MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

**Julie Roscoe**
**Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing**

Telephone: +44 (0)161 234 4552
j.roscoe@manchester.gov.uk

PO Box 532 Town Hall
Manchester M60 2LA

FAO Michael Percival
Deloitte LLP
100 Embankment,
Cathedral Approach,
Manchester
M3 7FB

Contact: Angela Leckie
Tel: 0161 234 4776
Fax: 0161 274 0014
Email: a.leckie@manchester.gov.uk

21st November 2024

Your reference:

Our reference: Plots K and J Mayfield P1(b)

Dear Sir / Madam

**Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, the Town and Country Planning (EIA) (England) Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the "EIA Regulations"). Scoping Request Under Part 4 Regulation 15(1)**

The site comprises land adjacent to the north of the Mancunian Way, to the south of Mayfield Park, to the west of Hoyle Street and to the east of Mayfield Phase 1a, with Baring Street beyond.

**Scoping Opinion of Manchester City Council Pursuant to Regulation 15**

Further to your request in respect of the above dated 23rd October.

In coming to a formal opinion on the scope of the Environmental Statement ("ES") Manchester City Council, as Local Planning Authority, has considered the supporting information contained within your "Manchester Phase 1b, Mayfield Screening and Scoping Report" submitted by yourselves on behalf of the Applicants Mayfield Medlock Limited. (and comments from statutory consultees) I have now had a chance to consider your scoping request, and I outline my response below.

The Proposed Development is considered an EIA development as it falls within the description and thresholds in Schedule 2 10(b) of the EIA Regulations as an 'Infrastructure Project - Urban Development Project' which has the potential to have significant effects on the environment. In accordance with Schedule 2, Categories 10(b) (urban development projects) of the EIA Regulations and owing to the location, scale and nature and of the Proposed Development, I note that you recognise the need for an EIA and have therefore submitted the scoping report for consideration to the City Council, as Local Planning Authority.

Before adopting a Scoping Opinion, the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, must take into account the information specified in Regulation 15(6) of the EIA Regulations.

(a) any information provided by the applicant about the proposed development;

(b) the specific characteristics of the particular development;

(c) the specific characteristics of development of the type concerned; and

(d) the environmental features likely to be significantly affected by the development.

This Scoping Opinion sets out the information that the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, considers should be included in the ES that the applicant intends to submit with the planning application in respect of the Proposed Development.

In formulating this Scoping Opinion, the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, has taken account of, the requirements of the EIA Regulations, the nature and scale of the Proposed Development, the nature of the receiving environment, current best practice in the preparation of environmental statements, and the views expressed by the organizations and bodies that responded to consultation on the Scope of the proposed ES.

This Scoping Opinion should not be construed as implying that the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, agrees with the conclusions set out in the Scoping Request regrading impacts of the proposal. This Scoping Opinion is without prejudice to any decisions subsequently taken in respect of any planning application submitted in respect of the Proposed Development.

Your report of October 2024 sets out the proposed chapters that the ES will cover, and the disciplines which you believe should be scoped out of the EIA.

These are as follows:

Scoped In

- Air Quality;
- Climate Change;
- Construction Management;
- Daylight Sunlight and Overshadowing;
- Ecology and nature conservation;
- Water Resources (Flood Risk and Drainage);
- Ground Conditions;
- Built Heritage
- Human Health;
- Noise and Vibration;
- Socio Economic;
- Townscape and Visual;
- Transport and Access; and

- Wind Microclimate.

Scoped out

- Agricultural circumstances;
- Archaeology
- Aviation
- Tv Reception (and Electronic Interference)
- Solar Glare

You have not covered Accidents and Disasters, Lighting and Waste.

Below is a consideration of the scoping report for the Proposed Development and comments on the approach which you have outlined.

**CONSULTATIONS**

Regulation 15 (4) of the EIA Regulations require the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, to consult appropriate bodies prior to adopting a Scoping Opinion.

Having regard to Regulation 2 of the EIA Regulations, the following consultees were consulted who have specific environmental responsibilities and which the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, considers are likely to have an interest in the development proposal.

- Historic England;
- Natural England;
- Environment Agency;
- Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU);
- Greater Manchester Archaeology Advisory Service (GMAAS);
- Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM);
- City Council Highway Services;
- City Council Environmental Health;
- City Council Flood Risk Management;
- Manchester Airport Group Safeguarding.
- United Utilities
- Cadent Gas

All responses of the consultees contacted by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, during the EIA scoping process are appended to this letter.

You are strongly recommended to consult further with consultees as appropriate throughout the planning application process as the development proposal evolves. It is thereby recommended all consultee responses are reviewed by the applicant in full.

Any subsequent ES submitted with a planning application should reflect the points raised by the consultation bodies where this reflects the requirements of the Regulations. It is recommended that the ES summarises the scoping responses from the consultation bodies and how they are, or are not, addressed in this regard. Any consultation responses received after the date of this letter, that have not been taken into account within this Scoping Opinion, will be forwarded to the applicant and should be given due consideration in the planning application and EIA process.

## CONTEXT

The Construction Site is approximately 1.63 hectares and comprises land adjacent to the north of the Mancunian Way, to the south of Mayfield Park, to the west of Hoyle Street and to the east of Mayfield Phase 1a, with Baring Street beyond

The site is currently a largely cleared following the demolition of a former logistics warehouse and vehicular compound in 2019. Following the demolition of those structures, the Site was used as a site compound for materials and vehicles during the construction of Mayfield Park between 2020 and 2022. Since the completion of the park, the Site has remained a mix of hard landscaping, alongside areas of made ground and the remains of material piles. There are limited areas of low-quality scrubland around the perimeter of the Site. The Site is accessible to vehicles from Hoyle Street and Baring Street (via the Phase 1a sites). The Site is currently surrounded by hoardings to provide physical security and to improve the visual quality of areas surrounding the Site by screening the vacant land from the park and from residents of Ardwick.

The Site is identified for redevelopment within the endorsed Mayfield Strategic Regeneration Framework (2018). It lies within an area identified in the Masterplan for the Site which accompanied the SRF for development as Phase 1b.

Applications for Phase 1 a were approved in 2020 in for delivery of the Poulton (Office Development), a Multi-Storey Car Park, Mayfield Park (application ref no 124972/FO/2019), and the Republic (application ref no 125248/FO/2019). These developments collectively referred to as the Baring Street Campus, within the Masterplan. The park is now completed and the construction of the Republic due to start on site in early 2025.

The Site is not located within a Conservation Area. There are 19 listed buildings within a 500m radius of the site boundary. Beyond the site boundary, the nearest listed buildings are to the south in Ardwick namely six addresses on Manor Street (Grade II) and Ardwick Green North (Grade II), the Church of St. Thomas (Grade II) and the Drill Hall (Grade II). To the north lies the Star and Garter Pub (Grade II), Piccadilly Station (Grade II*), the former Station Goods Office (Grade II) and London Road Fire Station (Grade II*).

The site lies within a highly accessible City Centre close to Piccadilly Station’s and the Piccadilly Station Metrolink stop. There are high-frequency bus routes on London Road and Fairfield Street.

## SENSITIVE RECEPTORS

The site is located within the Greater Manchester Combined Authority Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The site is not within, nor does it contain, any ecological designations including sites of specific interest (SSSI), sites of biological importance (SB1)

or special protection areas (SPA). The site is not located in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) or any other area designated for its landscape value. The closest watercourse to the site is the River Medlock located to the north and north east of the site but outside of the site boundary.

The majority of the Site is within flood zone 1 and is of a low risk of flooding however, a small area (approximately 0.1ha) close to the northern boundary lies within flood zones 2 and 3 (indicating a medium and high level of flooding respectively). The site is situated within the Manchester, Salford and Trafford Critical Drainage Area (CDA).

There are no designated heritage assets (Scheduled Monuments, Grade I, II* and II Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Registered Parks and Gardens or Registered Battlefields) within the site boundary. The nearest conservation area is the Whitworth Street / Princess Street Conservation Area, the boundary of which is c.500m from the Site. Similarly, there are no Listed Buildings on site but there are 19 listed buildings within a 500m radius of the site boundary.

There are no records of protected species within the Site and it is not subject to any environmental designations.

**PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

The Proposed Development would comprise the following:

Remediation and reprofiling works for the site to allow for the phased erection of two residential Plots (J and K) in 4 buildings above commercial space, supporting residential amenity areas that are accessible to the public and various back of house storage spaces, surrounded by new high quality public realm comprising Phase 1b

The total number of residential units is circa 900 at the time of writing. Plot J would comprise two buildings on top of a two-storey podium level, with J1 being part 7, part 17 storeys and J2 being part 10 and part 23 storeys. Plot K would comprise two buildings on top of a podium level, with K1 being part 9, part 28 storeys and K2 being part 11 and part 20 storeys.

A service road is also proposed to connect to Hoyle Street, which will be stopped up at the southern end to minimise traffic entering the Mayfield area.

**ASSESSMENT OF THE SCOPING REPORT**

I have now had a chance to consider your scoping request alongside the consultation responses received and I outline my response below.

