

Telephone

Fume/Odours discharge

Fumes, vapours and odours shall be extracted and discharged from the premises in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority before the use commences; any works approved shall be implemented before the use commences.

Mixed use schemes shall ensure provision for internal ducting in risers that terminate at roof level. Schemes that are outside the scope of such developments shall ensure that flues terminate at least 1m above the eave level and/or any openable windows/ventilation intakes of nearby properties.

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties.

<sup>1</sup>The applicant will need to consult with a suitably qualified ventilation engineer and submit a kitchen fume extract strategy report for approval. The strategy should include risk assessments for odour and noise and be based on appropriate guidance such as that published by EMAQ titled 'Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems' dated September 2018. Details should also be provided in relation to replacement air.

They have given some proposals for kitchen extraction from all the kitchen areas but they have not done the risk assessment to determine the level of control, this is required especially as they are proposing louvres in the façade and not flues above eaves. We also need to see drawings showing the proposed extraction systems and the order of the mitigation measures (i.e filters, UV etc)

## **DEMOLITION/CONSTRUCTION PHASE<sup>2</sup>**

1) A Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Council. This will contain a Noise & Vibration section (in addition to a dust emission section) that shall base the assessment on British Standard 5228, with reference to other relevant standards. It shall also contain a community consultation strategy which includes how and when local businesses and residents will be consulted on matters such as out of hours works. Any proposal for out of hours works (as below) will be submitted to and approved by this section, the details of which shall be submitted at least 4 weeks in advance of such works commencing.

2) Construction/demolition works shall be confined to the following hours unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority:

- Monday - Friday: 7.30am - 6pm
- Saturday: 8.30am - 2pm
- Sunday / Bank holidays: No work

Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential and commercial properties during the construction/demolition phase.

<sup>2</sup>The applicant should refer to [https://secure.manchester.gov.uk/info/100006/environmental\\_problems/2956/noise/9](https://secure.manchester.gov.uk/info/100006/environmental_problems/2956/noise/9) and IAQM/EPUK Construction Guidance at: <http://iaqm.co.uk/guidance/>. This should include all measures in the Environmental Statement for the control of noise, vibration and dust from the construction phase. The outline construction plan will need expanding on, in particular

the noise and vibration section as we need more detailed information on how these will be controlled with limits (based on BS5228)

## **HOURS<sup>2</sup>**

### Premises opening hours

The premises shall not be open outside the following hours unless otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority:-

*Hours are to be agreed prior to the usage commencing*

Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential accommodation.

## **LIGHT<sup>3</sup>**

### External Lighting Scheme

External lighting shall be designed and installed so as to control glare and overspill onto nearby residential properties.

Upon completion of the development a verification report will be required to validate that the work undertaken throughout the development conforms to the recommendations and requirements in the approved light consultant's report. The report shall also undertake post completion testing to confirm that acceptable criteria has been met. Any instances of non-conformity with the recommendations in the report shall be detailed along with any measures required to ensure compliance with the criteria.

Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties.

<sup>3</sup>The Environmental Protection section has looked at the submitted lighting assessment which concludes that if the lighting is installed as recommended there will be no impact on the environment and nearest residential. We require a validation report once the lights have been installed to confirm the predicted light levels meet the requirements of the ILP Guidance.

## **NSE<sup>14</sup>**

The premises shall be acoustically insulated and treated to limit the break out of noise in accordance with a noise study of the premises and a scheme of acoustic treatment that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented in full before the use commences or as otherwise agreed in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

Where entertainment noise is proposed the  $L_{Aeq}$  (entertainment noise) shall be controlled to 10dB below the  $L_{A90}$  (without entertainment noise) in each octave band at the facade of the nearest noise sensitive location, and internal noise levels at structurally adjoined residential properties in the 63Hz and 125Hz octave frequency bands shall be controlled so as not to exceed (in habitable rooms) 47dB and 41dB, respectively.

Upon completion of the development a verification report will be required to validate that the work undertaken throughout the development conforms to the recommendations and requirements in the approved acoustic consultant's report. The report shall also undertake post completion testing to confirm that acceptable criteria has been met. Any instances of non-conformity with the recommendations in the report shall be detailed along with any measures required to ensure compliance with the agreed noise criteria.

Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of the building and occupiers of nearby properties.

<sup>4</sup>The Environmental Protection section has reviewed the acoustic report submitted with the application. We are happy with the proposals for setting the limits for entertainment noise breakout and the 5dB allowance for an open window. We would like to know what the predicted noise levels will be at the residential receptors identified (noise breakout, people noise, traffic noise etc.) as the report just says negligible.

## **NSE6<sup>5</sup>**

Noise – external equipment insulation

Externally mounted ancillary plant, equipment and servicing shall be selected and/or acoustically treated in accordance with a scheme designed so as to achieve a rating level of 5dB ( $L_{Aeq}$ ) below the typical background ( $L_{A90}$ ) level at the nearest noise sensitive location.

The scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority in order to secure a reduction in the level of noise emanating from the site. The approved scheme shall be completed before the premises is occupied.

Upon completion of the development a verification report will be required to validate that the work undertaken throughout the development conforms to the recommendations and requirements in the approved acoustic report. The report shall also undertake post completion testing to confirm that the noise criteria has been met. Any instances of non-conformity with the recommendations in the report shall be detailed along with any measures required to ensure compliance with the agreed noise criteria.

Reason - To minimise the impact of the development and to prevent a general increase in pre-existing background noise levels around the site.

<sup>5</sup>The Environmental Protection section has reviewed the acoustic report submitted with the application. They have used a modal background for the plant assessment which is not in line our guidance, so this section requires updating.

## **REF<sup>6</sup>**

The approved scheme for the storage and disposal of refuse shall be implemented as part of the development and shall remain in situ whilst the use or development is in operation.

Reason - In the interests of amenity and public health.

<sup>6</sup>The Waste Management Strategy submitted with the application is acceptable.

## **CLAND01<sup>7</sup>**

a) The measures for investigating the site identified in the Site Investigation Proposal shall be carried out, before development commences and a report prepared outlining what measures, if any, are required to remediate the land (Remediation Strategy) which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

b) When the development within each phase commences, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the previously agreed Remediation Strategy and a Completion/Verification Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority.

In the event that ground contamination, groundwater contamination and/or ground gas, not previously identified, are found to be present on the site at any time before the development in each phase is occupied, then development shall cease and/or the development shall not be occupied until, a report outlining what measures, if any, are required to remediate the land (the Revised Remediation Strategy) is submitted to and approved in writing by the City Council as local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the Revised Remediation Strategy, which shall take precedence over any Remediation Strategy or earlier Revised Remediation Strategy.

Reason - To ensure that the presence of or the potential for any contaminated land and/or groundwater is detected and appropriate remedial action is taken in the interests of public safety, pursuant to [INSERT] of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

<sup>7</sup>See separate memo for comments

Information for Developers guidance documents can be downloaded using the following link:

[http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/500207/planning\\_and\\_regeneration/1962/additional\\_planning\\_guidance/3](http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/500207/planning_and_regeneration/1962/additional_planning_guidance/3)

Should you wish to discuss this matter further please contact Laura Miller on extension

██████████

Fiona Sharkey  
Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety

**Environmental Health  
Internal Memorandum**

|                        |                                                    |                               |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>To</b>              | <b>Head of Planning</b>                            | <b>FAO: Jennifer Atkinson</b> |
| <b>From</b>            | <b>Strategic Lead Compliance &amp; Enforcement</b> |                               |
| <b>Contact Officer</b> | <b>Laura Miller</b>                                | <b>Our Ref 663156</b>         |
| <b>Date</b>            | <b>2 June 2020</b>                                 |                               |
| <b>Telephone</b>       | [REDACTED]                                         |                               |

**Consultation on Planning Application**

Application No: 126431/FO/2020  
Location: Land Between Joe Mercer Way, Alan Turing Way, Manchester  
Proposal: Erection of a multi-use arena (Use Class D2) (61082 sqm) with a partially illuminated external facade together with ancillary retail/commercial uses (Classes A1, A3 and A4), with highways, access, servicing, landscaping, public realm and other associated works.

I write in response to your memo of 7 May 2020 regarding the above planning application. The Contaminated Land Section has received a copy of the following report:

- Ground Engineering Interpretative Report – OVG Manchester Limited, Buro Happold Engineering, Reference: 0042841, Dated: 2 March 2020.

The Contaminated Land Section has reviewed the above information in order to assess the following points:

1. The adequacy of the desk study information available for this site.
2. The adequacy of the site investigation.
3. The adequacy of the final risk assessment.
4. The acceptability of the proposed remediation strategy.
5. Whether the information submitted is sufficient to discharge the relevant contamination and/or gas condition from the planning approval.

The site is located at NGR SJ 86841 98878 and is 2.7ha in area. The site is currently used for car parking. Adjacent land use includes the Etihad campus and stadium, residential houses and apartments and the Ashton Canal. Previous land uses on and adjacent to the site have included The Bradford Road Gas Works, industrial units and agricultural land. The River Medlock used to flow through the site until the channel was

diverted in 1848. The site lies within the boundary of the Bradford Gas Works former landfill site. It is in close proximity to the Ashton Canal and lies above the Pennine Upper and Middle Coal Measures Secondary A aquifers.

## 1. The adequacy of the desk study information available for this site

The report includes a description of the site including its past historical uses. An appraisal of the site environmental setting is presented including its geology, hydrogeology and hydrological regime, mining activities, waste management issues, and identification of additional environmental sources, pathways and receptors. This information has been used to compile a clear site conceptual model, which identifies potential sources, pathways and receptors and likely pollution linkages.

