in the ES 2020.

Surrounding Highway Network

11.14 The surrounding highway network conditions remain the same as presented in the ES 2020.

Highway Safety

11.15 Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data for the highway network adjacent to the Site was obtained from Greater Manchester recorded road accident database (http://www.gmtu.gov.uk/gmaccidents/) for the most recent three years at the time of preparing the ES 2020, the period being 2017 to 2019.

11.16 The same database has been revisited to confirm the additional number of accidents that have occurred between 2019 and 30th September 2020 (the most recent date available).

11.17 A breakdown of the accidents recorded in the study area is presented in Table 11.1:

Table 11.1: Personal Injury Accident Data Summary

Junction/Link	Slight	Serious	Fatal	Totals
Portugal Street East	0	0	0	0
Longacre Street	0	0	0	0
Heyrod Street	0	0	0	0
Travis Street/Sheffield Street	0	0	0	0
Travis Street/Adair Street	0	0	0	0
Adair Street/A665 Great Ancoats Street	0	0	0	0
A665 Great Ancoats Street	1	0	0	0
Totals	1	0	0	0

11.18 It can be seen from Table 11.1 that there has been a single accident over the additional study period for which data is available. The accident resulted in slight injury. There were no fatal accidents recorded in the study area.

11.19 A review of the accident data does not reveal any clusters or patterns for the accidents recorded.

11.20 In light of the above, it is not considered that there is an existing safety issue that is likely to be exacerbated by the Revised Scheme.

Accessibility by Sustainable Modes of Travel

11.21 The accessibility of the site by sustainable modes of travel is consistent with the ES 2020.

Pedestrian Accessibility

11.22 The level of pedestrian accessibility remains consistent with the ES 2020.

Accessibility by Cycle

11.23 The level of cycle accessibility remains consistent with the ES 2020.

Accessibility by Public Transport

11.24 The level of accessibility by public transport remains consistent with the ES 2020.

Anticipated Future Baseline Conditions

Construction (2021-2022)

11.25 The ES 2020 was prepared on the basis that construction would commence in 2020. The Revised Scheme would now begin construction in 2021.

11.26 There is not expected to be any changes in comparison with the existing Baseline Conditions at the construction commencement date of 2021.

Operation (2022)

11.27 The year of operation is consistent with the ES 2020.

Assessment of Effects

Matters Scoped Out

11.28 The matters scoped out of the ES 2020 remain relevant to the Revised Scheme.

Embedded Mitigation

11.29 The embedded mitigation set out in the ES 2020 remain relevant to the Revised Scheme.

Limitations and Assumptions

11.30 The limitations and assumptions are unchanged from the ES 2020.

Assessment of Construction Phase Effects

11.31 The environmental effects likely to occur during construction of the Revised Scheme are consistent with the ES 2020.

Assessment of Operational Phase Effects

11.32 The environmental effects likely to occur throughout the operation of the Revised Scheme are consistent with the ES 2020.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

Construction and Decommissioning

11.33 The intra-project cumulative effects of the Revised Scheme during construction and decommissioning are consistent with the ES 2020.

Operational

11.34 The intra-project cumulative effects of the Revised Scheme throughout the operation are consistent with the ES 2020.

Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

Construction and Decommissioning

11.35 An updated list of major developments of similar scale within 1km vicinity of the site has been considered to assess the Revised Scheme interaction with other developments. The full list is provided in **ES Volume 4: Appendix 5.1A**.

11.36 There has been an additional site within the PSE SRF (see site 38 in **ES Volume 4: Appendix 5.1A**) which has been granted planning consent since the production of the ES 2020. There may be some level of additional interaction with construction/decommissioning traffic between the consented development and the Revised Scheme.

11.37 The significance of inter-project cumulative effects during construction and decommissioning is consistent with the ES 2020.

Operational

11.38 The inter-project cumulative effects for the operational phase is consistent with the ES 2020.

Mitigation of Effects

Construction Phase

11.39 There is no change to the mitigation presented in the ES 2020.

Operational Phase

11.40 There is no change to the mitigation presented in the ES 2020.

Travel Planning

11.41 There is no change to the mitigation presented in the ES 2020.

Residual Effects

Construction Phase

11.42 The residual effects likely to occur during construction of the Revised Scheme are consistent with the ES 2020.

Operational Phase

11.43 The residual effects likely to occur during the operational phase of the Revised Scheme are consistent with the ES 2020.

References

11.44 Department for Communities and Local Government (2019) National Policy Planning Framework

11.45 Manchester City Council (2012) Core Strategy 2012 – 2027

11.46 Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040

11.47 Institute of Environmental Assessment (1993) Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic

12. Air Quality

Introduction

12.1 This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme on Air Quality. It compares the changes in circumstance and the resulting changes to assessment results compared to the ES 2020. This chapter does not repeat the ES 2020 where the information remains relevant.

12.2 This assessment and chapter has been completed by a Senior Air Quality Engineer at Hydrock who is a Member of the Institute of Air Quality Management (MIAQM).

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance Documents

12.3 Since submission of the ES 2020, GMCA Clean Air Plans have been released for public consultation. The UK Air Quality Plan for Nitrogen Dioxide was published in 2017 (Ref 12.1). This requires local authorities that are likely to exceed the EU Limit Value of 40 $\mu g/m^3$ NO_2 beyond 2020, to reach compliance with this limit in the 'shortest possible time'. Serveral Local Authority areas within Greater Manchester have been instructed by the UK Government to achieve compliance.

12.4 TfGM, acting on behalf of GMCA and the 10 member local authorities, are developing proposals for the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan to meet the requirements of the UK Air Quality Plan. Proposals include the introduction of a Class C Clean Air Zone (CAZ) by spring 2022 (Ref 12.2). This CAZ will cover all roads in Greater Manchester excluding the strategic road network, such as the M60. Commercial vehicles, that do not meet CAZ emission standards will be charged a daily fee to travel within the zone cordon.

12.5 All other legislation, policy & guidance noted in the ES 2020 remains relevant for the Revised Scheme.

Assessment Methodology

12.6 The methodology described in the ES 2020 remains the same and is still valid for the Revised Scheme.

Baseline Conditions

12.7 Since the ES 2020 was submitted, GMCA has published 2019 monitoring data across its diffusion tube and automatic monitoring network (Ref 12.3). The updated diffusion tube and automatic monitoring results, which show monitored concentrations for 2014-2019, are presented in Table 12.1 and Table 12.2.

12.8 The addition of the 2019 monitoring results does not change the conclusions of the baseline assessment of the ES 2020.

Table 12.1: GMCA Diffusion Tube Monitoring Results

Site ID	Site Type [a]	Location		NO2 Annual Mean Concentration (µg/m^3)					
		X (m)	Y (m)	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
MAN71	R	385161	398290	**47.4**	**45.9**	**51.2**	**50.4**	**46.1**	**45.3**
MAN59	UB	384310	398337	36.1	35.9	38.5	35.9	32.2	31.6
MAN60	UB	384310	398337	-	35.8	40.8	35.7	31.6	33.1
MAN61	UB	384310	398337	-	34.9	38.0	36.3	32.1	32.6
MAN14	UB	387656	399016	22.9	21.9	23.3	22.1	18.6	-

R =Roadside, UB=Urban Background

Table 12.2: GMCA Automatic Monitoring Results

Site ID	Site Type	Location		2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
		X (m)	Y (m)	NO2: Annual Mean Concentration					
MAN3	UC	384310	398337	40	39	40	36	35	36
				NO2: Number of Exceedances of Hourly Mean (200 µg/m3)					
MAN3	UC	384310	398337	2	1	0	1	0	0
				PM10: Annual Mean Concentration					
MAN3	UC	384310	398337	20	20	20	20	21	20
				PM10: Number of Exceedances of 24 Hour Mean (50 µg/m3)					
MAN3	UC	384310	398337	5	3	3	3	2	7
				PM2.5: Annual Mean Concentration					
MAN3	UC	384310	398337	12	10	10	8	11	12

UB=Urban Centre

12.9 Since the ES 2020 was submitted, DEFRA have also released updated Background Mapping Concentrations (Ref 12.4). The most recent data was published in August 2020 and is based on 2018 modelling. Table 12.3 below presents the updated concentrations for the 1km x 1km grid square the site is located (385500,398500).

12.10 The updated background concentrations do not change the conclusions of the baseline assessment of the ES 2020.

Table 12.3: DEFRA Background Mapping Concentrations

Pollutant	NAQO	Annual Mean Concentration (µg/m3)				
	($\mu g/m^3$)	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2)	40	24.4	23.4	22.3	21.6	20.9
Particulate Matter (PM10)	40	12.9	12.6	12.3	12.1	12.0
Particulate Matter (PM2.5)	25	8.5	8.3	8.1	8.0	8.0

Anticipated Future Baseline Conditions

Construction (2021)

12.11 The future baseline scenario for the construction phase stays the same as compared to the ES 2020. Additional developments that have been approved since the ES 2020 have been reviewed and do not change the baseline conditions for the construction phase of the development.

Operation (2022)

12.12 The future baseline scenario for the operational phase stays the same as compared to the ES 2020. Additional developments that have been approved since the ES 2020 have been reviewed and do not change the baseline conditions for the operational phase of the development.

Assessment of Effects

Matters Scoped Out

12.13 The Matters Scoped Out of the ES 2020 still remain relevant.

12.14 The ES 2020 did not include any parking provisions and therefore no additional traffic movements were proposed. The new proposals include up to 5 car parking spaces, however, the transport consultants have confirmed that this will equate to a maximum number of vehicle movements during any day of five arrivals and five departures, which is well below the IAQM threshold criteria of 100 AADT. As these are below the IAQM's criteria for assessment, the impact is predicted to be Not Significant, in line with IAQM guidance. Therefore, it is still suitable to scope out further assessment of the long-term impacts from development traffic, as in the ES 2020.