Overall, I can confirm that the content of the submitted ‘Formal Scoping Opinion Request’ is considered to be appropriate and will form a generally appropriate structure for the Environmental Statement. This is also reflected in the nature of the consultation responses issued with this letter. You should note the specific points I have made below within the specific discipline areas which reflect the comments of the consultees and particularly regard must be given to these and those of the City Council, as Local Planning Authority.

These matters should also be included and addressed within the relevant chapters of ES.

**Comments on Baseline**

Noting Appendix B and para 5.34 (Scenario 1) of the Scoping Report we do not agree that the Baseline should include buildings not under construction under 132255/JO/2021 or 137263/FO/2021, Eider House 115178/FO/2017 as these are not under construction or are not considered sufficiently progressed to form part of the baseline.

**Discussion of alternatives**

Paragraph (3)(d) of Regulation 18, and paragraph 2 of Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations, require that environmental statements include discussion description of the reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Development and an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, that have been considered by the applicant.

No scope of consideration of alternatives is detailed within the scoping report. The ES will need to include an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, including a comparison of the environmental effects.

**Presentation and content of the Environmental Statement**

The purpose of an ES is to enable significant environmental impacts of a proposed development to be fully considered before an application for planning consent is determined.

The ES provides environmental information to aid the decision making process. The ES should be laid out clearly, with minimum use of technical terms (where appropriate) and should provide an objective and realistic description of the likely significant impacts of the proposed development.

The information should be presented in a manner which is comprehensible to the specialist and non-specialist alike. The ES should be concise with supporting technical information placed in appendices.

**Mitigation**

Mitigation measures may fall into a range of categories namely:

- avoidance of impacts;
- reduction in the magnitude of impacts; or
- compensation for losses incurred through unavoidable impacts;

These should identified in this manner within each of the technical chapters of the ES.

Mitigation measures should not be developed in isolation, as they may relate to more than one aspect of the environment (e.g. mitigation to address issues of landscaping, surface water management, air quality and biodiversity).

The ES should set out the mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce and where possible offset any significant adverse effects. The ES should also identify any residual effects that could be expected to persist even with mitigation in place.

The anticipated effectiveness of any mitigation measures proposed should be addressed within the ES. Only mitigation measures that can be shown to be deliverable (i.e. technically and financially viable), and which the applicant can deliver and implement as

part of any planning permission granted, should be taken into account as part of the assessment.

It is further recommended that a section is included in the ES in which the mitigation measures proposed across all the technical chapters are collated and presented as an integrated package.

It is considered best practice to outline in the ES, the structure of the environmental management and monitoring plan.

**Cross references and summarising of the findings**

All specialist chapters should be cross-referenced to other relevant disciplines (for example air quality impacts on ecology, traffic impacts on air quality). Consideration of the potential for interactions between the different aspects of the environment is essential to the production of a robust assessment.

The ES should not just be a collection of separate specialist chapters, but a comprehensive assessment of the environmental impacts of the proposed components of the wider scheme, and should account for how the identified impacts could be mitigated or avoided, or how suitable compensation could be provided to offset those effects.

In accordance with the requirements of paragraph 6 of Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations, each technical chapter should include a description of the forecasting methods or evidence, used to identify and assess the significant effects on the environment, including details of any difficulties (e.g. technical deficiencies, lack of know-how, etc.) encountered by the applicant during the preparation of the ES and the main uncertainties involved.

**ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS TO BE SCOPED OUT OF THE ES**

The City Council comments as follows, based on the information provided, on the matters proposed to be scoped out of the ES.

- Agricultural circumstances;
- Archaeology
- Aviation
- Tv Reception
- Solar Glare

**Agricultural Circumstances**

The scoping report states the site is on brownfield land in an urban environment. There will be no likely significant effects on agriculture and therefore this topic area can be scoped out of the ES.

**Archaeology**

The scoping report states the site is on brownfield land in an urban environment. It is accepted that the archaeology is unlikely to be of national significance and there will be no likely significant effects on archaeology and this discipline can therefore be scoped out of the ES on the basis that an archaeological desk-based assessment is submitted in support of the planning application

**Aviation**

The comments within your Scoping Report are noted as is the proposed mitigation and on this basis, it is considered that Aviation can be scoped out of the ES provided that the planning application is supported by information which considers the relevant aerodrome safeguarding criteria, consultation procedures, and addressed any potential impacts on aircraft safety. Such consideration will principally relate to the height of buildings at this location and whether there is any potential interference to RADAR operations.

It is considered that the aviation discipline will not give rise to likely significant effects on the environment this discipline can therefore be scoped out of the ES.

**Electronic Interference / TV and Telecommunications**

The comments within your scoping report are noted. It is accepted that on the basis that a report in relation to impacts on Television, FM Radio and DAB radio reception, which sets out mitigation for any interference, will be submitted in support of the application, that this topic matter can be scoped out of the ES.

**Solar Glare**

The comments within your scoping report are noted. It is accepted that subject to a standalone Solar Glare Assessment being provided as part of the technical documents to be submitted with the planning application, Solar Glare can be scoped out of the ES.

**Lighting**

There are no comments within your scoping report in relation to Lighting however it is considered that Lighting is capable of being scoped out of the ES but information on this should form part of the supporting documents to the planning application.

**Waste**

There are no comments on this within your scoping report in relation to Waste. The approach to waste management should cover management of commercial waste with a waste assessment and a completed waste proforma will need to be provided with the application to demonstrate that the commercial waste storage and collection regime will comply with the requirements of GD07. Subject to this detail and a Site Waste Management Plan ('SWMP') forming part of the supporting documents to the planning application, Waste can be scoped out of the ES.

**Accidents and disasters**

There are no comments on this within your scoping report in relation to this topic matter however it is considered that the nature of the proposed development is such that it not considered to pose risk of major accidents and/or disasters. As such, accidents and disasters can be scoped out of the ES.

**Summary**

I agree that the matters you have identified to be scoped out of the ES are appropriate with the addition of Accidents and Disasters, Lighting, and Waste.

The planning application must be supported by appropriate documentation, including any mitigation, to minimise any effects as a result of the Proposed Development from the matters confirmed above for scoping out. The City Council reserves the right to re-consider this position following a more detailed consideration of the reports which will accompany the planning application.

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT CHAPTERS - SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THE TECHNICAL CONTENTS**

The ES should be proportionate in its consideration of the aspects of the environment listed under Paragraph 2 of Regulation 4 of the EIA Regulations. Those aspects of the environment that are subject to the most significant impacts from the Proposed Development should be the primary focus of the ES.

Your scoping report advises that the ES will cover the following topic areas.

- Air Quality;
- Climate Change;
- Construction Management;
- Daylight Sunlight and Overshadowing;
- Ecology and nature conservation;
- Water Resources (Flood Risk and Drainage);
- Ground Conditions;
- Built Heritage
- Townscape and Visual;
- Human Health;
- Noise and Vibration;
- Socio Economic;
- Transport and Access; and
- Wind Microclimate.

**General Comments**

The scoping report identifies the development site as being located within Manchester City Centre. For planning purposes, the development site is located in the Regional Centre (policy EC3) as defined within the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).

The significance of the site in regional terms should be reflected throughout the ES. The Environmental Chapters must therefore consider the impacts of the Proposed Development on the local context 'Regional Centre' together with Manchester City Centre, the North West Region and the national context (where appropriate) in order to determine any wider significant environmental impacts.

**Air Quality**

The comments within your scoping report are noted the Assessment needs to reference the following Guidance : Information for developers | Manchester City Council in terms of the consideration of Air Quality in the ES subject to inclusion of:

An assessment for future receptors (ground floor receptors and upper floor residential) and include PM10 and PM2.5 as well as NO2.

Assessment of fugitive dust emissions and mitigation measures during the demolition and construction phase. Reference to IAQM best practice measures shall be made and adopted through the development. Details of clean air filters should be provided where required along with their location on the building and maintenance / replacement requirements.

It should be noted that sensitive receptors should include any adjacent schools and nurseries.

**Built Heritage**

There needs to be consideration within the ES in relation to affected Non Designated Heritage Assets (NDHA) for example consideration of the Mayfield Depot as a NDHA. Given this in terms of Appendix 5, views 4, 5 and 6 need to be included as heritage views. Otherwise the comments within your scoping report are noted and on this basis are acceptable in terms of consideration in the ES.

**Climate Change**

The comments within your scoping report are noted and on this basis are acceptable in terms of their consideration in the ES subject to consideration of including a broad approach and methodology for assessing the impact on climate change. Impacts and potential mitigation from the other technical chapters should feed into this assessment particularly around management of surface water, waste management, green and blue infrastructure, biodiversity and ecology, travel planning and efficiency of the building fabric, an assessment of the lifecycle of the building (including management of embodied carbon) and use of renewable energy as part of promoting a low carbon development and reducing emissions and the likely environmental impacts of this.

It should be noted that sensitive receptors should include any adjacent schools and nurseries.

**Construction Management**

The comments within your scoping report are noted. The construction of the site could result in the closure of roads and footpaths, physical works within the highway to form new site access points, layout improvements, service upgrades and the need to accommodate regular deliveries of materials and construction equipment. It is acknowledged that the precise nature of the construction related highway effects are difficult to identify in detail until a final construction programme and delivery phasing plan has been undertaken.