The desk study information was found to be **adequate**.

## 2. The adequacy of the site investigation

A review of site investigation and risk assessments carried out at the site can be summarised as follows:

- Eighteen boreholes to depths between 10 and 60m bgl (cable percussion with rotary follow on or rotary to whole depth). Eight boreholes to depths up to 16m bgl (to base of made ground) (cable percussion to whole depth). Fourteen trial pits to 4.5m bgl. Three structural observation pits to 2m bgl.
- Ground gas monitoring in eleven wells on six occasions.
- Groundwater levels monitored on six occasions.
- Two rounds groundwater sampling from ten boreholes.
- Made ground has been found across the site to 17.2m bgl, which includes ash, coal, clinker, brick, sandstone, limestone, pottery, concrete, rootlets, wood, plastic and rebar.
- The maximum depth of made ground was in the area of the former gas works in the north west corner. Pockets of coal were found on site (dumped), so would be easy to segregate and remove.
- Groundwater encountered does not seem to be a continuous body in the superficial deposits.
- 108 soil samples were collected and tested for pH, metals suite, total cyanide, total mercury, speciated PAH, phenol, EPH, PRO including BTEX, speciated TPH (CWG), SOM, TOC, asbestos (quantification where necessary), VOCs and SVOCs.
- Groundwater samples have been analysed for CLEA metals, speciated TPH, SVOC, VOC including PAH and BTEX, pH, Total Cyanide and Phenols.
- The site has been zoned as follows:
  - Zone 1 Ground level to 2.0m bgl (site wide)
  - Zone 2 Over 2.0m bgl West (former gas works)
  - Zone 3 Over 2.0m bgl East (former residential use)
  - Zone 4 Natural Strata (site wide)

The site investigation information that has been provided for this development is **inadequate**. In addition to the information provided, further information should be submitted which addresses the following issue:

- Provision of the calibration certificate(s) for the gas monitoring equipment to cover the entire monitoring period.

### 3. The adequacy of the final risk assessment

**Ground Assessment:** The soil chemical results have been compared to SGVs, GACs, C4SLs and S4ULs for a Commercial end use.

#### Zone 1

No elevations have been found against a commercial end use (there are some residential exceedances but this is not relevant for the proposals). Asbestos has been found in some samples in the form of loose fibres of Chrysotile and amosite and amosite board.

#### Zone 2

No elevations have been found against a commercial end use (there are some residential exceedances but this is not relevant for the proposals). Asbestos has been found in some samples in the form of loose fibres of Chrysotile.

#### Zone 3

No elevations have been found against a commercial end use (there are some residential exceedances but this is not relevant for the proposals). No asbestos was detected.

#### Zone 4

No elevations have been found against a commercial end use.

Barrier pipes are likely to be required due to some contaminants exceeding United Utilities criteria.

WAC testing has shown that spoil from zones 1 and 2 is likely to be classed as hazardous waste

The risks have been assessed to be moderate/low

**Controlled Waters Assessment:** The groundwater sample results have been compared to UK Drinking Water Regulations and Environmental Quality Standards.

There is no evidence that groundwater flow is in the direction of the river or to other surface water features. Perched water was located in localised areas within the made ground and at the boundary of the glacial till/alluvium and made ground. There is no evidence that these bodies are in continuation with one another or with offsite receptors. They appear to be due to depressions in low permeability materials which inhibit the downward percolation of water. Visual evidence of contamination in the form of a thin layer of product on the surface was observed in two locations (BH19/11 and BH19/15) on the initial monitoring visit.

#### Perched water in the made ground

Elevated cyanide, arsenic, chromium, copper, lead, nickel, zinc, benzene and TPH aromatic C10-C12.

#### Groundwater in Coal Measures

Elevated cyanide, arsenic, chromium, copper, nickel, zinc and TPH aromatic C10-C12

Risks to the Ashton Canal and River Medlock have been assessed to be low

**Ground Gas Assessment:** Gas monitoring has been undertaken on 6 no. occasions over 3 months, which is in accordance with CIRIA 665 for a site with a Moderate High gas generation potential and a Low development sensitivity. This is deemed consistent with recommended guidance and is deemed appropriate for a site of this nature.

A gas screening value (GSV) of 0.0178l/hr has been derived using the maximum gas concentration for Methane (10.9%v/v) and the maximum flow rate (0.2l/hr). This is deemed consistent with recommended guidance and is deemed appropriate for a site of this nature.

On this basis the report recommends the incorporation of gas protection measures to comply with Characterisation Situation 2 (CS2) due to consistently elevated carbon dioxide and methane being recorded.

The final risk assessment was found to be **adequate**.