12.15 As assessed in the ES 2020, the energy strategy is proposed to be entirely electrical based and there will be no additional emissions from combustion plant. Therefore, further assessment of the long-term impact from energy/heating source from the Proposed Development has been scoped out, as in the ES 2020.

Embedded Mitigation

12.16 The embedded mitigation stays the same as the ES 2020 which is that the energy strategy is proposed to be entirely electrical.

Limitations and Assumptions

12.17 The limitations and assumptions have not changed from the ES 2020.

Assessment of Construction Phase Effects

12.18 The likely significant environmental effects that are likely to occur during the construction of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

12.19 This is that there is a potential High Risk of dust impacts from the construction of the Scheme which is deemed Significant and mitigation is required to reduce the impact to Not Significant.

12.20 The impact assessment of construction traffic indicates a Negligible impact at receptor locations which is deemed Not Significant.

Assessment of Operational Phase Effects

12.21 The likely significant environmental effects that are likely to occur during the operation of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

12.22 This is that there is the potential for receptors on the ground and first floor level to be exposed to NO_2 levels that are above the annual NO_2 objective and the impact on proposed receptors is deemed Significant and mitigation is required to reduce the impact to Not Significant.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

12.23 The likely significant cumulative environmental effects remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

12.24 Cumulative effects have been reviewed in line with additional consented schemes since submission of the ES. The cumulative environmental effects remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Mitigation of Effects

12.25 The mitigation identified in the ES 2020 remains valid for the Revised Scheme

Residual Effects

12.26 The residual effects identified in the ES 2020 remain valid.

References

Ref 12.1 Defra, 2017, Defra Air Quality Plan for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2) in UK

Ref 12.2 GCMA Clean Air Plan Policy of Consultation: https://images.ctfassets.net/tlpgbvy1k6h2/3QO06YSFhtsVmBysx5wXgV/

15086c04fec14152f3d6d6f87e1cda1a/Clean_Air_Plan_Policy_for_Consultation.pdf

Ref 12.3 Greater Manchester Combined Authority, June 2020, 2019 Air Quality Annual Status Report

Ref 12.4 https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/data/laqm-background-maps?year=2018

13. Noise and Vibration

Introduction

13.1 This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme on Noise and Vibration. It summarises any potential changes to noise and vibration impacts associated with the proposed amendments to the Consented Scheme. This Chapter does not reiterate the findings of the Noise and Vibration ES Chapter supporting the Consented Scheme where the information remains relevant.

13.2 This Chapter has been completed by Edward Goldsmith, Principal Acoustic Engineer at Hydrock who holds an Acoustics BEng (Hons) degree from the University of Salford and is a full Member of the Institute of Acoustics (MIOA).

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance Documents

13.3 No significant changes to international, national and/or local noise & vibration legislation, policy or guidance have been published since the preparation of the ES 2020. Therefore, legislation, policy or guidance considered therein remains valid.

Assessment Methodology

13.4 No changes to the methodology described in the ES 2020 are required as a result of the Revised Scheme.

Baseline Conditions

13.5 No significant changes to existing noise and/or vibration sources in the vicinity of the Consented Scheme/Revised Scheme are considered to have occurred since the ES 2020.

13.6 Therefore, no significant changes to the baseline noise and vibration environment at, and in the vicinity of, the Consented Scheme/Revised Scheme are considered to have occurred since the submission of the ES 2020.

Anticipated Future Baseline Conditions

Construction (2021)

13.7 The future baseline scenario for the construction phase stays the same as compared to the ES 2020. Additional developments that have been approved since the ES 2020 have been reviewed and are not considered to result in any significant change to baseline conditions for the construction phase of the development.

Operation (2022)

13.8 The future baseline scenario for the construction phase stays the same as compared to the ES 2020. Additional developments that have been approved since the ES 2020 have been reviewed and are not considered to result in any significant change to baseline conditions for the operational phase of the development.

Assessment of Effects

Matters Scoped Out

13.9 The Matters Scoped Out of the ES 2020 still remain relevant.

13.10 The ES 2020 did not include any parking provisions and therefore no additional traffic movements were predicted from the Consented Scheme. The Revised Scheme include up to 5 car parking spaces, however, the transport consultants have confirmed that this will equate to a maximum number of vehicle movements during any day of five arrivals and five departures.

13.11 This represents a change in road traffic flows on the adjacent network of <1%. In accordance with CRTN road traffic noise predictions, together with fundamental acoustic principles, the corresponding change in noise level would be imperceptible. Therefore, it is still considered appropriate to scope out further assessment of impacts associated with development generated road traffic, as in the ES 2020.

Embedded Mitigation

13.12 The embedded mitigation stays the same as the ES 2020.

Limitations and Assumptions

13.13 The limitations and assumptions have not changed from the ES 2020.

Assessment of Construction Phase Effects

13.14 The likely significant environmental effects that during the construction phase of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme, as described in the ES 2020. Therefore, no additional assessment is required.

Assessment of Operational Phase Effects

13.15 The likely significant environmental effects during the operational phase of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme, as described in the ES 2020. Therefore, no additional assessment is required.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

13.16 The likely significant cumulative environmental effects remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

13.17 Cumulative effects have been reviewed in line with additional consented schemes since submission of the ES. The cumulative environmental effects remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Mitigation of Effects

13.18 The mitigation identified in the ES 2020 remains valid for the Revised Scheme

Residual Effects

13.19 The residual effects identified in the ES 2020 remain valid.

14. Ground Conditions

Introduction

14.1 This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme on Ground Conditions. It compares the changes in circumstance and the resulting changes to assessment results compared to the ES 2020. This chapter does not repeat the ES 2020 where the information remains relevant.

14.2 This assessment and chapter has been completed by Curtins Consulting and was written by Philip Winterburn CEng MICE MIStructE MCIWEM C.WEM who is a Chartered Water and Environmental Manager and a Chartered Civil Engineer.

14.3 The content of this chapter relies upon the findings of Hydrock report reference VHM-HYD-XX-DS-RP-GE-0001 dated 24 January 2020 titled Victoria House Manchester: Ground Conditions Desk Study, which was appended to the ES 2020, Appendix 14.1. It is advised in the Document Production Record, that this report was prepared, checked, and approved by competent professionals. The report remains valid for the assessment of the Revised Scheme.

14.4 This Chapter presents an assessment of the potential environmental impacts related to ground conditions at the Victoria House development site. Consideration is given to the issues of potentially contaminated land and groundwater, ground gas, and geotechnical issues relating to stability of the building. The purpose of the assessment is to ensure that impacts on human health and the wider environment are comprehensively assessed and that, where necessary, any perceived adverse effects of significance are mitigated.

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance Documents

14.5 The legislation, policy and guidance referred to in the ES 2020 remains relevant as listed below subject to the references identified as updated or replaced.

14.6 The content of this Chapter recognises the following legislation, policy and good practice guidance:

- Ref 14.1: Land contamination risk management (LCRM), Environment Agency (2021) - replaces Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, Environment Agency (2004);
- Ref 14.2: Section 78A of Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act of 1990;
- Ref: 14.3: The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019) – updates The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2018);
- Ref 14.4: Manchester City Council Core Strategy 2012;

- Ref 14.5: Planning Practice Guidance (PPG): Land Affected by Contamination, 2019 – *updates Planning Practice Guidance (PPG): Land Affected by Contamination, 2014* ;

- Ref 14.6: Planning & Contaminated Land, Technical Guidance, Manchester City Council, February 2021 – *replaces Planning Guidance in Relation to Ground Contamination: Guidance Note for Applicants, Developers, Land Owners and Consultants, Manchester City Council, Version 6, September 2016*;

- Ref 14.7: BS10175: 2017 Investigation of Contaminated Sites: Code of Practice;

- Ref 14.8: BS5930: 2015 Code of Practice for Ground Investigations;

- Ref 14.9: Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 4 Geotechnics and Drainage, Managing Geotechnical Risk HD22/08, 2008;

- Ref 14.10: CL:AIRE, Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice Version 2, 2011.

- Ref 14.11: CIRIA C552 2001; Contaminated Land Risk Assessment. A guide to Good Practice

- Ref 14.12: NATHANAIL P., JONES A., OGDEN, R., AND ROBERTSON A. 2014. Asbestos in soil and made ground: a guide to understanding and managing risks. CIRIA Report C733 Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments, London.

- Ref 14.13: Environment Agency 2001: Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination: Guidance on Pollution Prevention.

14.7 The updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance noted above do not materially alter the assessment requirements of this chapter compared with ES 2020.

14.8 The relevance of the legislation, policy and guidance referred to above is summarised below.

14.9 The Land contamination risk management- LCRM (Ref 14.1), specify the requirement for a Preliminary Risk Assessment as an outcome of a Desk Study and Site Reconnaissance. The report reference VHM-HYD-XX-DS-RP-GE-0001 dated 24 January 2020 titled Victoria House Manchester presented as a technical appendix to the ES 2020 Appendix 14.1 (which remains valid for this assessment) is compliant with the specified procedure.

14.10 Section 78A of Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act of 1990, (Ref 14.2), commonly referred to a 'Part 2A', is a regime for the identification and, where necessary, the remediation of, contaminated land. This legislation is currently implemented by the Contaminated Land (England) (Amendment) Regulations of 2012. Contaminated land is defined in terms of the harm it might cause, such as to human health, the water environment, ecosystems and property. The primary responsibility

for determining whether or not land is Contaminated rests with the Local Authority, which may enforce remediation to reduce the risk that the contaminated land imparts. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Ref 14.3) requires that, on completion of a development, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as Contaminated Land under Part 2A. Compliance with the above also ensures compliance with the Government's Planning Practice Guidance on Land Affected by Contamination, 2019 (Ref 14.5).