Notwithstanding this, the ES and following CMP should identify any mitigation measures necessary to address any significant effects during the construction phase of the proposed development.

Evidence should be provided with regard to baseline surrounding traffic flows and/or daily construction vehicle movements within the scope of the EIA assessment.

The CEMP should include the following which are usually required within a CMP which would work to further reduce environmental impacts:

- The duration/phasing of construction works and associated vehicle trips;
- Routing of construction traffic and associated swept-path assessment;
- Details of the location and arrangements for contractor parking;
- The identification of the vehicular access points into the site;
- Traffic Management measures for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists;
- Manage and coordinate construction activities with reference to ongoing/imminent construction works in the locality:
- Identify measures to control dust and mud including on the surrounding public highway including details of how the wheels of contractor's vehicles are to be cleaned during the construction period;
- The details of an emergency telephone contact number for the site contractor to be displayed in a publicly accessible location; and
- Highway dilapidation survey including photographs and commentary on the condition of carriageway/footways on construction vehicle routes surrounding the site.

**Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing**

The comments within your scoping report are noted. In terms of the baseline see comments on Baseline above. Subject to this adjustment, the scope as set out in the Scoping Report is acceptable.

**Ecology and nature conservation**

The comments within your scoping report are noted and on this basis are acceptable in terms of their consideration in the ES.

**Water Resources (Flood Risk and Drainage)**

The comments within your scoping report are noted and are generally acceptable however the following should be noted:

The majority of the Site is within flood zone 1 and is of a low risk of flooding however, a small area (approximately 0.1ha) to the north boundary lies within flood zones 2 and 3 (indicating a medium and high level of flooding respectively from the River Medlock). The Flood Map for Rivers and Sea can be viewed at: http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/.

The proposed development is generally within an area at very low risk of surface water flooding. The proposed development is at a low risk of groundwater flooding occurring at the surface.

The area is situated within the Conurbation Core Critical Drainage Area and in accordance with the Manchester City Council SFRA at least a 50% reduction in surface water runoff

should be provided through SUDS as part of any development which is situated on a brownfield site.

Surface water management for the site needs to follow the drainage hierarchy:

- Infiltration into ground
- Connection to the watercourse
- Connection to discharge water sewer and as a last resort;
- Connection to the combined sewer.

Surface water should be managed to ensure there is no increased surface water from the proposed development and runoff from extreme events should be retained within the site such that the adjacent third party land is not affected.

The Government has strengthened planning policy on the provision of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) for 'major' planning applications which was introduced on 6 April 2015 (Paragraph 103 of National Planning Policy Framework and Ministerial Statement on SuDS). As per the guidance issued by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG), all 'major' planning applications being determined from 6 April 2015, must consider sustainable drainage systems. Due to the size of the development the restriction for implementing SuDS within the site layout is minimal. We would also recommend that SuDS are drawn up within the site layout at the early stages of design.

The suitability of sustainable drainage systems should be assessed in accordance with paragraphs 051, 079 and 080 of the revised NPPF Planning Practice Guidance for Flood Risk and Coastal Change (http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change/).

Sustainable drainage systems should be designed in line with national Non-Statutory Technical Standards for SuDS

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/415773/sustainable-drainage-technical-standards.pdf) and local policies EN08, EN14 and EN17 of the Core Strategy.

Hydraulic calculations and drawings to support the design need to be provided and updated along with proposed standards of operation and maintenance in accordance with paragraph 081 of NPPF Planning Practice Guidance.

On the basis that the above and any mitigation is captured within the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy it is agreed that Water Resources (including Drainage and Flood Risk) can be scoped out of the ES.

**Ground Conditions**

The comments within your scoping report are noted and on this basis are acceptable in terms of their consideration in the ES.

**Human Health**

The comments within your scoping report are noted and on this basis are acceptable in terms of their consideration in the ES. It should be noted that sensitive receptors should include any adjacent schools and nurseries.

**Noise and Vibration**

The comments within your scoping report are noted and on this basis are acceptable in terms of their consideration in the ES subject to sensitive receptors including any adjacent schools and nurseries and residential properties within Ardwick adjacent to the site. Noise from Mayfield Depot (including WHP)(as it forms part of the wider site plan) will need to be captured as a consideration for this chapter.

**Socio-economic impacts**

The comments within your scoping report are noted and on this basis are acceptable in terms of their consideration in the ES.

**Townscape and Visual Impact**

The comments within your scoping report including the Receptors and Key views within Appendix 5 Visual Zone of Influence are noted and are generally acceptable in terms of their consideration in the ES however it is noted that view 14 does not appear to be in the previous agreed location (from Platform 14 -see Deloitte's e-mail 10-06-24)

**Transport and Access**

The comments within your scoping report and are noted. Detailed Highways comments on the scope of the ES, proposed methodology and relevant considerations are attached to this letter however the requirement for the following mitigation to be set out is noted:

The developer should identify appropriate mitigation to accommodate any increases in traffic generation and increased pedestrian and cyclist movements. Any appropriate mitigation should be identified in conjunction with TfGM UTC and MCC who will be happy to work with the developer to agree an approach. The TA should consider the impact of the development on the existing public transport networks in terms of extension of bus services, additional person trips. Mitigation measures should be considered where appropriate.

and should be included for consideration within the ES

**Wind Microclimate**

The comments within your scoping report are noted and on this basis are acceptable in terms of their consideration in the ES.

**Cumulative impacts**

The list of cumulative sites for assessment has been considered in order to assess any cumulative impacts of developments in this part of the City Centre is acceptable in terms of consideration in the ES (noting the comments on the Baseline above).

**FURTHER INFORMATION**

The City Council, as Local Planning Authority, has undertaken a thorough consideration of the information contained within your scoping report together with providing comments from relevant statutory consultees. The issuing of this Scoping Opinion does not preclude the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, from requesting further information at a later stage as the development proposals evolve or whilst a future planning application is being formally considered.

This letter also confirms the matters within part I of Schedule 4 to the to the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 that need to be covered within the Environmental Statement.

If you wish to discuss the above please contact Angela Leckie on the above number.

Yours sincerely



Julie Roscoe
Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing

Historic England

Ms Angela Leckie
Manchester City Council
Planning
PO Box 532
Town Hall
MANCHESTER
M60 2LA

Direct Dial: [redacted]

Our ref: PL00797213

12 November 2024

Dear Ms Leckie

**EIASCO/24/005 | Request for Scoping opinion under Part 4, Regulation 15 of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended) | Phase 1B Mayfield Manchester**

Thank you for consulting Historic England to request a scoping opinion for this site. I have reviewed the submitted EIA Screening and Scoping Report (Deloitte, October 2024), and I agree with the outcome of the that Built Heritage should be scoped in to the EIA.

Appendix F is not present in the version of the Scoing Report that has been uploaded to the planning website. The designated heritage assets are shown on the TVIA Zone of Visual Influence map in Appendix E, however the Manchester South Junction and Altrincham Railway Viaduct does not appear to have been included. This structure is listed at Grade II, and passes to the north of the development site, and should be included in the assessment of environmental impacts. I am otherwise happy with the proposed methodology for the Heritage Statement and Heritage Impact Assessment, and with the suggested view points.

Yours sincerely,

Louise Davies
Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas
[redacted]



*Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any Information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.*

Date: 30 October 2024
Our ref: 491402
Your ref: EIASCO/24/005

angela.leckie@manchester.gov.uk
**BY EMAIL ONLY**

Consultations
Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

T 0300 060 900

Dear Angela Leckie,

**Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping consultation (Regulation 15 (4) of the Town and Country Planning EIA Regulations 2017):** Request for Scoping opinion under Part 4, Regulation 15 of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended).
**Location:** Phase 1B Mayfield Manchester

Thank you for seeking our advice on the scope of the Environmental Statement (ES) in the consultation dated 22 October 2024, received on 22 October 2024.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

A robust assessment of environmental impacts and opportunities based on relevant and up to date environmental information should be undertaken prior to a decision on whether to grant planning permission. Annex A to this letter provides Natural England's advice on the scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed development.

Further guidance is set out in Planning Practice Guidance on environmental assessment, natural environment and climate change.

Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again.

Please note that Natural England must be consulted on Environmental Statements.

Please send any new consultations or further information on this consultation to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely

Georgia Egerton
Consultations Team

**Annex A – Natural England Advice on EIA Scoping**

**General Principles**

Schedule 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, sets out the information that should be included in an Environmental Statement (ES) to assess impacts on the natural environment. This includes:

- A description of the development – including physical characteristics and the full land use requirements of the site during construction and operational phases
- Expected residues and emissions (water, air and soil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation etc.) resulting from the operation of the proposed development
- An assessment of alternatives and clear reasoning as to why the preferred option has been chosen
- A description of the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the development including biodiversity (for example fauna and flora), land, including land take, soil, water, air, climate (for example greenhouse gas emissions, impacts relevant to adaptation, cultural heritage and landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors
- A description of the likely significant effects of the development on the environment – this should cover direct effects but also any indirect, secondary, cumulative, short, medium, and long term, permanent and temporary, positive, and negative effects. Effects should relate to the existence of the development, the use of natural resources (in particular land, soil, water and biodiversity) and the emissions from pollutants. This should also include a description of the forecasting methods to predict the likely effects on the environment
- A description of the measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and where possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment
- A non-technical summary of the information
- An indication of any difficulties (technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered by the applicant in compiling the required information

Further guidance is set out in Planning Practice Guidance on environmental assessment and natural environment.