#### **4. The acceptability of the proposed remediation strategy**

The following measures are proposed so that the contamination identified on site no longer presents a risk:

- Health and hygiene measures to be implemented due to asbestos.
- Gas protection measures to CS2 – still to be scoped.
- Barrier pipes are likely to be required.
- Watching brief for unexpected contamination.

The site investigation and final risk assessment for this development have identified levels of contamination that will require remediation prior to the site being suitable for its intended use. This Section requires submission of a remediation strategy for approval before the commencement of any remedial works on site.

#### **5. Whether the information submitted is sufficient to discharge the relevant site investigation and/or gas condition of the planning approval**

Before this Section can recommend discharge of conditions from this application, the following information needs to be submitted to the Council for approval:

- (i) Provision of the calibration certificate(s) for the gas monitoring equipment to cover the entire monitoring period.
- (ii) Submission of a detailed Remediation Strategy
- (iii) After completion of site works, a verification report is required to validate that the work undertaken conforms to the remediation proposals received and agreed by this Section.

Information for Developers guidance documents can be downloaded using the following link:

[http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/500207/planning\\_and\\_regeneration/1962/additional\\_planning\\_guidance/3](http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/500207/planning_and_regeneration/1962/additional_planning_guidance/3)

Please do not hesitate to contact Laura Miller if you require any clarification of the above.

Fiona Sharkey  
Strategic Lead Compliance & Enforcement

---

**Re: [EXT] Re: 126431/FO/2020 - Arena application**

1 message

**Laura Miller** [REDACTED]

23 June 2020 at 12:57

To: Jennifer Atkinson [REDACTED]

Hi Jennifer,

In that case I will wait on their comments before doing the AQ ones as their acceptance of the travel plan is quite important for the AQ conclusions.

Regarding noise, they are still using the modal value for the typical background noise. Whilst this is what is said in BS4142 it does not always apply and in some cases results in an elevated background. The updated noise note acknowledges that we have questioned the use of the modal value and then goes on to use it again. The need to look at the worked example in Appendix A of our noise and planning guidance which details the averaging method which we want to see used on this site (due to the number of LA90 readings below the mode).

Our guidance can be found here - [https://secure.manchester.gov.uk/downloads/download/5199/environmental\\_and\\_public\\_protection\\_information\\_for\\_developers](https://secure.manchester.gov.uk/downloads/download/5199/environmental_and_public_protection_information_for_developers)

I am happy to talk through this directly with them (I think it could be that they have just copied and pasted the original assessment instead of replacing it with the assessment using the averages.

I am happy with the resultant noise levels at the nearest noise sensitive receptors it is just the plant noise assessment that needs further clarification.

Kind Regards

Laura

Laura Miller (MRes, MA, BSc(Hons))  
Environmental Protection Section

Neighbourhoods Directorate  
Community Safety, Compliance and Enforcement  
Manchester City Council  
1 Hammerstone Road  
Gorton  
Manchester  
M18 8EQ

External [REDACTED]  
Internal [REDACTED]  
email [REDACTED]  
website: [www.manchester.gov.uk](http://www.manchester.gov.uk)

Please note that due to working compressed hours Wednesdays are a non-working day for me, I will respond to your email when I return to the office

**We are now on Twitter, for latest news and updates follow us [@EnvHealthMcr](https://twitter.com/EnvHealthMcr)**

**For the latest support and information about the coronavirus visit [www.manchester.gov.uk/coronavirus](http://www.manchester.gov.uk/coronavirus)**

 cid:image002.png@01D2FFE4.0FCB8C30  
**I♥MCR**

**Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail**

On Tue, 23 Jun 2020 at 12:51, Jennifer Atkinson [REDACTED] wrote:  
| Laura

We are still working through that at the moment.

Jen

---

Jennifer Atkinson  
Principal Planner  
Development Management North  
Planning Building Control and Licensing - Growth and Development  
Manchester City Council

Tel [REDACTED]  
Mobile [REDACTED]  
Email [REDACTED]  
[www.manchester.gov.uk](http://www.manchester.gov.uk)

Location address: Manchester City Council Town Hall Extension Lloyd Street Manchester M2 5DB.

Postal Address: Manchester City Council P.O. Box 532 Town Hall Manchester M60 2LA

**[Please note I am currently working from home until further notice. I can be contacted directly on my mobile]**

On Tue, 23 Jun 2020 at 09:08, Laura Miller [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi Jennifer

Have highways responded now following this additional information? Are they happy with the modelling?