14.11 Policy EN 18 – Contaminated Land and Ground Stability – of the Manchester City Council Core Strategy 2012, (Ref 14.4), requires that any proposal for development of contaminated land must be accompanied by a Health Risk Assessment. In addition, EN 18 requires that 'all new development within former mining areas shall undertake an assessment of any associated risk and, if necessary, incorporate appropriate mitigation measures'. These requirements are echoed in the City Council's 'Planning & Contaminated Land, Technical Guidance, February 2021 (Ref 14.6). The requirements are already addressed in the Hydrock report reference VHM-HYD-XX-DS-RP-GE-0001 dated 24 January 2020 titled Victoria House Manchester which is presented as a technical appendix to the ES 2020 Appendix 14.1 (which remains valid for this assessment) and will be further strengthened by a phase of intrusive site investigation and risk assessment to be completed after the existing building is demolished.

14.12 Reference items 14.7 – 14.13 are good practice guidance that applies when the project moves forward to physical (intrusive) site investigation, risk assessment, and geotechnical design. A commitment to compliance with this guidance is made in this ES.

14.13 Reference item 14.12 will be applied if risks presented by asbestos in soils are identified during the physical (intrusive) site investigation and risk assessment phase. A commitment to compliance with this guidance is made in this ES.

14.14 Reference item 14.13 will be referenced and adhered to subsequent to the physical (intrusive) site investigation, risk assessment and geotechnical design phase, when the proposed foundation technique is known. A commitment to compliance with this guidance is made in this ES.

Assessment Methodology

14.15 The requirement for any alterations to the Assessment Methodology for reason of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance or due to the Revised Scheme are discussed below.

The Study Area

14.16 The study area remains the same from that shown in ES 2020. The development site boundary, as shown on Simpson Hough Proposed Site Plan Drawing No. 10122-A-B5D9-G100-P-00-003 dated January 2020 included in ES 2020 Appendix 2.1 is limited spatially to the site boundary in terms of the intrusive ground investigations that are to be undertaken at a later date, but in terms of desk-based studies, the area extends to 250m from the site boundary to include reference to nearby associated development. A radial distance of 250m from the site boundary is a distance beyond which, no effects of the development in terms of Ground Conditions can be reasonably expected.

Baseline Surveys

Desk Based Research

14.17 Surveys to define baseline conditions are currently restricted to the tasks described in the Hydrock report, reference VHM-HYD-XX-DS-RP-GE-0001 dated 24 January 2020 titled Victoria House Manchester, presented as a technical appendix to the ES 2020 Appendix 14.1. The format of this report is compliant with the requirements of the Preliminary Risk Assessment stage of the Land contamination risk management (LCRM), Environment Agency (2021 (Ref: 14.1) and is therefore still appropriate.

Field Survey Work

14.18 Field survey work was restricted to a reconnaissance-level site inspection carried out by Hydrock (undertaken in accordance with reference 14.7 on 1st October 2018). It is noted that there does not appear to have been any significant changes of use of the site since 2018 that would materially affect the findings of the reconnaissance site visit.

Consultations

14.19 There is no requirement, in relation to Ground Conditions, to seek any additional consultations to those described in ES 2020 for reason of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or due to the Revised Scheme.

Magnitude of Effect

14.20 In the context of Ground Conditions the Magnitude of Effect criteria in the ES 2020 will still be appropriate after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Sensitivity of Receptor

14.21 In the context of Ground Conditions the Sensitivity of Receptor criteria in the ES 2020 will still be appropriate after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Duration of Effect

14.22 In the context of Ground Conditions the Duration of Effect criteria in the ES 2020 will still be appropriate after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Significance of Effect

14.23 In the context of Ground Conditions the Significance of Effect criteria in the ES 2020 will still be appropriate after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Existing Baseline Conditions

14.24 Existing baseline conditions are determined from the findings of the Hydrock report reference VHM-HYD-XX-DS-RP-GE-0001 dated 24 January 2020 titled Victoria House Manchester, presented as a technical appendix to the ES 2020 Appendix 14.1 (which remains valid)). In the context of Ground Conditions the Existing Baseline Conditions in the ES 2020, will still be appropriate after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Predicted Future Baseline Conditions

Construction (2021)

14.25 The future baseline scenario for the construction phase stays the same as compared to the ES 2020.

Operation (2022)

14.26 The future baseline scenario for the operational phase stays the same as compared to the ES 2020.

Assessment of Effects

Matters Scoped Out

14.27 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Matters Scoped Out as stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Embedded Mitigation

14.28 Embedded Mitigation has changed from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of the Revised Scheme. The occupied development is still almost entirely hardscape with no opportunity for contact between building users and any contamination associated with Made Ground. However, Made Ground left on site will be significantly reduced due to the increase in basement size in the Revised Scheme.

14.29 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no other changes required to Embedded Mitigation from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Limitations and Assumptions

14.30 *In In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no other changes required to Limitations and Assumptions from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.*

Assessment of Construction Phase Effects

14.31 Reasonable 'worst case' conditions have been assumed in this assessment.

Overview

14.32 In the context of Ground Conditions, the relevant design amendments of the Revised Scheme that could possibly impact the assessment are;

- Basement level: increase the size of the basement to the full size of the building for the provision of plant, refuse store, cycle storage, five car parking spaces, and an access ramp;

14.33 Construction will comprise demolition of the existing building and construction of the new one. When the site is cleared it will be subject to intrusive investigation for geo-environmental (contamination) and geotechnical (earthworks and foundations) purposes. The new building will include a basement across the full building footprint founded approximately 4m below existing ground level which will require excavation.

The entire building will be founded on piles, the design of which (number, depth, method of installation) will be an output of an interpretation of data obtained from the intrusive investigations and testing followed by geotechnical design. However, the piles are likely to be end-bearing socketed into the sandstone bedrock.

14.34 The materials excavated to form the basement will need to be taken off site. Materials of anthropogenic origin (Made Ground) will be sent to suitably licensed landfill, the location of which will be determined based on chemical testing of the material prior to its disposal. Clean, naturally-occurring materials, will be similarly disposed to suitably licensed landfill unless a use for it as fill material on a different site can be located, all in compliance with Waste Management legislation. The increase of the basement footprint severely limits any opportunity to re-use material on site rather than export it.

Human Health Risks

14.35 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Human Health Risks from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Controlled Waters

14.36 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Controlled Waters from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Stability of the Building

14.37 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Stability of the Building from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Assessment of Operational Phase Effects

14.38 Reasonable 'worst case' conditions have been assumed in this assessment.

Human Health Risk

14.39 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Human Health Risks from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Controlled Waters

14.40 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Controlled Waters from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Stability of the Building

14.41 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Stability of the Building from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

14.42 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Intra-Project Cumulative Effects from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

14.43 Cumulative effects have been reviewed in line with additional consented schemes since submission of the ES. In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Inter-Project Cumulative Effects from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Mitigation of Effects

Construction Phase - Human Health

14.44 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Construction Phase - Human Health Risks from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Construction Phase – Controlled Waters

14.45 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Construction Phase - Controlled Waters from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Construction Phase – Stability of the Building

14.46 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Construction Phase - Stability of the Building from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Operational Phase – Human Health

14.47 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Operational Phase - Human Health Risks from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Operational Phase – Controlled Waters

14.48 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Operational Phase - Controlled Waters from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Operational Phase – Stability of the Building

14.49 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Operational Phase - Stability of the Building from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

Residual Effects

14.50 In the context of Ground Conditions, there are no changes required to Residual Effects from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced

legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme. In the context of Ground Conditions ES 2020 concluded that there are no residual impacts of any significance.

References

Ref 14.1	Land contamination risk management (LCRM), Environment Agency (2021)
Ref 14.2	Section 78A of Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act of 1990
Ref 14.3	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2019)
Ref 14.4	Manchester City Council Core Strategy 2012
Ref 14.5	Planning Practice Guidance (PPG): Land Affected by Contamination, 2019;
Ref 14.6	Planning & Contaminated Land, Technical Guidance, Manchester City Council, February 2021
Ref 14.7	BS10175: 2017 Investigation of Contaminated Sites: Code of Practice;
Ref 14.8	BS5930: 2015 Code of Practice for Ground Investigations;
Ref 14.9	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 4 Geotechnics and Drainage, Managing Geotechnical Risk HD22/08, 2008;
Ref 14.10	CL:AIRE, Definition of Waste: Development Industry Code of Practice Version 2, 2011.
Ref 14.11	CIRIA C552 2001; Contaminated Land Risk Assessment. A guide to Good Practice
Ref 14.12	NATHANAIL P., JONES A., OGDEN, R., AND ROBERTSON A. 2014. Asbestos in soil and made ground: a guide to understanding and managing risks. CIRIA Report C733 Contaminated Land: Applications in Real Environments, London.
Ref 14.13	Environment Agency 2001: Piling and Penetrative Ground Improvement Methods on Land Affected by Contamination: Guidance on Pollution Prevention.

15. Water Environment

Introduction

15.1 This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme on the Water Environment. It compares the changes in circumstance and the resulting changes to assessment results compared to the ES 2020. This chapter does not repeat the ES 2020 where the information remains relevant.

15.2 This assessment and chapter has been completed by Chloé Grimsley, GMICE BSc, Principal Civil Engineer – Curtins.

15.3 The content of this chapter relies upon the findings of the Flood Risk Assessment by WSP, referenced 70048738-RPT-001 dated 31st January 2020.

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance Documents

15.4 The legislation, policy and guidance documents referred to in the ES 2020 remain relevant to the Revised Scheme.

15.5 The following document references in ES 2020 should reflect the latest versions noted as follows:

- National Planning Policy Framework, 2019 sets out the national framework for delivering sustainable development, Chapter 14 "Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change" para 148 to 165.

- Building Regulations Part H (Drainage and Waste Disposal), 2010. Statutory guidance for building drainage and sewerage.

Assessment Methodology

15.6 The requirement for any alterations to the Assessment Methodology for reason of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance or due to the Revised Scheme are discussed below.