**Cumulative and in-combination effects**

The ES should fully consider the implications of the whole development proposal. This should include an assessment of all supporting infrastructure.

An impact assessment should identify, describe, and evaluate the effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with other projects and activities that are being, have been or will be carried out. The following types of projects should be included in such an assessment (subject to available information):

a. existing completed projects;
b. approved but uncompleted projects;
c. ongoing activities;
d. plans or projects for which an application has been made and which are under consideration by the consenting authorities; and
e. plans and projects which are reasonably foreseeable, i.e. projects for which an application has not yet been submitted, but which are likely to progress before completion of the development and for which sufficient information is available to assess the likelihood of cumulative and in-combination effects.

**Environmental data**

Natural England is required to make available information it holds where requested to do so. National datasets held by Natural England are available at http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/publications/data/default.aspx.

Detailed information on the natural environment is available at www.magic.gov.uk.

Natural England's SSSI Impact Risk Zones are a GIS dataset which can be used to help identify the potential for the development to impact on a SSSI. The dataset and user guidance can be accessed from the Natural England Open Data Geoportal.

Natural England does not hold local information on local sites, local landscape character, priority habitats and species or protected species. Local environmental data should be obtained from the appropriate local bodies. This may include the local environmental records centre, the local wildlife trust, local geo-conservation group or other recording society.

**Biodiversity and Geodiversity**

**General principles**

The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs180-181 and 185-188) sets out how to take account of biodiversity and geodiversity interests in planning decisions. Further guidance is set out in Planning Practice Guidance on the natural environment.

The potential impact of the proposal upon sites and features of nature conservation interest and opportunities for nature recovery and biodiversity net gain should be included in the assessment.

Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) is the process of identifying, quantifying, and evaluating the potential impacts of defined actions on ecosystems or their components. EcIA may be carried out as part of the EIA process or to support other forms of environmental assessment or appraisal. Guidelines have been developed by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM).

Local planning authorities have a duty to conserve and enhance biodiversity as part of their decision making. Conserving biodiversity can include habitat restoration or enhancement. Further information is available here.

**Designated nature conservation sites**

The proposal is unlikely to adversely impact any European or internationally designated nature conservation sites (including 'habitats sites' under the NPPF) or nationally designated sites (Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves or Marine Conservation Zones).

**Regionally and Locally Important Sites**

The ES should consider any impacts upon local wildlife and geological sites, including local nature reserves. Local Sites are identified by the local wildlife trust, geoconservation group or other local group and protected under the NPPF (paragraph 180 and 181). The ES should set out proposals for mitigation of any impacts and if appropriate, compensation measures and opportunities for enhancement and improving connectivity with wider ecological networks. Contact the relevant local body for further information.

**Protected Species**

The conservation of species protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

is explained in Part IV and Annex A of Government Circular 06/2005 *Biodiversity and Geological Conservation: Statutory Obligations and their Impact within the Planning System*.

The ES should assess the impact of all phases of the proposal on protected species (including, for example, great crested newts, reptiles, birds, water voles, badgers and bats). Natural England does not hold comprehensive information regarding the locations of species protected by law. Records of protected species should be obtained from appropriate local biological record centres, nature conservation organisations and local groups. Consideration should be given to the wider context of the site, for example in terms of habitat linkages and protected species populations in the wider area.

The area likely to be affected by the development should be thoroughly surveyed by competent ecologists at appropriate times of year for relevant species and the survey results, impact assessments and appropriate accompanying mitigation strategies included as part of the ES. Surveys should always be carried out in optimal survey time periods and to current guidance by suitably qualified and, where necessary, licensed, consultants.

Natural England has adopted standing advice for protected species, which includes guidance on survey and mitigation measures . A separate protected species licence from Natural England or Defra may also be required.

**District Level Licensing for Great Crested Newts**

District level licensing (DLL) is a type of strategic mitigation licence for great crested newts (GCN) granted in certain areas at a local authority or wider scale. A DLL scheme for GCN may be in place at the location of the development site. If a DLL scheme is in place, developers can make a financial contribution to strategic, off-site habitat compensation instead of applying for a separate licence or carrying out individual detailed surveys. By demonstrating that DLL will be used, impacts on GCN can be scoped out of detailed assessment in the Environmental Statement.

**Priority Habitats and Species**

Priority Habitats and Species are of particular importance for nature conservation and included in the England Biodiversity List published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Most priority habitats will be mapped either as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, on the Magic website or as Local Wildlife Sites. Lists of priority habitats and species can be found here. Natural England does not routinely hold species data. Such data should be collected when impacts on priority habitats or species are considered likely.

Consideration should also be given to the potential environmental value of brownfield sites, often found in urban areas and former industrial land. Sites can be checked against the (draft) national Open Mosaic Habitat (OMH) inventory published by Natural England and freely available to download. Further information is also available here.

An appropriate level habitat survey should be carried out on the site, to identify any important habitats present. In addition, ornithological, botanical, and invertebrate surveys should be carried out at appropriate times in the year, to establish whether any scarce or priority species are present.

The Environmental Statement should include details of:

- Any historical data for the site affected by the proposal (e.g. from previous surveys)
- Additional surveys carried out as part of this proposal
- The habitats and species present
- The status of these habitats and species (e.g. whether priority species or habitat)
- The direct and indirect effects of the development upon those habitats and species
- Full details of any mitigation or compensation measures
- Opportunities for biodiversity net gain or other environmental enhancement

**Ancient Woodland, ancient and veteran trees**

The ES should assess the impacts of the proposal on any ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees, and the scope to avoid and mitigate for adverse impacts. It should also consider opportunities for enhancement.

Natural England maintains the Ancient Woodland Inventory which can help identify ancient woodland. The wood pasture and parkland inventory sets out information on wood pasture and parkland.

The ancient tree inventory provides information on the location of ancient and veteran trees.

Natural England and the Forestry Commission have prepared standing advice on ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees.

**Biodiversity net gain**

Paragraph 180 of the NPPF states that decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.

Biodiversity Net Gain is additional to statutory requirements relating to designated nature conservation sites and protected species.

Proposals for mandatory biodiversity net gain should be in line with the Environment Act 2021 and supporting regulations. Further information on biodiversity net gain, including draft Planning Practice Guidance, can be found here

The statutory biodiversity metric, together with ecological advice, should be used to calculate the change in biodiversity resulting from proposed development and demonstrate how proposals can achieve a net gain.
The metric should be used to:
• assess or audit the biodiversity unit value of land within the application area
• calculate the losses and gains in biodiversity unit value resulting from proposed development
• demonstrate that the required percentage biodiversity net gain will be achieved

Biodiversity Net Gain outcomes can be achieved on site, off-site or through a combination of both. On-site provision should be considered first. Delivery should create or enhance habitats of equal or higher value. When delivering net gain, opportunities should be sought to link delivery to relevant plans or strategies e.g. Green Infrastructure Strategies or Local Nature Recovery Strategies.

Opportunities for wider environmental gains should also be considered.

**Landscape**

**Nationally Designated Landscapes**
**Landscape and visual impacts**

The environmental assessment should refer to the relevant National Character Areas. Character area profiles set out descriptions of each landscape area and statements of environmental opportunity.

The ES should include a full assessment of the potential impacts of the development on local landscape character using landscape assessment methodologies. We encourage the use of Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), based on the good practice guidelines produced jointly by

the Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Assessment in 2013. LCA provides a sound basis for guiding, informing, and understanding the ability of any location to accommodate change and to make positive proposals for conserving, enhancing or regenerating character.

A landscape and visual impact assessment should also be carried out for the proposed development and surrounding area. Natural England recommends use of the methodology set out in *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 2013 (*(3rd edition) produced by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Assessment and Management. For National Parks and AONBs, we advise that the assessment also includes effects on the 'special qualities' of the designated landscape, as set out in the statutory management plan for the area. These identify the particular landscape and related characteristics which underpin the natural beauty of the area and its designation status.

The assessment should also include the cumulative effect of the development with other relevant existing or proposed developments in the area. This should include an assessment of the impacts of other proposals currently at scoping stage.

To ensure high quality development that responds to and enhances local landscape character and distinctiveness, the siting and design of the proposed development should reflect local characteristics and, wherever possible, use local materials. Account should be taken of local design policies, design codes and guides as well as guidance in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code. The ES should set out the measures to be taken to ensure the development will deliver high standards of design and green infrastructure. It should also set out detail of layout alternatives, where appropriate, with a justification of the selected option in terms of landscape impact and benefit.

**Heritage Landscapes**

The ES should include an assessment of the impacts on any land in the area affected by the development which qualifies for conditional exemption from capital taxes on the grounds of outstanding scenic, scientific, or historic interest. An up-to-date list is available at www.hmrc.gov.uk/heritage/lbsearch.htm.