Kind Regards

Laura

Laura Miller (MRes, MA, BSc(Hons))  
Environmental Protection Section

Neighbourhoods Directorate  
Community Safety, Compliance and Enforcement  
Manchester City Council  
1 Hammerstone Road  
Gorton  
Manchester  
M18 8EQ

External [REDACTED]  
Internal [REDACTED]  
email [REDACTED]  
website: [www.manchester.gov.uk](http://www.manchester.gov.uk)

Please note that due to working compressed hours Wednesdays are a non-working day for me, I will respond to your email when I return to the office

**We are now on Twitter, for latest news and updates follow us [@EnvHealthMcr](https://twitter.com/EnvHealthMcr)**

**For the latest support and information about the coronavirus visit [www.manchester.gov.uk/coronavirus](http://www.manchester.gov.uk/coronavirus)**

 cid:image002.png@01D2FFE4.0FCB8C30  
**I ♥ MCR**

**Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail**

On Mon, 22 Jun 2020 at 16:24, Jennifer Atkinson [REDACTED] wrote:

Laura

Did I send you this? Also, where are we up to with regards to the air quality point?

Thanks

Jen

---

Jennifer Atkinson  
Principal Planner  
Development Management North  
Planning Building Control and Licensing - Growth and Development  
Manchester City Council

Tel [REDACTED]  
Mobile [REDACTED]  
Email [REDACTED]  
[www.manchester.gov.uk](http://www.manchester.gov.uk)

Location address: Manchester City Council Town Hall Extension Lloyd Street Manchester M2 5DB.

Postal Address: Manchester City Council P.O. Box 532 Town Hall Manchester M60 2LA

**[Please note I am currently working from home until further notice. I can be contacted directly on my mobile]**

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Feekins, Laura** [REDACTED]  
Date: Tue, 16 Jun 2020 at 11:15  
Subject: RE: [EXT] Re: 126431/FO/2020 - Arena application  
To: Jennifer Atkinson [REDACTED]  
Cc: Chatfield, Jennifer [REDACTED]

Hi Jen

I am still waiting for responses on some of the points raised, but have commented on some in green below.

BH have issued a draft note in respect of the comments around the acoustic assessment methodology, this needs to be checked with the team first but I will aim to issue to you later this week.

On the travel planning / surface car park / air quality point – I have looked through the various relevant application documents, and I think the narrative is strongly set out that the overriding objective is to establish sustainable travel choices.

I have attached an extract from the Planning Statement, which draws together the various strands of this approach including the wider Etihad Campus initiatives, and notes that the expectation is these will be captured via planning conditions or Section 106 agreement as necessary.

This references the following documents, which are also of relevance:

- Etihad Campus Strategic Sustainability Framework
- Etihad Campus Strategic Vision: Transport and Movement
- Etihad Campus Movement and Transport Strategy: Transport Assessment
- Arena Transport Assessment and Addendum (ES Appendix 12.1)
- Arena Framework Travel Plan (ES Appendix 12.2)

I am still awaiting a response from BH, which I have chased, but I believe that the air quality assessment has been carried out on the basis of expected vehicle movements using the anticipated modal split that effectively includes use of a proportion of the surface car parking.

A negligible operational impact on air quality was concluded in the assessment.

Happy to discuss further if helpful?

Kind regards

Laura

**Laura Feekins**

Assistant Director | Deloitte LLP

D [REDACTED] | M: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | [www.deloitte.co.uk](http://www.deloitte.co.uk)

**From:** Jennifer Atkinson [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 02 June 2020 14:45

**To:** Feekins, Laura [REDACTED]

**Subject:** [EXT] Re: 126431/FO/2020 - Arena application

Laura

I now have some of the EH comments (not Air Quality as we are awaiting the further highways work modelling to be completed).

[Deliveries](#)

Deliveries, servicing and collections, including waste collections shall not take place outside the following hours: 07:30 to 20:00, Monday to Saturday, no deliveries/waste collections on Sundays/Bank Holidays. JA comment - Do these work? We would have to stipulate that this doesn't affect any vehicles associated with the arena concerts.

I have discussed with the applicant and CFG; this is broadly ok, but would need to be caveated for vehicles as you note above, movement of waste within the Etihad Campus (from the arena to the central Waste Compound, which is away from residential areas) and consistency with existing Etihad Campus operations (which do not restrict activity on Sundays and Bank Holidays).

I have proposed some tweaks to the suggested condition wording on that basis, as below – would this be acceptable?

*Excluding vehicle activity associated with the operation of events at the arena and movement of waste within the Etihad Campus between the arena and the existing Etihad waste compound, deliveries, servicing and collections, including waste collections shall not take place outside the following hours: 07:30 to 20:00, Monday to Saturday, no deliveries/waste collections on Sundays/Bank Holidays"*

### Fumes

Condition (?) - You will need to consult with a suitably qualified ventilation engineer and submit a kitchen fume extract strategy report for approval. The strategy should include risk assessments for odour and noise and be based on appropriate guidance such as that published by EMAQ titled 'Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems' dated September 2018. Details should also be provided in relation to replacement air.

You have given some proposals for kitchen extraction from all the kitchen areas but there is no risk assessment to determine the level of control, this is required especially as they are proposing louvres in the façade and not flues above eaves. We also need to see drawings showing the proposed extraction systems and the order of the mitigation measures (i.e filters, UV etc).