15.7 Given the consistent policy and guidance, the assessment methodology remains the same as the ES 2020.

The Study Area

15.8 The study area remains the same from that shown in ES 2020.

Baseline Surveys

Desk Based Research

15.9 The desk-based information has been reviewed to confirm the current status.

- Environment Agency Flood Map for Fluvial Sources – this confirms that the site remains within Flood Zone 1 – Low Risk from fluvial sources.

- Environment Agency Flood Map for Surface Water Sources – this confirms that the site remains at low risk of surface water flooding. The area of localised flood risk to the north of the development boundary remains constrained within Great Ancoats Street and not likely to pose as a risk to the development site.

Field Survey Work

15.10 There is no requirement, in relation to the Water Environment to complete any fieldwork for the Revised Scheme.

Consultations

15.11 There is no requirement, in relation to the Water Environment to seek any additional consultations to those described in ES 2020 for the Revised Scheme.

Significance Criteria

Magnitude of Effect

15.12 In the context of Water Environment, the Magnitude of Effect criteria in the ES 2020 will still be appropriate for consideration of the Revised Scheme.

Sensitivity of Receptor

15.13 In the context of Water Environment, the Sensitivity of Receptor criteria in the ES 2020 will still be appropriate for consideration of the Revised Scheme.

Significance of Effect

15.14 In the context of Water Environment, the Significance of Effect criteria in the ES 2020 will still be appropriate for consideration of Revised Scheme.

Baseline Conditions

15.15 The existing baseline conditions remain the same as presented in the ES 2020.

Anticipated Future Baseline Conditions

Construction (2021)

15.16 The future baseline scenario for the construction phase remains the same as compared to the ES 2020.

Operation (2022)

15.17 The future baseline scenario for the operational phase remains the same as compared to the ES 2020.

Assessment of Effects

Matters Scoped Out

15.18 There are no changes required to Matters Scoped Out as stated in ES 2020 in consideration of the Revised Scheme.

Embedded Mitigation

15.19 There are no changes required to Embedded Mitigation from those stated in ES 2020 in consideration of the Revised Scheme.

Limitations and Assumptions

15.20 There are no other changes required to Limitations and Assumptions from those stated in ES 2020 in consideration of the Revised Scheme.

Assessment of Construction Phase Effects

Contaminants and Suspended Sediments in Surface Water Run-off entering the local Drainage Infrastructure

15.21 There are no changes to the effects on Contaminants and Suspended Sediments in Surface Water Run-off entering the local Drainage Infrastructure risks from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of the Revised Scheme.

Risk of Flooding to Construction Works and site occupants

15.22 The relevant design amendments of the Revised Scheme that could possibly impact the assessment are:

- Basement level: increase the size of the basement to the full size of the building for the provision of plant, refuse store, cycle storage, five car parking spaces, and an access ramp;

15.23 The ES 2020 identifies the risk of flooding to the Construction Workers and site occupants as a result of the site preparation, earthworks and construction phase, particularly where excavations are required. The increase of the basement footprint increases the extent of the deep excavation works and will therefore require additional mitigation to cover the extended area. The temporary, short-term adverse effect will remain moderate to major significance (**Significant** in EIA terms) prior to implementation of any mitigation measures.

Assessment of Operational Phase Effects

Risk of Flooding to Employees

15.24 There are no changes to the risk of flooding to employees from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of the Revised Scheme.

Increase in Foul Flows and Associated Capacity Requirements in the Off-site Sewerage System

15.25 The relevant design amendments of the Revised Scheme that could possibly impact the assessment are:

- Amendments to the internal arrangements – i.e. number of residential and commercial units.

15.26 The ES 2020 identifies that the development will produce additional foul sewerage compared to the baseline situation, which will discharge to the United Utilities public sewer. The amendments to the internal arrangement will impact on the anticipated foul flow rates expected to discharge from the development site.

15.27 The Flood Risk Assessment Anticipates that an average of 7.5 l/s foul flows will be discharged based on 160 residential units and 0.03 hectares of commercial space. The

anticipated flows within the FRA should have identified 177 residential units discharging a flow rate of 8.2 l/s.

15.28 As a result of the Revised Scheme, it is anticipated that foul flows will be revised to an average of approximately 8.2 l/s based on 175 residential units and 0.08 l/s based on 0.13 hectares commercial/amenity space. The increase in flows is likely to have a negligible impact on the previous assessment and the direct, permanent, long-term adverse effect will remain a negligible significance (**not significant** in EIA terms) prior to the implementation of any mitigation measures.

Increase in potable water demand and associated capacity requirements of the offsite water supply network

15.29 The relevant design amendments of the Revised Scheme that could possibly impact the assessment are:

- Amendments to the internal arrangements – i.e. number of residential and commercial units.

15.30 The ES 2020 identifies that the development will increase the potable water demand on the United Utilities network compared to the existing situation. The amendments to the internal arrangement is not likely to impact significantly on the water supply given the increased area at basement level covers mainly storage access and car parking areas and the change of use at upper levels is from residential to amenity use. The direct, permanent, long-term adverse effect will remain a negligible significance (**not significant** in EIA terms) prior to the implementation of any mitigation measures.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

15.31 There are no changes to the Intra-Project Cumulative effects from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of the Revised Scheme.

Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

15.32 Cumulative effects have been reviewed in line with additional consented schemes since submission of the ES 2020. There are no changes to Inter-Project Cumulative effects from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of the Revised Scheme.

Mitigation of Effects

Risk of Flooding to Construction Works and site occupants

15.33 The ES 2020 provides mitigation for the risk of flooding to Construction Workers and site occupants. The proposed mitigation remains relevant to the revised scheme, however particular consideration will be required to include the increased extents of excavation to form the extended basement, and the Health and Safety and Construction Management Plan should be updated to reflect the increased basement excavation extents.

Increase in Foul Flows and Associated Capacity Requirements in the Off-site Sewerage System

15.34 The ES 2020 confirms that no specific mitigation is required subject to response from United Utilities. The proposed mitigation as a result of the Revised Scheme remains consistent with ES 2020.

Residual Effects

15.35 There are no changes to the Residual Effects from those stated in ES 2020 after consideration of updated and or replaced legislation, policy and guidance and or the Revised Scheme.

15.36 In summary, following mitigation there are no significant effects which will arise as a result of the Revised Scheme and this is consistent with ES 2020.

References

15.37 References as noted in ES 2020.

16. Ecology

Introduction

16.1 This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme on ecology. It compares the changes in circumstance and the resulting changes to the assessment results compared to the ES 2020. This chapter does not repeat the ES 2020 where the information remains relevant.

16.2 This assessment and chapter has been completed by Sacha Rogers, Managing Director, Penny Anderson Associates Ltd. Sacha holds a BSc (Hons) degree in Rural Environment Studies and is a Chartered Environmentalist and a full member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management.

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance Documents

16.3 There have been no changes to the legislative framework, policies or best practice guidance documents noted in the ES 2020.

Assessment Methodology

The Study Area

16.4 There have been no changes to the study area described in the ES 2020.

Baseline Surveys

Desk Based Research

16.5 There have been no changes to the desk based research described in the ES 2020.

Field Survey Work

Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey

16.6 There have been no changes to the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey as described in the ES 2020.

Building Assessment for Bats

16.7 An updated building assessment for bats was conducted in May 2021.

16.8 A single building within the PDS (National Grid Reference: SJ 842 973) was assessed for potential to support bat roosts, following established best practice guidance as set out in Bat Surveys Good Practice Guidelines (Collins). The building inspection for bats was conducted during a single visit on 5 May 2021 and took approximately two hours to complete. The survey was conducted using high-powered torches and clos-focusing binoculars to illuminate and examine potential roosting features and potential roost access points. Ladders were used where necessary to access lofts or external features such as fascia boards and soffits.

16.9 At the same time any evidence of nesting birds e.g. active nests and old nest remains was also recorded.

Consultations

16.10 There are no changes to the consultations undertaken as described in the ES 2020.

Significance Criteria

16.11 There are no changes to the assessment methodology described in the ES 2020.

Existing Baseline Conditions

16.12 The baseline scenario has not changed since the ES 2020. The update building assessment for bats confirms that the building was found to have no evidence of, or potential for, roosting bats and the PDS and adjacent habitats continue to have limited potential to support foraging or commuting bats due to a lack of semi-natural habitat.

16.13 No evidence of other protected species, including nesting birds, was found during the updated building assessment and the PDS continues to be highly unsuitable for protected and notable species due to a lack of semi-natural vegetation. Opportunities for nesting birds associated with the building remain limited due to a lack of suitable access points and perching or nesting locations.

Predicted Future Baseline Conditions

Construction (2021 - 2022)

16.14 The future baseline scenario in relation to construction has not changed compared with the ES 2020.

Operation (2022)

16.15 The future baseline scenario in relation to operation has not changed compared with the ES 2020.

Assessment of Effects

Matters Scoped Out

16.16 The matters which were scoped out of the ES 2020 remain relevant.

Embedded Mitigation

16.17 No embedded mitigation is required in respect of ecology and this is unchanged since the ES 2020.

Limitations and Assumptions

16.18 The building was fully accessible internally and externally during the updated building assessment for bats. The assessment was carried out at a suitable time of year for this type of survey during suitable weather conditions. There were, therefore, no limitations to the survey.

Assessment of Construction Phase Effects

16.19 The likely significant environmental effects that are likely to occur during the construction phase of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

16.20 The likely significant cumulative effects remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme in the ES 2020. Whilst the list of cumulative schemes now includes additional developments in proximity to the PDS which were not considered in the ES 2020 for the Consented Scheme, these are not anticipated to give rise to cumulative effects on ecology. This is because there are no features of ecological interest located within the PDS and this is unlikely to change from the current baseline to the time of commencement and operation of the Revised Scheme.

Mitigation of Effects

16.21 No mitigation was identified as being required in relation to ecology for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020 and this remains valid for the Revised Scheme.