**Connecting People with nature**

The ES should consider potential impacts on access land, common land, public rights of way and, where appropriate, the England Coast Path and coastal access routes and coastal margin in the vicinity of the development, in line with NPPF paragraph 104. It should assess the scope to mitigate for any adverse impacts. Rights of Way Improvement Plans (ROWIP) can be used to identify public rights of way within or adjacent to the proposed site that should be maintained or enhanced.

Measures to help people to better access the countryside for quiet enjoyment and opportunities to connect with nature should be considered. Such measures could include reinstating existing footpaths or the creation of new footpaths, cycleways, and bridleways. Links to other green networks and, where appropriate, urban fringe areas should also be explored to help promote the creation of wider green infrastructure. Access to nature within the development site should also be considered, including the role that natural links have in connecting habitats and providing potential pathways for movements of species.

Relevant aspects of local authority green infrastructure strategies should be incorporated where appropriate.

**Soils and Agricultural Land Quality**

Soils are a valuable, finite natural resource and should also be considered for the ecosystem services they provide, including for food production, water storage and flood mitigation, as a carbon store, reservoir of biodiversity and buffer against pollution. It is therefore important that the soil resources are protected and sustainably managed. Impacts from the development on soils and best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land should be considered in line with paragraphs 180 and 181 of the NPPF. Further guidance is set out in the Natural England Guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land.

As set out in paragraph 217 of the NPPF, new sites or extensions to sites for peat extraction should not be granted planning permission.

The following issues should be considered and, where appropriate, included as part of the Environmental Statement (ES):

- The degree to which soils would be disturbed or damaged as part of the development
- The extent to which agricultural land would be disturbed or lost as part of this development, including whether any best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land would be impacted.

This may require a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey if one is not already available. For information on the availability of existing ALC information see www.magic.gov.uk.

- Where an ALC and soil survey of the land is required, this should normally be at a detailed level, e.g. one auger boring per hectare, (or more detailed for a small site) supported by pits dug in each main soil type to confirm the physical characteristics of the full depth of the soil resource, i.e. 1.2 metres. The survey data can inform suitable soil handling methods and appropriate reuse of the soil resource where required (e.g. agricultural reinstatement, habitat creation, landscaping, allotments and public open space).
- The ES should set out details of how any adverse impacts on BMV agricultural land can be minimised through site design/masterplan.
- The ES should set out details of how any adverse impacts on soils can be avoided or minimised and demonstrate how soils will be sustainably used and managed, including consideration in site design and master planning, and areas for green infrastructure or biodiversity net gain. The aim will be to minimise soil handling and maximise the sustainable use and management of the available soil to achieve successful after-uses and minimise off-site impacts.

Further information is available in the Defra Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soil on Development Sites and
The British Society of Soil Science Guidance Note Benefitting from Soil Management in Development and Construction.

The following additional guidance is provided for minerals and waste development. The ES should consider and, where appropriate, include the following:

- The methods and equipment to be used for the protection, recovery, storage, and sustainable re-use of the different types of topsoil and subsoil, including consideration of any required phasing to minimise soil handling and maximise the sustainable management of the soil.

- The method of assessing whether soils are in a suitably dry condition to be handled (i.e. dry and friable), and the avoidance of soil handling, trafficking, and cultivation during the wetter winter period.

- A description of the restoration criteria, including the proposed soil horizon depths and soil characteristics; normally to an overall depth of 1.2 m over an evenly graded overburden layer (or, in the case of waste reclamation, an evenly graded capping layer), suitable for the proposed end-use, including the restored ALC Grade.

- The effects on land drainage, agricultural access, and water supplies, including other agricultural land in the vicinity. The impacts of the development on farm structure and viability, and on other established rural land use and interests, both during the site working period and following its reclamation.

- The restoration and aftercare of the site, in line with Chapter 17 'Facilitating the Sustainable Use of Minerals' of the NPPF.

- A detailed Restoration Plan illustrating the restored soil profile characteristics, landform and the intended standard of restoration including ALC Grade(s), together with details of surface features; water bodies; the availability of outfalls to accommodate future drainage requirements; and aftercare.

Further guidance is contained in the Defra Guidance for Successful Restoration of Mineral and Waste Sites and the Natural England guidance note Planning and aftercare advice for reclaiming land to agricultural use. Reference could also usefully be made to the Institute of Quarrying (2021) Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings which comprises separate sections, describing the typical choice of machinery and methods for handling soils at various phases. The techniques described by Sheets A-D are appropriate for the successful reinstatement of higher quality agricultural land. The Natural England Guide to reclaiming mineral extraction and landfill sites to agriculture also contains useful background information.

**Air Quality**

Air quality in the UK has improved over recent decades but air pollution remains a significant issue. For example, approximately 85% of protected nature conservation sites are currently in exceedance of nitrogen levels where harm is expected (critical load) and approximately 87% of sites exceed the level of ammonia where harm is expected for lower plants (critical level of 1µg) [1].A priority action in the England Biodiversity Strategy is to reduce air pollution impacts on biodiversity. The Government's Clean Air Strategy also has a number of targets to reduce emissions including to reduce damaging deposition of reactive forms of nitrogen by 17% over England's protected priority sensitive habitats by 2030, to reduce emissions of ammonia against the 2005 baseline by 16% by 2030 and to reduce emissions of NOx and $SO_2$ against a 2005 baseline of 73% and 88% respectively by 2030. Shared Nitrogen Action Plans (SNAPs) have also been identified as a tool to reduce environmental damage from air pollution.

The planning system plays a key role in determining the location of developments which may give rise to pollution, either directly, or from traffic generation, and hence planning decisions can have a significant impact on the quality of air, water and land. The ES should take account of the risks of air pollution and how these can be managed or reduced. This should include taking account of any strategic solutions or SNAPs, which may be being developed or implemented to mitigate the impacts on air quality. Further information on air pollution impacts and the sensitivity of different habitats/designated sites can be found on the Air Pollution Information System (www.apis.ac.uk).

Information on air pollution modelling, screening and assessment can be found on the following websites:

[1] Report: Trends Report 2020: Trends in critical load and critical level exceedances in the UK - Defra, UK

- SCAIL Combustion and SCAIL Agriculture - http://www.scail.ceh.ac.uk/
- Ammonia assessment for agricultural development https://www.gov.uk/guidance/intensive-farming-risk-assessment-for-your-environmental-permit
- Environment Agency Screening Tool for industrial emissions https://www.gov.uk/guidance/air-emissions-risk-assessment-for-your-environmental-permit
- Defra Local Air Quality Management Area Tool (Industrial Emission Screening Tool) – England http://www.airqualityengland.co.uk/laqm

**Water Quality**

The planning system plays a key role in determining the location of developments which may give rise to water pollution, and hence planning decisions can have a significant impact on water quality, and land. The assessment should take account of the risks of water pollution and how these can be managed or reduced. A number of water dependent protected nature conservation sites have been identified as failing condition due to elevated nutrient levels and nutrient neutrality is consequently required to enable development to proceed without causing further damage to these sites. The ES needs to take account of any strategic solutions for nutrient neutrality or Diffuse Water Pollution Plans, which may be being developed or implemented to mitigate and address the impacts of elevated nutrient levels. Further information can be obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

**Climate Change**

The ES should identify how the development affects the ability of the natural environment (including habitats, species, and natural processes) to adapt to climate change, including its ability to provide adaptation for people. This should include impacts on the vulnerability or resilience of a natural feature (i.e. what's already there and affected) as well as impacts on how the environment can accommodate change for both nature and people, for example whether the development affects species ability to move and adapt. Nature-based solutions, such as providing green infrastructure on-site and in the surrounding area (e.g. to adapt to flooding, drought and heatwave events), habitat creation and peatland restoration, should be considered. The ES should set out the measures that will be adopted to address impacts.

Further information is available from the Committee on Climate Change's (CCC) Independent Assessment of UK Climate Risk, the National Adaptation Programme (NAP), the Climate Change Impacts Report Cards (biodiversity, infrastructure, water etc.) and the UKCP18 climate projections.

The Natural England and RSPB Climate Change Adaptation Manual (2020) provides extensive information on climate change impacts and adaptation for the natural environment and adaptation focussed nature-based solutions for people. It includes the Landscape Scale Climate Change Assessment Method that can help assess impacts and vulnerabilities on natural environment features and identify adaptation actions. Natural England's Nature Networks Evidence Handbook (2020) also provides extensive information on planning and delivering nature networks for people and biodiversity.

The ES should also identify how the development impacts the natural environment's ability to store and sequester greenhouse gases, in relation to climate change mitigation and the natural environment's contribution to achieving net zero by 2050. Natural England's Carbon Storage and Sequestration by Habitat report (2021) and the British Ecological Society's nature-based solutions report (2021) provide further information.

**Contribution to local environmental initiatives and priorities**

The ES should consider the contribution the development could make to relevant local environmental initiatives and priorities to enhance the environmental quality of the development and deliver wider environmental gains. This should include considering proposals set out in relevant local strategies or supplementary planning documents including landscape strategies, green

infrastructure strategies, tree and woodland strategies, biodiversity strategies or biodiversity opportunity areas.