Happy to condition this, could the trigger point be pre-occupation?

### Opening Hours

To be agreed

### Acoustics

The acoustic report submitted with the application has been reviewed. The proposals for setting the limits for entertainment noise breakout and the 5dB allowance for an open window is acceptable. However, further details on what the predicted noise levels will be at the residential receptors identified (noise breakout, people noise, traffic noise etc.) needs to be provided as the report just says negligible.

### Plant

The acoustic report submitted with the application has been reviewed. A modal background for the plant assessment has been used which is not in line with City Council guidance. As such, the report needs to be updated.

Waste

Proposal for waste management is acceptable.

Noted, thanks.

Ground conditions

- Provision of the calibration certificate(s) for the gas monitoring equipment to cover the entire monitoring period.

- Submission of a detailed Remediation Strategy

JA comment - happy to condition this.

I think this should be fine to condition, provided it excludes the coal mining point, which would be addressed separately. Just waiting for confirmation from the applicant.

The key comments which needs addressing are the noise/plant. As discussed, we are not commenting on the air quality just yet in advance of the additional modelling. However, in advance of that, I would like a chat about the use of the surface level car parking around the site.

Thanks

Jen

---

Jennifer Atkinson

Principal Planner

Development Management North

Planning Building Control and Licensing - Growth and Development

Manchester City Council

Tel [REDACTED]

Mobile [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

[www.manchester.gov.uk](http://www.manchester.gov.uk)

Location address: Manchester City Council Town Hall Extension Lloyd Street Manchester M2 5DB.

Postal Address: Manchester City Council P.O. Box 532 Town Hall Manchester M60 2LA

**[Please note I am currently working from home until further notice. I can be contacted directly on my mobile]**

On Mon, 1 Jun 2020 at 11:53, Jennifer Atkinson [REDACTED] wrote:

Laura

As discussed this morning, highways have reviewed the comments by Asda. I would therefore like to request the following additional technical information under regulation 25 of the EIA regs

The following additional modelling required:

**x7: Ashton New Road / Alan Turing Way**

***Baseline:***

- *No cruise times/speeds on any of the links*
- *Ashton New Road East arm hasn't been signalised*

***Future:***

- *Same as in base*

**x21: Bradford Road / Hulme Hall Lane**

***Baseline:***

- *No cruise times/speeds on any of the links*

***Future:***

- *Same as in base*

**x20: Briscoe Lane / Hulme Hall Lane**

***Baseline:***

- *No cruise times/speeds on any of the links*

***Future:***

- *Same as in base*

**x1148: Alan Turing Way / Sportcity Way****Baseline:**

- Missing a 3-1 phase delay
- No cruise times/speeds on any of the links

**Future:**

- Same as in base

**x76: Oldham Road / Hulme Hall Lane / Queens Road****Baseline:**

- No issues

**Future:**

- Same as in base

**x10: Pottery Lane / Ashton Old Road / Alan Turing Way****Baseline:**

- No cruise times/speeds on any of the links

**Future:**

- Same as in base

**Rowsley Street Model**

**Baseline:** Junctions 8 file so unable to open

**Future:** Junctions 8 file so unable to open

*It should be noted that the Ashton New Rd (East) Lanes is signal controlled which hasn't been replicated in the model.*

*It should be highlighted that the modelling in principle, in terms of the methodology is acceptable, however, the actual results could vary given the flows used are incorrect.*

**Alan Turing Way/Gibbon Street**

The junction of Alan Turing Way – Gibbon Street – Asda should also be included in the assessment work.

**Other**

Consideration should also be given to the following:

- Impact on the network of traffic movements for a matinee event and the follow-on evening event coinciding and generating an extended and uninterrupted period of above average traffic.
- Impact of the coincidence of a weekend matinee performance at the venue and an afternoon kick off at the stadium on the retail access.

Many thanks

Jen

---

Jennifer Atkinson

Principal Planner

Development Management North

Planning Building Control and Licensing - Growth and Development

Manchester City Council

Tel [REDACTED]

Mobile [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

[www.manchester.gov.uk](http://www.manchester.gov.uk)

Location address: Manchester City Council Town Hall Extension Lloyd Street Manchester M2 5DB.

Postal Address: Manchester City Council P.O. Box 532 Town Hall Manchester M60 2LA

**[Please note I am currently working from home until further notice. I can be contacted directly on my mobile]**

On Wed, 13 May 2020 at 13:30, Jennifer Atkinson [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Eve and Laura

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS 2017 ("THE EIA REGULATIONS")**

**FURTHER INFORMATION AND EVIDENCE RESPECTING ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENTS UNDER PART 5 REGULATION 25(1)**

Thank you for your recent submission of planning application 126431 for the proposed multi use arena at South Of Sportcity Way, East Of Joe Mercer Way, West Of Alan Turing Way And North Of The Ashton Canal At The Etihad Campus Manchester.