Residual Effects

16.22 The residual effects identified in the ES 2020 remain valid.

References

Ref 16.1 Collins, J. (ed.) (2016) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edn.). The Bat Conservation Trust.

17. Television Interference

Introduction

17.1 This Chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme on local television reception. It compares the changes in circumstance and the resulting changes to assessment results compared to the ES 2020. This chapter does not repeat the ES 2020 where the information remains relevant, however certain sections have been updated.

17.2 The Chapter was produced by Gareth J Phillips BEng (Hons) MIET, MD & Senior Project Engineer, GTech Surveys Limited. The company undertakes pre- and post-construction television, radio and mobile phone reception surveys and reception impact assessments for due diligence and planning requirements. GTech Surveys Limited has extensive experience undertaking broadcast and telecommunications assessments within Manchester and the rest of the UK, satisfying Part 5, Regulation 18 (Parts 5a and 5b) of The Town and Country Planning EIA Regulations 2017.

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance Documents

17.3 With respect to the national, regional and local policies and frameworks that applied to the ES 2020, there have been no changes or updates with respect to telecommunications or broadcast reception or unwanted electronic interference.

Assessment Methodology

17.4 During the ES 2020, the likely significant effects as a result of all phases of the Proposed Development with respect to the reception of digital terrestrial television (DTT more commonly known as 'Freeview') and digital satellite television services (such as Sky and Freesat) in relation to surrounding receptors (predominantly local television viewers) were identified and assessed. The ES 2020 Chapter describes the methods used to assess the effects; determination of the baseline conditions currently existing at and around the Site and surrounding area; the mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset any significant negative effects, and the likely residual effects after these measures have been implemented. The impacts and effects to analogue television broadcasts were not assessed because all analogue television services were switched off in the Manchester area during 2009 and throughout the rest of the UK by 2012.

17.5 The same assessment methodology applied to the ES 2020 is still valid and applicable for the Revised Scheme. Summating, this includes an initial assessment and investigation of the potential for television interference i.e. reception impact modelling and a television baseline reception survey to record and assess the baseline reception conditions. Should interference be reported at a later date, a post-construction survey should be completed to investigate and validate any complaints. An understanding of the baseline conditions means effective comparisons can be made and suitable mitigation can be implemented for restoration of baseline conditions.

The Study Area

17.6 The Study Area as identified during the ES 2020 is still valid for the Revised Scheme. In summary, the study area for digital terrestrial television services includes a shadow zone and a 'key hole' shaped reflection zone, both extending out to a maximum of 5km south east of the Site (relative to the Winter Hill transmitter which serves the Manchester area). The shadow zone's width will be equal to the width of the Proposed Development / Revised Scheme relative to the transmitter.

17.7 With respect to the Study Area for digital satellite television services, the potential interference zones for digital satellite television services have been modelled based on the height of the Proposed Development and the typical elevation angle of satellite dishes in Manchester. The shadow zone for the Proposed Development / Revised Scheme extends north-northwest of the proposed development (due to location of satellites being positioned southeast of the Site). This remains the same as the ES 2020 assessment.

Baseline Surveys

Desk Based Research

17.8 For the ES 2020, desk-based modelling of the interference zones for the Proposed Development was completed for digital terrestrial and digital satellite television services. The assessment remains the same for the Revised Scheme. In summary, it was determined that digital terrestrial television interference is most likely to occur within 1km of the Site within its shadow zone relative to the Winter Hill television transmitter. With respect to digital satellite television services, it was determined that interference would most likely occur within 180m north-northwest of the Site.

17.9 For both digital terrestrial television and digital satellite television services, receptors closest to the Site are more likely to be impacted.

Field Survey Work

17.10 For the ES 2020 assessment, a television baseline signal survey was completed. The survey locations were selected in advance of the survey being undertaken and were concentrated around the key interference areas identified from the desk-based assessment. The chosen locations were subject to safety and access on the day.

17.11 The aim of the television baseline reception survey was to determine the condition of the terrestrial television signal in key interference areas and to more accurately assess whether an effect upon terrestrial television signals may be expected. The television baseline reception survey established the current signal quality in areas where interference issues are possible.

17.12 With respect to the Revised Scheme, it is considered that the data presented for the ES 2020 assessment remains valid and presents a good understanding the baseline reception conditions.

Consultations

17.13 No specific consultation was considered necessary to complete the television analysis for the Proposed Development. The understanding of television interference in

Manchester has been acquired over numerous surveys completed in Manchester and nationally since 2006. This remains valid for the Revised Scheme.

17.14 A review of the Manchester City Council (MCC) Scoping Opinion (issued November 2018) was completed with respect to television interference. The response stated, 'the comments within your scoping report are acceptable in terms of their consideration in the ES'. There were no further comments or considerations with respect to the MCC response.

Significance Criteria

17.15 The assessment methodology set out in the ES 2020 remains relevant to the assessment of the Revised Scheme.

Existing Baseline Conditions

17.16 As part of the ES 2020, a television baseline reception survey was undertaken prior to the construction of the Proposed Development. It confirmed that coverage is provided by the main regional Winter Hill television transmitter. It also confirmed that residences receive television services from a variety of sources (satellite and/or terrestrial services).

17.17 With respect to the reception conditions around the Site now, whilst there will be subtle changes to signal levels (a natural occurrence and to be expected), overall it is likely that reception conditions are very similar to those observed during the ES 2020 assessment and the Winter Hill transmitter still provides robust coverage.

Anticipated Future Baseline Conditions

Construction (2021-2022)

17.18 The anticipated future baseline for the construction of the Revised Scheme in 2021-2022 onwards is predicted to be similar or marginally worse to that of the existing baseline. Any significant interference to television signals would be mitigated thus ensuring baseline conditions remain. The mitigation may however change the way television services are provided.

Operation (2022)

17.19 The future baseline for 2022 is as per the anticipated future baseline for 2021-2020.

Assessment of Effects

Matters which have been scoped out

17.20 It remains valid to scope out matters as set out in the ES 2020. The impacts and effects to analogue television broadcasts were not assessed because all analogue television services were switched off in the Manchester area during 2009 and throughout the rest of the UK by 2012.

Embedded Mitigation

17.21 There is no embedded mitigation within the designs for the Revised Scheme associated to this assessment.

Limitations and Assumptions

17.22 Since the ES 2020, no changes to limitations or assumption have occurred. The same assumptions and limitations apply to the assessment.

Assessment of Construction Phase Effects

17.23 With respect to the likely significant environmental effects that are likely to occur during the construction of the Revised Scheme, these remain the same as those identified for the Consented Scheme, as described in the ES 2020. Effects during construction are likely to be less noticeable than during operation because there will be less physical obstruction of the signal whilst the Revised is incomplete.

Assessment of Operational Phase Effects

17.24 With respect to the likely significant environmental effects that are likely to occur during the operational phase of the Revised Scheme, these remain the same as those identified for the Consented Scheme, as described in the ES 2020. Overall, the resulting impact significance for terrestrial and television satellite television service reception can be classed as Minor Adverse and **Not Significant**.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

17.25 As identified during the ES 2020, with respect to the Revised Scheme, there will also be no intra-relationship effects with other topic areas.

Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

17.26 With respect to the Revised Scheme, the ES 2020 assessment regarding inter-relationship effects with other local, consented and submitted schemes is still valid.

Mitigation of Effects

17.27 The mitigation identified in the ES 2020 remains valid for the Revised Scheme.

Residual Effects

17.28 The residual effects identified in the ES 2020 remain valid.

Environmental Receptor	Description of Impact and Significance	Duration	Mitigation	Residual Impact and significance	Duration of Residual Impact
Construction Phase					
Effects during construction are likely to be less noticeable than during operation because there will be less physical obstruction of the signal whilst the Revised Scheme is incomplete.					
Operational Phase					
Terrestrial Television	Minor Adverse and Not Significant	Long term	Restoration of the baseline television service	Minor Adverse and Not Significant	Not Significant
Satellite Television	Minor Adverse and Not Significant	Long term	Restoration of the baseline television service	Minor Adverse and Not Significant	Not Significant
Cumulative Impacts					
Inter-relationship effects are inherently covered within the scheduled television baseline reception survey and any mitigation implemented as a result of the Revised Scheme in isolation.					

18. Wind Microclimate

Introduction

18.1 This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme on wind microclimate. It compares the changes in circumstance and the resulting changes to assessment results compared to the ES 2020. This chapter does not repeat the ES 2020 where the information remains relevant. This assessment and chapter have been completed by Jon Winchester BSc (Hons), MSc, PhD of GIA.

Legislation, Policy and Guidance

18.2 There has been no change in the legislation, policy & guidance presented in the ES 2020. As such, these all remains relevant.

Assessment Methodology

18.3 The methodology described in the ES 2020 remains the same.

Baseline Conditions

18.4 The baseline conditions remain the same as in the ES 2020.

Anticipated Future Baseline Conditions

18.5 The future baseline is anticipated to include the following schemes within the study area, in addition to those included in the ES 2020.

- Pollard Street (126261/FO/2020)
- Pollard Street (128191/FO/2020)
- Store Street (126608/FO/2020)
- Old Mill Street (126669/FO/2020)
- Plot E, 2 Heyrod Street (127317/FO/2020)

18.6 Of these schemes, most are significantly far from the Proposed Development Site (more than 150m) or low height (less than 10 storeys), such that they would not reasonably be expected to significantly impact the future baseline conditions. The exception to this is Plot E, 2 Heyrod Street (127317/FO/2020), which is up to 25 storeys and located adjacent to the Proposed Development Site to the south west.

18.7 A wind microclimate assessment was submitted as part of the application for 127317/FO/2020, the methodology for which was consistent with that used in the ES 2020 and hence can be used to infer the impact of the Plot E development on the future baseline conditions. The 127317/FO/2020 assessment found that conditions with Plot E included are expected to be windier than the future baseline conditions as

in the ES 2020, but still suitable for the intended use and not subject to any safety or distress exceedances. The assessment of this is considered below.