Manchester City Council
PO Box 532
Manchester
Lancashire
M60 2LA

**Our ref:** SO/2024/124530/01-L01
**Your ref:** EIASCO/24/005

**Date:** 24 October 2024

**FAO: Angela Leckie**

Dear Angela,

**REQUEST FOR SCOPING OPINION UNDER PART 4, REGULATION 15 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) REGULATIONS 2017 (AS AMENDED)**

**PHASE 1B MAYFIELD, MANCHESTER**

Thank you for requesting an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Opinion from the Environment Agency (EA) for the Phase 1B Mayfield development. Referral for this EIA scoping was received by the EA on the 22nd October 2024.

To inform our EIA scoping opinion below, we have reviewed the following report provided under EIASCO/24/005:

- Screening and Scoping Report – Manchester Phase 1b, Mayfield. Prepared by Deloitte. Dated October 2024.

**Environment Agency Scoping Opinion – Mayfield Phase 1b**

We note and acknowledge the determination reached within the Screening and Scoping Report (SSR) that the quantum of the development will meet the criteria of an EIA development outlined under Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.

Further to the above, we acknowledge the intended scope of the Environmental Statement (ES) to be prepared in association with Mayfield Phase 1b. We have no issues with the proposed scope of the ES.

In regards to the matter of land contamination, it is identified within the SSR report that currently an intention exists to undertake remediation of the site in a phased manner (wider to general phased progression of Plot J (Phase 1) and Plot K (Phase 2)). As we (the EA) have not yet been sighted on the results of the supplementary site investigation work undertaken for Phase 1B (21st March 2024), we are unable to the planning authority or developer initial advice as to whether we consider a potential risk to controlled waters is posed to/from the proposed development site and, in turn, advise on the suitability of a phased remediation of the development site.

Whereby a potential risk controlled waters has been identified warranting remedial action, we would encourage that the Mayfield development team undertakes early proactive engagement with us via our established preliminary planning advice service agreement.
Any queries or questions regarding this response, then please do not hesitate to get in

contact with me.

Yours sincerely,

**Mr Andy Davies**
**EA Green Growth Team Project Manager & Planning Advisor**

Direct e-mail [redacted]

Outlook

## Scoping Opinion EIASCO/24/005 Mayfield

**From** David Dutton [redacted]
**Date** Fri 08/11/2024 18:00
**To** Angela Leckie <angela.leckie@manchester.gov.uk>

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

Hi Angela

Given the River Medlock is hydrologically linked to a number of receptor sites such as Salford Quays SBI and ultimately the Mersey Estuary SPA, I have no objection to ecology being scoped in to the Environment Statement. I would however have likely accepted ecology to be scoped out.

**David Dutton**
**Ecologist**
Planning and Transportation
Planning and Transportation
Place

Tameside MBC | Twitter | Facebook | Instagram | LinkedIn
Dukinfield Town Hall | King Street | Dukinfield | Tameside | SK16 4LA

Tel. [redacted]
Mobile. [redacted]

***This email was sent at a time & date convenient to the sender; please do not feel under any pressure to respond immediately if this is outside your normal working hours.***

Email Disclaimer https://www.tameside.gov.uk/disclaimer



Greater Manchester Archaeological Advisory Service
School of Science, Engineering & Environment
Room LG 20, Peel Building
University of Salford
Salford M5 4WX

Angela Leckie
Principle Planner
Development Management Central Core
Planning Building Control and Licensing - Growth and Development
Manchester City Council
Town Hall
Manchester M60 2LA

Date: 23rd October 2024

Dear Angela

**Archaeological Consultation EIASCO/24/005: Manchester Phase 1b, Mayfield – Scoping Opinion (Archaeology)**

Thank you for consulting GMAAS on the above request for a Scoping Opinion.

The request is supported by a Scoping Report prepared by Deloitte in October 2024, which identifies that the proposed development falls within Schedule 2 (10b) of the EIA Regulations. The report includes a detailed section prepared by Salford Archaeology that considers archaeological matters associated with the proposed development. This summarises the baseline conditions and identifies areas of potential archaeological interest within the site. GMAAS and the Greater Manchester Historic Environment Record was consulted during the preparation of the document. It is concluded that the archaeological resource has the potential to be of local to regional significance and, as such, any harm to this resource can be offset through recording in advance of or during development groundworks. It is proposed that further detail will be presented in an archaeological desk-based assessment, which will be submitted in support of any future planning application.

GMAAS accepts that the archaeology is unlikely to be of national significance and is satisfied that archaeology can be scoped out of the EIA, but recommends that the archaeological desk-based assessment is submitted in support of the planning application in due course. It may be anticipated that a programme of intrusive archaeological investigation will be warranted in advance of or during the proposed development works. GMAAS will be content to see any such work secured through a negative planning condition attached to consent, and carried out in accordance with an agreed Project Design prepared by an appropriately qualified archaeological contractor.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Ian Miller
Heritage Management Director (Archaeology)
Tel: [redacted]

MANCHESTER CITY COUNCIL

**Development Management**
**Citywide Support (Highways)**

Telephone: [redacted]

Hammerstone Road Depot,
Manchester M18 8EQ

# Memorandum

| | |
|---|---|
| **To** | Angela Leckie |
| **From** | Laura Wareing |
| Date | 7 November 2024 |
| Subject | **EIASCO/24/005**<br>**Request for Scoping opinion under Part 4, Regulation 15 of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended)** |

We have reviewed the above application in relation to highways and our comments are as follows:

Context:

The proposed development is part of a larger Mayfield regeneration scheme. This proposal area will aim to deliver the first residential phase of a wider commercially led masterplan. The development will comprise of two plots, located to the south of Mayfield Park and north of Mancunian Way.

An EIA Scoping Report has been submitted for the proposed development. The Scoping Report notes that the proposals are likely to give rise to a range of transport issues and associated effects during the construction and operational phases. As such, transport has been scoped into the EIA, with the proposed assessment methodology detailed in Chapter 5.

The EIA Scoping Report confirms that the proposed development will be brought forwards as 2 plots (Plot J and K) and provide c. 900 homes in a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bed apartments. The buildings will range from 9 to 28 storeys and expected to be arranges in a staggered linear block in a north-south orientation.

The EIA Scoping Report suggests that the phased development will involve:

o Remediation and reprofiling works for the site to allow for the phased erection of two residential plots (referred to as Plot J and Plot K) which will form part of Phase 1b.
o The development plot will be made up of two podium levels to address the site level changes.
o The development will provide commercial space, residential space and amenity area and public realm.

o Creation of an at-grade route to the south of the residential blocks, which will be traffic calmed to encourage pedestrian flows whilst allowing for a service road to be created, with a buffer zone between this route and the Mancunian Way.
o The service road will connect to Hoyle Street, which will be stopped up at the southern end to minimise traffic entering the Mayfield area.
o Provisionally there is an ambition to deliver a new at-grade crossing over the Mancunian Way to provide improved access to the park for residents in Ardwick. It is anticipated that this will be indicative at the time of submission.
o Plot J will be made up of c. 406 residential dwellings and c. 1,500 sqm commercial space.
o Plot K will be made up of c. 494 residential dwellings and 3,500 sqm commercial space.

Document Submission

The EIA Scoping Report confirms that the proposed development will be supported by a Transport Assessment.

The EIA Scoping Note confirms that the Transport Consultant met with the Council in April 2024 to seek an agreed approach to the TA with MCC and TfGM.

It is also noted that a Stage 1 RSA will be provided at planning stage, for the proposed wider highway and footway works as part of the proposals.

For the avoidance of doubt the Transport Assessment should comprise of:

o A multi-modal trip generation assessment with further detail on anticipated public transport, pedestrian and cycle distribution/routes/capacities;
o Include analysis of collision data during the most recent five-year period, with identification of any underlying patterns that might be affected by the development;
o Provide justification for the proposed level of cycle parking. It should be noted that some short-stay cycle parking provision would also be beneficial for visitors. Sheltered and secure cycle parking will be required for staff;
o Provide justification for the proposed level of car parking (including disabled/pool car provision). Parking bays and aisle widths will need to align with MCC standards. Swept-path assessments may also be required;
o Include proposed S278 highways engineering drawings, which should demonstrate appropriate swept-path assessment, visibility and retention of safe pedestrian movement around the site access including both primary vehicular access points and emergency access/routes. A summary of the RSA1 findings within the TA would also be useful;
o Demonstration that waste and service vehicles can safely utilise the proposed 3 x lay-bys;
o Undertake a review of Traffic Regulation Orders on the surrounding streets in the vicinity of the development and identification of modifications;
o Include information on emergency access routes and how these would integrate with the adjacent highway network and developments;
o Provide details on/management of taxis (including engineering drawings); and
o Provide details on/management of site deliveries and servicing (including engineering drawings).

TfGM have been consulted on the proposals - comments of which are provided under separate cover.

Day to Day Operation:

In relation to transport, the Scoping report identified the following as key traffic and transport related issues:

- Severance of Communities
- Non-Motorised User Delay.
- Non-Motorised User Amenity.
- Fear and Intimidation on and By Road Users.
- Road User and Pedestrian Safety.

Whilst Highways note that information can be drawn from associated submission documents including the TA, Travel Plan and Construction Management Plan, the assessments undertaken as part of the EIA Transport Chapter should align with methodologies and assessment criteria outlined within IEMA Guidelines 'Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement' (2023).
Construction

The EIA Scope provides an anticipated construction programme which is still indicative but is understood to comprise:

- Phase 1: Plot J plus public realm which is anticipated to start on-site in 2026 and be complete by 2029.
- Phase 2: Plot K plus public realm and estate road with an anticipated start on site in 2026 and complete by 2030.