I am in receipt of comments from statutory consultees following the commencement of the statutory consultation process on this planning application. Below is a request for further technical information relating to traffic and transport to supplement the environmental statement in order to reach a reasoned conclusion on the likely significant effects of the development.

**Trip Generation**

The assessment work mostly applies existing data at the Etihad Stadium and other facilities similar to the proposed development.

For the wider network impact, the basis of the analysis is origin data for the Spice Girls concert only. It could be argued that a Spice Girls concert may attract a different demographic compared to other types of events. It should be noted that as part of the pre-application discussions, it was advised that a wider range of events should be used for the analysis as the Spice Girls concert wasn't a completely typical event.

The traffic diagrams for the highway network which show baseline / development and distribution trips should be provided as these are required in order to validate the turn movements that have been inputted into the models.

The TA does not describe whether there is other parking available within the vicinity of the development such as unrestricted on road parking which could affect trips. This should be confirmed and detailed.

### **Junction Assessments**

The PICADY outputs in the TA are illegible. Clear extracts of the outputs are required to validate the junction analysis.

### **Modelling**

There are plans to upgrade the junction of Alan Turing Way/Ashton New Road to a cyclops style junction. It is unclear if the existing junction arrangement or the proposed junction arrangement has been modelled - this should be clarified. There is likely to be a requirement to change the models to reflect the proposed design.

With reference to Section 4.7.5 of the TA, tabulating the results of the surveys would have been useful to understand how the road network is operating. This is the actual behaviour rather than modelled results. Fifteen-minute (or similar) time periods can be shown from the surveys. This isn't available from the LINSIG modelling. Furthermore, the junctions run on SCOOT day to day and LINSIG isn't able to correctly model SCOOT. For match days, the timings are controlled by Fixed-Time and manual control by the stewards. It is suspected that the LINSIG timings used are 'optimised' timings rather than the actual timings running.

The results presented for the match situation are much lower than in reality. It is suspected that this is because only the traffic passing the stopline is counted. The survey data needs re-assessing and the actual traffic conditions (and 'suppressed' demand) should be represented in the modelling.

Additionally, the results per road should be presented; not the overall junction. This provides a much clearer view of the operation of the junction. The delays and queues should be included in the results.

The tables presenting the information are confusing. This is because it is necessary to keep referring back to code letters describing the scenarios.

The situation for matches is presented as operating over-efficiently. This raises questions about the remaining analysis and will be an area that could be subject to criticism. This is replicated with the results of the match situation with much lower flows reported. This is not an accurate representation of onsite conditions. After the match, there is a continuous flow of pedestrians and buses along Ashton New Road and as such there is no traffic flowing.

The traffic increases for matches should be presented using the ATC data at the various data collection points. It should be noted that the LINSIG models have not yet been audited. Clarification is sought as to whether the food and retail outlets will be open when there are events or at all times. The latter should be assessed separately if they are operating at different times to the Arena.

In respect of Section 6.3.15, this doesn't actually appear to be the worst-case scenario. Evidence based upon previous concerts at the Etihad Stadium should be used or if that information isn't available then sensitivity tests should be carried out with a higher proportion of private vehicle trips.

The results shown in Section 7.1.42 should be presented on a link by link basis and should include delays and queue lengths. It should be highlighted that in terms of Section 7.1.44, there are no traffic problems anticipated at normal events at the stadium because the traffic volumes will be less than a normal football match.

With reference to Table 7.14, the increase in traffic flows doesn't actually describe the impact. The percentage increase in traffic volumes should also be provided in this section of the TA as well as the traffic delays before and after. Traffic flow changes don't describe the impact of the event on a wider scale as requested previously requested.

I would be grateful if you could consider the above points and provide an appropriate addendum report to the environmental statement.

I will provide you with a summary of other comments which do not affect the technical chapters in the environmental statement shortly.

Best wishes

Jennifer

---

Jennifer Atkinson

Principal Planner

Development Management North

Planning Building Control and Licensing - Growth and Development

Manchester City Council

Tel [REDACTED]

Mobile [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

[www.manchester.gov.uk](http://www.manchester.gov.uk)

Location address: Manchester City Council Town Hall Extension Lloyd Street Manchester M2 5DB.

Postal Address: Manchester City Council P.O. Box 532 Town Hall Manchester M60 2LA

**[Please note I am currently working from home until further notice. I can be contacted directly on my mobile]**

\*\*\*\*\*

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. The full text of the Council's email disclaimer is available at [www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer](http://www.manchester.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer).