Significance Criteria

18.8 The significance criteria remains the same as presented in the ES 2020.

Assessment of Effects

Matters which have been Scoped Out

18.9 The Matters Scoped Out of the ES 2020 remain relevant.

Embedded Mitigation

18.10 The embedded mitigation remains the same as the ES 2020.

Limitations and Assumptions

18.11 The limitations and assumptions remain the same as the ES 2020.

Assessment of Construction Phase Effects

18.12 The likely significant environmental effects that are likely to occur during the construction of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Assessment of Operational Phase Effects

18.13 The likely significant environmental effects that are likely to occur during the operation of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Assessment of Likely Significant Cumulative Effects

Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

18.14 The likely significant cumulative environmental effects remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Inter-Project Effects

18.15 The additional schemes within the future baseline will impact the cumulative assessment. As with the future baseline, the only additional scheme which would be reasonably expected to potentially have a significant impact is Plot E, 2 Heyrod Street (127317/FO/2020). The cumulative assessment submitted with 127317/FO/2020 showed that conditions were calmer than the conditions for the cumulative assessment in the ES 2020, with greater expanses suitable for sitting or standing and no safety or distress exceedances even in the absence of mitigation measures.

18.16 This means that the region of S15 safety exceedance reported in the wind assessment within the ES 2020 is no longer present when Plot E is included, so the effect on safety is **negligible (not significant).**

18.17 Apart from this effect, the conditions from the ES 2020 can be treated as a reasonable worst case and the effects remain the same as the ES 2020.

18.18 All ground level effects (with regards to local thoroughfares, building entrances and public realm) are **not significant.**

18.19 There are regions of S15 exceedance at terrace level, which is an adverse effect of **major significance (significant)** and will require the mitigation as outlined in the ES 2020.

Mitigation of Effects

18.20 The mitigation identified in the ES 2020 remains valid for the Revised Scheme.

Residual Impacts

18.21 The residual effects identified in the ES 2020 remain the same. All residual effects are **not significant.**

19. Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing

Introduction

19.1 This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme on daylight, sunlight and overshadowing. It compares the changes in circumstance and the resulting changes to assessment results compared to the ES 2020. This chapter does not repeat the ES 2020 where the information remains relevant. This assessment and chapter have been completed by Sam Wallis BSc (Hons) MRICS of GIA.

Legislation, Policy and Guidance

19.2 There has been no change in the legislation, policy & guidance presented in the ES 2020. As such, these all remains relevant.

Assessment Methodology

19.3 The methodology described in the ES 2020 remains the same.

Baseline Surveys

19.4 The baseline survey scope, methodology and outcome remain the same as set out in the ES 2020.

Significance Criteria

19.5 The significance criteria remains the same as set out in the ES 2020.

Assessment of Effects

Matters which have been Scoped Out

19.6 The Matters Scoped Out of the ES 2020 remain relevant.

Embedded Mitigation

19.7 The embedded mitigation remains the same as the ES 2020.

Limitations and Assumptions

19.8 The limitations and assumptions remain the same as the ES 2020.

Assessment of Construction Phase Effects

19.9 The likely significant environmental effects that are likely to occur during the construction of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020. A summary is presented below.

19.10 The demolition of the existing structures would have a negligible magnitude of effect on the surrounding buildings (which are of a moderate and low sensitivity), which would result in a **negligible significance of effect (not significant)** in terms of daylight and sunlight to the surrounding properties.

19.11 It identifies that no significant effects are expected. The same conclusion can therefore be reached in respect of the construction phase i.e. the construction of the Revised Scheme will cause **no adverse significant impacts** in terms of daylight and sunlight to the surrounding properties.

Assessment of Operational Phase Effects

19.12 The operational scenario considers the conditions in 2022 as this is the point at which construction of the Revised Scheme is expected to be completed.

Daylight Effects to Surrounding Properties

19.13 The assessment results remain the same as those presented in the ES 2020. The mass of the building is altering very slightly beyond that tested in the ES 2020. The massing changes are not significant enough to make any material difference to the results of the technical analysis that formed the basis of the ES 2020.

Quantum Apartments

19.14 The assessment results remain the same as those presented in the ES 2020. The significance of effect on daylight to this property (which has a medium sensitivity) is considered to be minor adverse (not significant). This is not considered to be a significant effect in terms of the EIA Regulations.

Ibis Hotel

19.15 The assessment results remain the same as those presented in the ES 2020. The significance of effect on daylight to this property is considered to be minor adverse (not significant). This not considered to be a significant impact in terms of the EIA regulations.

1 Adair Street

19.16 The assessment results remain the same as those presented in the ES 2020. The significance of effect on daylight to this property is considered to be minor adverse (not significant). This not considered to be a significant impact in terms of the EIA regulations.

Land at Portugal Street East

19.17 The assessment results remain the same as those presented in the ES 2020. The significance of effect on daylight to this property is considered to be negligible (not significant). This not considered to be a significant impact in terms of the EIA regulations.

Sunlight Effects to Surrounding Properties

19.18 The assessment results remain the same as those presented in the ES 2020.

Quantum Apartments

19.19 The assessment results remain the same as those presented in the ES 2020. The effect on sunlight to this property is considered to be negligible (not significant). This not considered to be a significant impact in terms of the EIA regulations.

Land at Portugal Street East

19.20 The assessment results remain the same as those presented in the ES 2020. The effect on sunlight to this property is considered to be negligible (not significant). This not considered to be a significant impact in terms of the EIA regulations.

Assessment of Likely Significant Cumulative Effects

Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

19.21 The likely significant cumulative environmental effects remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Inter-Project Effects

19.22 Cumulative effects have been reviewed in line with additional consented schemes since submission of the ES. The cumulative environmental effects remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Mitigation of Effects

19.23 The mitigation identified in the ES 2020 remains valid for the Revised Scheme.

Residual Impacts

The residual effects identified in the ES 2020 remain the same.

Environmental Receptor	Description of Impact and Significance	Duration	Mitigation	Residual Impact and significance	Duration of Residual Impact
Daylight Effects					
Ibis Hotel	Minor adverse (not significant)	Long term	n/a	Minor adverse (not significant)	Long term
Quantum Apartments	Moderate-minor adverse (not significant)	Long term	n/a	Moderate-minor adverse (not significant)	Long term
1 Adair Street	Minor adverse (not significant)	Long term	n/a	Minor adverse (not significant)	Long term
Land at Portugal Street East	Negligible (not significant)	Long term	n/a	Negligible (not significant)	Long term
Sunlight Effects					
Quantum Apartments	Negligible (not significant)	Long term	n/a	Negligible (not significant)	Long term
Land at Portugal Street East	Negligible (not significant)	Long term	n/a	Negligible (not significant)	Long term

20. Socio-Economics

Introduction

20.1 This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme on Socio-Economics. It compares the changes in circumstance and the resulting changes to assessment results compared to the ES 2020. This chapter does not repeat the ES 2020 where the information remains relevant.

20.2 This assessment and chapter has been completed by Tom Ellis (BA [Hons] MSc MRTPI), Planner at Turley Economics and verified by Andrew Lowe (MPlan [Hons] MRTPI), Associate Director at Turley Economics.

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance Documents

20.3 The legislation, policy and guidance set out in the ES 2020 remain relevant to the assessment of the Revised Scheme.

Assessment Methodology

20.4 The assessment methodology set out in the ES 2020 remains relevant to the assessment of the Revised Scheme.

Existing Baseline Conditions

20.5 Several datasets informing the baseline reported in the ES 2020 have since been updated. A summary of relevant updates to the baseline is presented below:

- **Population** – the population of Piccadilly Ward has grown by 7% from the 17,600 reported in the ES 2020 as of 2018, standing at 18,800 as of 2019[1]. The population of Manchester district has also grown (albeit by a smaller extent of 1%) from the 547,600 reported in the ES 2020 as of 2018, standing at 552,900 as of 2019; and

- **Education provision** – the latest Department for Education (DfE) data[2] indicates that the 8 primary schools located within 2km of the Revised Scheme have aggregate net available capacity to accommodate 230 pupils. This is 19 more than the 211 available places identified in the ES 2020, and, as reported in the ES 2020, the primary school with the greatest level of spare capacity (for 108 places) remains New Islington Free School. The closest secondary school to the Proposed Development (Trinity CofE High School) has available capacity for 78 places, which is 38 fewer places than the 116 reported in the ES 2020.

[1] ONS via Nomis (2020) Population Estimates: 2019

[2] Department for Education (2021) Get Information About Schools [Online]. Available at: https://get-information-schools.service.gov.uk/

Predicted Future Baseline Conditions

20.6 Several datasets informing the future baseline conditions reported in the ES 2020 have since been updated. A summary of relevant updates to the future baseline is presented below:

- **Demographic Changes** – The Office for National Statistics' (ONS) principal 2018-based sub-national population projections[3] forecast the population of Manchester to be 557,900 by 2022, the start of the operational phase. The average household size in Manchester is projected to be 2.45 in 2023[4], and therefore larger than the 2.29 in 2023 reported in the ES 2020.

Assessment of Effects

Matters which have been scoped out

20.7 It remains valid to scope out matters as set out in the ES 2020.

Embedded Mitigation

20.8 The embedded mitigation in terms of the characteristics of the Proposed Development described in the ES 2020 remains valid in principle, albeit, in line with the Revised Scheme parameters, minor updates to details relating to elements of the scheme providing social and economic benefits are set out below:

- The provision of 175 dwellings will add diversity to the housing stock and offer an increased variety of accommodation types for residents;
- The provision of 183 sqm commercial floorspace will provide additional employment opportunities in the area; and
- The provision of a cycle storage facility for 176 cycles will benefit new residents in terms of lifestyle and health.