The construction of the site could result in the closure of roads and footpaths, physical works within the highway to form new site access points, layout improvements, service upgrades and the need to accommodate regular deliveries of materials and construction equipment. It is acknowledged that the precise nature of the construction related highway effects are difficult to identify in detail until a final construction programme and delivery phasing plan has been undertaken.

It is recommended that the applicant has early engagement with MCCs Event and Network Management Team and work closely to safely manage highway and pedestrian safety during the construction phase.

The EIA and following CMP should identify any mitigation measures necessary to address any significant effects during the construction phase of the proposed development.

The EIA Scope states that the construction traffic generation of the Proposed Development will be based on reasonable assumptions for other similar sites, in lieu of a materials/construction waste management plan being available at this stage.
Hazardous/large loads: Hazardous/large loads are not expected during the construction or operation stage. If they are required these will be highly managed via the CEMP and site management, and therefore effects are not considered significant.

MCC Highways would also request that a Construction Management Plan (CMP) is conditioned with any planning approval. It is therefore recommended that the CEMP is updated to incorporate the following which are usually required within a CMP which would work to further reduce environmental impacts:

- The duration/phasing of construction works and associated vehicle trips;
- Routing of construction traffic and associated swept-path assessment;
- Details of the location and arrangements for contractor parking;
- The identification of the vehicular access points into the site;
- Traffic Management measures for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists;

o Manage and coordinate construction activities with reference to ongoing/imminent construction works in the locality:
o Identify measures to control dust and mud including on the surrounding public highway including details of how the wheels of contractor's vehicles are to be cleaned during the construction period;
o The details of an emergency telephone contact number for the site contractor to be displayed in a publicly accessible location; and
o Highway dilapidation survey including photographs and commentary on the condition of carriageway/footways on construction vehicle routes surrounding the site.

The Applicant should also note that MCC Highways also require information on proposed outline electricity/utility connection works and associated traffic management proposals prior to determination. This should be included within the submitted TA and also assessed as part of the EIA scoping process.

General Comments:

It is noted that a number of pre-application discussions have taken place between the Transport Consultant, MCC and TfGM. With this in mind Highways have provided some general comments below.

Mitigation:

The developer should identify appropriate mitigation to accommodate any increases in traffic generation and increased pedestrian and cyclist movements. Any appropriate mitigation should be identified in conjunction with TfGM UTC and MCC who will be happy to work with the developer to agree an approach.

The TA should consider the impact of the development on the existing public transport networks in terms of extension of bus services, additional person trips. Mitigation measures should be considered where appropriate.

Waste and Service Management

For this application site pre-planning discussions have been focused on on-street servicing through the introduction of 3 loading bays on the estate road and Hoyle Street. It is noted that more information is to be provided at submission stage.

For the avoidance of doubt, swept path analysis should be provided of a 11.5m refuse vehicles within the development site. The swept path should demonstrate that the refuse vehicle can enter and exit in forward gear and manoeuvre around the site safely.

If the development site proposes private waste collection then it is requested that details of this are provided.

It is requested that servicing is undertaken outside of the network AM and PM peak periods. It is also requested that a Service Management Strategy is in place.

Swept path analysis should be provided for the largest expected service/delivery vehicle within the development boundary. The number of deliveries and location of the delivery points should also be provided.

The TA should also reference pick-up/ drop-off activity associated with the site, both in terms of taxi movements and small-scale home deliveries.

It is requested that a service management strategy is submitted as part of the planning application.

Personal Delivery Management:

In order to fully understand the potential impacts of private taxi & food / parcel deliveries for new car-free residential developments within the city and the impact of this type of pick up / drop off activity, applicants will be expected to follow the below suggested guidance:

- All developments will ideally provide an off-highway location to accommodate all drop off / pick up activity at the site, including vehicular and cycle activity;
- The applicant must justify the numbers of trips associated with Taxi & Food / Parcel Deliveries as part of the planning submission. The methodology of the assessment should be agreed with MCC and utilise industry standard tools i.e. TRICS;
- Whilst it is accepted that current data is limited in terms of this type of activity, any additional justification and evidence from recently occupied sites would also be of benefit;
- Once a robust and agreed trip generation has been established, the applicant will be required to demonstrate how this activity can be accommodated either within the site itself or within the adopted highway. This should account for peak hour activity where the most likely period of conflict will occur.
- In terms of an internal drop off / pick up facility - the applicant will be expected to illustrate that all vehicle / cycle activity can be accommodated within the site. This should not impact on the adopted highway, including footway.
- Should drop off / pick up not be accommodated internally, the applicant will be required to assess the exiting highway layout and Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) and demonstrate that the parking restrictions can accommodate the peak number of movements associated with Taxi & Food / Parcel Deliveries. This should include surveys of existing on-street parking and loading / unloading activity within the vicinity of the site.
- Where amendments are required to the adopted highway, in order to provide a safe and functional drop off / pick up location, this will be captured as part of a S278 agreement to be fully funded by the applicant.

All developments will be expected to provide a Management Strategy for Food / Parcel Deliveries. This strategy will need to provide clear direction as to how the below considerations are to be brought forward and managed for the duration of the site's occupation:

1. Designate a Delivery Drop-off Point: Work with the management or housing staff of the development to establish a designated drop-off point for deliveries. This could be a specific lobby area or a central location easily accessible to delivery drivers.
2. Display Signage: If permitted, put up clear signage in the development's common areas to guide delivery drivers to the drop-off point. This will help prevent confusion and ensure timely deliveries.
3. Inform Residents: If possible, notify all residents of the new delivery process. Inform them about the designated drop-off point and any specific rules or guidelines they need to follow when receiving deliveries.
4. Set Delivery Hours: Establish specific delivery hours for residents of the development where possible. This could help manage the flow of deliveries, especially during peak times.
5. Regularly Review the Process: Periodically review how the drop-off process is working. Gather feedback from residents, delivery drivers, and staff to identify any areas for improvement and make necessary adjustments.
6. Consider a Delivery Holding Area: If feasible, set up a secure delivery holding area within the development. This can be especially helpful for residents who may not be immediately available to receive their orders.

7. Monitor Security Concerns: Ensure that the delivery process does not compromise the security and safety of the residents of the development. Address any security concerns promptly and collaborate with building management to implement appropriate measures.
8. Encourage Feedback: Encourage residents to provide feedback on their delivery experiences. This will help you assess the efficiency of the process and identify any potential issues that need to be addressed.

Off-Site Highways Works

A S278 agreement is required for works to the adopted highway - a deposit is required to begin the S278 application, additional costs will be payable and are to be agreed with S278 Statutory Approvals team. Following an assessment of the scope of works, all additional estimated costs are required to be paid in full prior to the expenditure of the initial deposit, or work on the technical approval process will cease and can delay the programme for the start of works on site. The minimum standard S278 technical approval timescale is between 4-6 months and, if TRO's are included, can take 12 months so please programme this into your timetable. Please note: you will not be able to start works on the highway until technical approval has been given by the S278 Engineer and the relevant highways permits granted.

Any modifications / improvements to the public highway or footpath will require agreement with MCC's Highways Applications and Network Resilience teams. This will be funded at the applicant's expense. The following link provides access: https://www.manchester.gov.uk/directory_record/287709/permission_to_work_on_the_highways_-_section_278_agreements/category/355/highways_and_pavements

It will also be expected that the Applicant funds the resurfacing of the footways across the site's perimeter. This should also include appropriate dropped kerbs/ tactile paving where required.

For any projects that require a S278 and/or S38 highway agreement a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA 1) is requested to inform the preliminary design at the pre-planning stage - prior to planning approval being granted. This ensures that any underlying highway safety issues have been identified and mitigation is proposed accordingly. The scope and study area of the RSA1 will be agreed on a site by site basis however, as a minimum, it is expected to include the following:

- 5 years of accident history
- Audit of key pedestrian routes (crossing points, footway widths, condition etc.)
- Audit of key cycling routes (ASLs, cycle lanes etc.)
- Highway layout including, but not limited to (visibility assessments, speed limits, TROs, traffic calming etc.)

A copy of the report (with Designer's Response) is to be made available to the Statutory Approvals Team upon request.

Public Realm

It is recommended that all public realm designs and materials are agreed with MCC's Capital Programmes and Property team prior to site works beginning. The MCC Flood Risk Management and Street Lighting teams will need to be consulted to discuss lighting and drainage associated with the site public realm.

For the avoidance of doubt, all non-standard materials to be used on the adopted highway will be subject to applicable commuted sums, likewise for the implementation of street trees on the highway.

It is expected that all modifications / improvements to the public highway are achieved with a maximum carbon footprint of 40%. Materials used during this process must also be a minimum of 40% recycled and fully recyclable. Developers will be expected to demonstrate that these standards can be met prior to planning conditions being discharged. The developer is to agree the above with MCC's Statutory Approvals and Network Resilience Teams post planning approval and prior to construction taking place.

It is recommended that footways are 2.0m minimum (clear of street furniture and other obstructions) in width to accommodate double buggies and other residents/visitors with restricted mobility.