Your personal data is very important to us. Please refer to our privacy notice at [www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.manchester.gov.uk/privacy) for further information.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**IMPORTANT NOTICE**

This communication is from Deloitte LLP, a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC303675. Its registered office is [1 New Street Square, London EC4A 3HQ, United Kingdom](#). Deloitte LLP is the United Kingdom affiliate of Deloitte NSE LLP, a member firm of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee ("DTTL"). DTTL and each of its member firms are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL and Deloitte NSE LLP do not provide services to clients. Please see [www.deloitte.co.uk/about](http://www.deloitte.co.uk/about) to learn more about our global network of member firms. For details of our professional regulation please see [Regulators](#).

This communication contains information which is confidential and may also be privileged. It is for the exclusive use of the intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient(s), please notify [REDACTED] and destroy this message immediately. Email communications cannot be guaranteed to be secure or free from error or viruses. All emails sent to or from a [@deloitte.co.uk](mailto:@deloitte.co.uk) email account are securely archived and stored by an external supplier within the European Union.

You can understand more about how we collect and use (process) your personal information in our [Privacy Notice](#).

Deloitte LLP does not accept any liability for use of or reliance on the contents of this email by any person save by the intended recipient(s) to the extent agreed in a Deloitte LLP engagement contract.

Opinions, conclusions and other information in this email which have not been delivered by way of the business of Deloitte LLP are neither given nor endorsed by it.



**image001.png**  
3K

---

**Re: Arena**

1 message

**Laura Miller** [REDACTED]

2 July 2020 at 16:57

To: Jennifer Atkinson [REDACTED]

Hi Jennifer,

I have looked at the EIA again and the operational impacts of the arena have been concluded that the air quality impacts will be negligible (due to loss in parking spaces and the promotion of the use of sustainable/public transport in the travel plan), therefore we are in agreement with the air quality assessment. They have given specifications for the new boilers and these should be installed as recommended too.

Unless anything fundamentally changes with the travel plan then our comments will not change.

Kind Regards

Laura

Laura Miller (MRes, MA, BSc(Hons))  
Environmental Protection Section

Neighbourhoods Directorate  
Community Safety, Compliance and Enforcement  
Manchester City Council  
1 Hammerstone Road  
Gorton  
Manchester  
M18 8EQ

External [REDACTED]  
Internal [REDACTED]  
email [REDACTED]  
website: [www.manchester.gov.uk](http://www.manchester.gov.uk)

Please note that due to working compressed hours Wednesdays are a non-working day for me, I will respond to your email when I return to the office

**We are now on Twitter, for latest news and updates follow us [@EnvHealthMcr](https://twitter.com/EnvHealthMcr)**

**For the latest support and information about the coronavirus visit [www.manchester.gov.uk/coronavirus](http://www.manchester.gov.uk/coronavirus)**

 cid:image002.png@01D2FFE4.0FCB8C30  
**I♥MCR**

**Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail**

On Thu, 25 Jun 2020 at 11:48, Jennifer Atkinson [REDACTED] wrote:  
Laura

As discussed.

Thanks

Jen

---

Jennifer Atkinson

Principal Planner  
Development Management North  
Planning Building Control and Licensing - Growth and Development  
Manchester City Council

Tel [REDACTED]

Mobile [REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

[www.manchester.gov.uk](http://www.manchester.gov.uk)

Location address: Manchester City Council Town Hall Extension Lloyd Street Manchester M2 5DB.

Postal Address: Manchester City Council P.O. Box 532 Town Hall Manchester M60 2LA

**[Please note I am currently working from home until further notice. I can be contacted directly on my mobile]**



image001.png

3K

---

**126431/FO/2020 - Reconsultation - Arena**

1 message

**Laura Miller** [REDACTED]

3 August 2020 at 13:16

To: Jennifer Atkinson [REDACTED]

Hi Jennifer,

I have looked at the updated noise report and we are now in agreement with the assessment undertaken.

For NSE1 we will need the post completion report once the arena and mitigation measures have been installed.

For NSE6 we will need an addendum report once the external plant has been selected to show that the modelled noise limits can be achieved. Then a post completion report once the plant and any mitigation measures have been installed.

Our comments are unchanged for our other conditions.

Kind Regards

Laura

Laura Miller (MRes, MA, BSc(Hons))  
Environmental Protection Section

**Please note that due to working compressed hours Wednesdays are a non-working day for me, I will respond to your email when I return to the office**

Neighbourhoods Directorate  
Community Safety, Compliance and Enforcement  
Manchester City Council  
1 Hammerstone Road  
Gorton  
Manchester  
M18 8EQ

External [REDACTED]  
Internal [REDACTED]  
email [REDACTED]  
website: [www.manchester.gov.uk](http://www.manchester.gov.uk)

We are now on Twitter, for latest news and updates follow us [@EnvHealthMcr](https://twitter.com/EnvHealthMcr)

For the latest support and information about the coronavirus visit [www.manchester.gov.uk/coronavirus](http://www.manchester.gov.uk/coronavirus)

 cid:image002.png@01D2FFE4.0FCB8C30  
I♥MCR

**Please consider the environment before printing an e-mail**



---

image001.png  
3K