Limitations and Assumptions

20.9 The limitations and assumptions described in the ES 2020 remain valid.

Assessment of Construction Phase Effects

Employment during construction and indirect and induced employment

20.10 It is considered that the changes proposed as a result of the Revised Scheme do not materially impact the assessment presented in the ES 2020 with regard to employment during construction and indirect and induced employment. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of this effect therefore remain unchanged and valid.

20.11 Therefore, in line with the conclusions of the ES 2020, this assessment concludes that the effect on employment during construction and indirect and induced employment

[3] ONS via Nomis (2020) 2018-based Population Projections

[4] ONS (2020) 2018-based Household projections. Note that projected average household size is not reported for the year of the beginning of the operational phase (2022), therefore, 2023 has been presented as the closest available year.

will be of **intermediate beneficial** significance and therefore **significant** in EIA terms, albeit temporary and short-term in duration.

Assessment of Operational Phase Effects

Population

20.12 Whilst a slightly lower number of apartments will be delivered as a result of the Revised Scheme (175) in comparison with the Consented Scheme (177), the updated future baseline average household size of 2.45 persons suggests that the total population of the Revised Scheme once operational could be slightly higher – at 429 – than reported in the ES 2020 (405).

20.13 Notwithstanding this, it is considered that the updated assessment of the effect on population as a result of the Revised Scheme and the updated future baseline position is not a material divergence from the assessment presented in the ES 2020. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of this effect therefore remain unchanged and valid.

20.14 Therefore, in line with the conclusions of the ES 2020, this assessment concludes that the effect on population will be of **intermediate beneficial** significance and therefore **significant** in EIA terms, and be permanent and long-term in duration.

Housing

20.15 Whilst a slightly lower number of apartments will be delivered as a result of the Revised Scheme (175) in comparison with the Consented Scheme (177), it is considered that the Revised Scheme's effect on housing is not a material divergence from the assessment as presented in the ES 2020. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of this effect therefore remain unchanged and valid.

20.16 Therefore, in line with the conclusions of the ES 2020, this assessment concludes that the effect on population will be of **minor beneficial** significance and therefore **not significant** in EIA terms, albeit permanent and long-term in duration.

Direct Employment

20.17 Whilst a slightly greater provision of commercial floorspace will be delivered as a result of the Revised Scheme (183 sqm) in comparison with the Consented Scheme (161 sqm), it is considered that the Revised Scheme's effect on direct employment is not a material divergence from the assessment as presented in the ES 2020. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of this effect therefore remain unchanged and valid.

20.18 Therefore, in line with the conclusions of the ES 2020, this assessment concludes that the effect on direct employment will be of **minor beneficial** significance and therefore **not significant** in EIA terms, albeit permanent and long-term in duration.

Education

Primary

20.19 Notwithstanding the changes as a result of the Revised Scheme and the updated baseline position (noting that a lower number of homes and greater available capacity in relevant primary schools are both factors which are likely to result in an effect of

slightly lower magnitude and sensitivity than previously assessed) it is considered that the Revised Scheme's effect on primary education is not a material divergence from the assessment as presented in the ES 2020. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of this effect therefore remain unchanged and valid.

20.20 Therefore, in line with the conclusions of the ES 2020, this assessment concludes that the effect on primary education will be **neutral** and therefore **not significant** in EIA terms.

Secondary

20.21 Notwithstanding the changes as a result of the Revised Scheme and the updated baseline position (noting that the updated baseline reported that there remains available secondary school capacity locally, albeit of a slightly lower level than previously assessed) it is considered that the Revised Scheme's effect on secondary education is not a material divergence from the assessment as presented in the ES 2020. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of this effect therefore remain unchanged and valid.

20.22 Therefore, in line with the conclusions of the ES 2020, this assessment concludes that the effect on secondary education will be **neutral** and therefore **not significant** in EIA terms.

Open Spaces

20.23 Whilst this updated assessment indicates that a slightly larger population will be accommodated at the Proposed Development than reported in the ES 2020 as a result of the Revised Scheme and updated future baseline, it is considered that the effect on demand for open spaces is not a material divergence from the assessment as presented in the ES 2020. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of this effect therefore remain unchanged and valid.

20.24 Therefore, in line with the conclusions of the ES 2020, this assessment concludes that the effect on open spaces will be **neutral** and therefore **not significant** in EIA terms.

Crime and Disorder

20.25 It is considered that the changes proposed as a result of the Revised Scheme do not materially impact the assessment presented in the ES 2020 with regard to crime and disorder. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of this effect therefore remain unchanged and valid.

20.26 Therefore, in line with the conclusions of the ES 2020, this assessment concludes that the effect on crime and disorder will be of **minor adverse** significance and therefore **not significant** in EIA terms, albeit permanent and long-term in duration.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

20.27 It is considered that the changes proposed as a result of the Revised Scheme do not materially impact the assessment presented in the ES 2020 with regard to the intra-project cumulative effect. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of the intra-project cumulative effect therefore remain unchanged and valid.

Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

20.28 It is considered that the changes proposed as a result of the Revised Scheme and the updated list of cumulative schemes do not materially impact the assessment presented in the ES 2020 with regard to inter-project cumulative effects. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of inter-project cumulative effects therefore remain unchanged and valid.

Mitigation of Effects

20.29 The mitigation of effects identified in the ES 2020 remain valid.

Residual Effects

20.30 The residual effects identified in the ES 2020 remain valid.

References

21. Human Health

Introduction

21.1 This chapter assesses the likely significant effects of the Revised Scheme on Human Health. It compares the changes in circumstance and the resulting changes to assessment results compared to the ES 2020. This chapter does not repeat the ES 2020 where the information remains relevant.

21.2 This assessment and chapter has been completed by Tom Ellis (BA [Hons] MSc MRTPI), Planner at Turley Economics and verified by Andrew Lowe (MPlan [Hons] MRTPI), Associate Director at Turley Economics.

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance Documents

21.3 The legislation, policy and guidance set out in the ES 2020 remain relevant to the assessment of the Revised Scheme.

Assessment Methodology

21.4 The assessment methodology set out in the ES 2020 remains relevant to the assessment of the Revised Scheme.

Existing Baseline Conditions

21.5 Several datasets informing the baseline reported in the ES 2020 have since been updated. A summary of relevant updates to the baseline is presented below:

- **Population** – the population of Piccadilly Ward has grown by 7% from the 17,600 reported in the ES 2020 as of 2018, standing at 18,800 as of 2019[5]. The population of Manchester district has also grown (albeit by a smaller extent of 1%) from the 547,600 reported in the ES 2020 as of 2018, standing at 552,900 as of 2019; and

- **Children** – as of 2019, it is estimated that people under the age of 19 account for 18% and 23% respectively of the population of Ancoats & Clayton ward and Manchester local authority[6], and thereby represent a slightly smaller share of the total population than reported in the ES 2020 (19% and 26% respectively).

- **Healthcare provision** – as reported by the ES 2020, it continues to be the case that all practices identified by the ES 2020 as local to the Proposed Development are currently accepting new patients. However, the number of patients on roll and number of GPs working at practices identified in the ES 2020 have changed during the period since the ES 2020 was prepared. Based on December 2020

[5] ONS via Nomis (2020) Population Estimates: 2019

[6] Ibid.

data sourced from NHS Digital[7], the below table therefore provides an updated review of local GP surgeries, including the number of patients on roll, full-time equivalent (FTE) GP staff, the number of patients per GP (and whether this is above or below the 1 GP: 1,800 patient ratio considered appropriate by guidance and also referenced in the ES 2020) and confirmation of acceptance of new patients.

Table 21.1: Provision of Healthcare, December 2020

GP Practice Name	Patients registered	FTE GPs	Patients per GP	Under 1 : 1800 threshold	Accepting new patients
Ancoats Urban Village Medical Practice	12,254	8.2	1,494	Yes	Yes
New Islington Medical Centre	6,785	2.1	3,231	No	Yes
The Vallance Centre	9,634	2.0	4,817	No	Yes
The Docs	8,245	3.2	2,577	No	Yes
Victoria Mill Medical Centre	3,107	1.5	2,071	No	Yes
City Health Centre	12,903	5.0	2,581	No	Yes
Cornerstone Family Practice	7,517	3.0	2,506	No	Yes
Whitley Road Medical Centre	6,668	3.8	1,755	Yes	Yes
Cornbrook Medical Practice – Boundary Surgery	14,030	7.0	2,004	No	Yes
West Gorton Medical Practice	7,104	5.0	1,421	Yes	Yes
Five Oaks Family Practice	8,932	3.8	2,351	No	Yes
Blackfriars Medical Practice	11,479	7.0	1,640	Yes	Yes

Source: NHS Digital (2021)

Predicted Future Baseline Conditions

21.6 The predicted future baseline conditions set out in the ES 2020 remain relevant to the assessment of the Revised Scheme.

Assessment of Effects

Matters which have been scoped out

21.7 It remains valid to scope out matters as set out in the ES 2020.

Embedded Mitigation

21.8 The embedded mitigation in terms of the characteristics of the Proposed Development described in the ES 2020 remains valid in principle, albeit, in line with the Revised

[7] NHS Digital (2021) General Practice Workforce: December 2020

Scheme parameters, a minor update to details relating to elements of the scheme providing social and economic benefits is set out below:

- provision of 176 cycle spaces will ensure a space is available for each flat within the development and will benefit the new residents in terms of lifestyle and healthcare improvement.

Limitations and Assumptions

21.9 The limitations and assumptions described in the ES 2020 remain valid.

Assessment of Construction Phase Effects

Air quality and noise

21.10 It is considered that the changes proposed as a result of the Revised Scheme do not materially impact the assessment presented in the ES 2020 with regard to air quality and noise. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of this effect therefore remain unchanged and valid.

21.11 Therefore, in line with the conclusions of the ES 2020, this assessment concludes that the effect on air quality and noise will be temporary, short-term, adverse and **minor** and **not significant** in EIA terms.