Travel Plan

A Framework Travel Plan should be submitted as part of the forthcoming planning application.

For a Travel Plan to be successful, it will be dependent on establishing a culture of sustainable travel behaviour at the outset, rather than on changing already established travel practices. The success of Travel Plan measures will depend on their effective delivery and commitment from the occupier and therefore robust arrangements for the implementation and running of the Travel Plan need to be included in the Framework Travel Plan from the outset. These include:

- A travel plan budget and resources for the implementation and day to day management of travel plan measures;
- Appropriate management structures;
- Detailed time frames for the delivery;
- Handover arrangements for the travel plan or its components when the developer's responsibility ceases; and
- Targets and monitoring arrangements.

The full Travel Plan should include tailored measures to overcome specific barriers, or take advantage of opportunities, presented by the site.

The development, submission, implementation and monitoring of a Full Travel Plan will be conditioned with any planning consent.

Highways Reference: 16306/PREAPP/2024

Outlook

**EIASCO/24/005, mayfield scoping report phase 1b Mayfield (plots J and K - residential units)**

**From** Sue Jones [redacted]
**Date** Wed 13/11/2024 13:25
**To** Angela Leckie <angela.leckie@manchester.gov.uk>

Hi Angela

I have reviewed the Scoping and Screening Report and comment as follows:

**Air Quality**
We agree that air quality will be scoped into the EIA. It is accepted that the application site is within the Greater Manchester Air Quality Management Area (map available at: https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/aqma/maps) and the  chapter will assess the effects associated with emissions of NO2 and PM10/PM2.5 generated by construction and operational traffic and will consider the impact on existing sensitive receptors, future receptors introduced by the development, and the potential for cumulative effects with other schemes.

**Noise and Vibration**
Environmental Health can agree the noise assessment will be scoped into the EIA. The Chapter to include current baseline conditions and will assess the potential for temporary construction noise and vibration, changes in road traffic noise, noise from entertainment uses, and noise from building services plant. This should include existing sensitive receptors and future sensitive receptors.

*I am unsure whether Mayfield Depot (as it forms part of the wider site plan) will still operate as existing once this development has been completed, if so they will need to capture the noise levels from the WHP when it is in operation.

**Contaminated Land**
Environmental Health can agree the ground assessment will be scoped into the EIA. A Preliminary Risk Assessment and Site Investigations have been carried out.

Kind regards

Sue

Sue Jones
Environmental Protection
Environmental Health
The Neighbourhoods Directorate
Growth & Neighbourhoods
Manchester City Council
Hammerstone Road Depot
Gorton
Manchester
M18 8EQ

External Tel: [redacted]
email: [redacted]
website: www.manchester.gov.uk

**We are now on X (formerly Twitter), for latest news and updates follow us @EnvHealthMcr**

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

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

Outlook

**CONSULTATION RESPONSE: EIASCO/24/005**

**From** Diane Jackson [redacted]
**Date** Tue 22/10/2024 13:26
**To** Angela Leckie <angela.leckie@manchester.gov.uk>

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

Reference: EIASCO/24/005
Location: Manchester Phase 1b, Mayfield
Our Reference: 2024/353

Dear Angela,

Thank you for consulting with the aerodrome safeguarding authority for Manchester Airport on this Scoping Opinion Request for the EIA for 2-4 Whitworth Street West, Manchester.

We agree with the statements in the Report at Chapter 3 with regards to aviation. It will be necessary to undertake impact assessments for potential radar interference and infringement of protected surfaces (OLS & IFPs). It is likely that mitigation measures can be made to resolve any negative impacts if found.

We do endorse the value of promoting early engagement with stakeholders and the only judge of whether there will be a radar interference issue is NATS. We would therefore urge consultation with them to discuss the implications of proposals as they take shape.

Sincerely,

Diane Jackson - MAG Group Aerodrome Safeguarding Team
**Stansted Airport | East Midlands Airport | Manchester Airport**

MAG, 3rd Floor, Olympic House, Manchester Airport, M90 1QX
m: [redacted]
e: [redacted]
www.magairports.com




**Disclaimer**

The information contained in this email and accompanying data are intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and / or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, the use of this information or any

disclosure, copying or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete all copies of this message and attachments.

Any statements or email signatures contained in this email shall not bind MAG contractually unless specifically stated.

Please note that MAG monitors incoming and outgoing mail for compliance with its Information Security policy. This includes scanning emails for computer viruses.

For more information about the MAG Group please visit; http://www.magworld.co.uk

Our main operating entities are MAG Airport Limited, a private limited company, registered in England under Company Number 11748654, with the Registered Office at 6th Floor, Olympic House, Manchester Airport, Manchester, United Kingdom, M90 1QX; Manchester Airport PLC, a public limited company, registered in England under Company Number 01960988, with the Registered Office at Manchester, Professional Services Limited, PO BOX 532, Town Hall, Manchester, M60 2LA; Stansted Airport Limited, is a private limited company, registered in England under Company Number 01990920, with the Registered Office at Enterprise House, Stansted Airport, Bassingbourn Road, Essex CM24 1QW; East Midlands International Airport Limited, a private limited company, registered in England under Company Number 02078271, with the Registered Office at East Midlands Airport, Pathfinder House, Castle Donington, Derby, East Midlands, DE74 2SA; Manchester Airport Group US Holdings Inc, 101 N Wacker Dr STE 101A, Chicago, IL 60606.

**Disclaimer**

The information contained in this email and accompanying data are intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and / or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, the use of this information or any disclosure, copying or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete all copies of this message and attachments.

Any statements or email signatures contained in this email shall not bind MAG contractually unless specifically stated.

Please note that MAG monitors incoming and outgoing mail for compliance with its Information Security policy. This includes scanning emails for computer viruses.

For more information about the MAG Group please visit; http://www.magworld.co.uk

Our main operating entities are MAG Airport Limited, a private limited company, registered in England under Company Number 11748654, with the Registered Office at 6th Floor, Olympic House, Manchester Airport, Manchester, United Kingdom, M90 1QX; Manchester Airport PLC, a public limited company, registered in England under Company Number 01960988, with the Registered Office at Manchester, Professional Services Limited, PO BOX 532, Town Hall, Manchester, M60 2LA; Stansted Airport Limited, is a private limited company, registered in England under Company Number 01990920, with the Registered Office at Enterprise House, Stansted Airport, Bassingbourn Road, Essex CM24 1QW; East Midlands International Airport Limited, a private limited company, registered in England under Company Number 02078271, with the Registered Office at East Midlands Airport, Pathfinder House, Castle Donington, Derby, East Midlands, DE74 2SA; Manchester Airport Group US Holdings Inc, 101 N Wacker Dr STE 101A, Chicago, IL 60606.

Outlook

**Planning Application Reference: EIASCO/24/005**

**From** Leamey, Helen [redacted]
**Date** Fri 25/10/2024 14:12
**To** Angela Leckie <angela.leckie@manchester.gov.uk>

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

**Your Ref: EIASCO/24/005**
**Our Ref: DC/24/2594**
**Location: Phase 1B Mayfield Manchester**
**Proposal: Request for Scoping opinion under Part 4, Regulation 15 of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended)**

Dear Planning Team

United Utilities wish to make the following comments regarding the proposal detailed above.

Whilst we have no specific comments to make on the scoping report, we would be grateful if you could advise the applicant of the following comments:

*According to our records, there are sewers and water mains sited adjacent to the proposed site boundary. The precise location of these assets (and their associated easement strips) will need to be confirmed by the applicant and any future development must not encroach on these assets or the associated maintenance strips.*

*We wish to highlight our free pre-application service for developers to discuss and agree drainage strategies and water supply requirements. We cannot stress highly enough the importance of developers contacting us as early as possible. If the applicant hasn't already done so, they can take advantage of our free pre-development service by emailing SewerAdoptions@uuplc.co.uk or by visiting our website https://www.unitedutilities.com/builders-developers/your-development/planning/pre-development-guidance/. To discuss how the proposal interacts with the water mains assets we recommend the applicant contacts DeveloperServicesWater@uuplc.co.uk.*

Please feel free to contact me should you have any further queries.

Kind regards

United Utilities
Water for the North West

**Helen Leamey MRTPI**
Town Planner
Planning, Landscape and Ecology
Asset Management
unitedutilities.com

**Please note I am not available on Mondays**

Our Planning Team can be contacted by email at [redacted]

**If you have received a great service today why not tell us?**
**Visit: unitedutilities.com/wow**

The information contained in this e-mail is intended only for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain legally privileged or confidential information or otherwise be exempt from disclosure. If you have received this Message in error or there are any problems, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message from your computer. You must not use, disclose, copy or alter this message for any unauthorised purpose. Neither United Utilities Group PLC nor any of its subsidiaries will be liable for any direct, special, indirect or consequential damages as a result of any virus being passed on, or arising from the alteration of the contents of this message by a third party.

United Utilities Group PLC, Haweswater House, Lingley Mere Business Park, Lingley Green Avenue, Great Sankey, Warrington, WA5 3LP
Registered in England and Wales. Registered No 6559020

www.unitedutilities.com
www.unitedutilities.com/subsidiaries