Assessment of Operational Phase Effects

Air quality

21.12 It is considered that the changes proposed as a result of the Revised Scheme do not materially impact the assessment presented in the ES 2020 with regard to air quality. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of this effect therefore remain unchanged and valid.

21.13 Therefore, in line with the conclusions of the ES 2020, this assessment concludes that the effect of changes to air quality in terms of health is considered to be adverse, permanent and long-term and of **intermediate** significance, which is **significant** in EIA terms.

Healthcare provision

21.14 As outlined in the Revised Scheme's ES **Chapter 20 (Socio-economics)**, the increase in the resident population resulting from the Proposed Development is estimated to amount to 429 people, which is slightly greater than reported in the ES 2020 (405). Whilst a slightly greater demand for healthcare provision could therefore be generated as a result of the Revised Scheme in comparison with the Consented Scheme, it is considered that the Revised Scheme's effect on healthcare provision is not a material divergence from the assessment as presented in the ES 2020. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of this effect therefore remain unchanged and valid.

21.15 Therefore, in line with the conclusions of the ES 2020, this assessment concludes that the effect on healthcare provision is considered to be adverse, permanent and long-term and of **intermediate** significance, which is **significant** in EIA terms.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

21.16 It is considered that the changes proposed as a result of the Revised Scheme do not materially impact the assessment presented in the ES 2020 with regard to the intra-project cumulative effect. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of the intra-project cumulative effect therefore remain unchanged and valid.

Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

21.17 It is considered that the changes proposed as a result of the Revised Scheme and the updated list of cumulative schemes do not materially impact the assessment presented in the ES 2020 with regard to inter-project cumulative effects. The conclusions of the ES 2020 in terms of inter-project cumulative effects therefore remain unchanged and valid.

Mitigation of Effects

21.18 The mitigation of effects identified in the ES 2020 remain valid.

Residual Effects

21.19 The residual effects identified in the ES 2020 remain valid.

References

22. Climate Change

Introduction

22.1 This chapter assesses the contribution of the Revised Scheme to climate change as a result of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions during construction and operation ('effects on climate'), as well as the vulnerability of the Revised Scheme to changes in climate ('vulnerability to climate change').

22.2 It reports changes in circumstances since the ES 2020 was prepared including new legislation and guidance, and also considers any implications to the assessment results, mitigation and significance of effects for the Revised Scheme relative to the Consented Scheme as reported in the ES 2020. This chapter does seek to not repeat the ES 2020 where the information remains valid.

22.3 The ES 2020 climate change chapter was prepared by WYG, and this update has been prepared by James Blake MSc MIEMA CEnv, Director at Turley Sustainability.

Legislative Framework, Policy and Guidance Documents

Climate Change Act (2008)

22.4 In April 2021, subsequent to the submission of the ES 2020, UK Government enshrined in law a new target to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 78% by 2035 under its sixth carbon budget (Ref 22.1). In line with recommendations of the Committee on Climate Change, this sixth carbon budget limits the volume of GHGs emitted over a 5-year period from 2033 to 2037, and will take the UK more than three-quarters of the way towards net zero by 2050. It is the first carbon budget to incorporate emissions from the UK's share of international aviation and shipping, thereby placing greater onus on the rapid decarbonisation of other sectors of the economy such as housing to contribute to this target.

Guidance Documents

22.5 In June 2020, subsequent to the submission of the ES 2020, IEMA published an updated EIA Guide to Climate Change Resilience & Adaptation (Ref 22.2). This guidance updates IEMA's original (2015) guidance on Climate Resilience and Adaptation in EIA, as referenced in the ES 2020. This updated guidance reflects lessons learnt from emerging practice, provides a number of EIA case studies where climate adaptation and resilience issues are considered, and provides geater emphasis on the need to consider and implement climate resilience measures within a project from an early stage.

22.6 IEMA's 2020 guidance recommends use of 'high emissions scenarios' when evaluating future climatic conditions as part of a climate change resilience and adaptation assessment to help ensure future climate change effects such as rainfall and temperature changes are not under-estimated. For the Met Office's latest UK Climate Projections (UKCP18) (Ref 22.3), the high emissions scenario is referred to as "RCP 8.5", and this scenario is applied as a reasonable worst-case in the ES 2020. The climate

change resilience assessment methodology of the ES 2020 is therefore aligned with this key element of the latest IEMA guidance.

22.7 All other legislation, policy and guidance set out in the ES 2020 remains relevant for the Revised Scheme.

Assessment Methodology

22.8 The methodology described in the ES 2020 remains the same for the Revised Scheme.

Existing Baseline Conditions (2020)

22.9 The ES 2020 used 2020 as the existing baseline year, however the qualitative nature of the climate change mitigation and resilience assessment work means the passage of time since the ES 2020 was submitted (with 2021 now forming the baseline year) has no significant implications to the baseline assessment as reported in the ES 2020.

Anticipated Future Baseline Conditions

Construction (2021)

22.10 The ES 2020 used 2020 as the future baseline year for construction, however the qualitative nature of the climate change mitigation and resilience assessment work means the passage of time since the ES 2020 was submitted (with 2021 now forming the future baseline year for construction) has no significant implications to change the future baseline assessment as reported in the ES 2020.

Operation (2022)

22.11 The future baseline scenario for the construction phase stays the same (2022) as the ES 2020.

Assessment of Effects

Matters Scoped Out

22.12 The position of the ES 2020 (no climate change matters scoped out) remains valid.

22.13 The Consented Scheme to which the ES 2020 relates included no car parking spaces and therefore no additional road traffic movements. The Revised Scheme includes up to 5 car parking spaces, and the transport consultants confirm this will generate a maximum of 5 No. vehicle movements during any single hour period. GHG emissions from this source are considered likely to be negligible and reduce year on year as a result of the continued uptake of low carbon alternatives such as electric vehicles (EVs). Given also that at least some of these vehicles movements are likely to be relocated journeys from elsewhere on the road network rather than wholly new (i.e. additional) journeys, a quantified assessment of GHG emissions from this source is not considered necessary.

Embedded Mitigation

22.14 The embedded mitigation remains as reported in the ES 2020. The all-electric energy strategy that is proposed will ensure the Revised Scheme is not locked in to high carbon fossil fuels such as natural gas, but instead benefits from the significant ongoing

decarbonisation of the UK electricity grid, with operational energy emissions reducing year on year as a result.

Limitations and Assumptions

22.15 The limitations and assumptions have not changed from the ES 2020.

Assessment of Construction Phase Effects

Effects on Climate

22.16 The likely significant environmental effects during construction of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Vulnerability to Climate Change

22.17 The likely significant environmental effects during construction of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Assessment of Operational Phase Effects

Effects on Climate

22.18 The likely significant environmental effects during operation of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Vulnerability to Climate Change

22.19 The likely significant environmental effects during operation of the Revised Scheme remain the same as those for the Consented Scheme as described in the ES 2020.

Assessment of Cumulative Effects

Intra-Project Cumulative Effects

22.20 The likely significant intra-project cumulative environmental effects remain the same as described in the ES 2020 for the Consented Scheme.

Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

22.21 The likely significant inter-project cumulative environmental effects remain the same as described in the ES 2020 for the Consented Scheme.

Mitigation of Effects

22.22 The mitigation identified in the ES 2020 remains valid for the Revised Scheme

Residual Effects

22.23 The residual effects identified in the ES 2020 remain valid for the Revised Scheme.

References

Ref 22.1	UK enshrines new target in law to slash emissions by 78% by 2035; Press Release; 20 April 2021; UK Government

	https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-enshrines-new-target-in-law-to-slash-emissions-by-78-by-2035
Ref. 22.2	EIA Guide to Climate Change Resilience & Adaptation; June 2020; IEMA https://www.iema.net/resources/reading-room/2020/06/26/iema-eia-guide-to-climate-change-resilience-and-adaptation-2020
Ref 22.3	UK Climate Projections (UKCP18); Met Office https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/research/approach/collaboration/ukcp/index

23. Environmental Management and Conclusions

23.1 The following additional mitigation measures have been identified in this ESA which should be incorporated into the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) pursuant to planning conditions:

- Incorporate measures to help safeguard the construction site from extreme weather events such as high rainfall events, wind or dry periods e.g. appropriate storage of materials to minimise potential impacts such as run-off pollution and/or dust generation; and

- Incorporate measures to safeguard construction site workers from extreme weather events such as high summer temperatures e.g. provision of appropriate PPE, potable water and areas of shade / refuge.

23.2 The Revised Scheme does not alter the conclusions of the ES 2020.

23.3 The Revised Scheme will deliver **significant beneficial effects** of an intermediate scale during the construction phase on employment, and during the operational phase on the population. The cumulative impacts with other developments in the area will also result in **significant beneficial effects** on construction employment, other employment, housing provision, population, and deprivation.

23.4 The Revised Scheme will deliver **significant beneficial effects** of a moderate scale on the long term townscape and views from Piccadilly Village, Ashton Canal Tow Path, and the A662 Ring Road. There will be some **significant adverse effects** to the townscape and visual receptors during the construction of the Proposed Development of a moderate scale. These will be short term in duration for the construction period, and are unavoidable for a development of this scale and nature, and are reversible.

23.5 There will be a **beneficial significant effect** of a moderate scale effect on the safety of construction workers following the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce risk of flooding. Following mitigation, there are no other beneficial or adverse significant effects as a result of, or on, the water environment.

23.6 Following the implementation of mitigation measures, the following environmental assessments do not identify any significant (adverse or beneficial) effects as a result of the construction or operation of the Revised Scheme: built heritage, archaeology, transport, noise and vibration, ecology, air quality, ground conditions, day light and sunlight, noise and vibration, wind micro-climate, climate change, TV receptions, and human health.

Turley Office
1 New York Street
Manchester
M1 4HD

T 0161 233 7676

Turley
Planning